

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
JOHN OWEN COLLECTION

THE WORKS OF  
JOHN OWEN  
VOLUME 22

*by John Owen*

**Books For The Ages**  
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA  
Version 1.0 © 2000

# THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

EDITED BY

**WILLIAM H. GOOLD**

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE EPISTLE

# TO THE HEBREWS

**HEBREWS 8:1-10:39**

VOLUME 22

*This Edition of*  
*THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN*  
*first published by Johnstone & Hunter, 1855*

## CHAPTER 8

THERE are two general parts of this chapter

1. A further explication of the excellency of the priesthood of Christ, or of Christ himself as vested with that office, — that is, both in his personal glory and in the usefulness of his office unto the church, — above those of the order of Aaron.
2. A further confirmation hereof; wherein is introduced the consideration, of the two covenants, the old and the new. For unto the former was the whole administration of the Levitical priests confined; of the latter, Christ, as our high priest, was the mediator and surety. And therefore the apostle fully proves the excellency of this new covenant above the old; which redounds unto the glory of its mediator.

The first part is contained in the first five verses; the latter extends from thence to the end of the chapter.

In the first part two things are designed:

1. A *recapitulation* of some things before delivered.
2. The *addition* of some further arguments in the confirmation of the same truth, so long before insisted on. Both of them he compriseth in three instances of the excellency of Christ in his priesthood, or in the discharge of his office:
  1. In his *exaltation* and the place of his present residence, verse 1.
  2. In the *sanctuary* whereof he is a minister, and the tabernacle wherein at present he doth administer, verse 2.
  3. In the *sacrifice* he had to offer, or which he offered before his entrance into that sanctuary, verse 3; which he illustrates by two especial considerations, verses 4, 5.

## VERSE 1.

Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὅς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

Κεφάλαιον. Syr., ܢܫܘܩܐ, “caput.” Vulg., “capitulum,” “summa.” Beta, “caeterum eorum quae diximus haec summa est,” “moreover this is the sum of what we speak;” “summatim autem dicendo,” “to speak briefly.”

Ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις. Syr., ܥܘܠܡܐܝܗܘܢ, “of all these things;” the head, chief, or principal of all these things. Vulg., “super ea quae dicuntur.” Rhem., “the sum concerning these things which he said.”

Τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν. Syr., “We have an high priest, him who sitteth;” omitting this word, or including it in ܢܫܘܩܐ, “is,” “ille.”

Τῆς μεγαλωσύνης. Vulg., “magnitudinis;” which the Rhemists render by “majesty;” and they retain “sedis” for θρόνου. Beza, “majestatis illius;” or, “throni virtutis magnificandi.”<sup>f1</sup>

**Ver. 1.**—Now of the things that are spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.

This first verse contains two things:

1. *A preface* unto that part of the ensuing discourse which immediately concerns the priesthood of Christ, unto the end of verse 5.
2. *A declaration* of the first pre-eminence of our high priest; which the apostle would have us in an especial manner to consider.

**First**, The preface is in these words, κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις: which may be considered either as unto its design in general, or as unto the sense of the words: —

1. The design of the apostle in this interlocution (which is not unusual with him), is to stir up the Hebrews unto a diligent consideration of what he insisted on, and to leave an impression of it on their minds. And this he doth for two reasons: —

(1.) Lest *the length and difficulty* of his preceding discourse should have any way discomposed their minds, or wearied them in their attention, so as that they could not well retain the substance of what he pleaded. In such cases it was always usual with them who pleaded important causes before the wisest judges, to recapitulate what had been spoken at length before, and to show what hath been evinced by the arguments they had used in their plea. To this purpose speaks Quintilian, lib. 6: cap. i.: “Perorationis duplex ratio est posita, aut in rebus, aut in affectibus. Rerum repetitio et congregatio, quae Graece dicitur ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, a quibusdam Latinorum enumeratio, et memoriam iudicis reficit, et totam simul causam ante oculos ponit; et etiam si per singula minus moverat, turba valet. In hac, quae repetemus quam brevissime dicenda sunt, et (quod Graeco verbo patet) decurrendum per capita.” How this whole course is steered by the apostle in this place is easy for any one to observe.

(2.) Because of the *importance of the matter* in hand. He is treating of the very head of all the differences between the law and the gospel, between those who adhered unto Mosaical institutions and those who embraced the faith. Hence he calleth them unto a renewed attention unto what he delivered. For herein he set life and death before them, and was zealous for them, and earnest with them, that they would choose life, and not die in their unbelief.

2. The sense of the words is to be considered. Κεφάλαιον is “capitulum,” “caput;” properly the “head” of any living creature. But the most frequent use of it is in a sense metaphorical, as it is here used by the apostle. And so it hath a double sense and use, whereunto it is principally applied (for it hath also other significations). For,

(1.) It is taken for that which is chief and principal in any matter, business, or cause. Κεφάλαιον ὅλου τοῦ πράγματος, Isoc.; — “The head of the whole business.” κεφάλαιον δὴ παιδείας, κέγομεν τὴν ὀρθὴν τροφήν, Plato, de Legib., lib.; — “The principal thing in education or instruction.” And so is “caput” used among the Latins: “Caput est in omni procuracione negotii et muneris publici, ut avaritiae pellatur etiam minima suspicio;” — “This is the chief or principal thing

in the management of all public affairs, that all suspicion of covetousness be far away.”

(2.) It is taken for the sum and substance of what hath been spoken or declared, reduced into a short scheme: Ὡς δὲ ἐν κεφαλῷ εἰπεῖν, — “Ut summam dicam,” Demosthenes. And so some render these words “summam dicendo.” And Isocrates hath an expression directly answering that of the apostle in this place, Nicoc.: **Κεφάλαιον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων**, — “The sum of what hath been spoken.” So **שֵׁר**, “caput,” the “head,” is used in the Hebrew: **בִּי תִשָּׂא אֶת-רֹאשׁ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל**, <sup><000></sup>Exodus 30:12; — “When thou takest the head” (the “sum”) of the children of Israel.” So also <sup><000></sup>Numbers 4:2. And in this sense is **ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι**, used by our apostle, as some think, <sup><000></sup>Ephesians 1:10: but it may have another sense in that place.

In whether of these two significations it is here used by our apostle, will best appear from the consideration of what it is applied unto, — **ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις**. For these words also are capable of a double interpretation.

(1.) **Ἐπί** may be put for **ἐν**, “in” or “among;” and then the things themselves treated of may be intended. And if so, **κεφάλαιον** requires the first signification, “the chief and principal thing” or “matter:” ‘Among all the things treated of, this is the principal;’ — as indeed it is, and that which all other things in debate did depend upon.

(2.) If **ἐπί** be in a manner redundant, and no more is intended but **τῶν λεγομένων**, “of the things spoken,” then **κεφάλαιον** is to be taken in the second signification, and denotes a recapitulation of them: ‘This is that which my arguments amount unto, the sum of what I have pleaded.’

Both these senses are consistent. For the apostle in this and the ensuing verses doth both briefly recapitulate what he had evinced by his preceding arguments, and also declare what is the principal thing that he had contended for and proved. I incline unto the latter signification of the word, respected in our translation; yet so as that the former also is true, and safely applicable unto the text.

And some directions we may take from the wisdom of the apostle in this management of his present subject, in our preaching or teaching of spiritual things; for, —

**Obs. I.** When the nature and weight of the matter treated of, or the variety of arguments wherein it is concerned, do require that our discourse of it should be drawn forth unto a length more than ordinary, it is useful to refresh the minds and relieve the memories of our hearers, by a brief recapitulation of the things insisted on. — It is so, I say, sometimes; as this way is taken once, and but once, by our apostle. When it is necessary, is left unto the wisdom and choice of those who are called unto this work. I mean, of such who, laboring diligently and conscientiously in the discharge of it, do really consider at all times what is for the benefit and edification of their hearers. But this is to be done only on great and important occasions. The usual way of the repetition of the heads of sermons before preached, is, in my judgment, useless and unprofitable.

**Obs. II.** When doctrines are important, and such as the eternal welfare of the souls of men are immediately concerned in, we are by all means to endeavor an impression of them on the minds of our hearers. — Be they never so precious and worthy of all acceptance, oftentimes they will not obtain an entrance into men's minds, unless they have an edge ministerially put upon them. Wherefore they are by all suitable means, with gravity and zeal, to be called unto a diligent attendance unto them. Weight is to be laid doctrinally, in their delivery, on things that are of weight really in themselves.

And this is the first part of this verse, or the preface of what ensues,

Secondly, The second part of it, in the following words, contains *the first general pre-eminence* of our high priest, and that taken from his *present and eternal state or condition*. And there are three things considerable in the words:

1. Our *relation* unto this high priest.
2. The *general denotation* of him.
3. His *eminency and dignity* in particular above all others.

1. Our *relation unto him* is expressed in the word ἔχομεν, “we have.” For the apostle, together with his assertion of the priesthood of Christ, and the declaration of the nature of it, doth frequently intersert the mention of our interest therein, or our relation unto him in the discharge of that office: “Such an high priest became us,” <sup><3023></sup> Hebrews 7:26; “We have not an high priest that cannot,” etc., <sup><3045></sup> Hebrews 4:15; “The high priest of our profession,” <sup><3001></sup> Hebrews 3:1; and here, “We have such an high priest.” And to the same purpose, “We have an altar,” <sup><3030></sup> Hebrews 13:10. And three things the apostle seems to design herein: —

(1.) The *dignity of the Christian church*, as now separated from the church of the Jews. In all their confidence in their worship, that which they principally boasted of was their high priest and his office. He was anointed with the holy oil. He wore the garments that were made “for beauty and for glory.” He had on his forehead a plate of gold with that glorious inscription, “Holiness unto Jehovah.” And he alone entered into the holy place, having made expiation for the sins of the people. The Christians, who were now separated from them, they despised, as those who had no lot nor portion in all this glory; — no such visible high priest as they had. So the same persons were afterwards reproached by the Pagans, that they had neither temples, nor altars, nor images or visible deities. So hard was it to call off the carnal minds of men from things visible and sensible in divine worship, unto those that are spiritual and heavenly. And herein lies the reproach of degenerated Christians, especially those of the Roman church, that whereas the gospel, in asserting the pure, heavenly, spiritual worship of God, had prevailed against the world, and triumphed over all that is carnal, invented to please the senses and satisfy the superstitious minds of men; they have made themselves the scorn and spoil of their conquered enemies, by returning to the same kind of worship, in various degrees, which was before destroyed and triumphed over.. And as therein they seem to make a public acknowledgment, that the gospel, in the management of their predecessors, had much injured the world, in the introduction of a worship spiritual and divine, excluding all those visible glories which it had found out to entertain the minds of men; so it will appear in the issue that they have made themselves transgressors, by building up what was before destroyed. But the primitive Christians did still oppose the spiritual worship of



sanctified souls, in the observation of the institutions of Christ, unto all the pretences of glory and beauty pleaded to be in their outward forms. So the apostle here, to evince the dignity of the Christian church against the unbelief of the Jews, pleads their relation unto an *invisible, spiritual high priest*, exalted in glory and dignity far above all that they could enjoy by virtue of a carnal commandment. ‘Whatever you think of us, whatever you boast of yourselves, “we have an high priest;”’ and that such an one as he immediately declares.

(2.) He would teach us, that whatever be the glory and dignity of this high priest, *without an interest in him*, without an especial relation unto him, unless “we have an high priest,” *we are not concerned therein*. Many do give their assent unto this truth, that Christ is a high priest; but how or wherein he is so to *them* they know not, nor yet do they make any use of him as such. Yea, unto many, the principal mysteries of the gospel are but mere notions and barren speculations; what it is to be practically influenced by them, and to live in the power of them, they know not. That there is a high priest, they believe, but what it is for them to have a high priest, they cannot understand. But this is that we are to look after, if we intend any benefit by it. And we may know whether we have a high priest or no, really and substantially, by the use which we make of him as such in all our approaches unto God. For he presides over the whole house of God, and all the sacred services thereof. None can come unto the Father but by him. Through him have we boldness, through him have we ability, through him have we access unto and acceptance with God. He presents both our persons and duties unto him. Without a daily improvement by faith of the office of Christ unto these ends, it cannot be said that we have a high priest.

(3.) That the office of the priesthood of Christ is confined unto the *church*, unto believers. Theirs he is, and *for them alone* doth he administer before God in this office.

2. There is a general *denotation* of this priest, as to his *qualifications*, in the word *τοιοῦτον*. He doth not now say, that ‘we have an high priest,’ only; nor ‘another high priest, not according to the ordinances of the law,’ — which he had proved before, from the type of Melchisedec and the testimony of the psalmist; but moreover such an one as hath that dignity

and those excellencies which he now ascribes unto him. The salvation of the church doth not depend merely on its having a high priest, — which yet in itself is absolutely necessary thereunto, — but on his dignity and excellency, his exaltation and glory.

Wherefore it is affirmed of him, that he is “such an high priest as is set on the right hand of the throne of the glorious Majesty in the heavens.” And two things we must consider in these words:

(1.) The *design* of the apostle in them; and,

(2.) Their particular *interpretation*: —

(1.) The design of the apostle, as we observed before, was not to prove the *reality* of his priesthood, that he was truly a priest; nor yet absolutely the qualifications of his person; but his dignity and excellency. For our LORD Jesus Christ, when he was on the earth, and whilst he offered up to God his great propitiatory sacrifice, was, as unto his outward state and condition, inferior unto the Levitical high priests, who were in great honor and veneration among the people. But the state and condition of any in the bearing and discharge of an office is not to be esteemed and reckoned from what he condescends unto, with respect unto any action or duty belonging unto that office, — for a king may condescend unto very mean services, when the condition of his subjects and good of the kingdom require it of him, — but it is to be reckoned from his durable estate, and perpetual abode therein. Now, although our LORD Christ was for a season in a condition of deep humiliation, taking on him “the form of a servant,” and being esteemed even as “a worm, and no man,” — which was necessary unto the sacrifice he had to offer, — yet as unto his durable state, wherein he continues in the discharge of his office, he is incomparably exalted above all the high priests under the law. And this is that which the apostle designs here to declare. For what did the high priest do, after he had offered the anniversary sacrifice of expiation unto God? He entered, indeed, into the holy place with the blood of the sacrifice, presenting it there before the august pledges of the presence of God; but all the while he was there, he stood before the typical throne, or ark and mercy-seat, with holy awe and reverence; and immediately on the discharge of his present duty, he was to withdraw and go out of the holy place. A great privilege this was, and a great honor was herein put on the high priest; for all others,

both priests and people, were everlastingly excluded out of that sanctuary. But what is this unto the glory of our high priest? For after he had offered his great sacrifice unto God, he “entered not into the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself.” And he entered, not to stand with humble reverence before the throne, but to sit on the throne of God, at his right hand. Nor did he do so to abide there for a season, but for evermore.

(2.) As to the words themselves, we may observe, that the apostle *three times* in this epistle maketh use of them with some little variety, <sup><SOD></sup>Hebrews 1:3, 12:2, and in this place. <sup><SOD></sup>Hebrews 1:3, “He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;” where there is no mention of the throne. <sup><SOD></sup>Hebrews 12:2, “He is set down at the right hand of the throne of God;” where “*Majesty*” is not added. Here we have both, “The right hand of the throne of the Majesty.” In the first place, the glory of his kingly power is intended; in the last, his exaltation and glory, as they ensued on his sufferings; and in this place, the declaration of his glory in his priestly office. The same glory and advancement hath respect unto various acts and powers in the LORD Christ: —

[1.] The manner of his enjoyment of this dignity and glory is expressed in the word ἐκάθισεν, “he sat down.” Hereof there was nothing typical in the legal high priest, who never sat down in the holy place. But as he was in many things typed by the Levitical priests, so in what they could not reach unto, he was represented in Melchisedec, who was both a king and a priest. And hence he is prophesied of as “a priest upon his throne,” <sup><SOD></sup>Zechariah 6:13. And the immutable stability of his state and condition is also intended.

[2.] The dignity itself consists in the place of his residence, where he sat down; and this was ἐν δεξιᾷ, “at the right hand.” See the exposition hereof, <sup><SOD></sup>Hebrews 1:3.

[3.] This right hand is said to be τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης. There is frequent mention in the Scripture of the throne of God. A throne is “insigne regium,” —an ensign of royal power. That intended by it is the manifestation of the glory and power of God, in his authority and sovereign rule over all.

[4.] This throne is here said to be *τῆς μεγαλωσύνης* of “Majesty,” or “glorious greatness and power;” that is, of God himself, for his essential glory and power are intended. “The right hand of the throne of Majesty,” is the same with “the right hand of God;” only God is represented in all his glory, —as on his throne. Christ is set down at the right hand of God, as considered in all his glorious power and rule. Higher expression there cannot be used to lead us into a holy adoration of the tremendous invisible glory which is intended. And this is the eternal stable condition of the LORD Christ, our high priest, —a state of inconceivable power and glory. Herein he dischargeth the remaining duties of his mediation, according as the nature of his especial offices do require. In this state doth he take care to provide for the application of the benefits of his oblation or sacrifice unto believers; and that by intercession, whereof we have spoken.

[5.] Thus is he said to be *ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, —“in the heavens;” as in the other place *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, “in the highest,” —that is, heavens. And by “the heavens” here, not these visible, aspectable heavens are intended, —for with respect unto them he is said to be “exalted above all heavens,” and to have “passed through them,” —but it is that which the Scripture calls “the heaven of heavens,” <sup>11027</sup>1 Kings 8:27, wherein is the especial residence and manifestation of the glorious presence of God. With respect hereunto our Savior hath taught us to call on “our Father which is in heaven.” And from the words we may observe, that, —

**Obs. III.** The principal glory of the priestly office of Christ depends on the glorious exaltation of his person. —To this end is it here pleaded by the apostle, and thereby he evinceth his glorious excellency above all the high priests under the law. To evidence and make useful this observation, the things ensuing are to be observed: —

**1.** The divine nature of Christ is capable of no real exaltation by an *addition of glory*, but only by the way of *manifestation*. So God absolutely is often in the Scriptures said to be “exalted;” —that is, he is so when he himself, by any acts of grace or providence, makes the eternal glory of his power, his holiness, or any other property of his nature, manifest and conspicuous; or when others ascribe unto him the glory and praise that are his due. So only may the LORD Christ be exalted, or made glorious, with respect unto his divine nature, wherein he is essentially “over all, God

blessed for ever.” And there is in this way an exaltation or manifestation of glory peculiar and proper unto the person of Christ, as distinct from the persons of the Father and the Holy Spirit; for he did in a peculiar way and manner for a season forego and leave his glory, as to the manifestation of it. For

“being” (essentially) “in the form of God, and counting it not robbery to be equal with God,” yet he “made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant,”

<PHI>Philippians 2:6, 7.

In his incarnation, and his whole converse on the earth, he cast a veil over his eternal glory, so as that it appeared not in its own native lustre. Those, indeed, who believed on him,

“beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth,” <JOH>John 1:14;

but they saw it “darkly,” and “as in a glass,” during the time of his humiliation. But after his resurrection his glory was unveiled, and made conspicuous, even when he was

“declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead,” <ROM>Romans 1:4.

**2.** The person of Christ, as to his divine nature, was always *on the throne*, and is incapable of the exaltation here mentioned, of sitting down at the right hand of it. Although “he came down from heaven,” although “he descended into the lower parts of the earth,” although he was exposed unto all miseries, was “obedient unto death, the death of the cross,” wherein “God redeemed his church with his own blood,” yet did he all this in the human nature that he assumed. His divine person can no more really leave the throne of majesty than cease to be. So he saith of himself,

“No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven,” <JOH>John 3:13,

His ascension into heaven in this place, which preceded the actual ascension of his human nature, is nothing but his admission into the knowledge of heavenly things, of all the secrets of the counsel of God (see <JOH>John 1:18, <MAT>Matthew 11:27); for it is of the knowledge of heavenly

mysteries that he is there discoursing with Nicodemus. In his incarnation, he came down from heaven, assuming a nature upon the earth; —the highest condescension of God, And whereas the acting of his power on the earth is often called his coming down from heaven, <sup><182></sup>Genesis 18:21, <sup><261></sup>Isaiah 64:1, how much more may this infinite condescension of the second person in assuming our nature be so called! But yet he was still in heaven; —”the Son of man, which is in heaven.” In his divine nature he was still on the throne of majesty; for this being an inseparable property of divine authority, he could never really forego it. Then, —

**3.** It is the human nature of Christ, or Christ in his human nature, or with respect unto it, that is *capable of this real exaltation*, by a real *addition of glory*. It is not the manifestation of his glory with respect unto his human nature, but the real collation of glory on him after his ascension, that is intended. This the whole Scripture testifieth unto, namely, a real communication of glory unto Christ by the Father, after his ascension, which he had not before. See <sup><221></sup>Luke 24:26; <sup><271></sup>John 17:24; <sup><423></sup>Acts 2:33, 5:31; <sup><510></sup>Romans 14:9; <sup><101></sup>Ephesians 1:20-23; <sup><310></sup>Philippians 2:9-11; <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 1:3, 12:2; <sup><102></sup>1 Peter, 1:21; <sup><152></sup>Revelation 5:12. And concerning this glory given him of God, we may observe, —

**(1.)** That it is not *absolutely infinite and essentially divine glory*. This cannot be communicated unto any. A creature, as was the human nature of Christ, cannot be made God, by an essential communication of divine properties unto it. Neither are they so communicable, nor is that a capable subject of their inhesion. Wherefore they speak dangerously who assert a real communication of the properties of the one nature of Christ unto the other, so as that the human nature of Christ shall be omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient: neither doth the union of the two natures in the person of Christ require any more the transfusion of the divine properties into the human, than those of the human into the divine. If, therefore, by that union, the human nature should be thought to be rendered subjectively omnipotent and omnipresent, the divine, on the other hand, must become limited and finite. But whatever belongs unto Christ with respect unto either nature, belongs unto the person of Christ; and therein he is all that he is in either nature; and in both hath done and doth what in either of them he hath done and doth, they yet continuing distinct in their essential properties.

(2.) Yet this exaltation and glory of Christ in his human nature is not only absolutely above, but also of another kind, than the utmost of what any other *created being* either hath or is capable of. It is more than any other creature is capable of, because it is founded in the union of his person; — a privilege which no other creature can ever pretend unto, or be made partaker of unto eternity, <sup><small>SCD</small></sup> Hebrews 2:16. This renders his glory in his exaltation of another kind than that of the most glorious creatures in their best condition. Again, it consists greatly in that power and authority over the whole creation, and every individual in it, and all their concerns, which is committed unto him. See our explanation hereof at large on <sup><small>SCD</small></sup> Hebrews 1:3.

4. This exaltation of the person of Christ gives *glory unto his office*, as the apostle here declares. It is the person of Christ which is vested with the office of the priesthood, or God could not have “redeemed the church with his own blood;” although he exercises all the duties of it, both here below and above, in the human nature only. And it is the person of Christ which is thus exalted and made glorious, although the especial subject of this exaltation and glory be the human nature only. And this gives glory unto his office; for, —

(1.) This is a manifest pledge and evidence of the *absolute perfection of his oblation*, and that “by one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.” When the high priest of old appeared for a while in the holy place, he returned again unto his former station, that he might be in a condition to offer another sacrifice at the return of the year; and hence doth our apostle prove that none of the worshippers were perfected by those sacrifices. But our high priest, having offered himself once for all, now sitting down for ever at the right hand of God, in glory and majesty inconceivable, it is evident that he hath fully expiated the sins of all that come unto God by him. And this declares the glory of his office.

(2.) By his glorious power he makes *all things subservient unto the ends of his mediation*; for he is given to be “head over all things to the church.” All things are in his power and at his disposal, as he is exalted at the right hand of God; and he will assuredly make them all work together for the good of them that do believe. And, —

(3.) He is able to render *the persons and duties of believers accepted* in the sight of God. To present them unto God is the great remaining duty of his office. That they be so, is their only real concern in this world, and that alone which their minds are principally exercised about. And what greater security can they have hereof than the interest and glory which this their high priest hath in heaven? <sup>1</sup> John 2:1, 2.

## VERSE 2.

The *second pre-eminence* of our LORD Christ as our high priest, which the apostle calls over in this summary of his discourse, is contained in this second verse.

**Ver. 2.** — Τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος.

Λειτουργός, “minister.” Τῶν ἁγίων. Vulg. Lat., “sanctorum.” Rhem., “of the holies.” Syr., **ܩܘܕܫܬܐ ܩܘܕܫܬܐ**, “of the holy house,” or “domus sanctuarii;” “of the house of the sanctuary.” “Sanctuarii,” “of the sanctuary,” as we shall see. **Ἦν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος.** Vulg. Lat., “quod fixit Deus;” which God hath fixed” or “pitched.” Rhem., “which our LORD pight;” following the original as to the word **Κύριος.** Syr. **ܐܠܗܐ** “God” **ܘܠܐ ܒܝ ܢܫܐ** “and not a son of man.” Some copies of the Vulgar Latin, “Dominus.”

**Ver. 2.** — A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the LORD pitched, and not man.

There are two parts of these words, expressing, —

1. What is affirmed of our high priest; namely, that he was “a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle.”
2. An amplification of what is so affirmed, by the description and distinction of this tabernacle; “which the LORD fixed, and not man.”

In the first also there are two things: —

1. The assertion of his office; he is “a minister.”



2. The assignation and limitation of his discharge of that office; it is “the sanctuary and true tabernacle.”

1. It is affirmed that he is **λειτουργός**, “a minister.” Having declared the glory and dignity which he is exalted unto, as “sitting down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven,” what can be further expected from him? There he lives, eternally happy in the enjoyment of his own blessedness and glory. Is it not reasonable it should be so, after all the hardships and miseries which he, being the Son of God, underwent in this world? Who can expect that he should any longer condescend unto office and duty? Neither generally have men any other thoughts concerning him. But where, then, would lie the advantage of the church in his exaltation, which the apostle designs in an especial manner to demonstrate? Wherefore unto the mention of it he immediately subjoins the continuation of his office. He is still **λειτουργός**, —a “public minister” for the church.

**Λειτουργέω** is “to minister,” either with God or before God, as a priest for others; or for God, in the name of God towards others, as do magistrates and ministers of the gospel. And therefore all these sorts are called **λειτουργοί**, or said to be **λειτουργῆσαι**. The LORD Christ is expressly spoken of here as a priest; it is a name of his priestly office, wherein he acts towards God. Nor is he anywhere called or said to be **διάκονος** in any of his actings from God towards us; although he be said therein to be **διάκονος**, <sup>ROMANS</sup> Romans 15:8: that is, he was so in the days of his flesh, but that name now no way belongeth unto him. He is not therefore styled “a minister,” because he executeth the purposes of God towards us, as Schlichtingius fancieth; but he acts towards God and before God on our behalf, according to the duty of a priest. He went into heaven to “appear in the presence of God for us,” and to discharge his office before God on our behalf. And it is granted also, that by virtue thereof he doth also communicate all good things from God unto us; for the whole administration of things sacred between God and the church is committed unto him. And we must observe, that, —

**Obs. I.** The LORD Christ, in the height of his glory, condescends to discharge the office of a public minister in the behalf of the church. — We are not to bound our faith on Christ as unto what he did for us on the

earth. The life and efficacy of the whole of his mediation depend on what he did antecedently thereunto, and what he doth consequently unto it; for in these things doth the glory of his love and grace most eminently appear. Antecedently unto what he did on earth, and to make way for it, there was his infinite condescension in *assuming our nature*. He was “in the form of God,” and in the eternal enjoyment of all the blessedness which the divine nature is essentially accompanied withal. Yet being thus “rich,” this was his “grace,” that “for our sakes he became poor.” This ineffable grace and love of Christ is the principal object of our faith and admiration, as it is declared by the apostle, Phillipians 2:6-9. And as he “emptied himself,” and laid aside his glory for a season, to undertake the work of mediation; so now he hath *resumed his glory*, as to the manifestation of his divine power, and hath the highest addition of glory in his human nature, by his exaltation at the right hand of God, yet he continueth his care of and love towards the church, so as to discharge the office of a public minister in their behalf. As all the shame, reproach, misery, with death, that he was to undergo on the earth, deterred him not from undertaking this work; so all the glory which he is environed withal in heaven diverts him not from continuing the discharge of it.

2. There is a limitation of this ministration of our high priest, with respect unto its proper object, and that in a double expression. For he is a minister,

(1.) *Τῶν ἁγίων.*

(2.) *Τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθιῆς.*

(1.) He is so *τῶν ἁγίων*. The word may be either of the masculine or of the neuter gender, and so respect either persons or things. If it be taken in the former way, it is of the saints. And this is the ordinary sense of *ἅγιοι* in the books of the New Testament, — “saints,” or “holy persons.” But they cannot be here precisely intended; and the apostle useth this word frequently in another sense in this epistle. *Τῶν ἁγίων*, from *ἅγιοι*, of the neuter gender, may have a double signification:

[1.] Of holy things in general;

[2.] Of holy places: —

[1.] Of things. So the Vulg. Lat. renders the word, “sanctorum;” which the Rhemists translate “holies;” that is, of holy persons or holy things. And ours place “holy things” in the margin. And the sense is true, if the signification of the word be extended unto all holy things; for the ministration of them all is committed unto Jesus Christ. But the word hath yet a more peculiar signification.

[2.] The inmost part of the tabernacle our apostle calls ἅγια ἁγίων, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:3; that is, קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים, —the “holy of holies,” “the most holy place.” And absolutely he calls it ἅγια, “the holies,” <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:8, 12, 25, 25, 13:11. And in answer thereunto, he calleth our spiritual presence before God, whereunto we have an access by the blood of Christ, by the same name, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 10:19. And hence the word is rendered by most interpreters, “the sanctuary;” as by the Syriac, “the house of the sanctuary;” — particularly that part of the tabernacle whereinto the high priest entered alone, and that but once a year. Take this sanctuary properly and literally, and Christ was not the minister of it. He never entered into it, nor could, nor had any right so to do; because it belonged and was appropriated unto others, as our apostle declares, verse 4.

Wherefore we must take our direction herein from the words following. For mentioning the whole tabernacle, as he doth here one part of it, namely, the sanctuary, he gives it a note of distinction from the old tabernacle of Moses, —“the true tabernacle.” So must “the sanctuary” be distinguished from that of old. It is that which answers thereunto. And this is nothing but *heaven itself*. Heaven, not as considered absolutely, but as the place of God’s glorious presence, the temple of the living God, where the worship of the church is presented, and all its affairs transacted. This is called God’s sanctuary, <sup><300></sup>Psalms 102:19:

“He looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the LORD behold the earth.”

And so the apostle himself plainly interprets this place, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:24:

“Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself.”

And this is called “the sanctuary,” because there doth really dwell and abide all that was typically represented in the sanctuary below. And

therein doth the LORD Christ discharge his priestly office for the good of the church. It was a joyful time with the church of old, when the high priest entered into the holy place; for he carried with him the blood wherewith atonement was made for all their sins. Yet he was quickly again to leave that place, and his ministration therein. But our high priest abides in the sanctuary, in the holy place, for ever, always representing the efficacy of the blood whereby atonement was made for all our sins. As no interposition between heaven and us should discourage us, while Christ is there ministering for us; so his being there will draw our hearts and minds thither continually, if so be we are really interested in his holy ministrations. These things are to some in darkness and obscurity; if not wholly out of their sight, yet out of their practice. In their faith, worship, and obedience, they find no concernment in the heavenly ministrations of this high priest. Things within the veil are hid from them. Yet would such persons be esteemed Christians. But the relief, the direction, the consolation, which true believers do or may, in the due exercise of faith, receive by the consideration hereof, are gracious and pleasant, yea, full of glory.

(2.) The second part of the limitation of the ministration of our high priest is in these words, **καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς**, —”and of that true tabernacle;” which is further described by its efficient cause, expressed both positively and negatively, “which the LORD pitched, and not man.”

Expositors generally agree that by “true” in this place, that which is substantial, solid, and abiding, is intended; for it is opposed unto that which is umbratile, transitory, and figurative. The old tabernacle could in no sense be said to be false, or deceiving; for it was an ordinance of God, set up and used by his appointment, and gave true directions unto its proper end. But it was figurative and typical, denoting somewhat that was to be the true and substantial tabernacle of God. So is the expression interpreted, <sup>415</sup>John 6:32,

“Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven;”

—that is, spiritually substantial and abiding, nourishing the soul unto eternal life.

But what is the “tabernacle” here intended, deserves our diligent inquiry. And I find a fourfold sense to be given of these words, “the true tabernacle:” —

[1.] Some (as Grotius) take it for “this whole universe, the fabric of heaven and earth.” This some, even among the heathen, have called “the tabernacle and temple of God.” This he hath made as it were to dwell in, as a certain fixed place for the manifestation of his glory. And whereas the ministry of Christ, at least as unto the effects of it, is not confined unto any certain place, above or below, to no material tabernacle or temple, the whole universe is called his tabernacle, as being that which is true, substantial, and abiding. And thus it may answer what is affirmed of “all power being given unto him in heaven and in earth,” and his being “given to be the head over all things unto the church.” I see nothing absurd in this opinion, nor contradictory unto the analogy of faith. But the design of the apostle in using these words and expressions, will not allow this to be his especial meaning; for somewhat he doth intend that the old tabernacle did typify and represent, which it did not the fabric of the universe, but that especial pattern which was showed unto Moses in the mount.

[2.] Some, with more probability, do judge that by “the true tabernacle,” the universal spiritual, catholic church,” is intended; for this is compared expressly unto a tabernacle, <sup>2311</sup>Isaiah 33:20, 54:2. And herein doth God dwell, and walk amongst men. Hereof Christ may be said to be the minister; for as he is the head of it, so he dwelleth in it. And it is undoubtedly in the behalf of this tabernacle that he continueth to administer in the holy place; and all the benefits of his ministration do redound hereunto. But yet all this doth not suffice to have the LORD Christ called the minister of this tabernacle. This, indeed, is that which he ministereth for; but it is not that which he ministereth by. The tabernacle and the things contained in it were the means of worship, and that which was materially employed in divine service; which the catholic church answereth not unto. Neither was the tabernacle of old, which is here alluded unto, a type of the church, but of Christ himself.

[3.] Most expositors take “the tabernacle,” as they do “the sanctuary,” for *heaven itself*. And they would have the word “true,” by a zeugma, to belong unto the sanctuary as well as unto the tabernacle; which we have

also before allowed. But yet this proveth not that the sanctuary and the tabernacle must be the same, though both be equally true in the same sense. This way go the Greek expositors, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and OEcumenius, on the place. And because this tabernacle is said to be “fixed of God,” Chrysostom reproacheth them who say that the heavens do move and are spherical, though he never had a prophetic dream of the Copernican hypothesis, But yet, as Beza well observes, they forsook their own interpretation on <sup><RBH></sup> Hebrews 9:11, 12, where the tabernacle is spoken of in the same sense that here it is. But besides the reasons that shall be given immediately for another interpretation, two things will not comply with this: For, *1st.* There is no reason why the apostle should express the same thing, first under the name of the *sanctuary*, and then of a *tabernacle*. *2dly.* There is no especial reason why it should be added peculiarly concerning the heavens, “which God hath fixed, and not man;” for this was never questioned.

[4.] I say, therefore, that by this “true tabernacle,” the human nature of the LORD Christ himself is intended. *Hereof* he is the minister; *herein* doth he minister before God above. For, —

**1st.** Hereof the old tabernacle was a type. Thence is the expression taken, and thereunto is opposition made in the epithet, “true.” This, therefore, is our best direction and rule in the interpretation of this expression. For look what that type did signify, what was to be the substantial antitype of it, — that is the “true tabernacle,” whereof the LORD Christ is the minister; for all agree that it is called “true” in opposition and answer unto that which was umbratile and figurative. Now that tabernacle was not erected to be a type of heaven, nor is any such thing intimated in the Scripture. A token, pledge, and means it was, of God’s presence with his people here on earth, of his nearness unto them; whence also he is said to “dwell among them.” But this he doth really and substantially only through Christ. He therefore alone is this “true tabernacle.” For, —

**2dly.** In answer hereunto, when he was incarnate, and came into the world, it is said that ἐσκήνωσε, “he fixed his tabernacle among us,” <sup><RBH></sup> John 1:14; that is the signification of the word which we have translated to “dwell,” because the tabernacle of old was the way and

means of God's dwelling among the people, in the pledges of his gracious presence. All that old curious structure, for a habitation for God, did only represent his taking our nature upon him, fixing his tent thereby among men. What was the pattern of this tabernacle, showed unto Moses on the mount, we must inquire, on verse 5.

**3dly.** He himself called his *own body* his temple, with respect unto the temple of Jerusalem, which was of the same nature and use with the tabernacle, <sup><412></sup>John 2:19-22. And this he did, because his body was that true, substantial temple and tabernacle whereof he was the minister.

**4thly.** That is the true tabernacle, which God truly and really inhabiteth, and on the account whereof he is our God. This was the nature, use, and end of the tabernacle of old. God dwelt therein, in the signs and pledges of his presence; and was on the account thereof the God of that people, according to the terms of the covenant between them, <sup><123></sup>Exodus 25:8; <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:3. That, therefore, wherein God *dwells really and substantially*, and on the account whereof he is our God in the covenant of grace, that, and no other, is the true tabernacle. But this is in Christ alone; for "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," <sup><511></sup>Colossians 2:9. Thus the human nature of Christ is that true, substantial tabernacle, wherein God dwelleth personally.

**5thly.** He is the only way and means of our approach unto God in holy worship, as the tabernacle was of old; which we have elsewhere declared.

That alone which seems to be of any force against this interpretation, is, 'That the human nature of Christ is that whereby he is the minister of this tabernacle; it cannot therefore be the tabernacle itself wherein he doth administer: and therefore the place of his abode must be intended by the tabernacle whereof he is the minister.'

*Ans.* By the same rule it would follow, that because Christ is the high priest, he is not the sacrifice; for the priest and the sacrifice among men cannot be the same. Howbeit Christ offered himself only. And the reason of these things is, that he was in his own person, and what he did therein, to answer all those types of priest, sacrifice, altar, tabernacle, and what belonged thereunto. He was the body and substance of them all,

<sup><5027</sup>Colossians 2:17. No one of them was able to represent the fullness of grace that was to be in Christ; therefore were there many of them ordained, and those of various sorts. And therefore his being eminently intended in one of them, no way hinders his being so in another. He was all in himself, —priest, tabernacle, altar, and sacrifice.

Again; The efficient cause of this true tabernacle is declared, both positively and negatively; “which the LORD pitched, and not man,” —**ἦν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος**. It is in the article **ἦν** confined unto the tabernacle, and extends not unto the sanctuary mentioned before; “of the true tabernacle, which the LORD pitched.” And hereby this tabernacle is distinguished from both the sanctuaries, the typical here below, and the real above, even heaven itself; for it was not of the same building with either of them, as the apostle declares, <sup><5011</sup>Hebrews 9:11.

<sup><5012</sup>**ἔπηξεν**, “pitched,” “fixed.” It is a word proper unto the erection and establishment of a tabernacle. The fixing of stakes and pillars, with the fastening of cords thereunto, was the principal means of setting up a tabernacle, <sup><5013</sup>Isaiah 54:2. The preparation of the human nature or body of Christ is that which is intended. “A body hast thou prepared me,” <sup><5014</sup>Hebrews 10:5. And this body was to be taken down, and folded up for a season, and afterwards to be erected again, without the breaking or loss of any part of it. This of all buildings was peculiar unto a tabernacle, and so was it with the body of Christ in his death and resurrection.

<sup><5015</sup>**ὁ Κύριος**. The author of this work was “the LORD.” This is the word or name whereby the writers of the New Testament do express the name Jehovah. And whereas, in the revelation of that name, God declared that self-subsisting firmitude and unchangeableness of his nature, whereby he would infallibly give subsistence unto his word, and accomplishment unto his promises, the apostle hath respect unto it in this great work, wherein all the promises of God became “yea and amen.” How this tabernacle was prepared and fixed immediately by the Holy Ghost, acting the infinite power of God alone therein, I have at large elsewhere declared.

It is added negatively, “and not man.” Some suppose a pleonasm in the words, and that this expression is redundant; for to say it was pitched by God, sufficiently includes that it was not done by man. But the expression is emphatical, and the apostle hath an especial design in it; for, —



1. The old tabernacle itself may in some sense be said to be pitched by God. It was done by his *command*, order, and direction, as were all other ordinances of his appointment. But it cannot be said that God pitched it, and not man; which excludes the whole service and ministry of man: for the ministry of men was used in the preparation, framing, and erection of it. But the pitching of this “true tabernacle” was the work of God alone, without any ministry or service of men: “A body hast thou prepared me.”
2. The apostle hath an especial respect unto the incarnation of Christ, without the concurrence of man in natural generation. This is expressed in answer unto that inquiry of the blessed Virgin, “How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?” <sup><113></sup>Luke 1:34, 35.

This was “the true tabernacle, which the LORD pitched,” and whereof Christ is the “minister.” And we may observe, —

**Obs. II.** That all spiritually sacred and holy things are laid up in Christ. — All the utensils of holy worship of old, all means of sacred light and purification, were all placed and laid up in the tabernacle. And these were all “patterns of the heavenly things themselves,” which are all laid up in Christ, “the true tabernacle.” They are all enclosed in him, and it will be in vain to seek for them elsewhere. For,

**Obs. III.** He hath the ministration of all these holy things committed unto him. — He is the minister both of the sanctuary and tabernacle, and of all things contained in them. Herein he stands in no need of help or assistance; nor can any take his work out of his hand.

**Obs. IV.** The human nature of Christ is the only true tabernacle, wherein God would dwell personally and substantially. — The dwelling of God with men was ever looked on as an infinite condescension. So Solomon expressed it, in his prayer at the dedication of the temple,

“But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee,” <sup><107></sup>1 Kings 8:27.

But there are various degrees of this condescension, various kinds of this inhabitation of God among men. Under the old testament, he dwelt in the tabernacle and temple, by many symbols and pledges of his glorious presence. Such in especial were the ark and mercy-seat; whence that which

was done before the ark is said to be done “before the LORD,” <sup>Exodus</sup> 30:8. This was, as Solomon expresseth it, a great condescension in the infinite, incomprehensible God; and there was a great glory accompanying this his presence. Under the new testament, God dwelleth in his saints by his Spirit, whereby they become a holy temple unto him. And of this inhabitation of God I have treated elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> But his dwelling in the human nature of Christ is quite of another nature than either of these; and his love with his condescension, inconceivably more conspicuous than in them.

Hence is that expression of our apostle: “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” <sup>Colossians</sup> 2:9. It is not any sign or token, it is not any effect of the divine power, goodness, and grace, that dwells in him, but “the fullness of the Godhead;” that is, the divine nature itself. And this dwelleth in him “bodily;” that is, by the assumption of the body or the human nature into personal subsistence with the Son of God. How glorious should this be in our eyes! How did they admire the condescension of God of old, in his dwelling in the tabernacle and temple by the glorious signs of his presence! and yet was it all but a dark representation and shadow of this glorious love and grace, whereby he dwells in our nature in Christ.

**Obs. V.** The church hath lost nothing by the removal of the old tabernacle and temple, all being supplied by this sanctuary, true tabernacle, and minister thereof. —The glory and worship of the temple was that which the Jews would by no means part withal. They chose rather to reject Christ and the gospel than to part with the temple, and its outward, pompous worship. And it is almost incredible how the vain mind of man is addicted unto an outward beauty and splendor in religious worship. Take it away, and with the most you destroy all religion itself; —as if there were no beauty but in painting; no evidence of health or vigor of body, but in warts and wens. The Christians of old suffered in nothing more, from the prejudice of the whole world, Jews and Gentiles, than in this, that they had a religion without temples, altars, images, or any solemnity of worship. And in later ages men ceased not, until they had brought into Christianity itself a worship vying for external order, ceremony, pomp, and painting, with whatever was in the tabernacle or temple of old; coming short of it principally in this, that *that* was of God’s

institution for a time, *this* of the invention of weak, superstitious, and foolish men. Thus is it in the church of Rome. And a hard thing it is to raise the minds of men unto a satisfaction in things merely spiritual and heavenly. They suppose they cannot make a worse change, nor more to their disadvantage, than to part with what is a present object and entertainment unto their senses, fancies, carnal affections, and superstitions, for that which they can have no benefit by, nor satisfaction in, but only in the exercise of faith and love, inclining us to that within the veil. Hence is there at this day so great a contest in the world about tabernacles and temples, modes of worship and ceremonies, which men have found out in the room of them which they cannot deny but God would have removed; for so they judge that he will be satisfied with their carnal ordinances in the church, when the time is come that he would bear his own no longer. But “unto them that believe Christ is precious” And this “true tabernacle,” with his ministration, is more unto them than all the old pompous ceremonies and services of divine institution, much more the superstitious observances of human invention.

**Obs. VI.** We are to look for the gracious presence of God in Christ only. — Of old all the tokens and symbols of God’s presence were confined unto and included in the tabernacle. There were they to be found, and nowhere else. Many altars the people of old did erect elsewhere, many high places they found out and prepared: but they were all sin and misery unto them; God granted his presence unto none of them all, <sup><XIII></sup>Hosea 8:11, 12:11. And many ways there are whereby men may and do seek after the presence of God, after his favor, and acceptance with him, not in and by this “true tabernacle:” but they labor in vain, and spend their strength for that which doth not profit; neither the love, nor grace, nor goodness, nor mercy of God, is elsewhere to be found, nor can we by any other way be made partakers of them.

**Obs. VII.** It is by Christ alone that we can make our approach unto God in his worship. — All sacrifices of old were to be brought unto the door of the tabernacle. What was offered elsewhere was an abomination to the LORD. With the instruments, with the fire, with the incense that belonged unto the tabernacle, were they to be offered, and not otherwise. And it is now by Christ alone that we have an “access in one Spirit unto the Father,” <sup><XIV></sup>Ephesians 2:18. He is the only way of going to him, <sup><XV></sup>John

14:6. And it is in and by his blood that he hath “consecrated a new and living way” unto the holy place, <sup><309></sup>Hebrews 10:19, 20.

**Obs. VIII.** It was an institution of God, that the people in all their distresses should look unto and make their supplications towards the tabernacle, or holy temple, <sup><1089></sup>1 Kings 8:29, 30. —And it is unto the LORD Christ alone, who is both the true tabernacle and the minister thereof, that we are to look in all our spiritual distresses.

**Obs. IX.** If any one else can offer the body of Christ, he also is the minister of the true tabernacle. —For the LORD Christ did no more. He did but offer himself; and they that can offer him, do put themselves in his place.

### VERSE 3.

The summary description of our high priest designed is carried on in this verse. And the apostle manifests, that as he wanted nothing which any other high priest had, that was necessary unto the discharge of his office, so he had it all in a more eminent manner than any other had.

**Ver. 3.** — Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ ζυσίας καθίσταται· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτο ὁ προσενέγκη.

**Καθίσταται εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν.** Syr., **קָטַרְתָּ מִן־בְּנֵי־בַיִת** “qui stat ut offerat,” “who standeth” (that is, at the altar) “that he may offer;” rendering **καθίσταται** neutrally, the whole sense is imperfect, “For every high priest who standeth” (at the altar) “that he may offer gifts and sacrifices; therefore,” etc.

**Δῶρα.** Syr., **מִנְחָה**, “*oblationem*.” Vulg., “munera.” Some rather use “dona,” and some “donaria,” “sacred gifts.”

**Καὶ ζυσίας.** Syr., **זָבְחֵי**, that is **זָבְחֵי־קָדְשִׁים**, “sacrifices.” Vulg., “hostias;” and the Rhemists, “hosts;” —It may be to countenance their name of the host in the mass.

**Ἀναγκαῖον.** Syr., **הָיָה צְדָקָה**, “justum erat,” “aequum erat;” “it was just and equal.” Vulg., “necesse est,” in the present tense; “it is necessary.”

Beza, “necesse fuit,” “it was necessary;” properly: and so the Syriac renders the verb substantive understood in the original, or included in the infinitive mood following, in the preterimperfect tense.

”Ἐχειν, “habere,” “hunt habere.” Syr., **לְהָנָא דְיְהוֹנָא לְה** “huic ut esset ei;” “to this man that there should be to him,” or “with him.”

”Ὁ προσενεγκῆ. Vulg., “aliquid quod offerat;” “something that he may offer.” Syr., **מָדָם דְּנִקְיָב**, “something that he should offer.” The Arabic adds, “for himself,” corruptly.

**Ver. 3.** —For every high priest is ordained [*appointed*] to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity [*it was necessary*] that this man [*should*] have somewhat also to offer.

The connection of these words unto what was before asserted, which giveth us the design of the apostle in them, is expressed in the causal conjunction, **γάρ**, “for.” He both giveth a confirmation of what he had before affirmed, —namely, — that Christ was the “minister of the true tabernacle,” that is, of his body, —and rendereth a reason why it should so be; and this he further confirms in the verses ensuing.

The reason he insists on is taken from the general nature of the office of “every high priest” That the LORD Christ is our high priest, he had sufficiently demonstrated and confirmed before; this, therefore, he now assumes as granted. And hereon what belongs unto him as such he further manifests, by showing what the nature of that office required, and what did necessarily belong unto every one that was partaker thereof.

There are therefore two things in the words:

1. A *general assertion* of the nature, duty, and office of every high priest.
2. A *particular inference* from thence, of what did necessarily belong unto the LORD Christ in the susception and discharge of this office.

In the first, **1.** The *universality* of the expression is to be observed: **Πᾶς ἄρχιερεύς**, —”Every high priest.” By the context, this universal is cast under a limitation with respect unto the law: “Every high priest” that is “made” or “appointed by the law;” for of those alone the apostle treateth.

There was, indeed, never any high priest accepted of God but those ordained by the law, yet was it necessary unto the apostle to make mention of the law also. And although they were many of them, yet were they all of the same order and office; and so were all alike authorized and obliged unto the same duties. Wherefore the apostle thus expresseth it by “every high priest,” to evidence that there lay no exception against his argument, seeing that, in the whole multitude of high priests, in their succession from first to last, there was no one but he was appointed unto this end, and had this duty incumbent on him. Yea, it is not one especial duty of their office, that might be omitted, which he insisteth on, but the general end for which they were ordained; as he expresseth it in the next word.

**2. Καθίσταται**, “is ordained;” that is, *appointed* of God by the law. Of the sense of this word I have spoken before, as also of the thing intended. See chapter <sup>SCHE</sup>5:1, 2.

**Obs. I.** God’s ordination or appointment gives rules, measures, and ends, unto all sacred offices and employments. —Whoever undertakes any thing in religion or divine worship without it, besides it, beyond it, is a transgressor, and therein worshippeth God in vain. He whom God doth not ordain in his service, is an intruder; and that which he doth not appoint is a usurpation. Nor will he accept of any duties, but what he himself hath made so.

**3.** The *principal end* why the high priests were ordained of God is expressed; it was “to offer gifts and sacrifices.”

This appears in their original institution, Exodus 28, 29.

**(1.)** They were to *offer*. God appointed Aaron and his successors, on purpose to offer gifts and sacrifices for the whole people.

**(2.)** *None but they were to offer*; that is, none but the priests were to offer, — none but they might approach unto God, to offer any thing sacredly unto him. The people might bring their offerings unto God; but they could not offer them on the altar. And some offerings, as those at the feast of expiation, were appropriated unto the high priests only. So is the case stated by Azariah, the high priest, <sup>CHRON</sup>2 Chronicles 26:18:

“Not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the LORD, but to the priests the sons of Aaron, who are consecrated;”

from <sup><ORIG></sup>Exodus 30:7, <sup><ORIG></sup>Numbers 18:7. And God hereby taught the people that nothing should ever be accepted from them, but in and by the hand of the great high priest who was to come. And this is that which we are yet taught thereby. And whoever he be, if as great and prosperous as king Uzziah, who shall think to approach unto God immediately, without the interposition of this high priest, he is smitten with the plague of spiritual leprosy.

4. *What they were to offer* is also declared: “gifts and sacrifices;” —δῶρα, “munera,” “donaria,” “dona.” Sometimes all קָרְבָּנִים, the “corbanim” in general, are intended by this word; for all sacred offerings, of what sort soever, are so called at their first institution, <sup><ORIG></sup>Leviticus 1:2: “If any one among you bring his corban unto the LORD.” And thereon the especial kinds of offerings and sacrifices are enumerated, which in general were all “corbanim.” So every thing that is brought unto the altar is called δῶρον, <sup><ORIG></sup>Matthew 5:23, 24: Προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρον, —“When thou bringest thy gift;” that is, קָרְבָּנֵיב קָרְבָּנֵיב, —to “offer gifts,” sacred gifts of all sorts, especially sacrifices properly so called. Or, by δῶρα the מִנְחֹת, “minchoth,” may be intended; as by ζυσίας the “zebachim” are. For these two contain the whole complex of sacred offering, For “zebachim,” or ζυσίαι, are bloody sacrifices, sacrifices by immolation or killing, of what sort soever the matter of it was, or unto what especial end soever it was designed; and the “minchoth” were offerings of dead things, as of corn, oil, meats, and drinks. To offer all these was the office of the priesthood ordained. And we are taught thereby, that,

**Obs. II.** There is no approach unto God without continual respect unto sacrifice and atonement. The principal end of sacrifices was to make atonement for sin. —And so necessary was this to be done, that the office of the priesthood was appointed for it. Men do but dream of the pardon of sin, or acceptance with God, without atonement. This the apostle layeth down as that which was necessary for “every high priest,” by God’s institution. There never was any high priest, but his office and duty it was to “offer gifts and sacrifices;” for unto that end was he ordained of God.

Secondly, Hence he infers that it was necessary that “this man should have somewhat to offer.” For being a minister of the heavenly sanctuary, and the true tabernacle, a high priest he was. But this he could not be, unless he had somewhat to offer unto God. A priest that hath nothing to offer, that was not ordained unto that end, is indeed no priest at all.

And in this assumption of the apostle we may observe,

1. The *note of inference*, “wherefore.”
2. The *designation* of the person spoken of, “this man.”
3. The *manner* of the ascription made unto him, “he must have.”
4. The *matter of it*, “somewhat to offer:” —

1. The note of inference is ὅθεν, “wherefore.” It is frequently used by the apostle in this epistle, when he proves his present assertions, from the old institutions of the law and their signification, <sup><3017></sup>Hebrews 2:17, <sup><3018></sup>3:1, 7:25, <sup><3019></sup>9:18. And the whole force of this inference, especially that in this place, depends on this supposition, that all the old typical institutions did represent what was really to be accomplished in Christ; whence it was “necessary” that he should be what they did signify and represent. Hence it is often observed in the Gospel, that he did or suffered such things, or in such a manner, because things were so ordered under the law.

2. The designation of the person is expressed: τοῦτον, “this man;” ‘he of whom we speak, this high priest of the new testament; — whom he had before described, and specified by his name, “Jesus;” and by his dignity, “the Son of God:” that “this man,” this Jesus, the high priest of the new testament.

3. The subject being stated, that which he affirms thereof is, that he, this priest, must have “somewhat to offer.” And this was “of necessity” that so it should be. For whatever otherwise this glorious person were, or might be, yet a high priest he could not be, unless he had somewhat to offer; for to offer gifts and sacrifices is the sole end of that office. This “necessity,” then, was absolute. For without this no office of priesthood could be discharged, and consequently no atonement be made, nor could we be brought unto God. And it is said that it was thus necessary ἔχειν, “that he should *have*.” And it is not possession only that is intended, but



possession with respect unto use. He was so to have somewhat to offer, as to offer it accordingly. For it would not avail the church to have a high priest that should have somewhat to offer, if it were not actually offered. Wherefore respect is had both unto the meetness of Christ unto his office and his faithfulness therein. *He had what to offer, and he did offer it.*

**4.** The matter of his offering is expressed: **τὶ ὁ προσενέγκη**, “somewhat to offer;” that is, in sacrifice unto God. The apostle expresseth it indefinitely, **τὶ ὁ**: but what it is which he was to have, he doth riot as yet declare. He was not engaged further by his present argument. But he elsewhere declares expressly what this was that he had to offer, what was the matter of his sacrifice, and what it was necessary that it should be. And this was “himself,” —his whole human nature, soul and body.

It may be it will be said, that it doth not necessarily follow, that if he have somewhat to offer, it must be *himself*; for he might offer somewhat else out of the flocks and herds, as they did of old. Nor, indeed, doth the apostle intend directly to prove it in this place, namely, that it must be himself which he must offer. But it doth necessarily follow from the arguments before insisted on, <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 7; for whatever else God had appointed or approved of to be offered in sacrifice, he had ordained the Levitical priesthood to offer, and appropriated the offering of it unto them; so as no such sacrifice could ever be offered by any who was not of the seed of Aaron. Whereas, therefore, our high priest was not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah, it is evident that he could not offer any of the things which were appropriated unto their ministry and service. And hence our apostle in the next verse affirms directly, that “if he were on the earth,” — that is, to officiate in his office with the things of the earth, after the manner of other priests, —he could not be so much as a priest at all; seeing all such services were appropriated unto and performed by the priests of another order. Again; if he might have done so, and accordingly had done so, our apostle manifests that his priesthood must have been ineffectual as unto the proper ends of it. For “the law could make nothing perfect;” not only because of the infirmity and imperfection of its priests, but also because of the insufficiency of its sacrifices unto the great ends of expiating sin, by whomsoever they were offered. For “it is impossible,” as he declares, “that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins,” or “purge the conscience” of the sinner, <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 10:1-4, etc.

Wherefore, as it was necessary that he should have somewhat to offer, so it was necessary that this somewhat should be himself, and nothing else.

Something must yet be added as unto the rendering of the words themselves, which influenceth their proper sense. Ἐνάγκη, “necessary,” “of necessity,” must have the verb substantive added, to determine its signification. Erasmus adds “est,” “it is necessary;” and we render it, “it is of necessity.” Beza supplies “fuit,” as doth the Syriac interpreter ܢܝܩܐ, “fuit,” “erat;” “it was necessary.” And so he renders ὁ προσενέγκη by “quod offerret,” “which he should offer;” in both respecting the time past. Others render it by “quod offerat,” “which he may offer;” with respect unto the time present or to come. And Beza gives this account of his translation, namely, that the apostle having respect unto the sacrifice of Christ, which was past, affirms that “*it was necessary* that he should have somewhat that he might offer;” and not that “*it is necessary* that he should have somewhat to offer.” And although I will not deny but that the Lord, by reason of the perpetual efficacy of his oblation, and the representation of it in his intercession, may be said to offer himself, yet his sacrifice and oblation of himself were properly on the earth, as I have fully proved elsewhere.

This text being urged by Grotius with respect unto the offering and sacrifice of Christ, Crellius replies, “Concludit scriptor divinus ex eo quod Christus sit sacerdos, necesse esse ut habeat quod offerat; non, ut loquitur Grotius, necesse fuisse ut haberet quod offerret, quasi de re praeterita loquatur,” Respons. ad cap. 10. But, as Beza very well observes, the apostle had before mentioned the one offering of Christ as already perfected and completed, <sup>scilicet</sup> Hebrews 7:27. He cannot, therefore, speak of it now but as that which was past; and here he only shows how necessary it was that he should have himself to offer, and so to offer himself, as he had done. And from these words we may observe, —

**Obs. III.** That there was no salvation to be had for us, no, not by Jesus Christ himself, without his sacrifice and oblation. — “It was of necessity that he should have somewhat to offer,” as well as those priests had of old according to the law. Some would have it that the Lord Christ is our Savior because he declared unto us the way of salvation, and gave us an example of the way whereby we may attain it, in his own personal obedience. But

whence, then, was it “of necessity that he must have somewhat to offer” unto God as our priest; that is, for us? For this belongeth neither unto his doctrine nor example. And it was necessary that he should have somewhat to offer, in answer unto those sacrifices of old which were offered for the expiation of sin. Nor could our salvation be otherwise effected, by any other acts or duties of our high priest; for the church could not be saved without taking away the guilt of sin. And the whole design of the priests and sacrifices of old, was to teach and instruct the church how alone this might be performed. And this was only by making atonement for it by sacrifice; wherein the beast sacrificed did suffer in the room of the sinner, and did by God’s institution bear his iniquity. And this our apostle hath respect unto, and the realizing of all those typical representations in Christ; without which his whole discourse is useless and vain. Wherefore there was no other way for our salvation, but by a real propitiation or atonement made for our sins. And whosoever looketh for it otherwise but in the faith and virtue thereof, will be deceived.

**Obs. IV.** As God designed unto the Lord Christ the work which he had to do, so he provided for him, and furnished him with whatever was necessary thereunto. —Somewhat he must have to offer. And this could not be any thing which was the matter of the sacrifices of the priests of old. For all those sacrifices were appropriated unto the discharge of the priesthood; and besides, they were none of them able to effect that which he was designed to do. Wherefore a body did God prepare for him, as is declared at large, <sup>3301</sup>Hebrews 10:1-8, etc.

**Obs. V.** The Lord Christ being to save the church in the way of office, he was not to be spared in any thing necessary thereunto. —And in conformity unto him, —

**Obs. VI.** Whatever state or condition we are called unto, what is necessary unto that state is indispensably required of us. —So are holiness and obedience required unto a state of reconciliation and peace with God.

#### VERSE 4.

Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ’ ἂν ἦν ἱερεὺς, ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων  
τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὰ δῶρα.

Vulg. Lat., “si esset super terrain;” all others, “in terra,” to the same purpose. Syr., **בְּאֶרְצָא**, “in the earth.” **Οὐδ’ ἄν ἦν ἱερεύς, כּוּמְרָא הוּא** **אִי לָא**, “even also he should not be a priest.” **Ὀντων τῶν ἱερέων**. The Vulgar omits **ἱερέων**, and renders the words, “cure essent qui offerrent.” Rhem., “whereas there were who did offer.” The Syriac agrees with the original. Beza, “manentibus illis sacerdotibus;” “quum sint alii sacerdotes.”

In the preceding discourses the apostle hath fully proved, that the *introduction of this new priesthood under the gospel had put an end unto the old*; and that it was necessary so it should do, because, as he had abundantly discovered in many instances, it was utterly insufficient to bring us unto God, or to make the church-state perfect. And withal he had declared the nature of this new priesthood. In particular he hath showed, that although this high priest offered his great expiatory sacrifice once for all, yet the consummation of this sacrifice, and the derivation of the benefits of it unto the church, depended on the following discharge of his office, with his personal state and condition therein; for so was it with the high priest under the law, as unto his great anniversary sacrifice at the feast of expiation, whose efficacy depended on his entrance afterwards into the holy place. Wherefore he declares this state of our high priest to be spiritual and heavenly, as consisting in the ministry of his own body in the sanctuary of heaven.

Having fully manifested these things, unfolding the mystery of them, he proceeds in this verse to show how necessary it was that so it should be,—namely, that he should neither offer the things appointed in the law, nor yet abide in the state and condition of a priest here on earth, as those other priests did. In brief, he proves that he was not in any thing to take on him *the administration of holy things in the church according as they were then established by law*. For whereas it might be objected, ‘If the Lord Christ was a high priest, as he pleaded, why then did he not administer the holy things of the church, according to the duty of a priest?’ To which he replies, that so he was not to do; yea, a supposition that he might do so was inconsistent with his office, and destructive both of the law and the gospel. For it would utterly overthrow the law, for one that was not of the line of Aaron to officiate in the holy place; and God had by the law made provision of others, that there was neither room nor place for his ministry. And the gospel also would have been of no use

thereby, seeing the sacrifice which it is built upon would have been of the same nature with those under the law. This the apostle confirms in this verse.

**Ver. 4.** —For indeed if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.

The words are a hypothetical proposition, with the reason or confirmation of it. The proposition is in the former part of the verse, “For indeed if he were on earth, he should not be a priest.” Hereof the remainder of the words is the reason or confirmation, “Seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.”

And we may consider first the causal connection, “for,” which relates unto what he had discoursed immediately before, as introducing a reason why things ought to be as he had declared. He had in sundry instances manifested his present state and condition, with the way and manner of the discharge of his office. A priest he was; and therefore he must have somewhat to offer; which must be somewhat of his own, seeing the law would not accommodate him with a sacrifice, nor yet the whole creation; the law having prepossessed unto its own use all that was clean and fit to be offered unto God. A sanctuary he must also have wherein to officiate; and this was to be heaven itself, because he was himself exalted into heaven, and set down at the right hand of God. And of all this there was yet another special reason: “For if he were on the earth,” etc.

“If indeed he were on earth.” The emphasis of the particle *μὲν*, is not to be omitted, — ‘If really it were so;’ for therein is force granted unto the concession that the apostle here makes: ‘Truly it must be so.’ “If he were on earth,” includes two things: —

**1.** *His continuance and abode on the earth:* —If he were not exalted into heaven in the discharge of his office; if he were not at the right hand of God; if he were not entered into the heavenly sanctuary, but could have discharged his whole office here on the earth, without any of these things. If he were thus on the earth, or thus to have been on the earth.

**2.** *The state and condition of his priesthood:* —If he were on the earth, or had a priesthood of the same order and constitution with that of the law; if he were to have offered the same sacrifices, or of the same kind with them,

which were to be perfected on the earth; if he were not to have offered himself, wherein his sacrifice could not be absolutely consummated without the presentation of himself in the most holy place not made with hands.

These two things the apostle was treating of:

1. His *present state and condition*, as to the sanctuary wherein he administered; which was heavenly.
2. His *sacrifice and tabernacle*; which was himself. In opposition unto both these is this supposition made, “If he were on the earth.”

This, therefore, is the full sense of this supposition, which is well to be observed, to clear the meaning of the whole verse, —which the Socinians endeavor with all their skill and force to wrest unto their heresy, —’If we did aver him to have such a priesthood as in the discharge thereof he were always to continue on the earth, and to administer in the sanctuary of the tabernacle or temple, with the blood of legal sacrifices.’ On this supposition the apostle grants that “he could not be a priest.” He had not been, or could not be so much as a priest, or a priest at all in any sense. That a priest he was to be, and that of necessity he must be so, had proved before. And on the occasion thereof he declares the nature of his sacrifice, tabernacle, and sanctuary; and now proves that they were so necessary for him, that without them he could not have been a priest.

It will be said, that he was a priest “on the earth;” and that therein he offered his great expiatory sacrifice, in and by his own blood. And it is true. But,

1. This was not “on the earth” in the sense of the law, which alone appointed the sacrifices on the earth; it was not in the way nor after the manner of the sacrifices of the law, which are expressed by that phrase, “on the earth.”
2. Although his oblation or sacrifice of himself was complete on the earth, yet the whole service belonging thereunto, to make it effectual in the behalf of them for whom it was offered, could not be accomplished on the earth. Had he not entered into heaven, to make a representation of his sacrifice in the holy place, he could not have been the high priest of the church from

that offering of himself; because the church could have enjoyed no benefit thereby. Nor would he ever have offered that sacrifice, if he had been to abide on the earth, and not afterwards to have entered the heavenly sanctuary to make it effectual. The high priest, on the great day of expiation, perfected his sacrifice for his own sin and the sins of the people without the tabernacle; but yet he neither could, nor would, nor ought to have attempted the offering of it, had it not been with a design to carry the blood into the holy place, to sprinkle it before the ark and mercy-seat, — the throne of grace. So was Christ to enter into the holy place not made with hands, or he could not have been a priest.

The reason of this assertion and concession is added in the latter part of the verse, “Seeing there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.”

ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων, “sacerdotibus existentibus,” “cum sint sacerdotes;” “whereas there are priests.” The apostle doth not grant that at that time when he wrote this epistle there were legal priests” de jure,” offering sacrifices according to the law. “De facto,” indeed, there were yet such priests ministering in the temple, which was yet standing; but in this whole epistle, as to right and acceptance with God, he proves that their office was ceased, and their administrations useless. Wherefore ὄντων respects the legal institution of the priests, and their right to officiate then, when the Lord Christ offered his sacrifice. Then there were priests who had a right to officiate in their office, and to “offer gifts according to the law.”

Two things are to be inquired into, to give us the sense of these words, and the force of the reason in them:

1. Why might not the Lord Christ be a priest, and offer his sacrifice, continuing on the earth to consummate it, notwithstanding the continuance of these priests according unto the law?
  2. Why did he not in the first place take away and abolish this order of priests, and so make way for the introduction of his own priesthood?
1. I answer unto the first, That if he had been a priest on the earth, to have discharged the whole work of his priesthood here below, whilst they were priests also, then he must either have been of the *same order* with them, or of *another*; and have offered sacrifices of the same kind as they did, or

sacrifices of another kind. But neither of these could be. For he could not be of the *same order* with them. This the apostle proves because he was of the tribe of Judah, which was excluded from the priesthood, in that it was appropriated unto the tribe of Levi, and family of Aaron. And therefore also he could not offer the same sacrifices with them; for none might do so by the law but themselves. And of *another order* together with them he could not be.; for there is nothing foretold of priests of several orders in the church at the same time. Yea, as we have proved before, the introduction of a priesthood of another order was not only inconsistent with that priesthood, but destructive of the law itself, and all its institutions. Wherefore, whilst they continued priests according to the law, Christ could not be a priest among them, neither of their order nor of another; that is, if the whole administration of his office had been upon the earth together with theirs, he could not be a priest among them.

**2.** Unto the second inquiry, I say the Lord Christ could not by any means take away that other priesthood, until he himself had accomplished all that ever was signified thereby, according unto God's institution. The whole end and design of God in its institution had been frustrated, if the office had ceased "de jure" before the whole of what was prefigured by its being, duties, and offices, was fulfilled. And therefore, although there was an intercision of its administrations for seventy years, during the Babylonish captivity, yet was the office itself continued in its right and dignity, because what it designed to prefigure was not yet attained. And this was not done till the Lord Christ ascended into the heavenly sanctuary, to administer in the presence of God for the church; for until then, the high priest's entering into the holy place in the tabernacle once a year had not an accomplishment in what was prefigured thereby. Wherefore there was not an end put unto their office and ministration by the oblation of Christ on the cross, but they still continued to offer sacrifices according to the law; for there yet remained, unto the fulfilling of what was designed in their whole office, his entering into the holy place above. Wherefore they were still to continue priests, until he had completed the whole *service* prefigured by them, in the oblation of himself, and entering thereon into the heavenly sanctuary.

This, therefore, is the sense of the apostle's reasoning in this place: The priests of the order of Aaron continued "de jure" their administrations of



holy things, or were so to do, until all was accomplished that was signified thereby. This was not done until the ascension of Christ into heaven; for the first tabernacle was to stand until the way was made open into the holiest of all, as we shall see afterwards. Now, the Lord Christ was not a priest after their order, nor could he offer the sacrifices appointed by the law. Hence it is evident, that he could not have been a priest had he been to continue on the earth, and to administer on the earth: for so their priesthood, with which his was inconsistent, could never have had an end; for this could not be without his entrance as a priest into the heavenly sanctuary.

It appears, therefore, how vain the pretense of the Socinians is, from this place to prove that the Lord Christ did not offer his expiatory sacrifice here on the earth. For the apostle speaks nothing of his oblation, which he had before declared to have been “once for all,” before he entered into heaven to make intercession for us; but he speaks only of the order of his priesthood, and the state and condition wherein the present administration of it was to be continued.

**Obs. I.** God’s institutions, tightly stated, do never interfere. —So we see those of the ancient priesthood and that of Christ did not. They had both of them their proper bounds and seasons; nor could the latter completely commence and take place until the former was expired. The entrance of Christ into the holy place, which stated him in that condition wherein he was to continue the exercise of his priesthood unto the consummation of all things, put an absolute period unto the former priesthood, by accomplishing all that was signified thereby, with a due and seasonable end unto all legal worship, as to fight and efficacy. When he had done all that was figured by them, he took the whole work into his own hand.

**Obs. II.** The discharge of all the parts and duties of the priestly office of Christ, in their proper order, was needful unto the salvation of the church. —His oblation was to be on the earth, but the continuation of the discharge of his office was to be in heaven. Without this the former would not profit us; if he had done no more he could not have been a priest. For,

1. As this dependeth on the *infinite wisdom* of God, ordering and disposing all things that concern the discharge of this office unto their proper times and seasons; so,

2. Believers do find in their own experience, how all things are suited unto their conditions and wants. Unless the foundation of a propitiation for their sins be first laid, they can have no hope of acceptance with God. This, therefore, was first done, in “the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” But when this is done, unless they have a continual application of the efficacy of it unto their souls, neither their peace with God nor their access unto God can be maintained. And this is done by the ministration of his office in the heavenly sanctuary, which ensues thereon.

### VERSE 5.

Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεκηρμάτισται Μωϋσῆς, μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνή· Ὅρα γὰρ, φησὶ, ποιήσης πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει.

Οἵτινες, “qui,” “ut qui;” “as those who.” **Λατρεύουσι**, “deserviunt,” “inserviunt.” Syr, **ܕܡܫܡܝܢܝܢ**, “who ministered,” (as in a sacred office); properly. **ὑποδείγματι**, “exemplari.” Rhem., “that serve the exemplar and shadow;” every way imperfectly. Syr., **ܠܕܡܘܬܐ**, “unto the similitude.” **Τῶν ἐπουρανίων**. Eras., “celestium.” Others, “rerum coelestium;” “of heavenly things.” Syr., **ܕܩܕܫܝܢܐ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ**. “of the things which are in heaven.” **Καθὼς κεκηρμάτισται**, “sicut responsum est Mosi.” Rhem., “as it was answered Moses.” **Κρηματισμός** is not an “answer,” but an “oracle,” given out upon inquiry, and so “any divine instruction.” “Quemadmodum divinitus dictum est.” “Admonished of God,” say we. Syr., **ܕܩܘܠܘܒܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ**, “it was spoken,” simply; which expresseth not the original.

**Ver. 5.** —Who serve [*in sacred worship*] unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, even as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.

1. We must first consider the *reading* of these words, by reason of the testimony which the apostle quotes out of the law, and his rendering thereof. The words in the original, <sup><0254></sup>Exodus 25:40, are, **בְּקֶרֶב וְרֵאשֶׁה**

וְעָשָׂה כַּתְּבֵנֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה מָרָא; — “And look” (or “take heed”) “and make after their pattern which was showed thee in the mount.” The apostle adds *πάντα*, “all things;” which is not in the original, nor in the version of the LXX. But,

(1.) He might take it from verse 9 of the chapter, where the word is expressed, *מָרָא אֶתְךָ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר אָנִי*; — “according unto all that I shall show thee.” (2.) Things indefinitely expressed are to be expounded universally: <sup><1089></sup>1 Kings 8:39, “And to give to every man according to his ways;” that is, <sup><4030></sup>2 Chronicles 6:30, “and render to every man according to all his ways.” <sup><5915></sup>Deuteronomy 19:15, “At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the month of three witnesses, shall the matter be established;” that is, <sup><4730></sup>2 Corinthians 13:1, “shall every word be established.” <sup><5810></sup>Psalms 110:1, “Until I make thine enemies thy footstool;” that is, <sup><4125></sup>1 Corinthians 15:25, “all enemies.” Wherefore the apostle, by the addition of *πάντα*, “all things,” says no more but what is expressed in one place, and necessarily understood in the other.

*כַּתְּבֵנֵיהֶם*, “according to their pattern,” or “the pattern of them,” the apostle renders by *κατὰ τὸ τύπον* only, “according to the pattern;” which comes all to one.

*Τύπος*. The word is from *בָּנָה*, to “bind;” and it is used for a prepared pattern or similitude that any thing is to be framed unto. So whereas the apostle renders it by *τύπος*, he intends *πρωτότυπος*, or *ἀρχέτυπος*, not *ἕκτυπος*, — such a type or pattern as other things are to be framed by, and not that which is the effigy or representation of somewhat else.

2. The *connection* of these words with the preceding discourse, which gives us the general design of the apostle, is nextly to be considered. He had before intimated two things:

- (1.) That the high priests according to the law did not minister the heavenly things;
- (2.) That the Lord Christ alone did so: whence he concludes his dignity and pre-eminence above them; — which is the argument he hath in hand.

Both these he confirms in these words. For he confines their ministry unto the types of heavenly things, exclusively unto the heavenly things themselves. And by showing, as in the verse preceding, that if Christ had been to continue on the earth he could not have been a priest, he manifests that he alone was to administer those heavenly things.

**3.** The argument in general whereby the apostle proves that “they served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,” —that is, only so, and no more, —is taken from the words of God to Moses. And the force of the argument is evident. For God in those words declares that there was something above and beyond that material tabernacle which was prescribed unto him; for he showed him either an original or an exemplar in the top of the mount, which what he was to do below did but shadow and represent. And therefore they who ministered in what he was to make could serve only therein to be “the example and shadow of heavenly things.” This, therefore, is the apostle’s argument from this testimony: ‘If God showed unto Moses on the top of the mount that which was heavenly, and he was to make an example or shadow of it; then they that ministered therein “served only unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.”’

In the words may be observed,

- 1.** The *persons* spoken of; “who.”
- 2.** *What is ascribed* unto them; they “serve.”
- 3.** The *limitation of that service*: wherein there is,
  - (1.)** The present *immediate object of it*; an “example and shadow:”
  - (2.)** The ultimate things intended; “heavenly things.”
- 4.** The *proof of the whole assertion*, from the words of God to Moses: wherein there is,
  - (1.)** The *manner* of the instruction given him; “he was warned of God:”
  - (2.)** The *instruction* or warning itself; “See that thou make,” etc.

**1.** There are the *persons* spoken of; οἵτινες, —”who.” It refers unto the priests mentioned verse 4, “Seeing there are priests that offer gifts; who.” But although that expression comprises the whole order of Levitical priests, yet it refers in particular unto the high priests, verse 3, Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεύς, —”Every high priest .....; which high priests.”

**2.** *What is ascribed unto them;* λατρεύουσι, —”do serve.” The general signification of the English word “to serve” is not intended, as any thing doth serve for an end, or one person serves another. For it is a sacred word, and signifies only to minister in sacred worship and service, as the Syriac translation renders it. And in particular, it respects here all the δικαιώματα λατρείας, “the ordinances of divine service,” which were appointed under the first tabernacle, <sup><800></sup>Hebrews 9:1. “They do serve,” — ‘They do, according unto the law, officiate in sacred things; that is, they did so “de jure,” in their first institution, and continue “de facto” so to do still.’ And the word λατρεύω is applied both unto the inward spiritual, and outward instituted holy worship of God. See <sup><400></sup>Matthew 4:10; <sup><400></sup>Acts 7:7; <sup><800></sup>Romans 1:9. It respects, therefore, all that the high priests did, or had to do, in the worship of God, in the tabernacle or temple.

**3.** The *limitation of their sacred service*, is, that it was ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ, —”to an example and shadow.” Δείγμα is a “specimen” of any thing; that whereby any thing is manifested by a part or instance. It is used in the New Testament only in Jude 7: Πρόκεινται δείγμα, —”Are set forth for an example,” (speaking of Sodom and Gomorrah,) or a “particular instance” of what would be God’s dealing with provoking sinners at the last day.

**(1.)** Δειγματίζω, which is framed of δείγμα, is but once used in the New Testament, <sup><500></sup>Colossians 2:15, where we render it to “make a show;” that is, a *representation* of what was done. ὑπόδειγμα, the word here used, is an “*example*” showing or declaring any thing in a way of instance: <sup><800></sup>John 13:15, ὑπόδειγμα ἔδωκα ὑμῖν, — “I have given you an example,” saith our Savior, when he had washed his disciples’ feet; that is, ‘showed you, in what I have done, what ye ought to do also.’ So <sup><500></sup>James 5:10, “Take, my brethren, the prophets for an example.” But whereas principally and commonly examples are patterns of other things, that which they are to be conformed unto, as in the places cited, <sup><800></sup>John 13:15, <sup><500></sup>James 5:10, this

cannot be the sense of it in this place; for the heavenly things were not framed and fashioned after the example of these, but on the contrary. Wherefore examples are of two sorts, “effigiantia” and “effigiata;” that is, *πρωτότυπα* and *ἔκτυπα*, —such as other things are framed by, or such as are framed by other things. In this latter sense it is here used; and I would choose to render it by a “resemblance.” It is less than *δείγμα*, “simile,” “quiddam,” — an obscure representation. Hence it is added, —

*Καὶ σκιῶ*, “and the shadow.” Some suppose a “shadow” is taken artificially, and opposed unto an express image or complete delineation of any thing, by a similitude taken from the first lines and shadows of any thing that is afterwards to be drawn to the life; and so they say it is used <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 10:1,

“The law had only a shadow of good things to come, and not the express image of the things themselves.”

But properly it is taken naturally, and opposed unto a body, or substance: <sup><300></sup>Colossians 2:17, “Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ.” It is indifferent in whether sense we here take the word, for what is affirmed is true in both. If we take it in the first way, it intends that obscure delineation of heavenly mysteries which was in the legal institutions. They did represent and teach them, and so were taught and represented in the divine service of those priests; but it was so obscurely, that none could see their beauty and excellency therein. If it be used in the latter way, then it declares that the substance of what God intended in all his worship was not contained nor comprised in the services of those priests. There were some lines and shadows, to represent the body, but the body itself was not there. There was something above them and beyond them, which they reached not unto.

(2.) The *things themselves* whence they are restrained by this limitation are expressed; “of heavenly things.” The things intended in these words are no other than what God showed unto Moses in the mount; and therefore we shall defer our inquiry into them until we come unto those words. This, therefore, is the meaning of the words: ‘The whole ministry of the priests of old was in and about earthly things, which had in them only a resemblance and shadow of things above.’ And we may observe by the way, —

**Obs. I.** God alone limits the signification and use of all his own institutions. —We ought not to derogate from them, nor to take any thing out of them which God hath put into them; nor can we put any thing into them that God hath not furnished them withal. And we are apt to err in both extremes. The Jews to this day believe that the ministration of their priests contained the heavenly things themselves. They do so, contrary to the nature and end of them, which the Scripture so often speaks unto. This is one occasion of their obstinacy in unbelief. They will imagine that there was nothing above or beyond their legal institutions, no other heavenly mysteries of grace and truth but what is comprised in them. They put more in them than ever God furnished them withal, and perish in their vain confidence.

It hath so fallen out also under the new testament. God hath instituted his holy sacraments, and hath put this virtue into them, that they should represent and exhibit unto the faith of believers the grace which he intendeth and designeth by them. But men have not been contented herewith; and therefore they will put more into them than God hath furnished them withal. They will have them to contain the grace in them which they exhibit in the way of a promise, and to communicate it unto all sorts of persons that are partakers of them. Thus, some would have baptism to be regeneration itself, and that there is no other evangelical regeneration but that alone, with the profession which is made thereon. Every one who is baptized is thereby regenerated. The sign and figure of grace, they would have to be the grace itself. Nothing can be invented more pernicious unto the souls of men; for all sorts of persons may be brought to a ruinous security about their spiritual condition by it, and diverted from endeavors after that real internal work, in the change of their hearts and natures, without which none shall see God. This is to put that into it which God never placed there. Some suppose it to be such a distinguishing, or rather separating ordinance, that the administration of it in such a way or at such a season, is the fundamental rule of all church fellowship and communion; whereas God never designed it unto any such end.

In the supper of the Lord, the church of Rome in particular is not contented that we have a representation and instituted memorial of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the signs of his body as broken and his

blood as shed for us, with an exhibition of grace in the word of promise, or the gospel; but they will have the natural body and blood of Christ, his flesh and bones, to be contained therein, and to be eaten or devoured by all that partake of the outward signs! This is to put that into the ordinance which God never put into it, and so to overthrow it. And there are two grounds or ends of what they do. The *first* is, to turn the *wisdom of faith* into a *carnal imagination*. It requires the light and wisdom of faith to apprehend the spiritual exhibition of Christ in the sacrament unto us. It is a great spiritual mystery, not at all to be apprehended but by the supernatural light of faith. This, the vain, darkened minds of men like not, they cannot away with it; it is foolishness unto them. Wherefore, under the name of a “mystery,” they have invented the most horrible and monstrous figments that ever befell the minds of men. This is easily received and admitted by a mere act of carnal imagination; and the more blind and dark men are, the more are they pleased with it. *Secondly*, They do it to *exclude the exercise of faith* in the participation of it. As they deal with the wisdom of faith as unto its nature, so they do with the exercise of faith as unto its use. God hath given this measure unto this ordinance, that it shall exhibit and communicate nothing unto us, that we shall receive no benefit by it, but in the actual exercise of faith. This the carnal minds and hearts of men like not. It requires a peculiar exercise of this grace, and that in a peculiar manner, unto a participation of any benefit by it. But this, under the notion of bringing more into the ordinance than ever. God put into it, they exclude, and ease all men of. Let them but bring their mouths and their teeth, and they fail not of eating the body and drinking the very blood of Christ. So, under a pretense of putting that in the ordinance which God never put into it, they have cast out of the hearts of men the necessity of those duties which alone render it useful and beneficial.

Some, on the other side, do derogate from them, and will not allow them that station or use which God hath appointed unto them in the church.

- (1.) Some do so from their *dignity*. They do so, by joining their own appointments unto them, as of equal worth and dignity with them.
- (2.) Some do so from their *necessity*, practically setting light by or disregarding the participation of them.



**(3.)** Some do so from their *use*, openly denying their continuance in the church of God.

The reasons why men are so prone to deviate from the will of God in his institutions, and to despise the measures he hath given them, are,

**(1.)** *Want of faith* in its principal power and act, which is submission and resignation of soul unto the sovereignty of God. Faith alone renders that an all-sufficient reason of obedience.

**(2.)** *Want of spiritual wisdom* and understanding to discern the mystery of the wisdom and grace of God in them.

**Obs. II.** It is an honor to be employed in any sacred service that belongs unto the worship of God, though it be of an inferior nature unto other parts of it. —It is so, I say, if we are called of God thereunto. This was the greatest honor that any were made partakers of under the old testament, that they “served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things” only. And if now God call any of us into his service, wherein yet, by the meanness of our gifts, or want of opportunities, we cannot serve him in so eminent a manner as some others do, yet if we abide in our station and duty, there is great honor in the meanest divine service.

**Obs. III.** So great was the glory of heavenly ministration in the mediation of Jesus Christ, as that God would not at once bring it forth in the church, until he had prepared the minds of men, by types, shadows, examples, and representations of it. —This was the end of all legal institutions of divine worship and service. And herein the wisdom of God provided in these to cases that were necessary.<sup>f3</sup>

**(1.)** He filled them with glory and beauty, that they might affect the minds of men with an admiration and expectation of that greater glory which they represented and pointed unto. And this they did among all them who truly believed; so that they continually looked and longed after the coming of Him, the glory of whose ministry was represented in them. In these two things did their faith principally act itself:

**[1.]** In a diligent inquiry into the mediation and ministry of Christ, with the glory which it was to be accompanied withal, <sup><600></sup>1 Peter 1:10, 11.

[2.] In earnest desire after the enjoyment of what they saw afar off, and which was obscurely represented unto them, <sup>2107</sup>Song of Solomon 2:17, 4:6. From both these arose that fervent love unto, zeal for, and delight in those ordinances of worship, which did so lead them unto these things that were so glorious; which in the Scripture are everywhere expressed, and which were so well-pleasing unto God.

(2.) On the other hand, because these institutions were to be so glorious, that they might be shadows of heavenly things, and the people unto whom they were given were carnal, and given to rest themselves in present outward appearances, God was pleased to intermix with them many services that were hard to be borne, and many laws with penalties severe and dreadful. This provision was laid in by divine wisdom, that they might not rest in what he designed only to prepare their minds for the introduction of that which was far more glorious. And well is it for us if we have a due apprehension of the glory of the heavenly ministration of Christ, now it is introduced. It is too evident that with many, yea, with most that are called Christians, it is far otherwise; for they are still seeking after the outward glory of a carnal worship, as though they had no view of the spiritual glory of the heavenly ministration of the gospel in the hand of Jesus Christ, our high priest. Nor will it be otherwise with any of us, unless we are enabled by faith to look within the veil, and see the beauty of the appearance of Christ at the right hand of God. The apostle tells us, that “the ministration of the law was glorious; yet had it no glory in comparison of that which doth excel.” But if we are not able to discern this more excellent glory, and satisfy ourselves therein, it is a great sign that we ourselves are carnal, and therefore are delighted with those things that are so. But we must proceed with our exposition.

4. The proof of the foregoing assertion is added by the apostle, in the words which God spake unto Moses with respect unto his building the tabernacle, which was the seat of all the divine service they were to administer. And there are two things to be considered in this testimony:

(1.) The *manner of its introduction*.

(2.) The *words of the testimony itself*: —

(1.) The words of the introduction are, **καθὼς κεχηρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς**,—"admonished of God." **Χρηματισμός** we render "the answer of God," <sup><510></sup>Romans 11:4: "But what saith unto him **ὁ χρηματισμός**,"—"the divine oracle;" a "responsum," a word or answer from God, giving caution or direction. And it is used principally for such an oracle of God as hath a warning or caution in it, for the avoiding somewhat on the one hand, as well as doing what is given in charge on the other. So Joseph was **χρηματισθείς**, "divinely warned" to avoid the danger that was designed unto the child Jesus, <sup><402></sup>Matthew 2:22; as the wise men were to avoid going unto Herod, verse 12. So <sup><510></sup>Hebrews 11:7, "Noah being **χρηματισθείς**,"—"divinely warned, was moved with fear." Yet sometimes it is used for any immediate private revelation, <sup><402></sup>Luke 2:26; <sup><402></sup>Acts 10:22. Wherefore two things are intended in this expression:

[1.] That Moses had an *immediate word*, command, or oracle, from God, to the purpose intended. And,

[2.] That he was to use *great caution* and heed about what was enjoined him, that there might be no miscarriage or mistake: "Admonished of God." And the manner of the expression in the original carrieth admonition in it: **הִשָּׁרְאָה יְעֻשָׂה**,—"And look to it and do," <sup><250></sup>Exodus 25:40; take diligent care about it. The same is the sense of **ὄρα**, when thus used, "take heed," "look well to it." When John, upon surprisal, would have fallen down before the angel to worship him, he replied, "**Ὁρα μὴ**,"—"See thou do it not," avoid it with care, <sup><620></sup>Revelation 22:9. The matter was of the greatest importance, and the utmost diligence was to be used about it; whence the divine oracle was given out in a way of charge and admonition, as we have well rendered the word. And we may observe, —

**Obs. IV.** That our utmost care and diligence in the consideration of the mind of God are required in all that we do about his worship. —There is nothing wherein men for the most part are more careless. Some suppose it belongs unto their own wisdom to order things in the worship of God as it seems most meet unto them; —an apprehension that I shall leave this world in admiration of, that ever it should befall the minds of so many good and honest men as it hath done. But the power of prejudice is inexpressible. Some think they are no further concerned in these things than only to follow the traditions of their fathers. This unto the

community of Christians is the only rule of divine worship. To suppose that it is their duty to inquire into the way and manner of the worship of God, the grounds and reasons of what they practice therein, is most remote from them. 'It was Moses that had the command to take care about the making of the tabernacle, and not the people. There was nothing left unto them but to do and observe what he had appointed.' And it is true; when God first reveals the way of his worship immediately from himself, as he did first by Moses, and last of all by his Son Jesus Christ, the people have nothing to do therewith, but only to observe and do what is appointed, as our Savior expressly declares, <sup>4181</sup>Matthew 28:20: but when his worship is so revealed and declared, there is not the meanest person, who professeth obedience unto him, who is exempted from this command of taking most diligent care about the due discharge of his duty herein. And this care and diligence are necessary, —

[1.] From the *aptness and proneness of the minds of men unto pernicious extremes in this matter*; for, —

**1st.** The generality of men have been stupidly negligent herein, as if it were a matter wherein they were not at all concerned. What is provided for them, what is proposed unto them, what comes in the ordinary way whereunto they have been accustomed, whatever it be, that they follow. And as they take it up on light grounds, so they observe it with light spirits. And this hath been the true cause of that inundation of profaneness which is come on the Christian world. For when once men come unto such an unconcernment in the worship of God, as to engage in it they know not well why, and to perform it they know not how, all manner of impiety will ensue in their lives; as is manifest in experience beyond the evidence of a thousand arguments.

**2dly.** Many in all ages have been prone to indulge unto their own imaginations and inventions, in the disposal of divine worship. And this bitter root hath sprung up into all the superstition and idolatry that the earth is filled withal at this day. From these two poisoned springs hath proceeded that woful apostasy from Christ and evangelical worship which the world groans under. Wherefore our utmost care and diligence are required herein.

[2.] The *concernment of the glory of God* calls for the same care in like manner. It were no hard thing to demonstrate, that the principal way and means whereby God expects that we should give glory unto him in this world, is by a due observation of the divine worship that he hath appointed; for herein do we in an especial manner ascribe unto him the glory of his sovereignty, of his wisdom, of his grace and holiness. When in his worship we bow down our souls under his authority alone; when we see such an impress of divine wisdom on all his institutions, as to judge all other ways folly in comparison of them; when we have experience of the grace represented and exhibited in them; then do we glorify God aright. And without these things, whatever we pretend, we honor him not in the solemnities of our worship. But we return.

(2.) In the charge given to Moses two things are observable:

[1.] The *time* when it was given him.

[2.] The *charge* itself.

[1.] The *time* when it was given: *Μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνὴν*, — “When he was about to make the tabernacle.” *Μέλλων* expresseth that which is immediately future. He was “in procinctu,” in readiness for that work; just as it were taking it in hand, and going about it. This made the divine warning seasonable. It was given him upon the entrance of his work, that it might make an effectual impression on his mind. And it is our duty, upon an entrance into any work we are called unto, to charge our consciences with a divine admonition. What immediate revelation was to Moses, that the written word is to us. To charge our consciences with rule from it, and its authority, will preserve us in whatever may fall out in the way of our duty; and nothing else will do it.

<sup>7</sup> *Ἐπιτελεῖν* is “perficere,” “to accomplish,” “to perfect,” “to finish.” But it includes here the beginning as well as the end of the work which he was to perfect. The same with *ποιῆσαι*, <sup><474></sup>Acts 7:44, where this whole passage is somewhat otherwise expressed, to the same purpose: *Καθὼς διετάξατο ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Μωϋσῇ· ποιῆσαι αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἑώρακει* “As he appointed who spake unto Moses,” (which was God himself, as our apostle here declares, in the second person, the great Angel of the covenant), “that he should make it according to the pattern which he

saw.” Wherefore ἐπιτελεῖν compriseth the whole service of Moses, in making, framing, and finishing the tabernacle.

[2.] The *warning and charge* itself is, that “he should make all things according to the pattern showed him in the mount.” What, this “pattern” was, how it was “showed unto Moses,” and how he was to “make all things according unto it,” are all of them things not easy to be explained.

In general, it is certain that God intended to declare hereby that, the work which Moses had to do, —the tabernacle he was to erect, and the worship thereof, —was not, either in the whole, or in any part of it, or any thing that belonged unto it, a matter of his own invention or *contrivance*, nor what he set upon by chance; but an exact representation of what God had instructed him in and showed unto him. This was the foundation of all the worship of God under the old testament, and the security of the worshippers. Hence, at the finishing of this work, it is eight times repeated in one chapter, that all things were done “as the LORD commanded Moses.” And herein was that truth fully consecrated unto the perpetual use of the church in all ages, that the will and command of God are the sole reason, rule, and measure, of all religious worship.

For the pattern itself, expositors generally agree, that on the top of the mount God caused to appear unto Moses, the form, fashion, dimensions, and utensils, of that tabernacle which he was to erect. Whether this representation were made to Moses by the way of internal vision, as the temple was represented unto Ezekiel, or whether there were an ethereal fabric proposed unto his bodily senses, is hard to determine. And this תְּבִינָה, “exemplar,” or “pattern,” our apostle here calls “heavenly things.” For to prove that the priests served only unto “the resemblance and shadow of heavenly things,” he produceth this testimony, that Moses was to “make all things according to the pattern showed him in the mount.” And this pattern, with all that belonged unto it, is called “heavenly things,” because it was made to appear in the air on the top of the mount, with respect unto that which was to be made beneath: or it may be called “heavenly,” because it was the immediate effect of the power of God, who worketh from heaven. But supposing such an ethereal tabernacle represented unto Moses, yet it cannot be said that it was the substance of the heavenly things themselves, but only a shadow or representation of

them. The heavenly things themselves, in the mind of God, were of another nature, and this pattern on the mount was but an external representation of them. So that here must be three things intended:

**1st.** The *heavenly things* themselves;

**2dly.** The *representation* of them on the mount;

**3dly.** The *tabernacle* made by Moses in imitation thereof: wherefore this tabernacle and its worship, wherein the Levitical priests administered their office, was so far from being the shadow of the substance of the heavenly things themselves, as that they were but a shadow of that shadow of them which was represented in the mount.

I know not that there is any thing in this exposition of the words that is contrary unto the analogy of faith, or inconsistent with the design of the apostle; but withal I must acknowledge, that these things seem to me exceeding difficult, and such as I know not how fully to embrace, and that for the reasons following: —

**1st.** If such a representation were made unto Moses in the mount, and that be the “pattern” intended, then the tabernacle with all its ministry was a shadow thereof. But this is contrary unto our apostle in another place, who tells us that indeed all legal institutions were only a “shadow,” but withal that the “substance” or “body was of Christ,” <sup>Colossians 2:17</sup>. And it is the body that the shadow doth immediately depend upon and represent. But according unto this exposition, this figure or appearance made in the mount must be the body or substance which those legal institutions did represent. But this figure was not Christ. And it is hard to say that this figure was the body which the tabernacle below was the shadow of, and that body was the shadow of Christ. But that Christ himself, his mediation and his church, —that is, his mystical body, —were not immediately represented by the tabernacle and the service of it, but somewhat else that was a figure of them, is contrary unto the whole dispute of the apostle in this place, and the analogy of faith.

**2dly.** I do not see how the priests could minister in the earthly tabernacle as an example and shadow of such an ethereal tabernacle. For if there were any such thing, it immediately vanished after its appearance; it ceased to be any thing, and therefore could not be any longer a “heavenly thing.”

Wherefore, with respect thereunto, they could not continue to “serve unto the example of heavenly things,” which were not.

**3dly.** No tolerable account can be given of the reason or use of such a representation. For God doth not dwell in any such tabernacle in heaven, that it should be thought to represent his holy habitation; and as unto that which was to be made on the earth, he had given such punctual instructions unto Moses, confirming the remembrance and knowledge of them in his mind by the Holy Spirit, by whom he was acted and guided, as that he needed no help from his imagination, in the view of the representation of such a fabric.

**4thly.** Whatever Moses did, it was “for a testimony unto the things which were to be spoken afterwards,” <sup><3035></sup>Hebrews 3:5. But these were the things of Christ and the gospel; which therefore he was to have an immediate respect unto.

The sense of the words must be determined from the apostle himself. And it is evident, —

**1st.** That “the heavenly things,” unto whose resemblance the legal priests did minister, and “the pattern showed unto Moses in the mount,” were the same. Hereon depends the whole force of his proof from this testimony.

**2dly.** These “heavenly things,” he expressly tells us, were those which were consecrated, dedicated unto God, and purified, by the sacrifice of the blood of Christ, <sup><3023></sup>Hebrews 9:23.

**3dly.** That Christ by his sacrifice did dedicate both himself, the whole church, and its worship, unto God. From these things it follows, —

**4thly.** That God did spiritually and mystically represent unto Moses the incarnation and mediation of Christ, with the church of the elect which was to be gathered thereby, and its spiritual worship. And moreover, he let him know how the tabernacle and all that belonged thereunto, did represent him and them. For the tabernacle that Moses made was a *sign and figure of the body of Christ*. This we have proved in the exposition of the second verse of this chapter; and it is positively affirmed by the apostle, <sup><5017></sup>Colossians 2:17. For therein would God dwell really and substantially: <sup><5009></sup>Colossians 2:9, “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the



Godhead bodily.” And the tabernacle was but to represent this inhabitation of God in Christ. Therefore did he dwell therein typically by sundry pledges of his presence, that he might represent the real substantial inhabitation of the Godhead in the body or human nature of Christ. This, therefore, was the **ἀρχέτυπος**, whereunto the tabernacle was to be framed; and this was that which was showed unto Moses on the top of the mount. These were the “heavenly things,” which they served unto the resemblance and shadow of. It is therefore most probable, and most agreeable unto the mystery of the wisdom of God in these things, that, before the building of the tabernacle below, God did show unto Moses what was to be signified and represented thereby, and what he would introduce when that was to be taken away. He first showed “the true tabernacle,” then appointed a figure of it, which was to abide and serve the worship of the church, until that true one was to be introduced, when this was to be taken down and removed out of the way: which is the substance of what the apostle designeth to prove.

It will be said, ‘That what was showed unto Moses in the mount was only **תְּבִנּוֹת** and **τύπος**, as here; that is, a “likeness,” “similitude,” and “type” of other things. This, therefore, could not be Christ himself and his mediation, which are the substance of heavenly things, and not a resemblance of them.’

I answer, **1st.** All representations of Christ himself, antecedent unto his actual exhibition in the flesh (as his appearances in human shape of old), were but resemblances and types of what should be afterwards.

**2dly.** His manifestation unto Moses is so called, not that it was a type of any other things above, but because it was the prototype of all that was to be done below.

**(1st.)** This was the foundation of the faith of the church of Israel in all generations. Their faith in God was not confined unto the outward things they enjoyed, but [rested] on Christ in them, and represented by them. They believed that they were only resemblances of him and his mediation; which when they lost the faith of, they lost all acceptance with God in their worship. The relation of their ordinances unto him, their expression of him as their prototype and substance, was the line of life, wisdom, beauty, glory, and usefulness, that ran through them all. This being now

taken away, they are all as a dead thing. When Christ was in them they were the delight of God, and the joy of the souls of his saints. Now he hath unclothed himself of them, and left them to be rolled up as a vesture, as a monument of the garments he thought meet to wear in the immature age of the church, they are of no more use at all. Who now could see any beauty, any glory, in the old temple administrations, should they be revived? Where Christ is, there is glory, if we have the light of faith to discern it; and we may say of every thing wherein he is not, be it never so pompous unto the eyes of flesh, “Ichabod,” — “Where is the glory of it?” or “It hath no glory.”

Jude tells us of a contest between Michael and the devil about the body of Moses, verse 9. It is generally thought that the devil would have hindered the burial of it, that in process of time it might have been an occasion of idolatry among that people. But that which was signified hereby, was the contest he made to keep the body of Moses, the whole system of Mosaical worship and ceremonies, from being buried, when the life and soul of it was departed. And this hath proved the ruin of the Jews unto this day.

**(2dly.)** Consider the progress of these heavenly things; that is, of Jesus Christ, and all the effects of his mediation in grace and glory.

[1st.] The idea, the original pattern or exemplar of them, was in the mind, the counsel, the wisdom, and will of God, ~~ROM~~ Ephesians 1:5, 8, 9.

[2dly.] Hereof God made various accidental representations, preparatory for the full expression of the glorious eternal idea of his mind. So he did in the appearance of Christ in the form of human nature to Abraham, Jacob, and others; so he did in the pattern that he showed unto Moses in the mount, which infused a spirit of life into all that was made unto a resemblance of it; so he did in the tabernacle and temple, as will be more fully declared afterwards.

[3dly.] He gave a substantial representation of the eternal idea of his wisdom and grace in the incarnation of the Son, in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwelt substantially, and in the discharge of his work of mediation.

[*4thly.*] An exposition of the whole is given us in the Gospel, which is God's means of instructing us in the eternal counsels of his wisdom, love, and grace, as revealed in Jesus Christ, <sup><408></sup>2 Corinthians 3:18.

The actings of faith with respect unto these heavenly things do begin where the divine progress of them doth end, and end where it begins. Faith in the first place respects and receives the revelation of the Gospel, which is the means of its receiving and resting in Christ himself; and through Christ our faith is in God, <sup><409></sup>1 Peter 1:21, as the eternal spring and fountain of all grace and glory.

### VERSE 6.

Νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαζήκης μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται.<sup>f4</sup>

There is no material difference in any translators, ancient or modern, in the rendering of these words; their signification in particular will be given in the exposition.

**Ver. 6.** —But now he hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises.

In this verse beginneth the second part of the chapter, concerning the difference between the two covenants, the old and the new, with the pre-eminence of the latter above the former, and of the ministry of Christ above the high priests on that account. The whole church-state of the Jews, with all the ordinances and worship of it, and the privileges annexed unto it, depended wholly on the covenant that God made with them at Sinai. But the introduction of this new priesthood whereof the apostle is discoursing, did necessarily abolish that covenant, and put an end unto all sacred ministrations that belonged unto it. And this could not well be offered unto them without the supply of another covenant, which should excel the former in privileges and advantages. For it was granted among them that it was the design of God to carry on the church unto a perfect state, as hath been declared on <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 7; wherefore he would not lead it backward, nor deprive it of any thing it had enjoyed, without provision

of what was better in its room. This, therefore, the apostle here undertakes to declare. And he doth it after his wonted manner, from such principles and testimonies as were admitted among themselves.

Two things unto this purpose he proves by express testimonies out of the prophet Jeremiah:

1. That *besides the covenant made with their fathers in Sinai*, God had promised to make *another covenant* with the church, in his appointed time and season.
2. That this *other promised covenant should be of another nature* than the former, and much more excellent, as unto spiritual advantages, unto them who were taken into it.

From both these, fully proved, the apostle infers the necessity of the abrogation of that first covenant, wherein they trusted, and unto which they adhered, when the appointed time was come. And hereon he takes occasion to declare the nature of the two covenants in sundry instances, and wherein the differences between them did consist. This is the substance of the remainder of this chapter.

This verse is a transition from one subject unto another; namely, from the *excellency of the priesthood of Christ* above that of the law, unto the *excellency of the new covenant* above the old. And herein also the apostle artificially compriseth and confirmeth his last argument, of the pre-eminency of Christ, his priesthood and ministry, above those of the law. And this he doth from the nature and excellency of that covenant whereof he was the mediator in the discharge of his office.

There are two parts of the words: First, An assertion of the *excellency of the ministry of Christ*. And this he expresseth by way of comparison; “He hath obtained a more excellent ministry:” and after he declareth the degree of that comparison; “By how much also.” Secondly, He annexeth the *proof of this assertion*; in that he is “the mediator of a better covenant, established on better” or “more excellent promises.”

In the first of these there occur these five things: —

1. The *note of its introduction*; “But now:”

2. What is *ascribed in the assertion* unto the Lord Christ; and that is a “ministry:”

3. How he *came by that ministry*; “He hath obtained it:”

4. The *quality of this ministry*; it is “better” or “more excellent” than the other:

5. The *measure and degree of this excellency*; “By how much also:” all which must be spoken unto, for the opening of the words: —

1. The introduction of the assertion is by the particles  $\nu\nu\tilde{\nu}\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , —”but now.”  $\text{N}\tilde{\nu}\nu$ , “now,” is a note of time, of the present time. But there are instances where these adverbial particles, thus conjoined, do not seem to denote any time or season, but are merely adversative, <sup><B17></sup>Romans 7:17; <sup><B11></sup>1 Corinthians 5:11, 7:14. But even in those places there seems a respect unto time also; and therefore I know not why it should be here excluded. As, therefore, there is an *opposition* intended unto the old covenant, and the Levitical priesthood; so the *season* is intimated of the introduction of the new covenant, and the better ministry wherewith it was accompanied; — “now,” at this time, which is the season that God hath appointed for the introduction of the new covenant and ministry.’ To the same purpose the apostle expresseth himself, treating of the same subject, <sup><B18></sup>Romans 3:26: “To declare  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\tilde{\nu}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\tilde{\omega}$ ,” “at this instant season,” now the gospel is preached, “his righteousness.” For, —

**Obs. I.** God, in his infinite wisdom, gives proper times and seasons unto all his dispensations unto and towards the church. —So the accomplishment of these things was in “the fullness of times,” <sup><B19></sup>Ephesians 1:10; that is, when all things rendered it seasonable and suitable unto the condition of the church, and for the manifestation of his own glory. He hasteneth all his works of grace in their own appointed time, <sup><B20></sup>Isaiah 60:22. And our duty it is to leave the ordering of all the concerns of the church, in the accomplishment of promises, unto God in his own time, <sup><B21></sup>Acts 1:7.

2. That which is ascribed unto the Lord Christ is  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ , —a “ministry.” The priests of old had a ministry; they ministered at the altar, as in the foregoing verse. And the Lord Christ was “a minister” also; so the apostle had said before, he was  $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ , verse 2, —”a

minister of the holy things.” Wherefore he had a “liturgy,” a “ministry,” a service, committed unto him. And two things are included herein: —

(1.) That it was an *office of ministry* that the LORD Christ undertook. He is not called a minister with respect unto one particular act of ministration; — so are we said to “minister unto the necessity of the saints,” which yet denotes no office in them that do so. But he had a standing office committed unto him, as the word imports. In that sense also he is called *διάκονος*, a “minister” in office, <sup>465B</sup>Romans 15:8.

(2.) *Subordination unto God* is included herein. With respect unto the church his office is supreme, accompanied with sovereign power and authority; he is “Lord over his own house.” But he holds his office in subordination unto God, being “faithful unto him that appointed him.” So the angels are said to minister unto God, <sup>207B</sup>Daniel 7:10; that is, to do all things according unto his will, and at his command. So had the Lord Christ a ministry. And we may observe, —

**Obs. II.** That the whole office of Christ was designed unto the accomplishment of the will and dispensation of the grace of God. For these ends was his ministry committed unto him. We can never sufficiently admire the love and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, in undertaking this office for us. The greatness and glory of the duties which he performed in the discharge thereof, with the benefits we receive thereby, are unspeakable, being the immediate cause of all grace and glory. Yet we are not absolutely to rest in them, but to ascend by faith unto the eternal spring of them. This is the grace, the love, the mercy of God, all acted in a way of sovereign power. These are everywhere in the Scripture represented as the original spring of all grace, and the ultimate object of our faith, with respect unto the benefits which we receive by the mediation of Christ. His office was committed unto him of God, even the Father; and his will did he do in the discharge of it. Yet also, —

**Obs. III.** The condescension of the Son of God to undertake the office of the ministry on our behalf is unspeakable, and for ever to be admired. — Especially will it appear so to be, when we consider who it was who undertook it, what it cost him, what he did and underwent in the pursuance and discharge of it, as it is all expressed, <sup>307B</sup>Philippians 2:6-8. Not only what he continueth to do in heaven at the right hand of God

belongeth unto this ministry, but all that he suffered also upon the earth. His ministry, in the undertaking of it, was not a dignity, a promotion, a revenue, <sup><418></sup>Matthew 20:28. It is true, it is issued in glory, but not until he had undergone all the evils that human nature is capable of undergoing. And we ought to undergo any thing cheerfully for him who underwent this ministry for us.

**Obs. IV.** The Lord Christ, by undertaking this office of the ministry, hath consecrated and made honorable that office unto all that are rightly called unto it, and do rightly discharge it. —It is true, his ministry and ours are not of the same kind and nature; but they agree in this, that they are both of them a ministry unto God in the holy things of his worship. And considering that Christ himself was God’s minister, we have far greater reason to tremble in ourselves on an apprehension of our own insufficiency for such an office, than to be discouraged with all the hardships and contests we meet withal in the world upon the account of it.

**3.** The general way whereby our Lord Christ came unto this ministry is expressed: **Τέτευχε**, —“He obtained it.” **Τυγχάνω** is either “sorte contingo,” “to have a lot or portion;” or to have any thing befall a man, as it were by accident; or “assequor,” “obtineo,” to “attain” or “obtain” any thing which before we had not. But the apostle designeth not to express in this word the especial call of Christ, or the particular way whereby he came unto his ministry, but only in general that he had it, and was possessed of it, in the appointed season, which before he had not. The way whereby he entered on the whole office and work of his mediation he expresseth by **κεκληρονόμυκε**, <sup><510></sup>Hebrews 1:4, — he had it by “inheritance;” that is, by free grant and perpetual donation, made unto him as the Son. See the exposition on that place.

There were two things that concurred unto his obtaining this ministry: (1.) The *eternal purpose and counsel of God* designing him thereunto; an act of the divine will accompanied with infinite wisdom, love, and power. (2.) The *actual call of God*, whereunto many things did concur, especially his unction with the Spirit above measure for the holy discharge of his whole office. Thus did he obtain this ministry, and not by any legal constitution, succession, or carnal rite, as did the priests of old. And we may see that,

---

**Obs. V.** The exaltation of the human nature of Christ into the office of this glorious ministry depended solely on the sovereign wisdom, grace, and love of God. —When the human nature of Christ was united unto the divine, it became, in the person of the Son of God, meet and capable to make satisfaction for the sins of the church, and to procure righteousness and life eternal for all that do believe. But it did not merit that union, nor could do so. For as it was utterly impossible that any created nature, by any act of its own, should merit the hypostatical union, so it was granted unto the human nature of Christ antecedently unto any act of its own in way of obedience unto God; for it was united unto the person of the Son by virtue of that union. Wherefore, antecedently unto it, it could merit nothing. Hence its whole exaltation, and the ministry that was discharged therein, depended solely on the sovereign wisdom and pleasure of God. And in this election and designation of the human nature of Christ unto grace and glory, we may see the pattern and example of our own. For if it was not upon the consideration or foresight of the obedience of the human nature of Christ that it was predestinated and chosen unto the grace of the hypostatical union, with the ministry and glory which depended thereon, but of the mere sovereign grace of God; how much less could a foresight of any thing in us be the cause why God should choose us in him before the foundation of the world unto grace and glory!

**4.** The quality of this ministry, thus obtained, as unto a comparative excellency, is also expressed: **Διαφορωτέρας**, — “More excellent.” The word is used only in this epistle in this sense, <sup>5000</sup>Hebrews 1:4, and in this place. The original word denotes only a difference from other things; but in the comparative degree, as here used, it signifies a *difference with a preference*, or a comparative excellency. The ministry of the Levitical priests, was good and useful in its time and season; this of our Lord Jesus Christ so differed from it as to be better than it, and more excellent; **πολλῶ ἄμεινον**. And, —

**5.** There is added hereunto the degree of this pre-eminence, so far as it is intended in this place and the present argument, in the word **ὅσῳ**, — “by how much.” ‘So much more excellent, by how much.’ The excellency of his ministry above that of the Levitical priests, bears proportion with the excellency of the covenant whereof he was the mediator above the old covenant wherein they administered; whereof afterwards.



So have we explained the apostle's assertion, concerning the excellency of the ministry of Christ. And herewith he closeth his discourse which he had so long engaged in, about the pre-eminence of Christ in his office above the high priests of old. And indeed, this being the very hinge whereon his whole controversy with the Jews did depend, he could not give it too much evidence, nor too full a confirmation. And as unto what concerns ourselves at present, we are taught thereby, that, —

**Obs. VI.** It is our duty and our safety to acquiesce universally and absolutely in the ministry of Jesus Christ. —That which he was so designed unto, in the infinite wisdom and grace of God; that which he was so furnished for the discharge of by the communication of the Spirit unto him in all fullness; that which all other priesthoods were removed to make way for, must needs be sufficient and effectual for all the ends unto which it is designed. It may be said, 'This is that which all men do; all that are called Christians do fully acquiesce in the ministry of Jesus Christ.' But if it be so, why do we hear the bleating of another sort of cattle? What mean those other priests, and reiterated sacrifices, which make up the worship of the church of Rome? If they rest in the ministry of Christ, why do they appoint one of their own to do the same things that he hath done, — namely, to offer sacrifice unto God ?

Secondly, The proof of this assertion lies in the latter part of these words; "By how much he is the mediator of a better covenant, established on better promises" The words are so disposed, that some think the apostle intends now to prove the excellency of the covenant from the excellency of his ministry therein. But the other sense is more suited unto the scope of the place, and the nature of the argument which the apostle presseth the Hebrews withal. For on supposition that there was indeed another, and that a "better covenant," to be introduced and established, than that which the Levitical priests served in, —which they could not deny, —it plainly follows, that he on whose ministry the dispensation of that covenant did depend must of necessity be "more excellent" in that ministry than they who appertained unto that covenant which was to be abolished. However, it may be granted that these things do mutually testify unto and illustrate one another. Such as the priest is, such is the covenant; such as the covenant is in dignity, such is the priest also.

In the words there are three things observable: —

1. What is in general ascribed unto Christ, declaring the nature of his ministry; he was a “mediator:”
2. The determination of his mediatory office unto the new covenant; “of a better covenant:”
3. The proof or demonstration of the nature of this covenant as unto its excellency, it was “established on better promises:” —

1. His office is that of a mediator, — **μεσίτης**, one that interposed between God and man, for the doing of all those things whereby a covenant might be established between them, and made effectual Schlichtingius on the place gives this description of a mediator: “Mediatorem foederis esse nihil aliud est, quam Dei esse interpretem, et internuntium in foedere cum hominibus pangendo; per quem scilicet et Deus voluntatem suam hominibus declarer, et illi vicissim divinae voluntatis notitia instructi ad Deum accedant, cumque eo reconciliati, pacem in posterum colant,” And Grotius speaks much unto the same purpose.

But this description of a mediator is wholly applicable unto Moses, and suited unto his office in giving of the law. See <sup><1219></sup>Exodus 20:19; <sup><1857></sup>Deuteronomy 5:27, 28. What is said by them doth indeed immediately belong unto the mediatory office of Christ, but it is not confined thereunto; yea, it is exclusive of the principal parts of his mediation. And whereas there is nothing in it but what belongs unto the prophetic office of Christ, —which the apostle here doth not principally intend, —it is most improperly applied as a description of such a mediator as he doth intend. And therefore, when he comes afterwards to declare in particular what belonged unto such a mediator of the covenant as he designed, he expressly placeth it in his “death for the redemption of transgressions,” <sup><3095></sup>Hebrews 9:15; affirming that “for that cause he was a mediator.” But hereof there is nothing at all in the description they give us of this office. But this the apostle doth in his, elsewhere, <sup><5015></sup>1 Timothy 2:5, 6,

“There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all.”

The principal part of his mediation consisted in the “giving himself a ransom,” or a price of redemption for the whole church. Wherefore this description of a mediator of the new testament is feigned only, to exclude his satisfaction, or his offering himself unto God in his death and bloodshedding, with the atonement made thereby.

The Lord Christ, then, in his ministry, is called **μεσίτης**, the “mediator” of the covenant, in the same sense as he is called **ἔγγυος**, the “surety;” whereof see the exposition on <sup><3072></sup>Hebrews 7:22. He is, in the new covenant, the mediator, the surety, the priest, the sacrifice, all in his own person. The ignorance and want of a due consideration hereof, are the great evidence of the degeneracy of Christian religion.

Whereas this is the first general notion of the office of Christ, that which compriseth the whole ministry committed unto him, and containeth in itself the especial offices of king, priest, and prophet, whereby he dischargeth his mediation, some things must be mentioned that are declarative of its nature and use. And we may unto this purpose observe,

**(1.)** That unto the office of a mediator it is required that there be *different persons* concerned in the covenant, and that by their own wills; as it must be in every compact, of what sort soever. So saith our apostle, “A mediator is not of one, but God is one,” <sup><4831></sup>Galatians 3:20; that is, if there were none but God concerned in this matter, as it is in an absolute promise or sovereign precept, there would be no need of, no place for a mediator, such a mediator as Christ is. Wherefore our consent in and unto the covenant is required in the very notion of a mediator.

**(2.)** That the persons entering into covenant be in such a *state and condition* as that it is no way convenient or morally possible that they should *treat immediately* with each other as to the ends of the covenant; for if they are so, a mediator to go between is altogether needless. So was it in the original covenant with Adam, which had no mediator. But in the giving of the law, which was to be a covenant between God and the people, they found themselves utterly insufficient for an immediate treaty with God, and therefore desired that they might have an internuncius to go between God and them, to bring his proposals, and carry back their consent, <sup><6122></sup>Deuteronomy 5:23-27. And this is the voice of all men really

convinced of the holiness of God, and of their own condition. Such is the state between God and sinners. The law and the curse of it did so interpose between them, that they could not enter into any immediate treaty with God, <sup><191B></sup>Psalm 5:3-5. This made a mediator necessary, that the new covenant might be established; whereof we shall speak afterwards.

(3.) That he who is this *mediator be accepted, trusted, and rested in* on both sides, or the parties mutually entering into covenant. An absolute trust must be reposed in him, so that each party may be everlastingly obliged in what he undertaketh on their behalf; and such as admit not of his terms, can have no benefit by, no interest in the covenant. So was it with the Lord Christ in this matter. On the part of God, he reposed the whole trust of all the concernments of the covenant in him, and absolutely rested therein. “Behold,” saith he of him, “my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth,” or is “well pleased,” — ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, Isaiah 42:1; <sup><191B></sup>Matthew 3:17. When he undertook this office, and said, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” the soul of God rested in him, <sup><122D></sup>Exodus 23:21; <sup><191B></sup>John 5:20-22. And to him he gives an account at last of his discharge of this thing, <sup><170A></sup>John 17:4. And on our part, unless we resign ourselves absolutely unto a universal trust in him and reliance on him, and unless we accept of all the terms of the covenant as by him proposed, and engage to stand unto all that he hath undertaken on our behalf, we can have neither share nor interest in this matter.

(4.) A mediator must be a *middle person* between both parties entering into covenant; and if they be of different natures, a perfect, complete mediator ought to partake of each of their natures in the same person. The necessity hereof, and the glorious wisdom of God herein, I have elsewhere at large demonstrated, and shall not therefore here again insist upon it.

(5.) A mediator must be one who *voluntarily and of his own accord* undertaketh the work of mediation. This is required of every one who will effectually mediate between any persons at variance, to bring them unto an agreement on equal terms. So it was required that the will and consent of Christ should concur in his susception of this office; and that they did so, himself expressly testifieth, <sup><301B></sup>Hebrews 10:5-10. It is true, he was designed and appointed by the Father unto this office; whence he is called his “servant,” and constantly witnesseth of himself, that he came to do the

will and commandment of him that sent him: but he had that to do in the discharge of this office, which could not, according unto any rule of divine righteousness, be imposed on him without his own voluntary consent. And this was the ground of the eternal compact that was between the Father and the Son, with respect unto his mediation; which I have elsewhere explained. And the testification of his own will, grace, and love, in the susception of this office, is a principal motive unto that faith and trust which the church placeth in him, as the mediator between God and them. Upon this his voluntary undertaking doth the soul of God rest in him, and he reposeth the whole trust in him of accomplishing his will and pleasure, or the design of his love and grace in this covenant, <sup>2530</sup>Isaiah 53:10-12. And the faith of the church, whereon salvation doth depend, must have love unto his person inseparably accompanying it. Love unto Christ is no less necessary unto salvation, than faith in him. And as faith is resolved into the sovereign wisdom and grace of God in sending him, and his own ability to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him; so love ariseth from the consideration of his own love and grace in his voluntary undertaking of this office, and the discharge of it.

**(6.)** In this voluntary undertaking to be a mediator, two things were required: —

**[1.]** That he should remove and take out of the way whatever kept the covenanters at a distance, or was a *cause of enmity* between them. For it is supposed that such an enmity there was, or there had been no need of a mediator. Therefore in the covenant made with Adam, there having been no variance between God and man, nor any distance but what necessarily ensued from the distinct natures of the Creator and a creature, there was no mediator. But the design of this covenant was to make reconciliation and peace. Hereon, therefore, depended the necessity of satisfaction, redemption, and the making of atonement, by sacrifice. For man having sinned and apostatized from the rule of God, making himself thereby obnoxious unto his wrath, according unto the eternal rule of righteousness, and in particular unto the curse of the law, there could be no new peace and agreement made with God unless due satisfaction were made for these things. For although God was willing, in infinite love, grace, and mercy, to enter into a new covenant with fallen man, yet would he not do it unto the prejudice of his righteousness, the dishonor of his rule, and the contempt

of his law. Wherefore none could undertake to be a mediator of this covenant, but he that was able to satisfy the justice of God, glorify his government, and fulfill the law. And this could be done by none but him, concerning whom it might be said that “God purchased his church with his own blood.

[2.] That he should *procure and purchase*, in a way suited unto the glory of God, the actual communication of all the good things prepared and proposed in this covenant; that is, grace and glory, with all that belong unto them, for them and on their behalf whose surety he was. And this is the foundation of the merit of Christ, and of the grant of all good things unto us for his sake.

(7.) It is required of this mediator, as such, that he give assurance to and undertake for the parties mutually concerned, as to the accomplishment of the terms of the covenant, undertaking on each hand for them: —

[1.] On the part of God towards men, that they *shall have peace and acceptance with him*, in the sure accomplishment of all the promises of the covenant. This he doth only declaratively, in the doctrine of the gospel, and in the institution of the ordinances of evangelical worship. For he was not a surety for God, nor did God need any, having confirmed his promise with an oath, swearing by himself, because he had no greater to swear by.

[2.] On our part, he *undertakes unto God* for our acceptance of the terms of the covenant, and our accomplishment of them, by his enabling us thereunto.

These things, among others, were necessary unto a full and complete mediator of the new covenant, such as Christ was. And, —

**Obs. VII.** The provision of this mediator between God and man was an effect of infinite wisdom and grace; yea, it was the greatest and most glorious external effect of them that ever they did produce, or ever will do in this world. The creation of all things at first out of nothing was a glorious effect of infinite wisdom and power; but when the glory of that design was eclipsed by the entrance of sin, this provision of a mediator, — one whereby all things were restored and retrieved into a condition of bringing more glory unto God, and securing for ever the blessed estate of

them whose mediator he is, —is accompanied with more evidences of the divine excellencies than that was. See [Ephesians 1:10](#).

2. Two things are added in the description of this mediator:

(1.) That he was a *mediator of a covenant*;

(2.) That this *covenant was better* than another which respect is had unto, whereof he was not the mediator: —

(1.) He was the mediator of a “covenant.” And two things are supposed herein: —

[1.] That there was a covenant made or prepared between God and man; that is, it was so far made, as that God who made it had *prepared the terms of it* in a sovereign act of wisdom and grace. The preparation of the covenant, consisting in the will and purpose of God graciously to bestow on all men the good things which are contained in it, all things belonging unto grace and glory, as also to make way for the obedience which he required herein, is supposed unto the constitution of this covenant.

[2.] That there was *need of a mediator*, that this covenant might be effectual unto its proper ends, of the glory of God and the obedience of mankind, with their reward. This was not necessary from the nature of a covenant in general; for a covenant may be made and entered into between different parties without any mediator, merely on the equity of the terms of it. Nor was it so from the nature of a covenant between God and man, as man was at first created of God; for the first covenant between them was immediate, without the interposition of a mediator. But it became necessary from the state and condition of them with whom this covenant was made, and the especial nature of this covenant. This the apostle declares, [Romans 8:3](#),

“For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.”

The law was the moral instrument or rule of the covenant that was made immediately between God and man: but it could not continue to be so after the entrance of sin; that is, so as that God might be glorified thereby, in the obedience and reward of men. Wherefore he “sent his Son in the likeness

of sinful flesh;” that is, provided a mediator for a new covenant. The persons with whom this covenant was to be made being all of them sinners, and apostatized from God, it became not the holiness or righteousness of God to treat immediately with them any more. Nor would it have answered his holy ends so to have done. For if when they were in a condition of uprightness and integrity, they kept not the terms of that covenant which was made immediately with them, without a mediator, although they were holy, just, good, and equal; how much less could any such thing be expected from them in their depraved condition of apostasy from God and enmity against him! It therefore became not the wisdom of God to enter anew into covenant with mankind, without security that the terms of the covenant should be accepted, and the grace of it made effectual. This we could not give; yea, we gave all evidences possible unto the contrary, in that

“God saw that every imagination of the thoughts of man’s heart was only evil continually,” ~~CHRIST~~ Genesis 6:5.

Wherefore it was necessary there should be a mediator, to be the surety of this covenant. Again, the covenant itself was so prepared, in the counsel, wisdom, and grace of God, as that the principal, yea, indeed, all the benefits of it, were to depend on what was to be done by a mediator, and could not otherwise be effected. Such were satisfaction for sin, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness; which are the foundation of this covenant.

(2.) To proceed with the text; this covenant, whereof the Lord Christ is the mediator, is said to be a “better covenant.” Wherefore it is supposed that there was another covenant, whereof the Lord Christ was not the mediator. And in the following verses there are two covenants, a first and a latter, an old and a new, compared together. We must therefore consider what was that *other covenant*, than which this is said to be *better*; for upon the determination thereof depends the right understanding of the whole ensuing discourse of the apostle. And because this is a subject wrapped up in much obscurity, and attended with many difficulties, it will be necessary that we use the best of our diligence, both in the investigation of the truth and in the declaration of it, so as that it may be distinctly



apprehended. And I shall first explain the text, and then speak to the difficulties which arise from it: —

[1.] There was an *original covenant* made with Adam, and all mankind in him. The rule of obedience and reward that was between God and him was not expressly called a covenant, but it contained the express nature of a covenant; for it was the agreement of God and man concerning obedience and disobedience, rewards and punishments. Where there is a law concerning these things, and an agreement upon it by all parties concerned, there is a formal covenant. Wherefore it may be considered two ways: —

**1st.** As it was a law only; so it proceeded from, and was a consequent of the nature of God and man, with their mutual relation unto one another. God being considered as the creator, governor, and benefactor of man; and man as an intellectual creature, capable of moral obedience; this law was necessary, and is eternally indispensable.

**2dly.** As it was a covenant; and this depended on the will and pleasure of God. I will not dispute whether God might have given a law unto men that should have had nothing in it of a covenant, properly so called; as is the law of creation unto all other creatures, which hath no rewards nor punishments annexed unto it. Yet this God calls a covenant also, inasmuch as it is an effect of his purpose, his unalterable will and pleasure, <sup>283</sup>Jeremiah 33:20, 21. But that this law of our obedience should be a formal, complete covenant, there were moreover some things required on the part of God, and some also on the part of man. Two things were required on the part of God to complete this covenant, or he did so complete it by two things: —

**(1st.)** By annexing unto it promises and threatenings of reward and punishment; the first of grace, the other of justice.

**(2dly.)** The expression of these promises and threatenings in external signs; the first in the tree of life, the latter in that of the knowledge of good and evil. By these did God establish the original law of creation as a covenant, gave it the nature of a covenant. On the part of man, it was required that he accept of this law as the rule of the covenant which God made with him. And this he did two ways: —

[1st.] By the *innate principles* of light and obedience concreated with his nature. By these he absolutely and universally assented unto the law, as proposed with promises and threatenings, as holy, just, good, —what was meet for God to require, what was equal and good unto himself.

[2dly.] By his acceptance of the commands concerning the tree of life, and that of the knowledge of good and evil, as the signs and pledges of this covenant. So was it established as a covenant between God and man, without the interposition of any mediator.

This is the covenant of works, absolutely the old, or first covenant that God made with men. But this is not the covenant here intended; for, —

**1st.** The covenant called afterwards “the first,” was *διαθήκη*, a “testament.” So it is here called. It was such a covenant as was a testament also. Now there can be no testament, but there must be death for the confirmation of it, <sup>ROM</sup> Hebrews 9:16. But in the making of the covenant with Adam, there was not the death of any thing, whence it might be called a testament. But there was the death of beasts in sacrifice in the confirmation of the covenant at Sinai, as we shall see afterwards. And it must be observed, that although I use the name of a “covenant,” as we have rendered the word *διαθήκη*, because the true signification of that word will more properly occur unto us in another place, yet I do not understand thereby a covenant properly and strictly so called, but such a one as hath the nature of a testament also, wherein the good things of him that makes it are bequeathed unto them for whom they are designed. Neither the word used constantly by the apostle in this argument, nor the design of his discourse, will admit of any other covenant to be understood in this place. Whereas, therefore, the first covenant made with Adam was in no sense a testament also, it cannot be here intended.

**2dly.** That first covenant made with Adam, had, as unto any benefit to be expected from it, with respect unto acceptation with God, life, and salvation, ceased long before, even at the entrance of sin. It was not abolished or abrogated by any act of God, as a law, but only was made weak and insufficient unto its first end, as a covenant. God had provided a way for the salvation of sinners, declared in the first promise. When this is actually embraced, that first covenant ceaseth towards them, as unto its curse, in all its concerns as a covenant, and obligation unto sinless

obedience as the condition of life; because both of them are answered by the mediator of the new covenant. But as unto all those who receive not the grace tendered in the promise, it doth remain in full force and efficacy, not as a covenant, but as a law; and that because neither the obedience it requires nor the curse which it threatens is answered. Hence, if any man believeth not, “the wrath of God abideth on him.” For its commands and curse depending on the necessary relation between God and man, with the righteousness of God as the supreme governor of mankind, they must be answered and fulfilled. Wherefore it was *never abrogated formally*. But as all unbelievers are still obliged by it, and unto it must stand or fall, so it is perfectly fulfilled in all believers, —not in their own persons, but in the person of their surety.

“God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us,” ROM Romans 8:3, 4.

But as a covenant, obliging unto personal, perfect, sinless obedience, as the condition of life, to be performed by themselves, so it ceased to be, long before the introduction of the new covenant which the apostle speaks of, that was promised “in the latter days.” But the other covenant here spoken of was not removed or taken away, until this new covenant was actually established.

**3dly.** The *church of Israel* was never absolutely under the power of that covenant as a covenant of life; for from the days of Abraham, the promise was given unto them and their seed. And the apostle proves that no law could afterwards be given, or covenant made, that should disannul that promise, ROM Galatians 3:17. But had they been brought under the old covenant of works, it would have disannulled the promise; for that covenant and the promise are diametrically opposite. And moreover, if they were under that covenant, they were all under the curse, and so perished eternally: which is openly false; for it is testified of them that they pleased God by faith, and so were saved. But it is evident that the covenant intended was a covenant wherein the church of Israel walked with God, until such time as this better covenant was solemnly introduced. This is plainly declared in the ensuing context, especially in the close of the chapter, where, speaking of this former covenant, he says,

it was “become old,” and so “ready to disappear.” Wherefore it is not the covenant of works made with Adam that is intended, when this other is said to be a “better covenant.”

[2.] There were other *federal transactions* between God and the church before the giving of the law on mount Sinai. Two of them there were into which all the rest were resolved: —

**1st.** The first promise, given unto our first parents immediately after the fall. This had in it the nature of a covenant, grounded on a promise of grace, and requiring obedience in all that received the promise.

**2dly.** The promise given and sworn unto Abraham, which is expressly called the covenant of God, and had the whole nature of a covenant in it, with a solemn outward seal appointed for its confirmation and establishment. Hereof we have treated at large on the sixth chapter.

Neither of these, nor any transaction between God and man that may be reduced unto them, as explanations, renovations, or confirmations of them, is the “first covenant” here intended. For they are not only consistent with the “new covenant,” so as that there was no necessity to remove them out of the way for its introduction, but did indeed contain in them the essence and nature of it, and so were confirmed therein. Hence the Lord Christ himself is said to be “a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made to the fathers,” <sup><518></sup>Romans 15:8. As he was the mediator of the new covenant, he was so far from taking off from, or abolishing those promises, that it belonged unto his office to confirm them. Wherefore, —

[3.] The other covenant or testament here supposed, whereunto that whereof the Lord Christ was the mediator is preferred, is none other but that which God made with the people of Israel on mount Sinai. So it is expressly affirmed, verse 9: “The covenant which I made with your fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt.” This was that covenant which had all the institutions of worship annexed unto it, <sup><301></sup>Hebrews 9:1-3; whereof we must treat afterwards more at large. With respect hereunto it is that the Lord Christ is said to be the “mediator of a better covenant;” that is, of another distinct from it, and more excellent.

It remains unto the exposition of the words, that we inquire what was this covenant, whereof our Lord Christ was the mediator, and what is here affirmed of it.

This can be no other in general but that which we call “the *covenant of grace*.” And it is so called in opposition unto that of “works,” which was made with us in Adam; for these two, *grace* and *works*, do divide the ways of our relation unto God, being diametrically opposite, and every way inconsistent, <sup><510></sup>Romans 11:6. Of this covenant the Lord Christ was the mediator from the foundation of the world, namely, from the giving of the first promise, <sup><510></sup>Revelation 13:8; for it was given on his interposition, and all the benefits of it depended on his future actual mediation. But here ariseth the first difficulty of the context, and that in two things; for, —

[1.] If this covenant of grace was made from the beginning, and if the LORD Christ was the mediator of it from the first, then where is the privilege of the gospel-state in opposition unto the law, by virtue of this covenant, seeing that under the law also the Lord Christ was the mediator of that covenant, which was from the beginning ?

[2.] If it be the covenant of grace which is intended, and that be opposed unto the covenant of works made with Adam, then the other covenant must be that covenant of works so made with Adam, which we have before disproved.

The answer hereunto is in the word here used by the apostle concerning this new covenant: **νενομοθέτηται**, whose meaning we must inquire into. I say, therefore, that the apostle doth not here consider the new covenant absolutely, and as it was virtually administered from the foundation of the world, in the way of a promise; for as such it was consistent with that covenant made with the people in Sinai. And the apostle proves expressly, that the renovation of it made unto Abraham was no way abrogated by the giving of the law, <sup><510></sup>Galatians 3:17. There was no interruption of its administration made by the introduction of the law. But he treats of such an establishment of the new covenant as wherewith the old covenant made at Sinai was absolutely inconsistent, and which was therefore to be removed out of the way. Wherefore he considers it here as it was actually completed, so as to bring along with it all the ordinances of worship which are proper unto it, the dispensation of the Spirit in them, and all the

spiritual privileges wherewith they are accompanied. It is now so brought in as to become the entire rule of the church's faith, obedience, and worship, in all things.

This is the meaning of the word **νενομοθέτηται**: “established,” say we; but it is, “reduced into a fixed state of a law or ordinance.” All the obedience required in it, all the worship appointed by it, all the privileges exhibited in it, and the grace administered with them, are all given for a statute, law, and ordinance unto the church. That which before lay hid in promises, in many things obscure, the principal mysteries of it being a secret hid in God himself, was now brought to light; and that covenant which had invisibly, in the way of a promise, put forth its efficacy under types and shadows, was now solemnly sealed, ratified, and confirmed, in the death and resurrection of Christ. It had before the confirmation of a promise, which is an oath; it had now the confirmation of a covenant, which is blood. That which before had no visible, outward worship, proper and peculiar unto it, is now made the only rule and instrument of worship unto the whole church, nothing being to be admitted therein but what belongs unto it, and is appointed by it. This the apostle intends by **νενομοθέτηται**, the “legal establishment” of the new covenant, with all the ordinances of its worship. Hereon the other covenant was disannulled and removed; and not only the covenant itself, but all that system of sacred worship whereby it was administered. This was not done by the making of the covenant at first; yea, all this was superinduced into the covenant as given out in a promise, and was consistent therewith. When the new covenant was given out only in the way of a *promise*, it did not introduce a worship and privileges expressive of it. Wherefore it was consistent with a form of worship, rites and ceremonies, and those composed into a yoke of bondage which belonged not unto it. And as these, being added after its giving, did not overthrow its nature as a promise, so they were inconsistent with it when it was completed as a covenant; for then all the worship of the church was to proceed from it, and to be conformed unto it. Then it was established. Hence it follows, in answer unto the second difficulty, that as a promise, it was opposed unto the covenant of works; as a covenant, it was opposed unto that of Sinai. This legalizing or authoritative establishment of the new covenant, and the worship thereunto belonging, did effect this alteration.

**3.** In the last place, the apostle tells us whereon this establishment was made; and that is ἐπι κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις, —”on better promises.” For the better understanding hereof we must consider somewhat of the original and use of divine promises in our relation unto God. And we may observe, —

(1.) That every covenant between God and man must be founded on and resolved into “*promises.*” Hence essentially a promise and a covenant are all one; and God calls an absolute promise, founded on an absolute decree, his covenant, <sup><001></sup>Genesis 9:11. And his purpose for the continuation of the course of nature unto the end of the world, he calls his covenant with day and night, <sup><001></sup>Jeremiah 33:20. The being and essence of a divine covenant lies in the promise. Hence are they called “the covenants of promise,” <sup><002></sup>Ephesians 2:12; —such as are founded on and consist in promises. And it is necessary that so it should be. For, —

[1.] The *nature of God* who maketh these covenants requireth that so it should be. It becometh his greatness and goodness, in all his voluntary transactions with his creatures, to propose that unto them wherein their advantage, their happiness and blessedness, doth consist. We inquire not how God may deal with his creatures as such; what he may absolutely require of them, on the account of his own being, his absolute essential excellencies, with their universal dependence on him. Who can express or limit the sovereignty of God over his creatures? All the disputes about it are fond. We have no measures of what is infinite. May he not do with his own what he pleaseth? Are we not in his hands, as clay in the hands of the potter? And whether he make or mar a vessel, who shall say unto him, What doest thou? He giveth no account of his matters. But upon supposition that he will condescend to enter into covenant with his creatures, and to come to agreement with them according unto the terms of it, it becometh his greatness and goodness to give them promises as the foundation of it, wherein he proposeth unto them the things wherein their blessedness and reward do consist. For,

**1st.** Herein he proposeth himself unto them as the *eternal spring* and fountain of all power and goodness. Had he treated with us merely by a law, he had therein only revealed his *sovereign authority and holiness*; the one in giving of the law, the other in the nature of it. But in promises he

revealeth himself as the eternal spring of goodness and power; for the matter of all promises is somewhat that is *good*; and the communication of it depends on *sovereign power*. That God should so declare himself in his covenant, was absolutely necessary to direct and encourage the obedience of the covenanters; and he did so accordingly, <sup>151</sup>Genesis 15:1, 17:1, 2.

**2dly.** Hereby he reserves the *glory of the whole* unto himself. For although the terms of agreement which he proposeth between himself and us be in their own nature “holy, just, and good,” —which sets forth his praise and glory, —yet if there were not something on his part which hath no antecedent respect unto any goodness, obedience, or desert in us, we should have wherein to glory in ourselves; which is inconsistent with the glory of God. But the matter of those promises wherein the covenant is founded is free, undeserved, and without respect unto any thing in us whereby it may in any sense be procured. And so in the first covenant, which was given in a form of law, attended with a penal sanction, yet the foundation of it was in a promise of a free and undeserved reward, even of the eternal enjoyment of God: which no goodness or obedience in the creature could possibly merit the attainment of. So that if a man should by virtue of any covenant be justified by works, though he might have whereof to glory before men, yet could he not glory before God, as the apostle declares, <sup>152</sup>Romans 4:2; and that because the reward proposed in the promise doth infinitely exceed the obedience performed.

[2.] It was also necessary *on our part* that every divine covenant should be founded and established on promises; for there is no state wherein we may be taken into covenant with God, but it is supposed we are not yet arrived at that perfection and blessedness whereof our nature is capable, and which we cannot but desire. And therefore when we come to heaven, and the full enjoyment of God, there shall be no use of any covenant any more, seeing we shall be in eternal rest, in the enjoyment of all the blessedness whereof our nature is capable, and shall immutably adhere unto God without any further expectation. But whilst we are in the way, we have still somewhat, yea principal parts of our blessedness, to desire, expect, and believe. So in the state of innocency, though it had all the perfection which a state of obedience according unto a law was capable of, yet did not the blessedness of eternal rest, for which we were made, consist therein. Now, whilst it is thus with us, we cannot but be desiring and



looking out after that full and complete happiness, which our nature cannot come to rest without. This, therefore, renders it necessary that there should be a promise of it given as the foundation of the covenant; without which we should want our principal encouragement unto obedience. And much more must it be so in the *state of sin and apostasy* from God; for we are now not only most remote from our utmost happiness, but involved in a condition of misery, without a deliverance from which we cannot be any ways induced to give ourselves up unto covenant obedience. Wherefore, unless we are prevented in the covenant with promises of deliverance from our present state, and the enjoyment of future blessedness, no covenant could be of use or advantage unto us.

[3.] It is necessary from the *nature of a covenant*. For every covenant that is proposed unto men, and accepted by them, requires somewhat to be performed on their part, otherwise it is no covenant; but where any thing is required of them that accept of the covenant, or to whom it is proposed, it doth suppose that somewhat be promised on the behalf of them by whom the covenant is proposed, as the foundation of its acceptance, and the reason of the duties required in it.

All this appears most evidently in the covenant of grace, which is here said to be “established on promises;” and that on two accounts. For, —

[1.] At the same time that *much is required of us* in the way of duty and obedience, we are told in the Scripture, and find it by experience, that of ourselves we can do nothing. Wherefore, unless the precept of the covenant be founded in a promise of giving grace and spiritual strength unto us, whereby we may be enabled to perform those duties, the covenant can be of no benefit or advantage unto us. And the want of this one consideration, that every covenant is founded in promises, and that the promises give life unto the precepts of it, hath perverted the minds of many to suppose an ability in ourselves of yielding obedience unto those precepts, without grace antecedently received to enable us thereunto; which overthrows the nature of the new covenant.

[2.] As was observed, we are all *actually guilty of sin* before this covenant was made with us. Wherefore unless there be a promise given of the pardon of sin, it is to no purpose to propose any new covenant terms unto us. For “the wages of sin is death;” and we having sinned must die,

whatever we do afterwards, unless our sins be pardoned. This, therefore, must be proposed unto us as the foundation of the covenant, or it will be of none effect. And herein lies the great difference between the promises of the *covenant of works* and those of *the covenant of grace*. The first were only concerning things future; eternal life and blessedness upon the accomplishment of perfect obedience. Promises of present mercy and pardon it stood in need of none, it was not capable of. Nor had it any promises of giving more grace, or supplies of it; but man was wholly left unto what he had at first received. Hence the covenant was broken. But in the covenant of grace all things are founded in promises of present mercy, and continual supplies of grace, as well as of future blessedness. Hence it comes to be “ordered in all things, and sure.”

And this is the first thing that was to be declared, namely, that every divine covenant is established on promises.

(2.) These promises are said to be “*better promises.*” The other covenant had its promises peculiar unto it, with respect whereunto this is said to be “established on better promises.” It was, indeed, principally represented under a *system of precepts*, and those almost innumerable; but it had its promises also, into the nature whereof we shall immediately inquire. With respect, therefore, unto them is the new covenant, whereof the Lord Christ is the mediator, said to be “established on better promises.” That it should be founded in promises, was necessary from its general nature as a covenant, and more necessary from its especial nature as a covenant of grace. That these promises are said to be “better promises,” respects those of the old covenant. But this is so said as to include all other degrees of comparison. They are not only better than they, but they are positively good in themselves, and absolutely the best that God ever gave, or will give unto the church. And what they are we must consider in our progress. And sundry things may be observed from these words: —

**Obs. VIII.** There is infinite grace in every divine covenant, inasmuch as it is established on promises. —Infinite condescension it is in God, that he will enter into covenant with dust and ashes, with poor worms of the earth. And herein lies the spring of all grace, from whence all the streams of it do flow. And the first expression of it is in laying the foundation of it in some undeserved promises. And this was that which became the

goodness and greatness of his nature, the means whereby we are brought to adhere unto him in faith, hope, trust, and obedience, until we come unto the enjoyment of him; for *that is the use of promises*, to keep us in adherence unto God, as the first original and spring of all goodness, and the ultimate satisfactory reward of our souls, ~~4002~~ 2 Corinthians 7:1.

**Obs. IX.** The promises of the covenant of grace are better than those of any other covenant, as for many other reasons, so especially because the grace of them prevents any condition or qualification on our part. —I do not say the covenant of grace is absolutely without conditions, if by conditions we intend the duties of obedience which God requireth of us in and by virtue of that covenant; but this I say, the principal promises thereof are not in the first place *remunerative* of our obedience in the covenant, but *efficaciously assumptive* of us into covenant, and establishing or confirming in the covenant. The covenant of works had its promises, but they were all remunerative, respecting an antecedent obedience in us; (so were all those which were peculiar unto the covenant of Sinai). They were, indeed, also of grace, in that the reward did infinitely exceed the merit of our obedience; but yet they all supposed it, and the subject of them was formally reward only. In the covenant of grace it is not so; for sundry of the promises thereof are the means of our being taken into covenant, of our entering into covenant with God. The first covenant absolutely was established on promises, in that when men were actually taken into it, they were encouraged unto obedience by the promises of a future reward. But those promises, namely, of the pardon of sin and writing of the law in our hearts, which the apostle expressly insisteth upon as the peculiar promises of this covenant, do take place and are effectual antecedently unto our covenant obedience. For although faith be required in order of nature antecedently unto our actual receiving of the pardon of sin, yet is that faith itself wrought in us by the grace of the promise, and so its precedency unto pardon respects only the order that God had appointed in the communication of the benefits of the covenant, and intends not that the pardon of sin is the reward of our faith.

This entrance hath the apostle made into his discourse of the two covenants, which he continues unto the end of the chapter. But the whole is not without its difficulties. Many things in particular will occur unto us in our progress, which may be considered in their proper places. In the

meantime there are some things in general which may be here discoursed, by whose determination much light will be communicated unto what doth ensue.

First, therefore, the apostle doth evidently in this place dispute concerning two covenants, or two testaments, comparing the one with the other, and declaring the disannulling of the one by the introduction and establishment of the other. What are these two covenants in general we have declared, — namely, that made with the church of Israel at mount Sinai, and that made with us in the gospel; not as absolutely the covenant of grace, but as actually established in the death of Christ, with all the worship that belongs unto it.

Here then ariseth a difference of no small importance, namely, whether these are indeed two distinct covenants, as to the essence and substance of them, or only different ways of the dispensation and administration of the same covenant. And the reason of the difficulty lieth herein: We must grant one of these three things:

- 1.** That either the covenant of grace was in force under the old testament; or,
- 2.** That the church was saved without it, or any benefit by Jesus Christ, who is the mediator of it alone; or,
- 3.** That they all perished everlastingly. And neither of the two latter can be admitted.

Some, indeed, in these latter days, have revived the old Pelagian imagination, that before the law men were saved by the conduct of natural light and reason; and under the law by the directive doctrines, precepts, and sacrifices thereof, —without any respect unto the Lord Christ or his mediation in another covenant. But I shall not here contend with them, as having elsewhere sufficiently refuted these imaginations. Wherefore I shall take it here for granted, that no man was ever saved but by virtue of the new covenant, and the mediation of Christ therein.

Suppose, then, that this new covenant of grace was extant and effectual under the old testament, so as the church was saved by virtue thereof, and the mediation of Christ therein, how could it be that there should at the

same time be another covenant between God and them, of a different nature from this, accompanied with other promises, and other effects?

On this consideration it is said, that the two covenants mentioned, the new and the old, were not indeed two distinct covenants, as unto their essence and substance, but only different administrations of the same covenant, called two covenants from some different outward solemnities and duties of worship attending of them. To clear this it must be observed, —

1. That by the *old covenant*, the original covenant of works, made with Adam and all mankind in him, is not intended; for this is undoubtedly a covenant different in the essence and substance of it from the new.
2. By the *new covenant*, not the new covenant absolutely and originally, as given in the first promise, is intended; but in its complete gospel administration, when it was actually established by the death of Christ, as administered in and by the ordinances of the new testament. This, with the covenant of Sinai, were, as most say, but different administrations of the same covenant.

But on the other hand, there is such express mention made, not only in this, but in sundry other places of the Scripture also, of *two distinct covenants, or testaments*, and such different natures, properties, and effects, ascribed unto them, as seem to constitute two distinct covenants. This, therefore, we must inquire into; and shall first declare what is agreed unto by those who are sober in this matter, though they differ in their judgments about this question, *whether two distinct covenants, or only a twofold administration of the same covenant, be intended*. And indeed there is so much agreed on, as that what remains seems rather to be a difference about the expression of the same truth, than any real contradiction about the things themselves. For, —

1. It is agreed that the way of *reconciliation with God*, of justification and salvation, was always one and the same; and that from the giving of the first promise none was ever justified or saved but by the new covenant, and Jesus Christ, the mediator thereof. The foolish imagination before mentioned, that men were saved before the giving of the law by following the guidance of the light of nature, and after the giving of the law by

obedience unto the directions thereof, is rejected by all that are sober, as destructive of the Old Testament and the New.

**2.** That the writings of the Old Testament, namely, the *Law, Psalms, and Prophets*, do contain and declare the doctrine of justification and salvation by Christ. This the church of old believed, and walked with God in the faith thereof. This is undeniably proved, in that the doctrine mentioned is frequently confirmed in the New Testament by testimonies taken out of the Old.

**3.** That by the covenant of Sinai, as properly so called, separated from its figurative relation unto the covenant of grace, none was ever eternally saved.

**4.** That the use of all the institutions whereby the old covenant was administered, was to represent and direct unto Jesus Christ, and his mediation.

These things being granted, the only way of life and salvation by Jesus Christ, under the old testament and the new, is secured; which is the substance of the truth wherein we are now concerned. On these grounds we may proceed with our inquiry.

The judgment of most reformed divines is, that the church under the old testament had the same promise of Christ, the same interest in him by faith, remission of sins, reconciliation with God, justification and salvation by the same way and means, that believers have under the new. And whereas the essence and the substance of the covenant consists in these things, they are not to be said to be under *another covenant*, but only a *different administration* of it. But this was so different from that which is established in the gospel after the coming of Christ, that it hath the appearance and name of another covenant. And the difference between these two administrations may be reduced unto the ensuing heads: —

**1.** It consisted in *the way and manner* of the declaration of the mystery of the love and will of God in Christ; of the work of reconciliation and redemption, with our justification by faith. For herein the gospel, wherein “life and immortality are brought to light,” doth in plainness, clearness, and evidence, much excel the administration and declaration of the same truths under the law. And the greatness of the privilege of the church

herein is not easily expressed. For hereby” with open face we behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord,” and Lord changed into the same image,” <sup>2</sup> Corinthians 3:18. The man whose eyes the Lord Christ opened, <sup>1</sup> Mark 8:23-25, represents these two states. When he first touched him, his eyes were opened, and he saw, but he saw nothing clearly; whence, when he looked, he said, “I see men as trees, walking,” verse 24: but upon his second touch, he Lord every man clearly,” verse 25. They had their sight under the old testament, and the object was proposed unto them, but at a great distance, with such an interposition of mists, clouds, and shadows, as that they saw men like trees, walking,” —nothing clearly and perfectly: but now under the gospel, the object, which is Christ, being brought near unto us, and all clouds and shadows being departed, we do or may see all things clearly. When a traveler in his way on downs or hills is encompassed with a thick mist and fog, though he be in his way yet he is uncertain, and nothing is presented unto him in its proper shape and distance; things near seem to be afar off, and things afar off to be near, and every thing hath, though not a false, yet an uncertain appearance. Let the sun break forth and scatter the mists and fogs that are about him, and immediately every thing appears quite in another shape unto him, so as indeed he is ready to think he is not where he was. His way is plain, he is certain of it, and all the region about lies evident under his eye; yet is there no alteration made but in the removal of the mists and clouds that interrupted his sight. So was it with them under the law. The types and shadows that they were enclosed in, and which were the only medium they had to view spiritual things in, represented them not unto them clearly and in their proper shape. But they being now removed, by the rising of the Sun of righteousness with healing in his wings, in the dispensation of the gospel, the whole mystery of God in Christ is clearly manifested unto them that do believe. And the greatness of this privilege of the gospel above the law is inexpressible; whereof, as I suppose, we must speak somewhat afterwards.

**2.** In the *plentiful communication of grace* unto the community of the church; for now it is that we receive “grace for grace,” or a plentiful effusion of it, by Jesus Christ. There was grace given in an eminent manner unto many holy persons under the old testament, and all true believers had true, real, saving grace communicated unto them; but the measures of grace

in the true church under the new testament do exceed those of the community of the church under the old. And therefore, as God winked at some things under the old testament, as polygamy, and the like, which are expressly and severely interdicted under the new, nor are consistent with the present administrations of it; so are sundry duties, as those of self-denial, readiness to bear the cross, to forsake houses, lands, and habitations, more expressly enjoined unto us than unto them. And the obedience which God requireth in any covenant, or administration of it, is proportionable unto the strength which the administration of that covenant doth exhibit. And if those who profess the gospel do content themselves without any interest in this privilege of it, if they endeavor not for a share in that plentiful effusion of grace which doth accompany its present administration, the gospel itself will be of no other use unto them, but to increase and aggravate their condemnation.

**3.** *In the manner of our access unto God.* Herein much of all that is called religion doth consist; for hereon doth all our outward worship of God depend. And in this the advantages of the gospel-administration of the covenant above that of the law is in all things very eminent. Our access now to God is immediate, by Jesus Christ, with liberty and boldness, as we shall afterwards declare. Those under the law were immediately conversant, in their whole worship, about outward, typical things, — the tabernacle, the altar, the ark, the mercy-seat, and the like obscure representations of the presence of God. Besides, the manner of the making of the covenant with them at mount Sinai filled them with fear, and brought them into bondage, so as they had comparatively a servile frame of spirit in all their holy worship.

**4.** *In the way of worship required under each administration.* For under that which was legal, it seemed good unto God to appoint a great number of outward rites, ceremonies, and observances; and these, as they were dark in their signification, as also in their use and ends, so were they, by reason of their nature, number, and the severe penalties under which they were enjoined, grievous and burdensome to be observed. But the way of worship under the gospel is spiritual, rational, and plainly subservient unto the ends of the covenant itself; so as that the use, ends, benefits, and advantages of it are evident unto all.



**5.** In the extent of the dispensation of the grace of God; for this is greatly enlarged under the gospel. For under the old testament it was upon the matter confined unto the posterity of Abraham according to the flesh; but under the new testament it extends itself unto all nations under heaven.

Sundry other things are usually added by our divines unto the same purpose. See Calvin. Institut. lib. 2:cap. xi.; Martyr. Loc. Com. loc. 16, sect. 2; Bucan. loc. 22, etc.

The Lutherans, on the other side, insist on two arguments to prove, that not a twofold administration of the same covenant, but that two covenants substantially distinct, are intended in this discourse of the apostle.

- 1.** Because in the Scripture they are often so called, and compared with one another, and sometimes opposed unto one another; the *first* and the *last*, the *new* and the *old*.
- 2.** Because the covenant of grace in Christ is *eternal, immutable*, always the same, obnoxious unto no alteration, no change or abrogation; neither can these things be spoken of it with respect unto any administration of it. as they are spoken of the old covenant.

To state our thoughts aright in this matter, and to give what light we can unto the truth, the things ensuing may be observed: —

- 1.** When we speak of the “old covenant,” we intend not the *covenant of works made with Adam*, and his whole posterity in him; concerning which there is no difference or difficulty, whether it be a distinct covenant from the new or no.
- 2.** When we speak of the “new covenant,” we do not intend *the covenant of grace absolutely*, as though that were not before in being and efficacy, before the introduction of that which is promised in this place. For it was always the same, as to the substance of it, from the beginning. It passed through the whole dispensation of times before the law, and under the law, of the same nature and efficacy, unalterable, “everlasting, ordered in all things, and sure.” All who contend about these things, the Socinians only excepted, do grant that the covenant of grace, considered absolutely, — that is, the promise of grace in and by Jesus Christ, — was the only way and means of salvation unto the church, from the first entrance of sin. But

for two reasons it is not expressly called a covenant, without respect unto any other things, nor was it so under the old testament. When God renewed the promise of it unto Abraham, he is said to make a covenant with him; and he did so, but it was with respect unto other things, especially the proceeding of the promised Seed from his loins. But absolutely under the old testament it consisted only in a promise; and as such only is proposed in the Scripture, <sup><4129></sup>Acts 2:39; <sup><3094></sup>Hebrews 6:14-16. The apostle indeed says, that the covenant was confirmed of God in Christ, before the giving of the law, <sup><887></sup>Galatians 3:17. And so it was, not absolutely in itself, but in the promise and benefits of it. The *νομοθεσία*, or full legal establishment of it, whence it became formally a covenant unto the whole church, was future only, and a promise under the old testament; for it wanted two things thereunto: —

(1.) It wanted its *solemn confirmation* and establishment, by the blood of the only sacrifice which belonged unto it. Before this was done in the death of Christ, it had not the formal nature of a *covenant* or a *testament*, as our apostle proves, <sup><3095></sup>Hebrews 9:15-23. For neither, as he shows in that place, would the law given at Sinai have been a covenant, had it not been confirmed with the blood of sacrifices. Wherefore the promise was not before a formal and solemn covenant.

(2.) This was wanting, that it was *not the spring, rule, and measure of all the worship of the church*. This doth belong unto every covenant, properly so called, that God makes with the church, that it be the *entire rule of all the worship that God requires of it*; which is that which they are to restipulate in their entrance into covenant with God. But so the covenant of grace was not under the old testament; for God did require of the church many duties of worship that did not belong thereunto. But now, under the new testament, this covenant, with its own seals and appointments, is the only rule and measure of all acceptable worship. Wherefore the new covenant promised in the Scripture, and here opposed unto the old, is not the promise of grace, mercy, life, and salvation by Christ, absolutely considered, but as it had the formal nature of a covenant given unto it, in its establishment by the death of Christ, the procuring cause of all its benefits, and the declaring of it to be the only rule of worship and obedience unto the church. So that although by “the covenant of grace,” we oftentimes understand no more but the way of life, grace, mercy, and

salvation by Christ; yet by “the new covenant,” we intend its actual establishment in the death of Christ, with that blessed way of worship which by it is settled in the church.

**3.** Whilst the church enjoyed all the *spiritual benefits of the promise*, wherein the substance of the covenant of grace was contained, before it was confirmed and made the sole rule of worship unto the church, it was not inconsistent with the holiness and wisdom of God to bring it under any other covenant, or prescribe unto it what forms of worship he pleased. It was not so, I say, upon these three suppositions: —

**(1.)** That this covenant did not disannul or make ineffectual the promise that was given before, but that *that* doth still continue the only means of life and salvation. And that this was so, our apostle proves at large, <sup><RBT></sup>Galatians 3:17-19.

**(2.)** That this other covenant, with all the worship contained in it or required by it, did not divert from, but direct and lead unto, the *future establishment of the promise* in the solemnity of a covenant, by the ways mentioned. And that the covenant made in Sinai, with all its ordinances, did so, the apostle proves likewise in the place before mentioned, as also in this whole epistle.

**(3.)** That it be of *present use* and advantage unto the church in its present condition. This the apostle acknowledgeth to be a great objection against the use and efficacy of the promise under the old testament, as unto life and salvation; namely, ‘To what end then serveth the giving of the law?’ whereunto he answers, by showing the necessity and use of the law unto the church in its then present condition, <sup><RBT></sup>Galatians 3:17-19.

**4.** These things being observed, we may consider that the Scripture doth plainly and expressly make mention of *two testaments, or covenants*, and distinguish between them in such a way, as what is spoken can hardly be accommodated unto a *twofold administration* of the same covenant. The one is mentioned and described, <sup><D40></sup>Exodus 24:3-8, <sup><RBT></sup>Deuteronomy 5:2-5, — namely, the covenant that God made with the people of Israel in Sinai; and which is commonly called “the covenant,” where the people under the old testament are said to keep or break God’s covenant; which for the most part is spoken with respect unto that worship which was peculiar

thereunto. The other is promised, <sup><263></sup>Jeremiah 31:31-34, 32:40; which is the new or gospel covenant, as before explained, mentioned <sup><433></sup>Matthew 26:28; <sup><412></sup>Mark 14:24. And these two covenants, or testaments, are compared one with the other, and opposed one unto another, <sup><401></sup>2 Corinthians 3:6-9; <sup><404></sup>Galatians 4:24-26; <sup><302></sup>Hebrews 7:22, 9:15-20.

These two we call “the old and the new testament.” Only it must be observed, that in this argument, by the “old testament,” we do not understand the books of the Old Testament, or the writings of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, or the oracles of God committed then unto the church, (I confess they are once so called, <sup><404></sup>2 Corinthians 3:14, “The veil remaineth untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament,” —that is, the books of it; unless we shall say, that the apostle intendeth only the reading of the things which concern the old testament in the Scripture;) for this old covenant, or testament, whatever it be, is abrogated and taken away, as the apostle expressly proves, but the word of God in the books of the Old Testament abideth for ever. And those writings are called the Old Testament, or the books of the Old Testament, not as though they contained in them nothing but what belongeth unto the old covenant, for they contain the doctrine of the New Testament also; but they are so termed because they were committed unto the church whilst the old covenant was in force, as the rule and law of its worship and obedience.

**5.** Wherefore we must grant *two distinct covenants*, rather than a twofold administration of the same covenant merely, to be intended. We must, I say, do so, provided always that the way of reconciliation and salvation was the same under both. But it will be said, —and with great pretense of reason, for it is that which is the sole foundation they all build upon who allow only a twofold administration of the same covenant, —’That this being the principal end of a divine covenant, if the way of reconciliation and salvation be the same under both, then indeed are they for the substance of them but one.’ And I grant that this would inevitably follow, if it were so equally by virtue of them both. If reconciliation and salvation by Christ were to be obtained not only under the old covenant, but by virtue thereof, then it must be the same for substance with the new. But this is not so; for no reconciliation with God nor salvation could be obtained by virtue of the old covenant, or the administration of it, as our

apostle disputes at large, though all believers were reconciled, justified, and saved, by virtue of the promise, whilst they were under the covenant.

As therefore I have showed in what sense the covenant of grace is called “the new covenant,” in this distinction and opposition, so I shall propose sundry things which relate unto the nature of the first covenant, which manifest it to have been a *distinct covenant*, and not a mere administration of the covenant of grace: —

**1.** This covenant, called “the old covenant,” was never intended to be of itself the absolute rule and law of life and salvation unto the church, but was made with a particular design, and with respect unto particular ends. This the apostle proves undeniably in this epistle, especially in the chapter foregoing, and those two that follow. Hence it follows that it could abrogate or disannul nothing which God at any time before had given as a general rule unto the church. For that which is *particular* cannot abrogate any thing that was *general*, and before it; as that which is *general* doth abrogate all antecedent *particulars*, as the new covenant doth abrogate the old. And this we must consider in both the instances belonging hereunto. For, —

**(1.)** God had before given the *covenant of works*, or perfect obedience, unto all mankind, in the law of creation. But this covenant at Sinai did not abrogate or disannul that covenant, nor any way fulfill it. And the reason is, because it was never intended to come in the place or room thereof, as a covenant, containing an entire rule of all the faith and obedience of the whole church. God did not intend in it to abrogate the covenant of works, and to substitute this in the place thereof; yea, in sundry things it re-enforced, established, and confirmed that covenant. For, —

**[1.]** It revived, declared, and expressed *all the commands of that covenant in the decalogue*; for that is nothing but a divine summary of the law written in the heart of man at his creation. And herein the dreadful manner of its delivery or promulgation, with its writing in tables of stone, is also to be considered; for in them the nature of that first covenant, with its inexorableness as unto perfect obedience, was represented. And because none could answer its demands, or comply with it therein, it was called “*the ministration of death*,” causing fear and bondage, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>2 Corinthians 3:7.

[2.] It revived the *sanction of the first covenant*, in the curse or sentence of death which it denounced against all transgressors. *Death* was the penalty of the transgression of the first covenant: “In the day that thou eatest, thou shalt die the death.” And this sentence was revived and represented anew in the curse wherewith this covenant was ratified, “Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them,” <sup><REV2></sup>Deuteronomy 27:26; <sup><REV1></sup>Galatians 3:10. For the design of God in it was to bind a sense of that curse on the consciences of men, until He came by whom it was taken away, as the apostle declares, <sup><REV3></sup>Galatians 3:19.

[3.] It revived the promise of that covenant, —*that of eternal life upon perfect obedience*. So the apostle tells us that Moses thus describeth the righteousness of the law, “That the man which doeth those things shall live by them,” <sup><REV4></sup>Romans 10:5; as he doth, <sup><REV5></sup>Leviticus 18:5.

Now this is no other but the covenant of works revived. Nor had this covenant of Sinai any promise of eternal life annexed unto it, as such, but only the promise inseparable from the covenant of works which it revived, saying, “Do this, and live.”

Hence it is, that when our apostle disputeth against *justification by the law*, or by the works of the law, he doth not intend the works peculiar unto the covenant of Sinai, such as were the rites and ceremonies of the worship then instituted; but he intends also the *works of the first covenant*, which alone had the promise of life annexed unto them.

And hence it follows also, that it was not a new covenant of works established in the place of the old, for the absolute rule of faith and obedience unto the whole church; for then would it have abrogated and taken away that covenant, and all the force of it, which it did not.

(2.) The other instance is in the *promise*. This also went before it; neither was it abrogated or disannulled by the introduction of this covenant. This promise was given unto our first parents immediately after the entrance of sin, and was established as containing the only way and means of the salvation of sinners. Now, this promise could not be abrogated by the introduction of this covenant, and a new way of justification and salvation be thereby established. For the promise being given out in general for the whole church, as containing the way appointed by God for righteousness,

life, and salvation, it could not be disannulled or changed, without a change and alteration in the counsels of Him “with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” Much less could this be effected by a particular covenant, such as that was, when it was given as a general and eternal rule.

2. But whereas there was an *especial promise* given unto Abraham, in the faith whereof he became “the father of the faithful,” he being their progenitor, it should seem that this covenant did wholly disannul or supersede that promise, and take off the church of his posterity from building on that foundation, and so fix them wholly on this new covenant now made with them. So saith Moses,

“The LORD made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, who are all of us here alive this day,” <sup><REB></sup>Deuteronomy 5:3.

God made not this covenant on mount Sinai with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but with the people then present, and their posterity, as he declares, <sup><REB></sup>Deuteronomy 29:14, 15. This, therefore, should seem to take them off wholly from that promise made to Abraham, and so to disannul it. But that this it did not, nor could do, the apostle strictly proves, <sup><REB></sup>Galatians 3:17-22; yea, it did divers ways establish that promise, both as first given and as afterwards confirmed with the oath of God unto Abraham, two ways especially: —

(1.) It declared the *impossibility of obtaining reconciliation and peace with God* any other way but by the promise. For representing the commands of the covenant of works, requiring perfect, sinless obedience, under the penalty of the curse, it convinced men that this was no way for sinners to seek for life and salvation by. And herewith it so urged the consciences of men, that they could have no rest nor peace in themselves but what the promise would afford them, whereunto they saw a necessity of betaking themselves.

(2.) By representing the ways and means of *the accomplishment of the promise*, and of that whereon all the efficacy of it unto the justification and salvation of sinners doth depend. This was the death, blood-shedding, oblation, or sacrifice of Christ, the promised seed. This all its offerings and ordinances of worship directed unto; as his incarnation, with the

inhabitation of God in his human nature, was typed by the tabernacle and temple. Wherefore it was so far from disannulling the promise, or diverting the minds of the people of God from it, that by all means it established it and led unto it. But, —

**3.** It will be said, as was before observed, ‘That if it did neither *abrogate the first covenant of works*, and come in the room thereof, nor *disannul the promise* made unto Abraham, then unto what end did it serve, or what benefit did the church receive thereby?’ I answer, —

(1.) There hath been, with respect unto God’s dealing with the church, *οἰκονομία τῶν καιρῶν*, — a “certain dispensation” and disposition of times and seasons, reserved unto the sovereign will and pleasure of God. Hence from the beginning he revealed himself *πολυτρόπως* and *πολυμερῶς*, as seemed good unto him, <sup>ROM</sup> Hebrews 1:1. And this dispensation of times had a *πλήρωμα*, a “fullness” assigned unto it, wherein all things, namely, that belong unto the revelation and communication of God unto the church, should come to their height, and have as it were the last hand given unto them. This was in the sending of Christ, as the apostle declares, <sup>ROM</sup> Ephesians 1:10,

“That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might bring all unto a head in Christ.”

Until this season came, God dealt variously with the church, *ἐν ποικίλῃ σοφίᾳ*, “in manifold” or “various wisdom,” according as he saw it needful and useful for it, in that season which it was to pass through, before the fullness of times came. Of this nature was his entrance into the covenant with the church at Sinai; the reasons whereof we shall immediately inquire into. In the meantime, if we had no other answer to this inquiry but only this, that in the order of the disposal or dispensation of the seasons of the church, before the fullness of times came, God in his manifold wisdom saw it necessary for the then present state of the church in that season, we may well acquiesce therein. But, —

(2.) The apostle acquaints us in general with the ends of this dispensation of God, <sup>ROM</sup> Galatians 3:19-24: “Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a



mediator. Now a mediator is not of one, but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” Much light might be given unto the mind of the Holy Ghost in these words, and that in things not commonly discerned by expositors, if we should divert unto the opening of them. I will at present only mark from them what is unto our present purpose.

There is a double inquiry made by the apostle with respect unto the law, or the covenant of Sinai:

[1.] Unto what end in general it served.

[2.] Whether it was not contrary to the promise of God.

Unto both these the apostle answereth from the nature, office, and work of that covenant. For there were, as hath been declared, two things in it:

[1.] A *revival and representation* of the covenant of works, with its sanction and curse.

[2.] A *direction of the church* unto the accomplishment of the promise.

From these two doth the apostle frame his answer unto the double inquiry laid down.

And unto the *first* inquiry, “unto what end it served,” he answers, “It was added because of transgressions.” The promise being given, there seems to have been no need of it, why then was it added to it at that season? “It was added because of transgressions.” The fullness of time was not yet come, wherein the promise was to be fulfilled, accomplished and established as the only covenant wherein the church was to walk with God; or, “the seed” was not yet come, as the apostle here speaks, to whom the promise was made. In the meantime some order must be taken about sin and transgression, that all the order of things appointed of God

might not be overflowed by them And this was done two ways by the law: —

[1.] By reviving the commands of the covenant of works, with the sanction of death, it put an awe on the minds of men, and set bounds unto their lusts, that they should not dare to run forth into that excess which they were naturally inclined unto. It was therefore “added because of transgressions;” that, in the declaration of God’s severity against them, some bounds might be fixed unto them; for “by the law is the knowledge of sin.”

[2.] To *shut up unbelievers*, and such as would not seek for righteousness, life, and salvation by the promise, under the power of the covenant of works, and curse attending it. “It concluded” or “shut up all under sin,” saith the apostle, <sup><REF></sup>Galatians 3:22. This was the end of the law, for this end was it added, as it gave a revival unto the covenant of works.

Unto the *second* inquiry, which ariseth out of this supposition, namely, that the law did convince of sin, and condemn for sin, which is, “whether it be not then contrary to the grace of God,” the apostle in like manner returns a double answer, taken from the second use of the law, before insisted on, with respect unto the promise. And, —

[1.] He says, ‘That although the law doth thus *rebuke sin, convince of sin*, and condemn for sin, so setting bounds unto transgressions and transgressors, yet did God never intend it as a means to give life and righteousness, nor was it able so to do.’ The end of the promise was to give righteousness, justification, and salvation, all by Christ, to whom and concerning whom it was made. But this was not the end for which the law was revived in the covenant of Sinai. For although in itself it requires a perfect righteousness, and gives a promise of life thereon, (“He that doeth these things, he shall live in them,”) yet it could give neither righteousness nor life unto any in the state of sin. See <sup><REF></sup>Romans 8:3, 10:4. Wherefore the promise and the law, having diverse ends, they are not contrary to one another.

[2.] Saith he, ‘*The law hath a great respect unto the promise*; and was given of God for this very end, that it might lead and direct men unto Christ;’ —which is sufficient to answer the question proposed at the

beginning of this discourse, about the end of this covenant, and the advantage which the church received thereby.

What hath been spoken may suffice to declare the nature of this covenant in general; and two things do here evidently follow, wherein the substance of the whole truth contended for by the apostle doth consist: —

**(1.)** That whilst the covenant of grace was contained and proposed only in the promise, before it was solemnly confirmed in the blood and sacrifice of Christ, and so *legalized* or established as the only rule of the worship of the church, the introduction of this other covenant on Sinai did not constitute a new way or means of righteousness, life, and salvation; but believers sought for them alone by the covenant of grace as declared in the promise. This follows evidently upon what we have discoursed; and it secures absolutely that great fundamental truth, which the apostle in this and all his other epistles so earnestly contendeth for, namely, that there neither is, nor ever was, either righteousness, justification, life, or salvation, to be attained by any law, or the works of it, (for this covenant at mount Sinai comprehended every law that God ever gave unto the church,) but by Christ alone, and faith in him.

**(2.)** That whereas this covenant being introduced in the pleasure of God, there was prescribed with it a *form of outward worship* suited unto that dispensation of times and present state of the church; upon the introduction of the new covenant in the fullness of times, to be the rule of all intercourse between God and the church, both that covenant and all its worship must be disannulled. This is that which the apostle proves with all sorts of arguments, manifesting the great advantage of the church thereby.

These things, I say, do evidently follow on the preceding discourses, and are the main truths contended for by the apostle.

**4.** There remaineth one thing more only to be considered, before we enter on the comparison between the two covenants here directed unto by the apostle. And this is, how this first covenant came to be an *especial covenant* unto that people: wherein we shall manifest the reason of its introduction at that season. And unto this end sundry things are to be considered concerning that people and the church of God in them, with

whom this covenant was made; which will further evidence both the nature, use, and necessity of it: —

(1.) This people were the posterity of Abraham, unto whom the promise was made that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Wherefore from among them was the promised Seed to be raised up in the fullness of time, or its proper season, — from among them was the Son of God to take on him the seed of Abraham. To this end sundry things were necessary: —

[1.] That they should have a *certain abiding place* or country, which they might freely inhabit, distinct from other nations, and under a rule or scepter of their own. So it is said of them, that

“the people should dwell alone, and not be reckoned among the nations,” <sup>1023</sup>Numbers 23:9;

and

“the scepter was not to depart from them until Shiloh came,” <sup>1040</sup>Genesis 49:10.

For God had regard unto his own glory in his faithfulness as unto his word and oath given unto Abraham, not only that they should be accomplished, but that their accomplishment should be evident and conspicuous. But if this posterity of Abraham, from among whom the promised Seed was to rise, had been, as it is at this day with them, scattered abroad on the face of the earth, mixed with all nations, and under their power, although God might have accomplished his promise really in raising up Christ from among some of his posterity, yet could it not be proved or *evidenced* that he had so done, by reason of the confusion and mixture of the people with others. Wherefore God provided a land and country for them which they might inhabit by themselves, and as their own, even the land of Canaan. And this was so suited unto all the ends of God towards that people, — as might be declared in sundry instances, — that God is said to have “espied this land out for them,” <sup>1310</sup>Ezekiel 20:6. He chose it out, as most meet for his purpose towards that people of all lands under heaven.

[2.] That there should be always kept among them *an open confession and visible representation* of the end for which they were so separated from all

the nations of the world. They were not to dwell in the land of Canaan merely for secular ends, and to make as it were a dumb show; but as they were there maintained and preserved to evidence the faithfulness of God in bringing forth the promised Seed in the fullness of time, so there was to be a testimony kept up among them unto that end of God whereunto they were preserved. This was the end of all their ordinances of worship, of the tabernacle, priesthood, sacrifices and ordinances; which were all appointed by Moses, on the command of God, “for a testimony of those things which should be spoken afterwards,” <sup><385></sup> Hebrews 3:5.

These things were necessary in the first place, with respect unto the ends of God towards that people.

(2.) It *becomes* not the wisdom, holiness, and sovereignty of God, to call any people into an especial relation unto himself, to do them good in an eminent and peculiar manner, and then to suffer them to live at their pleasure, without any regard unto what he hath done for them. Wherefore, having granted unto this people those great privileges of the land of Canaan, and the ordinances of worship relating unto the great end mentioned, he moreover prescribed unto them *laws, rules, and terms of obedience*, whereon they should hold and enjoy that land, with all the privileges annexed unto the possession thereof. And these are both expressed and frequently inculcated, in the repetition and promises of the law. But yet in the prescription of these terms, God reserved the sovereignty of dealing with them unto himself. For had he left them to stand or fall absolutely by the terms prescribed unto them, they might and would have utterly forfeited both the land and all the privileges they enjoyed therein. And had it so fallen out, then the great end of God in preserving them a separate people until the Seed should come, and a representation thereof among them, had been frustrated. Wherefore, although he punished them for their transgressions, according to the threatenings of the law, yet would he not bring the □□□, or “curse of the law,” upon them, and utterly cast them off, until his great end was accomplished, <sup><300></sup> Malachi 4:4-6.

(3.) God would not *take this people off from the promise*, because his church was among them, and they could neither please God nor be accepted with him but by faith therein. But yet they were to be dealt

withal according as it was meet. For they were generally a people of a hard heart, and stiff-necked, lifted up with an opinion of their own righteousness and worth above others. This Moses endeavoreth, by all manner of reasons and instances unto the contrary, to take them off from, in the book of Deuteronomy. Yet was it not effected among the generality of them, nor is to this day; for in the midst of all their wickedness and misery, they still trust to and boast of their own righteousness, and will have it that God hath an especial obligation unto them on that account. For this cause God saw it necessary, and it pleased him to put a *grievous and heavy yoke* upon them, to subdue the pride of their spirits, and to cause them to breathe after deliverance. This the apostle Peter calls “a yoke that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear,” <sup><415D></sup>Acts 15:10; that is, with peace, ease, and rest: which therefore the Lord Christ invited them to seek for in himself alone, <sup><412></sup>Matthew 11:29, 30. And this yoke that God put on them consisted in these three things: —

[1.] In a *multitude of precepts*, hard to be understood, and difficult to be observed. The present Jews reckon up six hundred and thirteen of them; about the sense of most of which they dispute endlessly among themselves. But the truth is, since the days of the Pharisees they have increased their own yoke, and made obedience unto their law in any tolerable manner altogether impracticable. It were easy to manifest, for instance, that no man under heaven ever did, or ever can, keep the Sabbath according to the rules they give about it in their Talmuds. And they generally scarce observe one of them themselves. But in the law, as given by God himself, it is certain that there are a multitude of arbitrary precepts, and those in themselves not accompanied with any spiritual advantages, as our apostle shows, <sup><399></sup>Hebrews 9:9, 10; only they were obliged to perform them by a mere sovereign act of power and authority.

[2.] In the *severity* wherewith the observance of all those precepts was enjoined them. And this was the *threatening of death*; for “he that despised Moses’ law died without mercy,” and “every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward.” Hence was their complaint of old,

“Behold, we die, we perish, we all perish. Whosoever cometh any thing near unto the tabernacle of the LORD shall die: shall we be consumed with dying?” <sup><0472></sup>Numbers 17:12, 13.

And the curse solemnly denounced against every one that confirmed not all things written in the law was continually before them.

[3.] In a *spirit of bondage unto fear*. This was administered in the giving and dispensation of the law, even as a spirit of liberty and power is administered in and by the gospel. And as this respected their present obedience, and manner of its performance, so in particular it regarded death not yet conquered by Christ. Hence our apostle affirms, that “through fear of death they were all their lifetime subject unto bondage.”

This state God brought them into, partly to subdue the pride of their hearts, trusting in their own righteousness, and partly to cause them to look out earnestly after the promised deliverer.

(4.) Into this *estate and condition* God brought them by a solemn covenant, confirmed by mutual consent between him and them. The tenor, force, and solemn ratification of this covenant, are expressed, <sup><0243></sup>Exodus 24:3-8. Unto the terms and conditions of this covenant was the whole church obliged indispensably, on pain of extermination, until all was accomplished, <sup><3004></sup>Malachi 4:4-6. Unto this covenant belonged the decalogue, with all precepts of moral obedience thence educed. So also did the laws of political rule established among them, and the whole system of religious worship given unto them. All these laws were brought within the verge of this covenant, and were the matter of it. And it had especial promises and threatenings annexed unto it as such; whereof none did exceed the bounds of the land of Canaan. For even many of the laws of it were such as obliged nowhere else. Such was the law of the sabbatical year, and all their sacrifices. There was sin and obedience in them or about them in the land of Canaan, none elsewhere. Hence, —

(5.) This covenant thus made, with these ends and promises, did never save nor condemn any man eternally. All that lived under the administration of it did attain eternal life, or perished for ever, but not by *virtue of this covenant as* formally such. It did, indeed, revive the commanding power and sanction of the first covenant of works; and

therein, as the apostle speaks, was “the ministry of condemnation,” 2 Corinthians: 3:9; for “by the deeds of the law can no flesh be justified.” And on the other hand, it directed also unto the promise, which was the instrument of life and salvation unto all that did believe. But as unto what it had of its own, it was confined unto things temporal. Believers were saved under it, but not by virtue of it. Sinners perished eternally under it, but by the curse of the original law of works. And, —

(6.) Hereon *occasionally fell out the ruin of that people*; “their table became a snare unto them, and that which should have been for their welfare became a trap,” according to the prediction of our Savior, <sup><192></sup>Psalm 69:22. It was this covenant that raised and ruined them. It raised them to glory and honor when given of God; it ruined them when abused by themselves to ends contrary to express declarations of his mind and will. For although the generality of them were wicked and rebellious, always breaking the terms of the covenant which God made with them, so far as it was possible they should, whilst God determined to reign over them unto the appointed season, and repining under the burden of it; yet they would have this covenant to be the only rule and means of righteousness, life, and salvation, as the apostle declares, <sup><183></sup>Romans 9:31-33, 10:3. For, as we have often said, there were two things in it, both which they abused unto other ends than what God designed them: —

[1.] There was the *renovation of the rule of the covenant of works* for righteousness and life. And this they would have to be given unto them for those ends, and so sought for righteousness by the works of the law.

[2.] There was ordained in it a *typical representation* of the way and means whereby the promise was to be made effectual, namely, in the mediation and sacrifice of Jesus Christ; which was the end of all their ordinances of worship. And the outward law thereof, with the observance of its institution, they looked on as their only relief when they came short of exact and perfect righteousness.

Against both these pernicious errors the apostle disputes expressly in his epistles unto the Romans and the Galatians, to save them, if it were possible, from that ruin they were casting themselves into. Hereon “the elect obtained,” but “the rest were hardened.” For hereby they made an



absolute renunciation of the promise, wherein alone God had inwrapped the way of life and salvation.

This is the nature and substance of that covenant which God made with that people; a particular, temporary covenant it was, and not a mere dispensation of the covenant of grace.

That which remains for the declaration of the mind of the Holy Ghost in this whole matter, is to declare the differences that are between those two covenants, whence the one is said to be “better” than the other, and to be “built upon better promises.”

Those of the church of Rome do commonly place this difference in three things:

1. In the *promises of them*: which in the old covenant were temporal only; in the new, spiritual and heavenly.
2. In the *precepts of them*: which under the old, required only external obedience, designing the righteousness of the outward man; under the new, they are internal, respecting principally the inner man of the heart.
3. In their *sacraments*: for those under the old testament were only outwardly figurative; but those of the new are operative of grace.

But these things do not express much, if any thing at all, of what the Scripture placeth this difference in. And besides, as by some of them explained, they are not true, especially the two latter of them. For I cannot but somewhat admire how it came into the heart or mind of any man to think or say, that God ever gave a law or laws, precept or precepts, that should “respect the outward man only, and the regulation of external duties.” A thought of it is contrary unto all the essential properties of the nature of God, and meet only to ingenerate apprehensions of him unsuited unto all his glorious excellencies. The life and foundation of all the laws under the old testament was, “Thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thy soul;” without which no outward obedience was ever accepted with him. And for the third of the supposed differences, neither were the sacraments of the law so barely “figurative,” but that they did exhibit Christ unto believers: for “they all drank of the spiritual rock; which rock

was Christ.” Nor are those of the gospel so operative of grace, but that without faith they are useless unto them that do receive them.

The things wherein this difference doth consist, as expressed in the Scripture, are partly *circumstantial*, and partly *substantial*, and may be reduced unto the heads ensuing: —

1. These two covenants differ in the *circumstance of time* as to their promulgation, declaration, and establishment. This difference the apostle expresseth from the prophet Jeremiah, in the ninth verse of this chapter, where it must be more fully spoken unto. In brief, the first covenant was made at the time that God brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, and took its date from the third month after their coming up from thence, <sup><19></sup>Exodus 19:24. From the time of what is reported in the latter place, wherein the people give their actual consent unto the terms of it, it began its formal obligation as a covenant. And we must afterwards inquire when it was abrogated and ceased to oblige the church. The new covenant was declared and made known “in the latter days,” <sup><30></sup>Hebrews 1:1, 2; “in the dispensation of the fullness of times,” <sup><40></sup>Ephesians 1:10. And it took date, as a covenant formally obliging the whole church, from the death, resurrection, ascension of Christ, and sending of the Holy Ghost. I bring them all into the epocha of this covenant, because though principally it was established by the first, yet was it not absolutely obligatory as a covenant until after the last of them.

2. They differ in the *circumstance of place* as to their promulgation; which the Scripture also taketh notice of. The first was declared on mount Sinai; the manner whereof, and the station of the people in *receiving* the law, I have in my Exercitations unto the first part of this Exposition at large declared, and thither the reader is referred, <sup><15></sup>Exodus 19:18. The other was declared on mount Zion, and the law of it went forth from Jerusalem, <sup><20></sup>Isaiah 2:3. This difference, with many remarkable instances from it, our apostle insists on, <sup><30></sup>Galatians 4:24-26: “These are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.” That is, Agar, the bondswoman whom Abraham took before the heir of promise was born, was a type of the old covenant given on Sinai, before the introduction of the new, or the covenant of promise; for so he adds: “For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth unto Jerusalem which

now is, and is in bondage with her children.” This mount Sinai, where the old covenant was given, and which was represented by Agar, is in Arabia, —cast quite out of the verge and confines of the church. And it “answereth,” or “is placed in the same series, rank, and order with Jerusalem,” namely, in the opposition of the two covenants. For as the new covenant, the covenant of promise, giving freedom and liberty, was given at Jerusalem, in the death and resurrection of Christ, with the preaching of the gospel which ensued thereon; so the old covenant, that brought the people into bondage, was given at mount Sinai in Arabia.

**3.** They differ in the *manner of their promulgation* and establishment. There were two things remarkable that accompanied the solemn declaration of the first covenant: —

**(1.)** The *dread and terror of the outward appearance on mount Sinai*, which filled all the people, yea, Moses himself, with fear and trembling, <sup><S28></sup>Hebrews 12:18-21; <sup><D96></sup>Exodus 19:16, 20:18, 19. Together herewith was a spirit of fear and bondage administered unto all the people, so as that they chose to keep at a distance, and not draw nigh unto God, <sup><R23></sup>Deuteronomy 5:23-27.

**(2.)** That it was given by the *ministry and “disposition of angels,”* <sup><H23></sup>Acts 7:53; <sup><R23></sup>Galatians 3:19. Hence the people were in a sense “put in subjection unto angels,” and they had an authoritative ministry in that covenant. The church that then was, was put into some kind of subjection unto angels, as the apostle plainly intimates, <sup><S11></sup>Hebrews 2:5. Hence the worshipping or adoration of angels began among that people, <sup><S28></sup>Colossians 2:18; which some, with an addition unto their folly and superstition, would introduce into the Christian church, wherein they have no such authoritative ministry as they had under the old covenant.

Things are quite otherwise in the promulgation of the new covenant. The Son of God in his own person did declare it. This he “*spoke from heaven,*” as the apostle observes; in opposition unto the giving of the law “on the earth,” <sup><S25></sup>Hebrews 12:25. Yet did he speak on the earth also; the mystery whereof himself declares, <sup><R23></sup>John 3:13. And he did all things that belonged unto the establishment of this covenant in a spirit of meekness and condescension, with the highest evidence of love, grace, and compassion, encouraging and inviting the weary, the burdened, the heavy

and laden to come unto him. And by his Spirit he makes his disciples to carry on the same work until the covenant was fully declared, <sup><SR1B></sup> Hebrews 2:3. See <sup><SR17></sup> John 1:17, 18.

And the whole ministry of angels, in the giving of this covenant, was merely in a way of service and obedience unto Christ; and they owned themselves the “fellow-servants” only of them that have “the testimony of Jesus,” <sup><SR9A></sup> Revelation 19:10. So that this “world to come,” as it was called of old, was no way put in subjection unto them.

**4.** They differ in their *mediators*. The mediator of the first covenant was *Moses*. “It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator,” <sup><SR9B></sup> Galatians 3:19. And this was no other but Moses, who was a servant in the house of God, <sup><SR3B></sup> Hebrews 3:5. And he was a mediator, as designed of God, so chosen of the people, in that dread and consternation which befell them upon the terrible promulgation of the law For they saw that they could no way bear the immediate presence of God, nor treat with him in their own persons. Wherefore they desired that there might be an internuncius, a mediator between God and them, and that Moses might be the person, <sup><SR5A></sup> Deuteronomy 5:24-27. But the mediator of the new covenant is the *Son of God himself*. For “there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all,” <sup><SR4B></sup> 1 Timothy 2:5. He who is the Son, and the Lord over his own house, graciously undertook in his own person to be the mediator of this covenant; and herein it is unspeakably preferred before the old covenant.

**5.** They differ in their *subject-matter*, both as unto precepts and promises, the advantage being still on the part of the new covenant. For, —

**(1.)** The old covenant, in the *preceptive part* of it, renewed the commands of the covenant of works, and that on their original terms. Sin it forbade, — that is, all and every sin, in matter and manner, — on the pain of death; and gave the promise of life unto perfect, sinless obedience only: whence the decalogue itself, which is a transcript of the law of works, is called “the covenant,” <sup><SR3C></sup> Exodus 34:28. And besides this, as we observed before, it had other precepts innumerable, accommodated unto the present condition of the people, and imposed on them with rigor. But in the new covenant, the very first thing that is proposed, is the accomplishment and establishment of the covenant of works, both as unto its commands and

sanction, in the obedience and suffering of the mediator. Hereon the commands of it, as unto the obedience of the covenanters, are not grievous; the yoke of Christ being easy, and his burden light.

(2.) The old testament, absolutely considered, had,

[1.] *No promise of grace*, to communicate spiritual strength, or to assist us in *obedience*; nor,

[2.] Any of *eternal life*, no otherwise but as it was contained in the promise of the covenant of works, “The man that doeth these things shall live in them;” and,

[3.] Had promises of *temporal things* in the land of Canaan *inseparable from it*. In the new covenant all things are otherwise, as will be declared in the exposition of the ensuing verses.

6. They differ, and that principally, in the *manner of their dedication and sanction*. This is that which gives any thing the formal nature of a covenant or testament. There may be a promise, there may be an agreement in general, which hath not the formal nature of a covenant, or testament, — and such was the covenant of grace before the death of Christ, — but it is the solemnity and manner of the confirmation, dedication, and sanction of any promise or agreement, that give it the formal nature of a covenant or testament. And this is by a sacrifice, wherein there is both bloodshedding and death ensuing thereon. Now this, in the confirmation of the old covenant, was only the sacrifice of beasts, whose blood was sprinkled on all the people, <sup><0245></sup>Exodus 24:5-8. But the new testament was solemnly confirmed by the sacrifice and blood of Christ himself, <sup><301></sup>Zechariah 9:11; <sup><302></sup>Hebrews 10:29, 13:20. And the Lord Christ dying as the mediator and surety of the covenant, he purchased all good things for the church; and as a testator bequeathed them unto it. Hence he says of the sacramental cup, that it is “the new testament in his blood,” or the pledge of his bequeathing unto the church all the promises and mercies of the covenant; which is the new testament, or the disposition of his goods unto his children. But because the <sup><303></sup>Hebrews 9:18-23, we must thither refer the full consideration of it.

7. They differ in the *priests* that were to officiate before God in the behalf of the people. In the old covenant, Aaron and his posterity alone were to

discharge that *office*; in the new, the Son of God himself is the only priest of the church. This difference, with the advantage of the gospel-state thereon, we have handled at large in the exposition of the chapter foregoing.

**8.** They differ in the *sacrifices* whereon the peace and reconciliation with God which is tendered in them doth depend. And this also must be spoken unto in the ensuing chapter, if God permit.

**9.** They differ in the *way and manner of their solemn writing or enrolment*. All covenants were of old solemnly written in tables of brass or stone, where they might be faithfully preserved for the use of the parties concerned. So the old covenant, as to the principal, fundamental part of it, was “engraven in tables of stone,” which were kept in the ark, <sup><BIB></sup>Exodus 31:18; <sup><BIB></sup>Deuteronomy 9:10; <sup><BIB></sup>2 Corinthians 3:7. And God did so order it in his providence, that the first draught of them should be broken, to intimate that the covenant contained in them was not everlasting nor unalterable. But the new covenant is written in the “fleshy tables of the hearts” of them that do believe <sup><BIB></sup>2 Corinthians 3:3; <sup><BIB></sup>Jeremiah 31:33.

**10.** They differ in their ends. The principal end of the first covenant was to discover sin, to condemn it, and to set bounds unto it. So saith the apostle, “It was added because of transgressions.” And this it did several ways: —

**(1.)** By *conviction*: for “by the law is the knowledge of sin;” it convinced sinners, and caused every mouth to be stopped before God.

**(2.)** By *condemning the sinner*, in an application of the sanction of the law unto his conscience.

**(3.)** By the *judgments* and punishments wherewith on all occasions it was accompanied. In all it manifested and represented the justice and severity of God.

The end of the new covenant is, to declare the love, grace, and mercy of God; and therewith to give repentance, remission of sin, and life eternal.

**11.** They differed in their *effects*. For the first covenant being the “ministration of death” and “condemnation,” it brought the minds and spirits of them that were under it into *servitude and bondage*; whereas

*spiritual liberty* is the immediate effect of the new testament. And there is no one thing wherein the Spirit of God doth more frequently give us an account of the difference between these two covenants, than in this of the liberty of the one and the bondage of the other. See <sup><RHS></sup>Romans 8:15; <sup><RHS></sup>2 Corinthians 3:17; <sup><RHS></sup>Galatians 4:1-7, 24, 26, 30, 31; <sup><RHS></sup>Hebrews 2:14, 15. This, therefore, we must a little explain. Wherefore the bondage which was the effect of the old covenant arose from several causes concurring unto the effecting of it: —

- (1.) The *renovation of the terms and sanction of the covenant of works* contributed much thereunto. For the people saw not how the commands of that covenant could be observed, nor how its curse could be avoided. They saw it not, I say, by any thing in the covenant of Sinai; which therefore “gendered unto bondage.” All the prospect they had of deliverance was from the promise.
- (2.) It arose from the *manner of the delivery of the law*, and God’s entering thereon into covenant with them. This was ordered on purpose to fill them with dread and fear. And it could not but do so, whenever they called it to remembrance.
- (3.) From the *severity of the penalties* annexed unto the transgression of the law. And God had taken upon himself, that where punishment was not exacted according to the law, he himself would “cut them off.” This kept them always anxious and solicitous, not knowing when they were safe or secure.
- (4.) From the *nature of the whole ministry of the law*, which was the “ministration of death” and “condemnation,” <sup><RHS></sup>2 Corinthians 3:7, 9; which declared the desert of every sin to be death, and denounced death unto every sinner, administering by itself no relief unto the minds and consciences of men. So was it the “letter that killed” them that were under its power.
- (5.) From the *darkness of their own minds, in the means, ways, and causes of deliverance* from all these things. It is true, they had a promise before of life and salvation, which was not abolished by this covenant, even the promise made unto Abraham; but this belonged not unto this covenant, and the way of its accomplishment, by the incarnation and mediation of

the Son of God, was much hidden from them, —yea, from the prophets themselves who yet foretold them. This left them under much bondage. For the principal cause and means of the liberty of believers under the gospel, ariseth from the clear light they have into the mystery of the love and grace of God in Christ. This knowledge and faith of his incarnation, humiliation, sufferings, and sacrifice, whereby he made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness, is that which gives them liberty and boldness in their obedience, <sup><487></sup>2 Corinthians 3:17, 18. Whilst they of old were in the dark as unto these things, they must needs have been kept under much bondage.

**(6.)** It was increased by *the yoke of a multitude of laws, rites, and ceremonies*, imposed on them; which made the whole of their worship a burden unto them, and insupportable, <sup><450></sup>Acts 15:10.

In and by all these ways and means there was a spirit of bondage and fear administered unto them. And this God did, thus he dealt with them, to the end that they might not rest in that state, but continually look out after deliverance.

On the other hand, the new covenant gives liberty and boldness, the liberty and boldness of children, unto all believers. It is the Spirit of the Son in it that makes us free, or gives us universally all that liberty which is any way needful for us or useful unto us. For “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;” namely, to serve God, “not in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the spirit.” And it is declared that this was the great end of bringing in the new covenant, in the accomplishment of the promise made unto Abraham, namely, “that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve God without fear ..... all the days of our life,” <sup><407></sup>Luke 1:72-75. And we may briefly consider wherein this deliverance and liberty by the new covenant doth consist, which it doth in the things ensuing: —

**(1.)** In *our freedom from the commanding power of the law*, as to sinless, perfect obedience, in order unto righteousness and justification before God. Its commands we are still subject unto, but not in order unto life and salvation; for unto these ends it is fulfilled in and by the mediator of the new covenant, who is “the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth,” <sup><50></sup>Romans 10:4.



(2.) In our freedom from the condemning power of the law, and the sanction of it in the curse. This being undergone and answered by him who was “made a curse for us,” we are freed from it, <sup><B10></sup>Romans 7:6; <sup><B13></sup>Galatians 3:13, 14. And therein also are we “delivered from the fear of death,” <sup><B15></sup>Hebrews 2:15, as it was penal and an entrance into judgment or condemnation, <sup><B24></sup>John 5:24.

(3.) In our freedom from conscience of sin, <sup><B10></sup>Hebrews 10:2, — that is, conscience disquieting, perplexing, and condemning our persons; the hearts of all that believe being “sprinkled from an evil conscience” by the blood of Christ.

(4.) In our freedom from the whole system of Mosaical worship, in all the rites, and ceremonies, and ordinances of it; which what a burden it was the apostles do declare, Acts 15, and our apostle at large in his epistle to the Galatians.

(5.) From all the laws of men in things appertaining unto the worship of God, <sup><B23></sup>1 Corinthians 7:23.

And by all these, and the like instances of spiritual liberty, doth the gospel free believers from that “spirit of bondage unto fear,” which was administered under the old covenant.

It remains only that we point out the heads of those ways whereby this liberty is communicated unto us under the new covenant. And it is done,

(1.) Principally by the grant and communication of the Spirit of the Son as a Spirit of adoption, giving the freedom, boldness, and liberty of children, <sup><B12></sup>John 1:12; <sup><B15></sup>Romans 8:15-17; <sup><B16></sup>Galatians 4:6, 7. From hence the apostle lays it down as a certain rule, that “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,” <sup><B17></sup>2 Corinthians 3:17. Let men pretend what they will, let them boast of the freedom of their outward condition in this world, and of the inward liberty or freedom of their wills, there is indeed no true liberty where the Spirit of God is not. The ways whereby he giveth freedom, power, a sound mind, spiritual boldness, courage, contempt of the cross, holy confidence before God, a readiness for obedience, and enlargedness of heart in duties, with all other things wherein true liberty doth consist, or which any way belong unto it, I must not here divert to declare. The world

judges that there is no bondage but where the Spirit of God is; for that gives that conscientious fear of sin, that awe of God in all our thoughts, actions, and ways, that careful and circumspect walking, that temperance in things lawful, that abstinence from all appearance of evil, wherein they judge the greatest bondage on the earth to consist. But those who have received him, do know that the whole world doth lie in evil, and that all those unto whom spiritual liberty is a bondage are the servants and slaves of Satan.

**(2.)** It is obtained by the *evidence of our justification before God, and the causes of it*. This men were greatly in the dark unto under the first covenant, although all stable peace with God doth depend thereon; for it is in the gospel that “the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith,” <sup>REF17</sup>Romans 1:17. Indeed “the righteousness of God without the law is witnessed by the law and the prophets,” <sup>REF21</sup>Romans 3:21; that is, testimony is given to it in legal institutions and the promises recorded in the prophets. But these things were obscure unto them, who were to seek for what was intended under the veils and shadows of priests and sacrifices, atonements and expiations. But our justification before God, in all the causes of it, being now fully revealed and made manifest, it hath a great influence into spiritual liberty and boldness.

**(3.)** By the *spiritual light which is given to believers into the mystery of God in Christ*. This the apostle affirms to have been “hid in God from the beginning of the world,” <sup>REF9</sup>Ephesians 3:9. It was contrived and prepared in the counsel and wisdom of God from all eternity. Some intimation was given of it in the first promise, and it was afterwards shadowed out by sundry legal institutions; but the depth, the glory, the beauty and fullness of it, were “hid in God,” in his mind and will, until it was fully revealed in the gospel. The saints under the old testament believed that they should be delivered by the promised Seed, that they should be saved for the Lord’s sake, that the Angel of the covenant would save them, yea, that the Lord himself would come to his temple; and they diligently inquired into what was foresignified concerning “the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” But all this while their thoughts and conceptions were exceedingly in the dark as to those glorious things which are made so plain in the new covenant, concerning the incarnation, mediation, sufferings, and sacrifice of the Son of God, —concerning the way of God’s being in Christ

reconciling the world unto himself. Now as darkness gives fear, so light gives liberty.

**(4.)** We obtain this liberty by *the opening of the way into the holiest, and the entrance we have thereby with boldness unto the throne of grace*. This also the apostle insists upon peculiarly in sundry places of his ensuing discourses, as <sup><300B></sup>Hebrews 9:8, 10:19-22: where it must be spoken to, if God permit, at large; for a great part of the liberty of the new testament doth consist herein.

**(5.)** By *all the ordinances of gospel-worship*, How the ordinances of worship under the old testament did lead the people into bondage hath been declared; but those of the new testament, through their plainness in signification, their immediate respect unto the Lord Christ, with their use and efficacy to guide believers in their communion with God, do all conduce unto our evangelical liberty. And of such importance is our liberty in this instance of it, that when the apostles saw it necessary, for the avoiding of offense and scandal, to continue the observance of one or two legal institutions, in abstinence from some things in themselves indifferent, they did it only for a season, and declared that it was only in case of scandal that they would allow this temporary abridgment of the liberty given us by the gospel.

**12.** They differ greatly with respect unto *the dispensation and grant of the Holy Ghost*. It is certain that God did grant the gift of the Holy Spirit under the old testament, and his operations during that season, as I have at large elsewhere declared;<sup>f6</sup> but it is no less certain, that there was always a promise of his more signal effusion upon the confirmation and establishment of the new covenant. See in particular that great promise to this purpose, <sup><300B></sup>Joel 2:28, 29, as applied and expounded by the apostle Peter, <sup><4006></sup>Acts 2:16-18. Yea, so sparing was the communication of the Holy Ghost under the old testament, compared with his effusion under the new, as that the evangelist affirms that “the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified,” <sup><4003></sup>John 7:39; that is, he was not yet given in that manner as he was to be given upon the confirmation of the new covenant. And those of the church of the Hebrews who had received the doctrine of John, yet affirmed that “they had not so much as heard whether there were any Holy Ghost” or no, <sup><4002></sup>Acts 19:2; that is,

any such gift and communication of him as was then proposed as the chief privilege of the gospel. Neither doth this concern only the plentiful effusion of him with respect unto those miraculous gifts and operations wherewith the doctrine and establishment of the new covenant was testified unto and confirmed: however, that also gave a signal difference between the two covenants; for the first covenant was confirmed by dreadful appearances and operations, effected by the ministry of angels, but the new by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost himself. But this difference principally consists herein, that under the new testament the Holy Ghost hath graciously condescended to bear the office of the comforter of the church. That this unspeakable privilege is peculiar unto the new testament, is evident from all the promises of his being sent as a comforter made by our Savior, <sup>4840</sup>John 14-16.; especially by that wherein he assures his disciples that “unless he went away” (in which going away he confirmed the new covenant)

“the Comforter would not come; but if he so went away, he would send him from the Father,” <sup>4847</sup>John 16:7.

And the difference between the two covenants which ensued hereon is inexpressible.

13. They differ in the *declaration made in them of the kingdom of God*. It is the observation of Augustine, that the very name of “the kingdom of heaven” is peculiar unto the new testament. It is true, God reigned in and over the church under the old testament; but his rule was such, and had such a relation unto secular things, especially with respect unto the land of Canaan, and the flourishing condition of the people therein, as that it had an appearance of a kingdom of this world. And that it was so, and was so to be, consisting in empire, power, victory, wealth, and peace, was so deeply fixed on the minds of the generality of the people, that the disciples of Christ themselves could not free themselves of that apprehension, until the new testament was fully established. But now in the gospel, the nature of the kingdom of God, where it is, and wherein it consists, is plainly and evidently declared, unto the unspeakable consolation of believers. For whereas it is now known and experienced to be internal, spiritual, and heavenly, they have no less assured interest in it and advantage by it, in all the troubles which they may undergo in this

world, than they could have in the fullest possession of all earthly enjoyments.

**14.** They differ in their *substance and end*. The old covenant was typical, shadowy, and removable, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 10:1. The new covenant is substantial and permanent, as containing the body, which is Christ. Now, consider the old covenant comparatively with the new, and this part of its nature, that it was typical and shadowy, is a great debasement of it. But consider it absolutely, and the things wherein it was so were its greatest glory and excellency; for in these things alone was it a token and pledge of the love and grace of God. For those things in the old covenant which had most of bondage in their use and practice, had most of light and grace in their signification. This was the design of God in all the ordinances of worship belonging unto that covenant, namely, to typify, shadow, and represent the heavenly, substantial things of the new covenant, or the Lord Christ and the work of his mediation. This the tabernacle, ark, altar, priests, and sacrifices did do; and it was their glory that so they did. However, compared with the substance in the new covenant, they have no glory.

**15.** They differ in *the extent of their administration, according unto the will of God*. The first was confined unto the posterity of Abraham according to the flesh, and unto them especially in the land of Canaan, <sup><480></sup>Deuteronomy 5:3, with some few proselytes that were joined unto them, excluding all others from the participation of the benefits of it. And hence it was, that whereas the personal ministry of our Savior himself, in preaching of the gospel, was to precede the introduction of the new covenant, it was confined unto the people of Israel, <sup><454></sup>Matthew 15:24. And he was the “minister of the circumcision,” <sup><618></sup>Romans 15:8. Such narrow bounds and limits had the administration of this covenant affixed unto it by the will and pleasure of God, <sup><470></sup>Psalms 147:19, 20. But the administration of the new covenant is extended unto all nations under heaven; none being excluded, on the account of tongue, language, family, nation, or place of habitation. All have an equal interest in the rising Sun. The partition wall is broken down, and the gates of the new Jerusalem are set open unto all comers upon the gospel invitation. This is frequently taken notice of in the Scripture. See <sup><480></sup>Matthew 28:19; <sup><4165></sup>Mark 16:15; <sup><6151></sup>John 11:51, 52, <sup><6120></sup>12:32; <sup><4118></sup>Acts 11:18, <sup><4170></sup>17:30; <sup><4006></sup>Galatians 5:6; <sup><4011></sup>Ephesians 2:11-16,

3:8-10; Colossians; 3:10, 11; 1 John 2:2; Revelation 5:9. This is the grand charter of the poor wandering Gentiles. Having wilfully fallen off from God, he was pleased, in his holiness and severity, to leave all our ancestors for many generations to serve and worship the devil. And the mystery of our recovery was “hid in God from the beginning of the world,” Ephesians 3:8-10. And although it was so foretold, so prophesied of, so promised under the old testament, yet, such was the pride, blindness, and obstinacy, of the greatest part of the church of the Jews, that its accomplishment was one great part of that stumbling-block whereat they fell; yea, the greatness and glory of this mystery was such, that the disciples of Christ themselves comprehended it not, until it was testified unto them by the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, the great promise of the new covenant, upon some of those poor Gentiles, Acts 11:18.

**16.** They differ in their *efficacy*; for the old covenant “made nothing perfect,” it could effect none of the things it did represent, nor introduce that perfect or complete state which God had designed for the church. But this we have at large insisted on in our exposition of the foregoing chapter.

Lastly, They differ in their *duration*: for the one was to be removed, and the other to abide for ever; which must be declared on the ensuing verses.

It may be other things of an alike nature may be added unto these that we have mentioned, wherein the difference between the two covenants doth consist; but these instances are sufficient unto our purpose. For some, when they hear that the covenant of grace was always one and the same, of the same nature and efficacy under both testaments, —that the way of salvation by Christ was always one and the same, —are ready to think that there was no such great difference between their state and ours as is pretended. But we see that on this supposition, that covenant which God brought the people into at Sinai, and under the yoke whereof they were to abide until the new covenant was established, had all the disadvantages attending it which we have insisted on. And those who understand not how excellent and glorious those privileges are which are added unto the covenant of grace, as to the administration of it, by the introduction and establishment of the new covenant, are utterly unacquainted with the nature of spiritual and heavenly things.

There remaineth yet one thing more, which the Socinians give us occasion to speak unto from these words of the apostle, that the new covenant is “established on better promises.” For from hence they do conclude that there were no promises of life under the old testament; which, in the latitude of it, is a senseless and brutish opinion. And, —

1. The apostle in this place intends only those promises whereon the new testament was *legally ratified*, and reduced into the form of a covenant; which were, as he declares, the promises of especial pardoning mercy, and of the efficacy of grace in the renovation of our natures, But it is granted that the other covenant was legally established on promises which respected the land of Canaan. Wherefore it is granted, that as to the promises whereby the covenants were actually established, those of the new covenant were better than the other.
2. The old covenant had express *promise of eternal life*: “He that doeth these things shall live in them.” It was, indeed, with respect unto perfect obedience that it gave that promise; however that promise it had, which is all that at present we inquire after.
3. The *institutions of worship* which belonged unto that covenant, the whole ministry of the tabernacle, as representing heavenly things, had the nature of a promise in them; for they all directed the church to seek for life and salvation in and by Jesus Christ alone.
4. The question is not, What promises are given in the law itself, or the old covenant formally considered as such? but, What promises had they who lived under that covenant, and which were not disannulled by it? for we have proved sufficiently, that the addition of this covenant did not abolish or supersede the efficacy of any promise that God had before given unto the church. And to say that the first promise, and that given unto Abraham, confirmed with the oath of God, were not promises of eternal life, is to overthrow the whole Bible, both Old Testament and New. And we may observe from the foregoing discourses, —

**Obs. X.** That although one state of the church hath had great advantages and privileges above another, yet no state hath had whereof to complain, whilst they observed the terms prescribed unto them.

—We have seen in how many things, and those most of them of the highest importance, the state of the church under the new covenant excels that under the old; yet was that in itself a state of unspeakable grace and privilege. For, —

**1.** It was a state of near relation unto God, by virtue of a covenant. And when all mankind had absolutely broken covenant with God by sin, to call any of them into a new covenant relation with himself, was an act of sovereign grace and mercy. Herein were they distinguished from the residue of mankind, whom God suffered to walk in their own ways, and winked at their ignorance, whilst they all perished in the pursuit of their foolish imaginations. This a great part of the Book of Deuteronomy is designed to impress a sense of upon the minds of the people. And it is summarily expressed by the psalmist, <sup>4177</sup>Psalm 147:19, 20; and by the prophet,

“We are thine: thou never barest rule over them: thy name was not called upon by them,” <sup>4369</sup>Isaiah 63:19.

**2.** This covenant of God was in itself holy, just, and equal. For although there was in it an imposition of sundry things burdensome, they were such as God in his infinite wisdom saw necessary for that people, and such as they could not have been without. Hence on all occasions God refers it even unto themselves to judge whether his ways towards them were not equal, and their own unequal. And it was not only just, but attended with promises of unspeakable advantages above all other people whatever.

**3.** God dealing with them in the way of a covenant, whereunto the mutual consent of all parties covenanting is required, it was proposed unto them for their acceptance, and they did accordingly willingly receive it, Exodus 24, Deuteronomy 5; so as that they had not whereof to complain.

**4.** In that state of discipline wherein God was pleased to told them, they enjoyed the way of life and salvation in the promise; for, as we have showed at large, the promise was not disannulled by the introduction of this covenant. Wherefore, although God reserved a better and more complete state for the church under the new testament, having “ordained better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect;” yet



was that other state in itself good and holy, and sufficient to bring all believers unto the enjoyment of God.

**Obs. XI.** The state of the gospel, or of the church under the new testament, being accompanied with the highest spiritual privileges and advantages that it is capable of in this world, two things do thence follow:

**1.** The great obligation that is on all believers unto holiness and fruitfulness in obedience, unto the glory of God. We have herein the utmost condescension of divine grace, and the greatest effects of it that God will communicate on this side glory. That which all these things tend unto, that which God requireth and expecteth upon them, is the thankful and fruitful obedience of them that are made partakers of them. And they who are not sensible of this obligation are strangers unto the things themselves, and are not able to discern spiritual things, because they are to be spiritually discerned.

**2.** The heinousness of their sin by whom this covenant is neglected or despised is hence abundantly manifest. This the apostle particularly asserts and insists upon, <sup><3000></sup>Hebrews 2:2, 3, <sup><3000></sup>10:28, 29.

### VERSE 7.

Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἄν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος.


For if that first [*covenant*] had been blameless, then should no place have been sought for the second.

In this verse, and so also in those that follow unto the end of this chapter, the apostle designeth a confirmation of what he had before asserted and undertaken to prove. And this was, that there is a necessity of a new and better covenant, accompanied with better promises and more excellent ordinances of worship than the former. Hereon it follows that the first was to be disannulled and abolished: which was the main thesis he had to prove. And there are two parts of his argument to this purpose. For first he proveth, that on the supposition of another and better covenant to be introduced, it did unavoidably follow that the first was to be abolished, as that which was not perfect, complete, or sufficient unto its end; which he

doth in this verse. Secondly, he proves that such a new, better covenant was to be introduced, in the verses following.

What he had before confirmed in sundry particular instances, he summarily concludes in one general argument in this verse, and that built on a principle generally acknowledged. And it is this, ‘All the privileges, all the benefits and advantages of the Aaronical priesthood and sacrifices, do all belong unto the covenant whereunto they were annexed, a chief part of whose outward administrations consisted in them.’ This the Hebrews neither could nor did question. The whole of what they pleaded for, the only charter and tenure of all their privileges, was the covenant that God made with their fathers at Sinai. Wherefore that priesthood, those sacrifices, with all the worship belonging unto the tabernacle or temple, were necessarily commensurate unto that covenant. Whilst that covenant continued, they were to continue; and if that covenant ceased, they were to cease also. These things were agreed between the apostle and them.

Hereon he subsumes, ‘But there is mention of another covenant to be made with the whole church, and to be introduced long after the making of that at Sinai.’ Neither could this be denied by them. However, to put it out of controversy, the apostle proves it by an express testimony of the prophet Jeremiah. In that testimony it is peculiarly declared, that this new covenant, that was promised to be introduced “in the latter days,” should be better and more excellent than the former, as is manifest from the promises whereon it is established; yet in this verse the apostle proceeds no further but unto the general consideration of God’s promising to make another covenant with the church, and what would follow thereon.

From this supposition the apostle proves that the first covenant is imperfect, blamable, and removable. And the force of his inference depends on a common notion or presumption, that is clear and evident in its own light, And it is this, when once a covenant is made and established, if it will serve unto and effect all that he who makes it doth design, and exhibit all the good which he intends to communicate, there is no reason why another covenant should be made. The making of a new for no other ends or purposes but what the old was every way sufficient for, argues lightness and mutability in him that made it. Unto this purpose doth he argue,  Galatians 3:21,

“If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.”

Could the first covenant have perfected and consecrated the church, could it have communicated all the grace and mercy that God intended to indulge unto the children of men, the wise and holy author of it would have had no thought about the introduction and establishment of another. It would have been no way agreeable unto his infinite wisdom and faithfulness so to do. Wherefore the promise hereof doth irrefragably prove, that both the first covenant and all the services of it were imperfect, and therefore to be removed and taken away.

Indeed this promise of a new covenant, diverse from that made at Sinai, or not like unto it, as the prophet speaks, is sufficient of itself to overthrow the vain pretences of the Jews wherein they are hardened to this day. The absolute perpetuity of the law and its worship, —that is, of the covenant at Sinai, — is the principal, fundamental article of their present faith, or rather unbelief. But this is framed by them in direct opposition unto the promises of God. For let it be demanded of them, whether they believe that God will make another covenant with the church, not according to the covenant which he made with their fathers at Sinai. If they shall say they do not believe it, then do they plainly renounce the prophets, and the promises of God given by them. If they do grant it, I desire to know of them with what sacrifices this new covenant shall be established; by what priest, with what worship, it shall be administered. If they say that they shall be done by the sacrifices, priests, and worship of the law, they deny what they granted before, namely, that it is a new and another covenant; for the sacrifices and priests of the law cannot confirm or administer any other covenant, but that which they belong and are confined unto. If it be granted that this new covenant must have a new mediator, a new priest, a new sacrifice, —as it is undeniable it must, or it cannot be a new covenant, —then must the old cease and be removed, that this may come into its place. Nothing but obstinacy and blindness can resist the force of this argument of the apostle.

The general design of the apostle in this verse being cleared, we may consider the words more particularly. And there are two things in them:

**1.** A *positive assertion*, included in a supposition, “If the first covenant had been blameless,” —had not been defective; that is, it was so.

**2.** The *proof of this assertion*: “If it had not been so, place would not have been sought for the second;”

which that there was, he proves in the following verses: —

**1.** In the first part of the words there is,

(1.) A causal conjunction, rendering a reason; “for.”

(2.) The subject spoken of: “That first covenant.”

(3.) What is affirmed of it, as the affirmation is included in a negative supposition: It was not blameless, it is not blameless: —

(1.) The conjunction, **γάρ**, “for,” showeth that the apostle intends the confirmation of what he had before discoursed. But he seems not to refer only unto what he had immediately before affirmed concerning the better promises of the new testament, but unto the whole argument that he hath in hand. For the general reason which here he insists upon, proves all that he had before delivered concerning the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, and the whole worship of the first covenant depending thereon.

(2.) The subject spoken of is **ἡ πρώτη ἐκεῖνη**, — “that first;” that is, **προτέρα διαθήκη**, that “*former covenant*,” the covenant made with the fathers at Sinai, with all the ordinances of worship thereunto belonging, whose nature and use we have before declared.

(3.) Hereof it is said, **εἰ ἄμεμπτος ἦν**. Vulg. Lat., “*si culpa vacasset*.” And so we, “if it had been faultless.” I am sure the expression is a little too harsh in our translation, and such as the original word will not bear, at least doth not require. For it seems to intimate, that absolutely there was something faulty or blameworthy in the covenant of God. But this must not be admitted. For besides that the author of it, which was God himself, doth free it from any such charge or imputation, it is in the Scripture everywhere declared to be “*holy, just, and good*.” There is, indeed, an intimation of a defect in it; but this was not with respect to its own

particular end, but with respect to another general end, whereunto it was not designed. That which is defective with respect unto its own particular end whereunto it is ordained, or which it is designed to accomplish, is really faulty; but that which is or may be so with respect unto some other general end, which it was never designed to accomplish, is not so in itself. This the apostle discourseth concerning, <sup><R1B></sup>Galatians 3:19-22. We must therefore state the signification of the word from the subject-matter that he treats about in this place; and this is the perfection and consummation, or the sanctification and salvation of the church. With respect hereunto alone it is that he asserts the insufficiency and imperfection of the first covenant. And the inquiry between him and the Hebrews was, not whether the first covenant was not in itself holy, just, good, and blameless, every way perfect with respect unto its own especial ends; but whether it was perfect and effectual unto the general ends mentioned. This it was not, saith the apostle; and proves it undeniably, from the promise of the introduction of another general covenant for the effecting of them. Whereas, therefore, to be not **ἄμεμπτος**, is either to have some fault or vice accompanying any thing and adhering unto it, whereby it is unsuited unto or insufficient for its own proper end; or it is that whereunto somewhat is wanting with respect unto another general end which is much to be desired, but such as it was never designed to accomplish; —as the art of arithmetic, if it be perfectly taught, is sufficient to instruct a man in the whole science of numeration; if it be not, it is faulty as unto its particular end; but it is no way sufficient unto the general end of making a man wise in the whole compass of wisdom, a thing far to be preferred before its particular end, be it never so perfect in its own kind; —it is in the latter sense only that the apostle affirms that the first covenant was not **ἄμεμπτος**,” or “blameless.” If it had been such as unto which nothing more was required or needful perfectly to complete and sanctify the church, —which was the general end God aimed at, —it had been absolutely perfect. But this it was not, in that it never was designed for the means of it. To the same purpose he argues, <sup><S071></sup>Hebrews 7:11, 19. And with respect unto this end it is said that “the law was weak,” <sup><R1B></sup>Romans 8:3; <sup><R1B></sup>Galatians 3:21; <sup><H138></sup>Acts 13:38, 39.

In brief, that which the apostle designeth to prove is, that the first covenant was of that constitution, that it could not accomplish the *perfect*

*administration* of the grace of God unto the church, nor was ever designed unto that end; as the Jews then falsely, and their posterity still foolishly also imagine it to have done.

2. The ensuing words in this verse include the general proof of his assertion concerning the insufficiency of the first covenant unto the ends of God towards the church: **Οὐκ ἂν δευτέρως ἐζητεῖτο τόπος.**

His argument is plainly this: ‘The promise of a new covenant doth unavoidably prove the insufficiency of the former, at least unto the ends for which the new one is promised. For otherwise unto what end serves the promise, and covenant promised?’ But there is some difficulty in the manner of the expression: “The place of the second had not been sought;” so the words lie in the original. But “the place of the second” is no more but “the second taking place;” the bringing in, the introduction and establishment of it. And this is said to be “sought;” but improperly, and after the manner of men. When men have entered into a covenant which proves insufficient for some end they do intend, they take counsel and seek out after other ways and means, or an agreement and covenant on such other terms as may be effectual unto their purpose. Wherefore this signifies no alteration, no defect in the wisdom and counsel of God, as unto what is now to be done, but only the outward change which he would now effect in the introduction of the new covenant. For as such changes among men are the issue of the alteration of their minds, and the effect of new counsels for the seeking out of new means for their end, so is this outward change, in the taking away of the old covenant and introduction of the new, represented in God; being only the second part of his counsel or purpose “which he had purposed in himself before the foundation of the world.” And we may hence observe, —

**Obs. I.** That whatever God had done before for the church, yet he ceased not, in his wisdom and grace, until he had made it partaker of the best and most blessed condition whereof in this world it is capable. —He found out place for this better covenant.

**Obs. II.** Let those unto whom the terms of the new covenant are proposed in the gospel take heed to themselves that they sincerely embrace and improve them; for there is neither promise nor hope of any further or fuller administration of grace.

**VERSE 8.**

Μεμρόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει, Ἴδου, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινὴν.<sup>f7</sup>

For finding fault with them, [*complaining of them,*] he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, and I will make [*when I will make*] a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah.

In this verse the apostle entereth upon the proof of his argument laid down in that foregoing. And this was, that the first covenant was not ἄμειπτος, “*unblamable,*” or every way sufficient for God’s general end; because there was room left for the introduction of another, which was done accordingly.

Of this covenant, so to be introduced, he declareth, in the testimony of the prophet afterwards, two things:

1. The qualification of it, or its especial adjunct; it was “new,” verse 8.
2. A description of it:
  - (1.) Negative, with respect unto the old, verse 9.
  - (2.) Positive, in its nature and effectual properties, verses 10-12.

From all which he inferreth the conclusion which he was contending for, enforced with a new consideration confirming it, verse 13: which is the sum of the last part of this chapter.

There are two general parts of this verse:

1. The *introduction* of the testimony, to be improved from the occasion of it, as expressed by the apostle.
2. The *testimony* itself which he insists on.

The FIRST is in these words: “For finding fault with them, he saith.” Wherein we have,

1. The note of connection;
2. The ground whereon the testimony is built;

3. The true reading of the words is to be considered: —

1. There is the causal conjunction, γάρ, “for,” which gives them connection unto the foregoing verse. That which is designed, is the confirmation of the foregoing argument. This is the proof of the assertion, that place was sought for another covenant, which evinced the insufficiency of the former; “for.” And the reason it intimates doth not consist in the words wherewith it is joined, “finding fault with them;” but respects those following, “he saith,” —”For... he saith, Behold, the days come:” which directly prove what he had affirmed.

2. There is the ground intimated of what is affirmed in the ensuing testimony. For the new covenant was not to be introduced absolutely, without the consideration of anything foregoing, but because the first was not ἄμεμπτος, or “unblamable.” Therefore the apostle shows that God brought it in in a way of blame. He did it “finding fault with them.”

3. These words may be diversely distinguished and read. For,

(1.) Placing the note of distinction thus, Μεμφόμενος γὰρ, αὐτοῖς λέγει, the sense is, “For finding fault,” complaining, blaming, “he saith unto them;” so that expression, μεμφόμενος, “finding fault,” respects the covenant itself. Piscator was the first, that I know of, who thus distinguished the words; who is followed by Schlichtingius and others. But

(2.) Place the note of distinction at αὐτοῖς, as it is by most interpreters and expositors, and then the sense of the words is rightly expressed in our English translation, “For finding fault with them,” (that is, with the people,) he saith.” And αὐτοῖς may be regulated either by μεμφόμενος or λέγει.

The reasons for fixing the distinction in the first place are,

(1.) Because μεμφόμενος, “finding fault,” answers directly unto οὐκ ἄμεμπτος, “was not without fault. And this contains the true reason why the new covenant was brought in. And,

(2.) It was not God’s complaint of the people that was any cause of the introduction of the new covenant, but of the old covenant itself, which was insufficient to sanctify and save the church.



But these seem not of force to change the usual interpretation of the words, For, —

(1.) Although the first covenant was not every way perfect with respect unto God's general end towards his church, yet it may be it is not so safe to say that God complained of it. When things or persons change the state and condition wherein they were made or appointed of God, he may complain of them, and that justly. So when man filled the world with wickedness, it is said that "it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth." But when they abide unaltered in the state wherein they were made by him, he hath no reason to complain of them. And so it was with the first covenant. So our apostle disputes about the law, that all the weakness and imperfection of it arose from sin; where there was no reason to complain of the law, which in itself was holy, just, and good.

(2.) God doth in this testimony *actually complain of the people*, namely, that they "brake his covenant;" and expresseth his indignation thereon, — "he regarded them not." But there is not in this testimony, nor in the whole context or prophecy whence it is taken, nor in any other place of Scripture, any word of complaint against the covenant itself, though its imperfection as unto the general end of perfecting the church-state, be here intimated.

(3.) There is an especial remedy expressed in the testimony against the evil which God complains of, or finds fault with in the people. This was, that "they continued not in his covenant." This is expressly provided against in the promise of this new covenant, verse 10. Wherefore, —

(4.) God gives this promise of a new covenant together with a complaint against the people, that it might be known to be an effect of free and sovereign grace. There was nothing in the people to procure it, or to qualify them for it, unless it were that they had wickedly broken the former. And we may hence observe, —

**Obs. I.** God hath oftentimes just cause to complain of his people, when yet he will not utterly cast them off. —It is mere mercy and grace that the church at all seasons lives upon; but in some seasons, when it falls under great provocations, they are signalized.

**Obs. II.** It is the duty of the church to take deep notice of God's complaints of them. —This, indeed, is not in the text, but ought not to be passed by on this occasion of the mention of God's complaining, or "finding fault with them." And God doth not thus find fault only when he speaks immediately by new revelations, as our Lord Jesus Christ found fault with and rebuked his churches in the revelation made unto the apostle John; but he doth it continually, by the rule of the word. And it is the especial duty of all churches, and of all believers, to search diligently into what God finds fault withal in his word, and to be deeply affected therewith, so far as they find themselves guilty. Want hereof is that which hath laid most churches in the world under a fatal security. Hence they say, or think, or carry themselves, as though they were "rich and increased in goods, and had need of nothing," when indeed "they are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." To consider what God blames, and to affect our souls with a sense of guilt, is that "trembling at his word" which he so approves of. And every church that intends to walk with God unto his glory ought to be diligent in this duty. And to guide them herein, they ought carefully to consider, —

**1.** The *times and seasons* that are passing over them. God brings his church under variety of seasons; and in them all requires especial duties from them, as those wherein he will be glorified in each of them. If they miss it herein, it is that which God greatly blames and complains of. Faithfulness with God in their generation, —that is, in the especial duties of the times and seasons wherein they lived, —is that which Noah, and Daniel, and other holy men, are commended for. Thus there are seasons of the great abounding of wickedness in the world; seasons of great apostasy from truth and holiness; seasons of judgment and of mercy, of persecution and tranquillity. In all these, and the like, God requireth especial duties of the church; whereon his glory in them doth much depend. If they fail here, if they are not faithful as unto their especial duty, God in his word finds fault with them, and lays them under blame. And as much wisdom is required hereunto, so I do not judge that any church can discharge its duty in any competent measure without a due consideration of it. For in a due observation of the times and seasons, and an application of ourselves unto the duties of them, consists that testimony which we are to give unto God and the gospel in our generation. That church which considers not its

especial duty in the days wherein we live, is fast asleep; and it may be doubted whether, when it is awaked, it will find oil in its vessel or no.

**2.** *The temptations which are prevalent, and which unavoidably we are exposed unto.* Every age and time hath its especial temptations; and it is the will of God that the church should be exercised with them and by them. And it were easy to manifest, that the darkness and ignorance of men, in not discerning the especial temptations of the age wherein they have lived, or neglecting of them, have been always the great causes and means of the apostasy of the church. Hereby hath superstition prevailed in one age, and profaneness in another; as false and noxious opinions in a third. Now, there is nothing that God requires more strictly of us, than that we should be wakeful against present prevalent temptations; and he chargeth us with guilt where we are not so. And those which are not awake with respect unto those temptations which are at this day prevalent in the world, are far enough from walking before God unto all well-pleasing. And sundry other things of the like nature might be mentioned unto the same purpose.

**Obs. III.** God often surpriseth the church with promises of grace and mercy. —In this place, where God complaineth of the people, findeth fault with them, chargeth them for not continuing in his covenant, and declares, that, as unto any thing in themselves, he “regarded them not,” it might be easily expected that he would proceed unto their utter casting off and rejection. But instead hereof, God surpriseth them, as it were, with the most eminent promise of grace and mercy that ever was made, or could be made unto them. So he doth in like manner, <sup>2173</sup>Isaiah 7:13, 14, 57:17-19. And this he will do, —

**1.** That he may glorify the riches and freedom of his grace. This is his principal end in all his dispensations towards his church. And how can they be made more conspicuous than in the exercise of them then, when a people are so far from all appearance of any desert of them, as that God declares his judgment that they deserve his utmost displeasure?

**2.** That none who have the least remainder of sincerity, and desire to fear the name of God, may utterly faint and despond at any time, under the greatest confluence of discouragements. God can come in, and will

ofttimes, in a way of sovereign grace, for the relief of the most dejected sinners. But we must proceed with our exposition.

The SECOND thing contained in this verse, is the *testimony* itself insisted on. And there is in the testimony,

1. The *author of the promise declared* in it, “He saith;” as afterwards, “Saith the Lord.”
2. The *note of its introduction*, signaling the thing intended, “Behold.”
3. The *time* of the accomplishment of what is here foretold and here promised, “The days come wherein.”
4. The *thing promised* is “a covenant:” concerning which is expressed,
  - (1.) He that makes it, “I,” — “I will make;”
  - (2.) Those with whom it is made, “the house of Israel, and the house of Judah;”
  - (3.) The manner of its making, **συντελέσω**;
  - (4.) The property of it, it is “a new covenant.”

1. He who gives this testimony is included in the word **λέγει**, “he saith,” — “For finding fault with them, he saith.” He who complains of the people for breaking the old covenant, promiseth to make the new. So in the next verse it is expressed, “Saith the Lord.” The ministry of the prophet was made use of in the declaration of these words and things, but they are properly his words from whom they are by immediate inspiration.

**Obs. IV.** “He saith,” —that is, **יהוה אלהים**, “saith the LORD,” —is the formal object of our faith and obedience. —Hereinto are they to be referred, herein do they acquiesce, and in nothing else will they so do. All other foundations of faith, as, ‘Thus saith the pope,’ or ‘Thus saith the church,’ or ‘Thus said our ancestors,’ are all but, delusions. “Thus saith the LORD,” gives rest and peace.

2. There is the note of introduction, calling, unto attendance, **הנה**, ‘**Ἴδοὺ**, —”Behold.” It is always found eminent, either in itself or in some of its

circumstances, that is thus prefaced. For the word calls for a more than ordinary diligence in the consideration of and attention unto what is proposed. And it was needful to signalize this promise; for the people unto whom it was given were very difficultly drawn from their adherence unto the old covenant, which was inconsistent with that now promised. And there seems to be somewhat more intimated in this word than a call unto special attention; and that is, that the thing spoken of is plainly proposed unto them concerned, so as that they may look upon it, and behold it clearly and speedily. And so is this new covenant here proposed so evidently and plainly, both in the entire nature and properties of it, that unless men wilfully turn away their eyes, they cannot but see it.

**Obs. V.** Where God placeth a note of observation and attention, we should carefully fix our faith and consideration. —God sets not any of his marks in vain. And if, upon the first view of any place or thing so signalized, the evidence of it doth not appear unto us, we have a sufficient call unto further diligence in our inquiry. And if we are not wanting unto our duty, we shall discover some especial impression of divine excellency or another upon every such thing or place.

**Obs. VI.** The things and concernments of the new covenant are all of them objects of the best of our consideration. As such are they here proposed; and what is spoken of the declaration of the nature of this covenant in the next verse is sufficient to confirm this observation.

**3.** The time is prefixed for the accomplishment of this promise: **קָבָלָהּ יְהוָה הַיּוֹמִים הַלְלוֹתָם**, —the days come.” “Known unto God are all his works from the foundation of the world;” and he hath determined the times of their accomplishment. As to the particular precise times or seasons of them, whilst they are future, he hath reserved them unto himself, unless where he hath seen good to make some especial revelation of them. So he did of the time of the sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt, <sup>158</sup>Genesis 15:13; of the Babylonish captivity, and of the coming of the Messiah after the return of the people, <sup>201</sup>Daniel 9. But from the giving of the first promise, wherein the foundation of the church was laid, the accomplishment of it is frequently referred unto “the latter days.” See our exposition on <sup>300</sup>Hebrews 1:1, 2. Hence under the old testament the days of the Messiah were called “the world to come,” as we have showed,

<sup><301B</sup>Hebrews 2:5. And it was a periphrasis of him, that he was ὁ ἐρχόμενος, <sup><411B</sup>Matthew 11:3, — “He that was to come.” And the faith of the church was principally exercised in the expectation of his coming. And this time is here intended. And the expression in the original is in the present tense, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, from the Hebrew, יָמֵי בָּאִים, “the days coming;” not the days that come, but “the days come.” And two things are denoted thereby: —

(1.) The *near approach* of the days intended. The time was now hastening apace, and the church was to be awakened unto the expectation of it: and this accompanied with their earnest desires and prayers for it; which were the most acceptable part of the worship of God under the old testament.

(2.) A *certainty* of the thing itself was hereby fixed in their minds. Long expectation they had of it, and now stood in need of new security, especially considering the trial they were falling into in the Babylonish captivity; for this seemed to threaten a defeat of the promise, in the casting away of the whole nation. The manner of the expression is suited to confirm the faith of them that were real believers among them against such fears. Yet we must observe, that from the giving of this promise unto the accomplishment of it was near six hundred years. And yet about ninety years after, the prophet Malachi, speaking of the same season, affirms, “that the Lord, whom they sought, should suddenly come to his temple,” <sup><301B</sup>Malachi 3:1.

**Obs. VII.** There is a time limited and fixed for the accomplishment of all the promises of God, and all the purposes of his grace towards the church. See <sup><301B</sup>Habakkuk 2:3, 4. And the consideration hereof is very necessary unto believers in all ages:

(1.) To keep up their hearts from desponding, when difficulties against their accomplishment do arise, and seem to render it impossible. Want hereof hath turned aside many from God, and caused them to cast their lot and portion into the world.

(2.) To preserve them from putting themselves on any irregular ways for their accomplishment.

(3.) To teach them to search diligently into the wisdom of God, who hath disposed times and seasons, as unto his own glory, so unto the trial and real benefit of the church.

4. The subject-matter of the promise given is a “covenant,” — בְּרִית. The LXX. render it by διαθήκη, — “a testament.” And that is more proper in this place than “a covenant.” For if we take “covenant” in a strict and proper sense, it hath indeed no place between God and man. For a covenant, strictly taken, ought to proceed on equal terms, and a proportionate consideration of things on both sides; but the covenant of God is founded on grace, and consists essentially in a free, undeserved promise. And therefore בְּרִית, “a covenant,” is never spoken of between God and man, but on the part of God it consists in a free promise, or a testament. And “a testament,” which is the proper signification of the word here used by the apostle, is suited unto this place, and nothing else. For, —

(1.) Such a covenant is intended as is ratified and confirmed by the death of him that makes it. And this is properly a testament: for this covenant was confirmed by the death of Christ, and that both as it was the death of the testator, and as it was accompanied with the blood of a sacrifice; whereof we must treat afterwards at large, if God will.

(2.) It is such a covenant, as wherein the covenanter, he that makes it, bequeatheth his goods unto others in the way of a legacy; for this is done by Christ herein, as we must also declare afterwards. Wherefore our Savior calls this covenant “the new testament in his blood.” This the word used by the apostle doth properly signify; and it is evident that he intends not a covenant *absolutely and strictly* so taken. With respect hereunto the first covenant is usually called the “old testament.” For we intend not thereby *the books of Scripture*, or oracles of God committed unto the church of the Jews, (which yet, as we have observed, are once called “the Old Testament,” <sup>4014</sup>2 Corinthians 3:14,) but the covenant that God made with the church of Israel at Sinai, whereof we have spoken at large. And this was called a “testament” for three reasons: —

[1.] Because it was confirmed *by death*; that is, the death of the sacrifices that were slain and offered at its solemn establishment. So saith our

apostle, “The first testament was not dedicated without blood,”

~~308~~ Hebrews 9:18. But there is more required hereunto; for even a covenant properly and strictly so called may be confirmed with sacrifices.

Wherefore, —

[2.] God did therein make over and grant unto the *church of Israel the good things of the land of Canaan*, with the privileges of his worship.

[3.] The principal reason of this denomination, “the old testament,” is taken from its being typically significative of the death and legacy of the great testator, as we have showed.

We have treated somewhat before concerning the nature of the new testament, as considered in distinction from and opposition unto the old. I shall here only briefly consider what concurreth unto the constitution of it, as it was then future, when this promise was given, and as it is here promised. And three things do concur hereunto: —

(1.) A *recapitulation, collection, and confirmation of all the promises of grace* that had been given unto the church from the beginning, even all that was spoken by the mouth of the holy prophets that had been since the world began, ~~309~~ Luke 1:70. The first promise contained in it the whole essence and substance of the covenant, of grace. All those afterwards given unto the church, on various occasions, were but explications and confirmations of it. In the whole of them there was a full declaration of the wisdom and love of God in sending his Son, and of his grace unto mankind thereby. And God solemnly confirmed them with his oath, namely, that they should be all accomplished in their appointed season. Whereas, therefore, the covenant here promised included the sending of Christ for the accomplishment of those promises, they are all gathered into one head therein. It is a constellation of all the promises of grace.

(2.) All these promises were to be reduced into an *actual covenant* or testament two ways: —

[1.] In that, as unto the accomplishment of the grace principally intended in them, they received it in the sending of Christ; and as to the confirmation and establishment of them for the communication of grace unto the church, they received it in the death of Christ, as a sacrifice of agreement or atonement.



[2.] They are established as the rule and law of reconciliation and peace between God and man. This gives them the nature of a covenant; for a covenant is the solemn expression of the terms of peace between various parties, with the confirmation of them.

(3.) They are *reduced unto such form of law*, as to become the only rule of the ordinances of worship and divine service required of the church. Nothing unto these ends is now presented unto us, or required of us, but what belongeth immediately unto the administration of this covenant, and the grace thereof. But the reader must consult what hath been discoursed at large unto this purpose on the 6th verse.

And we may see from hence what it is that God here promiseth and foretelleth, as that which he would do in the “days that were coming.” For whereas they had the promise before, and so virtually the grace and mercy of the new covenant, it may be inquired: ‘What is yet wanting, that should be promised solemnly under the name of a covenant?’ For the flail resolution of this question, I must, as before, refer the reader unto what hath been discoursed at large about the two covenants, and the difference between them, on verse 6. Here we may briefly name some few things, sufficient unto the exposition of this place; as, —

(1.) All those promises which had before been given out unto the church from the beginning of the world, were now reduced into the form of a covenant, or rather of a testament. The name of “a covenant” is indeed sometimes applied unto the promises of grace before or under the old testament; but בְּרִית, the word used in all those places, denoteth only “a free, gratuitous promise,” <sup>Gen</sup>Genesis 9:9, 17:4. But they were none of them, nor all of them together, reduced into the form of a testament; which they could not be but by the death of the testator. And what blessed privileges and benefits were included herein hath been showed before, and must yet further be insisted on in the exposition of the ninth chapter, if God permit.

(2.) There was another covenant superadded unto the promises, which was to be the immediate rule of the obedience and worship of the church. And according unto their observance of this superadded covenant, they were esteemed to have kept or broken covenant with God. This was the old covenant on Sinai, as hath been declared. Wherefore the promises could

not be in the form of a covenant unto the people, inasmuch as they could not be under the power of two covenants at once, and those, as it afterwards appeared, absolutely inconsistent. For this is that which our apostle proves in this place, namely, that when the promises were brought into the form and had the use of a covenant unto the church, the former covenant must needs disappear, or be disannulled. Only, they had their place and efficacy to convey the benefits of the grace of God in Christ unto them that did believe; but God here foretelleth that he will give them such an order and efficacy in the administration of his grace, as that all the fruits of it by Jesus Christ shall be bequeathed and made over unto the church in the way of a solemn covenant.

**(3.)** Notwithstanding the promises which they had received, yet the whole system of their worship sprang from, and related unto the covenant made at Sinai. But now God promiseth a new state of spiritual worship, relating only unto the promises of grace as brought into the form of a covenant.

**Obs. VIII.** The new covenant, as re-collecting into one all the promises of grace given from the foundation of the world, accomplished in the actual exhibition of Christ, and confirmed in his death, and by the sacrifice of his blood, thereby becoming the sole rule of new spiritual ordinances of worship suited thereunto, was the great object of the faith of the saints of the old testament, and is the great foundation of all our present mercies.

All these things were contained in that new covenant, as such, which God here promiseth to make. For, —

**(1.)** There was in it a *recapitulation* of all the promises of grace. God had not made any promise, any intimation of his love or grace unto the church in general, nor unto any particular believer, but he brought it all into this covenant, so as that they should be esteemed, all and every one of them, to be given and spoken unto every individual person that hath an interest in this covenant. Hence all the promises made unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the other patriarchs, and the oath of God whereby they were confirmed, are all of them made unto us, and do belong unto us no less than they did unto them to whom they were first given, if we are made partakers of this covenant. Hereof the apostle gives an instance in the singular promise made unto Joshua, which he applies unto believers,

<sup><816</sup> Hebrews 13:5. There was nothing of love or grace in any of them but was gathered up into this covenant.

(2.) The *actual exhibition* of Christ in the flesh belonged unto this promise of making a new covenant; for without it, it could not have been made. This was the desire of all the faithful from the foundation of the world; this they longed after, and fervently prayed for continually. And the prospect of it was the sole ground of their joy and consolation. “Abraham saw his day, and rejoiced.” This was the great privilege which God granted unto them that walked uprightly before him; such an one, saith he,

“shall dwell on high: his place of defense shall be the munition of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure. Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off,” <sup><830</sup> Isaiah 33:16, 17.

That prospect they had by faith of the King of saints in his beauty and glory, though yet at a great distance, was their relief and their reward in their sincere obedience. And those who understand not the glory of this privilege of the new covenant, in the incarnation of the Son of God, or his exhibition in the flesh, wherein the depths of the counsels and wisdom of God, in the way of grace, mercy, and love, opened themselves unto the church, are strangers unto the things of God.

(3.) It was *confirmed and ratified by the death and bloodshedding of Christ*, and therefore included in it the whole work of his mediation. This is the spring of the life of the church; and until it was opened, great darkness was upon the minds of believers themselves. What peace, what assurance, what light, what joy, depend hereon, and proceed from it, no tongue can express.

(4.) All *ordinances of worship* do belong hereunto. What is the benefit of them, what are the advantages which believers receive by them, we must declare when we come to consider that comparison that the apostle makes between them and the carnal ordinances of the law, <sup><830</sup> Hebrews 9.

Whereas, therefore, all these things were contained in the new covenant, as here promised of God, it is evident how great was the concernment of the saints under the old testament to have it introduced; and how great also ours is in it, now it is established.

**5.** The author or maker of this covenant is expressed in the words, as also those with whom it was made: —

**(1.)** The first is included in the person of the verb, “I will make;” “I will make, saith the Lord.” It is God himself that makes this covenant, and he takes it upon himself so to do. He is the principal party covenanting: “I will make a covenant.” God hath made a covenant: “He hath made with me an everlasting covenant.” And sundry things are we taught therein: —

**[1.]** The *freedom of this covenant*, without respect unto any merit, worth, or condignity in them with whom it is made. What God doth, he doth freely, — “*ex mera gratia et voluntate.*” There was no cause without himself for which he should make this covenant, or which should move him so to do. And this we are eminently taught in this place, where he expresseth no other occasion of his making this covenant but the sins of the people in breaking that which he formerly made with them. And it is expressed on purpose to declare the free and sovereign grace, the goodness, love, and mercy, which alone were the absolute springs of this covenant.

**[2.]** The *wisdom of its contrivance*. The making of any covenant to be good and useful, depends solely on the wisdom and foresight of them by whom it is made. Hence men do often make covenants, which they design for their good and advantage, but they are so ordered, for want of wisdom and foresight, that they turn unto their hurt and ruin. But there was infinite wisdom in the constitution of this covenant; whence it is, and shall be, infinitely effective of all the blessed ends of it. And they are utterly unacquainted with it, who are not affected with a holy admiration of divine wisdom in its contrivance. A man might comfortably spend his life in the contemplation of it, and yet be far enough from finding out the Almighty in it unto perfection. Hence is it that it is so divine a mystery in all the parts of it, which the wisdom of the flesh cannot comprehend. Nor, without a due consideration of the infinite wisdom of God in the contrivance of it, can we have any true or real conceptions about it: Ἐκὰς ἐκὰς ἔστε βέζηλοι. Profane, unsanctified minds can have no insight into this effect of divine wisdom.

**[3.]** It was *God alone* who could prepare and provide a surety for this covenant. Considering the necessity there was of a surety in this covenant, seeing no covenant between God and man could be firm and stable without

one, by reason of our weakness and mutability; and considering of what a nature this surety must be, even God and man in one person; it is evident that God himself must make this covenant. And the provision of this surety doth contain in it the glorious manifestation of all the divine excellencies, beyond any act or work of God whatever.

[4.] There is in this covenant a *sovereign law of divine worship*, wherein the church is consummated, or brought into the most perfect estate whereof in this world it is capable, and established for ever. This law could be given by God alone.

[5.] There is ascribed unto this covenant such an *efficacy of grace*, as nothing but almighty power can make good and accomplish. The grace here mentioned in the promises of it, directs us immediately unto its author. For who else but God can write the divine law in our hearts, and pardon all our sins? The sanctification or renovation of our natures, and the justification of our persons, being pro-raised herein, seeing infinite power and grace are required unto them, he alone must make this covenant with whom all power and grace do dwell.

“God hath spoken once; twice have I heard this; that power  
belongeth unto God. Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy,”  
Psalm 62:1 1, 12.

[6.] The *reward* promised in this covenant is God himself: “I am thy reward.” And who but God can ordain himself to be our reward?

**Obs. IX.** All the efficacy and glory of the new covenant do originally arise from, and are resolved into, the author and supreme cause of it, which is God himself. —And we might consider, unto the encouragement of our faith, and the strengthening of our consolation, —

[1.] His *infinite condescension*, to make and enter into covenant with poor, lost, fallen, sinful man. This no heart can fully conceive, no tongue can express; only we live in hope to have yet a more clear prospect of it, and to have a holy admiration of it unto eternity.

[2.] His *wisdom, goodness, and grace*, in the nature of that covenant which he hath condescended to make and enter into. The first covenant he made with us in Adam, which we brake, was in itself good, holy,

righteous, and just; — it must be so, because it was also made by him. But there was no provision made in it absolutely to preserve us from that woeful disobedience and transgression which would make it void, and frustrate all the holy and blessed ends of it. Nor was God obliged so to preserve us, having furnished us with a sufficiency of ability for our own preservation, so as we could no way fall but by a wilful apostasy from him. But this covenant is of that nature, as that the grace administered in it shall effectually preserve all the covenanters unto the end, and secure unto them all the benefits of it. For, —

[3.] His *power and faithfulness* are engaged unto the accomplishment of all the promises of it. And these promises do contain every thing that is spiritually and eternally good or desirable unto us. “O LORD, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth’.” How glorious art thou in the ways of thy grace towards poor sinful creatures, who had destroyed themselves! And, —

[4.] He hath made no created good, but *himself only* to be our reward.

(2.) The persons with whom this covenant is made are also expressed: “The house of Israel, and the house of Judah.” Long before the giving of this promise, that people were divided into two parts. The one of them, in way of distinction from the other, retained the name of Israel. These were the ten tribes, which fell off from the house of David, under the conduct of Ephraim; whence they are often also in the Prophets called by that name. The other, consisting of the tribe properly so called, with that of Benjamin and the greatest part of Levi, took the name of Judah; and with them both the promise and the church remained in a peculiar manner. But whereas they all originally sprang from Abraham, who received the promise and sign of circumcision for them all, and because they were all equally in their forefather brought into the bond of the old covenant, they are here mentioned distinctly, that none of the seed of Abraham might be excluded from the tender of this covenant. Unto the whole seed of Abraham according to the flesh it was that the terms and grace of this covenant were first to be offered. So Peter tells them, in his first sermon, that “the promise was unto them and their children” who were then present, —that is, the house of Judah; and “to all that were afar off,” —that is, the house of Israel in their dispersions, <sup>423</sup>Acts 2:39. So again he expresseth the order

of the dispensation of this covenant with respect to the promise made to Abraham, <sup><4125></sup>Acts 3:25, 26,

“Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God having raised his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you;”

namely, in the preaching of the gospel. So our apostle, in his sermon unto them, affirmed that “it was necessary that the word should be first spoken unto them,” <sup><4136></sup>Acts 13:46. And this was all the privilege that was now left unto them; for the partition-wall was now broken down, and all obstacles against the Gentiles taken out of the way. Wherefore this house of Israel and house of Judah may be considered two ways:

[1.] As that people were the whole entire posterity of *Abraham*.

[2.] As they were *typical*, and mystically significant of the whole church of God.

Hence alone it is that the promises of grace under the old testament are given unto the church under these names, because they were types of them who should really and effectually be made partakers of them.

[1.] In the first sense, God made this covenant with them, and this on sundry accounts: —

**1st.** Because He in and through whom alone it was to be established and made effectual was to be brought forth amongst them of the seed of Abraham, as the apostle Peter plainly declares, <sup><4125></sup>Acts 3:25.

**2dly.** Because all things that belonged unto the ratification of it were to be transacted amongst them.

**3dly.** Because, in the outward dispensation of it, the terms and grace of it were first in the counsel of God to be tendered unto them.

**4thly.** Because by them, by the ministry of men of their posterity, the dispensation of it was to be carried unto all nations, as they were to be blessed in the seed of Abraham; which was done by the apostles and other disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. So the law of the Redeemer went forth from Zion. By this means “the covenant was confirmed with many” of

them “for one week,” before the calling of the Gentiles, <sup><20></sup>Daniel 9:27. And because these things belonged equally unto them all, mention is made distinctly of “the house of Israel, and the house of Judah.” For the house of Judah was, at the time of the giving of this promise, in the sole possession of all the privileges of the old covenant; Israel having cut off themselves, by their revolt from the house of David; being cast out also, for their sins, amongst the heathen. But God, to declare that the covenant he designed had no respect unto those carnal privileges which were then in the possession of Judah alone, but only unto the promise made unto Abraham, he equals all his seed with respect unto the mercy of this covenant.

[2.] In the second sense the whole church of elect believers is intended under these denominations, being typified by them. These are they alone, being one made of twain, namely, Jews and Gentiles, with whom the covenant is really made and established, and unto whom the Mace of it is actually communicated. For all those with whom this covenant is made shall as really have the law of God written in their hearts, and their sins pardoned, according unto the promise of it, as the people of old were brought into the land of Canaan by virtue of the covenant made with Abraham. These are the true Israel and Judah, prevailing with God, and confessing unto his name.

**Obs. X.** The covenant of grace in Christ is made only with the Israel of God, the church of the elect. —For by the making of this covenant with any, the effectual communication of the grace of it unto them is principally intended. Nor can that covenant be said to be made absolutely with any but those whose sins are pardoned by virtue thereof, and in whose hearts the law of God is written; which are the express promises of it. And it was with respect unto those of this sort among that people that the covenant was promised to be made with them. See <sup><81></sup>Romans 9:27-33, <sup><81E></sup>11:7. But in respect of the outward dispensation of the covenant, it is extended beyond the effectual communication of the grace of it. And in respect thereunto did the privilege of the carnal seed of Abraham lie.

**Obs. XI.** Those who are first and most advanced as unto outward privileges, are oftentimes last and least advantaged by the grace and mercy of them. —Thus was it with these two houses of Israel and Judah. They



had the privilege and pre-eminence, above all nations of the world, as unto the first tender, and all the benefits of the outward dispensation of the covenant; yet, “though the number of them was as the sand of the sea, a remnant only was saved.” They came behind the nations of the world as unto the grace of it; and this by reason of their unbelief, and the abuse of the privileges granted unto them. Let not those, therefore, who now enjoy the greatest privileges be high-minded, but fear.

(3.) The manner of making this covenant is expressed by **συντελέσω** “perficiam,” “consummabo,” —“I will perfect” or “consummate.” In the Hebrew it is only **תָּכַרְתִּי**, “pangam,” “feriam,” —“I will make; but the apostle renders it by this word, to denote that this covenant was at once perfected and consummated, to the exclusion of all additions and alterations. Perfection and unalterable establishment are the properties of this covenant: “An everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure.”

(4.) As unto its distinguishing character, it is called “a new covenant.” So it is with respect unto the old covenant made at Sinai. Wherefore by this covenant, as here considered, is not understood the promise of grace given unto Adam absolutely; nor that unto Abraham, which contained the substance and matter of it, the grace exhibited in it, but not the complete form of it as a covenant. For if it were only the promise, it could not be called “a new covenant,” with respect unto that made at Sinai; for so it was before it absolutely two thousand five hundred years, and in the person of Abraham four hundred years at the least. But it must be considered as before described, in the establishment of it, and its law of spiritual worship. And so it was called “new” in time after that on Sinai eight hundred years. Howbeit it may be called “a new covenant” in other respects also. As, first, because of its *eminency*; —so it is said of an eminent work of God, “Behold, I work a new thing in the earth:” and its *duration and continuance*, as that which shall never wax old, is denoted thereby.

#### VERSE 9.

Ὁὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκης ἦν ἐποίησας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαζομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς

ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος.

For the quotation and translation of these words out of the prophet Jeremiah, the reader may consult the Exereitations in the first volume, Exere. 5. [p. 111.] פְּרִיתִי the apostle in this place renders by ἐποίησα, and in this place only; the reason whereof we shall see afterwards. אֶת-בְּרִיתִי אֲשַׁר-הִקְמָה הִפְרוּ, —”which my covenant they brake,” “rescinded,” “dissipated;” the apostle renders αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν διαθήκῃ μου, —”and they continued not in my covenant:” for not to abide faithful in covenant is to break it. וְאֲנִי כְּבִיעֻלָּתִי בָם, —”and I was an husband unto them,” or rather, “a lord over them;” in the apostle, καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, —”and I regarded them not.” On what reason and grounds the seeming alteration is made, we shall inquire in the exposition.

Οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, “non secundum testamentum;” “secundum illud testamentum;” and so the Syriac, אֵל אִיךְ הִי דִּיתִיקָא, —”not according unto that testament;” others, “foedus,” and “illud foedus.” Of the different translation of this word by a “testament” and a “covenant,” we have spoken before.

Ἦν ἐποίησα. Syr., דִּיִּהֲבַת, “which I gave,” “quod feci,” “which I made.” Τοῖς πατράσιν, for σὺν τοῖς πατράσιν, “with the fathers;” for that is required to be joined to the verb ἐποίησα. And therefore the Syriac, omitting the preposition, turns the verb into “gave” —”gave to the fathers;” which is properly אֶת-אֲבוֹתָם, “cum patribus eorum.”

Οὐκ ἐνέμειναν. Vulg., “non permanserunt;” others, “perstiterunt.” So the Syriac, אֵל קִיִּי, “they stood not,” “they continued not.” “Maneo” is used to express stability in promises and covenants: “At tu dictis, Albane, maneres,” Virg. AEn. 8:643; and, “Tu modo promissis maneat,” AEn. 2:160. So is “permaneo in officio, in armis, in amicitia,” to continue steadfast unto the end. Wherefore it is as well so rendered as by “persisto.” Ἐμμένω is so used by Thucydides: Ἐμμένειν, —”to abide firm and constant in covenants.” And ἐμμενής is he who is “firm,” “stable,” “constant” in promises and engagements.

Κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα, “ego neglexi,” “despexi,” “neglectui habui.” Syr., **בְּסִיָּה**, “I despised,” “I neglected,” “I rejected them.” Ἀμελέω, is “curae non habeo,” “negligo,” “contemno;” a word denoting a casting out of care with contempt. <sup>f8</sup>

**Ver. 9.** —Not according to that covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.

The greatest and utmost mercies that God ever intended to communicate unto the church, and to bless it withal, were enclosed in the new covenant. Nor doth the efficacy of the mediation of Christ extend itself beyond the verge and compass thereof; for he is only the mediator and surety of this covenant. But now God had before made a covenant with his people. A good and holy covenant it was; such as was meet for God to prescribe, and for them thankfully to accept of. Yet notwithstanding all the privileges and advantages of it, it proved not so effectual, but that multitudes of them with whom God made that covenant were so far from obtaining the blessedness of grace and glory thereby, as that they came short, and were deprived of the temporal benefits that were included therein. Wherefore, as God hereon promiseth to make a “new covenant” with them, seeing they had forfeited and lost the advantage of the former, yet if it should be of the same kind therewith, it might also in like manner prove ineffectual. So must God give, and the church receive, one covenant after another, and yet the ends of them never be obtained.

To obviate this objection, and the fear that thence might arise, God, who provideth not only for the safety of his church, but also for their comfort and assurance, declares beforehand unto them that it shall not be of the same kind with the former, nor liable to be so frustrated, as to the ends of it, as that was.

And there are some things remarkable herein: —

**1.** That the preface unto the promise of this new covenant is a blame charged on the people, —”finding fault with them,” blaming them, charging them with sin against the covenant that he had made with them.

2. That yet this was not the whole ground and reason of making this new covenant. It was not so, I say, that the people were not steadfast in it and unto the terms of it. For had it been so, there would have no more been needful to reinstate them in a good condition, but only that God should pardon their former sins, and renew the same covenant unto them again, and give them another venture or trial thereon. But inasmuch as he would do so no more, but would make another covenant of another nature with them, it is evident that there was some defect in the covenant itself, — it was not able to communicate those good things which God designed to bless the church withal.

3. These two things being the only reason that God gives why he will make this new covenant, namely, the sins of the people, and the insufficiency of the first covenant to bring the church into that blessed estate which he designed them; it is manifest that all his dealings with them for their spiritual and eternal good are of mere sovereign grace, and such as he hath no motive unto but in and from himself alone. There are sundry things contained in these words: —

First, An intimation that God had made a former covenant with his people: *Τὴν διαθήκην*. There is in these verses a repetition three times of making covenant; and in every place in the Hebrew the same words are used, *כָּרַתַּי בְּרִית*. But the apostle changeth the verb in every place. First, he expresseth it by *συντελέσω*, verse 8; and in the last place by *διαθήσομαι*, which is most proper, verse 10, (*ζεῖναι* and *διατιθέναι διαθήκην* are usual in other authors;) here he useth *ἐποίησα*, in reference unto that covenant which the people brake and God dis-annulled. And it may be he did so, to distinguish their alterable covenant from that which was to be unalterable, and was confirmed with greater solemnity. God made this covenant as others of his outward works, which he resolved to alter, change, or abolish, at the appointed season. It was a work whose effects might be shaken, and itself afterwards be removed; so he speaks, <sup><827></sup>Hebrews 12:27. The change of the things that are shaken is *ὡς πεπονημένον*, — “as of things that are made,” made for a season; so made as to abide and endure for an appointed time only: such were all the things of this covenant, and such was the covenant itself. It had no “criteria aeternitatis” upon it, —no evidences of an eternal duration. Nothing hath so but what is founded in the blood of Christ. He is *אֲבִי-עֵד*, “the

everlasting Father,” or the immediate author and cause of every thing that is or shall be everlasting in the church. Let men labor and contend about other things whilst they please; —they are all shaken, and must be removed.

**Obs. I.** The grace and glory of the new covenant are much set off and manifested by the comparing of it with the old. —This is done here by God, on purpose for the illustration of it. And it is greatly made use of in this epistle; partly to prevail with us to accept of the terms thereof, and to abide faithful therein; and partly to declare how great is their sin, and how sore will be the destruction of them by whom it is neglected or despised. As these things are insisted on in other places, so are they the subject of the apostle’s discourse, <sup><3025></sup>Hebrews 12 from verse 15 unto the end.

**Obs. II.** All God’s works are equally good and holy in themselves; but as unto the use and advantage of the church, he is pleased to make some of them means of communicating more grace than others. —Even this covenant, which the new was not to be like unto, was in itself good and holy; which those with whom it was made had no reason to complain of. Howbeit God had ordained that by another covenant he would communicate the fullness of his grace and love unto the church. And if every thing that God doth be improved in its season, and for its proper ends, we shall have benefit and advantage by it, though he hath yet other ways of doing us more good, whose seasons he hath reserved unto himself. But this is an act of mere sovereign goodness and grace, that whereas any have neglected or abused mercies and kindnesses that they have received, instead of casting them off on that account, God takes this other course, of giving them such mercies as shall not be so abused. This he did by the introduction of the new covenant in the room of the old; and this he doth every day. So <sup><2576></sup>Isaiah 57:16-18. We live in days wherein men variously endeavor to obscure the grace of God, and to render it inglorious in the eyes of men; but he will for ever be “admired in them that believe.”

**Obs. III.** Though God makes an alteration in any of his works, ordinances of worship, or institutions, yet he never changeth his intention, or the purpose of his will —In all outward changes there is with him “no variableness nor shadow of turning.” “Known unto him are all his works from the foundation of the world;” and whatever change there seems to be

in them, it is all effected in pursuance of the unchangeable purpose of his will concerning them all. It argued not the least change or shadow of turning in God, that he appointed the old covenant for a season, and for some certain ends, and then took it away, by making of another that should excel it both in grace and efficacy.

Secondly, It is declared with whom this former covenant was made: **πατράσιν αὐτῶν**, —"with their fathers." Some Latin copies read, "cure patribus vestris," — "with your fathers;" but having spoken before of "the house of Israel and of the house of Judah" in the third person, he continueth to speak still in the same. So likewise is it in the prophet, **אבותם**, —"their fathers."

**1.** "Their fathers," their progenitors, were those that this people always boasted of. For the most part, I confess, they rose higher in their claim from them than those here principally intended, namely, unto Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs. But in general their fathers it was whereof they made their boast; and they desired no more but only what might descend unto them in the right of these fathers. And unto these God here sends them, and that for two ends: —

**(1.)** To let them know that he had more grace and mercy to communicate unto the church than ever those fathers of theirs were made partakers of. So would he take them off from boasting of them, or trusting in them.

**(2.)** To give warning by them to take heed how they behaved themselves under the tender of this new and greater mercy. For the fathers here intended were those that God made the covenant withal at Sinai; but it is known, and the apostle hath declared at large in the third chapter of this epistle, how they brake and rejected this covenant of God, through their unbelief and disobedience, so perishing in the wilderness. These were those fathers of the people with whom the first covenant was made; and so they perished in their unbelief. A great warning this was unto those that should live when God would enter into the new covenant with his church, lest they should perish after the same example. But yet was it not effectual towards them; for the greatest part of them rejected this new covenant, as their fathers did the old, and perished in the indignation of God.

**Obs. IV.** The disposal of mercies and privileges, as unto times, persons, seasons, is wholly in the hand and power of God. —Some he granted unto the fathers, some to their posterity, and not the same to both. Our wisdom it is to improve what we enjoy, not to repine at what God hath done for others, or will do for them that shall come after us. Our present mercies are sufficient for us, if we know how to use them. He that wanteth not a believing heart shall want nothing else.

2. Who those fathers were with whom God made this covenant, is further evident from the time, season, and *circumstances* of the making of it: —

(1.) For the *time* of it, it was done ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, that is, ἐκεῖνη, —“in that day.” That a “day” is taken in the Scripture for an *especial* time and season wherein any work or duty is to be performed, is obvious unto all. The reader may see what we have discoursed concerning such a day on the third chapter. And the time here intended is often called the day of it: <sup><310></sup>Ezekiel 20:6, “In the day I lifted up mine hand unto them to bring them forth of the land of Egypt;” —at that time or season. A certain, determinate, limited time, suited with means unto any work, occasion, or duty, is so called a “day.” And it answereth unto the description of the time of making the new covenant given in the verse foregoing, “Behold, the days are coming,” —the time or season approacheth. It is also used in a way of eminency; a day, or a signal eminent season: <sup><310></sup>Malachi 3:2, “Who may abide the day of his coming?” —the illustrious glory and power that shall appear and be exerted at his coming. “In the day,” is, at that great, eminent season, so famous throughout all their generations.

(2.) This day or season is described from the work of it: ἐπιλαζομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἵρ'ἵπῳ, —“that I firmly laid hold.” And ἐπιλαμζάνω, is “to take hold of” with a design of helping or delivering; and sundry things are intimated as well as the way and manner of the deliverance of that people at that time: —

[1.] The *woful, helpless condition* that they were in then in Egypt. So far were they from being able to deliver themselves out of their captivity and bondage, that, like children, they were not able to stand or go, unless God took them and led them by the hand. So he speaks, <sup><310></sup>Hosea 11:3, “I taught them to go, taking them by their arms.” And certainly never were weakly, froward children, so awkward to stand and go of themselves, as

that people were to comply with God in the work of their deliverance. Sometimes they refused to stand, or to make a trial of it; sometimes they cast themselves down after they were set on their feet; and sometimes with all their strength went backwards as to what God directed them unto. He that can read the story of their deliverance with any understanding, will easily discern what pains God was at with that people to teach them to go when he thus took them by the hand. It is therefore no new thing, that the church of God should be in a condition of itself able neither to stand nor go. But yet if God will take them by the hand for their help, deliverance shall ensue.

[2.] It expresth the *infinite condescension* of God towards this people in that condition, that he would bow down to take them by the hand. In most other places the work which he then accomplished is ascribed unto the lifting up or stretching out of his hand, <sup>300</sup>Ezekiel 20:6. See the description of it, <sup>180</sup>Deuteronomy 4:34, 26:8. It was towards their enemies a work of mighty power, of the lifting up of his hand; but towards them it was a work of infinite condescension and patience, —a bowing down to take them by the hand. And this was the greatest work of God. For such were the frowardness and unbelief, so multiplied were the provocations and temptations of that people, that if God had not held them fast by the hand, with infinite grace, patience, forbearance, and condescension, they had inevitably ruined themselves. And we know in how many instances they endeavored frowardly and obstinately to wrest themselves out of the hand of God, and to cast themselves into utter destruction. Wherefore this word, “When I took them by the hand,” for the end mentioned, compriseth all the grace, mercy, and patience, which God exercised towards that people, whilst he wrought out their deliverance by lifting up his hand amongst and against their adversaries.

And indeed no heart can conceive, no tongue can express, that infinite condescension and patience which God exerciseth towards every one of us, whilst he holds us by the hand to lead us unto rest with himself. Our own hearts, in some measure, know with what waywardness and frowardness, with what wanderings from him and withdrawing from his holy conduct, we exercise and are ready to weary his patience continually; yet do not mercy and grace let go that hold which they have taken on us. O that our souls might live in a constant admiration of that divine grace



and patience which they live upon; that the remembrance of the times and seasons wherein, if God had not strengthened his hand upon us, we had utterly destroyed ourselves, might increase that admiration daily, and enliven it with thankful obedience!

[3.] The *power* of this work intended is also included herein; not directly, but by consequence. For, as was said, when God took them by the hand by his grace and patience, he lifted up the hand of his power, by the mighty works which he wrought among their adversaries. What he did in Egypt, at the Red Sea, in the wilderness, is all included herein. These things made the day mentioned eminent and glorious. It was a great day, wherein God so magnified his name and power in the sight of all the world.

[4.] All these things had respect unto and issued in that *actual deliverance* which God then wrought for that people. And this was the greatest mercy which that people ever were or ever could be made partakers of, in that condition wherein they were under the old testament. As unto the outward part of it, consider what they were delivered from, and what they were led into, and it will evidently appear to be as great an outward mercy as human nature is capable of. But besides, it was gloriously typical, and representative of their own and the whole church's spiritual deliverance from sin and hell, from our bondage to Satan, and a glorious traduction into the liberty of the sons of God. And therefore did God engrave the memorial of it on the tables of stone, "I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." For what was typified and signified thereby is the principal motive unto obedience throughout all generations; nor is any moral obedience acceptable unto God that doth not proceed from a sense of spiritual deliverance.

And these things are here called over in this promise of giving a new covenant, partly to mind the people of the mercies which they had sinned against, and partly to mind them that no concurrence of outward mercies and privileges can secure our covenant-relation unto God, without the special mercy which is administered in the new covenant, whereof Jesus Christ is the mediator and surety.

Thus great on all accounts was the day, and the glory of it, wherein God made the old covenant with the people of Israel; yet had it no glory in

comparison of that which doth excel. The light of the sun of glory was on this day “seven-fold, as the light of seven days,” <sup><330></sup>Isaiah 30:26. A perfection of light and glory was to accompany that day, and all the glory of God’s work and his rest therein, the light of seven days, was to issue in it.

From the things we have observed, it is fully evident both what was the “covenant” that God made, and who were “the fathers” with whom it was made. The covenant intended is none other but that made at Sinai, in the third month after the coming of the people out of Egypt, <sup><191></sup>Exodus 19:1; which covenant, in the nature, use, and end of it, we have before described. And the fathers were those of that generation, those who *came* out of Egypt, and solemnly in their own persons, they and their children, entered into the covenant, and took upon them to do all that was required therein; whereon they were sprinkled with the blood of it, <sup><121></sup>Exodus 24:3-8, <sup><152></sup>Deuteronomy 5:27. It is true, all the posterity of the people unto whom the promise was now given were bound and obliged by that covenant, no less than those who first received it; but those only are intended in this place who actually in their own persons entered into covenant with God. Which consideration will give light unto what is affirmed, that “they brake his covenant,” or” continued not in it.”

A comparison being intended between the two covenants, this is the first general part of the foundation of it with respect unto the old.

The second part of it is in the event of making this covenant; and this is expressed both on the part of man and God, or in what the people did towards God, and how he carried it towards them thereon.

First, The event on the part of the people is in these words, “Because they continued not in my covenant,” — **Ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου.**

**ἧ**,” which,” in the original, is expressed by **ὅτι**, which we render “because;” **ὅτι**, as it is sometimes a relative, sometimes a redditive, “which,” or “because.” If we follow our translation, “because,” it seems to give a reason why God made a covenant with them not like the former; namely, because they continued not in the former, or brake it. But this indeed was not the reason of it. The reason, I say, why God made this

new covenant not according unto the former, was not because they abode not in the first. This could be no reason of it, nor any motive unto it. It is therefore mentioned only to illustrate the grace of God, that he would make this new covenant notwithstanding the sin of those who brake the former; as also the excellency of the covenant itself, whereby those who are taken into it shall be preserved from breaking it, by the grace which it doth administer. Wherefore I had rather render **ὅτι** here by “which,” as we render **אֲשֶׁר** in the prophet, —”which my covenant;” or “for,” —”for they abode not.” And if we render it “because,” it respects not God’s making a new covenant, but his rejecting them for breaking the old.

That which is charged on them is, that they “continued not,” they “abode not” in the covenant made with them. This God calls his covenant, “They continued not in my covenant;” because he was the author of it, the sole contriver and proposer of its terms and promises, **הִפְרִי**, they “brake,” they rescinded, removed it, made it void. The Hebrew word expresseth the matter of fact, what they did; they “brake” or made void the covenant: the word used by the apostle expresseth the manner how they did it; namely, by not continuing faithful in it, not abiding by the terms of it. The use of the word **μένω**, and **ἐμμένω**, unto this purpose, hath been before declared. And what is intended hereby we must inquire:—

**1.** God made this covenant with the people on Sinai, in the authoritative proposition of it unto them; and thereon the people solemnly accepted of it, and took it upon themselves to observe, do, and fulfill the terms and conditions of it, <sup><1248></sup>Exodus 19:8, especially <sup><1249></sup>Exodus 24:3, 7,

“The people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the LORD hath said, will we do.”

And, “All that the LORD hath said, will we do, and be obedient.” So <sup><1252></sup>Deuteronomy 5:27. Hereupon the covenant was ratified and confirmed between God and them, and thereon the blood of the covenant was sprinkled on them, <sup><1251></sup>Exodus 24:8. This gave that covenant its solemn ratification.

**2.** Having thus accepted of God’s covenant, and the terms of it, Moses ascending again into the mount, the people made the golden calf. And this fell out so suddenly after the making of the covenant, that the apostle

expresseth it by, “They continued not in it,” —’they made haste to break it.’ He expresseth the sense of the words of God hereon, <sup><0230></sup>Exodus 32:7, 8,

“Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: they have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.”

For therein they brake the covenant wherein God had in a peculiar manner assumed the glory of that deliverance unto himself.

**3.** Wherefore the breaking of the covenant, or their not continuing in it, was firstly and principally the making of the molten calf. After this, indeed, that generation added many other sins and provocations, before all things proceeded so far that “God sware in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest.” This fell out on their professed unbelief and murmuring on the return of the spies, <sup><0144></sup>Numbers 14, whereof we have treated at large on <sup><0100></sup>Hebrews 3. Wherefore this expression is not to be extended unto the sins of the following generations, neither in the kingdom of Israel nor in that of Judah, although they variously transgressed against the covenant, disannulling it so far as lay in them. But it is their sin who personally first entered into covenant with God that is reflected on. That generation with whom God made that first covenant immediately brake it, continued not in it. And therefore let that generation look well to themselves unto whom this new covenant shall be first proposed. And it so fell out, that the unbelief of that first generation who lived in the first days of the promulgation of the new covenant, hath proved an occasion of the ruin of their posterity unto this day. And we may observe, —

**Obs. V.** That sins have their aggravations from mercies received. —This was that which rendered this first sin of that people of such a flagitious nature in itself, and so provoking unto God, namely, that they who contracted personally the guilt of it had newly received the honor, mercy and privilege, of being taken into covenant with God. Hence is that threatening of God with respect hereunto, “Nevertheless in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them,” <sup><0224></sup>Exodus 32:34. He would have a

remembrance of this provoking sin in all their following visitations. Let us therefore take heed how we sin against received mercies, especially spiritual privileges, such as we enjoy by the gospel.

**Obs. VI.** Nothing but effectual grace will secure our covenant obedience one moment. —Greater motives unto obedience, or stronger outward obligation thereunto, no people under heaven could have than this people had newly received; and they had publicly and solemnly engaged themselves thereunto. But they “quickly turned out of the way.” And therefore in the new covenant is this grace promised in a peculiar manner, as we shall see on the next verse.

Secondly, The acting of God towards them hereon is also expressed: “And I regarded them not.” There seems to be a great difference between the translation of the words of the prophet and these of the apostle taken from them. In the former place we read, “Although I was an husband unto them;” in this, “I regarded them not.” And hereby the utmost difference that can be objected against the rendering of these words by the apostle is represented. But there was no need of rendering the words in the prophet, **וְאֲנֹכִי בְעֵלְתִּי בָם**, “Although I was an husband unto them,” as we shall see. Howbeit many learned men have exceedingly perplexed themselves and others in attempting a reconciliation between these passages or expressions, because they seem to be of a direct contrary sense and importance. I shall therefore premise some things which abate and take off from the weight of this difficulty, and then give the true solution of it. And unto the first end we may observe, —

**1.** That nothing of the main controversy, nothing of the substance of the truth which the apostle proves and confirms by this testimony, doth any way depend on the precise signification of these words. They are but occasional, as to the principal design of the whole promise; and therefore the sense of it doth not depend on their signification. And in such cases liberty in the variety of expositions may be safely used.

**2.** Take the two different senses which the words, as commonly translated, do present, and there is nothing of contradiction, or indeed the least disagreement between them. For the words, as we have translated them in the prophet, express an aggravation of the sin of the people: “They brake my covenant, although I was” (that is, therein) “an husband

unto them,” exercising singular kindness and care towards them. And as they are rendered by the apostle, they express the effect of that sin so aggravated, — He “regarded them not;” that is, with the same tenderness as formerly: for he denied to go with them as before, and exercised severity towards them in the wilderness until they were consumed. Each way, the design is to show that the covenant was broken by them, and that they were dealt withal accordingly.

But expositors do find or make great difficulties herein. It is generally supposed that the apostle followed the translation of the LXX., in the present copy whereof the words are so expressed. But how they came to render **בְּעֵלְתֵי** by **ἡμέλησα**, they are not agreed. Some say the original copies might differ in some letters from those we now enjoy. Therefore it is thought: they might read, as some think, **בְּחֵלְתֵי**, neglexi,” or **נְעֵלְתֵי**, “fastidivi,” — “I neglected” or “loathed them.” And those who speak most modestly, suppose that the copy, which the LXX. made use of had one of these words instead of **בְּעֵלְתֵי**, which yet is the truer reading; but because this did not belong unto the substance of the argument which he had in hand, the apostle would not depart from that translation which was then in use amongst the Hellenistical Jews.

But the best of these conjectures is uncertain, and some of them by no means to be admitted. Uncertain it is that the apostle made any of his quotations out of the translation of the LXX.; yea, the contrary is certain enough, and easy to be demonstrated. Neither did he write this epistle unto the Hellenistical Jews, or those who lived in or belonged unto their dispersions, wherein they made use of the Greek tongue; but unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea principally and in the first place, who made no use of that translation. He expressed the mind of the Scripture as he was directed by the Holy Ghost, in words of his own. And the coincidence of them with those in the present copies of the LXX. hath been accounted for in our Exercitations.

Dangerous it is, as well as untrue, to allow of alterations in the original text, and then upon our conjectures to supply other words into it than what are contained in it. This is not to explain, but to corrupt the Scripture. Wherefore one learned man (Pococke in Miscellan.) hath endeavored to prove that **בְּעֵלְתֵי**, by all rules of interpretation, in this

place must signify to “despise and neglect,” and ought to have been so translated. And this he confirms from the use of it in the Arabic language. The reader may find it in the place referred unto, with great satisfaction.

My apprehensions are grounded on what I have before observed and proved. The apostle neither in this nor in any other place doth bind up himself precisely unto the translation of the words, but infallibly gives us the sense and meaning; and so he hath done in this place. For whereas **בעל** signifies a “husband,” or to be a husband or a lord, **ב** being added unto it in construction, as it is here, **בם בעלתי**, it is as much as “jure usus sum maritali,” — ‘I exercised the right, power, and authority of a husband towards them; I dealt with them as a husband with a wife that breaketh covenant.’ that is, saith the apostle, “ ‘ I regarded them not’ with the love, tenderness, and affection of a husband.’ So he dealt indeed with that generation which so suddenly brake covenant with him. He provided no more for them as unto the enjoyment of the inheritance, he took them not home unto him in his habitation, his resting-place in the land of promise; but he suffered them all to wander, and bear their whoredoms in the wilderness, until they were consumed. So did God exercise the right, and power, and authority of a husband towards a wife that had broken covenant. And herein, as in many other things in that dispensation, did God give a representation of the nature of the covenant of works, and the issue of it.

Thirdly, There is a confirmation of the truth of these things in that expression, “Saith the Lord.” This assertion is not to be extended unto the whole matter, or the promise of the introduction of the new covenant; for that is secured with the same expression, verse 8, **λέγει Κύριος**, “Saith the Lord.” But it hath a peculiar **πάθος** in it, being added in the close of the words, — **נאם יְהוָה**, and respects only the sin of the people, and God’s dealing with them thereon. And this manifests the meaning of the preceding words to be God’s severity towards them: ‘I used the authority of a husband, I regarded them not as a wife any more, saith the Lord.’

Now, God thus uttered his severity towards them, that they might consider how he will deal with all those who despise, break, or neglect his covenant. ‘So,’ saith he, ‘I dealt with them; and so shall I deal with others who offend in an alike manner.’

‘This was the issue of things with them with whom the first covenant was made. They received it, entered solemnly into the bonds of it, took upon themselves expressly the performance of its terms and conditions, were sprinkled with the blood of it; but they “continued not in it,” and were dealt withal accordingly. God used the right and authority of a husband with whom a wife breaketh covenant; he “neglected them,” shut them out of his house, deprived them of their dowry or inheritance, and slew them in the wilderness.

On this declaration, God promiseth to make another covenant with them, wherein all these evils should be prevented. This is the covenant which the apostle designs to prove better and more excellent than the former. And this he cloth principally from the mediator and surety of it, compared with the Aaronical priests, whose office and service belonged wholly unto the administration of that first covenant. And he confirms it also from the nature of this covenant itself, especially with respect unto its efficacy and duration. And hereunto this testimony is express, evidencing how this covenant is everlastingly, by the grace administered in it, preventive of that evil success which the former had by the sin of the people.

Hence he says of it, *Οὐ κατὰ τήν*, —”Not according unto it;” a covenant agreeing with the former neither in promises, efficacy, nor duration. For what is principally promised here, namely, the giving of a new heart, Moses expressly affirms that it was not done in the administration of the first covenant. It is neither a renovation of that covenant nor a reformation of it, but utterly of another nature, by whose introduction and establishment that other was to be abolished, abrogated, and taken away, with all the divine worship and service which was peculiar thereunto. And this was that which the apostle principally designed to prove and convince the Hebrews of. And from the whole we may observe sundry things.

**Obs. VII.** No covenant between God and man ever was, or ever could be stable and effectual, as unto the ends of it, that was not made and confirmed in Christ. —God first made a covenant with us in Adam. There was nothing therein but the mere defectibility of our natures as we were *creatures* that could render it ineffectual. And from thence did it proceed. In him we all sinned, by breach of covenant. The Son of God had not then interposed himself, nor undertaken on our behalf. The apostle tells us that



“in him all things consist;” —without him they have no consistency, no stability, no duration. So was this first covenant immediately broken. It was not confirmed by the blood of Christ. And those who suppose that the efficacy and stability of the present covenant do depend solely on our own will and diligence, had need not only to assert our nature free from that depravation which it was under when this covenant was broken, but also from that defectibility that was in it before we fell in Adam. And such as, neglecting the interposition of Christ, do betake themselves unto imaginations of this kind, surely know little of themselves, and less of God.

**Obs. VIII.** No external administration of a covenant of God’s own making, no obligation of mercy on the minds of men, can enable them unto steadfastness in covenant obedience, without an effectual influence of grace from and by Jesus Christ. —For we shall see in the next verses that this is the only provision which is made in the wisdom of God to render us steadfast in obedience, and his covenant effectual unto us.

**Obs. IX.** God, in making a covenant with any, in proposing the terms of it, retains his right and authority to deal with persons according to their deportment in and towards that covenant: “They brake my covenant, and I regarded them not.”

**Obs. X.** God’s casting men out of his especial care, upon the breach of his covenant, is the highest judgment that in this world can fall on any persons.

And we are concerned in all these things. For although the covenant of grace be stable and effectual unto all who are really partakers of it, yet as unto its external administration, and our entering into it by a visible profession, it may be broken, unto the temporal and eternal ruin of persons and whole churches. Take heed of the golden calf.

### VERSES 10-12.

“Ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας, Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεὸν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν· καὶ οὐ μὴ

διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφον αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνωθὶ τὸν Κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν ὅτι ἴλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι.<sup>19</sup>

The design of the apostle, or what is the general argument which he is in pursuit of, must still be borne in mind throughout the consideration of the testimonies he produceth in the confirmation of it. And this is, to prove that the Lord Christ is the mediator and surety of a better covenant than that wherein the service of God was managed by the high priests according unto the law. For hence it follows that his priesthood is greater and far more excellent than theirs. To this end he doth not only prove that God promised to make such a covenant, but also declares the nature and properties of it, in the words of the prophet. And so, by comparing it with the former covenant, he manifests its excellency above it. In particular, in this testimony the imperfection of that covenant is demonstrated from its issue. For it did not effectually continue peace and mutual love between God and the people; but being broken by them, they were thereon rejected of God. This rendered all the other benefits and advantages of it useless. Wherefore the apostle insists from the prophet on those properties of this other covenant which infallibly prevent the like issue, securing the people's obedience for ever, and so the love and relation of God unto them as their God.

Wherefore these three verses give us a description of that covenant whereof the Lord Christ is the mediator and surety, not absolutely and entirely, but as unto those properties and effects of it wherein it differs from the former, so as infallibly to secure the covenant relation between God and the people. That covenant was broken, but this shall never be so, because provision is made in the covenant itself against any such event.

And we may consider in the words, —

1. The particle of introduction, ὅτι, answering the Hebrew וְיָדַעְתֶּם.
2. The *subject* spoken of, which is διαθήκη; with the way of making it, ἣν διαθήσομαι, — “which I will make.”
3. The *author* of it, the Lord Jehovah; “I will ..... saith the Lord.”

4. Those *with whom it was to be made*, “the house of Israel.”
5. The *time* of making it, “after those days.”
6. The *properties, privileges, and benefits* of this covenant, which are of two sorts:

(1.) Of *sanctifying*, inherent grace; described by a double consequent:

[1.] Of God’s relation unto them, and theirs to him; “I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people,” verse 10.

[2.] Of their advantage thereby, without the use of such other aids as formerly they stood in need of, verse 11.

(2.) Of *relative grace*, in the pardon of their sins, verse 12. And sundry things of great weight will fall into consideration under these several heads.

**Ver. 10.** —For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will give my laws into their mind, and write them upon their hearts: and I will be unto them a God, and they shall be to me a people.

1. The introduction of the declaration of the new covenant is by the particle **ὅτι**. The Hebrew **כִּי**, which is rendered by it, is variously used, and is sometimes redundant. In the prophet, some translate it by an exceptive, “sed;” some by an illative, “quoniam.” And in this place **ὅτι**, is rendered by some quamobrem, “wherefore; and by others “nam,” or enim, as we do it by “for.” And it doth intimate a reason of what was spoken before, namely, that the covenant which God would now make should not be according unto that, like unto it, which was before made and broken.

2. The thing promised is a “covenant:” in the prophet **בְּרִית**, here **διαθήκη**. And the way of making it, in the prophet **אָכַרְתָּ**; which is the usual word whereby the making of a covenant is expressed. For signifying to “cut,” to “strike,” to “divide,” respect is had in it unto the sacrifices wherewith covenants were confirmed. Thence also were “foedus percutere,” and “foedus ferire.” See <sup><15></sup>Genesis 15:9, 10, 18. **אָרַפְתָּ**, or **עָרַפְתָּ**, that is, “cure,” which is joined in construction with it, <sup><15></sup>Genesis 15:18, <sup><15></sup>Deuteronomy 5:2. The apostle renders it by **διαθήσονται**, and that

with a dative case without a preposition, **τῷ οἴκῳ**, “I will make” or “confirm unto.” He had used before **συντελέσω** to the same purpose.

We render the words **בְּרִית** and **διαθήκη** in this place by a “covenant,” though afterward the same word is translated by a “testament.” A covenant properly is a compact or agreement on certain terms mutually stipulated by two or more parties. As promises are the foundation and rise of it, as it is between God and man, so it compriseth also precepts, or laws of obedience, which are prescribed unto man on his part to be observed. But in the description of the covenant here annexed, there is no mention of any condition on the part of man, of any terms of obedience prescribed unto him, but the whole consists in free, gratuitous promises, as we shall see in the explication of it. Some hence conclude that it is only one part of the covenant that is here described. Others observe from hence that the whole covenant of grace as a covenant is absolute, without any conditions on our part; which sense Estius on this place contends for. But these things must be further inquired into: —

(1.) The word **בְּרִית**, used by the prophet, doth not only signify a “covenant” or compact properly so called, but a *free, gratuitous promise* also. Yea, sometimes it is used for such a free purpose of God with respect unto other things, which in their own nature are incapable of being obliged by any moral condition. Such is God’s covenant with day and night, <sup>2630</sup>Jeremiah 33:20, 25. And so he says that he “made his covenant,” not to destroy the world by water any more, “with every living creature,” <sup>1090</sup>Genesis 9:10, 11. Nothing, therefore, can be argued for the necessity of conditions to belong unto this covenant from the name or term whereby it is expressed in the prophet. A covenant properly is **συνθήκη**, but there is no word in the whole Hebrew language of that precise signification.

The making of this covenant is declared by **בְּרִית**. But yet neither doth this require a mutual stipulation, upon terms and conditions prescribed, unto an entrance into covenant. For it refers unto the sacrifices wherewith covenants were confirmed; and it is applied unto a mere gratuitous promise, <sup>1158</sup>Genesis 15:18, “In that day did the LORD make a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land.”

As unto the word **διαθήκη**, it signifies a “covenant” improperly; properly it is a “testamentary disposition.” And this may be without any conditions on the part of them unto whom any thing is bequeathed.

(2.) The *whole* of the covenant intended is expressed in the ensuing description of it. For if it were otherwise, it could not be proved from thence that this covenant was more excellent than the former, especially as to security that the covenant relation between God and the people should not be broken or disannulled. For this is the principal thing which the apostle designs to prove in this place; and the want of an observation thereof hath led many out of the way in their exposition of it. If, therefore, this be not an entire description of the covenant, there might yet be something reserved essentially belonging thereunto which might frustrate this end. For some such conditions might yet be required in it as we are not able to observe, or could have no security that we should abide in the observation of them: and thereon this covenant might be frustrated of its end, as well as the former; which is directly contrary unto God’s declaration of his design in it.

(3.) It is evident that there can be *no condition* previously required, unto our entering into or participation of the benefits of this covenant, antecedent unto the making of it with us. For none think there are any such with respect unto its original constitution; nor can there be so in respect of its making with us, or our entering into it. For, —

[1.] This would render the covenant inferior in a way of grace unto that which God made with the people at Horeb. For he declares that there was not any thing in them that moved him either to make that covenant, or to take them into it with himself. Everywhere he asserts this to be an act of his mere grace and favor. Yea, he frequently declares, that he took them into covenant, not only without respect unto any thing of good in them, but although they were evil and stubborn. See <sup>1800</sup>Deuteronomy 7:7, 8, 9:4, 5.

[2.] It is contrary unto the nature, ends, and express properties of this covenant. For there is nothing that can be thought or supposed to be such a condition, but it is comprehended in the promise of the covenant itself; for all that God requireth in us is proposed as that which himself will effect by virtue of this covenant.

(4.) It is certain, that in the *outward dispensation of the covenant*, wherein the grace, mercy, and terms of it are proposed unto us, many things are required of us in order unto a participation of the benefits of it; for God hath ordained, that all the mercy and grace that is prepared in it shall be communicated unto us ordinarily in the use of outward means, wherewith a compliance is required of us in a way of duty. To this end hath he appointed all the ordinances of the gospel, the word and sacraments, with all those duties, public and private, which are needful to render them effectual unto us. For he will take us ordinarily into this covenant in and by the rational faculties of our natures, that he may be glorified in them and by them. Wherefore these things are required of us in order unto the participation of the benefits of this covenant. And if, therefore, any one will call our attendance unto such duties the condition of the covenant, it is not to be contended about, though properly it is not so. For, —

[1.] God doth work the grace of the covenant, and communicate the mercy of it, antecedently unto all ability for the performance of any such duty; as it is with elect infants.

[2.] Amongst those who are equally diligent in the performance of the duties intended he makes a discrimination, preferring one before another. “Many are called, but few are chosen;” and what hath any one that he hath not received?

[3.] He actually takes some into the grace of the covenant whilst they are engaged in an opposition unto the outward dispensation of it. An example of this grace he gave in Paul.

(5.) It is evident that the *first grace* of the covenant, or God’s putting his law in our hearts, can depend on no condition on our part. For whatever is antecedent thereunto, being only a work or act of corrupted nature, can be no condition whereon the dispensation of spiritual grace is superadded. And this is the great ground of them who absolutely deny the covenant of grace to be conditional; namely, that the first grace is absolutely promised, whereon and its exercise the whole of it doth depend.

(6.) Unto a full and complete interest in all the promises of the covenant, faith on our part, from which *evangelical repentance* is inseparable, is required. But whereas these also are wrought in us by virtue of that

promise and grace of the covenant which are absolute, it is a mere strife about words to contend whether they may be called conditions or no. Let it be granted on the one hand, that we cannot have an actual participation of the relative grace of this covenant in adoption and justification, without faith or believing; and on the other, that this faith is wrought in us, given unto us, bestowed upon us, by that grace of the covenant which depends on no condition in us as unto its discriminating administration, and I shall not concern myself what men will call it.

(7.) Though there are no conditions properly so called of the whole grace of the covenant, yet there are conditions in the covenant, taking that term, in a large sense, for that which by the order of divine constitution precedeth some other things, and hath an influence into their existence; for God requireth many things of them whom he actually takes into covenant, and makes partakers of the promises and benefits of it. Of this nature is that whole obedience which is prescribed unto us in the gospel, in our walking before God in uprightness; and there being an order in the things that belong hereunto, some acts, duties, and parts of our gracious obedience, being appointed to be means of the further additional supplies of the grace and mercies of the covenant, they may be called conditions required of us in the covenant, as well as duties prescribed unto us.

(8.) The benefits of the covenant are of two sorts:

[1.] The *grace and mercy* which it doth collate.

[2] The *future reward* of glory which it doth promise.

Those of the former sort are all of them means appointed of God, which we are to use and improve unto the obtaining of the latter, and so may be called conditions required on our part. They are only collated on us, but conditions as used and improved by us.

(9.) Although *διαθήκη*, the word here used, may signify and be rightly rendered a “covenant,” in the same manner as *בְּרִית* doth, yet that which is intended is properly a “testament,” or a “testamentary disposition” of good things. It is the will of God in and by Jesus Christ, his death and bloodshedding, to give freely unto us the whole inheritance of grace and glory. And under this notion the covenant hath no condition, nor are any such either expressed or intimated in this place.

**Obs. I.** The covenant of grace, as reduced into the form of a testament, confirmed by the blood of Christ, doth not depend on any condition or qualification in our persons, but on a free grant and donation of God; and so do all the good things prepared in it.

**Obs. II.** The precepts of the old covenant are turned all of them into promises under the new. —Their preceptive, commanding power is not taken away, but grace is promised for the performance of them. So the apostle having declared that the people brake the old covenant, adds that grace shall be supplied in the new for all the duties of obedience that are required of us.

**Obs. III.** All things in the new covenant being proposed unto us by the way of promise, it is faith alone whereby we may attain a participation of them. —For faith only is the grace we ought to exercise, the duty we ought to perform, to render the promises of God effectual to us, <sup>380</sup>Hebrews 4:1, 2.

**Obs. IV.** Sense of the loss of an interest in and participation of the benefits of the old covenant, is the best preparation for receiving the mercies of the new.

**3.** The *author* of this covenant is God himself: “I will make it, saith the LORD.” This is the third time that this expression, “Saith the Lord,” is repeated in this testimony. The work expressed, in both the parts of it, the disannulling of the old covenant and the establishment of the new, is such as calls for this solemn interposition of the authority, veracity, and grace of God. “I will do it, saith the Lord.” And the mention hereof is thus frequently inculcated, to beget a reverence in us of the work which he so emphatically assumes unto himself. And it teacheth us that, —

**Obs. V.** God himself, in and by his own sovereign wisdom, grace, goodness, all-sufficiency, and power, is to be considered as the only cause and author of the new covenant; or, the abolishing of the old covenant, with the introduction and establishment of the new, is an act of the mere sovereign wisdom, grace, and authority of God. It is his gracious disposal of us, and of his own grace; —that whereof we had no contrivance, nor indeed the least desire.



**4.** It is declared *whom this new covenant is made withal*: “With the house of Israel.” Verse 8, they are called distinctly “the house of Israel, and the house of Judah.” The distribution of the posterity of Abraham into Israel and Judah ensued upon the division that fell out among the people in the days of Rehoboam. Before, they were called Israel only. And as in verse 8 they were mentioned distinctly, to testify that none of the seed of Abraham should be absolutely excluded from the grace of the covenant, however they were divided among themselves; so here they are all jointly expressed by their ancient name of Israel, to manifest that all distinctions on the account of precedent privileges should be now taken away, that “all Israel might be saved.” But we have showed before, that the whole Israel of God, or the church of the elect, are principally intended hereby.

**5.** The *time* of the accomplishment of this promise, or making of this covenant, is expressed, “After those days.” There are various conjectures about the sense of these words, or the determination of the time limited in them.

Some suppose respect is had unto the time of giving the law on mount Sinai. Then was the old covenant made with the fathers; but after those days another should be made. But whereas that time, “those days,” were so long past before this prophecy was given out by Jeremiah, namely, about eight hundred years, it was impossible but that the new covenant, which was not yet given, must be “after those days;” wherefore it was to no purpose so to express it that it should be after those days, seeing it was impossible that otherwise it should be.

Some think that respect is had unto the captivity of Babylon and the return of the people from thence; for God then showed them great kindness, to win them unto obedience. But neither can this time be intended; for God then made no new covenant with the people, but strictly obliged them unto the terms of the old, <sup>3000</sup>Malachi 4:4-6. But when this new covenant was to be made, the old was to be abolished and removed, as the apostle expressly affirmeth, verse 13. The promise is not of new obligation, or new assistance unto the observance of the old covenant, but of making a new one quite of another nature, which then was not done.

Some judge that these words, “after those days,” refer unto what went immediately before, “And I regarded them not:” which words include the total rejection of the Jews. ‘After those days wherein both the house of Judah and the house of Israel shall be rejected, I will make a new covenant with the whole Israel of God.’ But neither will this hold the trial; for, —

(1.) Supposing that expression, “And I regarded them not,” to intend the rejection of the Jews, yet it is manifest that their excision and cutting off absolutely was not in nor for their *non-continuance in the old covenant*, or not being faithful therein, but for the rejection of the new when proposed unto them. Then they fell by unbelief, as the apostle fully manifests, <sup><3801></sup>Hebrews 3 of this epistle, and <sup><6101></sup>Romans 11. Wherefore the making of the new covenant cannot be said to be after their rejection, seeing they were rejected for their refusal and contempt of it.

(2.) By this interpretation *the whole house of Israel*, or all the natural posterity of Abraham, would be utterly excluded from any interest in this promise. But this cannot be allowed: for it was not so “de facto,” a remnant being taken into covenant; which though but a remnant in comparison of the whole, yet in themselves so great a multitude, as that in them the promises made unto the fathers were confirmed. Nor on this supposition would this prediction of a new covenant have been any promise unto them, or any of them, but rather a severe denunciation of judgment. But it is said expressly, that God would make this covenant with them, as he did the former with their fathers; which is a promise of grace and mercy.

Wherefore “after those days,” is as much as in those days, —an indeterminate season for a certain. So, “in that day,” is frequently used in the prophets, <sup><2321></sup>Isaiah 24:21, 22; <sup><3211></sup>Zechariah 12:11. A time, therefore, certainly future, but not determined, is all that is intended in this expression, “after those days.” And herewith most expositors are satisfied. Yet is there, as I judge, more in the words.

“Those days,” seem to me to comprise the whole time allotted unto the economy of the old testament, or dispensation of the old covenant. Such a time there was appointed unto it; in the counsel of God. During this season things fell out as described, verse 9. The certain period fixed unto these days is called by our apostle “the time of reformation,” <sup><3101></sup>Hebrews

9:10. “After those days,” —that is, in or at their expiration, when they were coming unto their end, whereby the first covenant waxed old and decayed, — God would make this covenant with them. And although much was done towards it before those days came absolutely unto an end and did actually expire, yet is the making of it said to be “after those days,” because being made in the wane and declension of them, it did by its making put a full and final end unto them.

This in general was the time here designed for the making and establishing of the new covenant. But we must yet further inquire into the precise time of the accomplishment of this promise. And I say, the whole of it cannot be limited unto any one season absolutely, as though all that was intended in God’s making of this covenant did consist in any one individual act. The making of the old covenant with the fathers is said to be “in the day wherein God took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt.” During the season intended there were many things that were preparatory to the making of that covenant, or to the solemn establishment of it. So was it also in the making of the new covenant. It was gradually made and established, and that by sundry acts preparatory for it or confirmatory of it. And there are six degrees observable in it, —

**(1.)** The first peculiar entrance into it was made by the *ministry of John the Baptist*. Him had God raised to send under the name and in the spirit and power of Elijah, to prepare the way of the Lord, Malachi 4. Hence is his ministry called “the beginning of the gospel,” <sup><400></sup>Mark 1:1, 2. Until his coming, the people were bound absolutely and universally unto the covenant in Horeb, without alteration or addition in any ordinance of worship. But his ministry was designed to prepare them, and to cause them to look out after the accomplishment of this promise of making the new covenant, <sup><300></sup>Malachi 4:4-6. And these by whom his ministry was despised, did “reject the counsel of God against themselves,” —that is, unto their ruin; and made themselves liable to that utter excision with the threatening whereof the writings of the Old Testament are closed, <sup><300></sup>Malachi 4:6. He therefore called the people off from resting in or trusting unto the privileges of the first covenant, <sup><400></sup>Matthew 3:8-10; preached unto them a doctrine of repentance; and instituted a new ordinance of worship, whereby they might be initiated into a new state or condition, a new relation unto God. And in his whole ministry he pointed

at, and directed and gave testimony unto Him who was then to come to establish this new covenant. This was the beginning of the accomplishment of this promise.

(2.) *The coming in the flesh and personal ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ himself*, was an eminent advance and degree therein. The dispensation of the old covenant did yet continue; for he himself, as “made of a woman,” was “made under the law,” yielding obedience unto it, observing all its precepts and institutions. But his coming in the flesh laid an axe unto the root of that whole dispensation; for therein the main end that God designed thereby towards that people was accomplished. The interposition of the law was now to be taken away, and the promise to become all unto the church. Hence upon his nativity this covenant was proclaimed from heaven, as that which was immediately to take place, <sup>1003</sup> Luke 2:13, 14. But it was more fully and evidently carried on in and by his personal ministry. The whole doctrine thereof was preparatory unto the immediate introduction of this covenant. But especially there was therein and thereby, by the truth which he taught, by the manner of his teaching, by the miracles which he wrought, in conjunction with an open accomplishment of the prophecies concerning him, evidence given that he was the Messiah, the mediator of the new covenant. Herein was a declaration made of the person in and by whom it was to be established: and therefore he told them, that unless they believed it was he who was so promised, they should die in their sins.

(3.) The way for the introduction of this covenant being thus prepared, it was solemnly *enacted and confirmed in and by his death*; for herein he offered that sacrifice to God whereby it was established. And hereby the promise properly became *διαθήκη*, a “testament,” as our apostle proves at large, <sup>1004</sup> Hebrews 9:14.-16. And he declares in the same place, that it answered those sacrifices whose blood was sprinkled on the people and the book of the law, in the confirmation of the first covenant; which things must be treated of afterwards. This was the center wherein all the promises of grace did meet, and from whence they derived their efficacy. From henceforward the old covenant, and all its administrations, having received their full accomplishment, did abide only in the patience of God, to be taken down and removed out of the way in his own time and manner; for really and in themselves their force and authority did then cease, and

was taken away. See <sup><H24></sup>Ephesians 2:14-16; <sup><D14></sup>Colossians 2:14, 15. But our obligation unto obedience and the observance of commands, though formally and ultimately it be resolved into the will of God, yet immediately it respects the revelation of it, by which we are directly obliged. Wherefore, although the causes of the removal of the old covenant had already been applied thereunto, yet the law and its institutions were still continued not only lawful but useful unto the worshippers, until the will of God concerning their abrogation was fully declared.

**(4.)** This new covenant had the *complement* of its making and establishment *in the resurrection of Christ*. For in order hereunto the old was to have its perfect end. God did not make the first covenant, and therein revive, represent, and confirm the covenant of works, with the promise annexed unto it, merely that it should continue for such a season, and then die of itself, and be arbitrarily removed; but that whole dispensation had an end which was to be accomplished, and without which it was not consistent with the wisdom or righteousness of God to remove it or take it away. Yea, nothing of it could be removed, until all was fulfilled. It was easier to remove heaven and earth than to remove the law, as unto its right and title to rule the souls and consciences of men, before all was fulfilled. And this end had two parts: —

**[1.]** The *perfect fulfilling of the righteousness* which it required. This was done in the obedience of Christ, the surety of the new covenant, in the stead of them with whom the covenant was made.

**[2.]** That *the curse of it should be undergone*. Until this was done, the law could not quit its claim unto power over sinners. And as this curse was undergone in the suffering, so it was absolutely discharged in the resurrection of Christ. For the pains of death being loosed, and he delivered from the state of the dead, the sanction of the law was declared to be void, and its curse answered. Hereby did the old covenant so expire, as that the worship which belonged unto it was only for a while continued, in the patience and forbearance of God towards that people.

**(5.)** The first solemn promulgation of this new covenant, so made, ratified, and established, was on *the day of Pentecost*, seven weeks after the resurrection of Christ. And it answered the promulgation of the law on mount Sinai, the same space of time after the delivery of the people out of

Egypt. From this day forward the ordinances of worship, and all the institutions of the new covenant, became obligatory unto all believers. Then was the whole church absolved from any duty with respect unto the old covenant, and the worship of it, though it was not manifest as yet in their consciences.

(6.) The question being stated about the continuance of the obligatory force of the old covenant, the contrary was solemnly promulged *by the apostles, under the infallible conduct of the Holy Ghost, Acts 15.*

These were the articles, or the degrees of the time intended in that expression, “after those days;” all of them answering the several degrees whereby the old vanished and disappeared.

The circumstances of the making of this covenant being thus cleared, the nature of it in its promises is next proposed unto us. And in the exposition of the words we must do these two things:

1. Inquire into the *general nature* of these promises.
2. *Particularly* and distinctly explain them: —

FIRST, The *general nature* both of the covenant and of the promises whereby it is here expressed must briefly be inquired into, because there are various apprehensions about them. For some suppose that there is an especial efficacy towards the things mentioned intended in these promises, and no more; some judge that the things themselves, the event and end, are so promised.

In the first way Schlichtingius expresseth himself on this place:

“Non ‘ut olim curabo leges meas in lapideis tantum tabulis inscribi, sed tale foedus cum illis feriam ut meae leges ipsis eorum mentibus et cordibus insculpantur:’ —apparet haec verba intra vim et efficaciam accipiendam esse, non veto ad ipsum inscriptionis effectum necessario porrigenda, qui semper in libera hominis potestate positus est; quod ipsum docent et sequentia Dei verba, ver. 12. Quibus ipse Deus causam seu modum ac rationem huius rei aperit, quae ingenti illius gratia ac misericordia populo exhibenda continetur. Hac futurum dicit ut populus tanto ardore sibi serviat, suasque leges observet. Sensus ergo est, ‘tale percutiam foedus

quod maximas et sufficientissimas vires habebit populum meum in officio continendi.”

And another:

“I will, instead of these external, carnal ordinances and observations, give them spiritual commands for the regulating of their affections, precepts most agreeable unto all men, [made] by the exceeding greatness of that grace and mercy. In this and many other particulars I shall incline their affections willingly to receive my law.”

The sense of both is, that all which is here promised consisteth in the nature of the means, and their efficacy from thence, to incline, dispose, and engage men unto the things here spoken of, but not to effect them certainly and infallibly in them to whom the promise is given. And it is supposed that the efficacy granted ariseth from the nature of the precepts of the gospel, which are rational, and suited unto the principles of our intellectual natures. For these precepts, enlivened by the promises made unto the observance of them, with the other mercies wherewith they are accompanied in God’s dealing with us, are meet to prevail on our minds and wills unto obedience; but yet, when all is done, the whole issue depends on our own wills, and their determination of themselves one way or other.

But these things are not only liable unto many just exceptions, but do indeed overthrow the whole nature of the new covenant, and the text is not expounded but corrupted by them; wherefore they must be removed out of the way. And, —

**1.** The exposition given can no way be accommodated unto the words, so as to grant a truth in their plain literal sense. For whereas God says, “He will put his laws in their mind, and write them in their heart, and they shall all know him,” —which declares what he will effectually do; the sense of their exposition is, that indeed he will not do so, only he will do that which shall move them and persuade them to do that themselves which he hath promised to do himself, and that whether they ever do so or no! But if any one concerning whom God says that he will write his law in his heart, have it not so written, be it on what account it will, —suppose it be

that the man will not have it so written, —how can the promise be true, that God will write his law in his heart? It is a sorry apology, to say that God in making that promise did not foresee the obstruction that would arise, or could not remove it when it did so.

**2.** It is the *event*, or the *effect* itself, that is directly promised, and not any such efficacy of means as might be frustrated. For the weakness and imperfection of the first covenant was evidenced hereby, that those with whom it was made continued not in it. Hereon God neglected them, and the covenant became unprofitable, or at least unsuccessful as unto the general end of continuing the relation between God and them, —of his being their God, and they being his people. To redress this evil, and prevent the like for the future, —that is, effectually to provide that God and his people may always abide in that blessed covenant relation, —he promiseth the things themselves whereby it might be secured. That which the first covenant could not effect, God promised to work in and by the new.

**3.** It is nowhere said nor intimated in the Scripture, that the efficacy of the new covenant, and the accomplishment of the promises of it, should depend on and arise from the *suitableness of its precepts unto our reason*, or natural principles; but it is universally and constantly ascribed unto the efficacy of the Spirit and grace of God, not only enabling us unto obedience, but enduing us with a spiritual, supernatural, vital principle, from which it may proceed.

**4.** It is true, that our *own wills*, or the free actings of them, are required in our faith and obedience; whence it is promised that we shall be “willing in the day of his power.” But that our wills are left absolutely herein unto our own liberty and power, without being inclined and determined by the grace of God, is that Pelagianism which hath long attempted the church, but which shall never absolutely prevail.

**5.** The putting the laws of God in our minds, and the writing of them in our hearts, that we may know him, and fear him always, is promised in the same way and manner as is the forgiveness of sin, verse 12; and it is hard to affix such a sense unto that promise, as that God will use such and such means that our sins may be pardoned, which yet may all of them fail.



**6.** As this exposition is no way suited unto the words of the text, nor of the context, or scope of the place, so indeed it overthrows the nature of the new covenant, and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which comes thereby. For, —

**(1.)** If the *effect* itself, or the things mentioned are not promised, but only the *use of means*, left unto the liberty of men's wills whether they will comply with them or no, then the very being of the covenant, whether it ever shall have any existence or no, depends absolutely on the wills of men, and so may not be. For it is not the proposal of the terms of the covenant, and the means whereby we may enter into it, that is called the making of this covenant with us; but our real participation of the grace and mercy promised in it. This alone gives a real existence unto the covenant itself, without which it is not a covenant; nor without it is it properly made with any.

**(2.)** The Lord Christ would be made hereby the *mediator of an uncertain covenant*. For if it depend absolutely on the wills of men whether they will accept of the terms of it and comply with it or no, it is uncertain what will be the event, and whether ever any one will do so or no; for the will being not determined by grace, what its actings will be is altogether uncertain.

**(3.)** The covenant can hereon in no sense be a *testament*; which our apostle afterwards proves that it is, and that irrevocably ratified by the death of the testator. For there can, on this supposition, be no certain heir unto whom Christ did bequeath his goods, and the inheritance of mercy, grace, and glory. This would make this testament inferior to that of a wise man, who determines in particular unto whom his goods shall come.

**(4.)** It takes away that difference between this and the former covenant which it is the main scope of the apostle to prove; at least it leaves the difference to consist only in the gradual efficacy of outboard means; which is most remote from his purpose. For there were by the old covenant means supplied to induce the people unto constant obedience, and those in their kind powerful. This is pleaded by Moses, in the whole book almost of Deuteronomy. For the scope of all his exhortations unto obedience is to show that God had so instructed them in the knowledge of his will by giving of the law, and had accompanied his teachings with so many signal

mercies, such effects of his mighty power, goodness, and grace; that the covenant was accompanied with such promises and threatenings, that therein life and death temporal and eternal were set before them; all which made their obedience so reasonable and necessary, that nothing but profligacy in wickedness could turn them from it. To this purpose are discourses multiplied in that book. And yet notwithstanding all this, it is added, “that God had not circumcised their hearts to fear him and obey him always,” as it is here promised. The communication of grace effectual, producing infallibly the good things proposed and promised in the minds and hearts of men, belonged not unto that covenant. If, therefore, there be no more in the making of the new covenant but only the adding of more forcible outward means and motives, more suitable unto our reasons, and meet to work on our affections, it differs only in some unassignable degrees from the former. But this is directly contrary unto the promise in the prophet, that it shall not be according unto it, or of the same kind; no more than Christ, the high priest of it, should be a priest after the order of Aaron.

**(5.)** It would on this supposition follow, that God might fulfill his promise of “putting his laws in the minds of men, and writing them in their hearts,” and yet none have the laws put into their minds, nor written in their hearts; which things are not reconcilable by any distinction unto the ordinary reason of mankind.

Wherefore we must grant that it is the effect, the event in the communication of the things promised, that is ascribed unto this covenant, and not only the use and application of means unto their production. And this will yet further appear in the particular exposition of the several parts of it. But yet, before we enter thereon, two objections must be removed, which may in general be laid against our interpretation.

*First*, “This covenant is promised as that which is *future*, to be brought in at a certain time, “after those days,” as hath been declared. But it is certain that the things here mentioned, the grace and mercy expressed, were really communicated unto many both before and after the giving of the law, long ere this covenant was made; for all who truly believed and feared God had these things effected in them by grace: wherefore their effectual

communication cannot be esteemed a property of this covenant which was to be made afterwards.’

*Ans.* This objection was sufficiently prevented in what we have already discoursed concerning the efficacy of the grace of this covenant before itself was solemnly consummated. For all things of this nature that belong unto it do arise and spring from the mediation of Christ, or his interposition on the behalf of sinners. Wherefore this took place from the giving of the first promise; the administration of the grace of this covenant did therein and then take its date. Howbeit the Lord Christ had not yet done that whereby it was solemnly to be confirmed, and that whereon all the virtue of it did depend. Wherefore this covenant is promised now to be made, not in opposition unto what grace and mercy was derived from it both before and under the law, nor as unto the first administration of grace from the mediator of it; but in opposition unto the covenant of Sinai, and with respect unto its outward solemn confirmation.

*Secondly,* ‘If the *things themselves* are promised in the covenant, then all those with whom this covenant is made must be really and effectually made partakers of them. But this is not so; they are not all actually sanctified, pardoned, and saved, which are the things here promised.’

*Ans.* The making of this covenant may be considered two ways:

1. As unto the *preparation and proposition of its terms and conditions.*
2. As unto the *internal stipulation between God and the souls of men.*

In this sense alone God is properly said to make this covenant with any. The preparation and proposition of laws are not the making of the covenant. And therefore all with whom this covenant is made are effectually sanctified, justified, and saved.

SECONDLY, These things being premised, as it was necessary they should be, unto the right understanding of the mind of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed unto the particular parts of the covenant as here expressed, namely, in the blessed properties and effects of it, whereby it is distinguished from the former.

The first two expressions are of the same nature and tendency, “I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts.” In general it is the

reparation of our nature by the restoration of the image of God in us, — that is, our sanctification, — which is promised in these words. And there are two things in the words both doubly expressed:

1. The *subject* wrought upon; which is the “mind” and the “heart.”
2. The *manner* of producing the effect mentioned in them; and that is by “putting” and “writing.” And,
3. The *things* by these means so communicated; which are the “laws” of God.

1. The subject spoken of is the *mind and heart*. When the apostle treats of the depravation and corruption of our nature, he placeth them **τῇ διανοίᾳ** and **ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ**, <sup>◀4018</sup> Ephesians 4:18; that is, “the mind and the heart.” These are, in the Scripture, the seat of natural corruption, the residence of the principle of alienation from the life of God which is in us. Wherefore the renovation of our natures consists in the rectifying and curing of them, in the furnishing them with contrary principles of faith, love, and adherence unto God. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. VI.** The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in the new covenant, in its being and existence, in its healing, repairing efficacy, is as large and extensive as sin is in its residence and power to deprave our natures. — This is the difference about the extent of the new covenant, and the grace of it: Some would have it to extend unto all persons, in its tender and conditional proposition; but not unto all things, as unto its efficacy in the reparation of our natures. Others assert it to extend unto all the effects of sin, in the removal of them, and the cure of our natures thereby; but as unto persons, it is really extended unto none but those in whom these effects are produced, whatever be its outward administration, which was also always limited: unto whom I do subscribe.

The *first* thing mentioned is the “mind.” **קַרְבֵּן** the apostle renders by **διάνοια**, “the inward part.” The mind is the most secret, inward part or power of the soul. And the prophet expresseth it by the “inward part,” because it is the only safe and useful repository of the laws of God. When they are there laid up, we shall not lose them; neither men nor devils can take them from us. And he also declares wherein the excellency of covenant obedience doth consist. It is not in the *conformity of our outward*

*actions* unto the law, although that be required therein also; but it principally lieth in the *inward parts*, where God searcheth for and regardeth truth in sincerity, <sup><550></sup>Psalm 51:6. Wherefore **διάνοια** is the “mind and understanding,” whose natural depravation is the spring and principle of all disobedience; the cure whereof is here promised in the first place. In the outward administration of the means of grace, the affections, or, if I may so speak, the more outward part of the soul, are usually first affected and wrought upon: but the first real effect of the internal promised grace of the covenant is on the mind, the most spiritual and inward part of the soul. This in the New Testament is expressed by the renovation of the mind, <sup><510></sup>Romans 12:2, <sup><402></sup>Ephesians 4:23; and the opening of the eyes of our understandings, <sup><401></sup>Ephesians 1:17, 18; God shining into our hearts, to give us the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ, <sup><406></sup>2 Corinthians 4:6. Hereby the enmity against God, the vanity, darkness, and alienation from the life of God, which the mind naturally is possessed and filled withal, are taken away and removed, —of the nature of which work I have treated at large elsewhere;<sup>f10</sup> —for the law of God in the mind, is the saving knowledge of the mind and will of God, whereof the law is the revelation, communicated unto it and implanted in it.

**2.** The way whereby God in the covenant of grace thus works on the mind is expressed by **διδούς**: so the apostle tenders **δίδωμι**, “I will give.” **Διδούς**, “giving,” may by an enallage be put for **δώρα**, “I will give.” So is it expressed in the next clause, **ἐπιγράψω**, in the future tense, “I will write.” The word in the prophet is, “I will give;” we render it, “I will put.” But there are two things intimated in the word:

- (1.) The *freedom* of the grace promised; it is a mere grant, gift, or donation of grace.
- (2.) The *efficacy* of it.

That which is given of God unto any is received by them, otherwise it is no gift. And this latter is well expressed by the word used by us, “I will put;” which expresseth an actual communication, and not a fruitless tender. This the apostle renders emphatically, **διδούς**; that is, **εἰμί**, “This is that which I do, am doing in this covenant; namely, freely giving that grace whereby my laws shall be implanted on the minds of men.”

**3.** To show in general, before we proceed to the nature of this work, so far as is necessary unto the exposition of the words, we may here consider what was observed in the third place, namely, what it is that is thus promised to be communicated, and so carry it on with us unto the other clause of this promise.

That which is to be put into this spiritual receptacle is in these words, **Τοὺς νόμους μου**, “My laws;” in the plural number. Expositors inquire what laws are here intended, whether the moral law only, or others also. But there is no need of such inquiry. There is a metonymy of the subject and effect in the words. It is that knowledge of the mind and will of God which is revealed in the law, and taught by it, which is promised. The “laws of God,” therefore, are here taken largely, for the whole revelation of the mind and will of God. So doth **תּוֹרָה** originally signify “doctrine” or “instruction.” By what way or revelation soever God makes known himself and his will unto us, requiring our obedience therein, it is all comprised in that expression of “his laws.”

From these things we may easily discern the nature of that grace which is contained in this first branch of the first promise of the covenant. And this is, the *effectual operation* of his Spirit in the renovation and saving illumination of our minds, whereby they are habitually made conformable unto the whole law of God, —that is, the rule and the law of our obedience in the new covenant, —and enabled unto all acts and duties that are required of us. And this is the first grace promised and communicated unto us by virtue of this covenant, as it was necessary that so it should be. For,

- 1.** The mind is the principal seat of all spiritual obedience.
- 2.** The proper and peculiar actings of the mind, in discerning, knowing, judging, must go before the actings of the will and affections, much more all outward practices.
- 3.** The depravation of the mind is such, by blindness, darkness, vanity, and enmity, that nothing can inflame our souls, or make an entrance towards the reparation of our natures, but an internal, spiritual, saving operation of grace upon the mind.
- 4.** Faith itself is principally ingenerated by an infusion of saving light into the mind, **2** Corinthians 4:4, 6. So, —

**Obs. VII.** All the beginnings and entrances into the saving knowledge of God, and thereon of obedience unto him, are effects of the grace of the covenant.

The *second* part of this first promise of the covenant is expressed in these words, “And will write them upon their hearts;” which is that which renders the former part actually effectual.

Expositors generally observe, that respect is had herein unto the *giving of the law on mount Sinai*, —that is, in the first covenant; for then the law (that is, “the ten words”) was written in tables of stone. And although the original tables were broken by Moses, when the people had broken the covenant, yet would not God alter that dispensation, nor write his laws any other way, but commanded new tables of stone to be made, and wrote them therein. And this was done, not so much to secure the outward letter of them, as to represent the hardness of the hearts of the people unto whom they were given. God did not, God would not by virtue of that covenant otherwise dispose of his law. And the event that ensued hereon was, that they brake these laws, and abode not in obedience. This event God promiseth to obviate and prevent under the new covenant, and that by writing these laws now in our hearts, which he wrote before only in tables of stone; that is, he will effectually work that obedience in us which the law doth require, for he “worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.” The heart, as distinguished from the mind, compriseth the will and the affections; and they are compared unto the tables wherein the letter of the law was engraven. For as by that writing and engraving, the tables received the impression of the letters and words wherein the law was contained, which they did firmly retain and represent, so as that although they were stones still in their nature, yet were they nothing but the law in their use; so by the grace of the new covenant there is a durable impression of the law of God on the wills and affections of men, whereby they answer it, represent it, comply with it, and have a living principle of it abiding in them. Wherefore, as this work must necessarily consist of two parts, namely, the removal out of the heart of whatever is contrary unto the law of God, and the implanting of principles of obedience thereinto; so it comes under a double description or denomination in the Scripture. For sometimes it is called a “taking away of the heart of stone,” or “circumcising of the heart;” and sometimes the

“giving of an heart of flesh,” the “writing of the law in our hearts;” — which is the renovation of our natures into the image of God in righteousness and the holiness of truth. Wherefore in this promise the whole of our sanctification, in its beginning and progress, in its work upon our whole souls and all their faculties, is comprised. And we may observe,

**Obs. VIII.** The work of grace in the new covenant passeth on the whole soul, in all its faculties, powers, and affections, unto their change and renovation. —The whole was corrupted, and the whole must be renewed. The image of God was originally in and upon the whole, and on the loss of it the whole was deprived. See <sup>1</sup>Thessalonians 5:23.

**Obs. IX.** To take away the necessity and efficacy of renewing, changing, sanctifying grace, consisting in an internal, efficacious operation of the principles, habits, and acts of internal grace and obedience, is plainly to overthrow and reject the new covenant.

**Obs. X.** We bring nothing to the new covenant but our hearts, as tables to be written in, with the sense of the insufficiency of the precepts and promises of the law, with respect unto our own ability to comply with them.

The last thing in the words, is the relation that ensues hereon between God and his people: “I will be unto them a God, and they shall be to me a people.” This is indeed a distinct promise by itself, summarily comprising all the blessings and privileges of the covenant. And it is placed in the center of the account given of the whole, as that from whence all the grace of it doth spring, wherein all the blessings of it do consist, and whereby they are secured. Howbeit in this place it is peculiarly mentioned, as that which hath its foundation in the foregoing promise. For this relation, which implies mutual acquiescency in each other, could not be, nor ever had been, if the minds and hearts of them who are to be taken into it were not changed and renewed. For neither could God approve of and rest in his love towards them, whilst they were enemies unto him in the deprivation of their natures; nor could they find rest or satisfaction in God, whom they neither knew, nor liked, nor loved.



This is the general expression of any covenant relation between God and men, “He will be unto them a God, and they shall be to him a people.” And it is frequently made use of with respect unto the first covenant, which yet was disannulled. God owned the people therein for his peculiar portion, and they avouched him to be their God alone.

Nor can this be spoken of God and any people, but on the ground of an especial covenant. It is true, God is the God of all the world, and all people are his; yea, he is a God unto them all. For as he made them, so he sustains, rules, and governeth them in all things, by his power and providence. But with respect hereunto God doth not freely promise that he will be a God unto any, nor can so do; for his power over all, and his rule of all things, is essential and natural unto him, so as it cannot otherwise be. Wherefore, as thus declared, it is a peculiar expression of an especial covenant relation. And the nature of it is to be expounded by the nature and properties of that covenant which it doth respect.

Two things we must therefore consider, to discover the nature of this relation:

1. The *foundation* of it.
2. The *mutual actings* in it by virtue of this relation.

1. Unto the manifestation of the *foundation* of it, some things must be premised: —

(1.) Upon the entrance of sin there continued no such *covenant relation* between God and man, as that by virtue thereof he should be their God, and they should be his people. God continued still in the full enjoyment of his sovereignty over men; which no sin, nor rebellion, nor apostasy of man could in the least impeach. And man continued under an obligation unto dependence on God and subjection unto his will in all things. For these cannot be separated from his nature and being until final judgment be executed; after which God rules over them only by power, without any respect unto their wills or obedience. But that especial relation of mutual interest by virtue of the first covenant ceased between them.

(2.) God would not enter into any other covenant with sinful, fallen man, to be “a God unto them,” and to take them to be a “peculiar people” unto

him, immediately in *their own persons*. Nor was it consistent with his wisdom and goodness so to do; for if man was not steadfast in God's covenant, but brake and disannulled it when he was sinless and upright, only created with a possibility of defection, what expectations could there be that now he was fallen, and his nature wholly depraved, any new covenant should be of use unto the glory of God or advantage of man? To enter into a new covenant that must necessarily be broken, unto the aggravation of the misery of man, became not the wisdom and goodness of God. If it be said, 'God might have so made a new covenant immediately with men as to secure their future obedience, and to have made it firm and stable,' I answer, It would not have become the divine wisdom and goodness to have dealt better with men after their rebellion and apostasy than before, namely, on their own account. He did in our first creation communicate unto our nature all that grace and all those privileges which in his wisdom he thought meet to endow it withal, and all that was necessary to make them who were partakers of it everlastingly blessed. To suppose that, on his own account alone, he would immediately collate more grace upon it, is to suppose him singularly well pleased with our sin and rebellion. This, then, God would not do. Wherefore, —

**(3.)** God provided in the first place that there should be a *mediator*, a *sponsor*, an *undertaker*, with whom alone he would treat about a new covenant, and so establish it. For there were, in the contrivance of his grace and wisdom concerning it, many things necessary unto it that could no otherwise be enacted and accomplished. Nay, there was not any one thing in all the good which he designed unto mankind in this covenant, in a way of love, grace, and mercy, that could be communicated unto them, so as that his honor and glory might be advanced thereby, without the consideration of this mediator, and what he undertook to do. Nor could mankind have yielded any of that obedience unto God which he would require of them, without the interposition of this mediator on their behalf. It was therefore with him that God firstly made this covenant.

How it was needful that this mediator should be God and man in one person; how he became so to undertake for us, and in our stead; what was the especial covenant between God and him as unto the work which he undertook personally to perform; have, according unto our poor weak measure and dark apprehension of these heavenly things, been declared at

large in our Exercitations on this epistle, and yet more fully in our discourse of the mystery and glory of the person of Christ.<sup>f11</sup> Wherefore, as unto this new covenant, it was firstly made with Jesus Christ, the surety of it and undertaker in it. For, —

**(1.)** God neither would nor, “salva justitia, sapientia, et honore,” could, treat immediately with sinful, rebellious men on terms of grace for the future, until satisfaction was undertaken to be made for sins past, or such as should afterwards fall out. This was done by Christ alone; who was therefore the **πρῶτον δεκτικόν** of this covenant and all the grace of it. See <sup><18></sup>2 Corinthians 5:19, 20; <sup><18></sup>Galatians 3:13, 14; <sup><18></sup>Romans 3:25.

**(2.)** No restipulation of obedience unto God could be made by man, that might be a ground of entering into a covenant intended to be firm and stable. For whereas we had broken our first covenant engagement with God in our best condition, we were not likely of ourselves to make good a new engagement of a higher nature than the former. Who will take the word or the security of a bankrupt for thousands, who is known not to be worth one farthing; especially if he have wasted a former estate in luxury and riot, continuing an open slave to the same lusts? Wherefore it was absolutely necessary that in this covenant there should be a surety, to undertake for our answering and firm standing unto the terms of it. Without this, the event of this new covenant, which God would make as a singular effect of his wisdom and grace, would neither have been glory to him nor advantage unto us.

**(3.)** That grace which was to be the spring of all the blessings of this covenant, unto the glory of God and salvation of the church, was to be deposited in some safe hand, for the accomplishment of these ends. In the first covenant, God at once committed unto man that whole stock of grace which was necessary to enable him unto the obedience of it. And the grace of reward which he was to receive upon the performance of it, God reserved absolutely in his own hand; yea, so as that perhaps man did not fully understand what it was. But all was lost at once that was committed unto our keeping, so as that nothing at all was left to give us the least relief as unto any new endeavors. Wherefore God will now secure all the good things of this covenant, both as to grace and glory, in a third hand, in the hand of a mediator. Hereon the promises are made unto him, and the

fullness of grace is laid up in him, <sup><3014></sup>John 1:14; <sup><3019></sup>Colossians 1:19, 2:3; <sup><3018></sup>Ephesians 3:8; <sup><3022></sup>2 Corinthians 1:20.

(4.) As he was the mediator of this covenant, *God became his God*, and he became the *servant of God* in a peculiar manner. For he stood before God in this covenant as a public representative of all the elect. See our comment on <sup><3005></sup>Hebrews 1:5, 8, 9, 2:13. God is a God unto him in all the promises he received on the behalf of his mystical body; and he was his servant in the accomplishment of them, as the pleasure of the Lord was to prosper in his hand.

(5.) God being in this covenant a God and Father unto Christ, he came by virtue thereof to be our God and Father, <sup><3017></sup>John 20:17; <sup><3022></sup>Hebrews 2:12, 13. And we became “heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ;” and his people, to yield him all sincere obedience.

And these things may suffice briefly to declare the foundation of that covenant relation which is here expressed. Wherefore, —

**Obs. XI.** The Lord Christ, God and man, undertaking to be the mediator between God and man, and a surety on our behalf, is the spring and head of the new covenant, which is made and established with us in him.

2. The nature of this covenant relation is expressed on the one side and the other: “I will be unto them a God, and they shall be to me a people:” —

(1.) On the part of God it is, “I will be unto them a God;” or, as it is elsewhere expressed, “I will be their God.”

And we must make a little inquiry into this unspeakable privilege, which eternity only will fully unfold: —

[1.] The person speaking is included in the verb, *καὶ ἔσομαι*, “I will be;” ‘I, Jehovah, who make this promise.’ And herein God proposeth unto our faith all the glorious properties of his nature: ‘I, who am that I am, Jehovah, — goodness and being itself, and the cause of all being and goodness to others; infinitely wise, powerful, righteous, etc. I, that am all this, and in all that I am will be so.’ Here lies the eternal spring of the infinite treasures of the supplies of the church, here and for ever. Whatever God is in himself, whatever these properties of his nature extend to, in it all God hath promised to be our God: <sup><3017></sup>Genesis 17:1, “I am God

Almighty; walk before me.” Hence, to give establishment and security to our faith, he hath in his word revealed himself by so many names, titles, properties, and that so frequently; — it is that we may know him who is our God, what he is, and what he will be unto us. And the knowledge of him, as so revealing himself, is that which secures our confidence, faith, hope, fear, and trust.

“The LORD will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble; and they that know thy name will put their trust in thee,”  
<sup>1000</sup>Psalm 9:9, 10.

[2.] ‘What he promiseth is, that “he will be a God unto us.” Now, although this compriseth absolutely every thing that is good, yet may the notion of being a God unto any be referred unto two general heads:

**1st.** An all-sufficient preserver; and,

**2dly.** An all-sufficient rewarder: so himself declares the meaning of this expression, <sup>1000</sup>Genesis 17:1, 15:1. ‘I will be all this unto them that I am a God unto in the way of preservation and recompence,’ <sup>1000</sup>Hebrews 11:6.

[3.] The declared rule and measure of God’s actings towards us as our God, are the promises of the covenant, both of mercy, grace, pardon, holiness, perseverance, protection, success, and spiritual victory in this world, and of eternal glory in the world to come. In and by all these things will he, in all that he is in himself, be a God unto those whom he takes into this covenant.

[4.] It is included in this part of the promise, that they that take him to be their God, they shall say, “Thou art my God,” <sup>1000</sup>Hosea 2:23; and carry it towards him according unto what infinite goodness, grace, mercy, power, and faithfulness, do require.

And we may observe, —

**Obs. XII.** As nothing less than God becoming our God could relieve, help, and save us, so nothing more can be required thereunto.

**Obs. XIII.** The efficacy, security, and glory of this covenant, depend originally on the nature of God, immediately and actually on the mediation

of Christ. It is the covenant that God makes with us in him as the surety thereof.

**Obs. XIV.** It is from the engagement of the properties of the divine nature that this covenant is “ordered in all things and sure.” Infinite wisdom hath provided it, and infinite power will make it effectual.

**Obs. XV.** As the grace of this covenant is inexpressible, so are the obligations it puts upon us unto obedience.

(2.) The relation of man unto God is expressed in these words, “And they shall be unto me a people;” or, “They shall be my people.” And two things are contained herein: —

[1.] God’s owning of them to be his in a peculiar manner, according to the tenor and promise of this covenant, and dealing with them accordingly.

Λαὸς περιούσιος, <sup><3124></sup> Titus 2:14, —”A peculiar people.” Let others take heed how they meddle with them, lest they intrench on God’s propriety, <sup><3113></sup> Jeremiah 2:3.

[2.] There is included in it that which is essentially required unto their being his people, namely, the profession of all subjection or obedience unto him, and all dependence upon him. Wherefore this also belongs unto it, namely, their avouching this God to be their God, and their free engagement unto all that obedience which in the covenant he requireth. For although this expression, “And they shall be unto me a people,” seems only to denote an act of God’s grace, assuming of them into that relation unto himself, yet it includes their avouching him to be their God, and their voluntary engagement Of obedience unto him as their God. When he says, “Ye are my people;” they also say, “Thou art my God,” <sup><3123></sup> Hosea 2:23. Yet is it to be observed, —

**Obs. XVI.** That God doth as well undertake for our being his people as he cloth for his being our God. —And the promises contained in this verse do principally aim at that end, namely, the making of us to be a people unto him.

**Obs. XVII.** Those whom God makes a covenant withal, are his in a peculiar manner. —And the profession hereof is that which the world principally maligneth in them, and ever did so from the beginning.

**Ver. 11.** And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.

The second general promise, declaring the nature of the new covenant, is expressed in this verse. And the matter of it is set down,

1. *Negatively*, in opposition unto what was in use and necessary under the first covenant.
2. *Positively*, in what should take place in the room of it, and be enjoyed under this new covenant, and by virtue of it.

**First**, In the former part we may observe, —

1. The *vehemency of the negation*, in the redoubling of the negative particle, οὐ μή: ‘They shall by no means do so; that shall not be the way and manner with them whom God makes this covenant withal.’ And this is designed to fix our minds on the consideration of the privilege which is enjoyed under the new covenant, and the greatness of it.
2. The thing thus denied is *teaching*, not absolutely, but as unto a certain *way* and *manner* of it. The negation is not universal as unto teaching, but restrained unto a certain kind of it, which was in use and necessary under the old covenant. And this necessity was either from God’s institution, or from practice taken up among themselves, which must be inquired into.
3. The *subject-matter of this teaching*, or the matter to be taught, was the knowledge of God, “Know the Lord.” The whole knowledge of God prescribed in the law is here intended. And this may be reduced unto two heads:
  - (1.) *The knowing of him*, and the taking him thereon to be God, to be God alone; which is the first command.
  - (2.) *Of his mind and will*, as unto the obedience which the law required in all the institutions and precepts thereof; all the things which God revealed for their good: <sup>from</sup> Deuteronomy 29:29,

“Revealed things belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.”

4. The *manner of the teaching* whose continuation is denied, is exemplified in a distribution into teachers and them that are taught: “Every man his neighbor, and every man his brother.” And herein,

(1.) The *universality* of the duty, “every one,” is expressed; and therefore it was reciprocal. Every one was to teach, and every one was to be taught; wherein yet respect was to be had unto their several capacities.

(2.) The *opportunity* for the discharging of the duty is also declared, from the mutual relation of the teachers and them that are taught: “Every one his neighbor and his brother.”

**Secondly**, The positive part of the promise consists of two parts: —

1. The thing promised, which is the *knowledge of God*: “They shall all know me.” And this is placed in opposition unto what is denied: “They shall not teach one another, saying, Know the Lord.” But this opposition is not as unto the act or duty of teaching, but as unto the effect, or saving knowledge itself. The principal efficient cause of our learning the knowledge of God under the new covenant is included in this part of the promise. This is expressed in another prophet and promise, “They shall be all taught of God.” And the observation hereof will be of use unto us in the exposition of this text.

2. There is added the *universality* of the promise with respect unto them with whom this covenant is made: “All of them, from the least unto the greatest;” —a proverbial speech, signifying the generality intended without exception: <sup>2480</sup>Jeremiah 8:10,

“Every one, from the least even unto the greatest, is given unto covetousness.”

This text hath been looked on as attended with great difficulty and much obscurity; which expositors generally rather conceal than remove. For from the vehement denial of the use of that sort or kind of teaching which was in use under the old testament, some have apprehended and contended that all outward stated ways of instruction under the new testament are useless and forbidden. Hereon by some *all the ordinances of the church*, the whole ministry and guidance of it, hath been rejected; which is, in sum, that there is no such thing as a professing church in the world. But



yet those who are thus minded are no way able to advance their opinion, but by a direct contradiction unto this promise in their own sense of it. For they endeavor in what they do to *teach others their opinion*, and that not in the way of a public ordinance, but *every one his neighbor*; which, if any thing, is here denied in an especial manner. And the truth is, that if all outward teaching be absolutely and universally forbidden, as it would quickly fill the world with darkness and brutish ignorance, so, if any one should come to the knowledge of the sense of this or any other text of Scripture, it would be absolutely unlawful for him to communicate it unto others; for to say, ‘Know the Lord, or the mind of God in this text,’ either to neighbor or brother, would be forbidden. And of all kinds of teaching, that by a public ministry, in the administration of the ordinances of the church, —which alone is contended against from these words, —seems least to be intended; for it is private, neighborly, brotherly instruction only, that is expressed. Wherefore, if, on a supposition of the prohibition of such outward instruction, any one shall go about to teach another that the public ordinances of the church are not to be allowed as a means of teaching under the new testament, he directly falls under the prohibition here given in his own sense, and is guilty of the violation of it. Wherefore these words must necessarily have another sense, as we shall see they have in the exposition of them, and that plain and obvious.

Howbeit some learned men have been so moved with this objection, as to affirm that *the accomplishment of this promise of the covenant belongs unto heaven, and the state of glory*; for therein alone, they say, we shall have no more need of teaching in any kind. But as this exposition is directly contrary unto the design of the apostle, as respecting the teaching of the new covenant and the testator thereof; when he intends only that of the old, and exalts the new above it; so there is no such difficulty in the words as to force us to carry the interpretation of them into another world. Unto the right understanding of them sundry things are to be observed: —

**1.** That sundry things seem in the Scripture oftentimes to be denied *absolutely* as unto their nature and being, when indeed they are so only *comparatively* with respect unto somewhat else which is preferred before them. Many instances might be given hereof. I shall direct only unto one that is liable to no exception: <sup><2472></sup>Jeremiah 7:22, 23,

“I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or *sacrifices*: but this thing commanded I them, swing, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you.”

The Jews of that time preferred the ceremonial worship by burnt-offerings and sacrifices above all moral obedience, above the great duties of faith, love, righteousness, and holiness. And not only so, but in a pretended diligent observation thereof, they countenanced themselves in an open neglect and contempt of moral obedience, placing all their confidence for acceptance with God in these other duties. To take them off from this vain, ruining presumption, as God by sundry other prophets declared the utter insufficiency of these sacrifices and burnt-offerings by themselves to render them acceptable unto him, and then prefers moral obedience above them; so here he affirms that *he commanded them* not. And the instance is given in that time wherein it is known that all the ordinances of worship by burnt-offerings and sacrifices were solemnly instituted. But a comparison is made between ceremonial worship and spiritual obedience; in respect whereof God says he commanded not the former, namely, so as to stand in competition with the latter, or to be trusted unto in the neglect of it, wherein the evils and miscarriages reprov'd did consist. So our blessed Savior expounds this and the like passages in the prophets, in a comparison between the lowest instances of the ceremonial law, such as tithing of mint and cummin, and the great duties of love and righteousness. “These things,” saith he, speaking of the latter, “ye ought to have done;” that is, principally and in the first place have attended unto, as those which the law chiefly designed. But what then shall become of the former? Why, saith he, “Them also ye ought not to leave undone”“ in their proper place obedience was to be yielded unto God in them also. So is it in this present case. There was an outward teaching of “every man his neighbor, and every man his brother,” enjoined under the old testament. This the people trusted unto and rested in, without any regard unto God’s teaching by the inward circumcision of the heart. But in the new covenant, there being an express promise of an *internal, effectual teaching by the Spirit of God*, by writing his law in our hearts, —without which all outward

teaching is useless and ineffectual, — it is here denied to be of any use; that is, it is not so absolutely, but in comparison of and in competition with this other effectual way of teaching and instruction. Even at this day we have not a few who set these teachings in opposition unto one another, whereas in God's institution they are subordinate. And hereon, *rejecting the internal, efficacious* teaching of the Spirit of God, they betake themselves only unto their own endeavors in the outward means of teaching; wherein for the most part there are none more negligent than themselves. But so it is, that the ways of God's grace are not suited, but always lie contrary unto the corrupt reasonings of men. Hence some reject all the outward means of teaching by the ordinances of the gospel, under a pretense that the inward teaching of the Spirit of God is all that is needful or useful in this kind. Others, on the other hand, adhere only unto the outward means of instruction, despising what is affirmed concerning the inward teaching of the Spirit of God, as a mere imagination. And both sorts run into these pernicious mistakes, by opposing those things which God hath made subordinate.

**2.** The teaching intended, whose continuance is here denied, is that which was then in use in the church; or rather, was to be so when the new covenant state was solemnly to be introduced. And this was twofold:

(1.) That which was *instituted* by God himself; and,

(2.) That which the people had *superadded* in the way of practice: —

(1.) The first of these is, as in other places, so particularly expressed, <sup>DEUT</sup>Deuteronomy 6:6-9, “And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gate.” Add hereunto the institution of fringes for a memorial of the commandments; which was one way of saying, “Know the Lord,” <sup>NUM</sup>Numbers 15:38, 39.

Two things may be considered in these institutions:

[1.] What is *natural* and *moral*, included in the common mutual duties of men one towards another; for of this nature is that of seeking the good of others by instructing them in the knowledge of God, wherein their chiefest happiness doth consist.

[2.] That which is ceremonial, as to the *manner* of this duty, is described in sundry instances, as those of frontlets and fringes, writing on posts and doors. The first of these is to abide for ever. No promise of the gospel doth evacuate any precept of the law of nature; such as that is of seeking the good of others, and that their chiefest good, by means and ways proper thereunto. But as unto the latter, which the Jews did principally attend unto and rely upon, it is by this promise, or the new covenant, quite taken away.

(2.) As unto the *practice of the church of the Jews* in these institutions, it is not to be expressed what extremities they ran into. It is probable that about the time spoken of in this promise, which is that of the Babylonian captivity, they began that intricate, perplexed way of teaching which afterwards they were wholly addicted unto. For all of them who pretended to be serious, gave up themselves unto the teaching and learning of the law. But herewithal they mixed so many vain curiosities and traditions of their own, that the whole of their endeavor was disapproved of God. Hence, in the very entrance of their practice of this way of teaching, he threatens to destroy all them that attended unto it: <sup>3112</sup>Malachi 2:12, “The LORD will cut off the master and the scholar out of the tabernacles of Jacob.” It is true, we have not any monuments or records of their teaching all that time, neither what they taught, nor how; but we may reasonably suppose it was of the same kind with what flourished afterwards in their famous schools derived from these first inventors. And of such reputation were those schools among them, that none was esteemed a wise man, or to have any understanding of the law, who was not brought up in them. The first record we have of the manner of their teaching, or what course they took therein, is in the Mishna. This is their interpretation of the law, or their saying one to another, “Know the LORD.” And he that shall seriously consider but one section or chapter in that whole book, will quickly discern of what kind and nature their teaching was; for such an operose, laborious, curious, fruitless work, there is not another instance to be given of in the whole world. There is not any one head, doctrine, or precept of

the law, suppose it be of the Sabbath, of sacrifices, or offerings, but they have filled it with so many needless, foolish, curious, superstitious questions and determinations, as that it is almost impossible that any man in the whole course of his life should understand them, or guide his course according unto them. These were the burdens that the Pharisees bound on the shoulders of their disciples, until they were utterly weary and fainted under them. And this kind of teaching had possessed the whole church then, when the new covenant was solemnly to be introduced, no other being in use. And this is absolutely intended in this promise, as that which was utterly to cease. For God would take away the law, which in itself was “a burden,” as the apostle speaks, “which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear.” And the weight of that burden was unspeakably increased by the expositions and additions whereof this teaching consisted. Wherefore the removal of it is here proposed in the way of a promise, evidencing it to be a matter of grace and kindness unto the church. But the removal of teaching in general is always mentioned as a threatening and punishment.

Wherefore the denial of the *continuation of this teaching* may be considered two ways: —

- (1.) As it was *external*, in opposition unto and comparison of the *effectual internal* teaching by the grace of the new covenant; so it is laid aside, not absolutely, but comparatively, and as it was solitary.
- (2.) It may be considered in the *manner* of it, with especial respect unto the ceremonial law, as it consisted in the observance of sundry rites and ceremonies. And in this sense it was utterly to cease; above all, with respect unto the additions which men had made unto the ceremonial institutions wherein it did consist. Such was their teaching by writing parts of the law on their fringes, frontiers, and doors of their houses; especially as these things were enlarged, and precepts concerning them multiplied in the practice of the Jewish church. It is promised concerning these things, that they shall be absolutely removed, as useless, burdensome, and inconsistent with the spiritual teaching of the new covenant. But as unto that kind of instruction, whether by public, stated preaching of the word, or that which is more private and occasional, which is subservient unto the promised teaching of the Spirit of God, and which

he will and doth make use of in and for the communication of the knowledge itself here promised, there is nothing intimated that is derogatory unto its use, continuance, or necessity. A supposition thereof would overthrow the whole ministry of Jesus Christ himself and of his apostles, as well as the ordinary ministry of the church.

And these things are spoken in exposition of this place, taken from the meaning and intention of the word *teaching*, or the duty itself, whose continuance and further use is denied. But yet, it may be, more clear light into the mind of the Holy Spirit may be attained, from a due consideration of what it is that is so to be taught. And this is, “Know the Lord.” Concerning which two things may be observed: —

**1.** That there was a *knowledge of God* under the old testament, so revealed as that it was hidden under *types*, wrapped up in *veils*, expressed only in *parables* and *dark sayings*. For it was the mind of God, that as unto the clear perception and revelation of it, it should lie hid until the Son came from his bosom to declare him, to make his name known, and to “bring life and immortality to light;” yea, some things belonging hereunto, though virtually revealed, yet were so compassed with darkness in the manner of their revelation, as that the angels themselves could not clearly and distinctly look into them. But that there were some such great and excellent things concerning God and his will laid up in the revelation of Moses and the prophets, with their institutions of worship, they did understand. But the best and wisest of them knew also, that notwithstanding their best and utmost inquiry, they could not comprehend the time, nature, and state of the things so revealed; for it was revealed unto them, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister in their revelation of those things, <sup>4012</sup>1 Peter 1:12. And as our apostle informs us, Moses in his ministry and institutions gave “testimony unto the things which were to be spoken” (that is, clearly) “afterwards,” <sup>3005</sup>Hebrews 3:5. This secret, hidden knowledge of God, principally concerned the incarnation of Christ, his mediation and suffering for sin, with the call of the Gentiles thereon. These, and such like mysteries of the gospel, they could never attain the comprehension of. But yet they stirred up each other diligently to inquire into them, as to what they were capable of attaining, saying one to another, “Know the Lord.” But it was little that they could attain unto, “God having provided some better things for us,

that they without us should not be made perfect.” And when that church ceased to make this the principal part of their religion, namely, a diligent inquiry into the hidden knowledge of God, in and by the promised seed, with a believing desire and expectation of its full manifestation, contenting themselves with the letter of the word, looking on types and shadows as things present and substances, they not only lost the glory of their profession, but were hardened into an unbelief of the things signified unto them in their real exhibition. Now this kind of teaching, by mutual encouragement to look into the veiled things of the mystery of God in Christ, is now to cease, at the solemn introduction of the new covenant, as being rendered useless by the full, clear revelation and manifestation of them made in the gospel. They shall no more, that is, they shall need no more, to teach, so to teach this knowledge of God; for it shall be made plain to the understanding of all believers. And this is that which I judge to be principally intended by the Holy Ghost in this part of the promise, as that which the positive part of it doth so directly answer unto.

**2.** The *knowledge of the LORD* may be here taken, not *objectively* and *doctrinally*, but *subjectively*, for the renovation of the mind in the saving knowledge of God. And this neither is nor can be communicated unto any by external teaching alone, in respect whereunto it may be said comparatively to be laid aside, as was intimated before. We have, I hope, sufficiently freed the words from the difficulties that seem to attend them, so as that we shall not need to refer the accomplishment of this promise unto heaven, with many ancient and modern expositors; nor yet, with others, to restrain it unto the first converts to Christianity, who were miraculously illuminated; much less so to interpret them as to exclude the ministry of the church in teaching, or any other effectual way thereof. Somewhat may be observed of the particular expressions used in them: —

**1.** There is in the original promise the word עוֹד, “amplius,” “no more.” This is omitted by the apostle, yet so as that it is plainly included in what he expresseth. For the word denotes the time and season which was limited unto that kind of teaching which was to cease. This season being to expire at the publication of the gospel, the apostle affirms absolutely then, “They shall not teach,” what the prophet before declared with the limited season now expired, “They shall do so no more.”

2. The prophet expresseth the subject spoken of indefinitely, **וְכָל אִישׁ אֶת־בְּרֹתוֹ**, —"A man his neighbor, a man his brother;" that is, any man: the apostle by the universal **ἕκαστος**, "every man;" which is also reducible unto any one, —every one that is or may be called to this work, or hath occasion or opportunity for it. For of this teaching, the rule is ability and opportunity; — he that can do it, and hath an opportunity for it.

3. That which they taught or intended in that expression, "Know the Lord," is the same with what is promised in the latter part of the verse, where it must be spoken unto.

Some things, according to our method and design, may be observed from the exposition of these words.

**Obs. XVIII.** The instructive ministry of the old testament, as it was such only, and with respect unto the carnal rites thereof, was a ministry of the letter, and not of the Spirit, which did not really effect in the hearts of men the things which it taught. —The spiritual benefit which was obtained under it proceeded from the promise, and not from the efficacy of the law, or the covenant made at Sinai. For as such, as it was legal and carnal, and had respect only unto outward things, it is here laid aside.

**Obs. XIX.** There is a duty incumbent on every man to instruct others, according to his ability and opportunity, in the knowledge of God; the law whereof, being natural and eternal, is always obligatory on all sorts of persons. —This is not here either prohibited or superseded; but only it is foretold, that as unto a certain manner of the performance of it, it should cease. That it generally ceaseth now in the world, is no effect of the promise of God, but a cursed fruit of the unbelief and wickedness of men. The highest degree in religion which men now aim at, is but to attend unto and learn by the public teaching of the ministry. And, alas, how few are there who do it conscientiously, unto the glory of God and the spiritual benefit of their own souls! The whole business of teaching and learning the knowledge of God is generally turned into a formal spending, if not misspense of so much time. But as for the teaching of others according unto ability and opportunity, to endeavor for abilities, or to seek for opportunities thereof, it is not only for the most part neglected, but



despised. How few are there who take any care to instruct their own children and servants! but to carry this duty farther, according unto opportunities of instructing others, is a thing that would be looked on almost as madness, in the days wherein we live. We have far more that mutually teach one another sin, folly, yea, villany of all sorts, than the *knowledge* of God and the duty we owe unto him. This is not what God here promiseth in a way of grace, but what he hath given up careless, unbelieving professors of the gospel unto, in a way of vengeance.

**Obs. XX.** It is the Spirit of grace alone, as promised in the new covenant, which frees the church from a laborious but ineffectual way of teaching. — Such was that in use among the Jews of old; and it is well if somewhat not much unlike it do not prevail among many at this day. Whoever he be who, in all his teaching, doth not take his encouragement from the internal, effectual teaching of God under the covenant of grace, and bends not all his endeavors to be subservient thereunto, hath but an old testament ministry, which ceaseth as unto any divine approbation.

**Obs. XXI.** There was a hidden treasure of divine wisdom, of the knowledge of God, laid up in the mystical revelations and institutions of the old testament, which the people were not then able to look into, nor to comprehend. — The confirmation and explanation of this truth is the principal design of the apostle in this whole epistle. This knowledge, those among them that feared God and believed the promises stirred up themselves and one another to look after and to inquire into, saying unto one another, “Know the Lord;” howbeit their attainments were but small, in comparison of what is contained in the ensuing promise.

**Obs. XXII.** The whole knowledge of God in Christ is both plainly revealed and savingly communicated, by virtue of the new covenant, unto them who do believe, as the next words declare.

The positive part of the promise remaineth unto consideration. And two things must be inquired into:

1. *Unto whom* it is made.
2. What is the *subject-matter* of it: —

1. Those unto whom it is made are so expressed in the prophet, כֹּלֵם לְמִקְטָנָם וְעַד־גְּדֹלָם. The expression of them absolutely, and then by a distribution, is emphatical. The former the apostle renders in the plural number, as the words are in the original, πάντες αὐτῶν: but the terms of the distribution he rendereth in the singular number, which increaseth the emphasis, ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν.

The proposition is universal, as to the modification of the subject, “all;” but in the word αὐτῶν, “of them,” it is restrained unto those alone with whom this covenant is made.

The distribution of them is made in a proverbial speech, “From the least to the greatest,” used in a peculiar manner by this prophet, <sup><318></sup>Isaiah 6:13, <sup><319></sup>8:10, <sup><320></sup>31:34, <sup><321></sup>42:1, <sup><322></sup>44:12. It is only once more used in the Old Testament, and not elsewhere, <sup><323></sup>Jonah 3:5. And it may denote either the *universality* or the *generality* of them that are spoken of, so as none be particularly excluded or excepted, though all absolutely be not intended. Besides, several sorts and degrees of persons are intended. So there ever were, and ever will be, naturally, politically, and spiritually, in the church of God. None of them, upon the account of their difference from others on the one hand or the other, be they the least or the greatest, are excepted or excluded from the grace of this promise. And this may be the sense of the words, if only the external administration of the grace of the new covenant be intended: None are excluded from the tender of it, or from the outward means of the communication of it, in the full, plain revelation of the knowledge of God.

But whereas it is the internal, effectual grace of the covenant, and not only the means, but the infallible event thereon, —not only that they shall be all taught to know, but that they shall all actually know the Lord, — all individuals are intended; that is, that whole church all whose children are to be taught of God, and so to learn as to come unto him by saving faith in Christ. So doth this part of the promise hold proportion with the other, of writing the law in the hearts of the covenanters. As unto all these, it is promised absolutely that they shall know the Lord.

But yet among them there are many distinctions and degrees of persons, as they are variously differenced by internal and external circumstances. There are some that are greatest, and some that are least, and various

intermediate degrees between them. So it hath been, and so it ever must be, whilst the natural, acquired, and spiritual abilities of men have great variety of degrees among them; and whilst men's outward advantages and opportunities do also differ. Whereas, therefore, it is promised that they shall all of them know the Lord, it is not implied that they shall all do so *equally*, or have the same degree of spiritual wisdom and understanding. There is a measure of saving knowledge due unto, and provided for all in the covenant of grace, such as is necessary unto the participation of all other blessings and privileges of it; but in the degrees hereof some may and do very much excel others, And we may observe, —

**Obs. XXIII.** There are, and ever were, different degrees of persons in the church, as unto the saving knowledge of God. —Hence is that distribution of them into fathers, young men, and children, <sup><sup>1</sup>1 John 2:13, 14. All have not one measure, all arrive not to the same stature: but yet as to the ends of the covenant, and the duties required of them in their walk before God, they that have most have nothing over, nothing to spare; and they that have least shall have no lack. Every one's duty it is to be content with what he receives, and to improve it unto the uttermost.</sup>

**Obs. XXIV.** Where there is not some degree of saving knowledge, there no interest in the new covenant can be pretended.

**2.** The thing promised, is the *knowledge of God*: “They shall all know me.” No duty is more frequently commanded than this is, nor any grace more frequently promised. See <sup><sup>1</sup>Deuteronomy 29:6; <sup><sup>2</sup>Jeremiah 24:7; <sup><sup>3</sup>Ezekiel 11:10, 36:23, 26, 27: for it is the foundation of all other duties of obedience, and of all communion with God in them. All graces as unto their exercise, as faith, love, and hope, are founded therein. And the woful want of it which is visible in the world is an evidence how little there is of true evangelical obedience among the generality of them that are called Christians. And two things may be considered in this promise:</sup></sup></sup>

(1.) The *object*, or what is to be known.

(2.) The *knowledge* itself, of what kind and nature it is: —

(1.) The first is *God himself*: “They shall all know me, saith the LORD.” And it is so not absolutely, but as unto some especial revelation of himself. For there is a knowledge of God, as God, by the light of nature.

This is not here intended, nor is it the subject of any gracious promise, but is common unto all men. There was, moreover, a knowledge of God by revelation under the old covenant, but attended with great obscurity in sundry things of the highest importance. Wherefore there is something further intended, as is evident from the antithesis between the two states herein declared. In brief, it is the knowledge of him as revealed in Jesus Christ under the new testament. To show what is contained herein *doctrinally*, were to go over the principal articles of our faith, as declared in the gospel. The sum is, — To “know the Lord,” is to know God as he is in Christ *personally*, as he will be unto us in Christ *graciously*, and what he requires of us and accepts in us through the Beloved. In all these things, notwithstanding all their teaching and diligence therein, the church was greatly in the dark under the old testament; but they are all of them more clearly revealed in the gospel.

(2.) The knowledge of these things is that which is promised. For notwithstanding the clear revelation of them, we abide in ourselves unable to discern them and receive them. For such a spiritual knowledge is intended as whereby the mind is renewed, being accompanied with faith and love in the heart. This is that knowledge which is promised in the new covenant, and which shall be wrought in all them who are interested therein. And we may observe, —

**Obs. XXV.** The full and clear declaration of God, as he is to be known of us in this life, is a privilege reserved for and belonging unto the days of the new testament. Before, it was not made; and more than is now made is not to be expected in this world. And the reason hereof is, because it was made by Christ. See the exposition on <sup><R00B></sup>Hebrews 1:1, 2.

**Obs. XXVI.** To know God as he is revealed in Christ, is the highest privilege whereof in this life we can be made partakers; for this is life eternal, that we may know the Father, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, <sup><E00B></sup>John 17:3.

**Obs. XXVII.** Persons destitute of this saving knowledge are utter strangers unto the covenant of grace; for this is a principal promise and effect of it, wherever it doth take place.

**Ver. 12.** — For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.

This is the great fundamental promise and grace of the new covenant; for though it be last expressed, yet in order of nature it precedeth the other mercies and privileges mentioned, and is the foundation of the collation or communication of them unto us. This the causal ὅτι whereby the apostle rendereth **וְ** in the prophet, doth demonstrate. ‘What I have spoken, saith the Lord, shall be accomplished, “for I will be merciful,”’ etc.; —without which there could be no participation of the other things mentioned. Wherefore, not only an addition of new grace and mercy is expressed in these words, but a reason also is rendered why, or on what grounds he would bestow on them those other mercies.

The house of Israel and the house of Judah, with whom this covenant was made in the first place, and who are spoken of as representatives of all others who are taken into it, and who thereon become the Israel of God, were such as had broken and disannulled God’s former covenant by their disobedience; —”Which my covenant they brake.” Nor is there any mention of any other qualification whereby they should be prepared for or disposed unto an entrance into this new covenant. Wherefore the first thing in order of nature that is to be done unto this end; is the free pardon of sin. Without a supposition hereof, no other mercy can they be made partakers of; for whilst they continue under the guilt of sin, they are also under the curse. Wherefore a reason is here rendered, and that the only reason, why God will give unto them the other blessings mentioned: “For I will be merciful.”

**Obs. XXVIII.** Free and sovereign, undeserved grace in the pardon of sin, is the original spring and foundation of all covenant mercies and blessings. — Hereby, and hereby alone, is the glory of God and the safety of the church provided for. And those who like not God’s covenant on these terms (as none do by nature) will eternally fall short of the grace of it. Hereby all glorying and all boasting in ourselves is excluded; which was that which God aimed at in the contrivance and establishment of this covenant, **Ⓜ**Romans 3:27; **Ⓜ**1 Corinthians 1:29-31. For this could not be, if the fundamental grace of it did depend on any condition or qualification in ourselves. If we let go the free pardon of sin, without respect unto any

thing in those that receive it, we renounce the gospel. Pardon of sin is not merited by antecedent duties, but is the strongest obligation unto future duties. He that will not receive pardon unless he can one way or other deserve it, or make himself meet for it; or pretends to have received it, and finds not himself obliged unto universal obedience by it, neither is nor shall be partaker of it.

In the promise itself we may consider,

1. *Whom* it is made unto;
2. *What* it is that is promised: —

1. The first is expressed in the pronoun *αὐτοῶν*, “their,” three times repeated. All those absolutely, and *only* those with whom God makes this covenant, are intended. Those whose sins are not pardoned do in no sense partake of this covenant; it is not made with them. For *this* is the covenant that God makes with them, that he will be merciful unto their sins; that is, unto them in the pardon of them. Some speak of a universal conditional covenant, made with all mankind. If there be any such thing, it is not that here intended; for they are all actually pardoned with whom this covenant is made. And the indefinite declaration of the nature and terms of the covenant, is not the making of a covenant with any. And what should be the condition of this grace here promised of the pardon of sin? ‘It is,’ say they, ‘that men repent, and believe, and turn to God, and yield obedience unto the gospel.’ If so, then men must do all these things before they receive the remission of sins? ‘Yes.’ Then must they do them whilst they are *under the law, and the curse of it*, for so are all men whose sins are not pardoned. This is to make obedience unto the law, and that to be performed by men whilst under the curse of it, to be the condition of gospel-mercy; which is to overthrow both the law and the gospel.

‘But then, on the other hand it will follow,’ they say, ‘that men are pardoned before they do believe; which is expressly contrary unto the Scripture.’ *Ans.*

- (1.) The communication and donation of faith unto us is an effect of the same grace whereby our sins are pardoned; and they are both bestowed on us by virtue of the same covenant.

(2.) The application of pardoning mercy unto our souls is in order of nature consequent unto believing, but in time they go together.

(3.) Faith is not required unto the procuring of the pardon of our sins, but unto the receiving of it: “Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins,” <sup><400></sup>Acts 10:43. But that which we shall observe from hence is, that —

**Obs. XXIX.** The new covenant is made with them alone who effectually and eventually are made partakers of the grace of it. — “This is the covenant that I will make with them,..... I will be merciful unto their unrighteousness,” etc. Those with whom the old covenant was made were all of them actual partakers of the benefits of it; and if they are not so with whom the new is made, it comes short of the old in efficacy, and may be utterly frustrated. Neither doth the indefinite proposal of the terms of the covenant prove that the covenant is made with them, or any of them, who enjoy not the benefits of it. Indeed this is the excellency of this covenant, and so it is here declared, that it doth effectually communicate all the grace and mercy contained in it unto all and every one with whom it is made; whomsoever it is made withal, his sins are pardoned.

2. The subject-matter of this promise, is the pardon of sin. And that which we have to consider for the exposition of the words, is.

(1.) What is meant by *sins*.

(2.) What by the *pardon* of them.

(3.) What is the *reason* of the peculiar expression in this place: —

(1.) Sin is spoken of with respect unto its guilt especially; so is it the object of mercy and grace. Guilt is the desert of punishment, or the obligation of the sinner unto punishment, by and according unto the sentence of the law. Pardon is the dissolution of that obligation.

Sin is here expressed by three terms, **ἀδικία**, **ἁμαρτία**, **ἀνομία**, — ”unrighteousness, “sin,” and “transgression, as we render the words. In the prophet there is only **הַטְּאָת** and **פֶּשַׁעַן** is wanting. But they are elsewhere all three used, where mention is made of the pardon of sin, or the causes of it; as,

[1.] In the declaration of the name of God with respect thereunto, <sup><4340></sup>Exodus 34:7, וְפָשַׁע וְחַטָּאתָ נָשָׂא עֹון, — “pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin.”

[2.] In the confession of sin, for the removal of it by the expiatory, sacrifice, <sup><4352></sup>Leviticus 16:21: “Aaron shall confess over him וְאָת־כָּל־פְּשָׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל־חַטָּאתָם אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹת, — “all their iniquities, all their transgressions, in all their sins.”

[3.] In the expression of the forgiveness of sin in justification, <sup><4353></sup>Psalms 32:1, 2. Wherefore the apostle might justly make up the expression and general enumeration of sins, here defective in the prophet, seeing it is elsewhere so constantly used to the same purpose, and on the like occasion.

Nor are those terms needlessly multiplied, but sundry things we are taught thereby; as,

[1.] That those whom God graciously takes into covenant are many of them antecedently obnoxious unto *all sorts of sins*.

[2.] That in the grace of the covenant there is mercy provided for the *pardon of them all*, even of them “from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses,” <sup><4433></sup>Acts 13:39. And that,

[3.] Therefore *none should be discouraged* from resting on the faithfulness of God in this covenant, who are invited unto a compliance therewith.

But there is yet more intended in the use of these words. For they do distinctly express all those respects of sin in general by which the conscience of a sinner is affected, burdened, and terrified; as also whereon the equity of the curse and punishment for sin doth depend.

The first is ἀδικία, “unrighteousness.” This is usually taken for sins against the second table, or the transgression of that rule of righteousness amongst men which is given by the moral law. But here, as in many other places, it expresseth a general affection of sin with respect unto God. A thing unequal and unrighteous it is, that man should sin against God, his sovereign ruler and benefactor. As God is the supreme lord and governor of



all, as he is our only benefactor and rewarder, as all his laws and ways towards us are just and equal, the first notion of righteousness in us is the rendering unto God what is due unto him; that is, universal obedience unto all his commands. Righteousness towards man is but a branch springing from this root; and where this is not, there is no righteousness amongst men, whatever is pretended. If we give not unto God the things that are God's, it will not avail us to give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, nor unto other men what is their own. And this is the first consideration of sin, that renders the sinner obnoxious unto punishment, and manifests the equity of the sanction of the law; —it is an unrighteous thing. Herewith the conscience of the sinner is affected, if he be convinced of sin in a due manner. The original perfection of his nature consisted in this righteousness towards God, by rendering his due unto him in a way of obedience. This is overthrown by sin; which is therefore both shameful and ruinous: which distresseth the conscience, when awakened by conviction.

The second is **ἁματία**. This is properly a missing of, an *erring from that end* and scope which it is our duty to aim at. There is a certain end for which we were made, and a certain rule proper unto us whereby we may attain it. And this end being our only blessedness, it is our interest, as it was in the principles of our natures, to be always in a tendency towards it. This is the glory of God, and our eternal salvation in the enjoyment of him. Thereunto the law of God is a perfect guide. To sin, therefore, is to forsake that rule, and to forego therein our aim at that end. It is to place self and the world as our end, in the place of God and his glory, and to take the imaginations of our hearts for our rule. Wherefore the perverse folly that is in sin, in wandering away from the chiefest good as our end, and the best guide as our rule, embracing the greatest evils in their stead, is **ἁμαρτία**, rendering punishment righteous, and filling the sinner with shame and fear.

There is, thirdly, **ἄνομία**. We have no one word in our language properly to express the sense hereof; nor is there so in the Latin. We render it “transgression of the law.” **Ἄνομος** is a *lawless person*; whom the Hebrews call “a son of Belial,” —one who owns no yoke nor rule; and **ἄνομία** is a *voluntary unconformity unto the law*. Herein the formal nature

of sin consists, as the apostle tells us, <sup>αἰματι</sup> John 3:4. And this is that which in the first place passeth on the conscience of a sinner.

Wherefore, as all sorts of particular sins are included in these multiplied names of sin; so the general nature of sin, in all its causes and respects, terrifying the sinner, and manifesting the righteousness of the curse of the law, is declared and represented by them. And we may learn, —

**Obs. XXX.** That the aggravations of sin are great and many, which the consciences of convinced sinners ought to have regard unto.

**Obs. XXXI.** There are grace and mercy in the new covenant provided for all sorts of sins, and all aggravations of them, if they be received in a due manner.

**Obs. XXXII.** Aggravations of sin do glorify grace in pardon. Therefore doth God here so express them, that he may declare the glory of his grace in their remission.

**Obs. XXXIII.** We cannot understand aright the glory and excellency of pardoning mercy, unless we are convinced of the greatness and vileness of our sins in all their aggravations.

(2.) That which is promised with respect unto these sins is two ways expressed:

**First,** ἰλεως ἔσομαι, — “I will be merciful.”

**Secondly,** Οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι — “I will remember no more.”

It is pardon of sin that is intended in both these expressions; the one respecting the cause of it, the other its perfection and assurance. And two things are considerable in the pardon of sin: —

[1.] A *respect unto the mediator of the covenant*, and the propitiation for sin made by him. Without this there can be no remission, nor is any promised.

[2.] The *dissolution of the obligation of the law* binding over the guilty sinner unto punishment. These are the essential parts of evangelical pardon, and respect is had in these words unto them both: —

**1st** Ἰλεως, which we translate “merciful,” is “propitious,” “gracious” through a propitiation. But the Lord Christ is the only ἱλαστήριον or “propitiation” under the new testament, <sup><RB></sup>Romans 3:25; <sup><RD></sup>1 John 2:2. And he died εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι, to “propitiate” God for sin; to render him propitious unto sinners, <sup><RH></sup>Hebrews 2:17. In him alone God is Ἰλεως, “merciful” unto our sins.

**2dly.** The law, with the sanction of it, was the means appointed of God to bring sin unto a judicial remembrance and trial. Wherefore the dissolution of the obligation of the law unto punishment, which is an act of God, the supreme rector and judge of all, belongeth unto the pardon of sin. This is variously expressed in the Scripture; here by “remembering sin no more.” The assertion whereof is fortified by a double negative. Sin shall never be called legally to remembrance. But the whole doctrine of the pardon of sin I have so largely handled, in the exposition of <sup><RH></sup>Psalm 130, that I must not here again resume the same argument. <sup>f12</sup>

### VERSE 13.

Ἐν τῷ λέγειν, Καινήν, πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ.

Having in the foregoing verses proved in general the insufficiency of the old covenant, the necessity of the new, the difference between the one and the other, with the preference of the latter above the former, —in all confirming the excellency of the priesthood of Christ above that of Aaron, — in this last verse of the chapter he maketh an especial inference from one word in the prophetic testimony, wherein the main truth which he endeavored to confirm with respect unto the Hebrews was asserted. It was their persuasion, that of what sort soever this promised covenant should be, yet the former was still to continue in force, obliging the church unto all the institutions of worship thereunto appertaining. Hereon depended the main controversy that the apostle had with them; for he knew that this persuasion was destructive to the faith of the gospel, and would, if pertinaciously adhered unto, prove ruinous to their own souls Wherefore the contrary hereunto, or the total cessation of the first covenant, he presseth on them with all sorts of arguments; —as from the nature, use, and end of it; from its insufficiency to consecrate or make perfect the state

of the church; from the various prefigurations and certain predictions of the introduction of another covenant, priesthood, and ordinances of worship, which were better than those that belonged unto it, and inconsistent with them; with many other cogent evidences to the same purpose. Here he fixeth on a new argument in particular, to prove the necessity and certainty of its abolition; and hereby, according unto his wonted manner, he makes a transition unto his following discourse, wherein he proves the same truth from the distinct consideration of the use and end of the institutions, ordinances, and sacrifices belonging unto that covenant. This he pursues unto the 19th verse of the 10th chapter; and so returns unto the parenetical part of the epistle, making due applications of what he had now fully evinced.

**Ver. 13.** —In that he saith, A new [*covenant*], he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

A double argument the apostle here maketh use of:

1. From a *special word* or testimony.
2. From a *general maxim* of truth in all kinds: —

1. In the former we may consider,

- (1.) The testimony he makes use of;
- (2.) The inference unto his own purpose which he makes from it: —

(1.) The first consisteth in the *adjunct* of this other promised covenant. It is called by God himself *new*: Ἐν τῷ λέγειν, Καινήν, —”In that,” or “Whereas it is said, A new;” or, ‘In that he calleth it, nameth it, A new.’ So it is expressly in the prophet, “Behold, I will make a new covenant.” Thus every word of the Holy Ghost, though but occasional unto the principal subject spoken of, is sufficient evidence of what may be deduced from it. And by this kind of arguing we are taught, that the word of God is full of holy mysteries, if with humility, and under the conduct of his Holy Spirit, we do, as we ought, diligently inquire into them. This, therefore, he layeth down as the foundation of his present argument, That God himself doth not call this promised covenant another covenant, or a second, nor only declare the excellency of it; but signally calls it “a new covenant.”

(2.) That which he infers from hence is, that *πεπαλαίωσε τὴν πρώτην*, — “he hath made the first old.” The force of the argument doth not lie in this, that he calleth the second new; but that he would not have done so had not he made the first old. For *πεπαλαίωσε* is of an active signification, and denotes an authoritative act of God upon the old covenant, whereof the calling the other new was a sign and evidence. He would not have done so, but that he made the other old; for with respect thereunto this is called new. But yet it was the designation of the new covenant that was the foundation of making the other old.

The word respecting the *time past*, we must inquire what time it doth refer unto. And this must be either the time of the prediction and promise of the new covenant, or the time of its introduction and establishment. And it is the first season that is intended. For the introduction of the new covenant did actually take away and abolish the old, making it to disappear; but the act of God here intended, is only his making it old in order thereunto. And he did this upon and by the giving of this promise, and afterwards by various acts, and in various degrees.

[1.] He did it by *calling the faith of the church* from resting in it, through the expectation of the bringing in of a better in the room of it. This brought it under a decay in their minds, and gave it an undervaluation unto what it had before. They were now assured that something much better would in due time be introduced. Hence, although they abode in the observation of the duties and worship it required, it being the will of God that so they should do, yet this expectation of and longing after the better covenant now promised, made it decay in their minds and affections. So did God make it old.

[2.] He did it by a *plain declaration of its infirmity*, weakness, and insufficiency for the great ends of a perfect covenant between God and the church. Many things unto this purpose might have been collected out of the nature of its institutions and promises, from the first giving of it, as is done by our apostle in his present discourses. But these things were not clearly understood by any in those days; and as to the most, the veil was on them, so that they could not see at all unto the end of the things that were to be done away. But now, when God himself comes positively to declare by that prophet that it was weak and insufficient, and therefore he

would make another, a better, with them; this made it old, or declared it to be in a tendency unto a dissolution.

[3.] From the giving of this promise, God did variously *by his providence* break in upon and weaken its administration; which by its decaying age was more and more manifested. For, —

**1st.** Immediately after the giving of this promise, the Babylonian captivity gave a total intercision and interruption unto the whole administration of it for seventy years. This, having never before fallen out from the making of it on mount Sinai, was an evident token of its approaching period, and that God would have the church to live without it.

**2dly.** Upon the return of the people from their captivity, neither the temple, nor the worship of it, nor any of the administrations of the covenant, nor the priesthood, were ever restored unto their pristine beauty and glory. And whereas the people in general were much distressed at the apprehension of its decay, God comforts them, not with any intimation that things under that covenant should ever be brought into a better condition, but only with an expectation of His coming amongst them who would put an utter end unto all the administrations of it, <sup><300></sup>Haggai 2:6-9. And from that time forward it were easy to trace the whole process of it, and to manifest how it continually declined towards its end.

Thus did God make it old, by variously disposing of it unto its end; and to give an evidence thereof, called the other covenant which he would make, a new one. And it did not decay of itself. For no institution of God will ever wax old of itself; will ever decay, grow infirm, or perish, unless it be disannulled by God himself. Length of time will not consume divine institutions; nor can the sins of men abate their force. He only that sets them up can take them down.

And this is the first argument of the apostle, taken from this testimony, to prove that the first covenant was to be abolished.

**2.** But whereas it may be questioned whether it directly follows or no, that it must be taken away because it is made old, he confirms the truth of his inference from a *general maxim*, which hath the nature of a new argument also. “Now,” saith he, “that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.”

“Old” is significative of that which is to have an end, and which draws towards its end. Every thing that can wax old hath an end; and that which doth so, draws towards that end. So the psalmist affirming that the heavens themselves shall perish, adds, as a proof thereof, “They shall wax old as a garment;” and then none can doubt but they must have an end, as unto their substance or their use.

There are in the words,

(1.) The notation of the subject, **τὸ δέ**, —”but that,” or ‘that, whatever it be.’ The general rule gives evidence unto the former inference, ‘Whatever it be that waxeth old.’

(2.) The description of it in a double expression, **παλαιούμενον** and **γηράσκον**. The words are generally supposed to be synonymous, and to be used for emphasis only. We express the first by *decay*, “that which decayeth,” to avoid the repetition of the same word, we having no other to express “waxing old,” or “made old,” by. But **παλαιούμενον** is not properly “that which decayeth;” it is that which hath the effect passively of **πεπαλαίωσε**, “that which is made old;” and it properly respecteth things. Things are so said to be made old, not persons. But the other word, **γηράσκον**, respects persons, not things. Men, and not inanimate things, are said **γηράσκειν**. Wherefore although the apostle might have used a pleonasm to give emphasis unto his assertion, and to aver the certainty of the end of the old covenant, yet nothing hinders but that we may think that he had respect unto the things and persons that belonged unto its administration.

That which is affirmed of this subject of the proposition, is, that it is **ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ**, “near unto a disappearance;” that is, an abolition and taking out of the way. The proposition is universal, and holds absolutely in all things, as is evident in the light of nature. Whatever brings things unto a decay and age will bring them unto an end; for decay and age are the expressions of a tendency unto an end. Let an angel live never so long, he waxeth not old, because he cannot die. Waxing old is absolutely opposed unto an eternal duration, <sup>1542</sup> Psalm 102:26, 27.

It being the removal of the old covenant and all its administrations that is respected, it may be inquired why the apostle expresseth it by

**ἀφανισμός**, “a disappearance,” or “vanishing out of sight.” And respect may be had herein,

**(1.)** To the glorious outward appearance of the administrations of it. This was that which greatly captivated the minds and affections of those Hebrews unto it. They were carnal themselves, and these things, the fabric of the temple, the ornaments of the priests, the order of their worship, had a glory in them which they could behold with their carnal eyes, and cleave unto with their carnal affections. The ministration of the letter was glorious. ‘All this glory,’ saith the apostle, ‘shall shortly disappear, shall vanish out of your sight,’ according to the prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, Matthew 24.

**(2.)** To the gradual removal of it. It departed as a thing will by its removal out of our sight. We by little and little lose the prospect of it, until it utterly disappears. How it was made so to disappear, at what time, in what degrees, by what acts of divine authority, must be spoken unto distinctly elsewhere. All the glorious institutions of the law were at best but as stars in the firmament of the church, and therefore were all to disappear at the rising of the Sun of Righteousness.

**Τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.**



## CHAPTER 9

THE general design of the apostle in these discourses is to manifest and prove that the old covenant made with the church at Sinai, with all the ordinances of worship and privileges thereunto belonging, was taken away, or ceased to be of any force in the church. Hereon did a total alteration of the whole present Church-state of the Hebrews depend; which it is easy to think how difficult it was with them to forego. For they both looked on it to be of God's own appointment, as it was, and expected all their happiness by a strict adherence unto it. Wherefore, that they might with the more readiness embrace the truth, he not only declares that "de facto" that covenant was ceased, but evinceth by all sorts of reasons that it was *necessary that so it should do*, and that unspeakable advantages did accrue unto the church thereby.

In the pursuit of this design, he unfolds unto them the greatest mysteries of the wisdom and counsel of God that ever were revealed unto the church, before he spake unto us by the Son. For, —

**1.** On this occasion he takes off the veil from the face of Moses, declaring the nature and end of the old covenant; and the use, signification, and efficacy of all the institutions and ordinances of worship thereunto belonging. They were all prescribed unto the diligent observation of the church of the old testament; and their adherence unto them was the great trial of their obedience unto God, whilst that church-state continued, <sup><3001</sup>Malachi 4:4. Howbeit the best among them were much in the dark as unto their proper use and signification. For the veil was so on the face of Moses, that

“the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which was to be abolished,” <sup><4013</sup>2 Corinthians 3:13.

This he now doctrinally removes. And the sole reason why the Hebrews did not hereon “behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,” nor yet do unto this day, is because there was and is a veil of blindness on their minds, as well as there was a veil of darkness on the face of Moses;

and it is only converting grace that can remove it. “When they shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away,” verse 16.

**2.** He takes occasion from hence to declare the great mystery of the redemption of the church by Christ; of the office that he bare, and the work that he performed therein. This was that which he principally designed, as being indeed the sole foundation of Christian religion. Wherefore, we have in this epistle, as a clear exposition of the *first promise*, with all those which were given in the explication or confirmation of it, so also of the *law* and its worship, which were afterwards introduced; that is, in general, of the whole old testament, or God’s instruction of the church under it. Hence that blessed light, which now shines forth in the promises and legal institutions of the old testament, is derived unto us through the exposition of them given unto us by the Holy Ghost in this epistle. We are therefore to remember, that in our inquiries into these things, we are conversant in the deepest mysteries of the wisdom and counsel of God, —those which animated the faith and obedience of both churches: which calls not only for our utmost diligence, but for continual reverence and godly fear.

Unto the general end mentioned, the apostle makes use of all sorts of arguments, taken from the constitution, nature, use, efficacy, officers, and ordinances, of the one covenant and the other; comparing them together. And in all his arguings he openly designs the demonstration of these two things:

- 1.** That the *old covenant*, with all its administrations, was to cease.
- 2.** That it was not only unto the advantage of the church that they should so do, but absolutely *necessary*, that it might be brought unto that *perfect state* which it was designed unto.

In order unto the first of these, he hath done two things in the preceding chapters:

**1.** He hath declared that there were *prefigurations* and *predictions* of the cessation of the first covenant and all its administrations; as also, that God had so ordered all things in and under that covenant, as that they must necessarily expire and cease at a certain appointed time.

**2.** He hath evinced the *necessity* hereof, because that covenant could not *consummate the state of the church*, nor give assured rest and peace unto the consciences of them that approached unto God in and by its services. And both these he confirms by the consideration of the *typical nature* of all its ordinances and institutions; for whereas there was in and by them a representation made of heavenly things, those heavenly things themselves could not be introduced without their removal.

It is the second thing mentioned, or the advantage of the church by the taking away of the first covenant, and all its sacred administrations, that he principally insists upon. For herein he designed (as was before observed) to declare the glorious mystery of the counsel of God concerning the redemption and salvation of the church by Jesus Christ. But whereas this in general is the substance of the gospel, and the subject of all his other epistles, he doth not here consider and declare it absolutely, but as it was prefigured and typed out by those institutions of worship, whereby God both instructed the church and exercised their faith and obedience, under the old testament.

Three things there were which were the glory of those administrations, and which the Hebrews so rested in as that they refused the gospel out of an adherence unto them:

1. The *priestly office*.
2. The *tabernacle* with all its furniture, wherein that office was exercised.
3. The *duties and worship of the priests* in that tabernacle by sacrifices; especially those wherein there was a solemn expiation of the sins of the whole congregation.

In reference unto these, the apostle proves three things:

1. That neither any nor all of them could *consummate* or make perfect the state of the church, nor yet really effect assured *peace* and confidence between God and the worshippers.
2. That they were all *typical* and *figurative*, ordained to represent things that were far more sublime, glorious, and excellent than themselves.

**3.** That indeed the Lord Christ, in his person and mediation, was all those things *really and substantially* which they did but *obumbrate and prefigure*; that he was and did what they could only direct unto an expectation of.

**1.** These things he declareth and evinceth fully with respect unto the priestly office, in the seventh chapter; in our exposition whereof we have endeavored to declare the sense and force of his arguings unto that purpose.

**2.** He doth the same as unto the tabernacle in general, in the eighth chapter, confirming his discourse with that great collateral argument taken from the nature and excellency of that covenant whereof the Lord Christ was the surety and mediator. Wherefore,

**3.** There remains only the consideration of the services and sacrifices which belonged unto the priestly office in that tabernacle. Herein the Hebrews placed their greatest confidence for reconciliation with God; and with respect unto them, boasted of the excellency of their church-state and worship. This the apostle knew to be the great point in difference between him and them, and that whereon the whole doctrine of the justification of sinners before God did depend. This, therefore, was exactly to be discussed, from the nature of the things themselves, and the testimonies of the Holy Ghost in the Scripture; on which principles alone he deals with these Hebrews. This is that which he now in particular engageth into, handling it at large in this and the next chapter, unto verse 19, where he returns unto his first exhortation, in a use of the truth which he had evinced.

Two things unto this purpose he designs in general:

**1.** To declare the nature, use, and efficacy, of the rites, services, and sacrifices of the law.

**2.** To manifest the nature, glory, and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, whereby those other had an end put unto them, and so were taken away. And in comparing these things together, he wonderfully sets out the wisdom and grace of God in dealing with the church, so as to manifest that all his counsels, from the beginning, did aim at and center in the person and

mediation of Christ. And these things are duly to be considered by all who desire to understand the mind of the Holy Ghost in this epistle.

This chapter hath two general parts:

1. A proposition and declaration of the *fabric of the tabernacle*, its furniture, and the services performed therein; from the beginning unto verse 10.
2. A declaration of the *nature of the tabernacle and sacrifice* of the Lord Christ, with the end and efficacy thereof; from verse 11 unto the end.

Of the first general, there are four parts:

- (1.) A proposition of the *constitution of the tabernacle of old*, with all its utensils and furniture, as it was prepared for the service of the priests, verses 1-5.
- (2.) The *use of that tabernacle* and the things in it, in and unto the sacred duties and services of the priests, verses 6, 7.
- (3.) The *judgment of the apostle* upon the whole both of the fabric and its use, verse 8.
- (4.) The *reasons* of that judgment, verses 9, 10.

In the first part there is,

- [1.] A *general proposition of the whole*, verse 1.
- [2.] A *particular explanation* of it, verses 2-5.

### VERSE 1.

Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιοῦματα λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν.

Some things must be premised unto the reading of these words. Ἡ πρώτη, “the first,” doth in the original answer in gender unto all things which the apostle treats of, —namely, the priesthood, the tabernacle, and the covenant. But many Greek copies do expressly read σκηνή, “the tabernacle.” So is the text expressed in Stephen’s edition, wherein he followed sixteen ancient manuscripts, adhering generally unto the

concurrent agreement of the greatest number; and the word is retained in the most common edition. But there are ancient copies also where it is omitted: and they are attested unto by all ancient translations, as the Syriac and Vulgar Latin; the Arabic supplying “covenant,” in the room of it. Wherefore Beza left it out, and is followed by the generality of expositors, as he is by our translators. Cameron contends for retaining it. But the reasons for its rejection are cogent and undeniable; as, —

**1.** In the last verse of the preceding chapter, whereunto this immediately succeeds, the apostle mentioning the old covenant, calleth it absolutely **τὴν πρώτην**, “the first,” without the addition of **διαθήκην**; and immediately repeating **ἡ πρώτην**, —that is, “that first,” —it is irrational to think that he refers it to another subject.

**2.** His design requires that the first covenant he intended; for he is not engaged in a comparison between the *tabernacle* and the *new testament*, but between the *old covenant* and the *new*. And the words of the text, with those that follow, contain a concession of what belonged unto the old covenant, particularly in the administration of divine worship; as is observed by Photius and OEcumenius.

**3.** The expression in the close of the verse, “A worldly sanctuary,” is no more nor less but the tabernacle; for it is that which the apostle immediately describes in its parts and furniture, which are the parts of the tabernacle, and no other. And if the word **σκηνή**, “the tabernacle,” be here retained, the sense must be, “And verily the first tabernacle had ordinances of worship and a tabernacle.”

**4.** In the next verse, adding an account of what he had affirmed, he saith, “For there was a tabernacle prepared; the first:” which would render this sense to the context, ‘For the first tabernacle had a tabernacle; for there was a tabernacle prepared.’ Wherefore I shall adhere unto the supplement made by our translators, “the first covenant.”

**Δικαιώματα λατρείας.** Some read these words by an **ἀσύνδετον**, and not in construction, from the ambiguity of the case and number of **λατρείας**, which may be either of the genitive singular or accusative plural,” ordinances, services.” This it is supposed the following phrase of speech doth intimate, **Τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν**, “And also a worldly

sanctuary:” which requires that the preceding words should be construed by apposition. And a difference there is between **δικαίωμα** and **λατρεία**; but whereas it is evident that the apostle intends no **λατρεία** or “service” here but what was performed **ἐν δικαιοώμασιν**, “by virtue of ordinances or institutions,” the word ought to be read in construction, “ordinances of worship.”

**Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καί.** Syr., “but in the first there were in it;” as the Arab.,” in the first covenant there was contained.” Vulg. Lat., “habuit quidem et prius,” the comparative for the positive, unto the sense of the apostle: “and the first truly had also.” Beza, “habuit igitur prius foedus et;” transferring **καί** unto the words following: “wherefore the first covenant had also;” as we after him. Others, “habuit igitur etiam prius.” Most, in rendering the particles **μὲν οὖν**, have principal respect unto the note of inference **οὖν**, and include the assertory particle **μὲν** in it. I think the principal respect is to be had thereunto, as it is in the Vulgar Latin, “and verily that first also had.” **Δικαιώματα λατρείας.** Syr., “commands of ministry,” or “precepts;” which gives us the plain sense and true meaning of the apostle, as we shall see afterwards. “Ordinances concerning the administration of divine worship.” Vulg. Lat., “justificationes culturae;” Rhem., “justifications of service,” most obscurely, and in words leading from the sense of the Holy Ghost. Others, “ritus cultus;” “constitutos ritus cultuum,” “appointed rites of worship” or “service.” All agree what it is the apostle intends, namely, the ordinances of Levitical worship; which are expressed in the Vulgar by “justificationes culturae,” both barbarously and beside the mind of the apostle.

**Ἅγιον κοσμικόν.** Syr., “a worldly holy house.” The tabernacle was frequently called” the house of God,” and “the house of the sanctuary.” Vulg., “sanctum seculare;” Rhem., “a secular sanctuary:” which the Interlinear changeth into “mundanum.” “Seculare” denotes duration; but it is not the design of the apostle to speak of the duration of that which he is proving to be ceased. Beza, “sanctuarium mundanum.” Some respect the particles **τό τε**, and render them “illudque.”<sup>f13</sup>

**Ver. 1.** —Then verily even that first [*covenant*] had ordinances of worship, and also a worldly sanctuary.

Proceeding unto the comparison designed between the old covenant and the new, as unto the services and sacrifices wherewith the one and the other were established and confirmed, he introduceth the **πρότασις** of the first by way of concession, as unto what really belonged thereunto. And this is the constant method of the apostle in all the comparisons he makes. He still allows full weight and measure unto that comparate which he prefers the other above. And as this, on the one hand, taketh away all cause of complaint, as though the worth and value of what he determineth against were concealed, so it tends unto the real exaltation of that which he gives the preference unto. It is an honor unto the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, that they are so much more glorious and excellent than those of the old covenant, which yet were excellent and glorious also.

There is in this verse, —

1. An *introduction of the concession* intended, **Μὲν οὖν καί**. The contexture of these particles is somewhat unusual. Hence some would have **καί** to be redundant: some join it in construction with **δικαιώματα** that follows. This was the judgment of Beza, whom our translators follow; for the word “also” (“had also ordinances”) renders **καί** in the original: and thereon they omit it in the first place, not saying, “and then verily,” but “then verily,” —that is, **μὲν οὖν**. If this be so, the assertion of the apostle seems to be built on a tacit supposition that the latter covenant hath ordinances of worship. Hence he grants the first had so *also*: ‘Even that had also ordinances of worship, as the new hath.’ But I see not at all that any such supposition is here made by the apostle; yea, he doth rather oppose those ordinances of divine worship unto the privileges of the new covenant, than allow the same things to be under both. And this is evident in the worldly sanctuary which he ascribes unto the first covenant, for he had expressly denied that there was any such under the new, <sup>SKIB</sup> Hebrews 8:2. Wherefore although **καί**, “and,” seems to be redundant, yet it is emphatical, and increaseth the signification of the other particles, as it is often used in the Scripture. And the introduction of the concession, intimated by this contexture of the notes of it, “then verily even that,” shows both the reality of it and the weight that he lays upon it. **Οὖν** we render “then;” most do it by “igitur,” “therefore.” But the connection unto the foregoing discourse is rather real than verbal. It is not an inference made from what was before declared, but a continuation of the same



design. ‘And yet moreover it is granted;’ or, ‘therefore it is granted;’ ‘verily so it was.’ And so μέν serves unto the protasis of the comparison, whereunto δέ answereth, verse 11, “but Christ being come.”

2. The subject spoken of is ἡ πρώτη, “the first,” —that is, διαθήκη; ‘that first covenant whereof we treat,’ —the covenant made with the fathers at Sinai, which, as unto the administrations of it, the Hebrews as yet adhered unto. The nature of this covenant we have spoken unto at large on the foregoing chapter, and thither refer the reader.

3. Of this covenant it is affirmed in general, that it had two things:

(1.) “Ordinances of worship;”

(2.) “A worldly sanctuary;” and the relation of them unto it is, that it *had* them: —

(1.) It *had* them, εἶχε. It refers unto the time past. The apostle saith not “it hath them,” but “it had them.” ‘That is,’ say some, ‘it had so whilst that tabernacle was standing, and whilst these things were in force; but now the covenant is abolished, and it hath none of them.’ But this answers not the apostle’s intention. For he acknowledgeth that covenant and all its ordinances “de facto” to have been yet in being, in the patience and forbearance of God; only he affirms that it was ἐγγύς ἀφανισμοῦ, <sup><883></sup>Hebrews 8:13, — “ready to disappear.” Nor was he to take for granted what was the principal χρινόμενον between him and the Hebrews, but to prove it; which he doth accordingly. Hence he grants that there were “priests that offered gifts according to the law,” <sup><884></sup>Hebrews 8:4; and some “served at the tabernacle,” <sup><885></sup>Hebrews 13:10. But the apostle hath respect unto the time wherein that covenant was first made. Then it had these things annexed unto it, which were the privileges and glory of it; for the apostle hath, in the whole discourse, continual respect unto the first making of the covenant, and the first institution of its administrations. It *had them*; that is, they belonged unto it, as those wherein its administration did consist.

**Obs. I.** Every covenant of God had its proper privileges and advantages. — Even the first covenant had so, and those such as were excellent in themselves, though not comparable with them of the new. For to make any covenant with men, is an eminent fruit of goodness, grace, and

condescension in God; whereon he will annex such privileges thereunto as may evince it so to be.

(2.) This first covenant had two things in general: —

[1.] **Δικαιώματα λατρείας**. Both translations and interpreters have cast some difficulty on the meaning of these words, in themselves plain and evident. **Δικαιώματα** are **דִּקְיָוֹת**. And the word is generally rendered by **δικαίωμα** in the Greek versions, and next unto that by **νομικόν**; that which is “legal” and “right.” The Vulgar Latin renders it by “justificationes;” from the inclusion of “jus,” “justum” in the signification of it. In the New Testament it is used, <sup><6005></sup> Luke 1:6; <sup><6132></sup> Romans 1:32, 2:26, 5:16, 8:4; <sup><8301></sup> Hebrews 9:1, 10; <sup><6504></sup> Revelation 15:4, 19:8. And in no one place doth it signify “institution;” but it may be better rendered “righteousness” When alone we so translate it, <sup><6136></sup> Romans 5:16. In the context and construction wherein it is here placed, it can have no signification but that of “ordinances,” “rites,” “institutions, “statutes;” — the constant sense of **דִּקְיָוֹת**, determined both by its derivation and invariable use. Wherefore all inquiries on these words, in what sense the rites of the law may be called “justifications,” or whether “because the observation of them did justify before men,” or were signs of our justification before God, are all useless and needless. What there is of just and right in the signification of the word, respects the right of God in the constitution and imposition of these ordinances. They were appointments of God, which he had right to prescribe; whence their observation on the part of the church was just and equal.

These ordinances or statutes were so **λατρείας**, “of service;” that is, as we render it, “divine service.” **Λατρεία** is originally of as large a signification as **δουλεία**, and denotes any service whatever. But it is here, and constantly in the New Testament, as is also the verb **λατρεύω**, restrained unto “divine service,” <sup><6132></sup> John 16:2; <sup><6104></sup> Romans 9:4, 12:1; “cultus,” “of worship;” and so were it better rendered than by “divine service.” In one place it signifies by itself as much as **δικαιώματα λατρείας** doth here, <sup><6104></sup> Romans 9:4, “Unto whom belongeth the giving of the law, **καὶ ἡ λατρεία**, —”and the worship;” that is, **δικαιώματα λατρείας**, “the ordinances of worship,” — the ordinances of the ceremonial law. For although God was served in and according to the

commands of the moral law, or the unchangeable prescriptions, “the ten words;” and also in the duties required in the due observance of the judicial law; yet this λατρεία, or עֲבֹדָה, was the immediate worship of the tabernacle, and the services of the priests that belonged thereunto. Hence the Jews call all idolatry and superstition עֲבֹדָה זָרָה, —”strange worship.”

And this was that part of divine worship about which God had so many controversies with the people of Israel under the old testament; for they were always apt to run into noxious extremes about it. For the most part they were prone to neglect it, and to run into all manner of superstition and idolatry. For the law of this worship was a hedge that God had set about them, to keep them from those abominations; and if at any time they brake over it, or neglected it, and let it fall, they failed not to rush into the most abominable idolatry. On the other hand, oftentimes they placed all their trust and confidence, for their acceptance with God and blessing from him, on the external observance of the ordinances and institutions of it. And hereby they countenanced themselves not only in a neglect of moral duties and spiritual obedience, but in a course of flagitious sins and wickednesses. To repress these exorbitancies with respect unto both these extremes, the ministry of the prophets was in an especial manner directed. And we may observe some things here in our passage, as included in the apostle’s assertion, though not any part of his present design: —

**Obs. II.** There was never any covenant between God and man but it had some ordinances or arbitrary institutions of external divine worship annexed unto it. —The original covenant of works had the ordinances of the tree of life, and of the knowledge of good and evil; the laws whereof belonged not unto that of natural light and reason. The covenant of Sinai, whereof the apostle speaks, had a multiplication of them. Nor is the new covenant destitute of them or their necessary observance. All public worship, and the sacraments of the church are of this nature. For whereas it is ingrafted in natural light that some external worship is to be given unto God, he would have it of his own prescription, and not, as unto the modes of it, left unto the inventions of men. And because God hath always, in every covenant, prescribed the external worship and all the duties of it which he will accept, it cannot but be dangerous for us to make any additions thereunto. Had he prescribed none at any time, seeing some are

necessary in the light of nature, it would follow by just consequence that they were left unto the finding out and appointment of men; but he having done this himself, “let not us add unto his words, lest he reprove us, and we be found liars.” And in his institution of these ordinances of external worship there is both a demonstration of his sovereignty and an especial trial of our obedience, in things whereof we have no reason but his mere will and pleasure.

**Obs. III.** It is a hard and rare thing to have the minds of men kept upright with God in the observation of the institutions of divine worship. —Adam lost himself and us all by his failure therein. The old church seldom attained unto it, but continually wandered into one of the extremes mentioned before. And at this day there are very few in the world who judge a diligent observation of divine institutions to be a thing of any great importance. By some they are neglected, by some corrupted with additions of their own, and by some they are exalted above their proper place and use, and turned into an occasion of neglecting more important duties. And the reason of this difficulty is, because faith hath not that assistance and encouragement from innate principles of reason, and that sensible experience of this kind of obedience, as it hath in that which is moral, internal, and spiritual.

[2.] That these ordinances of divine worship might be duly observed and rightly performed under the first covenant, there was a *place* appointed of God for their solemnization. It had **τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν**, —”also a worldly sanctuary.” He renders **שְׁתַּבַּח** by **ἅγιον** properly a” holy place,” a “sanctuary” And why he calls it **κοσμικόν**, or “worldly,” we must inquire. And some things must be premised unto the exposition of these words: —

**1st.** The apostle, treating of the services, sacrifices, and place of worship, under the old testament, doth not instance in nor insist upon the temple, with its fabric and the order of its services, but in the tabernacle set up by Moses in the wilderness And this he doth for the ensuing reasons: —

**(1st.)** Because his principal design is to confirm the pre-eminence of the *new covenant above the old*. To this end he compares them together in their first introduction and establishment, with what did belong unto them therein. And as this in the new covenant was the priesthood, mediation,

and sacrifice of Christ; so in the old it was the tabernacle with the services and sacrifices that belonged unto it. These the first covenant was accompanied with and established by; and therefore were they peculiarly to be compared with the tabernacle of Christ, and the sacrifice that he offered therein. This is the principal reason why in this disputation he hath all along respect unto the *tabernacle*, and not unto the *temple*.

**(2dly.)** Although the temple, with its glorious fabric and excellent order, added much unto the outward beauty and splendor of the sacred worship, yet was it no more but a large exemplification of what was virtually contained in the tabernacle and the institutions of it, from whence it derived all its glory; and therefore these Hebrews principally rested in and boasted of the revelation made unto Moses, and his institutions. And the excellency of the worship of the new covenant being manifested above that of the tabernacle, there is no plea left for the additional outward glory of the temple.

**2dly.** Designing to treat of this holy tent or tabernacle, he confines himself unto the first general distribution of it, <sup><27></sup>Exodus 26:33, “And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy and the most holy;” the holy utensils of which two parts he afterwards distinctly describes. The whole was called **שְׁכֵנֶת עֵדוּת**; which he renders by **τὸ ἅγιον**, “the holy place,” or “sanctuary.” The tabernacle of witness erected in the wilderness in two parts, the holy and the most holy, with the utensils of them, is that whose description he undertakes.

It is observed by the apostle, that the first covenant had this sanctuary;

**1st.** Because so soon as God had made that covenant with the people, he prescribed unto them the erection and making of this sanctuary, containing all the solemn means of the administration of the covenant itself.

**2dly.** Because it was the principal mercy, privilege, and advantage, that the people were made partakers of by virtue of that covenant. And it belongs unto the exposition of the text, as to the design of the apostle in it, that we consider what that privilege was, or wherein it did consist. And, —

**(1st.)** This tabernacle, with what belonged thereunto, was a *visible pledge of the presence of God among the people, owning, blessing, and protecting*

of them; and it was a pledge of God's own institution. In imitation whereof, the superstitious heathens invented ways of obliging their idol gods to be present among them for the same ends. Hence was that prayer at the removal of the tabernacle and the ark therein, <sup><0175></sup>Numbers 10:35, 36,

“Rise up, LORD, and let thine enemies be scattered; and let them that hate thee flee before thee.”

And when it rested he said, “Return, O LORD, unto the many thousands of Israel.” And thence the ark was called “the ark of God's strength” (see <sup><0175></sup>Psalms 68:1, 2, 132:8; <sup><0175></sup>2 Chronicles 6:41), because it was a pledge of God's putting forth his strength and power in the behalf of the people. And according unto this institution, it was a most effectual means to strengthen their faith and confidence in God; for what could they desire more, in reference thereunto, than to enjoy such a gracious earnest of his powerful presence among them? But when they ceased to trust in God, and put their confidence in the things themselves, — which were no otherwise useful but as they were pledges of his presence, — they proved their ruin. Hereof we have a fatal instance in their bringing the ark into the field, in their battle against the Philistines, <sup><0175></sup>1 Samuel 4:3-11. And it will fare no better with others who shall rest satisfied with outward institutions of divine worship, neglecting the end of them all, which is faith and trust in God, <sup><0175></sup>Jeremiah 7:4. But men of corrupt minds had rather place their trust in any thing but God: for they find that they can do so and yet continue in their sins; as those did in the prophet, verses 8-10. But none can trust in God unless he relinquish all sin whatever; all other pretended trust in him is but the entitling of him unto our own wickedness.

**(2dly.)** It was the *pledge and means of God's residence or dwelling* among them, which expresseth the peculiar manner of his presence, mentioned in general before. The tabernacle was God's house; nor did he promise at any time to dwell among them but with respect thereunto, <sup><0175></sup>Exodus 15:17, <sup><0175></sup>25:8, 29:44-46; <sup><0175></sup>Numbers 5:3. And the consideration hereof was a powerful motive unto holiness, fear, and reverence; unto which ends it is everywhere pressed in the Scripture.

**(3dly.)** It was a *fixed seat* of all divine worship, wherein the truth and purity of it were to be preserved. Had the observation of the ordinances of

divine service been left unto the memories of private persons, it would quickly have issued in all manner of foolish practices, or have been utterly neglected; but God appointed this sanctuary for the preservation of the purity of his worship, as well as for the solemnity thereof. See <sup><6118></sup>Deuteronomy 12:8-11. Here was the book of the law laid up; according unto the prescript whereof the priests were obliged in all generations to take care of the public worship of God.

**(4thly.)** It was principally the privilege and glory of the church of Israel, in that it was a *continual representation of the incarnation of the Son of God*; a type of his coming in the flesh to dwell among us, and, by the one sacrifice of himself, to make reconciliation with God and atonement for sins. It was such an expression of the idea of the mind of God concerning the person and mediation of Christ, as in his wisdom and grace he thought meet to intrust the church withal. Hence was that severe injunction, that all things concerning it should be made “according unto the pattern showed in the mount;” for what could the wisdom of men do in the prefiguration of that mystery, which they had no comprehension of?

But yet this sanctuary the apostle calls **κοσμικόν**, “worldly.” Expositors both ancient and modern do even weary themselves in their inquiries why the apostle calls this sanctuary “worldly.” But I think they do so without cause, the reason of the appellation being evident in his design and the context. And there is a difficulty added unto it by the Latin translation, which renders the word “seculare,” which denotes “continuance” or duration. This expresseth the Hebrew **עולם**; but that the apostle renders by **αἶών**, and not by **κόσμος**, and therefore here hath no respect unto it. The sense that many fix upon is, that he intends the outward court of the temple, whereinto the Gentiles or men of the world were admitted, whence it was called “worldly,” and not sacred. But this exposition, though countenanced by many of the ancients, is contrary unto the whole design of the apostle. For,

**1st.** He speaks of the tabernacle, wherein was no such outward court; nor indeed was there any such belonging to the temple, whatever some pretend.

**2dly.** The whole sanctuary whereof he speaks he immediately distributes into two parts, as they were divided by the veil, namely,

the holy and the most holy place; which were the two parts of the tabernacle itself.

**3dly.** He treats of the sanctuary only with respect unto the divine service to be performed in it by the priests, which they did not in any outward court whereinto the Gentiles might be admitted.

Wherefore the apostle terms this sanctuary “worldly,” because it was every way in and of this world. For,

**1st.** The *place* of it was on the earth, in this world; in opposition whereunto the sanctuary of the new covenant is in heaven, <sup><800></sup> Hebrews 8:2.

**2dly.** Although the *materials* of it were as durable as any thing in that kind that could be procured, as gold and shittim-wood, because they were to be of a long continuance, yet were they “worldly;” that is, “caduca,” fading and perishing things, as are all things of the world; God intimating thereby that they were not to have an everlasting continuance. Gold, and wood, and silk, and hair, however curiously wrought and carefully preserved, are but for a time.

**3dly.** All the *services* of it, all its sacrifices, in themselves, separated from their typical, representative use, were all worldly; and their efficacy extended only unto worldly things, as the apostle proves in this chapter.

**4thly.** On these accounts the apostle calls it worldly; yet not absolutely so, but in opposition unto that which is heavenly. All things in the ministration of the new covenant are heavenly. So is the priest, his sacrifice, tabernacle, and altar, as we shall see in the process of the apostle’s discourse. And we may observe from the whole, —

**Obs. IV.** That divine institution alone is that which renders any thing acceptable unto God. — Although the things that belonged unto the sanctuary, and the sanctuary itself, were in themselves but worldly, yet being divine ordinances, they had a glory in them, and were in their season accepted with God.

**Obs. V.** God can animate outward, carnal things with a hidden, invisible spring of glory and efficacy. — So he did this sanctuary with its relation



unto Christ; which was an object of faith, which no eye of flesh could behold.

**Obs. VI.** All divine service or worship must be resolved into divine ordination or institution. — A worship not ordained of God is not accepted of God. “It had ordinances of worship.”

**Obs. VII.** A worldly sanctuary is enough for them whose service is worldly; and these things the men of the world are satisfied with.

## VERSE 2.

Two things were ascribed unto the first covenant in the verse foregoing:

1. Ordinances of worship;
2. A worldly sanctuary. In this verse the apostle enters upon a description of them both, inverting the order of their proposal, beginning with the latter, or the sanctuary itself.

**Ver. 2.** — Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατασκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ἣ ἢ τε λυχνία, καὶ ἡ τράπεζα, καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἧτις λέγεται ἅγια.

Vulg. Lat., “tabernaculum enim factum est primum;” “the first tabernacle was made;” ambiguously, as we shall see. Syr., קְדָמָא דְאֵתְעֵבֶר בְּמִשְׁכַּן “in tabernaculo primo quod factum erat;” “in the first tabernacle that was made.” *Λυχνία*. Vulg. Lat., “candelabra,” “candlesticks.” Syr., אֵתְעֵבֶר בְּהַ מְנִרְתָּא, “in it was the candlestick.” *Πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων*. Vulg., “propositio panum,” “the proposition of loaves.” Others, “propositi panes.” Syr. וְלֶחֶם פָּנֵי, “and the bread of faces.” *ἧτις λέγεται ἅγια*. Vulg. “quae dicitur sancta;” dicitur sanctum;” “quod sancta vocant;” for some read ἅγια, some ἄγια. Syr., וּמִתְקַיָּא דִּית קוּדְשָׁא “and it was called the holy house.”

**Ver. 2.** — For there was a tabernacle made [*prepared*]; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary.

Our translation thus rendering the words, avoids the ambiguity mentioned in the Vulgar Latin. “First of all there was a tabernacle made.” But whereas

our rendering is also obscure, “the first” being mentioned, where only one thing went before, —which yet includes a distribution supposed, —I would supply it with *two parts*, —’There was a tabernacle made, consisting of two parts;’ “tabernaculum bipartite exstructum;” for the following words are a distinct description of these two parts.

1. The subject spoken of is the “tabernacle.”
2. That which in general is affirmed of it is, that it was “made.”
3. There is a distribution of it into two parts in this and the following verse.
4. These parts are described and distinguished by,
  - (1.) Their *names*;
  - (2.) Their *situation* with respect unto one another;
  - (3.) Their *contents* or sacred utensils.

The one is so described in this verse:

- (1.) By its situation, it was “the first,” that which was first entered into;
  - (2.) By its utensils, which were three;
    - [1.] The candlestick;
    - [2.] The table;
    - [3.] The shew-bread;
  - (3.) By its name, it was called “The sanctuary:” —
1. The subject treated of is *σκηνή*, that is *מִקְדָּשׁ*, —”the tabernacle;” the common name for the whole fabric, as “the temple” was afterwards of the house built by Solomon. An eminent type this was of the incarnation of Christ, whereby the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily, <sup><sup>Colossians 2:9;</sup> substantially in the human nature, as it dwelt *typically* and by representation in this tabernacle. Hence is it so expressed, “He was made flesh,” <sup><sup>John 1:14;</sup> —”and pitched his tabernacle amongst” or “with us.” The consideration hereof the apostle on set purpose fixed on,

as the great concomitant, privilege, or glory of the first covenant, whereof he treats, and whose consideration was excellently suited unto his design. Immediately on the giving of the law, and making that covenant in Horeb which was accepted of by the people and solemnly ratified, <sup>(124)</sup>Exodus 24:3-8, the whole of their remaining station in that place, for some months, was taken up in Moses' receiving revelations, and the people's making provision about and for this tabernacle, with what belonged thereunto. Forty days was Moses in the mount with God, whilst he instructed him in all things that belonged unto it; so great and glorious was the design of divine wisdom in this tabernacle and its appurtenances. For it was the house wherein his glory was to dwell; and not only so, but a type and representation of the depth of his counsel in the incarnation of his Son, whereby the divine nature would personally dwell in the human for ever.

**2.** It is affirmed of this tabernacle that it was “made;” —”tabernaculum exstructum,” “constructum,” “praeparatum,” “ornatum,” “adornatum;” “built,” “prepared,” “adorned.” There is more included in the word than the mere building of the fabric. For the apostle, in this one word, reflects on and compriseth,

- (1.) The *provision of materials* made by the people;
- (2.) The *workings* of those materials by Bezaleel;
- (3.) The *erection* of the whole by the direction of Moses;
- (4.) The *adorning* of it unto its use: that is the substance of the book of Exodus from <sup>(125)</sup>Exodus 25 to the end.

First, preparation was made for it; then the materials were wrought, and that with such curious workmanship, accompanied with such rich devoted ornaments, that it was adorned in its making. It was prepared in its materials, it was wrought into its form, it was beautified in its ornaments; unto all which respect is had in this word. That which principally gave unto it its order, beauty, glory, and use, was, that it was entirely, and in all the parts and appurtenances of it, made according to the pattern which God showed Moses in the mount. And therefore, when it was finished and erected, all the parts belonging unto it, and all that was in it, were distinctly recounted, and it is added concerning them all, separately and in conjunction, they were all made “as the LORD commanded Moses,”

<sup><1019></sup>Exodus 40:19-32. For it is the authority and wisdom of God alone that give beauty, use, and order, unto all that belongs unto his worship.

**3.** The first part of this tabernacle being so prepared, it had its furniture, that was to abide and be used in it: —

(1.) There was in it ἡ λυχνία, —”the candlestick.” The Vulgar Latin reads “*candelabra*,” in the plural number. Hence many disputes arise among the expositors who adhere unto that translation. Some of them contend that the apostle hath respect unto the temple of Solomon, wherein were ten candlesticks, five on the one side, and five on the other, <sup><1079></sup>1 Kings 7:49; which is directly contrary to his scope and the words of the text. Some suppose that the one candlestick which was in the tabernacle was intended, but is spoken of in the plural number because of the six branches that came out of it, three on each side, and that which went directly upwards made seven, having lamps in them all, <sup><1253></sup>Exodus 25:31, 32. But whereas it is constantly called “the candlestick,” and spoken of as one utensil only, the apostle could not call it “the candlesticks,” for that was but one. Wherefore the most sober of them depart from their common translation, and adhere unto the original; and make use of the expression to prove that it was the tabernacle of Moses, and not the temple of Solomon, wherein were ten candlesticks, that the apostle refers unto. The making of this candlestick is particularly described, <sup><1253></sup>Exodus 25:31, to the end of the chapter. Its frame, measures, and use, are not of our present consideration; they may be found in expositors on that place. It was placed on the south side of the tabernacle, near the veils that covered the most holy place; and over against it on the north side was the table with the shew-bread; and in the midst, at the very entrance of the most holy place, was the altar of incense. See <sup><1273></sup>Exodus 27:20-27. And this candlestick was made all of beaten gold, of one piece, with its lamps and appurtenances, without either joints or screws; which is not without its mystery. To fit it for its service, pure oil olive was to be provided by the way of offering from the people, <sup><1273></sup>Exodus 27:20. And it was the office of the high priest to “order it;” that is, to dress its lamps, every evening and every morning, supplying them with fresh oil, and removing whatsoever might be offensive, <sup><1273></sup>Exodus 27:21. And this is called “a statute for ever” unto the generations of the priests, on the behalf of the children of Israel; which manifests the great concernment of the church in this holy utensil.

(2.) On the other side of the sanctuary, over against the candlestick, were “the table and the shew-bread;” which the apostle reckons as the second part of the furniture of this first part of the tabernacle, distinguishing them from each other: “the table, and the shew-bread.” The making of this table, with its measures and use, its form and fashion, is recorded, <sup><1253></sup>Exodus 25:23-28, 37:10, etc. שֻׁלְחָן, “table.” The manner of its covering, when it was to be carried whilst the tabernacle was movable, is described, <sup><1005></sup>Numbers 4:7, 8. And it was a utensil fashioned for beauty and glory.

(3.) Upon this table, which the apostle adds, was “the shew-bread.” It is here rendered by the apostle πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, —the “proposition of the bread or “loaves; by an hypallage for ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, —the “bread of proposition,” as it is rendered, <sup><1134></sup>Matthew 12:4; the bread that was proposed or set forth. In the Hebrew it is אֲרֵי, “bread,” in the singular number; which the apostle renders by ἄρτοι, in the plural, as also doth the evangelist. For that bread consisted of many loaves; as ἄρτος properly signifies “a loaf.” So the LXX. render it by ἄρτους, <sup><1231></sup>Exodus 25:30.

The number of these loaves, or cakes, as we call them, was twelve; and they were set on the table in two rows, six in a row, being laid one upon the other. The Jews say that every loaf was ten hand-breadths long, and five hand-breadths broad, and seven fingers thick. But this cannot well be reconciled unto the proportion of the table. For the table itself was but two cubits long, and one cubit broad; and whereas it had a border of an hand-breadth round about, nothing could lie on the table but what was placed within that border. And seeing a cubit was but five hand-breadths, it cannot be conceived how two rows of loaves, that were ten hand-breadths long, and five hand-breadths broad, could be placed within that border. Wherefore they suppose that there were props of gold coming up from the ground, that bore the ends of the cakes. But if so, it could not be said that they were placed on the table, which is expressly affirmed. Wherefore it is certain that they were of such shape, proportion, and measures, as might fitly be placed on the table within the border; and more we know not of them.

These cakes were renewed every Sabbath, in the morning; the renovation of them being part of the peculiar worship of the day. The manner of it, as

also of the making of them, is described, <sup><0315></sup>Leviticus 24:5-9. And because the new bread was to be brought in and immediately placed in the room of that which was taken away, it is called absolutely **לֶחֶם הַתָּמִיד**, —”the continual bread,” <sup><0407></sup>Numbers 4:7. For God says it was to be before him **תָּמִיד**, “jugiter,” <sup><0253></sup>Exodus 25:30, —”always,” or “continually.” Why it is called **לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים**, “the bread of faces,” there is great inquiry. One of the Targums renders it “inward bread;” for the word is used sometimes for that which looks inward: the LXX., **ἄρτους ἐνωπίους**, “present bread, or “bread presented.” Many think they were so called because they were set forth before the faces of the priests, and stood in their view when they first entered the tabernacle. But the reason of it is plain in the text: **לֶפְנֵי לֶחֶם פָּנִים**, —”the shew-bread before my face,” saith God. They were presented before the Lord as a memorial, twelve of them, in answer to the twelve tribes of Israel. The Jews think they were called “bread of faces,” because being made in an oblong square, they appeared with many faces; that is, as many as they had sides. But they cannot evince this to have been the fashion of them, and it is absurd to imagine that they had such a name given unto them from their outward form.

This is all that the apostle observes to have been in the first part of the tabernacle. There was in it, moreover, the altar of incense. But this was not placed in the midst of it at any equal distances from the sides, but just at the west end, where the veil opened to give an entrance into the most holy place; wherefore by our apostle it is reckoned unto that part of the sanctuary, as we shall see on the next verse.

**4.** Concerning this part of the tabernacle, the apostle affirms that it was called **ἁγία**, “holy.” This name of it was given and stated, <sup><0253></sup>Exodus 26:33, “The veil shall divide **וּבֵין קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדָשִׁים**, —”between the holy” (that is, that part of the sanctuary,) “and the most holy,” which our apostle describes in the next place. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. I.** Every part of God’s house, and the place wherein he will dwell, is filled and adorned with pledges of his presence, and means of communicating his grace. Such were all the parts of the furniture of this part of the tabernacle. And so doth God dwell in his church, which in some sense is his tabernacle with men.

But the principal inquiry about these things, is concerning their mystical signification and use. For by the apostle they are only proposed in general, under this notion, that they were all typical representations of things spiritual and evangelical. Without this he had no concernment in them. This, therefore, we shall inquire into.

We may in this matter be supplied by expositors with variety of conjectures. But none of them, so far as I have observed, have at all endeavored to fix any certain rule for the trial and measure of such conjectures, nor to guide us in the interpretation of this mystery.

Some say, the candlestick, with its branches, represented the *seven planets*, the sun in the midst, as the *scapus* of the candlestick was in the midst of the six branches, three on the one side, and three on the other. And the loaves of bread, say they, did represent the fruits of the earth as influenced by the heavenly bodies. This is the interpretation of Philo, a Jew and Platonical philosopher; and it doth not unbecome his principles. But that any Christian writer should approve of it I somewhat wonder, nor doth it deserve a confutation.

Some say that the altar of incense signified those that are of a *contemplative life*; the table of shew-bread, those that follow the *active life*; and the candlestick, those that follow both of them. The pretended reasons of this application of these things may be seen in the commentaries of Ribera and Tena on this place.

Some, with more sobriety and probability, affirm the candlestick to represent the ministry of the church, appointed for the illumination of it; and the table with the shew-bread, the ordinances as administered by them: which things are declared succinctly by Gomarus on this place; and unto them they may have safely a secondary application.

But, as was said, a rule is to be fixed to guide us in the interpretation of the mystical signification of these things, and the application of them; without which we shall wander in uncertain and unapprovable conjectures. And it is plainly given us in the context. For therein are two things manifest:

**1.** That the tabernacle and all contained in it were typical of Christ. This is directly affirmed, <sup><sup>SMD</sup> Hebrews 8:2, as hath been evinced in the exposition of

that place. And it is the design of the apostle further to declare and confirm it in what remains of this chapter.

**2.** That the Lord Christ, in this representation of him by the tabernacle, its utensils and services, is not considered absolutely, but as the church is in mystical union with him; for he is proposed, set forth, and described, in the discharge of his mediatory office. And these things give us an evident rule in the investigation of the original significancy of the tabernacle, with all the parts, furniture, and services of it, and the design of God therein. They were all representative of Christ in the discharge of his office, and by them did God instruct the church as unto their faith in him and expectation of him.

This is excellently observed by Cyril. in Johan. lib. 4:cap. xxviii.:

“Christus licet unus sit, multifariam tamen a nobis intelligitur. Ipse est tabernaculum propter carnis tegumentum; ipse est mensa, quia noster cibus est et vita; ipse est arca habens legem Dei reconditam, quia est verbum patris; ipse est candelabrum, quia est lux spiritualis; ipse est altare incensi, quia est odor suavitatis in sanctificationem; ipse est altare holocausti, quia est hostia pro totius mundi vita in cruce oblata.’ And other instances he gives unto the same purpose. And although I cannot comply with all his particular applications, yet the ground he builds upon and the rule he proceeds by are firm and stable. And by this rule we shall inquire into the signification of the things mentioned by the apostle in the first part of the tabernacle: —

The candlestick, with its seven branches, and its perpetual light with pure oil, giving light unto all holy administrations, did represent the *fullness of spiritual light* that is in Christ Jesus, and which by him is communicated unto the whole church. “In him was life; and the life was the light of men,”

Ⓜ John 1:5. God gave unto him the Spirit not by measure, Ⓜ John 3:35.

And the Holy Spirit rested on him in all variety of his gifts and operations, especially those of spiritual light, wisdom, and understanding, Ⓜ Isaiah 11:2, 3; and in allusion unto this candlestick with its seven lamps, is called “the seven Spirits that are before the throne of God,” Ⓜ Revelation 1:4; as he in and by whom the Lord Christ gives out the fullness and perfection of spiritual light and gifts, unto the illumination of the church, even as the light of the tabernacle depended on the seven lamps of the candlestick.



Wherefore, by the communication of the fullness of the Spirit in all his gifts and graces unto Christ, he became the fountain of all spiritual light unto the church. For he subjectively enlightens their minds by his Spirit, <sup><4017</sup>Ephesians 1:17-19; and objectively and doctrinally conveys the means of light unto them by his word.

Again; there was one candlestick which contained the holy oil, (a type of the Spirit) in itself. Thence was it communicated unto the branches on each side of it, that they also should give light unto the tabernacle; yet had they originally no oil in themselves, but only what was continually communicated unto them from the body of the candlestick. And so the communications from Christ of spiritual gifts unto the ministers of the gospel, whereby they are instrumental in the illumination of the church, was signified thereby. For “unto every one of us is given grace according unto the measure of the gift of Christ,” even as he pleaseth, <sup><4017</sup>Ephesians 4:7.

But hereon we must also remember, that this candlestick was all one beaten work of pure gold, both the scapus, the body, and all the branches of it. There were neither joints, nor screws, nor pins in or about it, <sup><1251</sup>Exodus 25:36. Wherefore, unless ministers are made partakers of the divine nature of Christ, by that faith which is more precious than gold, and are intimately united unto him, so as mystically to become one with him, no pretended conjunction unto him by joints and screws of outward order will enable them to derive that pure oil from him with whose burning light they may illuminate the church. But this I submit unto the judgment of others.

This is of faith herein: That which God instructed the church in by this holy utensil and its use, was, that the promised Messiah, whom all these things typed and represented, was to be, by the fullness of the Spirit in himself, and the communication of all spiritual graces and gifts unto others, the only cause of all true saving light unto the church. “He is the true light, which lighteth every man coming into the world;” namely, that is savingly enlightened. Upon the entrance of sin, all things fell into darkness; spiritual darkness covered mankind, not unlike that which was on the face of the deep before God said, “Let there be light, and there was light,” <sup><40012</sup>2 Corinthians 4:6. And this darkness had two parts; first, that which was

external, with respect unto the will of God concerning sinners, and their acceptance with him; secondly, on the minds of men, in their incapacity to receive such divine revelations unto that end as were or should be made. This was the double veil, the veil veiled and the covering covered over the face of all nations, which was to be destroyed, <sup><331></sup>Isaiah 25:7. And they are both removed by Christ alone; the former by his doctrine, the latter by his Spirit. Moreover, there was no light at all in the sanctuary, for the performance of any holy administrations, but what was given unto it by the lamps of this candlestick; and therefore was it to be carefully dressed every morning and evening, by a perpetual statute. And if the communication of spiritual gifts and graces do cease, the very church itself, notwithstanding its outward order, will be a place of darkness.

**Obs. II.** The communication of sacred light from Christ, in the gifts of the Spirit, is absolutely necessary unto the due and acceptable performance of all holy offices and duties of worship in the church. And, —

**Obs. III.** No man, by his utmost endeavors in the use of outward means, can obtain the least beam of saving light, unless it be communicated unto him by Christ, who is the only fountain and cause of it.

The table and the shew-bread, mentioned in the next place, respected him also, under another consideration. The use of the table, which was all overlaid with gold, was only to bear the bread which was laid upon it. What resemblance there might be therein unto the divine person of Christ, which sustained the human nature in its duties, that bread of life which was provided for the church, it may be is not easy to declare. Howbeit, the head of Christ is said to be “as the most fine gold,” Cant. 5:11. Wherefore the matter of it being most precious, and the form of it beautiful and glorious, it might as far represent it as any thing could do which is of this creation, as all these things were, verse 11. But that the Lord Christ is the only bread of life unto the church, the only spiritual food of our souls, he himself doth fully testify, <sup><312></sup>John 6:32-35. He, therefore, he alone, was represented by this “continual bread” of the sanctuary.

### VERSES 3-5.

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεῦτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνῆ ἢ λεγομένη ἅγια  
 ἁγίων· χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα ζυματήριον, καὶ τὴν κιζωτὸν τῆς

διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ἧ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάζδος Ἐβραίων ἢ βλαστήσασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· Ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουζιμ δόξης κατυσκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον· περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος.

Μετὰ δὲ το δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνῆ, “but after the second veil,” or “covering.” Our Latin translation reads, “post medium velum;” that is, “after the veil that was in the midst:” but there were not three veils, whereof this should be in the midst, but two only. The Syriac somewhat changeth the words, “the inner tabernacle, which was within the face of the second gate.” The same thing is intended; but “the inner” is added; and “after the second veil” is expressed by an Hebraism. What **καταπέτασμα** is, which is rendered “velum,” and “velamentum,” a “veil,” a “covering,” and by the Syriac, a “gate of entrance,” we shall see afterwards.

Ἡ λεγομένη, “quod dicitur,” “quod vocatur.” Syr., “it was called.” Χρσοῦν ἔχουσα ζυμιατήριον, “aureum habens thuribulum;” “having the golden censer.” Syr., “and there were in it the house of incense of gold;” whereby either the altar or the censer may be understood. Ἐν ἧ στάμνος. Syr., “and there was in it;” referring plainly to the ark.

Περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος, “non est tempus,” “non est propositum;” “it is not a time or place,” “it is not my purpose to speak;” “non est modo dicendum.” Κατὰ μέρος, “singulatim;” Vulg. Lat., “per singula;” Arias, “per partes;” Syr., “by one and one,” “apart,” “particularly,” according to the parts laid down distinctly. The Syriac adds the following words unto these, “It is not time to speak of these things by one and one, which were thus disposed.” But the original refers that expression unto what follows.<sup>f14</sup>

**Ver. 3-5.** —And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid [*covered*] round about [*on every side*] with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron’s rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat; of which [*things*] we cannot [*shall not*] now speak particularly.

The apostle in these verses proceedeth unto the description of the second part of the tabernacle, with the things contained in it, or the holy furniture thereof. His design is not to give us an exact description of these things, as he declares in the close of the fifth verse, but only to declare their use and signification. Wherefore he doth not propose an accurate account of their station and relation one to another, but makes such mention of them in general as was sufficient unto his end, namely, to manifest their use and signification. Wherefore they deal injuriously both with him and the text, who rigidly examine every word and passage, as though he had designed an exact account of the frame, posture, fashion, and measure, of this part of the tabernacle, and every thing contained in it; whereas the use and signification of the whole is all that he intends. A due consideration hereof renders the anxious inquiry that hath been made about the assignation of holy utensils unto this part of the sanctuary, and the placing of them with respect unto one another, —which was no part of his design, —altogether needless. For with respect unto the end he aimed at, the words he useth are exactly the truth.

He describes this part of the tabernacle,

1. From its *situation*; it was “after the second veil.”
2. From its *name*, given unto it by God himself; it was called “The holiest of all,” or” The holy of holies.”
3. From its *utensils* or vessels; which were,
  - (1.) The golden censer;
  - (2.) The ark, —*what was in it or with it*:
    - [1.] The golden pot that had manna;
    - [2.] Aaron’s rod;
    - [3.] The tables of the covenant.
4. The *cherubim*; which he describes,
  - (1.) From their quality, “cherubim of glory;”
  - (2.) Their use, they “shadowed the mercy-seat.”

**5.** The *mercy-seat itself*, but this is mentioned as it were only occasionally with respect unto the use of the cherubim.

And this sufficiently manifests, that in the rehearsal of these things the apostle designeth not accuracy of order; for the mercy-seat was, for glory and signification, far above the cherubim wherewith it was overshadowed.

With respect unto these things among others, in another place, he affirms that the ministration of divine worship under the law was glorious; but withal he adds that it had no glory in comparison of that which doth excel,—namely, the spiritual ministration of divine worship under the gospel, ~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 3:9, 10. And this is that which we should always mind in the consideration of these things; for if we yet look after and value such an outward glory as they did exhibit, we are carnal, and cannot behold the beauty of spiritual things.

The verbal difficulties which occur in this context have occasioned critical expositors to labor greatly about them. That is the field wherein they choose to exercise their skill and diligence. But as unto the things themselves, and the difficulties that are in the real interpretation of them, little light is contributed by most of their endeavors. Wherefore some of these words have been so belabored with all sorts of conjectures, that there is no room left for any addition in the same kind; and it were but lost labor to repeat what must be confuted if it were mentioned. I shall therefore take no further notice of any difficulty in the words, but as the explication of it is necessary unto the interpretation of the context; and so far nothing shall be omitted.

**1.** The first thing mentioned by the apostle is the situation of this part of the tabernacle; it was “after the second veil.” It was so unto them that entered into the tabernacle; they had to pass through the whole length of the first part before they came unto this; nor was there any other way of entrance into it. And by calling this partition of the two parts of the sanctuary the “second veil,” the apostle intimates that there was a former. Howbeit that former was not a separating veil of any part of the tabernacle, as this was. It was only the hanging of the door of the tent. This the apostle here reckons as a veil, because as by this veil the priests were hindered from entering into, or looking into the most holy place, so by that other the people were forbidden to enter or look into the first part

of the sanctuary, whereinto the priests entered daily. The making of the first veil is declared, <sup>(125)</sup>Exodus 26:36, 37, and it is called **הַתְּכָלִיף** “the hanging,” or “covering for the door.”) The making of this second veil is declared, <sup>(125)</sup>Exodus 26:31-33, and it is called “the veil” or “covering.” The apostle renders it by **καταπέτασμα**; as also it is <sup>(125)</sup>Matthew 27:51, where it is spoken of as in the temple. And so it is rendered by the LXX., <sup>(125)</sup>Exodus 26:31; as the former is called **κάλυμμα**, a covering. From **πετάζω**, which is “to extend,” “to stretch out” so as to cover with what is so extended, is **καταπέτασμα**, “a veil” to be a covering unto any thing, dividing one thing from another; as **περιπέτασμα** is that which covereth any thing round about: such was this veil.

The end, use, and signification of it, the apostle expressly declares verse 8, where they must be spoken unto.

**2.** He describes this part of the tabernacle by its name; it is called “The most holy,” “The holy of holies,” — **קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים** So it is called by God himself, <sup>(125)</sup>Exodus 26:33, 34, “The holy of holies;” that is, most holy, — the superlative degree expressed by the repetition of the substantive, as is usual in the Hebrew. Some give instances of this kind of phraseology in Greek writers, remote enough from Hebraisms; as Sophocles, Elect. 849: **Δειλαία δειλαίων κυρείς**, — “misera miserarum es;” that is, “miserrima.” But however the phrase of **ἅγια ἁγίων** may be Greek, the apostle intends to express the Hebraism itself. And “holy” in the Hebrew is of the singular number; “holies,” of the plural: but in the Greek both are of the plural number. And what is thus called was most eminently typical of Christ, who is called by this name, <sup>(125)</sup>Daniel 9:24, “To anoint the Most Holy.” The place in the tabernacle which was most sacred and most secret, which had the most eminent pledges or symbols of the divine presence, and the clearest representations of God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself is so called.

**Obs. I.** The more of Christ, by the way of representation or exhibition, any institutions of divine worship do contain or express, the more sacred and holy are they in their use and exercise. But, —

**Obs. II.** It is Christ alone who in himself is really the Most Holy, the spring and fountain of all holiness unto the church.

3. The *first* utensil reckoned unto this second part of the tabernacle is χρυσῶν ζυματήριον; and the relation of it thereunto is, that *it had it*, — ἔχουσα. He doth not say, it was in it, but “it had it.” If any one would see the various conjectures of learned men about this assertion of the apostle, as also about that following, concerning what was contained in the ark, he may consult the collections of Mr Pool on the place, where he will find them represented in one view. My design being only to declare what I conceive consonant unto the truth, I shall not spend time in repeating or refuting the conjectures of other men.

Θυματήριον, we translate a “censer;” but it may as well be rendered the “altar of incense;” as it is by the Syriac the “house of spices,” —the place for the spices whereof the incense was compounded. The altar of incense was all overlaid with beaten gold; hence it is here said to be χρυσοῦν, of “gold.” And whereas it was one of the most glorious vessels of the tabernacle, and most significant, if the apostle intended it not in this word, he takes no notice of it at all; which is very unlikely.

And of this altar he says not that it was in the *second tabernacle*, but that it *had it*. And in that expression he respects not its *situation*, but its *use*. And the most holy place may well be said to have had the altar of incense, because the high priest could never enter into that place, nor perform any service in it, but he was to bring incense with him taken in a censer from this altar. Whereas, therefore, there was a twofold use of the altar of incense; the one of the ordinary priests, to burn incense in the sanctuary every day; and the other of the high priest, to take incense from it when he entered into the most holy place, to fill it with a cloud of its smoke; the apostle intending a comparison peculiarly between the Lord Christ and the high priest only in this place, and not the other priests in the daily discharge of their office, he takes no notice of the use of the altar of incense in the sanctuary, but only of that which respected the most holy place, and the entrance of the high priest thereinto: for so he expressly applies it, verse 12. And therefore he affirms this place to have had this golden altar, its principal use and end being designed unto the service thereof. This I judge to be the true meaning of the apostle and sense of his words, and shall not therefore trouble myself nor the reader with the repetition or confutation of other conjectures. And that this was the principal use of this altar is plainly declared in the order for the making

and disposal of it, <sup>(Exo)</sup>Exodus 30:6, “Thou shalt put it before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee.” Although it was placed without the veil, and that for this end, that the high priest might not enter one step into the most holy place until the smoke of the incense went before him, yet had it peculiar respect unto the ark and mercy-seat, and is therefore reckoned in the same place and service with them by the apostle.

And this is yet made further evident, in that when the high priest entered into the most holy place, and had no service to perform but with respect unto the things pertaining thereunto, he was to make atonement on this altar with the blood of the sin-offering, as he did on the ark and mercy-seat, <sup>(Exo)</sup>Exodus 30:10. This is an undeniable demonstration that, as unto the use of it, it belonged principally unto the most holy place, and is here so declared by the apostle. Wherefore, the assignation hereof unto ‘that place by the author is so far from an objection against the authority of the epistle, — unto which end it hath by some been made use of, — as that it is an argument of his divine wisdom and skill in the nature and use of these institutions.

The manner of the service of this altar intended by the apostle was briefly thus: The high priest, on the solemn day of expiation, —that is, once a-year, —took a golden censer from this altar; after which, going out of the sanctuary, he put fire into it, taken from the altar of burnt-offerings without the tabernacle, in the court where the perpetual fire was preserved. Then returning into the holy place, he filled his hands with incense taken from this altar, the place of the residence of the spices. And this altar being placed just at the entrance of the most holy place, over against the ark and mercy-seat, upon his entrance he put the incense on the fire in the censer, and entered the holy place with a cloud of the smoke thereof. See <sup>(Lev)</sup>Leviticus 16:12, 13. The composition and making of this incense is declared, <sup>(Exo)</sup>Exodus 30:34, 35, etc. And being compounded, it was beaten small, that it might immediately take fire, and so placed on this altar before the ark, verse 36. And the placing of this incense “before the testimony,” as is there affirmed, is the same with what our apostle affirms, that the most holy place *had it*.



That in general by incense, *prayer* is signified, the Scripture expressly testifieth: “Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense,” Psalm 141.

2. And there is a fourfold resemblance between them:

- (1.) In that it was *beaten and pounded* before it was used. So doth acceptable prayer proceed from “a broken and contrite heart,” Isaiah 51. 17.
- (2.) It was of no use until *fire* was put under it, and that taken from the altar. Nor is that prayer of any virtue or efficacy which is not kindled by the fire from above, the Holy Spirit of God; which we have from our altar, Christ Jesus.
- (3.) It naturally *ascended upwards* towards heaven, as all offerings in the Hebrew are called עלות, “ascensions,” risings up. And this is the design of prayer, to ascend unto the throne of God: “I will direct unto thee, and will look up;” that is, pray, <sup><BR></sup>Psalm 5:3.
- (4.) It yielded *a sweet savor*: which was one end of it in temple services, wherein there was so much burning of flesh and blood. So doth prayer yield a sweet savor unto God; a savor of rest, wherein he is well pleased.

In this general sense, even the prayers of the saints might be typified and represented in that daily burning of incense which was used in the sanctuary. But it must be granted that this incense is distinguished from the prayers of the saints, as that which is in the hand of Christ alone, to give virtue and efficacy unto them, <sup><BR></sup>Revelation 8:4. Wherefore this golden altar of incense, as placed in the sanctuary, and whereon incense was burned continually every morning and evening, was a type of Christ, by his mediation and intercession giving efficacy unto the continual prayers of all believers.

But that which the apostle in this place hath alone respect unto, was the burning of the incense in the golden censer on the day of expiation, when the high priest entered into the most holy place. And this represented only the personal mediatory prayer of Christ himself. Concerning it we may observe:

**(1.)** That the time of it was after the sacrifice of the sin-offering; for the high priest was to take along with him the blood of that sacrifice, to carry with him into the holy place, Leviticus 16:

**(2.)** That the incense was kindled with fire taken from the altar, when the blood of the sacrifices was newly offered.

And two things in the mediatory prayer of Christ are hereby intimated unto us:

**(1.)** That the efficacy of them ariseth from and dependeth on the sacrifice of himself. Hence his intercession is best apprehended as the representation of himself and the efficacy of his sacrifice in heaven, before the throne of God.

**(2.)** That this prayer is quickened and enlivened by the same fire wherewith the sacri- rice of himself was kindled, —that is, by the eternal Spirit; whereof we shall treat on verse 14. Yet we must not so oblige ourselves unto the times, seasons, and order of these things, as to exclude the prayers which he offered unto God before the oblation of himself. Yea, that solemn prayer of his, recorded John xvii., wherein he sanctified himself to be an oblation, was principally prefigured by the cloud of incense which filled the most holy place, covering the ark and mercy-seat. For by reason of the imperfection of these types, and their accommodation unto the present service of the church so far as it was carnal, they could not represent the order of things as they were to be accomplished in the person of Christ, who was both priest and sacrifice, altar, tabernacle, and incense. For the law had only a shadow of these things, and not the perfect image of them. Some obscure lines of them were drawn therein, but their beautiful order was not represented in them. Although, therefore, the offering of incense from the golden altar in the most holy place was after the offering of sacrifice on the altar of burnt-offerings, yet was the mediatory prayer of Christ for the church of the elect, wherein he also prepared and sanctified himself to be a sacrifice, thereby typified. So also the beating or bruising of the incense before its firing did represent the agony of his soul, with the strong cries and supplications that he offered unto God therein. And we may observe, —

**Obs. III.** The mediatory intercession of Jesus Christ is a sweet savor unto God, and efficacious for the salvation of the church. —The smoke of this perfume was that which covered the ark and mercy-seat. Hereby the law itself, which was contained in the ark, became compliant unto our salvation; for herein Christ was declared to be the end of the law for righteousness unto them that do believe.

**Obs. IV.** The efficacy of Christ's intercession dependeth on his oblation. —It was fire from the altar of burnt-offerings wherewith the incense was kindled.

**Obs. V.** The glory of these types did no way answer the glory of the antitype, or that which was represented by them. —It is acknowledged that the service of the high priest at and from this golden altar, and his entrance with a cloud of incense into the most holy place, had great glory in it, and was suited to ingenerate a great veneration in the minds of the people; howbeit they were all but carnal things, and had no glory in comparison of the spiritual glory of Christ in the discharge of his office. We are apt in our minds to admire these things, and almost to wish that God had ordained such a service in the gospel, so outwardly glorious. For there is that in it which is suited unto those images of things which men create and are delighted withal in their minds. And besides, they love in divine service to be taken up with such a bodily exercise as carries glory with it, —an appearance of solemn veneration. Wherefore many things are found out by men unto these ends. But the reason of all is, because we are carnal. We see not the glory of spiritual things, nor do know how to be exercised in our minds about them with pure acts of faith and love.

**Obs. VI.** We are always to reckon that the efficacy and prevalency of all our prayers depends on the incense which is in the hand of our merciful high priest. —It is offered with the prayers of the saints, ~~xxx~~ Revelation 8:4. In themselves our prayers are weak and imperfect; it is hard to conceive how they should find acceptance with God. But the invaluable incense of the intercession of Christ gives them acceptance and prevalency.

The *second* thing in this part of the tabernacle mentioned by the apostle is the ark. This he describes,

- (1.) From its appellation; “the ark of the covenant:”
- (2.) From one particular in its fabric; it was “overlaid round about with gold:”
- (3.) From the things that accompanied it, and had no other use but to be laid up by it; “the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron’s rod that budded:”
- (4.) From what was placed in it, which to preserve was its principal use; “the tables of the covenant.”

This vessel in the Hebrew is called אֲרוֹן; as the ark in the flood was called תֵּבָה. But the Greeks render both by *χιζωτός* as the Latins by *arca*. This, with the mercy-seat wherewith it was covered, was the most glorious and mysterious utensil of the tabernacle, and afterwards of the temple; the most eminent pledge of the divine presence, the most mysterious representation of the holy properties of his nature in Christ. This, as the heart of all divine service, was first formed; all other things had a relation unto it, <sup><0231></sup>Exodus 25:10, 11. To treat of the fabric, that is, the materials, dimensions, and fashion of this ark, is not unto our present purpose. For these things the apostle himself here declines, as being no season to treat of them particularly. This he intends in these words, “Which we shall not now speak of.” And their mystical signification he gives afterwards.

(1.) The name of it is “the ark of the covenant.” Sometimes it is called “the ark of the testimony,” <sup><0233></sup>Exodus 26:33, <sup><0235></sup>39:35, <sup><0208></sup>40:3, 5; most commonly “the ark of the covenant,” <sup><0408></sup>Numbers 10:33, <sup><0144></sup>14:44, <sup><0508></sup>Deuteronomy 10:8, etc.; sometimes “the ark of God,” <sup><0408></sup>1 Samuel 3:3, 6:2, etc. “The ark of the testimony” it was called, because God called the tables of the covenant by the name of his “testimony,” or that which testified his will unto the people, and, by the people’s acceptance of the terms of it, was to be a perpetual witness between God and them, <sup><0236></sup>Exodus 25:16, 31:18, etc. On the same account is it called “the ark of the covenant,” namely, because of what was contained in it, or the tables of the covenant; which, as I have showed elsewhere, were usually called “the covenant” itself. And so they are called “the tables of testimony,” <sup><0218></sup>Exodus 31:18; that is, the covenant which was the testimony of God.

And lastly it was called “the ark of God,” because it was the most eminent pledge of the especial presence of God among the people.

(2.) As to the fabric of it, the apostle observes in particular, that it was on every side “overlaid” or “covered with gold,” — *πάντοθεν*, “every way, within and without,” —with plates of beaten gold. This, as I said before, was the most sacred and glorious instrument of the sanctuary; yea, the whole sanctuary, as unto its use in the church of Israel, was built for no other end but to be as it were a house and habitation for this ark, <sup>Exod</sup>Exodus 26:33, <sup>1Ch</sup>1Ch 40:21. Hence sanctification proceeded unto all the other parts of it; for, as Solomon observed, the places were holy whereunto the ark of God came, <sup>2Ch</sup>2Ch 8:11. And of such sacred veneration was it among the people, so severe was the exclusion of all flesh from the sight of it, —the high priest only excepted, who entered that holy place once a year, and that not without blood, —as that the nations about took it to be the God that the Israelites worshipped, <sup>1Sa</sup>1Sa 4:8. And it were not difficult to evidence that many of the pretended mysterious ceremonies of worship that prevailed among the nations of the world afterwards, were invented in compliance with what they had heard concerning the ark and worship of God thereby.

This was the most signal token, pledge, or symbol, of the presence of God among the people. And thence metonymically it hath sometimes the name of God ascribed unto it, as some think; and of “the glory of God,” <sup>Psa</sup>Psalms 78:61. And all neglects about it or contempt of it were most severely punished. From the tabernacle it was carried into the temple built by Solomon, where it continued until the Babylonian captivity; and what became of it afterwards is altogether uncertain.

God gave this ark that it might be a representation of Christ, as we shall show; and he took it away to increase the desire and expectation of the church after him and for him. And as it was the glory of God to hide and cover the mysterious counsels of his will under the old testament, — whence this ark was so hidden from the eyes of all men, —so under the new testament it is his glory to reveal and make them open in Jesus Christ, <sup>2Co</sup>2Co 3:18.

(3.) In this ark, as it was placed in the tabernacle, the apostle affirmeth that there were three things: —

[1.] “The golden pot that had manna,” When the manna first fell, every one was commanded to gather an omer, for his own eating, <sup><DIG></sup>Exodus 16:16. Hereon God appointed that a pot should be provided which should hold an omer, to be filled with manna, to be laid up before the Lord for their generations, verse 33. There was it miraculously preserved from putrefaction, whereas of itself it would not keep two days unto an end. And it is added, “As the LORD commanded Moses, so Aaron laid it up before the testimony, to be kept,” verse 34. But there is a prolepsis in the words; Aaron is said to do what he did afterwards. For the testimony was not yet given, nor Aaron yet consecrated unto his office. It is not said in this place, where the making of it is appointed, that it was of gold, nor is there any mention of what matter it was made. That it was of gold the apostle here declares, who wrote by inspiration. And the thing is evident itself; for it was to be placed in that part of the sanctuary wherein all the vessels were either of pure gold, or at least overlaid with it, and a pot of another nature would have been unsuitable thereunto. And it was to be made of that which was most durable, as being to be kept for a memorial throughout all generations.

The reason of the sacred preservation of this manna in the most holy place was, because it was a type of Christ; as himself declares, <sup><DIG></sup>John 6:48-51.

[2.] The next thing mentioned is “Aaron’s rod that budded.” This rod originally was that wherewith Moses fed the sheep of his father-in-law, Jethro, in the wilderness, which he had in his hand when God called unto him out of the bush. And thereon God ordained it to be the token of the putting forth of his power in the working of miracles, having by a trial confirmed the faith of Moses concerning it, <sup><DIG></sup>Exodus 4:17. Hereby it became sacred; and when Aaron was called unto the office of the priesthood, it was delivered into his keeping. For on the budding of it, on the trial about the priesthood, it was laid up before the testimony; that is, the ark, <sup><DIG></sup>Numbers 17:10. That same rod did Moses take from before the testimony when he was to smite the rock with it, and work a miracle; whereof this was consecrated to be the outward sign, <sup><DIG></sup>Numbers 20:8-11. Hereof the apostle affirms only that it “budded;” but in the story it is, that it “brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds; “being originally cut from an almond tree, <sup><DIG></sup>Numbers 17:8. But the apostle mentions what was sufficient unto his purpose.

This rod of Moses belonged unto the holy furniture of the tabernacle; because the spiritual Rock that followed them was to be smitten with the rod of the law, that it might give out the waters of life unto the church.

[3.] The last thing mentioned is “the tables of the covenant;” the two tables of stone, cut out by Moses, and written on with the finger of God, containing the ten commandments; which were the substance of God’s covenant with the people. This testimony, this covenant, these tables of stone, with the moral law engraven in them, were, by the express command of God, put into the ark, <sup><12516></sup>Exodus 25:16, 21, 40:20; <sup><15105></sup>Deuteronomy 10:5. And “there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone” with the law written in them, as is expressly affirmed, <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 8:9; <sup><14510></sup>2 Chronicles 5:10. Wherefore, whereas it is said of Aaron’s rod and the pot of manna, that they were placed *before the testimony*, <sup><14171></sup>Numbers 17:10, <sup><12516></sup>Exodus 16:34, —that is, the ark; and that the book of the law was also put *into the side of it*, —that is, laid beside it, <sup><15126></sup>Deuteronomy 31:26; and not only are the tables of stone appointed *expressly to be put into the ark*, but also it is likewise affirmed that “there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone;” this place of the apostle hath been exceedingly tortured and perplexed by critics, and all sorts of expositors, with multiplied conjectures, objections, and solutions. I know not that the repetition of them in this place would be of any use. Those who have a mind to exercise themselves about them, do know where to find them. I shall therefore give only that interpretation of the words which, for the substance of it at least, all sober expositors do betake themselves unto. The true, real posture of these things was after this manner: In the closed ark there was nothing at all but the two tables of stone. Before it, or at the ends of it, adjoining unto it, were the pot of manna and the miracle-working rod. Neither of these was of any actual use in the service of God, but only were kept as sacred memorials. Unto this end being placed by it, they were joined unto and reckoned with the ark. This appurtenance of them unto the ark the apostle expresseth by the preposition ἐν, from the Hebrew עַל. Now this preposition is so frequently used in the Scripture to signify adhesion, conjunction, approximation, appurtenance of one thing unto another, that it is mere cavilling to assign it any other signification in this place, or to restrain it unto inclusion only, the things themselves requiring that sense. See <sup><18120></sup>Job 19:20;

<sup><600></sup>Deuteronomy 6:7; <sup><912></sup>1 Samuel 1:24; <sup><301></sup>Hosea 4:3; <sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:10; <sup><1212></sup>Matthew 21:12; <sup><1217></sup>Luke 1:17. And a multitude of instances are gathered by others

**Ver. 5.** —”And over it the cherubim of glory, shadowing the mercy-seat; of which things we cannot now speak particularly.”

The apostle proceedeth in his description of the immediate appurtenances of the ark. He hath declared what was disposed with reference unto it, as the golden censer; what was before it, as the pot of manna and Aaron’s rod; what was within it, namely, the tables of the covenant; now he showeth what was over it: so giving an account of its whole furniture, and all that any way belonged unto it.

Two things he adds, namely,

1. The cherubim;
2. The mercy-seat.

And first he describes the cherubim,

- (1.) By their *positure*; they were “over the ark:”
- (2.) By their *title*; “*cherubim* of glory:”
- (3.) Their *use*; they “shadowed the mercy-seat.”

1. The making, form, fashion, and use of these cherubim, are declared, Exodus 25: The signification of the name, and their original shape or form, any further than that they were “*alata animata*,” “winged creatures,” are not certainly known. Most, as unto the derivation of the name, follow Kimchi; who affirms the letter caph to be servile, and a note of similitude, and the word to signify “a youth or a child.” Such these images are thought to represent; only they had wings instead of arms, as we now usually paint angels; for their bodies, sides, and feet are mentioned in other places, <sup><300></sup>Isaiah 6:2. See <sup><300></sup>Ezekiel 1:5-7, where they are expressly said to have “the shape of a man.” Wherefore, both as they were first framed for the tabernacle, and afterwards for the temple, when their dimensions were exceedingly enlarged, they were of human shape; only with wings, to denote the angelical nature.



There were two of them, one at each end of the ark or mercy-seat. Their faces were turned inwards, one towards another, so as that their wings touched one another. This posture gave unto the whole work of the ark, mercy-seat, and cherubim, the form of a seat, which represented the throne of God. From thence he spake; whence the whole was called **וְרִבִּי**, “the oracle.”

As unto their place and posture, they were over the ark. For these cherubim had feet whereon they stood, <sup><4483></sup>2 Chronicles 3:13. And these feet were joined in one continued beaten work unto the ends of the mercy-seat which was upon the ark; wherefore they were wholly over it, or above it, as the apostle here speaks.

As unto the appellation whereby he describes them, it is “cherubim of glory;” that is, say expositors generally, **χερουζιμ ἔνδοξα**, — “glorious cherubim.” If so, this term is not given them from the matter whereof they were made. Those, indeed, in the tabernacle were of beaten gold, being but of a small measure or proportion, <sup><10258></sup>Exodus 25:18. Those in the temple of Solomon were made of the wood of the olive tree, only overlaid with gold; for they were very large, extending their wings unto the whole breadth of the oracle, which was twenty cubits, <sup><11023></sup>1 Kings 6:23-28; <sup><4480></sup>2 Chronicles 3:10-13. But such was the matter of other utensils also, as the candlestick, which yet is not called the candlestick of glory. Nor are they so called from their shape and fashion; for this, as I have showed, most probably was human shape with wings, wherein there was nothing peculiarly glorious. But they are so called from their posture and use; for, stretching out their wings on high, and looking inwards with an appearance of veneration, and so compassing the mercy-seat with their wings, all but the fore part of it, they made a representation of a glorious seat or throne, wherein the majestical presence of God did sit and reside. And from between these cherubim, above the mercy-seat, it was that God spake unto Moses, and gave out his oracles, <sup><10252></sup>Exodus 25:22; as a man on a throne speaks above the place where he sits and rests. Hence may they be called the “glorious cherubim.”

But I must add, that by “glory” here, the majestical presence of God himself is intended. The cherubim represented the glorious presence of God himself, as he dwelt among the people. So the apostle, reckoning up

the privileges of the Hebrews, <sup><810></sup>Romans 9:4, affirms that unto them appertained “the adoption and the glory.” And therein not the ark is intended, although it may be that is sometimes called “the glory;” or signified under that name, as <sup><802></sup>1 Samuel 4:21, 22, <sup><808></sup>Psalms 26:8; but it is God himself in his peculiar residence among the people, —that is, in the representation of his presence which is in Christ, who is Immanuel, and therefore called “the glory of Israel,” <sup><823></sup>Luke 2:32. The cherubim being designed to make a representation hereof, as we shall immediately declare, are called the “cherubim of glory.”

As unto their use, it is expressed by *κατασκιάζοντα*. The Hebrew word in that language is of the masculine gender, but the apostle here useth it in the neuter, as appears by this participle; and so do the LXX. where they make mention of them. This, as some suppose, is done because for the most part they had the form of brute creatures; for so they say they had four faces, of a man, of a lion, of an ox, and of an eagle. But although there was this form in the appearance of them made unto Ezekiel, <sup><810></sup>Ezekiel 1:10; yet was it not so of those images in the tabernacle, nor of them afterwards in the temple. But the only reason of this construction is, that Hebrew word not being translated as unto its signification, but literally transferred into the Greek language, is looked on as indeclinable, as all words foreign unto a language are, and belonging unto the neuter gender. “Shadowing,” “covering,” “protecting,” *כַּבֵּד*, <sup><823></sup>Exodus 25:20, “They shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering over the mercy-seat with their wings;” or, “their wings covering over the mercy-seat.” But this office of the cherubim we cannot understand, until we have declared what was that mercy-seat which they so covered over, and which the apostle makes mention of in the last place.

**2.** The making and frame of it is declared, <sup><827></sup>Exodus 25:17. In the Hebrew it is called *capporeth*, or *cipporeth*, from *caphar*. The verb in Kal signifies “to cover,” “to pitch over,” and thereby to cover, <sup><804></sup>Genesis 6:14. Thence is *capporeth*, “a covering.” But this *cipporeth* is rendered by our apostle *ἱλαστήριον*, a “propitiatory,” a “mercy-seat;” as it is also by the LXX. sometimes, and sometimes by *ἐπίθημα*, an “imposed covering.” But whereas, in allusion hereunto, the Lord Christ is said to be *ἱλαστήριον*, <sup><812></sup>Romans 3:25; and *ἱλασμός*, <sup><811></sup>1 John 2:2; that sense must be taken in, and so it is constantly rendered by our translation “the mercy-seat.” And

in that sense it is derived from *cipper* in Pihel, which signifies “to remove or take away,” and consequently “to be propitious and merciful in taking away of sin;” as also “to appease,” “atone,” “reconcile,” and “purge,” whereby sin is taken away. See <sup><0132></sup>Genesis 32:20, “to appease;” <sup><1164></sup>Proverbs 16:14, “to pacify;” <sup><0563></sup>Psalms 65:3, “to purge away,” applied to sin; <sup><0738></sup>Psalms 78:38, “to forgive iniquities;” <sup><0518></sup>Deuteronomy 21:8, “to be merciful;” <sup><0790></sup>Psalms 79:9, “to expiate.” Thence is “the day of expiation,” the great day of fast unto the Jews. This is the fast which was said to be over, in the storm that Paul and his companions were in; for it was on the tenth day of the seventh month, about which season navigation is dangerous, Hence cipporeth is rendered *ἰλαστήριον*, “a mercy-seat.” Yet if we will have respect also unto the first sense of the verb, and its use in Exodus, we may render it “a covering mercy-seat.” The matter of this mercy-seat was of “pure beaten gold;” the measures of it exactly commensurate and answering unto that of the ark; “two cubits and an half the length of it, and a cubit and an half the breadth of it,” <sup><0250></sup>Exodus 25:10-16. As unto the use of it, it was put *עַל-הָאָרֶן מִלְּמַעַלָּה*, verse 21, — “above upon the ark.” What was the thickness of it, there is no mention. The Jews say it was an hand-breadth; which is not likely. However, it was of considerable substance; for the cherubim were beaten out of it, at its ends, verses 18, 19. For the situation and posture of it, some suppose that it was held in the hands of the cherubim, at a good distance from the ark. And the reason they give for this conjecture is, that so it did best represent a throne. The mercy-seat was as the *seat of it*, and the ark *as the footstool*; for so they say it is called when the church is invited to “worship at his footstool,” <sup><0905></sup>Psalms 99:5. But this reason indeed everts the supposition which it was produced to confirm. For the ark and mercy-seat being exactly oommensurate, and the one placed directly over the other, it could have no appearance of a footstool, which must be placed before the seat itself. Nor is there any mention of the hands of the cherubim, as there is directly of their feet, in those made by Solomon. Nor is it probable they had any, but only wings instead of them; although those in Ezekiel’s vision, as they served the providence of God, had “the hands of a man under their wings,” <sup><0108></sup>Ezekiel 1:8. Nor could it be called a covering unto the ark, if it were at that distance from it, as this conceit will make it to be. It was therefore laid immediately on the ark, so as the cherubim were represented to be above the throne; as the seraphim were in Isaiah’s

vision, <sup>(216)</sup>Isaiah 6:2. It had, as we observed, the just dimension of the ark. But the ark had “a crown of gold round about” it; that is, on its sides and its ends, <sup>(251)</sup>Exodus 25:11, 37:2. But this crown or fringe of gold was so placed on the outsides of it, that it diminished nothing of its proportion of two cubits and a half in length and a cubit and a half in breadth. Wherefore the mercy-seat being exactly of the same measure, it fell in upon it, on the inside of the border or crown of gold.

It remains only that we inquire whether it was itself the covering of the ark, or whether the ark had a covering of its own, which it was placed upon. It is certain that the ark was open when the testimony, or tables of stone with the law written in them, was put into it. And there is no mention of the opening or shutting of it, how it should be closed and fastened when the tables were put into it. These things, I suppose, would not have been omitted, had it *had a covering of its own*. Besides, it is certain that this propitiatory, and the cherubim belonging thereunto, were never to be separated from the ark; and when the ark was removed and carried by the staves, they were carried upon it. This is evident from hence, because, whereas all the other golden utensils had rings and staves wherewith they were borne, these had none, but must be carried in the hands of men, if they were not inseparable from the ark. And when the men of Beth-shemesh looked into the ark, it doth not appear that they first took off the mercy-seat with the cherubim, and then brake up the covering of the ark; but only lifted up the mercy-seat by the cherubim, which opened the ark, and discovered what was therein, <sup>(166)</sup>1 Samuel 6:19. I do judge, therefore, that this mercy-seat was the only covering of the ark above, falling in close within the crown of gold, exactly answering it in its dimensions. Out of this mercy-seat, of the same substance with it, and contiguous unto it, the cherubim being formed, their wings which were above, some distance from it, being turned towards it, did overshadow it, giving a representation of a glorious throne.

This is a brief description of the utensils of the most holy place. The ark, which was as the heart and center of the whole, was placed at the west end of it, with its ends towards the sides of the place, the face as unto the entrance, and the back part unto the west end. Before it was placed the pot of manna, and the rod that budded, as afterwards; at one end of it was placed the book of the law. In the ark was the testimony, or the two tables

of stone with the law written in them by the finger of God, and nothing else. When they were put into it, it was covered with the mercy-seat, and that shadowed with the wings of the cherubim. At the entrance into it was the golden altar of incense, with the golden censer; which although, as our apostle shows, it did in its use principally respect the service of this part of the tabernacle, yet could not be placed within the veil, because the high priest was not to enter himself until he had raised a cloud of incense, through which he entered.

The apostle having given this account of the sanctuary in both parts of it, and what was contained in them, adds, “Of which we now cannot speak particularly;” or rather, “Concerning which things it is not now a season to speak particularly,” or of the several parts of it, one by one. And the reason hereof was, because he had an especial design to manage, from the consideration of the whole fabric, —the service of the high priest in it; which the particular consideration of each part by itself would have too much diverted him from. Howbeit he plainly intimates that all, and every one of them in particular, were of singular consideration, as *typical of the Lord Christ and his ministry*. For unto this end doth he reckon them up in order. Only it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost not to give unto the church a particular application of them in this place, but he hath left it unto our humble diligence to seek after it out of the Scripture, according unto the analogy of faith, and such rules of the interpretation of those mysteries as himself giveth, in the ensuing declaration of their nature, use, and end in general. This, therefore, I shall briefly endeavor; yet so as, according unto the example of the apostle, not to divert from the especial design of the place.

As was said before so must I say again, expositors either pass by these things without any notice, or indulge unto various conjectures, without any certain rule of what they assert. Those of the Roman church are generally so taken up with their fourfold sense of the Scripture, literal, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical, —wherein for the most part they know not how to distinguish one from another, —that they wrest this and the like passages unto what sense they please. I shall keep myself unto a certain rule, and where that will not guide me, I shall not venture on any conjectures.

When Ezekiel had his vision of God in the administration of his providence, he says of it,

“This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD,” <sup>2013</sup> Ezekiel 1:28.

And we may say of this holy place with its furniture, ‘This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD in the administration of grace.’

Why God would in this manner, by these means, represent himself and the glory of his grace absolutely, we can give no reason but his own holy will and infinite wisdom. But this we find he did, and that with great solemnity. For first he made a glorious representation of it immediately by his own power in the mount. He showed a pattern of it in the mount; which was not only an exemplar of what he would have framed here below, but expressive of the idea in his own mind of good things to come. And thereon he gave command that it should in all things be made exactly according unto that pattern, enabling certain persons with wisdom, skill, and understanding so to do. And some things we may observe concerning the whole in general.

**1.** The *nature* of the things themselves, or the materials of the whole, being earthly, and the state of the church unto whose service it was allotted being imperfect, and designed so to be, two things did necessarily follow thereon: —

**(1.)** That sundry concernments of it, as the outward shape, form, and dimensions both of the tabernacle and all its utensils, were accommodated unto the present state of the church. Hence were they made outwardly glorious and venerable; for the people being comparatively carnal, were affected with such things. Hence were they all portable also, at their first institution, to comply with the state of the people in the wilderness; whence alterations were made in all of them, excepting the ark and mercy-seat, on the building of the temple. In these things, therefore, we are not to seek for any mystical signification, for they were only in compliance with present use. They served, as the apostle immediately declares, unto the use of “carnal ordinances,” which were to continue unto the time of reformation only.

(2.) That the resemblance of heavenly things in them was but dark and obscure, as the apostle expressly affirms, <sup><small>scrit></sup> Hebrews 10:1. This both the nature of the things themselves, being earthly and carnal, with that state wherein the church was to be kept unto the fulness of time, did require.

2. This yet is certain and indubitable, —which gives us our stable rule of the interpretation of their significancy, —that God chose this way and these means to represent his glorious presence in and with the LORD Christ, unto all the ends of his mediation. For with respect unto them it is said that “in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” <sup><small>scrit></sup> Colossians 2:9; namely, as it dwelt *typically* in the tabernacle by the outward pledges of his especial presence. Whence he concludes that they were all “a shadow,” whereof “the body was Christ,” verse 17. But we need seek for no further testimony hereunto than the express design of the apostle in this place. For his whole discourse, in this and the ensuing chapter, is to manifest the representation of Christ in them all. And those who would have only an application to be made of something unto Christ by way of accommodation or allusion, as the Socinians contend, do reject the wisdom of God in their institution, and expressly contradict the whole scope of the apostle. We have, therefore, nothing else to do but to find out the resemblance which, as an effect of divine wisdom, and by virtue of divine institution, was in them unto God’s being in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. And to this end the things ensuing may be observed:

---

(1.) The *spring, the life and soul* of all this service, was the *decalogue*, “the ten words,” written in tables of stone, called “the tables of the covenant.” This is the eternal, unalterable rule of our relation unto God as rational creatures, capable of moral obedience and eternal rewards. Hereunto all this service related, as prefiguring the way whereby the church might be freed from the guilt of its transgression, and obtain the accomplishment of it in them and for them. For, —

[1.] It was given and prescribed unto the people, and by them accepted, as the *terms of God’s covenant*, before any of these things were revealed or appointed, <sup><small>scrit></sup> Deuteronomy 5:2-27. Wherefore all these following institutions did only manifest how that covenant should be complied withal and fulfilled.

[2.] It was written in *tables of stone*, and those renewed after they were broken, before any of these things were prepared or erected, <sup><130></sup>Exodus 34:1. God, by the occasional breaking of the first tables, on the sin of the people, declared that there was no keeping, no fulfilling of that covenant, before the provision made in these ordinances was granted unto the people.

[3.] The *ark was made and appointed* for no other end but to *preserve and keep these tables of the covenant*, or testimony of God, <sup><1236></sup>Exodus 25:16. And it was hereon the great token and pledge of the presence of God among the people, wherein his glory dwelt among them. So the wife of Phinehas the priest made the dying confession of her faith: she said, "The glory is departed from Israel, for the ark of God is taken," <sup><002></sup>1 Samuel 4:22. Wherefore, —

[4.] All other things, the *whole tabernacle*, with all the furniture, utensils, and services of it, were made and appointed *to minister unto the ark*; and when the ark was removed from them they were of no use nor signification. Wherefore, when it was absent from the tabernacle, "all the house of Israel lamented after the LORD," <sup><002></sup>1 Samuel 7:2; for the remaining tabernacle was no longer unto them a pledge of his presence. And therefore, when Solomon afterwards had finished all the glorious work of the temple, with all that belonged unto it, "he assembled all the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel, that they might bring up the ark of the covenant into its place" in the temple, <sup><1001></sup>1 Kings 8:1-4. Before this was done, all that glorious and costly structure was of no sacred use. This order of things doth sufficiently evidence that the spring of all these services lay in the tables of the covenant.

(2.) This law, as unto the *substance* of it, was the only *law of creation*, the rule of the first covenant of works; for it contained the sum and substance of that obedience which is due unto God from all rational creatures made in his image, and nothing else. It was the whole of what God designed in our creation unto his own glory and our everlasting blessedness. What was in the tables of stone was nothing but a transcript of what was written in the heart of man originally; and which is returned thither again by the grace of the new covenant, <sup><2633></sup>Jeremiah 31:33; <sup><4002></sup>2 Corinthians 3:3.



(3.) Although this law as a covenant was broken and disannulled *by the entrance of sin*, and became insufficient as unto its first ends, of the justification and salvation of the church thereby, <sup><RBB></sup>Romans 8:3; yet as a *law and rule of obedience* it was never disannulled, nor would God suffer it to be. Yea, one principal design of God in Christ was, that it might be fulfilled and established, <sup><HBT></sup>Matthew 5:17, 18; <sup><RBB></sup>Romans 3:31. For to reject this law, or to abrogate it, had been for God to have laid aside that glory of his holiness and righteousness which in his infinite wisdom he designed therein. Hence, after it was again broken by the people as a covenant, he wrote it a second time himself in tables of stone, and caused it to be safely kept in the ark, as his perpetual testimony. That, therefore, which he taught the church by and in all this, in the first place, was, that this law was to be fulfilled and accomplished, or they could have no advantage of or benefit by the covenant.

(4.) This law was given unto the people with great *dread and terror*. Hereby were they taught, and did learn, that they were no way able of themselves to answer or stand before the holiness of God therein. Hereon they desired that, on the account thereof, they might not appear immediately in the presence of God, but that they might have a *mediator* to transact all things between God and them, <sup><RBB></sup>Deuteronomy 5:22-27.

(5.) God himself by all ways declared, that if he should deal with the people according unto the tenor and rigor of this law, they could not stand before him. Wherefore on all occasions he calls them to place their confidence, not in their *own obedience* thereunto, but in *his mercy and grace*. And that this was their faith, themselves professed on all occasions. See <sup><SDB></sup>Psalms 130:3, 4, 143:2.

(6.) All this God instructed them in, by those *mystical vessels* of the most holy place. For after the tables were put into the ark, as under his eye and in his presence, he ordained that it should be covered with the mercy-seat. For hereby he did declare both that the law was to be kept and fulfilled, and yet that mercy should be extended unto them.

(7.) This great mystery he instructed them in three ways:

[1.] In that the *covering of the ark was a propitiatory, a mercy-seat*; and that its use was to cover the law in the presence of God. This was a great

instruction; for if God should mark iniquities according unto the law, who should stand?

[2.] In that the *blood of the atonement for sin was brought into the holy place and sprinkled on the mercy-seat*, <sup><B16></sup>Leviticus 16:14. And this was done seven times, to denote the perfection of the reconciliation that was made. And herein were they also taught, that the covering of the law by the mercy-seat, so as that mercy and pardon might be granted notwithstanding the sentence and curse of the law, was from the atonement made for sin by the expiatory sacrifice.

[3.] By the *cloud of incense* that covered both ark and mercy-seat, testifying that God received from thence a savor of rest, <sup><B16></sup>Leviticus 16:13.

(8.) The *cherubim*, or angels under that denomination, were the ministers of God in executing *the curse and punishment* on man when, after his sin, he was driven out of the garden of God, <sup><B24></sup>Genesis 3:24. Hence ensued a fear and dread of angels on all mankind, which they abused unto manifold superstitions. But now, to testify that all things in heaven and earth should be reconciled and brought under one head, <sup><B10></sup>Ephesians 1:10, there was a representation of their ministry in this great mystery of the law and the mercy-seat. Wherefore they are ready unto the ministry of the church of mankind, all things being now reconciled, <sup><B14></sup>Hebrews 1:14, purely with respect unto the mercy-seat which their faces were turned towards, and which they shadowed with their wings.

(9.) Yet was this *mystery so great*, —namely, that which was represented by these types, —that the angels themselves were *to bow down to look into it*, <sup><B12></sup>1 Peter 1:12. So are they here represented in a posture of admiration and adoration. And in their overshadowing of the mercy-seat with their wings, they declared how this mystery in the fullness of it was hid from the eyes of all men. See <sup><B8-12></sup>Ephesians 3:8-12.

(10.) The ground was originally blessed of God, to bring forth food for man, for the preservation of his life in that state and condition wherein he was to live unto God according unto the covenant of works, <sup><B29></sup>Genesis 1:29; but upon the entrance of sin it was cursed, neither are the fruits of it any more a token or pledge of the favor of God, nor are they sufficient to

maintain a life unto God, <sup><0087></sup>Genesis 3:17, 18. Wherefore God declared that there must be *bread given the church from heaven*, which might maintain a spiritual life in them. This God did by giving them *manna* in the wilderness. And that all instructions in grace and mercy might be reduced into a head in this holy place, because of that whereof it was a type, a *pot filled with it* was placed for a memorial in this holy place, before the ark and mercy-seat. See <sup><0983></sup>Psalms 78:24, 25; <sup><0631></sup>John 6:31. Hereby were they taught to look for the bread of life from heaven, which should maintain them in their spiritual, and nourish them unto eternal life.

**(11.)** When the whole church was ready to perish for want of water, a *rock was smitten with the rod of Moses*, which brought water out of it unto their refreshment. God taught them thereby that the Rock of Ages was to be smitten with the rod of the law, that the waters of life might be brought forth thereby, <sup><0004></sup>1 Corinthians 10:4. Wherefore this rod also was laid up for an instructive memorial before the ark.

In all these things did God instruct the church by the tabernacle, especially by this most holy place, the utensils, furniture, and services of it. And the end of them all was, to give them such a representation of the mystery of his grace in Christ Jesus as was meet for the state of the church before his actual exhibition in the flesh. Hence he is declared in the gospel to be the body and substance of them all. And I shall endeavor, with all humble reverence, to make that application of them unto him which Scripture light guides us unto.

**1.** In his *obedience unto God* according unto the law he is the true *ark*, wherein the law was kept inviolate; that is, was fulfilled, answered, and accomplished, <sup><0057></sup>Matthew 5:17; <sup><0630></sup>Romans 8:3, 10:4. Hence by God's gracious dealing with sinners, pardoning and justifying them freely, the law is not disannulled, but established, <sup><0031></sup>Romans 3:31. That this was to be done, that without it no covenant between God and man could be firm and stable, was the principal design of God to declare in all this service; without the consideration whereof it was wholly insignificant. This was the original mystery of all these institutions, that in and by the obedience of the promised seed, the everlasting, unalterable law should be fulfilled. In him, as the Jews speak, was the "law restored unto its pristine crown," signified by that crown of gold which was round about the ark wherein the

law was kept. Then had the law its crown and glory, when it was fulfilled in Christ. This the church of Israel ought to have learned and believed, and did so whilst they continued to pray for mercy “for the Lord’s sake,” as <sup><207></sup>Daniel 9:17. But afterwards, when they rejected the knowledge hereof, and adhered unto the law absolutely as written in tables of stone, they utterly perished, <sup><188></sup>Romans 9:31-33, <sup><102></sup>10:2, 3. And they do all yet, what lieth in them, return unto the material ark and tables of stone, who reject the accomplishment of the law in and by Jesus Christ.

**2.** He was the *mercy-seat*; that is, he was represented by it. So the apostle speaks expressly, “God set him forth to be *ἱλαστήριον*,” <sup><188></sup>Romans 3:25, — “a propitiation;” that is, to answer the mercy-seat and what was signified thereby. And this was to cover the law under the eye of God. He interposeth between God and his throne and the law, that he may not enter into judgment with us in pursuit of the curse of it. The law required obedience, and threatened the curse in case of disobedience. With respect unto the obedience which it required, Christ was the ark in whom it was fulfilled; and with respect unto the curse of the law, he was the mercy-seat or propitiation whereby atonement was made, that the curse should not be inflicted, <sup><188></sup>Galatians 3:13.

**3.** It was *his blood in figure* that was carded into the holy place to make atonement, as the apostle declares at large in this chapter. The efficacy of his blood, when he offered himself an expiatory sacrifice for sin unto God, prevailed for an atonement in the holy place not made with hands. See <sup><188></sup>Hebrews 10:11-14.

**4.** It is his *intercession* that is the *cloud of incense* which covers the ark and mercy-seat. This gives a continual sweet savor unto God from his oblation, and renders acceptable all the worship of the church in their approaches unto him, <sup><188></sup>Revelation 8:3. These things did God instruct the church in by types and figures, to prepare their faith for the receiving of him at his actual oblation. And on the representation so made of him, all that truly believed lived in the expectation of him and longing after him, with the departure of these shadows of good things to come, <sup><217></sup>Cant. 2:17, 4:6, <sup><218></sup>8:14; <sup><217></sup>Luke 10:24; <sup><101></sup>1 Peter 1:10, 11. And the refusal of this instruction was that which ruined this church of the Hebrews.

**5.** It was *He* who took off the *original curse of the law*, whose first execution was committed unto the cherubim, when man was driven out of the garden, and kept from all approaches unto the tree of life. Hereby he made reconciliation between them and the elect church of God, <sup>4010</sup>Ephesians 1:10. Hence have they now a ministry with respect unto the mercy-seat, for the good of “the heirs of salvation,” <sup>4014</sup>Hebrews 1:14.

**6.** He was the *bread of life*, typed by the *manna* kept in the golden pot before the mercy-seat; for he alone is the nourishment of the spiritual life of men. The mystery hereof himself at large declares, <sup>4031</sup>John 6:31-35. This were they taught to expect in the memorial of that heavenly food which was preserved in the sanctuary.

**7.** He was that *spiritual rock* which was smitten with the *rod of Moses*, the curse and stroke of the law. Hereon the waters of life flowed from him, for the quickening and refreshment of the church, <sup>4033</sup>1 Corinthians 10:3, 4.

Thus was the Lord Christ all and in all from the beginning. And as the general design of the whole structure of the tabernacle, with all that belonged thereunto, was to declare that God was reconciled to sinners, with a blessed provision for the glory of his holiness and the honor of the law, which is in and by Jesus Christ alone; so every thing in it directed unto his person, or his grace, or some act of his mediation. And two things do now attend all these institutions:

**1.** As they are interpreted by gospel light, they are a glorious representation of the wisdom of God, and a signal confirmation of faith in Him who was prefigured by them.

**2.** Take them in themselves, separated from this end, and they give no representation of any one holy property of the nature of God, —nothing of his wisdom, goodness, greatness, love, or grace; but are low and carnal, base and beggarly. And that we may have a due apprehension of them, some things in general concerning them may be considered.

**1.** The whole scheme, frame, fashion, use, and service of the tabernacle, with all that belonged thereunto, was a mere arbitrary effect of the sovereign will and pleasure of God. Why he would by this way and by these means declare himself appeased unto the church, and that he would graciously dwell amongst them; why he would by them type out and

prefigure the incarnation and mediation of Christ, —no other reason can be given but his own will, which in all things is to be adored by us. Other ways and means unto the same ends were not wanting unto divine wisdom, but this in the good pleasure of his will he determined on. In the supreme authority of God was the church absolutely to acquiesce whilst it was obliged unto the observation of these ordinances, and other reason of them they could not give. And whereas their use is now utterly ceased, yet do they abide on the holy record, as some think the fabric of heaven and earth shall do after the final judgment, to be monuments of his wisdom and sovereignty. But the principal ends of the preservation of this memorial in the sacred record are two:

(1.) That it may be a perpetual testimony unto the prescience, faithfulness, and power of God. His infinite prescience is testified unto, in the prospect which therein he declares himself to have had of the whole future frame of things under the gospel, which he represented therein; his faithfulness and power, in the accomplishment of all those things which were prefigured by them.

(2.) That it might testify the abundant grace and goodness of God unto the church of the new testament, which enjoyeth the substance of all those spiritual things, whereof of old he granted only the types and shadows. Wherefore, —

2. It must be acknowledged, that the *instruction* given by these things into the mysteries of the will of God, and consequently all those teachings which were influenced and guided by them, were *dark, obscure, and difficult* to be rightly apprehended and duly improved. Hence the way of teaching under the old testament was one reason for the abolishing of that covenant, that a more effectual way of instruction and illumination might be introduced. This is declared at large in the exposition of the preceding chapter. There was need for them all to go up and down, every one unto his brother, and every one unto his neighbor, saying, “Know the LORD;” for the true knowledge of him, and of the mysteries of his will, was by these means very difficult to be obtained. And now that the Jews have lost all that prospect unto the promised seed which their forefathers had in these things, it is sad to consider what work they make with them. They have turned the whole of all legal institutions into such an endless,

scrupulous, superstitious observance of carnal rites, in all imaginable circumstances, as never became the divine wisdom to appoint, as is marvellous that any of the race of mankind should enbondage themselves unto. Yea, now that all things are plainly fulfilled in Christ, some among ourselves would have the most of them to have represented heaven and the planets, the fruits of the earth, and I know not what besides. But this was the way which the infinite wisdom of God fixed on for the instruction of the church in the state then allotted unto it.

**3.** This instruction was *sufficient* unto the end of God, in the edification and salvation of them that did believe. For these things being diligently and humbly inquired into, they gave that image and resemblance of the work of God's grace in Christ which the church was capable of in that state, before its actual accomplishment. Those who were wise and holy among them, knew full well that all these things in general were but types of better things; and that there was something more designed of God in the pattern showed unto Moses than what they did contain. For Moses made and did all things

“for a testimony unto what should be spoken afterwards,”

<RRB> Hebrews 3:5.

In brief, they all of them believed that through the Messiah, the promised seed, they should really receive all that grace, goodness, pardon, mercy, love, favor, and privilege, which were testified unto in the tabernacle and all the services of it. And because they were not able to make distinct, particular applications of all these things unto his mediatory actings, their faith was principally fixed on the person of Christ, as I have elsewhere demonstrated. And with respect unto him, his sufferings, and his glory, they diligently inquired into these things, <GMB> 1 Peter 1:11. And this was sufficient unto that faith and obedience which God then required of the church. For, —

**4.** Their *diligent inquiry into these things*, and the meaning of them, was the principal exercise of their faith and subjection of soul unto God; for even in these things also did “the Spirit testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that did follow.” And as the exercise of faith herein was acceptable unto God, so the discoveries of grace which they received therein were refreshing unto their souls; for hereby they often saw the

King in his beauty, and beheld the pleasant land, which was far off,  
2387Isaiah 33:17.

**5.** That worship which was *outwardly performed* in and by these things was full of beauty and glory, 2 Corinthians 3. It was also suited to beget a due reverence of the majesty and holiness of God. It was God's way of worship, it was God's order; and so had characters of divine wisdom upon it. Wherefore, although the people were originally obliged unto the observance of it by the mere sovereign will and pleasure of God, yet the things themselves were so beautiful and glorious, as nothing but the substance of the things themselves in Christ could excel. This made the devil as it were steal away so many rites of the tabernacle worship, and turn them unto his own use in the idolatry of the nations.

**6.** It is a sad instance of the degeneracy of the corrupted nature of man, that whereas all these things were appointed for no other end but to signify beforehand the coming of Christ, his sufferings, and the glory that ensued; the principal reason why the church of the Jews rejected him at his coming was, that they preferred these institutions and their carnal use above and before him who was the substance and life of them all. And no otherwise will it fall out with them all who prefer any thing in religion before him, or suppose that any thing is accepted with God without him. Some things we may also observe in general, for our own instruction, from what we have discoursed on this occasion: —

**Obs. VII.** Although the sovereign will and pleasure of God be the only reason and original cause of all instituted worship, yet there is, and ever was, in all his institutions, such an evidence of divine wisdom and goodness as gives them beauty, desirableness, and usefulness unto their proper end. — There is that in them which, unto an enlightened mind, will distinguish them for ever from the most plausible inventions of men, advanced in the imitation of them. Only a diligent inquiry into them is expected from us, 2388Psalm 111:2, 3. When men have slight considerations of any of God's institutions, when they come unto them without a sense that there is divine wisdom in them, that which becomes him from whom they are, it is no wonder if their glory be hid from them. But when we diligently and humbly inquire into any of the ways of God, to find out the





Εἰς τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν. Vulg. Lat., “in priori tabernaculo;” for “in prius tabernaculum.” Syr., **לְמִשְׁכְּנָא בְּיַיָּא**, “into the outward tabernacle;” that is, of those parts mentioned by the apostle.

Διαπαντός. Vulg. Lat., “semper,” “always.” Syr., **בְּכָל-זְמַן**, “in omnitempore;” others generally, “quovis tempore;” “at every season,” at any time, as occasion required.

Τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες. Vulg. Lat., “sacrificiorum officia consummantes,” “perfecting to this part” or “offices of the sacrifices;” but the sacrifices belonged not at all unto the duties of the tabernacle. Syr., **וּמְשַׁלְּמִין הָיוּ תְּשַׁמְּשִׁהוּן**, “and they were perfecting their ministry.” “Ritus obeuntes,” “cultus obeuntes;” Beza, “ritus cultus obeuntes;” — “performing the rites of sacred worship.”

Εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν. Vulg. Lat., “in secundo autem.” Syr., **דִּין** **דְּלִגְו מִנְה לְמִשְׁכְּנָא**, “and into the tabernacle that was within it,” or “within the other.” “In secundum autem,” “sed in alterum;” “but into the second,” or “the other.”

Ἄπαξ. Syr., **הוּ אֶחָד**; which Boderus renders substantively, “unum est,” “that inward tabernacle was one.” But the reference is unto what follows, and is better rendered adverbially, “semel,” “once.”

Ὅν χωρὶς αἵματος, “non sine sanguine.” Syr., “cum sanguine illo,” “with that blood.”

Ὁ προσφέρει. Vulg. Lat., Eras., “quem offert;” Syr., “which he was offering,” “which he offereth.” **Ψπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν λαοῦ ἄγνοημάτων**. Vulg. Lat., pro sua et populi ignorantia;” very corruptly. Syr., **חֶלְף נַפְשָׁה וְחֶלְף סְכָלוּתָה דְּעָמָא**, “for his own soul, and the errors of the people;” rightly.

**Ver. 6, 7.** — Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service [*of God.*] But into the second [*went*] the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and [*for*] the errors of the people.

I follow the common translation, but shall take notice of what it seems defective in. And there is in the words, —

**First**, A *supposition* of what was before declared, as the foundation of what he was now further to assert: “Now when these things were thus ordained.” And there is therein,

1. The manner of the inference;
2. The subject spoken of;
3. What is spoken of it: —

1. The *manner* of the inference is the particle **δέ**, which we ponder “now when;” “*vero*,” “*but*.” “Now when” is included in the tense of the participle,

2. The *subject* spoken of, **τούτων**, “these things;” that is, the things spoken of in the precedent verses, —namely, the two parts of the tabernacle, and the sacred furniture of them.

3. That *which is affirmed of them* is, that they were “ordained.” And the manner thereof is also added, that they were “thus ordained,” — **κατεσκευασμένων**. Beza once rendered it by “ordinatis;” whom I suppose ours follow, rendering it by “ordained.” But “ordinatis” is rather “ordered” than “ordained.” “To be ordained,” signifies the appointment and designation of them; and so they were ordained of God: but that which is here expressed is their building, framing, finishing, and disposition into their actual order. So the word is used for the making of the tabernacle, verse 2: “A tabernacle was made.” “These things being prepared, made, and finished.” The preparation, structure, and finishing of the tabernacle, and all its utensils, with their disposition into their sacred order, are respected in this word. They were “disposed” **οὕτω**, “thus;” that is, in the manner declared, —that the tabernacle should consist of two parts, that the one should contain such and such holy utensils, and the other those of another sort.

**Secondly**, When these things were thus prepared and *ordered*, they stood not for a *magnificent show*, but were designed unto *constant use* in the service of God. This the apostle declares, in the same order wherein he had

described the parts of the tabernacle in their distribution into the first and the second, the outward and inward tabernacle.

As to the first tabernacle, wherein were the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, he declares the use of it,

1. With respect unto the *persons* for whose ministry it was ordained;
2. Of that *ministry* itself;
3. Of the *time and season* of its performance.

1. The persons who administered therein were the *priests*. They, and they alone, entered into the sanctuary. All others were forbidden to approach unto it, on pain of excision. These priests, who had this privilege, were all the posterity of Aaron, unless they fell under exception by some legal incapacitating blemish. For a long time, —that is, from the preparing of the tabernacle unto the building of the temple, —they administered in this sanctuary promiscuously, under the care of God and directions of the high priest. For the inspection of the whole was committed in an especial manner unto the high priest, <sup><0046></sup>Numbers 4:16; <sup><3810></sup>Zechariah 3:7; yea, the actual performance of the daily service of this part of the sanctuary was in the first place charged on him, <sup><0221></sup>Exodus 27:21. But the other priests being designed to help and assist him on all occasions, this service in process of time was wholly devolved on them. And if the high priest did at any time minister in this part of the sanctuary, he did it not as the high priest, but as a priest only, for all his peculiar service belonged unto the most holy place.

In process of time, when the priests of the posterity of Aaron were multiplied, and the services of the sanctuary were to be increased by the building of the temple, wherein instead of one candlestick there were ten, David, by God's direction, cast all the priests into twenty-four courses or orders, that should serve in their turns, two courses in a month; which rule continued unto the destruction of the second temple, 1 Chronicles 24; <sup><0005></sup>Luke 1:5. And he did it for sundry ends:

- (1.) That none of the priests of the posterity of Aaron might be utterly excluded from this privilege of approaching unto God in the sanctuary; and if they had been, it is likely they would have disposed of

themselves into other ways and callings, and so have both neglected and defiled the priesthood.

(2.) That there might be no neglect at any time in the solemn ministry, seeing that which lies on all promiscuously is too often neglected by all. For although the high priest was to “keep the charge, to judge the house, and to keep the courts,” <sup><300></sup>Zechariah 3:7, and so take care for the due attendance unto the daily ministration; yet was the provision more certain, when, being ordained by law, or by divine institution, all persons concerned herein knew the times and seasons wherein they might and wherein they ought to attend on the altar. These were the officers that belonged unto the sanctuary, the persons who alone might enter into it on a sacred account. And when the structure of the whole was to be taken down, that it might be removed from one place to another, as it was frequently in the wilderness, the whole was to be done by the priests, and all the holy utensils covered, before the Levites were admitted to draw nigh to carry them, so as they might not touch them at all, <sup><0015></sup>Numbers 4:15.

Yet must it be observed, that although this was the peculiar service of the priests, yet was it not their only service. Their whole sacred employment was not confined unto this their entrance into the sanctuary. There was a work committed unto them, whereon their whole service in the sanctuary did depend. This was the offering of sacrifices; which was accomplished in the court without, on the brazen altar before the door of the tabernacle: which belonged not unto the purpose of the apostle in this place.

This was the great privilege of the priests under the old testament, that they alone might and did enter into the sanctuary, and make an approach unto God. And this privilege they had as they were types of Christ, and no otherwise. But withal it was a great part and a great means of that state of servitude and fear wherein the people or the body of the church was kept. They might not so much as come nigh the pledges of God’s presence; it was forbidden them under the penalty of death and being cut off; whereof they sadly complained, <sup><0172></sup>Numbers 17:12, 13.

This state of things is now changed under the gospel. It is one of the principal privileges of believers, that, being made kings and priests unto God by Jesus Christ, this distinction as unto especial gracious access unto

God is taken away, <sup><606></sup>Revelation 1:5, 6; <sup><428></sup>Ephesians 2:18; <sup><630></sup>Romans 5:2. Neither doth this hinder but that yet there are and ought to be officers and ministers in the house of God, to dispense the holy things of it, and to minister in the name of Christ, For in their so doing they do not hinder, but promote, the approach of the church into the presence of God; which is the principal end of their office. And as this is their peculiar honor, for which they must be accountable, <sup><837></sup>Hebrews 13:17; so the church of believers itself ought always to consider how they may duly improve and walk worthy of this privilege, purchased for them by the blood of Christ.

**2.** The general foundation of the service of these priests in the sanctuary was, that they went or entered into it, — **εἰσίσαιν**. This also itself was a divine ordinance. For this entrance both asserted their privilege, all others being excluded on pain of death, and gave bounds unto it. Hereinto they were to enter; but they were to go ‘no farther: they were not to go into or look into the most holy place, nor to abide in the sanctuary when the high priest entered into it; which the apostle here hath an especial regard unto. They entered into the first tabernacle, but they went no farther. Hereinto they entered through the first veil, or the covering of the door of the tabernacle, <sup><123></sup>Exodus 26:36, 37. Through that veil, by turning it aside, so as that it closed immediately on their entrance, the priests entered into the sanctuary. And this they were to do with an especial reverence of the presence of God; which is the principal design of that command, “Ye shall reverence my sanctuary,” <sup><887></sup>Leviticus 19:30: which is now supplied by the holy reverence of the presence of God in Christ which is in all believers. But moreover, the equity of the command extends itself unto that especial reverence of God which we ought to have in all holy services. And although this be not confined unto any postures or gestures of the body, yet those that naturally express a reverential frame of spirit are necessary unto this duty.

**3.** The time of this their entrance into the sanctuary to discharge their service is expressed. They entered it **διαπαντός**; that is, **χρόνου**, “quovis tempore;” “always,” say we; “jugiter,” that is, “every day.” There was no divine prohibition as unto any days or times wherein they might not enter into the sanctuary, as there was with respect unto the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, which was allowed only once a year. And the services that were required of them made it necessary that they should

enter into it every day. But the word doth not absolutely signify “every day,” seeing there was a special service for which they entered only once a-week; but “always,” is “at all times,” as occasion did require. There was also an especial service, when the high priest entered into the sanctuary, which was neither daily nor weekly, but occasional; which is mentioned, <sup>LEVITICUS 4:6, 7.</sup> For when the anointed priest was to offer a sacrifice for his own sins, he was to carry some of the blood of it into the sanctuary, and sprinkle it towards the veil that was before the most holy place. This he was to do seven times; which is a mystical number, denoting that perfect atonement and expiation of sin which was to be made by the blood of Christ. But this being an occasional service, the apostle seems to have had no respect unto it.

4. The service itself performed by them is expressed: *Τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες*, — “Accomplishing the services.” The expression is sacred, respecting mystical rites and ceremonies, such as were the things here intended: ‘Officiating in the ministry of the sacred ceremonies.’ For *ἐπιτελοῦντες* is not “perfecting” or “accomplishing” only, but “sacredly ministering:” ‘In discharge of the priestly office, accomplishing the sacred services committed unto them.’ And these services were of two sorts:

(1.) Daily.

(2.) Weekly.

(1.) Their daily services were two:

[1.] The *dressings of the lamps* of the candlestick, supplying them with the holy oil, and taking care of all things necessary unto the cleansing of them, that their light might be preserved. This was done morning and evening, a continual service in all generations, — the service of the candlestick, — *λατρεία*.

[2.] The *service of the golden altar*, the altar of incense in the midst of the sanctuary, at the entrance of the most holy place, before or over against the ark of the testimony. Hereon the priests burned incense every day, with fire taken from the altar of burnt-offerings, that was in the court before the door of the tabernacle. This service was performed evening and morning, immediately after the offering of the daily sacrifice on the altar of burnt-offerings. And whilst this service was performed the people gave

themselves to prayer without, with respect unto the sacrifice offered, <sup><BIB></sup>Luke 1:10. For this offering of incense on the sacrifice, and that fired with a coal from the altar whereon the sacrifice was burned, was a type, as we have declared, of the intercession of Christ. For although they understood it not clearly in the notion, yet were true believers guided to express it in their practice. The time of the priest's offering incense they made the time of their own solemn prayers, as believing that the efficacy and acceptance of their prayers depended on what was typified by that incense, <sup><BIB></sup>Psalm 141:2. These were the daily services. It is uncertain whether they were all performed at the same time or no; namely, those of the candlestick and the altar of incense. If they were, it should seem that they were done by no more but one priest at one time; that is, every morning and evening. For of Zacharias it is said, that "it was his lot to burn incense in the temple;" and no other was with him there when he saw the vision, <sup><BIB></sup>Luke 1:8, 9, 21, 22. Wherefore, whereas it is said in the institution of these things, "Aaron and his sons shall do this service," it is intended that some one of them should do it at any one time.

(2.) The weekly service of the sanctuary was the change of the bread on the table of shew-bread. This was performed every Sabbath-day in the morning, and not else.

Now all this daily service was typical. And that which it did represent was the continual application of the benefits of the sacrifice and whole mediation of Christ unto the church here in this world. That the tabernacle itself with the inhabitation of God therein was a type of the incarnation of the Son of God, we have showed before; and have also declared that all the utensils of it were but representations of his grace in the discharge of his office. He is the light and life of the church, the lamp and the bread thereof. The incense of his intercession renders all their obedience acceptable unto God. And therefore there was a continual application made unto these things without intermission every day. And we may thence observe, that,

---

**Obs.** A continual application unto God by Christ, and a continual application of the benefits of the mediation of Christ by faith, are the springs of the light, life, and comfort of the church.



**Ver. 7.** — "But into the second [*went*] the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and [*for*] the errors of the people."

The use and service of the second part of the tabernacle, or the most holy place, which the apostle designeth principally to apply unto his present argument, are declared in this present verse. And he describes them,

1. By the person who alone might perform the service which belonged unto this part of the sanctuary; and this was *the high priest*.
2. By that which in general was required unto the other part of it; *he went into it*. This is not here expressed, but the sense of it is traduced from the foregoing verse. The other priests entered into the sanctuary, and the high priest into *this*; that is, he entered or went into it.
3. From the time and season of this his entrance, which was *once a-year only*; in opposition unto the entrance of the priests into the other part, which was *at all times, every day*.
4. By the manner of his entrance, or what he carried with him to administer or perform the holy service of the place, expressed negatively; *not without blood, —that is, with blood*.
5. From the use of the blood which he so carried in with him; it was that which *he offered for himself and the errors of the people*.

That which the apostle here respects and describes was the great anniversary sacrifice of expiation, whose institution, rites, and solemnities are at large declared, Leviticus 16. And herein, —

1. The *person* designed unto this service was the "high priest alone," and no other person, <sup>(NKJ)</sup> Leviticus 16:2, 32. And he was to be so *alone* as that none were to attend, assist, or accompany him, in any part of the service. Yea, it was so far from it, that any person entered with him into the most holy place, that no one was allowed to be in the other part of the sanctuary, where he might so much as see the veil opened, or look in after him whilst he performed his service, verse 17. As all the people were kept out of the sanctuary and waited at the door whilst the priests entered daily into it; so all the priests were kept without the sanctuary whilst the high priest entered into the most holy place. Hence there was one always

provided, who was next in succession unto that office, to perform this office in case of sickness or occasional pollutions of him who was actually high priest. And he was called “the second priest,” <sup><1258></sup>2 Kings 25:18. From whence, in times of disorder and confusion, they had afterwards two high priests at once, <sup><883></sup>John 18:13, 24. Thus sacredly was the presence of God in the holy place made inaccessible, not only to all the people, but even unto all the priests themselves.

Some say that indeed the high priest went alone into the most holy place once a-year only, but with other priests and on other occasions he might enter oftener. But this is weak beneath consideration; for the express institution was, that he should go alone, and go but once. And this was that great truth which in this ordinance God stated unto the church, namely, that there is no entrance into the gracious presence of God but by the high priest. That the true high priest should take along all believers with him, and give them admission with boldness unto the throne of grace, was, as the apostle declares in the next verse, not as yet made known.

**2.** The way whereby he engaged into this service was, that he *went into this holy place*. This, as we observed before, is not here expressed, but is necessarily traduced from the foregoing verse. And it is his entrance through the veil that is intended; which also was a part of his service. For it was a type both of the entrance of Christ into heaven, and of our entrance by him unto the throne of grace, verse 24, <sup><3008></sup>Hebrews 10:19, 20. This was that veil which in the temple was rent from the top to the bottom upon the death of our Savior, <sup><1251></sup>Matthew 27:51. For hereby the way was laid open into the holy place, and the gracious presence of God discovered unto all that come unto him by Christ.

**3.** The *time* of this service is expressed, that it was only “once every year.” The first order unto this purpose was a prohibition or negative precept, that the high priest “should not come *at all times* into the holy place,” <sup><816></sup>Leviticus 16:2; that is, *not every day, as* he did into the sanctuary, — *not at any time* of his own choice. He might not choose, he might not appoint a time for the service of this holy place, whatever occasion he apprehended of it or necessity for it. Times of sacred worship are the Lord’s, no less than the things of it. Our own stated times are no less disapproved by him than any other parts of sacred worship of our

own finding out, <sup><112></sup>1 Kings 12:32, 33. And as this time of the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place was limited unto “once every year,” which our apostle observes; so the precise day of the year was determined by the law. It was fixed unto “the tenth day of the seventh month,” or Tisri; which, reckoning from Nisan, the beginning of their ecclesiastical year, answers unto our September. This was the great day of atonement, which with the fast of it ensued thereon, <sup><161></sup>Leviticus 16:29.

But whereas it is said that he entered “once every year,” the meaning is, that upon *one day in the year only he did so*, and had liberty so to do: for it is evident that on that day he went *twice into it*; yea, it is most probable that he did *so four times*. He had three offerings or sacrifices to offer on the day of expiation. The first was of a bullock and a ram, for himself and his household, <sup><161></sup>Leviticus 16:3. This the apostle notes distinctly, “which he offered for himself.” Secondly, a goat, for a sin-offering, which he offered for the people, for “the errors of the people,” verse 9. Thirdly, the service of the scape-goat, which also had the nature of a sacrifice, verse 10. Of the first two, whose blood was offered on the altar, it is said distinctly that he carried of the blood into the most holy place. He did so, first that of the bullock and the ram, before he offered the goat for the sins of the people. He killed not the goat until he came out of the holy place, after he had carried in the blood of the sacrifice for himself, verses 11-14. After this he carried in the blood of the goat that was offered for the sins of the people, verse 15. So that of necessity he must enter twice distinctly on that one day into the most holy place.

Yea, it is most probable and almost very certain, that he entered into it four times on that day. For before he carried in the blood, he was to go in with the incense to make a cloud over the mercy-seat. And it is evident that he could not carry in the incense and the blood at the same time: for when he went in with the incense, he had in one hand a censer full of burning coals from the altar, and he so carried it, that besides both his hands were filled with incense, verse 12; so that he could carry no blood with him at that time. And when he carried in the blood also, both his hands were in like manner employed. For with the finger of one he was to sprinkle the blood upon and before the mercy-seat: whence it is of necessity that he must have had the blood which he sprinkled in his other hand; for he was to sprinkle it seven times, which could not be done with

the blood that was at once upon the finger wherewith he sprinkled it. Wherefore this” once every year” is on one day only; for that day he entered four times into the holy place within the veil, as is plain in the order of the service according unto its institution.

When all this was done, that there might be a full representation of the atonement to be made by the Lord Christ, and of the plenary remission of sins by his blood, the high priest laid all the sins of the people on the head of the scape-goat, which carried them away into the wilderness of everlasting oblivion, verses 20-22.

As these institutions were multiplied to typify the one single sacrifice and oblation of the body of Christ, because of the imperfection inseparable from the nature of earthly things, whereby no one of them could absolutely represent it; so in this distinction and distribution of them, the condescension, love, and grace of God, were adorable and glorious. For in the shedding of the blood of the sacrifice, and offering it by fire on the altar, he plainly declared the imputation of the guilt of their sins unto the sacrifice, its bearing of them, and the expiation of their guilt thereby. By carrying of the blood into the holy place, he testified his acceptance of the atonement made, and his reconciliation unto the people. And hereon the full remission and pardon of all their sins, no more to be had in remembrance, was manifested, in the sending away of the scape-goat into the wilderness. Hence the Jews have a saying, that on the day of expiation all Israel were made as innocent as in the day of creation. How all this was accomplished in and by the sacrifice of Christ must be afterwards declared.

**4.** As to the *nature* of this service, the apostle tells us that it was “not without blood.” tie so expresseth it to show the impossibility of entering into the holy place any otherwise. And from hence he takes his ensuing argument of the necessity of the death and blood-shedding of the mediator or high priest of the new testament. “Not without blood;” as he might not do it otherwise, so he did it *by blood*. And this was the manner of the service: After the high priest had filled the most holy place with a cloud of incense, he returned to the altar of burnt-offerings without the tabernacle, where the sacrifice had been newly slain; and whilst the blood of the beast was fresh, and as it were living, <sup><small>Heb 10:20</sup> he took of it in his hand, and entering again into the holy place, he sprinkled it seven times

with his finger towards the mercy-seat, <sup><Orig></sup>Leviticus 16:11-14. And there is, as was said, an emphasis in the expression, “Not without blood,” to manifest how impossible it was that there should be an entrance into the gracious presence of God without the blood of the sacrifice of Christ. The only propitiation for sins is made by the blood of Christ; and it is by faith alone that we are made partakers thereof, <sup><Orig></sup>Romans 3:25, 26.

**5.** This blood is further described by *the use of it*; “which he offered.” Where or when he offered it, is not expressed. In the most holy place there was no use of this blood, but only the sprinkling of it; but the sprinkling of blood was always consequential unto the offering or oblation properly so called. For the oblation consisted principally in the atonement made by the blood at the altar of burnt-offerings. It was given and appointed for that end, to make atonement with it at that altar, as is expressly affirmed, <sup><Orig></sup>Leviticus 17:11. After this, it was sprinkled for purification. Wherefore, by *προσφέρει*, the apostle here renders the Hebrew *אָבִירָה*, used in the institution, <sup><Orig></sup>Leviticus 16:15; which is only to *bring*, and not to *offer* properly. Or he hath respect unto the offering of it that was made at the altar without the sanctuary. The blood which was there offered he brought a part of it with him into the most holy place, to sprinkle it, according unto the institution.

**6.** The apostle declares *for whom* this blood was offered. And this was “for himself and the people;” first for himself, and then for the people. For he hath respect unto the distinct sacrifices that were to be offered on that day. The first was of a bullock and a ram; which was for himself. And this argued, as the apostle observes, the great imperfection of that church-state. They could have no priest to offer sacrifices for the sins of the people, but he must first offer for himself, and that the blood of other creatures. But the true high priest was to offer his own blood; and that not for himself at all, but for others only.

**(1.)** Re offered “for himself;” that is, for his own sins, <sup><Orig></sup>Leviticus 16:6. Wherefore the Vulg. Lat. reads the words, “pro sua et populi ignorantia,” very corruptly, changing the number of the substantive; but very truly applying *ἀγνομάτων* to the priest as well as unto the people. Others would supply the words by adding *τῶν* before *ἑαυτοῦ*, and so repeat *ἀγνομάτων*. But the apostle expresseth the words of the institution,

לִּי-אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, “which for himself,” leaving the application unto the series of the context and the nature of the service: “For himself;” —that is, his own sins.

(2.) The blood was offered also “for the people;” that is, the people of Israel, the people of God, the church, the whole congregation. And as the high priest herein bore the person of Christ, so did this people of all the elect of God, who were represented in them and by them. It was that people, and not the whole world, that the high priest offered for; and it is the elect people alone for whom our great high priest did offer and doth intercede.

7. That which he offered for. It was their “errors,” or their sins. The Socinians, some of them, —not for want of understanding, but out of hatred unto the true sacrifice of Christ, —contend from hence that the anniversary sacrifice on the great day of expiation, the principal representation of it, was only for sins of ignorance, of imbecility and weakness. But it is a fond imagination; at least the argument from these words for it is so. For besides that the Scripture calls all sins by the name of “errors,” <sup><1912></sup>Psalm 19:12, 25:7; and the worst, the most provoking of all sins, is expressed by “erring in heart,” <sup><9510></sup>Psalm 95:10; and the LXX. frequently render “to sin” by ἄγνοεῖν, <sup><4409></sup>2 Chronicles 16:9; <sup><0821></sup>1 Samuel 26:21; <sup><3016></sup>Hosea 4:16, etc; —besides, I say, this application of the word elsewhere unto all sorts of sins, in the enumeration of those errors of the people which the high priest offered for they are said to be

“all their iniquities,” and “all their transgressions in all their sins,”  
<sup><1621></sup>Leviticus 16:21.

Wherefore to offer for the “errors” of the people, is to offer for “all their sins,” of what nature soever they were. And they are thus called, because indeed there is no such predominancy of malice in any sin in this world as wherein there is not a mixture of error, either notional or practical, of the mind or of the heart, which is the cause or a great occasion of it. See <sup><5013></sup>1 Timothy 1:13; <sup><1023></sup>Matthew 12:31, 32. Here, indeed, lies the original of all sin. The mind being filled with darkness and ignorance, alienates the whole soul from the life of God. And as it hath superadded prejudices, which it receives from corrupt affections, it yet neither directs nor judgeth aright, as unto particular acts and duties, under all present circumstances. And what

notions of good and evil it cannot but retain, it gives up in particular instances unto the occasions of sin. Wherefore, —

**Obs. I.** Spiritual illumination of the mind is indispensably necessary unto our walking with God.

**Obs. II.** Those who would be preserved from sin, must take care that spiritual light do always bear sway in their minds. And therefore, —

**Obs. III.** Constantly to watch against the prevalency of corrupt prejudices and affections in their mind. And, —

**Obs. IV.** When the light of the mind is solicited by temptations to suspend its conduct and determination on present circumstances, to know that sin lies at the door; this is its last address for admission. And, —

**Obs. V.** If error grow strong in the heart through the love of sin, truth will grow weak in the mind as to the preservation of the soul from it. And, —

**Obs. VI.** Nothing ought to influence the soul more unto repentance, sorrow, and humiliation for sin, than a due apprehension of the shameful error and mistake that is in it.

### VERSE 8.

Τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου μήπω  
πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς  
ἐχούσης στάσιν.

Τοῦτο δηλοῦντος. Vulg. Lat., “hoe significante,” “hoc declarante,” “hoc innuente.” Syr., **ܢܫܘܒܘܢܐ ܢܚܝܒܐ** “by this manifesting.” “Manifestans,” “patefaciens,” “notum faciens;” “making known.” **Δῆλος**, is “openly manifest.” **Καὶ τυφλῷ δῆλον**, “which a blind man may see.” And **δηλόω**, is “manifestly, plainly, perspicuously to declare.”

**Μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι**. Vulg. Lat., nondum propalatum esse, made *palam*, “open,” “manifest.” Syr., **ܠܗ ܢܘܗܘܐ ܢܚܝܒܐ**, “not yet revealed.” “Manifestata,” “facta manifests;” “not made evidently to appear.”

Τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν. Vulg. Lat., “viam sanctorum,” “the way of the holies.” Beza, “viam ad sacrarium,” “the way into the sanctuary.” “Viam in sancta sanctorum,” “the way into the most holy place.” None suspect ἁγίων to be of the masculine gender.

Ἐχούσης στάσιν. Vulg. Lat., “habente statum,” “having” or “continuing its state or condition.” And στάσις is sometimes so used; “having its station;” “adhuc consistente,” as yet abiding, continuing its state, standing, consisting.

**Ver. 8.** —The Holy Ghost this signifying, [Syr., *signifying hereby, evidently declaring,*] that the way into the holiest of all [*the way of the most holy place, of the holies*] was not as yet made manifest, whilst yet the first tabernacle was standing, [*kept its station*].

The apostle in this verse enters on a declaration of the use which he designed to make of the description of the tabernacle, its furniture and its utensils, which he had before laid down. Now, this was not to give a particular account of the nature, use, and signification of every thing in it, — which he declined in his close of the recounting of them, affirming that it belonged not to his purpose to treat of them particularly on this occasion, —but from the consideration of the whole, in its structure, order, and services, he would prove the dignity, pre-eminence, and efficacy of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, above those which belonged thereunto. And hence would he manifest the unspeakable advantage of the church in the removal of the one and introduction of the other.

The first inference which he makes unto this purpose is laid down in this verse. And it is taken from what he had observed immediately before concerning the time and manner of the high priest’s entrance into the most holy place. It was done by him alone, and that only once a-year, and that not without the blood of the sacrifices which he offered. None of the people were ever suffered to draw nigh thereunto; nor might the rest of the priests themselves come into the sanctuary, the place of their daily ministration, whilst the high priest went in, and was in the most holy place. ‘In this order, this disposal of the institutions of divine service,’ saith he, ‘there was that instruction provided for the use of the church which I shall now declare.’ And three things he expresseth with respect hereunto:



1. *Who gave that instruction*; it was the Holy Ghost.
2. *The way whereby he gave it*; it was by the manifest signification of his mind, in and by what he did, appointed, ordered, or prescribed.
3. What was the *instruction* he gave; namely, “that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, whilst the first tabernacle was standing.”

And concerning this we must inquire,

1. What is here intended by “the holiest of all.”
2. What is the “way into this holiest of all,” or “the way of the holies.”
3. How this way was “manifest,” and how it was “not manifest.”
4. What was the duration of that state wherein this way was not manifest; namely, “whilst the first tabernacle was standing.”

**First**, The *author* of this instruction was the Holy Ghost: “The Holy Ghost this signifying;” that is, saith Grotius, “Deo per affiatum suum Mosi haec praecepente.” So they speak by whom the divine personality of the Holy Ghost is denied. But it is not only here supposed, but it may be hence undeniably proved. For he that by his word and works teacheth and instructeth the church, is a person. For acts of understanding, will, power, and authority, such as these are, are the acts of a person. We intend no more *by a person*, but one that hath an understanding, will, and power of his own, which he is able to act and exert. Moreover, he is a *divine* person. For he who by his authority and wisdom disposed of the worship of God under the old testament, so as it might typify and represent things afterwards to come to pass and be revealed, is so, and none other. He who doth these things, and can do them, is he in whom we believe, *the Holy Spirit*. And as he is the immediate author and appointer of all divine worship, so there are characters of his wisdom and holiness on all the parts of it.

**Secondly**, The *way* whereby he gave this instruction was by the signification of the things intended, — “signifying, declaring manifestly, evidently, openly.” He did it not by any especial revelation made unto Moses about it, he did not in words declare it, or express it as a doctrinal

truth; but this signification was made in the nature and order of the things appointed by him. The framing of the tabernacle and the constitution of the services belonging thereunto, made this declaration. For things in his wisdom were thus disposed, that there should be the first tabernacle, whereinto the priests did enter every day, accomplishing the divine services that God required. Howbeit in that tabernacle there were not the pledges of the gracious presence of God, —it was not the especial residence of his glory: but the peculiar habitation of God was separated from it by a veil; and no person living might so much as look into it, on pain of death. But yet, lest the church should apprehend that indeed there was no approach, here or hereafter, for any person into the gracious presence of God, he ordained that once a-year the high priest, and he alone, should enter into that holy place with blood. Hereby he plainly signified that an entrance there was to be, and that with boldness, thereinto. For unto what end else did he allow and appoint that *once a-year* there should be an entrance into it by the high priest, *in the name of* and for the service of the church? But this entrance being only once a-year, by the high priest only, and that with the blood of atonement, —which was always to be observed whilst that tabernacle continued, —he did manifest that the access represented was not to be obtained during that season. For all believers in their own persons were utterly excluded from it. And we may hence observe, —

**Obs. I.** That the divine ordinances and institutions of worship are filled with wisdom sufficient for the instruction of the church in all the mysteries of faith and obedience. —How eminent was the divine wisdom of the Holy Ghost in the structure and order of this tabernacle! What provision of instruction for the present and future use of the church was laid up and stored in them! What but infinite wisdom and prescience could order things so in their typical signification? He that considers only the outward frame and state of these things, may see a curious and beautiful structure, a beautiful order of external worship; yet can he find nothing therein but what the wisdom and contrivance of men might attain unto; at least, they might find out things that should have as glorious an outward appearance. But take them in their proper state, as unto their signification and representation of spiritual and heavenly things in Christ Jesus, and there is not the least concernment of them but it infinitely transcends all

human wisdom and projection. He alone in whose divine understanding the whole mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God and his mediation did eternally reside, could institute and appoint these things. And to instruct us unto a humble adoration of that wisdom, is the framing of the whole fabric, and the institution of all its ordinances, contained in the sacred record for the use of the church.

**Obs. II.** It is our duty with all humble diligence to inquire into the mind of the Holy Ghost in all ordinances and institutions of divine worship. — Want hereof lost the church of Israel. They contented themselves with the consideration of outward things, and the external observance of the services enjoined unto them. Unto this day the Jews perplex themselves in numberless curious inquiries into the outward frame and fashion of these things, the way, manner, and circumstances of the external observation of the services of it. And they have multiplied determinations about them all, and every minute circumstance of them, so as it is utterly impossible that either themselves or any living creature should observe them according to their traditions and prescriptions. But in the meantime, as unto the mind of the Holy Ghost in them, their true use and signification, they are stark blind and utterly ignorant. Yea, hardness and blindness are so come upon them unto the utmost, that they will not believe or apprehend that there is either spiritual wisdom, instruction, or signification of heavenly things in them. And herein, whilst they profess to know God, are they abominable and disobedient. For no creatures can fall into higher contempt of God than there is in this imagination, namely, that the old institutions had nothing in them but so much gold and silver, and the like, framed into such shapes, and applied to such outward uses, without regard unto things spiritual and eternal. And it is a great evidence of the apostate condition of any church, when they rest in and lay weight upon the external parts of worship, especially such as consist in corporeal observances, with a neglect of spiritual things contained in them, wherein are the effects of divine wisdom in all sacred institutions.

And whereas the apostle affirms that this frame of things did plainly signify (as the word imports) the spiritual mysteries which he declares, it is evident with what great diligence we ought to search into the nature and use of divine institutions Unless we are found in the exercise of our duty herein, the things which in themselves are plainly declared will be obscure

unto us, yea, utterly hidden from us. For what is here said to be clearly signified, could not be apprehended but by a very diligent search into and consideration of the way and means of it. It was to be collected out of the things he ordained, with the order of them, and their respect unto one another. Most men think it not worth while to inquire with any diligence into sacred institutions of divine worship. If any thing seem to be wanting or defective therein, if any thing be obscure and not determined, as they suppose, in the express words, without more ado they supply it with somewhat of their own. But there are many things useful and necessary in the worship of God which are to be gathered from such intimations of the mind of the Holy Ghost as he hath in any place given of them; and those who with humility and diligence do exercise themselves therein, shall find plain, satisfactory significations of his mind and will in such things as others are utterly ignorant of.

**Thirdly**, That which the Holy Ghost did thus signify and instruct the church in, (the **τοῦτο**, “this,” in the words,) was, “that the way into the most holy place” (“the way of the holies”) “was not yet made manifest.” And for the explication hereof we must consider the things before proposed: —

**1.** What the apostle intends by “the *holies*.” It is generally supposed by expositors that it is heaven itself which is hereby intended. Hence some of the ancients, the schoolmen, and sundry expositors of the Roman church, have concluded that no believers under the old testament, none of the ancient patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, or David, were admitted into heaven whilst the first tabernacle stood; that is, until the ascension of Christ. Hereon they framed a limbus for them in some subterranean receptacle, — whither they suppose the soul of Christ went, when it is said that he “descended into hell,” — where they were detained, and whence by him they were delivered. But whatever becomes of that imagination, the most learned expositors of that church of late, such as Ribera, Estius, Tena, Maldonate, A Lapide, do not fix it on this text; for the supposition whereon it is founded is wholly alien from the scope of the apostle, and no way useful in his present argument. For he discourseth about the privileges of the church by the gospel and priesthood of Christ in this world, and not about its future state and condition. Besides, he says not that there was no entrance into the holies during that season, but only that

“the way of it was not yet manifest.” Wherefore they might enter into it, although the way whereby they did so was not yet openly declared; for they had but a shadow, or dark, obscure representation of good things to come. And this is the interpretation that most sober expositors do give of the words: Heaven with eternal blessedness was proposed unto the faith, hope, and expectation of the saints under the old testament. This they believed, and in the hope of it walked with God, as our apostle proves at large, Hebrews 11. Howbeit the way, that is, the means and cause of communicating the heavenly inheritance unto them, namely, by the mediation and sacrifice of Christ, was but obscurely represented; not illustriously manifested, as it is now, life and immortality being brought to light by the gospel. And as these things are true, so this interpretation of the words being consonant unto the analogy of faith, is safe, only we may inquire whether it be that which is peculiarly intended by the apostle in this place or no.

The comment of Grotius on these words is, that the apostle signifies “*superaetherias sedes. Via eo ducens est evangelium, praecepta habens vere coelestia Eam viam Christus primus patefecit; aditumque fecit omnibus ad summum coelum. Pervenient quidem, eo, Abrahamus, Isaacus, Jacobus, ut videre est, <sup>4081</sup>Matthew 8:11, et alii viri eximii, ut videbimus infra, cap. 11:40. Sed hi eo pervenient quasi per machinam, non per viam; extraordinaria quadam et rara Dei dispensatione.*” But these things are most remote from the mind of the Holy Ghost, not only in this place, but in the whole Scripture also. For, —

**(1.)** How far the gospel is this “way into the holiest” shall be declared immediately. That it is so because of the heavenly precepts which it gives, that is, which were not given under the old testament, is most untrue. For the gospel gives no precepts of holiness and obedience that were not for the substance of them contained in the law. There is no precept in the gospel exceeding that in the law, “Thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself.” Only the gospel adds new motives unto obedience, new encouragements and enforcements of it, with directions for its due performance.

**(2.)** That Christ should be no otherwise the way but only as he revealed and declared the gospel and the precepts of it, is not only untrue and

injurious unto the honor of Christ, but directly contrary unto the design of the apostle in this place. For he is treating of the sacerdotal office of Christ only, and the benefit which the church doth receive thereby; but the revelation of the doctrine or precepts of the gospel was no duty of that office, nor did it belong thereunto. *That* he did as the prophet of the church; but all his sacerdotal actings are towards God in the behalf of the church, as hath been proved.

**(3.)** That the ancient patriarchs went to heaven by a secret engine, and that some of them only in an extraordinary way, is plainly to deny that they were saved by faith in the promised Seed, —that is, to affirm that they were not saved by the mediation of Christ; which is contrary unto the whole economy of God in the salvation of the church, and to many express testimonies of the Scripture. These Socinian fictions do not cure but corrupt the word of God, and turn away the minds of men from the truth unto fables. We shall therefore yet further inquire into the true meaning of the Holy Ghost in these words.

The apostle by **ἀγίων** here, **ὁδὸν τῶν ἁγίων**, intends the same with what, verse 3, he called **ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων**, “the holy of holies,” the second part of the sanctuary; whereinto the high priest alone could enter once a-year, as he declares in the foregoing verse: only whereas he there spake of the material fabric of the tabernacle, and the things contained in it, here he designs what was signified thereby; for he declares not what these things were, but what the Holy Ghost did signify in and by them. Now, in that most holy place were all the signs and pledges of the gracious presence of God, — the testimonies of our reconciliation by the blood of the atonement, and our peace with him thereby. Wherefore, to enter into these holies, is nothing but an access with liberty, freedom, and boldness, into the gracious presence of God, on the account of reconciliation and peace made with him. This the apostle doth so plainly and positively declare, **Hebrews 10:19-22**, that I somewhat admire so many worthy and learned expositors should utterly miss of his meaning in this place. The “holies,” then, is the gracious presence of God, whereunto believers draw nigh in the confidence of the atonement made for them, and of acceptance thereon. See **Romans 5:1, 2**; **Ephesians 2:14-18**; **Hebrews 4:14-16**, **10:19**. The atonement being made, and received by faith, conscience being

purged, bondage and fear being removed, believers do now under the gospel enter with boldness into this gracious presence of God.

**2.** We must consider what is the “way” into these holies, which was “not yet made manifest.” And here also expositors indulge unto many conjectures, very needlessly, as I suppose; for the apostle doth elsewhere expressly declare himself, and interpret his own meaning, namely, <sup><3019></sup>Hebrews 10:19, 20. This way is no other but the sacrifice of Christ, the true high priest of the church. For by the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place with blood the Holy Ghost did signify that the way into it, namely, for believers to enter by, was only the one true sacrifice which he was to offer and to be. And accordingly, to give an indication of the accomplishment of this type, when he expired on the cross, having offered himself unto God for the expiation of our sins, the veil of the temple, which enclosed and secured this holy place from any entrance into it, was rent from the top to the bottom, whereby it was laid open unto all, <sup><4179></sup>Matthew 27:51. And an evidence this is that the Lord Christ offered his great expiatory sacrifice in his death here on earth, a true and real sacrifice; and that it was not an act of power after his ascension, metaphorically called a sacrifice, as the Socinians dream. For until that sacrifice was offered the way could not be opened into the holies; which it was immediately after his death, and signified by the rending of the veil. This is ὁδὸς τῶν ἁγίων, the only way whereby we enter into the most holy place, the gracious presence of God, and that with boldness.

**3.** Of this way it is affirmed that it was “not yet made manifest, whilst the first tabernacle was standing.” And a word is peculiarly chosen by the apostle to signify his intention. He doth not say that there was no way then into the most holy place, none made, none provided, none made use of; but, there was not a φανέρωσις, an “open manifestation” of it. There was an entrance under the old testament into the presence of God, as unto grace and glory, namely, the virtue of the oblation of Christ; but this was “not as yet made manifest.” Three things were wanting thereunto: —

**(1.)** It was not yet *actually existent*, but only was virtually so. The Lord Christ had not yet actually offered himself unto God, nor made atonement for sin. Howbeit by virtue of the eternal agreement that was between the Father and him, concerning what he should accomplish in the fullness of

time, the benefit of what he was so to do was applied unto them that did believe; they were saved by faith, even as we are. Hence is he called, “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;” that is, *in and from the giving of the first promise*.

(2.) Although the coming of his person was promised, and his *sacrifice variously shadowed out* or represented unto the church, yet their perception and understanding thereof was weak and dark, —proportionate unto the means of its revelation. Hence, whatever were its virtue and efficacy, yet was it not in itself and its own nature made manifest.

(3.) There were many *blessed privileges* that attended the opening of this way, or the actual existence of it, in the oblation of Christ, which the church of the old testament was not acquainted with, nor made partaker of. And although these things belonged not unto the essence of the way, yet they did so as unto our entrance into it. We could not without them, —that is, the administration of the Spirit in gospel ordinances, —make use of this way, though prepared and set open, unto the glory of God and our own spiritual advantage.

Wherefore the plain, open manifestation of the way into the holiest, which the apostle denies unto the church under the old testament, consists in these three things: —

(1.) In the actual *exhibition of Christ in the flesh*, and his sacrifice of himself, making atonement for sin; for hereby alone was the way laid open unto an access with boldness into the gracious presence of God. Without this, the law and its curse were like the cherubim and flaming sword, that turned every way to keep sinners from drawing nigh unto God. Hereby were they removed, a new and living way being consecrated for our access unto him.

(2.) In the full, *plain declaration* of the nature of his person and of his mediation. And therefore, although the gospel be not this way in the precepts of obedience which it gives unto us, yet is it the declaration and manifestation of this way, and our sole direction how to make use of it, or how to enter by it into the most holy place. This they enjoyed not under the old testament, but were limited unto typical institutions directing the



priests how, to enter into the sanctuary made with hands; which were but an obscure representation of these things.

(3.) In the *introduction or revelation* and establishment of those privileges of gospel-worship whereby believers are led comfortably into the presence of God, as our apostle declares, <sup><5806></sup> Hebrews 10:19-22. For they are full of light and grace, and a guide unto all the steps of faith and obedience in this way. Hereunto may be added all those things which we have declared to belong unto that perfection or consummation of the church-state, which the law could not bring it unto, on <sup><5071></sup> Hebrews 7:11.

In these things consisteth that manifestation of the way into the most holy place which is here denied unto the old testament.

4. The *continuance* of this state is added: “Whilst the first tabernacle was standing.”

(1.) By “the first tabernacle,” the apostle understands not that first part of the tabernacle into which the priests entered continually, accomplishing the divine services, which before he had so called; but he intends the whole tabernacle, with respect unto the *true tabernacle* of the body of Christ, which succeeded into its room. Neither yet doth he understand precisely that tent or tabernacle which was erected in the wilderness, —which was not in itself of any long continuance, nor designed thereunto, for it was only suited unto the service of the church whilst it was in an unsettled condition, —but he intends the whole worship instituted together with it and belonging unto it, celebrated afterwards in the temple according unto the laws of that tabernacle. For there was the same worship and the same order of things in the one and the other; and so the same signification made at first by the Holy Ghost in the constitution of the tabernacle was still continued under the temple also.

(2.) It was *continued whilst this first tabernacle*, or the tabernacle in this sense, was “*standing*.” “Having its station;” that is, according unto the mind of God, it had its state and use in the church. This it had absolutely until the death of Christ, and no longer. For until then both the Lord Christ himself and all his disciples continued the observation of all its services, according to the mind of God; for he was made under the law of it, whilst it was in force, *Declaratively* it continued until the day of Pentecost; for

then, in the coming of the Holy Ghost, was the foundation of the gospel church-state, order, and worship, solemnly laid, whereon, a new way of worship being established, the abrogation of the old was declared. And this, was yet further made known by the determination put unto the observation of it among the Gentile converts by the Holy Ghost, in the council of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. *Actually* it continued until the destruction of the temple, city, and people, some years after. Its first station it had in God's appointment, the second in his connivance, and the third in his, patience.

It is the first of these that is here intended. The tabernacle, —that is, the laws and service of it, —preserved its station and use in the church, by God's ordinance and appointment, unto the death of Christ. Then did he pronounce concerning it and all things belonging unto it, "It is finished." Then was the veil rent, and the way into the holiest laid open. Then was peace with God publicly confirmed by the blood of the cross,

~~and~~ Ephesians 2:14-16; and the nature of the way of our access unto him made known. And some things we may hence observe, which also tend unto the further explication of the mind of the Holy Ghost in the text: —

**Obs. III.** Although the Lord Christ was not actually exhibited in the flesh under the old testament, nor had actually offered himself unto God for us, yet had believers then an access into the grace and favor of God, though the way, the cause and means of it, was not manifestly declared unto them. The apostle doth not exclude them all from the grace and favor of God, but only shows their disadvantage in comparison of believers under the gospel, in that this way was not manifested unto them.

**Obs. IV.** The design of the Holy Ghost in all the tabernacle ordinances and institutions of worship, was to direct the faith of believers unto what was signified by them.

**Obs. V.** Typical institutions, attended diligently unto, were sufficient to direct the faith of the church unto the expectation of the real expiation of sin, and acceptance with God thereon. God was never wanting unto the church in what was necessary unto it in its present condition, so as that it might be guided in its faith and encouraged unto obedience.

**Obs. VI.** Though the standing of the first tabernacle was a great mercy and privilege, yet the removal of it was a greater; for it made way for the bringing in of that which was better.

**Obs. VII.** The divine wisdom in the economy and disposal of the revelation of the way into the holiest, or of grace and acceptance with himself, is a blessed object of our contemplation. The several degrees of it we have considered on <sup>800</sup>Hebrews 1:1, 2.

**Obs. VIII.** The clear manifestation of the way of redemption, of the expiation of sin, and peace with God thereon, is the great privilege of the gospel.

**Obs. IX.** There is no access into the gracious presence of God but by the sacrifice of Christ alone.

#### VERSES 9, 10.

Ἦτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, καθ' ὃν δῶρά τε καὶ ζυσίαι προσφέρονται, μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα, μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, καὶ δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς, μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα.

Ἦτις παραβολή. Vulg. Lat., “quae parabola est.” Syr., **שְׁמֵרָה**, “an exemplar,” or “example.” So all render it, though it answers the Hebrew **שְׁמֵרָה**, “a parable” or “proverb.” “quod erat exemplar;” so Beza and others.

Εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα. Vulg. Lat., “temporis instantis,” “of the instant time” or “season;” which Arias rectifies into “in tempus praesens,” “for the time present;” Beza, “pro tempore illo praesente,” “for that present time;” “pro tempore tum praesente,” “for the time that was then present;” Syr., **לְהַיְוָה**, “for that time,” omitting **ἐνεστηκότα**.

Καθ' ὃν. Vulg. Lat., “juxta quam.” It being uncertain what he refers “quam” unto, Arias rectifieth it, “juxta quod;” for ὃν answereth unto **καιρὸν**, and not unto **παραβολή**. “Quo,” “wherein;” Syr., “in quo,” “wherein.”

**Δῶρά τε καὶ ζῦσῖαι.** Vulg. Lat., “munera et hostiae,” “dona et sacrificia.” Syr., “gifts (that is, meat and drink offerings) and sacrifices by blood.” Syr., **קִרְבָּנֵי וְדְבָרֵי**, “oblations and victims,” or “bloody sacrifices.”

**Κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τον λατρεύοντα.** Vulg. Lat., “juxta conscientiam perfectum facere servientem,” “make him that did the service perfect according to conscience;” others, “in conscientia sanctificare cultorem;” others, “consummare:” of the sense of the word we have spoken before. Syr., “perfect the conscience of him that offered them.”

**Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι.** Syr., “in meat and drink,” in the singular number.

**Καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς.** Syr., **בְּמַעֲמֹדֵיהֶם וְנֵיִן** “And in the washing of kinds kinds,” that is, various kinds; with respect not unto the various rites of washing, but the various kinds of things that were washed.

**Δικαιώμασι σαρκός.** Vulg. Lat., “justitiis carnis;” so it renders **δικαίωμα** by “justitia,” or “justificatio,” constantly, but very improperly. Syr. **פְּרִקְרָא דְּבִסְרָא** “precepts of the flesh.” “Ritibus carnalibus,” “ordinances, institutions, rites of the flesh, concerning fleshly things.”

**Ἐπικέιμενα.** Vulg. Lat., “*impositis;*” others, “*imposita;*” “incumbent on, lying on them.”<sup>f16</sup>

**Ver. 9, 10.** —Which [*was*] a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect, as per-raining to the conscience; [*which stood*] only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed [*on them*] until the time of reformation.

I shall not alter the translation, but show what might be more properly expressed, as unto some instances, in our exposition.

Expositors have made use of various conjectures in their commentaries on this place. What is material in the most eminent of them, the reader may see in Mr Poole’s Collections. But I must needs say, that in my judgment they have brought more difficulty unto the text than they have freed it

from. Wherefore I shall not detain the reader in the examination of them; but I shall give that interpretation of the text which I hope will evidence its truth unto such as impartially seek after it, and are in any measure acquainted with the things treated of.

The apostle, in these two verses, gives a summary account and reason of the imperfection of the tabernacle and all its services, wherein the administration of the old covenant did consist. This was direct and proper unto his present argument. For his design is to prove the *pre-eminence of the new covenant above the old*, from the excellency of the high priest thereof, with his tabernacle and sacrifice. Unto this end a discovery of the imperfection and weakness of the first tabernacle and services was indispensably necessary. And if, notwithstanding its outward excellency and glory, it was no other but what it is here declared to be, as evidently it was not, then was it not only an unreasonable thing, and a plain rejection of the wisdom and grace of God, to adhere unto it in opposition unto the gospel, — which was done by the most of the Hebrews, — but it was altogether unmeet and useless to be retained with the profession of the gospel, which the residue of them earnestly contended for. This was that which the apostle designed ultimately to convince them of. And a work herein both great and difficult was committed unto him. For there is nothing more difficult than to dispossess the minds of men of such persuasions in religion as they have been bred up in, and received by a long tract of tradition from their fathers. So we find it to be in such persuasions and observances as are evidently false and impious, unto the understandings of all that are not under the power of such prejudices: so is it at present with them of the Roman church, and others. But these Hebrews had a pretense or plea for their obstinacy herein which none other ever had in the like case but themselves; for the things which they adhered unto were confessedly of divine institution. Wherefore the apostle labors principally to prove, that in the will and wisdom of God they were to continue only for a season, and also that the season of their expiration was now come. And this he doth in this place, by a declaration of their nature and use whilst they did continue; whence it is evident that God never designed them a perpetual station in the church, and that because they could not effect what he purposed and had promised to do for it. This is the substance of his present argument.

There are in the words themselves,

1. The *subject* spoken of, ἥτις, “which.”
2. The proper *use and end* of it; it was “a figure.”
3. The *limitation of that use as unto time*; “for the time then present.”
4. The *especial nature* of it; the “offering of gifts and sacrifices.”
5. The *imperfection* of it therein; “they could not consummate the worshippers in conscience.”
6. The *reason of that imperfection*; it “stood only in meats and drinks,” etc.
7. The *manner of its establishment*; it was “imposed.”
8. The *time allotted for its continuance*; “until the time of reformation.”

1. The *subject* spoken of is expressed by ἥτις, “which.” Some would refer it unto παραζωλή following, and so read the words, “Which figure was for the time present.” But there is no cause for this traduction of the words. The verb substantive, ἦν, is deficient, as usually, and is to be supplied as in our translation, “which was.” “Which,” that is, σκηνή, “the tabernacle;” — not only the fabric and structure of it, but the tabernacle in both parts of it, with all its furniture, vessels, utensils, and services, as before described.

2. As unto its *proper use and end*, the apostle affirms that it was παραζωλή, —figura, exemplar,” exemplum,” “comparatio,” “similitudo,” “typus,” “representatio:” so variously is this word rendered by interpreters. Most fix on “exemplar” or “exemplum;” but they are τύπος and ὑπόδειγμα, not παραζωλή. And in all these versions the proper sense of the word as used in the Scripture is missed. It is not תְּבִנִית that the apostle intends, but מִשָּׁל, as it is rendered by the Syriac.

And this many have observed, namely, that it answers unto מִשָּׁל, but yet have missed in the interpretation of it. מִשָּׁל is the same with חִיָּה wherewith it is joined, as of the same signification and importance,

<sup>1005</sup>Psalm 49:5, 78:2. And whereas it is said that the queen of Sheba tried

the wisdom of Solomon בְּחִידוֹת, <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 10:1; the Targum renders it by במתלין, the Chaldee מתל, and the Syriac מתל, being the same with the Hebrew מְשַׁל. Now חִידָה is *enigma, problema, γρίφος*, “a riddle,” “a hard question;” and חוּד is to speak enigmatically, obscurely, so as that one thing is to be gathered out of another. So is מְשַׁל used also, <sup><2100></sup>Ezekiel 20:49, “Is he not מְשַׁל מְשַׁלִּים, “proverbiator proverbiorum?” —”one that speaks darkly and obscurely;” that expresseth one thing and intends another, using similitudes and metaphors; an obscure, mystical instruction, by figures, signs, symbols, metaphors, and the like.

Thus is παραζολή almost constantly used in the New Testament. So our Lord Jesus Christ expressly opposeth speaking in parables unto a clear, plain, open teaching, so as to be understood of all. See <sup><4100></sup>Matthew 13:10, 13. <sup><5100></sup>John 16:28, 29, “Now speakest thou openly, and no parable.” Wherefore παραζολή, in this place, is an obscure, mystical, metaphorical instruction. God taught the church of old the mysteries of our redemption by Christ, by the tabernacle, its fabric, parts, utensils, and services; but it was but an obscure, parabolical, figurative instruction. So should the word here be rendered, “a figurative instruction,” or the word “parable” be here retained, as it is in other places. This was God’s way of teaching the mysteries of his wisdom and grace; which, as it was sufficient for the state of the church which was then present, so it instructs us in what he requires, what he expects from us, unto whom all these things are unfolded, made plain and evident.

**3.** The third thing in the text is the *time or season* wherein the tabernacle was so parabolically or mystically instructive. It was εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα. Some few copies for τὸν read τοῦτον, as doth that now before me, —”unto this present time.” This reading is generally rejected by expositors, as not suited unto the mind of the apostle in this place. For he intends not the time that was then present when he wrote the epistle, not the times of the gospel, not the time after the resurrection of Christ until the destruction of the temple, which the addition of that word would denote; for God had prepared another kind of instruction for that season, and not by parables, or mystical metaphors. But yet the word may be retained, and a sense given of the words both sound and proper. For εἰς may well signify as much as “until;” or be taken τελικῶς, as it is often.

Εἰς τοῦτον καιρόν, —”unto this season;” ‘until the time that God would grant another kind of teaching, which now he hath done. It served until this present season, wherein the gospel is preached, and all the things signified by it are accomplished.’ But I shall rather follow the reading of the most copies, though the Vulgar Latin reading “temporis instantis” seems to favor the first. And Arias rectifying it into “in tempus praesens,” gives the same sense also. But the word ἐνεστηκότα being of the preterimperfect tense, signifies *a time that was then present*, but is now past. And it is therefore well rendered by our translators, “the time then present;” as if τότε had been in the text; —the *time then present* when the tabernacle was made and erected, ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς, the season of the church which was then present. For the apostle in this whole discourse not only respects the tabernacle, and not the temple, but he considers the first erection of the tabernacle in a peculiar manner; for then was it proposed as the means of the administration of the first covenant and the worship thereunto belonging. It is the covenants which he principally designeth a comparison between. And he doth in that way of the disposition and administration of them, which was given and appointed at their first establishment. As this in the new covenant was the person, office, sacrifice, and ministry of Christ; so as unto the first, it was the tabernacle and all the services of it.

Wherefore “the time then present,” was the state and condition of the church at the first setting up of the tabernacle. Not as though this time were confined unto that or those ages wherein the tabernacle was in use, before the building of the temple; but this instruction, which was then signally given, was the whole of what God granted unto the church during that state wherein it was obliged unto the ordinances and services which were then instituted. The instructions which God thought meet to grant unto the church at that season were obscure, mystical, and figuratively representative; yet was it sufficient for the faith and obedience of the church, had it been diligently attended unto, and what the Holy Ghost signified thereby. So are all God’s ways of instruction in all seasons. We cannot err but either by a neglect of inquiry into them, or by looking for more than God in his wisdom hath committed unto them.

And this sense those who render παραζολή by a “figure,” “type,” or “example,” must come unto: for the use of it is confined unto the time of



the erection of the tabernacle, and the institution of the ordinances thereunto belonging; but a type or figure was unto them of no use but so far as it was instructive, which was obscurely and mystically. And that this is the sense of the word the apostle declares, verse 8, where he shows the substance of what the Holy Ghost signified by the building, disposal, and services of the tabernacle; that is, what he taught the church thereby parabolically and figuratively.

This kind of instruction, whatever now it seem to us, was meet and fit for them unto whom it was given. And by the administration of grace in it, it was a blessed means to ingenerate faith, love, and obedience, in the hearts and lives of many unto an eminent degree. And we may consider from hence what is required of us, unto whom the clear revelation of the wisdom, grace, and love of God, is made known from the bosom of the Father, by the Son himself.

**4.** The *especial nature* and use of this tabernacle and its service is declared: “In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices.” Καθ’ ὅν, the Vulgar Latin reads “juxta quam;” making the relative to answer unto ἥτις, or to παραζολή. But the gender will not allow it in the original. Καθ’ ὅν is as much as ἐν ᾧ, “in which time,” “during which season:” for immediately upon the setting up of the tabernacle God gave unto Moses laws and institutions for all the gifts and sacrifices of the people, which were to be offered therein. This was the first direction which God gave after the setting up of the tabernacle, namely, the way and manner of offering all sorts of gifts and sacrifices unto him.

And the apostle here distributes all the קָרְבָּנִים, all the “sacred offerings,” into δῶρα and ζυσίας, —that is, unbloody and bloody sacrifices; as he did before, <sup>800</sup> Hebrews 5:1, where the distinction hath been explained.

Of them all he affirms, Προσφέρονται, —”They are offered;” not that they *were* so: for the apostle erects a scheme of the first tabernacle and all its services at its first institution, and presents it unto the consideration of the Hebrews as if it were then first erected. He doth, indeed, sometimes speak of the priests and sacrifices as then in being, with respect unto that continuance of the temple and its worship which it had in the patience of God, as we have showed on <sup>800</sup> Hebrews 8:4; but here, treating only of the tabernacle and its worship, as that which was granted in the confirmation

and for the administration of the old covenant, then entered into, —as the tabernacle, priesthood, and sacrifice of Christ were given in the confirmation of the new, —he represents that as present which was past long before. The tabernacle served aptly for the use whereunto it was designed, —it was meet for the offering of gifts and sacrifices; and so alone is the tabernacle of Christ for its proper end also.

**5.** On these concessions, the apostle declares the *imperfection of this whole order of things*, and its impotency as unto the great end that might be expected from it; for these “gifts and sacrifices could not make perfect him that did the service, as pertaining unto the conscience.” This was the end aimed at, this was represented in them and by them. And if they could not really effect it, they were weak and imperfect, and so not always to be continued. The end represented in and by them, was to make atonement for sin, that the anger of God being pacified, they might have peace with him. The covenant was then newly established between God and the church, before any laws were given about these offerings and sacrifices, Exodus 24. God knew that there would be among the people, and even the priests themselves, many sins and transgressions against the rules and laws of that covenant. This of itself it could not dispense withal; for its sanction was the curse against every one that continued not in all things written in the book of it: wherefore if this curse on all just and righteous occasions should rigidly have been put in execution, the covenant would only have proved the means and cause of the utter destruction and excision of the whole people; for “there is no man that liveth and sinneth not.” And on many occasions sin abounded in that state of the church, wherein light and grace were but sparingly dispensed, in comparison of the times of the new covenant. Wherefore God, in his mercy and patience, provided that by sacred gifts and offerings atonement should be made for sin, so as that the curse of the covenant should not be put in immediate execution against the sinner, <sup>4871</sup>Leviticus 17:11. But there were two things to be considered in those sins which God had appointed that atonement should be made for. The first was, *the external, temporal punishment which was due unto them*, according unto the place which the law or covenant had in the polity or commonwealth of Israel. The other, that *eternal punishment* which was due unto every sin by the law, as the rule of all moral obedience; for “the wages of sin is death.” In the first of these, the *person of the sinner*, in all

his outward circumstances, his life, his goods, his liberty, and the like, was concerned. In the latter, his conscience, or the inward man alone was so. And as unto the first of them, the gifts and sacrifices mentioned, being rightly offered, were able in themselves, “*ex opere operato*,” to free the sinner from all temporal, political inconvenience or detriment, so as that his life and inheritance should be continued in the land of Canaan, or his state preserved entire in the commonwealth of Israel. This the apostle here tacitly acknowledgeth, namely, that the gifts and sacrifices were able to free the sinner from temporal punishment, and give him outward peace in his possessions. But as unto the latter, wherein *conscience* was concerned, he denies that they had any such efficacy.

They were not able, —*μή δυνάμενα*. It agrees in gender with *ζυσίαι*, only, and not with *δώρα*, which being of the neuter gender, usually regulates the construction in such conjunctions: but most think it equally respects both the antecedent substantives; and instances may be given where a participle respecting more antecedent substantives than one may agree in gender with either of them, as, “*Leges et plebiscita coactae*.” But I rather think that the apostle confines the impotency he mentions unto “sacrifices” only; that is, *ζυσίαι*, “slain and bloody sacrifices.” For those things which were *δώρα*, “gifts,” and no more, were not designed to make atonement for sin; that was to be done by blood, and no otherwise: so the words should be read, “offered gifts and sacrifices that could not perfect.”

These sacrifices were impotent and ineffectual unto this end, *τελειῶσαι*. What the *τελείωσις* is which the apostle so frequently mentions in this epistle, I have before declared, and so what it is *τελειῶσαι*. It is indeed to “perfect,” to “consummate,” to “sanctify,” to “dedicate,” to “consecrate;” but whereas those sacrifices did all these things outwardly, and as unto the flesh, as the apostle grants, verse 13, he doth not here absolutely deny it unto them, but in a certain respect only.

They could not do it *κατὰ συνείδησιν*—as *unto the conscience of the sinner before God*. What he intends hereby he doth more fully declare, <sup>800</sup>Hebrews 10:2. There is a conscience condemning for sin. This could not be taken away by those sacrifices. They were not able to do it; for if ‘they could have done so, the sinner would have had complete peace with God, and would not have had need to have offered those sacrifices any more.

But they were multiplied and often repeated, because of their disability unto this end. Wherefore *τελειῶσαι κατὰ συνείδησιν*, is to give peace of conscience unto men, through a sense of perfect atonement made for sin, in the sight of God, with an interest in his love and favor thereon. This, it is to be “perfect” or “consummated, as pertaining to conscience” in the sight of God, namely, to have a conscience condemning for sin taken away. This those sacrifices of the law could not effect. It will be said, then, ‘Unto what end did they serve? Were they of no use but only to free men from the penalties of the law or covenant, as it was a rule of the polity or commonwealth of Israel, and the tenure of their possessions in Canaan?’ Yes, they were moreover part of the *παραζολή* or “mystical instruction” which God granted the church in those days, directing them unto the one sacrifice and offering of Christ, typically representing it, and through faith applying the virtue and efficacy of it unto their consciences every day.

6. The *person* is described towards whom this effect of purifying the conscience is denied. They could not thus perfect *τὸν λατρεύοντα*, — “him that did the service,” saith our translation, I think not so properly. He that did the service was the priest only; but respect is had unto every one that brought his gift or offering unto the altar. *Ἐπιτελεῖν τὰς λατρείας*, “sacredly to accomplish the services,” was the work of the priest alone, verse 6. But *ὁ λατρεύων*, is the same with *ὁ προσερχόμενος*, <sup>580B</sup> Hebrews 10:1; that is, every one who brought his sacrifice to be offered, that atonement might be made for him. And *λατρεύων* comprehends the whole of divine worship in all individuals: *Τῷ Θεῷ λατρεύσεις*, <sup>400B</sup> Matthew 4:10. But he also may be said to do the service, on whose account and in whose stead it was performed.

But the defect charged doth not in the first place reflect on the persons, as though it was by their default. They worshipped God according unto his own institutions; but it was in the sacrifices themselves. And if they could not make the worshippers, those who did the service, perfect, they could make none so, for it was they alone who had the benefit of them.

The note of Grotius on this place is, “Isti cultus non possunt sectatorum suorum animos purgare a vitiis quemadmodum evangelium;” —most remote from the mind of the Holy Ghost: for he speaks not of *purging our*

*minds from vices, but of purifying conscience by atonement made for the guilt of sin; and opposeth not those sacrifices unto the doctrine of the gospel, but unto the sacrifice of Christ. And we may hence observe, —*

**Obs. I.** There is a state of perfect peace with God to be attained under imperfect obedience. For it is charged as a weakness in the legal administrations, that they could not give such a peace where any sin remained; it is therefore to be found in the sacrifice of Christ, as is proved at large in the next chapter. “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God.”

**Obs. II.** Nothing can give perfect peace of conscience with God but what can make atonement for sin. And whoever attempt it any other way but by virtue of that atonement, will never attain it, in this world nor hereafter.

**Ver. 10.** — “Only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed [*on them*] until the time of reformation.”

It is acknowledged that there is no small difficulty in the connection of these words, or their relation unto what doth immediately precede; and therefore expositors have multiplied conjectures about it, in whose examination we are not concerned. I shall therefore no further consider any of them, but as they relate unto what I judge to be their true coherence. Two things are plain and evident unto this purpose: —

**1.** That the design of the apostle in the words themselves, is to manifest and declare the *weakness of the services of the tabernacle*, and their insufficiency for attaining the end proposed in them. This end in general was the perfecting of the church-state in religious worship; and in particular, to make the worshippers *perfect as unto their consciences* before God. And he gives such a description of them as of itself will sufficiently evince their weakness and insufficiency. For what is it possible that things of that kind and nature which is here described can contribute unto these ends

**2.** That the things instanced in do comprise *a great part of the Levitical institutions*; and his assertion concerning them may, by a parity of reason, be extended unto them all. For to render his description of them comprehensive, the apostle

(1.) Expresseth them in a particular enumeration of the heads whereunto they might be reduced, “Meats and drinks, and divers washings.” And then,

(2.) To show that he intends all things of an alike nature with them, he adds the general nature of them all, — they were “carnal ordinances:”

---

(1.) A great part of the Levitical religious observances may be reduced unto these heads of “meats and drinks, and divers washings.” Laws and institutions were multiplied about these things; what they might eat, and what they might not; what was clean, and what was unclean unto that end; what they might drink, and what vessels defiled all liquors; what were to be, their eatings and drinkings, and when upon their peace-offering, and at their solemn feasts; their great variety of washings, of the priests, of the people, of their garments, and their flesh, stated and occasional, do take up a great part of the entire system of their ordinances. And as laws were multiplied concerning these things, so many of them were enforced with very severe penalties. Hence they were difficultly to be learned, and always impossible to be observed. The Mishna and Talmud —that is, the whole religion of the present Jews —consist almost wholly in scrupulous inquiries, and endless determinations, or rather conjectures, about these things and their circumstances.

(2.) All the laws concerning these things were carnal, “carnal ordinances;” such as, for the matter, manner of performance, and end of them, were carnal. This being their nature, it evidently follows that they were instituted only for a time, and were so far from being able themselves to perfect the state of the church, as that they were not consistent with that perfect state of spiritual things which God would introduce, and had promised so to do.

The scope and design of the apostle being thus fixed, the coherence and interpretation of the words will not be so difficult as at first view they may appear.

*Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι*, —”Only in meats and drinks,” etc, Our translators observing the sense elliptical, have supplied it with “which stood,” — which stood only in meats and drinks.” And that supplement may give a

double sense: —1. It may respect the *substance* of the things spoken of. “Which,” relates to “gifts and sacrifices.” And so the sense intended is, that they consisted “in meats and drinks, and divers washings.” And this was the natural substance of them. They consisted in such things as might be eaten and drunk, being duly prepared, as flesh, flour, salt, oil, and wine. Hence were they called meat and drink-offerings. And they had washings also that belonged unto them, as the washing of the inwards, <sup><0297></sup>Exodus 29:17; and of the burnt-offerings peculiarly, <sup><0300></sup>Leviticus 1:9, 13; of the hands and feet of the priests, <sup><0303></sup>Exodus 30:18, 19; and of the leper, <sup><0349></sup>Leviticus 14:9. Howbeit it cannot be said that the gifts and sacrifices, as they were such, did consist in these things, though in them things of this nature were offered unto God. Wherefore the supplement of, “which stood,” cannot be admitted in that sense. 2. It may respect the *consummation* of these gifts and sacrifices, or the celebration of the whole service that belonged unto them, and all their necessary circumstances or consequents: ‘which stood in these things;’ that is, which were accompanied with them. and not perfected without them.

The argument in the words is to prove the insufficiency of the gifts and sacrifices of the law unto the end mentioned, of perfecting conscience before God. And this is evidenced by the consideration of their necessary adjuncts, or what belonged unto them, and were inseparable from them. It is not said that these “gifts and sacrifices” were only meats and drinks, and so things of no value: for neither doth the apostle treat of the old institutions with such contempt, nor would the truth of his assertion have been evident unto the Hebrews; but he argues unto a discovery of their use and end from the things that did always accompany them, and were inseparable from them. For those by whom they were offered were obliged, by the same divine institution, at the same time unto sundry “meats and drinks, and divers washings;” which proves both the gifts and sacrifices to have been of the same kind, and to have had respect unto carnal things, as they had. For if those gifts and sacrifices had an immediate effect on the consciences of men unto their purification before God, by any virtue inherent in them, whence is it that the observances which by the same law accompanied them were only about “meats and drinks, and divers washings?” And this sense is not to be refused.

But whereas there is an ellipsis in the connection of the words, it may be otherwise supplied. For having mentioned the “gifts and sacrifices” of the law, the apostle makes an addition unto them of the remaining institutions and ceremonies of it, whose very nature and use declared their insufficiency unto the end inquired after; — “[*And other laws*] only concerning meats and drinks, and divers washings;” which in general he calls “carnal rites.” Hereby is the argument in hand carried on and completed.

There are four things in the words:

1. An *account* of the legal institutions, under several heads.
2. Their *nature in general*, with that of others of the same kind; they were “carnal ordinances,” or fleshly rites.
3. The way of *the relation of the people unto them*; they were “*imposed*” on them.
4. The *time* for which they were imposed, or the measure of their duration; which was, “until the time of reformation.”

**First**, For the *nature* of them, they consisted,

1. In “meats and drinks.” Take the words in their full extent, and they may be comprehensive of four sorts of institutions: —

(1.) Of all those which concerned meats, or things to be eaten or not eaten, as being clean or unclean; an account whereof is given, Leviticus 11 throughout. With reference thereunto doth the apostle reflect on the Levitical institutions in these words, “Touch not, taste not, handle not; which all are to perish with the using;” <sup><512></sup>Colossians 2:21, 22, — are all carnal things.

(2.) The portion of the priests out of the sacrifices; especially what they were to eat in the holy place, as the portion of the sin-offering, <sup><128></sup>Exodus 29:31-33; <sup><810></sup>Leviticus 10:12, 13, 17; and what they were to eat of the peace-offerings in any clean place, verses 14, 15. And the prohibition of drinking wine or strong drink in the holy place, verses 8, 9, may be here respected in “drinks,” about which these institutions were. And these were such, as without which the service of the



sacrifices could not be acceptably performed, verses 17, 18. And therefore are they intended in this place in an especial manner, if it be the design of the apostle to prove the insufficiency of the sacrifices from the nature of their inseparable adjuncts, which were carnal and perishing things.

(3.) The eating of the remainder of the peace-offering, whether of a vow or of thanksgiving; the law whereof is given as a holy ordinance, <sup><B7B></sup>Leviticus 7:14-17.

(4.) The laws concerning the feasts of the whole people, with their eating and drinking before the Lord, Leviticus 23. All these divine ordinances were ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, —”concerning meats and drinks,” that were necessary to be observed with their offering of “gifts and sacrifices,” declaring of what nature they were. And the observation of them all was at the same time imposed on them.

2. They consisted in, or were concerning “divers washings” Βαπτισμός is any kind of washing, whether by, dipping or sprinkling, —putting the thing to be washed into the water, or applying the water unto the thing itself to be washed. Of these washings there were various sorts or kinds under the law: for the priests were washed, <sup><B7B></sup>Exodus 29:4; and the Levites, <sup><B7B></sup>Numbers 8:7; and the people, after they had contracted any impurity, <sup><B7B></sup>Leviticus 15:8, 16. But the apostle seems to have particular respect unto the washings of the priests and of the offerings in the court of the tabernacle, before the altar; for these were such, as without which the gifts and sacrifices could not be rightly offered unto God.

**Secondly**, It is added in the description of these things, καὶ δικαίωμασιν σαρκός, —”institutis carnalibus,” “ritibus,” “ceremoniis,” “justitiis, justificationibus carnis.” “Carnal ordinances,” say we. The signification of δικαίωμα in this place hath been spoken unto before. Rites of worship arbitrarily imposed, whose “jus” or “right” depended on the will or pleasure of God. And they are said to be of the flesh for the reason given, verse 13, — “they sanctified unto the purifying of the flesh,” and no more.

The words may be an expression of the nature in general of the law about meats, drinks, and washings; they were “carnal ordinances.” But the distinctive copulative, καί, “and,” will not admit of that sense. It seems,

therefore, to contain an addition of all those other legal ordinances which any way belonged unto the purifications of the law.

The force of the reasonings in these words is evident. For the design of the apostle is to prove, that, in the perfect church-state which God would bring in under the new covenant, the worshippers were to enjoy peace of conscience, with joy and boldness in the presence of God, from a perfect atonement and purification of sin. Holy this is effected by the one sacrifice of Christ, he afterwards declares. But the ordinances of the law, and the Levitical sacrifices, were weak and imperfect as unto this end; for in them and by them men were conversant wholly in carnal things, in meats, drinks, washings, and such like carnal observances, which could reach no farther than the *sanctification of the flesh*, as he evidenceth in the application of all these things unto his present argument, verse 13. And the faith of believers is rather weakened than confirmed by all things of the like nature, that divert their minds from an immediate respect unto and total dependence on the one sacrifice of Christ.

**Thirdly**, Concerning all these things it is affirmed, that they were “imposed” on the people, —ἐπικέίμενα. There is a difficulty in the syntax of this word, which all interpreters take notice of. If it refers unto the substantives immediately foregoing, βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, etc., it agrees not with them in case; if unto ζυσίας in the other verse, it agrees not with it in gender. And the apostle had before adjoined unto it a participle of the feminine gender, —δυνάμεναι. Some think that the letter iota is added unto the first word, or taken from the latter, so that originally they were both of the same gender. But whereas the apostle had put together δῶρα καὶ ζυσίας, the one of the neuter, the other of the feminine gender, he might apply his adjectives either to one or both, without offense to grammar. Yet I rather judge that in this word he had respect unto all the things whereof he had discoursed from the very beginning of the chapter. Concerning them all he declares that they were thus “imposed;” and so the use of the word in the neuter gender is proper.

Many judge that there is an objection anticipated in these words. For upon the description of the nature and use of the tabernacle, with all its furniture and services, he declares that they could not all of them, nor any of them, perfect the worshippers that attended unto them. Hereon it might be well

inquired, ‘To what purpose, then, were they appointed? unto what end did they serve?’ Hereunto he replies, ‘That they were never designed unto perpetual use, but only imposed on the people unto the time of reformation.’ But whether there be a respect unto any such objection or no, he plainly declares their use and duration according unto the mind of God; which were such as their nature did require. And hereby also he confirms his argument of their insufficiency unto the great end of perfecting, sanctifying, or consecrating the state of the church. And hereof there are two evidences in these words: —

**1.** They were things *imposed*; that is, on the people under the law. They were laid on them as a burden. The word is properly “incumbentia,” lying on them; that is, as a burden. There was a weight in all these legal rites and ceremonies, which is called a “yoke,” and too heavy for the people to bear, <sup>4150</sup>Acts 15:10. And if the imposition of them be principally intended, as we render the word, “imposed,” it respects the bondage they were brought into by them. Men may have a weight lying on them, and yet not be brought into bondage thereby. But these things were so imposed on them as that they might feel their weight, and groan under the burden of it. Of this bondage the apostle treats at large in the epistle unto the Galatians. And it was impossible that those things should perfect a church-state, which’ in themselves were such a burden, and effective of such a bondage.

**2.** As unto the *duration* assigned unto them, they were thus imposed **μὲχρι̅ καιροῦ**, —for a determined limited, season. ‘They were never designed to continue for ever. And this is the great controversy which we have at this day with the Jews. The principal foundation of their present unbelief is, that the law of Moses is eternal, and that the observation of its rites and institutions is to be continued unto the end of the world. The contrary hereunto the apostle had evidently proved in the foregoing chapters. Whereas, therefore, he had undeniably demonstrated that they were not to be of perpetual use in the church, nor could ever effect that state of perfection which God designed unto it, he now declares that there was a certain determinate season fixed in the purpose and counsel of God for their cessation and removal. And this he describes in the last word.

This was the season **διορθώσεως**: “correction,” say some; “direction,” others; we, “of reformation,” restraining the word unto the things spoken

of, and retaining its usual signification, most improperly. For “reformation” is the amendment and reduction of any thing in the church unto its primitive institution, by abolishing and taking away the abuses that have crept into it, or corrupt additions that have been made unto it; but nothing of that nature is here intended. Many such seasons there were under the old testament, wherein the things belonging unto the worship of God were so reformed; but now not the reduction of the tabernacle and its services unto its first institution is intended, but its utter removal and taking away out of the service of God in the church. But if respect be had unto the whole state of the church in general, and what God designed unto it, taking the word “reformation” in a universal sense, for the introduction of a new animating form and life, with new means and ways of their expression and exercise in new ordinances of worship, the word may be of use in this place.

Those who render it, “of correction,” are no less out of the way. For “correction” might be applied unto the abuses that had crept into the worship of God; —so it was by our Savior with respect unto pharasaical traditions: but the apostle treats here of the worship itself as it was first instituted by God, without respect unto any such abuses. This was not the object of any just correction.

The *time* intended is sufficiently known and agreed upon. It is the great time or season of the coming of the Messiah, as the king, priest, and prophet of the church, to order and alter all things, so as it might attain its perfect state. This was the season that was to put an end unto all legal observances, wherein they were to expire.

Unto the bringing in of this season God had ordered and disposed all things from the foundation of the world. See <sup>406</sup>Luke 1:68-75. And it is called **καὶρὸς διορθώσεως**, because therein God finally disposed and directed all things in the church unto his own glory and the eternal salvation thereof. See <sup>411</sup>Ephesians 1:10. And we may observe from the whole verse, —

**Obs. I.** That there is nothing in its own nature so mean and abject, but the will and authority of God can render it of sacred use and sacred efficacy, when he is pleased to ordain and appoint it. — Such were the “meats and drinks, and divers washings,” under the law; which, however contemptible

in themselves, had a religious use from the appointment of God. For others to attempt the like, as they do with their salt, and oil, and the like, in the Papacy, is foolishly to imitate his sovereignty, and proudly to usurp his authority.

**Obs. II.** The fixing of times and seasons, for the state of things in the church, is solely in the hand of God. and at his sovereign disposal. —He alone appointed this “time of reformation;” the church could neither hasten it nor was to refuse it. Wherefore quiet waiting alone is our duty, as unto the accomplishment of all promises concerning the state of the church in this world.

**Obs. III.** It is a great part of the blessed liberty which the Lord Christ brought into the church, namely, its freedom and liberty from legal impositions, and every thing of the like nature in the worship of God.

**Obs. IV.** The time of the coming of Christ was the time of the general final reformation of the worship of God, wherein all things were unchangeably directed unto their proper use.

### VERSE 11.

Unto this verse the account of the Levitical priesthood, its sanctuary and services, is continued. Amongst them, the service of the high priest in the most holy place on the day of expiation was principally designed; for this was looked on and trusted unto by the Hebrews, as the principal glory of their worship, and as of the greatest efficacy as unto atonement and reconciliation with God. And so it was, in its proper place. Hence they have a saying yet common amongst them, “That on the day of expiation, when the high priest entered into the most holy place, all Israel were made as innocent as in the day of creation.” In what sense it neither was nor could be so shall be declared on <sup><5801></sup>Hebrews 10:1-3. But in these things the glory of the administration of the old covenant did consist; which the apostle allows unto it in his demonstration of the excellency of the new above it. Wherefore this ministry of the high priest on that day he hath an especial respect unto, in the account he gives of the priesthood of Christ and its administration.

But yet, although he hath a principal regard hereunto, he doth not respect it only and singly. The whole description of the sanctuary and its services he also regards, in the comparison he intends between the Lord Christ in his office and these things. In him, his office, sanctuary, and sacrifice, do the excellency and efficacy of the new covenant consist, in opposition unto all those of the like kind under the law. The want of a due observation hereof hath led some expositors into mistakes: for they would confine all that he says unto a correspondency with what was done on that solemn day by the high priest, whereas he doth also expressly declare that the truth, reality, and substance of the tabernacle, all its utensils, its services and sacrifices, were to be found in him alone; for unto this end doth he give us such a description of them all in particular.

But, as was said, that which he principally respects in the comparison he makes between the type and the antitype, is the high priest and his especial service in the most holy place, which he makes an entrance into in this verse.

**Ver. 11.** —Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως.<sup>f17</sup>

**Παραγενόμενος.** Vulg., “assistens,” “assisting.” Syr., ܦܪܥܝܢܐ, “who cometh.” “Adveniens,” “coming.”

**Ἀρχιερεύς.** Syr., ܪܫܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ, “was an high priest,” or “was made an high priest;” whereunto it adds, instead of “good things to come,” “of the good things which he hath wrought.”

**Διὰ μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς.** Vulg. Lat., “per amplius et perfectius tabernaculum;” barbarously for “mains et praestantius.” Syr. ܕܡܫܚܢܐ ܘܥܠ ܠܡܫܒܢܐ ܕܦܐܪܦܐ, “and he entered into that great and perfect tabernacle.”

**Οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως.** Vulg. Lat., “non hujus creationis.” Syr., ܕܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ, “of” or “from among these creatures.” Most, “hujus structurae,” “of this building.”

**Ver. 11.** —But Christ being come, an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building.

The introduction of the comparison in the redditive conjunction **δέ**, “but,” answers unto **μέν** in the first verse of the chapter; which are the common notes of comparison and opposition. **Εἶχε μέν..... Χριστός**, — “That had truly ..... but Christ,” etc. In this and the next verse the apostle lays down in general what he proves and confirms by instances in this, and unto the 20th verse of the following chapter.

And there are two things which he declares in this and the verse ensuing: 1. Who is the high priest of the new covenant, and what is the tabernacle wherein he administered his office, ver. 11. 2. What are the especial services he performed, in answer unto those of the legal high priest, and their preference above them, ver. 12.

In this verse he expresseth the subject whereof he treats, or the person of the high priest concerning whom he treats. And he describes him,

1. By his *name*; it is “Christ.”
2. By his *entrance on his office*; “being come.”
3. His *office itself*; “an high priest.”
4. The *effects of his office*, or the especial object of it; “good things to come.”
5. The *tabernacle* wherein he administereth or dischargeth his office; which is described by a comparison with the old tabernacle, and that two ways:

(1.) Positively; that it was “greater” and “more perfect” or “more excellent” than it.

(2.) By a double negation, the latter exegetical of the former; “not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building” or “creation.” All these particulars must be distinctly opened, to give a right understanding of the sense of the; place and meaning of the words: —

**First**, The person spoken of is “Christ.” I have observed before the variety of appellations or names whereby the apostle on various occasions

expresseth him in this epistle, otherwise than he is wont to do in any other of his epistles. Sometimes he calls him Jesus only, sometimes Christ, sometimes Jesus Christ, sometimes the Son, and sometimes the Son of God. And he had respect herein unto the various notions which the church of the Jews had concerning his person from the prophecies and promises of the Old Testament. And he useth none of them peculiarly but when there is a peculiar reason for it, as we have already observed on sundry occasions. And so there is in this place. He doth not say Jesus is come, or the Son, or the Son of God, but “Christ being come;” that is, “the Messiah being come.” Under that name and notion was he promised from the beginning, and the fundamental article of the faith of the church was, that the Messiah was to come; —all their desires and expectations were fixed on the coming of the Messiah. Hence ὁ ἐρχόμενος, “he that was to come,” was the name whereby they expressed their faith in him. Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; <sup><011></sup>Matthew 11:3, — “Art thou he who is to come?” And the coming of Christ, or the Messiah, was the time and the cause wherein and whereby they expected the last revelation of the will of God, and the utmost perfection of the church. Wherefore the apostle on this occasion mentions him by his name, ‘He who was promised of old that he should come, upon whose coming the faith of the church was built, by whom and at whose coming they expected the last revelation of the will of God, and consequently a change in their present administrations, the promised Messiah being come.’ The church was founded of old on the name *Jehovah*, as denoting the unchangeableness and faithfulness of God in the accomplishment of his promises, <sup><011></sup>Exodus 6:2, 3. And this name of *Christ* is declarative of the accomplishment of them. Wherefore by calling him by this name, as it was most proper when he was to speak of his coming, so in it he minds the Hebrews of what was the ancient faith of their church concerning him, and what in general they expected on his coming. He had now no more to offer unto them but what they had for many ages expected, desired, and earnestly prayed for.

**Secondly**, As a general foundation of what is afterwards ascribed unto him, or as *the way whereby he entered on his office*, he affirms that he is “come:” “Christ being come,” —παραγενόμενος. The word is nowhere else used to express the advent or coming of Christ. Hence by the Vulgar it is rendered “assistens;” which as it doth not signify to “come,” so the



sense is corrupted by it. The Rhemists render that translation, “but Christ assisting an high priest.” But this increaseth the ambiguity of the mistake of that translation, as not declaring that Christ himself was this high priest, which is the direct assertion of the apostle. That which is intended is the accomplishment of the promise of God, in the sending and exhibition of Christ in the flesh: ‘He being now come, according as was promised from the foundation of the world.’ For although the word is inseparable in its construction with what followeth, “an high priest,” —”being come an high priest;” yet his coming itself in order unto the susception and discharge of that office is included in it. And upon this coming itself depended the demonstration of the faithfulness of God in his promises. And this is the great fundamental article of Christian religion, in opposition unto Judaism, as it is declared, <sup>(1)</sup>1 John 4:2, 3. Wherefore, by his being “come,” in this place, no one single act is intended, as his advent or coming doth usually signify his incarnation only; but the sense of the word is comprehensive of the whole accomplishment of the promise of God in sending him, and his performance of the work whereunto he was designed thereon. In that sense is he frequently said to come, or to be come, <sup>(2)</sup>1 John 5:20.

And, as was before observed, there is not only argument herein unto the apostle’s design, but that which, being duly weighed, would fully determine all the controversy he had with these Hebrews. For all their legal administrations were only subservient unto his coming, and representations thereof, —all given in confirmation of the truth of the promises of God that so he should come: wherefore upon his coming they must all necessarily cease and be removed out of the church.

**Thirdly**, There is in the words a determination of the especial *end of his coming*, under present consideration, —”an high priest,” “being come an high priest;” that is, in answer unto and in the room of the high priest under the law. This states the subject of the apostle’s argument. He had before proved that he was to be a *priest*, that he *was* a priest, and *how* he came so to be. He now asserts it as the foundation of those actings which he was to ascribe unto him in answer unto those of the legal high priests, whose offices and services, with the effects of them, he had before declared: ‘Those high priests did so, “but Christ being come an high priest,” etc.’

**Fourthly**, He adds the especial *object* of his office, or the things about which he is conversant in the discharge of it: “Of the good things to come.” As the assertion is positive, so there is a comparison and opposition included in it. The high priests of the law were not so. They were not priests of “good things;” that is, absolutely, or such as were necessary unto the purification, sanctification, and justification of the church. And so far as they were priests of good things, they were so of good things present, not of the good things promised, that were for to come. And this is the force of the article τὸν, “of the good things;” namely, that God had promised unto the church. A priest, or a high priest, may be said to be the priest of the things that he doth in the execution of his office, or of the things which he procureth thereby; he is the priest of his duties, and of the effects of them; — as a minister may be said to be a minister of the word and sacraments which he administereth, or of the grace of the gospel which is communicated thereby. Both are here included, both the duties which he performed and the effects which he wrought.

The things whereof Christ is a high priest, are said to be “*things to come;*” — that is, they are yet so, absolutely so; or they were so called with respect unto the state of the church under the old testament. Most expositors embrace the first sense. ‘These good things to come,’ they say, ‘are that future eternal salvation and glory which were procured for the church by the priesthood of Christ, and were not so by the Levitical priesthood. To the administration of the priesthood under the law he assigns only things present, temporal things, or what could be effected by them in their own virtue and power; but unto that of Christ he assigns eternal things, as he speaks immediately, he hath “obtained eternal redemption for us.” The eternal salvation and glory of the church were procured by the priesthood of Christ, or Christ himself in the discharge of that office, and were not so by the Levitical priests. These things are true, but not the meaning, at least not the whole meaning, of the apostle in this place. For, —

**1.** This confines the relation of the priesthood of Christ in this place unto the *effects of it only*, and excludes the consideration of his sacerdotal actings in the great sacrifice of himself; for this was not now to come, but was already past and accomplished. But this is so far from being excluded by

the apostle, as that it is principally intended by him. This is evident from the words ensuing, wherein the tabernacle is described in which he was thus “an high priest of good things to come;” for this was his human nature, wherein he offered himself, as we shall see.

**2.** He doth not in this place compare together and oppose the future state of glory which we shall have by Christ with and unto the state of the church in this world under the old testament; which were not equal, nor would be cogent unto his purpose, seeing the saints of old were also made partakers of that glory. But he compares the present state of the church, the privileges, advantages, and grace which it enjoyed by the priesthood of Christ, with what it had by the Aaronical priesthood; for the fundamental principle which he confirms is, that the **τελείωσις**, or present “perfection” of the church, is the effect of the priesthood of Christ.

Wherefore the apostle expresseth these things by that notion of them which was received under the old testament and in the church of the Hebrews, namely, the “good things to come;” —that is, they were so from the beginning of the world, or the giving of the first promise. Things which were fore-signified by all the ordinances of the law, and which thereon were the desire and expectation of the church in all preceding ages; the things which all the prophets foretold, and which God promised by them, directing the faith of the church unto them; in brief, all the good things in spiritual redemption and salvation which they looked for by the Messiah, are now called the “good things to come.” Of these things Christ was now come the high priest; the law having only the shadow, and not so much as the perfect image of them, <sup><small>SCOT</sup> Hebrews 10:1. And these things may be referred unto two heads: —

**(1.)** Those wherein the *actual administration* of his office did consist, for, as we said, he was the high priest of the duties of his own office, he by whom they were performed. These in general were his oblation and intercession. For although his intercession be continued in heaven, yet was it begun on the earth; as his oblation was offered on the earth, but is continued in heaven, as unto the perpetual exercise of it. The whole preparation unto, and actual oblation of himself, was accompanied with most fervent and effectual intercessions, <sup><small>SCOT</sup> Hebrews 5:7. And such was his solemn prayer recorded John 17: These things themselves, in the first

place, were the “good things to come.” For these were they which were designed in, and the substance of, the first promise; as also of all those which were afterwards given for the confirmation of the faith of the church therein. These did all the legal institutions direct unto and represent. And that they are here intended by the apostle, he plainly declares in the next verse; for with respect unto these good things to come, he opposeth his own blood and sacrifice, with the atonement he made thereby, unto the blood of bulls and of goats, with whatever could be effected thereby.

**(2.)** The effects of these sacerdotal actings are also intended: for these also are reckoned hereunto in the close of the next verse, in the instance of one of them, namely, “eternal redemption,” which is comprehensive of them all. And these also were of two sorts: —

**[1.]** Such as *immediately* respected God himself. Of this nature was the atonement and reconciliation which he made by his blood, and peace with God for sinners thereon. See <sup><4159></sup>2 Corinthians 5:19, 20; <sup><4124></sup>Ephesians 2:14-16.

**[2.]** The *benefits* which hereon are actually collated on the church, whereby it is brought into its consummate state in this world. What they are we have discoursed at large on <sup><3711></sup>Hebrews 7:11.

These, therefore, are the “good things to come,” consisting in the bringing forth and accomplishing of the glorious effects of the hidden wisdom of God, according unto his promises from the beginning of the world, in the sacrifice of Christ, with all the benefits and privileges of the church, in righteousness, peace, and spiritual worship, which ensued thereon. And we may observe, —

**Obs. I.** These things alone are the true and real good things that were intended for and promised unto the church from the beginning of the world. —The Jews had now utterly lost the true notion of them, which proved their ruin; and yet do they continue in the same fatal mistake unto this day. They found that great and glorious things were spoken of by all the prophets, to be brought in at the coming of the Messiah; and the hope of good things to come they lived upon, and continue yet so to do. But being carnal in their own minds, and obstinately fixed unto the desire of earthly things, they fancied them to consist in things quite of another

nature; —honor, riches, power, a kingdom and dominion on the earth, with a possession of the wealth of all nations, were the good things which they hoped were to come. As to reconciliation and peace with God by a full and perfect atonement for sin, righteousness, deliverance from spiritual adversaries, with a holy worship acceptable unto God, they are things which they neither desired nor regarded. Wherefore, choosing the world and the things of it before those which are spiritual and heavenly, unto the world they are left, and the curse which it lieth under. And it is to be feared that some others also have deceived themselves with carnal apprehensions of the good things, if not of the priesthood, yet of the kingdom of Christ.

**Obs. II.** These things alone are absolutely good unto the church; all other things are good or evil as they are used or abused. —Outward peace and prosperity are good in themselves, but oftentimes they prove not so to the church. Many a time have they been abused unto its great disadvantage. They are not such things as are too earnestly to be desired, for who knows what will be the end of them? But these things are absolutely good in every state and condition.

**Obs. III.** So excellent are these good things, as that the performance and procuring of them were the cause of the coming of the Son of God, with his susception and discharge of his sacerdotal office. —They are excellent in their relation unto the wisdom, grace, and love of God, whereof they are the principal effects; and excellent in relation unto the church, as the only means of its eternal redemption and salvation. Had they been of a lower or meaner nature, so glorious a means had not been designed for the effecting of them. Woe unto them by whom they are despised! “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?” And, —

**Obs. IV.** Such a price and value did God put on these things, so good are they in his eyes, as that he made them the subject of his promises unto the church from the foundation of the world. —And in all his promises concerning them, he still opposed them unto all the good things of this world, as those which were incomparably above them and better than them all. And therefore he chose out all things that are precious in the whole creation to represent their excellency; which makes an appearance of promises of earthly glories in the Old Testament, whereby the Jews

deceived themselves. And because of their worth, he judged it meet to keep the church so long in the desire and expectation of them.

**Fifthly**, That which the apostle hath immediate respect unto in the declaration of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, is what he had newly at large declared concerning the tabernacle and the service of the high priest therein. Wherefore he assigns a tabernacle unto this high priest, in answer unto that under the law, whereby he came, or wherein he administered the duties of his office. And concerning this he,

1. Asserts that “he came by a tabernacle.”
2. Describes this tabernacle in comparison with the former:
  - (1.) Positively, that it was “greater and more perfect;”
  - (2.) Negatively, in that being “not made with hands,” it was not of the same building with it.

1. He *came by a tabernacle*. These words may have prospect unto what is afterwards declared in the next verse, and belong thereunto; —as if he had said, ‘Being come an high priest, he entered into the holy place by a perfect tabernacle, with his own blood;’ for so the high priest of the law entered into the holy place, by or through the tabernacle, with the blood of others But the words do rather declare the constitution of the tabernacle intended than the use of it, as unto that one solemn service; for so before he had described the frame and constitution of the old tabernacle, before he mentioned its use.

“Being come an high priest, by such a tabernacle;” that is, wherein he administered that office. What is the tabernacle here intended, there is great variety in the judgment of expositors, Some say it is the church of the new testament, as Chrysostom, who is followed by many. Some say it is heaven itself. This is embraced and pleaded for by Schlichtingius, who labors much in the explanation of it. But whereas this is usually opposed, because the apostle in the next verse affirms that “Christ entered into the holies,” which he expounds of heaven itself, by this tabernacle, which therefore cannot be heaven also, he endeavors to remove it. For he says there is a double tabernacle in heaven. For as the apostle hath in one and the same place described a double tabernacle here on earth, a first and a

second, with their utensils and services, distinguished the one from the other by a veil; so there are two places in heaven answering thereunto. The first of these he would have to be the dwelling-place of the angels; the other the place of the throne of God himself, represented by the most holy place in the tabernacle. Through the first of these he says the LORD Christ passed into the second, which is here called his tabernacle. And it is indeed said that the Lord Christ in his exaltation did “pass through the heavens,” and that he was “made higher than the heavens;” which would seem to favor that conceit, though not observed by him. But there is no ground to conceit or fancy such distinct places in heaven above; yea, it is contrary to the Scripture so to do, for the residence of the holy angels is before and about the throne of God. So are they always placed in the Scripture, <sup><2070></sup>Daniel 7:10; <sup><4080></sup>Matthew 18:10; <sup><6511></sup>Revelation 5:11. And these aspectable heavens, which Christ passed through, were not so much as the veil of the tabernacle in his holy service, which was his own flesh, <sup><5010></sup>Hebrews 10:20. The only reason of this ungrounded, curious imagination, is a design to avoid the acknowledgment of the sacrifice of Christ whilst he was on the earth. For this cause he refers this tabernacle unto his entrance into the most holy place, as the only means of offering himself. But the design of the apostle is to show, that as he was a high priest, so he had a tabernacle of his own wherein he was to minister unto God.

**2.** This tabernacle, whereby he came a high priest, was his own human nature. The bodies of men are often called their tabernacles, 2 Corinthians:5:1; <sup><6014></sup>2 Peter 1:14. And Christ called his own body the temple, <sup><4029></sup>John 2:19. His flesh was the veil, <sup><5010></sup>Hebrews 10:20. And in his incarnation he is said to “pitch his tabernacle among us,” <sup><4014></sup>John 1:14. Herein dwelt “the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” <sup><5009></sup>Colossians 2:9, — that is, substantially; represented by all the pledges of God’s presence in the tabernacle of old. This was that tabernacle wherein the Son of God administered his sacerdotal office in this world, and wherein he continueth yet so to do in his intercession. For the full proof hereof I refer the reader unto our exposition on <sup><5002></sup>Hebrews 8:2.

And this gives us an understanding of the description given of this tabernacle in the adjuncts of it, with reference unto that of old. This is given us, —

(1.) Positively, in a double comparative property: —

[1.] That it was “greater” than it; —greater in dignity and worth, not quantity and measures. The human nature of Christ, both in itself, its conception, framing, gracious qualifications and endowments, especially in its relation unto and subsistence in the divine person of the Son, was far more excellent and glorious than any material fabric could be. In this sense, for comparative excellency and dignity, is *μείζων* almost constantly used in the New Testament. So is it in this epistle, <sup><3016></sup>Hebrews 6:13, 16. The human nature of Christ doth thus more excel the old tabernacle than the sun doth the meanest star.

[2.] “More perfect.” This respects its sacred use. It was more perfectly fitted and suited unto the end of a tabernacle, both for the inhabitation of the divine nature and the means of exercising the sacerdotal office in making atonement for sin, than the other was. So it is expressed, <sup><3016></sup>Hebrews 10:5, “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not have, but a body hast thou prepared me.” This was that which God accepted, wherewith he was well pleased, when he rejected the other as insufficient unto that end. And we may hence observe, that, —

**Obs. V.** The human nature of Christ, wherein he discharged the duties of his sacerdotal office in making atonement for sin, is the greatest, the most perfect and excellent ordinance of God; far excelling those that were most excellent under the old testament. —An ordinance of God it was, in that it was what he designed, appointed, and produced unto his own glow; and it was that which answered all ordinances of worship under the old testament, as the substance of what was shadowed out in them and by them. And I have labored elsewhere to represent the glow of this ordinance as the principal effect of divine wisdom and goodness, the great means of the manifestation of his eternal glory. The wonderful provision of this tabernacle will be the object of holy admiration unto eternity. But the glory of it is a subject which I have elsewhere peculiarly labored in the demonstration of. <sup>f18</sup> And unto the comparison with those of old, here principally intended, its excellency and glory may be considered in these as in other things:

**1st.** Whatever they had of the glory of God in type, figure, and representation; that it had in truth, reality, and substance.



**2dly.** What they only shadowed out as unto reconciliation and peace with God, that it did really effect.

**3dly.** Whereas they were capable only of a holiness by dedication and consecration, which is external, giving an outward denomination, not changing the nature of the things themselves; this was glorious in real internal holiness, wherein the image of God doth consist.

**4thly.** The matter of them all was earthly, carnal, perishing; his human nature was heavenly as unto its original, —”the Lord from heaven;” and immortal or eternal in its constitution, —he was “made a priest after the power of an endless life;” for although he died once for sin, yet his whole nature had always its entire subsistence in the person of the Son of God.

**5thly.** Their relation unto God was by virtue of an outward institution or word of command only that of his was by assumption into personal union with the Son of God.

**6thly.** They had only outward, typical pledges of God’s *presence*; “in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.”

**7thly.** They were exposed unto the injuries of time, and all other outward occurrences, wherein there was nothing of the glory or worship of God; he never did nor could suffer any thing but what belonged unto his office, and is now exalted above all adversities and oppositions. And other considerations of the like nature might be added.

**Obs. VI.** The Son of God undertaking to be the high priest of the church, it was of necessity that he should come by or have a tabernacle wherein to discharge that office, — He” came by a tabernacle.” So it is said unto the same purpose, that it “was of necessity that he should have somewhat to offer,” <sup>scribes</sup> Hebrews 8:3. For being to save the church by virtue of and in the discharge of that office, it could not be otherwise done than by the sacrifice of himself in and by his own tabernacle.

(2.) He describes this tabernacle by a double negation:

[1.] That it was “not made with hands.”

[2.] That it was “not of this building.” And this latter clause is generally taken to be exegetical of the former only, and that because of

its introduction by **τουτ' ἔστιν**, “that is to say.” I shall consider both:

[1.] It was **ἀχειροποίητος** —”not made with hands.” The old tabernacle whilst it stood was the temple of God. So it is constantly called by David in the Psalms. Temples were generally sumptuous and glorious fabrics, always answering the utmost ability of them that built them. Not to have done their best therein they esteemed irreligious; for they designed to express somewhat of the greatness of what they worshipped, and to beget a veneration of what was performed in them. And this men in the degenerate state of Christianity are returned unto, endeavoring to represent the greatness of God, and the holiness of his worship, in magnificent structures, and costly ornaments of them. Howbeit the best of them all are made by the hands of men; and so are no way meet habitations for God, in the way he had designed to dwell among us. This Solomon acknowledgeth concerning the temple which he had built, which yet was the most glorious that ever was erected, and built by God’s own appointment: <sup>40162</sup>Chronicles 2:5, 6,

“The house which I build is great: for great is our God above all gods. But who is able to build him an house, seeing the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain him? who am I then, that I should build him an house, save only to burn sacrifice before him?”

And <sup>41027</sup>1 Kings 8:27,

“Will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded?”

Service was to be done unto God in that temple according unto his appointment, but a meet habitation for him it was not. And our apostle lays it down as a principle suited unto natural light, that “God, who made all things, could not dwell **ἐν χειροποίητοις νασίδις**,” —”in temples made with hands,” <sup>441724</sup>Acts 17:24. Such was the tabernacle of old; but such was not that wherein our Lord Jesus administereth his office.

There seems to me to have been an apprehension among the Jews that there should be a temple wherein God would dwell, that should not be made with hands. Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the first year of his ministry,

upon his purging of the temple, upon their requiring a sign for the justification of his authority in what he had done, says no more but only, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,” <sup><4189></sup>John 2:19. He spake of the same temple, as to their destruction of it and his own raising it again. Thus he called his own body. “He spake,” saith the evangelist, “of the temple of his body.” That other fabric was a type thereof, and so partook of the same name with it; but yet was no further a temple, or a habitation of God, but as it was typical of that body of his, wherein the fullness of the Godhead did dwell. This testimony of his seemeth to have provoked the Jews above every other; —unless it was that, when he plainly declared his divine nature unto them, affirming that he was before Abraham; for this cast them into so much madness, as that immediately “they took up stones to cast at him,” <sup><4188></sup>John 8:58, 59. But their malice was more inveterate against him for what he thus spake concerning the temple; for, three years after, when they conspired to take away his life, they made these words the ground of their accusation. But as is usual in such cases, when they could not pretend that his own words, as he spake them, were criminal, they variously wrested them to make an appearance of a crime, though they knew not of what nature. So the psalmist prophesied that they should do, <sup><4185></sup>Psalms 56:5, 6. Some of them affirmed him to have said,

“I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days,” <sup><4186></sup>Matthew 26:61.

Which was apparently false, as is evident in comparing his words with theirs. Wherefore others of them observing that the witness was not yet home unto their purpose, and the design of the priests, they swore positively that he said,

“I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands,” <sup><4188></sup>Mark 14:58.

For they are not the words of the same persons, variously reported by the evangelists; for these in Mark are other witnesses, which agreed not with what was sworn before, as he observes, verse 59, “But neither so did their witness agree together.” However, they fix on a notion that was passant among them, of a temple to be built without hands. And sundry things

there are in the prophets which led them into an apprehension that God would dwell among men in a temple or tabernacle that should not be made with hands. And all their predictions were accomplished when the eternal Word, by the assumption of our nature, fixed his tabernacle among us, <sup><B14></sup>John 1:14.

This is that which the apostle intimates: Whereas Solomon openly affirms that the habitation of God could not be in the temple that he had built, because it was made with hands, and it is a principle of natural light, that he who made the world and all things contained therein could not dwell in such a temple; and whereas it seems to have belonged unto the faith of the church of old that there should be a temple wherein God would dwell that was to be **ἀχειροποίητος**; in comparing the human nature of Christ with the old tabernacle, he affirms in the first place that it was not made with hands.

Respect also is had herein unto the framing of the fabric of the old tabernacle by Bezaleel. For although the pattern of it was shown unto Moses in the mount from heaven, yet the actual framing and erection of it was by the hands of workmen skillful to work in all kinds of earthly materials, <sup><E30></sup>Exodus 31:1-6, <sup><E31></sup>36:1. And although by reason of the wisdom, cunning, and skill which they had received in an extraordinary way, they framed, made, and reared a tabernacle most artificial and beautiful; yet when all was done, it was but the work of men's hands. But the constitution and production of the human nature of Christ was an immediate effect of the wisdom and power of God himself, <sup><L15></sup>Luke 1:35. Nothing of human wisdom or contrivance, nothing of the skill or power of man, had the least influence into or concurrence in the provision of this glorious tabernacle, wherein the work of the redemption of the church was effected. The body of Christ, indeed, was "made of a woman," of the substance of the blessed Virgin; but she was purely passive therein, and concurrent in no efficiency either moral or physical thereunto. It was the contrivance of divine wisdom and the effect of divine power alone.

[2.] The apostle' adds, as a further dissimilitude unto the other tabernacle, "That is, not of this building." Expositors generally take these words to be merely exegetical of the former: "Not made with hands; that is, not of this building." To me there seems to be an **ἀύξησης** in them. 'It is so not made

with hands like unto that tabernacle, as that it is not of the order of any other created thing; not of the same make and constitution with any thing else in the whole creation here below.’ For although the substance of his human nature was of the same kind with ours, yet the production of it in the world was such an act of divine power as excels all other divine operations whatever. Wherefore God speaking of it saith, “The LORD hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man,”

<sup>2812</sup>Jeremiah 31:22; or conceive him without natural generation.

**Κτίσις** is the word whereby the creation of all things is constantly expressed in the New Testament; and sometimes it signifies the things that are created. Neither is it ever used, nor **κτίζω**, whence it is derived, to signify the constitution of the ordinances of the old testament, the tabernacle, the temple, or any thing belonging thereunto. Wherefore **ταύτης** here doth not limit it unto that constitution, so as that “not of this building” should be, “not made with hands as that tabernacle was.” It is therefore not of the order of created things here below, either such as were immediately created at the beginning, or educed out of them by a creating act of power. For although it was so as unto its substance, yet in its constitution and production it was an effect of the divine power above the whole order of this creation, or things created.

**Obs. VII.** God is so far from being obliged unto any means for the effecting of the holy counsels of his will, as that he can when he pleaseth exceed the whole order and course of the first creation of all things, and his providence in the rule thereof.

### VERSE 12.

From the comparison between the tabernacle of old and that of the high priest of the new covenant, there is a procedure in this verse unto another, between his sacerdotal actings and those of the high priest under the law. And whereas, in the description of the tabernacle and its especial services, the apostle had insisted in a peculiar manner on the entrance of the high priest every year into the most holy place, —which was the most solemn and most mystical part of the tabernacle service, —in the first place he gives an account of what answered thereunto in the sacerdotal administrations of Christ; and how much on all accounts, both of the

*sacrifice* in the virtue whereof he entered into the most holy place, and of the *place* itself whereinto he entered, and of the *time* when, it did in glory and efficacy excel that service of the high priest under the law.

**Ver. 12.** —Οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσηλθεν ἑφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰώνιαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος.

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. Syr., **הַנְּפִשָׁתוֹ לְמַדְבָּרָא**, “by the blood of his own soul” or “life.” He made his soul an offering for sin, <sup>2510</sup> Isaiah 53:10. Blood is the life of the sacrifice. Ἐφάπαξ. Syr., **בְּיָמֵי אֶחָד**, “one time;” not many times, not once every year, as they did under the law. Εἰς τὰ ἅγια. Syr., **לְבַיִת מִקְדָּשָׁה**, “into the house of the sanctuary;” less properly, for by that expression’ the old tabernacle is intended, but the apostle respects heaven itself. “In sancta,” “sancta sanctorum,” “sacrarium;” —that which answers unto the most holy place in the tabernacle, where was the throne of God, the ark and mercy-seat. Αἰώνιαν. Vulg., “aeterna redemptione inventa;” “aeternam redemptionem nactus;” “aeterna redemptione acquisita;” most properly, and according unto the use of the word in all good authors.

**Ver. 12.** —Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the [*most*] holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.

In this verse there is a direct entrance into the great mystery of the sacerdotal actings of Christ, especially as unto the sacrifice he offered to make atonement tot sin. But the method which the apostle proceedeth in is what he was led unto by the proposal he had made of the types of it under the law; wherefore he begins with the complement or consequent of it, in answer unto that act or duty of the high priest wherein the glory of his office was most conspicuous, which he had newly mentioned.

And here, because part of our design in the exposition of this whole epistle is to free and vindicate the sense of it from the corrupt glosses which the Socinians, and some that follow them, have cast upon it, I shall on this great head of the sacrifice of Christ particularly insist on the removal of them. And indeed the substance of all that is scattered up and down their writings against the proper sacrifice of Christ, and the true nature of his

sacerdotal office, is comprised in the comment on this epistle composed by Crellius and Schlichtingius I shall therefore first examine their corrupt wrestings of the words and false interpretations of them, before. I proceed unto their exposition.

They begin, “Nunc etiam opponit sacrificium ipsius Christi, sacrificio pontificis antiqui.” This is the *πρώτον ψεύδος*, of their interpretation of this and the following verses. If this be not so, all that they afterwards assert, or infer from it, falls of itself. But this is most false. There is not any thing directly either of the sacrifice of Christ or of the high priest, but only what was consequent unto the one and the other; yea, there is that which excludes them from being intended. The entrance of the high priest into the holy place was not his sacrifice. For it supposed his sacrifice to be offered before, in the virtue whereof, and with the memorial of it, he so entered; that is, with “the blood of goats and calves.” For all sacrifices were offered at the brazen altar; and that of the high priest on the day of expiation is expressly declared so to have been, Leviticus 16. And the entrance of Christ into heaven was not his sacrifice, nor the oblation of himself. For he offered himself unto God with strong cries and supplications; but his entrance into heaven was triumphant. So he entered into heaven by virtue of his sacrifice, as we shall see; but his entrance into heaven was not the sacrifice of himself.

They add in explication hereof: “Pontifex antiquus per sanguinem hircorum et vitulorum ingrediebatur in sancta, Christus vero non per sanguinem tam vilem, sed pretiosissimum; quod alius esse non potuit quam ipsius proprius. Nam sanguis quidem humanus sanguine brutorum, sed sanguis Christi, sanguine caeterorum omnium hominum longe est pretiosior; cum ipse quoque caeteris hominibus omnibus imo omnibus creaturis longe sit praestantior, Deoque charior et prior, utpote unigenitus eius Filius.” What they say of the “preciousness of the blood of Christ” above that of brute creatures, is true; but they give two reasons for it, which comprise not the true reason of its excellency as unto the ends of his sacrifice:

1. They say, it was “the blood of a man.”
2. That “this man was more dear to God than all other creatures, as his only-begotten Son.” Take these last words in the sense of the Scripture,

and the true reason of the preciousness and efficacy of the blood of Christ in his sacrifice is assigned; take them in their sense, and it is excluded. The Scripture by them intends his eternal generation, as the Son of the Father; they, only his nativity of the blessed Virgin, with his exaltation after his resurrection. But the true excellency and efficacy of the blood of Christ in his sacrifice was from his divine person, whereby “God purchased his church with his own blood,” ~~Acts~~ Acts 20:28.

Nor do I know of what consideration the “preciousness” of the blood of Christ can be with them in this matter; for it belonged not unto his sacrifice, or the oblation of himself, as they pretend. For they would have the offering of himself to consist only in his *entrance into heaven, and appearing in the presence of God*, when, as they also imagine, he had neither flesh nor blood.

They proceed unto a speculation about the use and signification of the preposition *per*, *by*, or *διὰ*:

“Notandum est auctorem, ut elegantiae istius comparationis consuleret, usum esse in priori membro voce, ‘per;’ licet pontifex legalis non tantum per sanguinem hircorum et vitulorum, hoc est, fuso prius sanguine istorum animalium, seu interveniente sanguinis eorum fusione, sed etism cum ipsorum sanguine in sancta fuerit ingressus, ver. 7. Verum quia in Christi sacrificio similitudo eousque extendi non potuit, cum Christus non alienum sed suum sanguinem fuderit, nec sanguinem suum post mortem, sed seipsum, et quidem jam immortalem, depositis carnis et sanguinis exuviis, quippe quae regnum Dei possidere nequeant, in coelesti illo tabernaculo obtulerit; proindeque non cum sanguine, sed tantum fuso prius sanguine, seu interveniente sanguinis sui fusione in sancta fuerit ingressus; idcirco auctor minus de legali pontifice dixit quam res erat; vel potius ambiguitate particulae, ‘per,’ quae etiam idem quod ‘cum,’ in sacris literis significare solet, comparationis concinnitati consulere voluit.”

The design of this whole discourse is to overthrow the nature of the sacrifice of Christ, and to destroy all the real similitude between it and the sacrifice of the high priest; the whole of its sophistry being animated by a



fancied signification of the preposition “per,” or falsely-pretended reason of the use of it by the apostle. For,

1. The high priest did indeed carry of the blood of the sacrifice into the holy place, and so may be said to enter into it with blood; as it is said he did it “not without blood,” verse 7: yet is it not that which the apostle hath here respect unto; but it is the sacrifice at the altar, where the blood of it was shed and offered, which he intends, as we shall see immediately.
2. There is therefore nothing less ascribed unto the high priest herein than belonged unto him; for all that is intended is, that he entered into the holy place by virtue of the blood of goats and calves which was offered at the altar. Less than his due is not ascribed unto him, to make the comparison fit and meet, as is boldly pretended. Yea,
3. The nature of the comparison used by the apostle is destroyed by this artifice; especially if it be considered as a mere comparison, and not as the relation that was between the type and the antitype; for that is the nature of the comparison that the apostle makes between the entrance of the high priest into the holy place and the entrance of Christ into heaven. That there may be such a comparison, that there may be such a relation between these things, it is needful that they should really agree in that wherein they are compared, and not by force or artifice be fitted to make some kind of resemblance the one of the other. For it is to no purpose to compare things together which disagree in all things; much less can such things be the types one of another. Wherefore the apostle declares and allows a treble dissimilitude in the comparates, or between the type and the antitype: for Christ entered by his *own blood*, the high priest by the *blood of goats and calves*; Christ *only once*, the high priest *every year*; Christ into *heaven*, the high priest into the *tabernacle* made with hands. But in other things he confirms a similitude between them; namely, in the entrance of the high priest into the holy place by the blood of his sacrifice, or with it. But by these men this is taken away, and so no ground of any comparison left; — only the apostle makes use of an ambiguous word, to frame an appearance of some similitude in the things compared, whereas indeed there is none at all! For unto these ends he says, “by the blood,” whereas he ought to have said, “with the blood.” But if he had said so, there would have been no appearance of any similitude between the things compared. For they allow

not Christ to enter into the holy place by or with his own blood in any sense; not by virtue of it as offered in sacrifice for us, nor to make application of it unto us in the fruits of his oblation for us. And what similitude is there between the high priest entering into the holy place by the blood of the sacrifice that he had offered, and the Lord Christ entering into heaven without his own blood, or any respect unto the virtue of it as offered in sacrifice?

**4.** This notion of the sacrifice or oblation of Christ to consist only in his *appearance in heaven* without flesh or blood, as they speak, overthrows all the relation of types or representations between it and the sacrifices of old. Nay, on that supposition, they were suited rather to deceive the church than instruct it in the nature of the great expiatory sacrifice that was to be made by Christ. For the universal testimony of them all was, that atonement and expiation of sin was to be made by blood, and no otherwise; but according unto these men, Christ offered not himself unto God for the expiation of our sins until he had neither flesh nor blood.

**5.** They say, it is true, he offered himself in heaven, “*fuse prius sanguine.*” But it is an order of time, and not of causality, which they intend. His blood was shed before, but therein, they say, was no part of his offering or sacrifice. But herein they expressly contradict the Scripture and themselves. It is by the offering of Christ that our sins are expiated, and redemption obtained. This the Scripture doth so expressly declare as that they cannot directly deny it. But these things are constantly ascribed unto the blood of Christ, and the shedding of it; and yet they would have it that Christ offered himself then only, when he had neither flesh nor blood.

They increase this confusion in their ensuing discourse:

“*Aliter enim ex parte Christi res sese habuit, quam in illo antique. In antique illo, ut in aliis quae pro peccato lege divina constituta erant, non offerebatur ipsum animal mactatum, hoc est, nec in odorem suavitatis, ut Scriptura loquitur, adolebatur, sed renes ejus et adeps tantum; nec inferebatur in sancta, sed illius sanguis tantum. In Christi autem sacrificio, non sanguis ipsius quem mactatus effudit, sed ipse offerri, et in illa sancta coelestia ingredi debuit. Idcirco infra ver. 14, dicitur, seipsum, non vero sanguinem*

suum Deo obtulisse; licet alias comparatio cum sacrificiis  
expiatoriis postulare videretur, ut hoc posterius potius doceretur.”

**1.** Here they fully declare, that, according to their notion, there was indeed no manner of similitude between the things compared, but that, as to what they are compared in, they were opposite, and had no agreement at all. The ground of the comparison in the apostle is, that they were both *by blood*, and this alone. For herein he allows a dissimilitude, in that Christ's was “*by his own blood*,” that of the high priest “*by the blood of goats and calves*.” But according unto the sense of these men, herein consists the difference between them, that the one was *with blood*, and the other *without it*; which is expressly contradictory to the apostle.

**2.** What they observe of the sacrifices of old, that not the *bodies of them*, but only the *kidneys and fat* were burned, and the blood only carried into the holy place, is neither true nor any thing to their purpose. For,

**(1.)** The whole bodies of the expiatory sacrifices were burnt and consumed with fire; and this was done without the camp, <sup><BR27></sup>Leviticus 16:27, to signify the suffering of Christ, and therein the offering of his body without the city, as the apostle observes, <sup><SR31></sup>Hebrews 13:11, 12

**(2.)** They allow of no use of the blood in sacrifices, but only as to the carrying of it into the holy place: which is expressly contradictory unto the main end of the institution of expiatory sacrifices; for it was that by their blood atonement should be made on the altar, <sup><BR71></sup>Leviticus 17:11. Wherefore there is no relation of type and antitype, no similitude for a ground of comparison between the sacrifice of Christ and that of the high priest, if it was not made by his blood.

**(3.)** Their observation, that in verse 14 the Lord Christ is said to *offer himself, and not to offer his blood*, is of no value. For in the offering of his blood Christ offered himself, or he offered himself by the offering of his blood; his person giving the efficacy of a sacrifice unto what he offered. And this is undeniably asserted in that very verse. For the “*purging of our consciences from dead works*,” is the expiation of sin; but Christ, even according to the Socinians, procured the expiation of sin by the offering of himself; yet is this here expressly assigned unto his blood, “*How much*

more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?" Wherefore in the offering of himself he offered his blood.

They add, as the exposition of these words, "He entered into the holiest;" — "Ingressus in sancta, necessario ad sacrificium istud requiritur. Nec ante oblatio, in qua sacrificii ratio potissimum consistit, peragi potuit, cum ea in sanctis ipsis fieri debuerit. Hinc manifestum est pontificis nostri oblationem et sacrificium non in truce, sed in coelis peractam esse, et adhuc peragi."

*Ans.* **1.** What they say at first is true; but what they intend and infer from thence is false. It is true that the entrance into the holy place, and carrying of the blood in thither, did belong unto the anniversary sacrifice intended; for God had prescribed that order unto its consummation and complement. But that the sacrifice or oblation did consist therein is false; for it is directly affirmed that both the bullock and goat for the sin-offering were offered before it, at the altar, <sup><BR></sup>Leviticus 16:6, 9.

**2.** It doth not therefore hence follow, as is pretended, that the Lord Christ offered not himself a sacrifice unto God on the earth, but did so in heaven only; but the direct contrary doth follow. For the blood of the sin-offering was offered on the altar, before it was carried into the holy place; which was the type of Christ's entrance into heaven.

**3.** What they say, that the sacrifice of Christ was performed or offered in heaven, and is yet so offered, utterly overthrows the whole nature of his sacrifice. For the apostle everywhere represents that to consist absolutely in one offering, once offered, not repeated or continued. Herein lies the foundation of all his arguments for its excellency and efficacy. Hereof the making of it to be nothing but a continued act of power in heaven, as is done by them, is utterly destructive.

What they add in the same place about the nature of redemption, will be removed in the consideration of it immediately. In the close of the whole they affirm, that the obtaining of everlasting salvation by Christ was not an act antecedent unto his entering into heaven, as the word seems to import, — εὐράμενος, "having obtained;" but it was done by his entrance itself into that holy place; whence they would rather read the word εὐράμενος in the present tense, "obtaining." But whereas our redemption

is everywhere constantly in the Scripture assigned unto the blood of Christ, and that alone, — <sup><400></sup>Ephesians 1:7; <sup><500></sup>Colossians 1:14; <sup><600></sup>1 Peter 1:18, 19; <sup><700></sup>Revelation 5:9, “Hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood,” —it is too great a confidence, to confine this work unto his entrance into heaven, without any offering of his blood, and when he had no blood to offer. And in this place, the “redemption obtained” is the same upon the matter with the “purging of our consciences from dead works,” verse 14, which is ascribed directly unto his blood.

These glosses being removed, I shall proceed unto the exposition of the words.

The apostle hath a double design in this verse and those two that follow: 1. To declare the *dignity* of the person of Christ in the discharge of his priestly office above the high priest of old. And this he doth,

- (1.) From the *excellency of his sacrifice*, which was his own blood;
- (2.) The *holy place* whereinto he entered by virtue of it, which was heaven itself; and,
- (3.) The *effect of it*, in that by it be procured eternal redemption: which he doth in this verse. 2.

To prefer the efficacy of this sacrifice of Christ for the purging of sin, or the purification of sinners, above all the sacrifices and ordinances of the law, verses 13, 14.

In this verse, with respect unto the end mentioned, the entrance of Christ into the holy place, in answer unto that of the legal high priest, described verse 7, is declared. And it is so,

1. As unto the *way or means* of it;
  2. As unto its *season*
  3. As unto its *effect*: in all which respects Christ was manifested in and by it to be far more excellent than the legal high priest.
1. The *manner* and way of it is expressed,
- (1.) Negatively; it was “not by the blood of goats and calves.”

(2.) Positively; it was “by his own blood.”

2. For the *time* of it, it was “once,” and but once.

3. The *effect* of that blood of his, as offered in sacrifice, was, that he “obtained” thereby “eternal redemption.”

The thing asserted is the entrance of Christ, the high priest, into the holy place. That he should do so was necessary, both to answer the type and for the rendering his sacrifice effectual in the application of the benefits of it unto the church, as it is afterwards declared at large. And I shall open the words, not in the order wherein they lie in the text, but in the natural order of the things themselves. And we must show,

1. What is the *holy place* whereinto Christ entered.
2. What was that *entrance*.
3. *How he did it once*; whereon will follow,
4. The consideration of the *means* whereby he did it,
5. With the *effect* of that means: —

1. For the *place* whereinto he entered, it is said he did so εἰς τὰ ἅγια, — “into the holies.” It is the same word whereby he expresseth the “sanctuary,” the second part of the tabernacle, whereinto the high priest entered once a-year. But in the application of it unto Christ, the signification of it is changed. He had nothing to do with, he had no right to enter into that holy place, as the apostle affirms, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 8:4. That, therefore, he intends which was signified thereby; that is, *heaven itself*, as he explains it in <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:24. The heaven of heavens, the place of the glorious residence of the presence or majesty of God, is that whereinto he entered.

2. His *entrance* itself into this place is asserted: “He entered.” This entrance of Christ into heaven upon his ascension may be considered two ways:

(1.) As it was *regal*, glorious and triumphant; so it belonged properly unto his kingly office, as that wherein he triumphed over all the enemies of the church. See it described, <sup><400></sup>Ephesians 4:8-10, from <sup><400></sup>Psalms 68:18. Satan,

the world, death, and hell, being conquered, and all power committed unto him, he entered triumphantly into heaven. So it was regal

**(2.)** As it was *sacerdotal*. Peace and reconciliation being made by the blood of the cross, the covenant being confirmed, eternal redemption obtained, he entered as our high priest into the holy place, the temple of God above, to make his sacrifice effectual unto the church, and to apply the benefits of it thereunto.

**3.** This he did “once” only, “once for all.” In the foregoing description of the service of the high priest, he shows how he went into the holy place “once every year;” that is, on one day, wherein he went to offer. And the repetition of this service every year proved its imperfection, seeing it could never accomplish perfectly that whereunto it was designed, as he argues in the next chapter. In opposition hereunto, our high priest entered once only into the holy place; a full demonstration that his one sacrifice had fully expiated the sins of the church.

**4.** Of this entrance of Christ it is said, —

**(1.)** Negatively, that he did not do it “by the blood of goats and calves.” And this is introduced with the disjunctive negative, οὐδέ, “neither;” which refers unto what was before denied of him, as unto his entrance into the tabernacle made with hands. ‘He did not do so, neither did he make his entrance by the blood of goats and calves’ A difference from and opposition unto the entrance of the high priest annually into the holy place is intended. It must therefore be considered how he so entered.

This entrance is at large described, Leviticus 16: And,

**[1.]** It was by the blood of a bullock and a goat, which the apostle here renders in the plural number, “goats and calves,” because of the annual repetition of the same sacrifice.

**[2.]** The order of the institution was, that first the bullock or calf was offered, then the goat; the one for the priest, the other for the people. This order belonging not at all unto the purpose of the apostle, he expresseth it otherwise, “goats and calves.”

Τράγος is a “goat;” a word that expresseth “totum genus caprinum,” — that whole kind of creature, be it young or old. So the goats of his offering

were שְׂעִירֵי, “kids,” verse 5; that is, young he-goats, for the precise time of their age is not determined. So the bullock the priest offered for himself was פָּר, “juvencus ex genere bovino;” which is μόσχος, for it expresseth “genus vitulinum,” all young cattle.

Concerning these it is intimated, in this negative as unto Christ, that the high priest entered into the holy place δι’ αἵματος, “by their blood;” which we must inquire into.

Two things belonged unto the office of the high priest, with respect unto this blood. For,

[1.] He was to offer the blood both of the bullock and the goat at the altar for a sin-offering, <sup><BR></sup>Leviticus 16:9, 11. For it was the blood wherewith alone atonement was to be made for sin, and that at the altar, <sup><BR></sup>Leviticus 17:11; so far is it from truth that expiation for sin was made only in the holy place, and that it is so by Christ without blood, as the Socinians imagine.

[2.] He was to carry some of the blood of the sacrifice into the sanctuary, to sprinkle it there, to make atonement for the holy place, in the sense before declared. And the inquiry is, which of these the apostle hath respect unto.

Some say it is the latter; and that δυά here is put for σύν, —”by” for “with.” He entered *with* the blood of goats and calves; namely, that which he carried with him into the holy place. So plead the Socinians and those that follow them, with design to overthrow the sacrifice which Christ offered in his death and bloodshedding, confining the whole expiation of sin, in their sense of it, unto what is done in heaven. But I have before disproved this surmise. And the apostle is so far from using the particle διά improperly for σύν, so to frame a comparison between things wherein indeed there was no similitude, as they dream, that he useth it on purpose to exclude the sense which σύν, “with,” would intimate: for he doth not declare with what the high priest entered into the holy place, for he entered with incense as well as with blood; but what it was by virtue whereof he so entered as to be accepted with God. So it is expressly directed, <sup><BR></sup>Leviticus 16:2, 3,



“Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place.... With a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering, shall he come.”

Aaron was not to bring the bullock into the holy place, but he had right to enter into it by the sacrifice of it at the altar. Thus, therefore, the high priest entered into the holy place by the blood of goats and calves; namely, by virtue of the sacrifice of their blood which he had offered without at the altar. And so all things do exactly correspond between the type and the antitype. For, —

(2.) It is affirmed positively of him that “he entered by his own blood,” and that in opposition unto the other way; *διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος* (*δέ* for *ἀλλά*), —”but by his own blood.”

It is a vain speculation, contrary to the analogy of faith, and destructive or the true nature of the oblation of Christ, and inconsistent with the dignity of his person, that he should carry with him into heaven a part of that material blood which was shed for us on the earth. This some have invented, to maintain a comparison in that wherein is none intended. The design of the apostle is only to declare by virtue of what he entered as a priest into the holy place. And this was by virtue of his own blood when it was shed, when he offered himself unto God. This was that which laid the foundation of, and gave him right unto the administration of his priestly office in heaven. And hereby were all those good things procured which he effectually communicates unto us in and by that administration.

This exposition is the center of all gospel mysteries, the object of the admiration of angels and men unto all eternity. What heart can conceive, what tongue can express, the wisdom, grace, and love, that are contained therein? This alone is the stable foundation of faith in our access unto God. Two things present themselves unto us: —

[1.] The unspeakable love of Christ in offering himself and his own blood for us. See <sup><402></sup>Galatians 2:20; <sup><605></sup>Revelation 1:5; <sup><616></sup>1 John 3:16; <sup><415></sup>Ephesians 5:25-27. There being no other way whereby our sins might be purged and expiated, <sup><305></sup>Hebrews 10:5-7, out of his infinite love and grace he condescended unto this way, whereby God might be glorified, and his church sanctified and saved. It were well if we did always consider

aright what love, what thankfulness, what obedience, are due unto him on the account hereof.

[2.] The excellency and efficacy of his sacrifice is hereby demonstrated, that through him our faith and hope may be in God. He who offered this sacrifice was “the only-begotten of the Father,” the eternal Son of God. That which he offered was “his own blood.” “God purchased his church with his own blood,” <sup><40B></sup>Acts 20:28. How unquestionable, how perfect must the atonement be that was thus made! how glorious the redemption that was procured thereby

5. This is that which the apostle mentions in the close of this verse as the *effect of his blood-shedding*, “Having obtained eternal redemption.” The word **εὐράμενος** is variously rendered, as we have seen. The Vulgar Latin reads, “redemptioe aeterna inventa.” And those that follow it do say that things rare, and so sought after, are said to be found. And Chrysostom inclines unto that notion of the word. But **εὐρίσκω** is used in all good authors, for not only “to find,” but “to obtain” by our endeavors. So do we render it, and so we ought to do, <sup><40C></sup>Romans 4:1; <sup><40D></sup>Hebrews 4:16. He obtained effectually eternal redemption by the price of his blood. And it is mentioned in a tense denoting the time past, to signify that he had thus obtained eternal redemption before he entered into the holy place. How he obtained it we shall see in the consideration of the nature of the thing itself that was obtained.

Three things must be inquired into, with what brevity we can, for the explication of these words:

- (1.) What is “*redemption*;”
- (2.) Why is this redemption called “eternal;”
- (3.) How Christ” *obtained*” it.

(1.) All redemption respects a state of bondage and captivity, with all the events that do attend it. The object of it, or those to be redeemed, are only persons in that estate. There is mention, verse 15, of “the redemption of transgressions,” but it is by a metonymy of the cause for the effect. It is transgression which cast men into that state from whence they are to be redeemed. But both in the Scripture and in the common notion of the

word, “redemption” is the deliverance of persons from a state of bondage. And this may be done two ways:

[1.] By power;

[2.] By payment of a price.

That which is in the former way is only improperly and metaphorically so called. For it is in its own nature a bare deliverance, and is termed “redemption” only with respect to the state of captivity from whence it is a deliverance. It is a vindication into liberty by any means. So the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, though wrought merely by acts of power, is called their redemption. And Moses, from his ministry in that work, is called *λυτρωτής*, a “redeemer,” <sup><4075></sup>Acts 7:35. But this redemption is only metaphorically so called, with respect unto the state of bondage wherein the people were. That which is properly so is by a price paid, as a valuable consideration. *Λύτρον* is a “ransom,” a price of redemption. Thence are *λύτρωσις*, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, *λυτρωτής*, “redemption” and a “redeemer.” So the redemption that is by Christ is everywhere said to be a “price,” a “ransom.” See <sup><4018></sup>Matthew 20:28; <sup><4105></sup>Mark 10:45; <sup><4161></sup>1 Corinthians 6:20; <sup><5016></sup>1 Timothy 2:6; <sup><6018></sup>1 Peter 1:18, 19. It is the deliverance of persons out of a state of captivity and bondage, by the payment of a valuable price or ransom. And the Socinians offer violence not only to the Scripture, but to common sense itself, when they contend that the redemption which is constantly affirmed to be by a price is metaphorical, and that only proper which is by power.

The price or ransom in this redemption is two ways expressed:

[1.] By that which gave it its worth and value, that it might be a sufficient ransom for all;

[2.] By its especial nature.

The first is the *person of Christ himself*: “He gave himself for us,” <sup><4021></sup>Galatians 2:20; “He gave himself a ransom for all,” <sup><5016></sup>1 Timothy 2:6; “He offered himself to God,” <sup><3014></sup>Hebrews 9:14; <sup><4018></sup>Ephesians 5:2. This was that which made the ransom of an infinite value, meet to redeem the whole church. “God purchased the church with his own blood,” <sup><4018></sup>Acts 20:28. The especial nature of it is, that it was by *blood*, “by his own blood.” See

☞ Ephesians 1:7; ☞ 1 Peter 1:18, 19. And this blood of Christ was a ransom, or price of redemption, partly from the invaluableness of that obedience which he yielded unto God in the shedding of it; and partly because this ransom was also to be an atonement, as it was offered unto God in sacrifice. For it is by blood, and no otherwise, that atonement is made, ☞ Leviticus 17:11. Wherefore he is “set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,” ☞ Romans 3:24, 25.

That the Lord Jesus Christ did give himself a ransom for sin; that he did it in the shedding of his blood for us, wherein he made his soul an offering for sin; that herein and hereby he made atonement, and expiated our sins; and that all these things belong unto our redemption, is the substance of the gospel. That this redemption is nothing but the expiation of sin, and that expiation of sin nothing but an act of power and authority in Christ now in heaven, as the Socinians dream, is to reject the whole gospel

Though the nature of this redemption be usually spoken unto, yet we must not here wholly put it by. And the nature of it will appear in the consideration of the state from whence we are redeemed, with the causes of it:

[1.] The *meritorious cause* of it was sin, or our original apostasy from God. Hereby we lost our primitive liberty, with all the rights and privileges thereunto belonging.

[2.] The *supreme efficient cause* is God himself. As the ruler and judge of all, he cast all apostates into a state of captivity and bondage; for liberty is nothing but peace with him. But he did it with this difference: sinning angels he designed to leave irrecoverably under this condition; for mankind he would find a ransom.

[3.] The *instrumental cause* of it was the curse of the law. This falling on men brings them into a state of bondage. For it separates as to all relation of love and peace between God and them, and gives life unto all the actings of sin and death; wherein the misery of that state consists. To be separate from God, to be under the power of sin and death, is to be in bondage.

[4.] The *external cause*, by the application of all other causes unto the souls and consciences of men, is Satan. His was the power of darkness, his the power of death over men in that state and condition; that is, to make

application of the terror of it unto their souls, as threatened in the curse, <sup><RBH</sup> Hebrews 2:14, 15. Hence he appears as the head of this state of bondage, and men are in captivity unto him. He is not so in himself, but as the external application of the causes of bondage is committed unto him.

From hence it is evident that four things are required unto that redemption which is a deliverance by price or ransom from this state. For,

[1.] It must be by such a ransom as whereby *the guilt of sin is expiated*; which was the meritorious cause of our captivity. Hence it is called “the redemption of transgressions,” verse 15; that is, of persons from that state and condition whereinto they were cast by sin or transgression.

[2.] Such as wherewith in respect of God *atonement must be made*, and satisfaction unto his justice, as the supreme ruler and judge of all.

[3.] Such as whereby the *curse of the law might be removed*; which could not be without undergoing of it.

[4.] Such as whereby the *power of Satan might be destroyed*. How all this was done by the blood of Christ, I have at large declared elsewhere.

(2.) This redemption is said to be “eternal.” And it is so on many accounts:

[1.] Of the *subject-matter* of it, which are things eternal; none of them are carnal or temporal. The state of bondage from which we are delivered by it in all its causes was spiritual, not temporal; and the effects of it, in liberty, grace, and glory, are eternal.

[2.] Of its *duration*. It was not for a season, like that of the people out of Egypt, or the deliverances which they had afterwards under the judges, and on other occasions. They endured in their effects only for a season, and afterwards new troubles of the same kind overtook them. But this was eternal in all the effects of it; none that are partakers of it do ever return into a state of bondage. So,

[3.] It *endures in those effects unto all eternity in heaven itself*.

(3.) This redemption Christ obtained by “his blood.” Having done all in the sacrifice of himself that was, in the justice, holiness, and wisdom of God, required thereunto, it was wholly in his power to confer all the

benefits and effects of it on the church, on them that do believe. And sundry things we may observe from this verse.

**Obs. I.** The entrance of our Lord Jesus Christ as our high priest into heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us, and to save us thereby unto the uttermost, was a thing so great and glorious as could not be accomplished but by his own blood. — No other sacrifice was sufficient unto this end: “Not by the blood of bulls and goats.” The reason hereof the apostle declares at large, <sup>300</sup> Hebrews 10:4-10. Men seldom rise in their thoughts unto the greatness of this mystery; yea, with the most, this “blood of the covenant,” wherewith he was sanctified unto the remainder of his work, is a common thing. The rain of Christian religion lies in the slight thoughts of men about the blood of Christ; and pernicious errors do abound in opposition unto the true nature of the sacrifice which he made thereby. Even the faith of the best is weak and imperfect as to the comprehension of the glory of it. Our relief is, that the uninterrupted contemplation of it will be a part of our blessedness unto eternity. But yet whilst we are here, we can neither understand how great is the salvation which is tendered unto us thereby, nor be thankful for it, without a due consideration of the way whereby the Lord Christ entered into the holy place. And he will be the most humble and most fruitful Christian whose faith is most exercised, most conversant about it.

**Obs. II.** Whatever difficulties lay in the way of Christ, as unto the accomplishment and perfection of the work of our redemption, he would not decline them, nor desist from his undertaking, whatever it cost him. — “Sacrifice and burnt-offering thou wouldest not have; then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.” He made his way into the holy place by his own blood. What was required of him for us, that we might be saved, he would not decline, though never so great and dreadful; and surely we ought not to decline what he requires of us, that he may be honored.

**Obs. III.** There was a holy place meet to receive the Lord Christ after the sacrifice of himself, and a suitable reception for such a person, after so glorious a performance. — It was a place of great glory and beauty whereinto the high priest of old entered by the blood of calves and goats; the visible pledges of the presence of God were in it, whereunto no other person might approach. But our high priest was not to enter into any holy

place made with hands, unto outward, visible pledges of the presence of God, but into the heaven of heavens, the place of the glorious residence of the majesty of God itself.

**Obs. IV.** If the Lord Christ entered not into the holy place until he had finished his work, we may not expect an entrance thereinto until we have finished ours. —He fainted not, nor waxed weary, until all was finished; and it is our duty to arm ourselves with the same mind.

**Obs.V.** It must be a glorious effect which had so glorious a cause; and so it was, even “eternal redemption.”

**Obs. VI.** The nature of our redemption, the way of its procurement, with the duties required of us with respect thereunto, are greatly to be considered by us.

#### VERSES 13, 14.

There is in these verses an *argument* and *comparison*. But the comparison is such, as that the ground of it is laid in the relation of the compares the one unto the other; namely, that the one was the type and the other the antitype, otherwise the argument will not hold. For although it follows, that he who can do the greater can do the less, whereon an argument will hold “a majori ad minus;” yet it doth not absolutely do so, that if that which is less can do that which is less, then that which is greater can do that which is greater; which would be the force of the argument if there were nothing but a naked comparison in it: but it necessarily follows hereon, if that which is less, in that less thing which it doth or did, was therein a type of that which was greater, in that greater thing which it was to effect. And this was the case in the thing here proposed by the apostle. The words are, —

**Ver. 13, 14.** — Εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα τούρων καὶ πράγων, καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους, ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα· πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ Πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ, καθαρῆι τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν (ὕμῶν) ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι.

The words have no difficulty in them as to their grammatical sense; nor is there any considerable variation in the rendering of them in the old translations. Only the Syriac retains **ܣܘܠܚܘܢ**, that is, **μόσχων**, from ver. 12, instead of **τάϋρων**, here used. And both that and the Vulgar place **τράγων** here before **τάϋρων**, as in the foregoing verse, contrary unto all copies of the original, as to the order of the words.

For **Πνεύματος αἰωνίου** the Vulgar reads **Πνεύματος ἁγίου**, “per Spiritum sanctum.” The Syriac follows the original, **ܕܒܪܘܚܝܢ ܥܠܡܝܢ**, “by the eternal Spirit.”

**Τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν**. The original copies vary, some reading **ἡμῶν**, “our,” but most **ὑμῶν**, “your;” which our translators follow.<sup>f19</sup>

**Ver. 13, 14.** —For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth unto the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God!”

The words are argumentative, in the form of a hypothetical syllogism; wherein the assumption of the proposition is supposed, as proved before. That which is to be confirmed is what was asserted in the words foregoing; namely, “That the Lord Jesus Christ by his blood hath obtained for us eternal redemption.” This the causal redditive conjunction; “for,” doth manifest; whereunto the note of a supposition, “if,” is premised as a note of a hypothetical argumentation.

There are two parts of this confirmation:

**1.** A most full declaration of the way and means whereby he obtained that redemption; it was by the “offering himself through the eternal Spirit without spot unto God.”

**2.** By comparing this way of it with the typical sacrifices and ordinances of God. For arguing “ad homines,” — that is, unto the satisfaction and conviction of the Hebrews, — the apostle makes use of their concessions to confirm his own assertions. And his argument consists of two parts:

**1.** A *concession* of their efficacy unto their proper end.



**2.** An *inference* from thence unto the greater and more noble efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, taken partly from the relation of type and antitype that was between them, but principally from the different nature of the things themselves.

To make evident the force of his argument in general, we must observe,

**1.** That what he had proved before he takes here for granted, on the one side and the other. And this was, that all the Levitical services and ordinances were in themselves carnal, and had carnal ends assigned unto them, and had only an obscure representation of things spiritual and eternal; and on the other side, that the tabernacle, office, and sacrifice of Christ were spiritual, and had their effects in eternal things,

**2.** That those other carnal, earthly things were types and resemblances, in God's appointment of them, of those which are spiritual and eternal.

From these suppositions the argument is firm and stable; and there are two parts of it:

**1.** That as the ordinances of old, being carnal, had an efficacy unto their proper end, to purify the unclean as to the flesh; so the sacrifice of Christ hath a certain efficacy unto its proper end, namely, the "purging of our conscience from dead works." The force of this inference depends on the relation that was between them in the appointment of God.

**2.** That there was a greater efficacy, and that which gave a greater evidence of itself, in the sacrifice of Christ, with respect unto its proper end, than there was in those sacrifices and ordinances, with respect unto their proper end: "How much more!" And the reason hereof is, because all their efficacy depended on a mere arbitrary institution. In themselves, that is, in their own nature, they had neither worth, value, nor efficacy, — no, not even as unto those ends whereunto they were by divine institution designed: but in the sacrifice of Christ, who is therefore here said to "offer himself unto God through the eternal Spirit," there is an innate glorious worth and efficacy, which, suitably unto the rules of eternal reason-and righteousness, will accomplish and procure its effects,

**Ver. 13.** —There are two things in this verse, which are the ground from whence the apostle argueth and maketh his inference in that which follows:

1. A *proposition* of the sacrifices and services of the law which he had respect unto.
2. An *assignation* of a certain efficacy unto them.

The sacrifices of the law he refers unto two heads:

1. “The blood of bulls and of goats.”
2. “The ashes of an heifer.”

And the distinction is,

1. From the matter of them;
2. The manner of their performance. For the manner of their performance, the blood of bulls and goats was “offered,” which is supposed and included; —the ashes of the heifer were “sprinkled,” as it is expressed.

1. The matter of the first is “the blood of bulls and of goats.” The same, say some, with the “goats and calves” mentioned in the verse foregoing. So generally do the expositors of the Roman church; and that because their translation reads “hircorum et vitulorum,” contrary unto the original text. And some instances they give of the same signification of **μύσχω** and **ταύρω**. But the apostle had just reason for the alteration of his expression. For in the foregoing verse he had respect only unto the anniversary sacrifice of the high priest, but here he enlargeth the subject unto the consideration of all other expiatory sacrifices under the law; for he joins unto the “blood of bulls and of goats” the “ashes of an heifer,” which were of no use, in the anniversary sacrifice. Wherefore he designed in these words summarily to express all sacrifices of expiation and all ordinances of purification that were appointed under the law. And therefore the words in the close of the verse, expressing the end and effect of these ordinances, “sanctifieth the unclean unto the purifying of the flesh,” are not to be restrained unto them immediately foregoing, “*the*

ashes of an heifer sprinkled;” but an equal respect is to be had unto the other sort, or “the blood of bulls and of goats.”

The Socinian expositor, in his entrance into that wresting of this text wherein he labors in a peculiar manner, denies that the water of sprinkling is here to be considered as typical of Christ, and that because it is the anniversary sacrifice alone which is intended, wherein it was of no use. Yet he adds immediately, that in itself it was a type of Christ; so wresting the truth against his own convictions, to force his design. But the conclusion is strong on the other hand; because it was a type of Christ, and is so here considered, whereas it was not used in the great anniversary sacrifice, it is not that sacrifice alone which the apostle hath respect unto.

Wherefore by “bulls and goats,” by a usual synecdoche, all the several kinds of clean beasts, whose blood was given unto the people to make atonement withal, are intended. So is the matter of all sacrifices expressed, <sup><B71B></sup>Psalm 50:13, “Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?” Sheep are contained under goats, being all beasts of the flock.

And it is the “blood” of these bulls and goats which is proposed as the first way or means of the expiation of sin, and purification under the law. For it was by their blood, and that as offered at the altar, that atonement was made, <sup><B71B></sup>Leviticus 17:11. Purification was also made thereby, even by the sprinkling of it.

**2.** The second thing mentioned unto the same end, is “the ashes of an heifer,” and the use of them; which was by “sprinkling.” The institution, use, and end of this ordinance, are described at large, Numbers 19. And an eminent type of Christ there was therein, both as unto his suffering and the continual efficacy of the cleansing virtue of his blood in the church. It would too much divert us from the present argument, to consider all the particulars wherein there was a representation of the sacrifice of Christ and the purging virtue of it in this ordinance; yet the mention of some of them is of use unto the explication of the apostle’s general design: as, —

**(1.)** It was to be a red heifer, and that without spot or blemish, whereon no yoke had come, verse 2. Red is the color of guilt, <sup><B71B></sup>Isaiah 1:18, yet was there no spot or blemish in the heifer: so was the guilt of sin upon Christ, who in himself was absolutely pure and holy. No yoke had been on her;

nor was there any constraint on Christ, but he offered himself willingly, through the eternal Spirit.

**(2.)** She was to be led forth without the camp, verse 3; which the apostle alludes unto, <sup>Heb 13:11</sup> Hebrews 13:11, representing Christ going out of the city unto his suffering and oblation.

**(3.)** One did slay her before the face of the priest, and not the priest himself: so the hands of others, Jews and Gentiles, were used in the slaying of our sacrifice.

**(4.)** The blood of the heifer being slain, was sprinkled by the priest seven times directly before the tabernacle of the congregation, verse 4: so is the whole church purified by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ.

**(5.)** The whole heifer was to be burned in the sight of the priest, verse 5: so was whole Christ, soul and body, offered up to God in the fire of love, kindled in him by the eternal Spirit.

**(6.)** Cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet, were to be cast into the midst of the burning of the heifer, verse 6; which were all used by God's institution in the purification of the unclean, or the sanctification and dedication of any thing unto sacred use, to teach us that all spiritual virtue unto these ends, really and eternally, was contained in the one offering of Christ.

**(7.)** Both the priest who sprinkled the blood, the men that slew the heifer, and he that burned her, and he that gathered her ashes, were all unclean, until they were washed, verses 7-10: so when Christ was made a sin-offering, all the legal uncleannesses, that is, the guilt of the church, were on him, and he took them away.

But it is the use of this ordinance which is principally intended. The ashes of this heifer, being burned, were preserved, that, being mixed with pure water, they might be sprinkled on persons who on any occasion were legally unclean. Whoever was so, was excluded from all the solemn worship of the church. Wherefore, without this ordinance, the worship of God and the holy state of the church could not have been continued. For the means, causes, and ways of legal defilements among them, were very many, and some of them unavoidable. In particular, every tent and house, and all persons in [hem, were defiled, if any one died among them; which

could not but continually fall out in their families. Hereon they were excluded from the tabernacle and congregation, and all duties of the solemn worship of God, until they were purified. Had not therefore these ashes, which were to be mingled with living water, been always preserved and in a readiness, the whole worship of God must quickly have ceased amongst them. It is so in the church of Christ. The spiritual defilements which befall believers are many, and some of them unavoidable unto them whilst they are in this world; yea, their duties, the best of them, have defilements adhering unto them. Were it not that the blood of Christ, in its purifying virtue, is in a continual readiness unto faith, that God therein hath opened a fountain for sin and uncleanness, the worship of the church would not be acceptable unto him. In a constant application thereunto doth the exercise of faith much consist.

**3.** The nature and use of this ordinance are further described by its object, “the unclean,” — **κεκοινωνήμενους** that is, those that were made common. All those who had a liberty of approach unto God in his solemn worship were so far sanctified; that is, separated and dedicated. And such as were deprived of this privilege were made common, and so unclean.

The unclean especially intended in this institution were those who were defiled by the dead. Every one that by any means touched a dead body, whether dying naturally or slain, whether in the house or field, or did bear it, or assist in the bearing of it, or were in the tent or house where it was, were all defiled; no such person was to come into the congregation, or near the tabernacle. But it is certain that many offices about the dead are works of humanity and mercy, which morally defile not. Wherefore there was a peculiar reason of the constitution of this defilement, and this severe interdiction of them that were so defiled from divine worship. And this was to represent unto the people the curse of the law, whereof death was the great visible effect. The present Jews have this notion, that defilement by the dead arises from the poison that is dropped into them that die by the angel of death; whereof see our exposition on **Hebrews 2:14**. The meaning of it is, that death came in by sin, from the poisonous temptation of the old serpent, and befell men by the curse which took hold of them thereon. But they have lost the understanding of their own tradition. This belonged unto the bondage under which it was the will of God to keep that people, that they should dread death as an effect of the curse of the law,

and the fruit of sin; which is taken away in Christ, <sup><3824></sup>Hebrews 2:14; <sup><4856></sup>1 Corinthians 15:56, 57. And these works, which were unto them so full of defilement, are now unto us accepted duties of piety and mercy.

These and many others were excluded from an interest in the solemn worship of God, upon ceremonial defilements. And some vehemently contend that none were so excluded for moral defilements; and it may be it is true, for the matter is dubious. But that it should thence follow that none under the gospel should be so excluded, for moral and spiritual evils, is a fond imagination; yea, the argument is firm, that if God did so severely shut out from a participation in his solemn worship all those who were legally or ceremonially defiled, much more is it his will that those who live in spiritual or moral defilements should not approach unto him by the holy ordinances of the gospel.

**4.** The manner of the application of this purifying water was by sprinkling, being sprinkled; or rather, transitively, “sprinkling the unclean.” Not only the act, but the efficacy of it is intended. The manner of it is declared, <sup><4187></sup>Numbers 19:17, 18. The ashes were kept by themselves. When use was to be made of them, they were to be mingled with clean living water, water from the spring. The virtue was from the ashes, as they were the ashes of the heifer slain and burnt as a sin-offering. The water was used as the means of their application. Being so mingled, any clean person might dip a bunch of hyssop (see <sup><4510></sup>Psalms 51:7) into it, and sprinkle any thing or person that was defiled. For it was not confined unto the office of the priest, but was left unto every private person; as is the continual application of the blood of Christ. And this rite of sprinkling was that alone in all sacrifices whereby their continued efficacy unto sanctification and purification was expressed. Thence is the blood of Christ called “the blood of sprinkling,” because of its efficacy unto our sanctification, as applied by faith unto our souls and consciences.

The effect of the things mentioned is, that they “sanctified unto the purifying of the flesh;” namely, that those unto whom they were applied might be made Levitically clean, — be so freed from the carnal defilements as to have an admission unto the solemn worship of God and society of the church.

“Sanctifieth.” ἀγιάζω in the New Testament doth signify for the most part, “to purify and sanctify internally and spiritually.” Sometimes it is used in the sense of שָׁדַף in the Old Testament, “to separate, dedicate, consecrate.” So is it by our Savior, <sup><6179></sup>John 17:19, Καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν, —”And for them I sanctify myself;” that is, ‘separate and dedicate myself to be a sacrifice.’ So is it here used. Every defiled person was made common, excluded from the privilege of a right to draw nigh unto God in his solemn worship: but in his purification he was again separated to him, and restored unto his sacred right.

The word is of the singular number, and seems only to respect the next antecedent, σποδὸς δαμάλεως, —”the ashes of an heifer.” But if so, the apostle mentions “the blood of bulls and goats” without the ascription of any effect or efficacy thereunto. This, therefore, is not likely, as being the more solemn ordinance. Wherefore the word is distinctly to be referred, by a zeugma, unto the one and the other. The whole effect of all the sacrifices and institutions of the law is comprised in this word. All the sacrifices of expiation and ordinances of purification had this effect, and no more.

They “sanctified unto the purifying of the flesh.” That is, those who were legally defiled, and were therefore excluded from an interest in the worship of God, and were made obnoxious unto the curse of the law thereon, were so legally purified, justified, and cleansed by them, as that they had free admission into the society of the church, and the solemn worship thereof. This they did, this they were able to effect, by virtue of divine institution.

This was the state of things under the law, when there was a church purity, holiness, and sanctification, to be obtained by the due observance of external rites and ordinances, without internal purity or holiness. Wherefore these things were in themselves of no worth or value. And as God himself doth often in the prophets declare, that, merely on their own account, he had no regard unto them; so by the apostle they are called “worldly, carnal, and beggarly rudiments.” Why then, it will be said, did God appoint and ordain them? why did he oblige the people unto their observance? I answer, It was not at all on the account of their outward use and efficacy, as unto the purifying of the flesh, which, as it was alone, God always despised; but it was because of the representation of good things to come which the wisdom of God had inlaid them withal. With

respect hereunto they were glorious, and of exceeding advantage unto the faith and obedience of the church.

This state of things is changed under the new testament. For now “neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” The thing signified, namely, internal purity and holiness, is no less necessary unto a right unto the privileges of the gospel, than the observance of these external rites was unto the privileges of the law. Yet is there no countenance given hereby unto the impious opinion of some, that God by the law required only external obedience, without respect unto the inward, spiritual part of it; for although the rites and sacrifices of the law, by their own virtue, purified externally, and delivered only from temporary punishments, yet the precepts and the promises of the law required the same holiness and obedience unto God as doth the gospel.

**Ver. 14.** — “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God!”

This verse contains the inference or argument of the apostle from the preceding propositions and concessions. The nature of the argument is “a minori,” and “a proportione.” From the first, the inference follows as unto its truth, and *formally*; from the latter, as to its greater evidence, and *materially*.

There are in the words considerable,

- 1.** The subject treated of, in opposition unto that before spoken unto; and that is, “the blood of Christ.”
- 2.** The means whereby this blood of Christ was effectual unto the end designed, in opposition unto the way and means of the efficacy of legal ordinances; he “offered himself” (that is, in the shedding of it) “unto God without spot, through the eternal Spirit.”
- 3.** The end assigned unto this blood of Christ in that offering of himself, or the effect wrought thereby, in opposition unto the end and effect of legal ordinances; which is, to “purge our consciences from dead works.”



**4.** The benefit and advantage which we receive thereby, in opposition unto the benefit which was obtained by those legal administrations; that we may “serve the living God.” All which must be considered and explained.

**First**, The nature of the inference is expressed by, “How much more.” This is usual with the apostle, when he draws any inference or conclusion from a comparison between Christ and the high priest, the gospel and the law, to use an **ἀύξησης** in expression, to manifest their absolute pre-eminence above them: See <sup><80D></sup>Hebrews 2:2, 3, 3:3, <sup><80E></sup>10:28, 29, <sup><80F></sup>12:25. Although these things agreed in their general nature, whence a comparison is founded, yet were the one incomparably more glorious than the ether. Hence elsewhere, although he alloweth the administration of the law to be glorious, yet he affirms that it had no glory in comparison of what doth excel, <sup><80G></sup>2 Corinthians 3:10. The person of Christ is the spring of all the glory in the church; and the more nearly any thing relates thereunto, the more glorious it is.

There are two things included in this way of the introduction of the present inference, “How much more:” —

**1.** An equal certainty of the event and effect ascribed unto the blood of Christ, with the effect of the legal sacrifices, is included in it. So the argument is “a minori.” And the inference of such an argument is expressed by, “much more,” though an equal certainty be all that is evinced by it. ‘If those sacrifices and ordinances of the law were effectual unto the ends of legal expiation and purification, then is the blood of Christ assuredly so unto the spiritual and eternal effects whereunto it is designed.’ And the force of the argument is not merely, as was observed before, “a comparatis,” and “a minori,” but from the nature of the things themselves, as the one was appointed to be typical of the other.

**2.** The argument is taken from a proportion between the things themselves that are compared, as to their efficacy. This gives greater evidence and validity unto the argument than if it were taken merely “a minori.” For there is a greater reason, in the nature of things, that “the blood of Christ should purge our consciences from dead works,” than there is that “the blood of bulls and of goats should sanctify unto the purifying of the flesh.” For that had all its efficacy unto this end from the sovereign pleasure of God in its institution; in itself it had neither worth nor dignity,

whence, in any proportion of justice or reason, men should be legally sanctified by it. The sacrifice of Christ also, as unto its original, depended on the sovereign pleasure, wisdom, and grace of God; but being so appointed, upon the account of the infinite dignity of his person, and the nature of his oblation, it had a real efficacy, in the justice and wisdom of God, to procure the effect mentioned in the way of purchase and merit. This the apostle refers unto in these words, “Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unto God.” That the offering was “himself,” that “he offered himself through the eternal Spirit,” or his divine person, is that which gives assurance of the accomplishing of the effect assigned unto it by his blood, above any grounds we have to believe that “the blood of bulls and goats should sanctify unto the purifying of the flesh.” And we may observe from this, “How much more,” that, —

**Obs. I.** There is such an evidence of wisdom and righteousness, unto a spiritual eye, in the whole mystery of our redemption, sanctification, and salvation by Christ, as gives an immovable foundation unto faith to rest upon in its receiving of it. —The faith of the church of old was resolved into the mere sovereign pleasure of God, as to the efficacy of their ordinances; nothing in the nature of the things themselves did tend unto their establishment. But in the dispensation of God by Christ, in the work of our redemption by him, there is such an evidence of the wisdom and righteousness of God in the things themselves, as gives the highest security unto faith. It is unbelief alone, made obstinate by prejudices insinuated by the devil, that hides these things from any, as the apostle declares, <sup>400B</sup>2 Corinthians 4:3, 4. And hence will arise the great aggravation of the sin, and condemnation of them that perish.

**Secondly,** We must consider the things themselves.

**First,** The *subject* spoken of, and whereunto the effect mentioned is ascribed, is “the *blood of Christ.*” The person unto whom these things relate is Christ. I have given an account before, on sundry occasions, of the great variety used by the apostle in this epistle in the naming of him. And a peculiar reason of every one of them is to be taken from the place where it is used. Here he calls him Christ; for on his being Christ, the Messiah, depends the principal force of his present argument. It is the blood of him who was promised of old to be the high priest of the church, and the

sacrifice for their sins; in whom was the faith of all the saints of old, that by him their sins should be expiated, that in him they should be justified and glorified; Christ, who is the Son of the living God, in whose person God purchased his church with his own blood. And we may observe, that,

---

**Obs. II.** The efficacy of all the offices of Christ towards the church depends on the dignity of his person. —The offering of his blood was prevalent for the expiation of sin, because it was *his blood*, and for no other reason. But this is a subject which I have handled at large elsewhere.

A late learned commentator on this epistle takes occasion in this place to reflect on Dr Gouge, for affirming that Christ was a priest in both natures; which, as he says, cannot be true. I have not Dr Gouge's Exposition by me, and so know not in what sense it is affirmed by him; but that Christ is a priest in his entire person, and so in both natures, is true, and the constant opinion of all protestant divines. And the following words of this learned author, being well explained, will clear the difficulty. For he saith, "That he that is a priest is God; yet as God he is not, he cannot be a priest. For that Christ is a priest in both natures, is no more but that in the discharge of his priestly office he acts as God and man in one person; from whence the dignity and efficacy of his sacerdotal act-ings do proceed. It is not hence required, that whatever he doth in the discharge of his office must be an *immediate act of the divine* as well as of the human nature. No more is required unto it, but that the person whose acts they are is God and man, and acts as God and man, in each nature suitably unto its essential properties. Hence, although God cannot die, —that is, the divine nature cannot do so, —yet 'God purchased his church with his own blood;' and so also 'the Lord of glory was crucified' for us. The sum is, that the person of Christ is the principle of all his mediatory acts; although those acts be immediately performed in and by virtue of his distinct natures, some of one, some of another, according unto their distinct properties and powers. Hence are they all theandrical; which could not be if he were not a priest in both natures." Nor is this impeached by what ensues in the same author, namely, "That a priest is an officer; and all officers, as officers, are made such by commission from the sovereign power, and are servants under them." For, —

**1.** It may be this doth not hold among the divine persons; it may be no more is required, in the dispensation of God towards the church, unto an office in any of them, but their own infinite condescension, with respect unto the order of their subsistence. So the Holy Ghost is in particular the comforter of the church by the way of office, and is *sent* thereon by the Father and Son; yet is there no more required hereunto, but that the order of the operation of the persons in the blessed Trinity should answer the order of their subsistence: and so he who in his person proceedeth from the Father and the Son is sent unto his work by the Father and the Son; no new act of authority being required thereunto, but only the determination of the divine will to act suitably unto the order of their subsistence.

**2.** The divine nature considered in the abstract cannot serve in an office; yet he who was “in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, took upon him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death.” It was in the human nature that he was a servant; nevertheless it was the Son of God, he who in his divine nature was in the form of God, who so served in office and yielded that obedience. Wherefore he was so far a mediator and priest in both his natures, as that whatever he did in the discharge of those offices was the act of his entire person; whereon the dignity and efficacy of all that he did did depend.

That which the effect intended is ascribed unto, is the blood of Christ. And two things are to be inquired hereon.

**1.** What is meant by “the blood of Christ.”

**2.** How this effect was wrought by it.

First, It is not only that material blood which he shed, absolutely considered, that is here and elsewhere called “the blood of Christ,” when the work of our redemption is ascribed unto it, that is intended; but there is a double consideration of it, with respect unto its efficacy unto this end:

**1.** That it was the pledge and the sign of all the internal obedience and sufferings of the soul of Christ, of his person. “He became obedient unto death, the death of the cross,” whereon his blood was shed. This was the great instance of his obedience and of his sufferings, whereby he made reconciliation and atonement for sin. Hence the effects of all his sufferings, and of all obedience in his sufferings, are ascribed unto his blood.

**2.** Respect is had unto the sacrifice and offering of blood under the law. The reason why God gave the people the blood to make atonement on the altar, was because “the life of the flesh was in it,” <sup><871b></sup>Leviticus 17:11, 14. So was the life of Christ in his blood, by the shedding whereof he laid it down. And by his death it is, as he was the Son of God, that we are redeemed. Herein he made his soul an offering for sin, <sup><253b></sup>Isaiah 53:10. Wherefore this expression, “the blood of Christ,” in order unto our redemption, or the expiation of sin, is comprehensive of all that he did and suffered for those ends, inasmuch as the shedding of it was the way and means whereby he offered it, or himself (in and by it), unto God.

**Secondly,** The second inquiry is, how the effect here mentioned was wrought by the blood of Christ. And this we cannot determine without a general consideration of the effect itself; and this is, the “purging of our conscience from dead works.” **Καθαριεῖ**, —”shall purge.” That is, say some, shall purify and sanctify, by internal, inherent sanctification. But neither the sense of the word, nor the context, nor the exposition given by the apostle of this very expression, <sup><301b></sup>Hebrews 10:1, 2, will admit of this restrained sense. I grant it is included herein, but there is somewhat else principally intended, namely, the expiation of sin, with our justification and peace with God thereon.

**1.** For the proper sense of the word here used, see our exposition on <sup><300b></sup>Hebrews 1:3. Expiation, lustration, carrying away punishment by making atonement, are expressed by it in all good authors.

**2.** The context requires this sense in the first place; for, —

**(1.)** The argument here used is immediately applied to prove that Christ hath “obtained for us eternal redemption;” but redemption consists not in internal sanctification only, although that be a necessary consequent of it, but it is the pardon of sin through the atonement made, or a price paid: “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” <sup><300c></sup>Ephesians 1:7.

**(2.)** In the comparison insisted on there is distinct mention made of “the blood of bulls and goats,” as well as of “the ashes of an heifer sprinkled;” but the first and principal use of blood in sacrifice was to make atonement for sin, <sup><871b></sup>Leviticus 17:11.

(3.) The end of this purging is to give boldness in the service of God, and peace with him therein, —that we may “serve the living God;” but this is done by the expiation and pardon of sin, with justification thereon.

(4.) It is “conscience” that is said to be purged. Now conscience is the proper seat of the *guilt* of sin; it is that which chargeth it on the soul, and which hinders all approach unto God in his service with liberty and boldness, unless it be removed: which, —

(5.) Gives us the best consideration of the apostle’s exposition of this expression, <sup><small>scm</small></sup> Hebrews 10:1, 2; for he there declares, that to have the conscience purged, is to have its *condemning power for sin* taken away and cease.

There is therefore, under the same name, a twofold effect here ascribed unto the blood of Christ; the one in answer and opposition unto the *effect of the blood of bulls and goats being offered*; the other in answer unto the *effect of the ashes of an heifer being sprinkled*: the first consisting in making atonement for our sins; the other in the sanctification of our persons. And there are two ways whereby these things are procured by the blood of Christ:

1. By its *offering*, whereby sin is expiated.
2. By its *sprinkling*, whereby our persons are sanctified.

The first ariseth from the satisfaction he made unto the justice of God, by undergoing in his death the punishment due to us, being made therein a curse for us, that the blessing might come upon us; therein, as his death was a sacrifice, as he offered himself unto God in the shedding of his blood, he made atonement: the other from the virtue of his sacrifice applied unto us by the Holy Spirit, which is the sprinkling of it; so doth the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanse us from all our sins.

The Socinian expositor on this place endeavors, by a long perplexed discourse, to evade the force of this testimony, wherein the expiation of sin is directly assigned unto the blood of Christ. His pretense is to show how many ways it may be so; but his design is to prove that really it can be so by none at all; for the assertion, as it lies in terms, is destructive of their heresy. Wherefore he proceeds on these suppositions: —

1. “That the expiation for sin is our deliverance from the punishment due unto sin, by the power of Christ in heaven.” But as this is diametrically opposite unto the true nature of it, so is it unto its representation in the sacrifices of old, whereunto it is compared by the apostle, and from whence he argueth. Neither is this a tolerable exposition of the words: ‘The “blood of Christ,” in answer unto what was represented by the blood of the sacrifices of the law, doth “purge our consciences from dead works;” that is, Christ, by his power in heaven, doth free us from the punishment due to sin.’
2. “That Christ was not a priest until after his ascension into heaven.” That this supposition destroys the whole nature of that office, hath been sufficiently before declared.
3. “That his offering himself unto God was the presenting of himself in heaven before God, as having done the will of God on the earth.” But as this hath nothing in it of the nature of a sacrifice, so what is asserted to be done by it can, according to these men, be no way said to be done by his blood, seeing they affirm that when Christ doth this he hath neither flesh nor blood.
4. “That the resurrection of Christ gave all efficacy unto his death.” But the truth is, it was his death, and what he effected therein, that was the ground of his resurrection. He was “brought again from the dead through the blood of the covenant.” And the efficacy of his death depends on his resurrection only as the evidence of his acceptance with God therein.
5. “That Christ confirmed his doctrine by his blood;” that is, because he rose again.

All these principles I have at large refuted in the exercitations about the priesthood of Christ, and shall not here again insist on their examination. This is plain and evident in the words, unless violence be offered unto them, namely, that “the blood of Christ,” — that is, his suffering in soul and body, and his obedience therein, testified and expressed in the shedding of his blood, — was the procuring cause of the expiation of our sins, “the purging of our consciences from dead works,” our justification, sanctification, and acceptance with God thereon. And, —

**Obs. III.** There is nothing more destructive unto the whole faith of the gospel, than by any means to evacuate the immediate efficacy of the blood of Christ. — Every opinion of that tendency breaks in upon the whole mystery of the wisdom and grace of God in him. It renders all the institutions and sacrifices of the law, whereby God instructed the church of old in the mystery of his grace, useless and unintelligible, and overthrows the foundation of the gospel.

The second thing in the words, is the *means* whereby the blood of Christ came to be of this efficacy, or to produce this effect. And that is, because in the shedding of it “he offered himself unto God, through the eternal Spirit, without spot.” Every word is of great importance, and the whole assertion filled with the mystery of the wisdom and grace of God, and must therefore be distinctly considered.

There is declared what Christ did unto the end mentioned, and that is expressed in the matter and manner of it:

1. He “offered himself.”
2. To whom; that is, “to God.”
3. How, or from what principle, by what means; “through the eternal Spirit.”
4. With what qualifications; “without spot.”

1. “He offered himself.” To prove that his blood purgeth away our-sins, he affirms that he “offered himself.” His whole human nature was the offering; the way of its offering was by the shedding of his blood. So the beast was the sacrifice, when the blood alone or principally was offered on the altar; for it was the blood that made atonement. So it was by his blood that Christ made atonement, but it was his person that gave it efficacy unto that end. Wherefore by “himself,” the whole human nature of Christ is intended. And that, —

(1.) Not in distinction or separation from the divine. For although the human nature of Christ, his soul and body, only was offered, yet he offered himself through his own eternal Spirit. This offering of himself, therefore, was the act of his whole person, both natures concurred in the offering, though one alone was offered.



(2.) All that he did or suffered in his soul and body when his blood was shed, is comprised in this offering of himself. His obedience in suffering was that which rendered this offering of himself “a sacrifice unto God of a sweet-smelling savor.”

And he is said thus to offer “himself,” in opposition unto the sacrifices of the high priests under the law. They offered goats and bulls, or their blood; but he offered himself. This, therefore, was the nature of the offering of Christ: — It was a sacred act of the Lord Christ, as the high priest of the church, wherein, according unto the will of God, and what was required of him by virtue of the eternal compact between the Father and him concerning the redemption of the church, he gave up himself, in the way of most profound obedience, to do and suffer whatever the justice and law of God required unto the expiation of sin; expressing the whole by the shedding of his blood, in answer unto all the typical representations of this his sacrifice in all the institutions of the law.

And this offering of Christ was proper sacrifice, —

(1.) From the *office* whereof it was an act. It was an act of his sacerdotal office; he was made a priest of God for this end, that he might thus offer himself, and that this offering of himself should be a sacrifice.

(2.) From the *nature* of it. For it consisted in the sacred giving up unto God the thing that was offered, in the present destruction or consumption of it. This was the nature of a sacrifice; it was the destruction and consumption by death and fire, by a sacred action, of what was dedicated and offered unto God. So was it in this sacrifice of Christ. As he suffered in it, so in the giving himself up unto God in it there was an effusion of his blood and the destruction of his life.

(3.) From the *end* of it, which was assigned unto it in the wisdom and sovereignty of God, and in his own intention; which was to make atonement for sin: which gives an offering the formal nature of an expiatory sacrifice.

(4.) From the *way* and *manner* of it. For therein, —

[1.] He *sanctified* or dedicated himself unto God to be an offering, <sup>4879</sup>John 17:19.

[2.] He accompanied it with *prayers and supplications*, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 5:7.

[3.] There was an *altar* which sanctified the offering, which bore it up in its oblation; which was his own divine nature, as we shall see immediately.

[4.] He *kindled the sacrifice* with the fire of divine love, acting itself by zeal unto God's glory and compassion unto the souls of men.

[5.] He tendered all this unto God as an *atonement for sin*, as we shall see in the next words.

This was the free, real, *proper sacrifice* of Christ, whereof those of old were only types and obscure representations; the prefiguration hereof was the sole cause of their institution. And what the Socinians pretend, namely, that the Lord Christ offered no real sacrifice, but only what he did was called so metaphorically, by the way of allusion unto the sacrifices of the law, is so far from truth, as that there never had been any such sacrifices of divine appointment but only to prefigure this, which alone was really and substantially so. The Holy Ghost doth not make a forced accommodation of what Christ did unto those sacrifices of old, by way of allusion, and by reason of some resemblances; but shows the uselessness and weakness of those sacrifices in themselves, any further but as they represented this of Christ.

The nature of this oblation and sacrifice of Christ is utterly overthrown by the Socinians. They deny that in all this there was any offering at all; they deny that his shedding of his blood, or any thing which he did or suffered therein, either actually or passively, his obedience, or giving himself up unto God therein, was his sacrifice, or any part of it, but only somewhat required previously thereunto, and that without any necessary cause or reason- But 'his sacrifice, his offering of himself, they say, is nothing but his appearance in heaven, and the presentation of himself before the throne of God, whereon he receiveth power to deliver them that believe in him from the punishment due to sin. But, —

(1.) This appearance of Christ in heaven is nowhere called his oblation, his sacrifice, or his offering of himself. The places wherein some grant it may be so, do assert no such thing; as we shall see in the explanation of them, for they occur unto us in this chapter.

(2.) It no way answers the atonement that was made by the blood of the sacrifices at the altar, which was never carried into the holy place; yea, it overthrows all analogy, all resemblance and typical representation between those sacrifices and this of Christ, there being no similitude, nothing alike between them. And this renders all the reasoning of the apostle not only invalid, but altogether impertinent.

(3.) The supposition of it utterly overthrows the true nature of a proper and real sacrifice, substituting that in the room of it which is only metaphorical, and improperly so called. Nor can it be evidenced wherein the metaphor doth consist, or that there is any ground why it should be called an offering or a sacrifice; for all things belonging to it are distinct from, yea, contrary unto a true, real sacrifice.

(4.) It overthrows the nature of the priesthood of Christ, making it to consist in his actings *from God towards us* in a way of power; whereas the nature of the priesthood is to *act with God for and on the behalf of the church*.

(5.) It offers violence unto the text. For herein Christ's offering of himself is expressive of the way whereby his blood purgeth our consciences; which in their sense is excluded. But we may observe, unto our purpose,

---

**Obs. IV.** This was the greatest expression of the inexpressible love of Christ; "he offered himself." —What was required thereunto, what he underwent therein, have on various occasions been spoken unto. His condescension and love in the undertaking and discharge of this work, we may, we ought to admire, but we cannot comprehend. And they do what lies in them to weaken the faith of the church in him, and its love towards him, who would change the nature of his sacrifice in the offering of himself; who would make less of difficulty or suffering in it, or ascribe less efficacy unto it. This is the foundation of our faith and boldness in approaching unto God, that Christ hath "offered himself" for us. Whatsoever might be effected by the glorious dignity of his divine person, by his profound obedience, by his unspeakable sufferings, all offered as a sacrifice unto God in our behalf, is really accomplished.

**Obs. V.** It is hence evident how vain and insufficient are all other ways of the expiation of sin, with the purging of our consciences before God. — The sum of all false religion consisteth always in contrivances for the expiation of sin; what is false in any religion hath respect principally thereunto. And as superstition is restless, so the inventions of men have been endless, in finding out means unto this end. But if any thing within the power or ability of men, any thing they could invent or accomplish, had been useful unto this end, there would have been no need that the Son of God should have offered himself. To this purpose, see <sup><3015></sup>Hebrews 10:5-8; <sup><3016></sup>Micah 6:6, 7.

**2.** The next thing in the words, is unto whom he offered himself; that is, “to God.” He gave himself an offering and a sacrifice to God. A sacrifice is the highest and chiefest act of sacred worship; especially it must be so when one offereth himself, according unto the will of God. God as God, or the divine nature, is the proper object of all religious worship, unto whom as such alone any sacrifice may be offered. To offer sacrifice unto any, under any other notion but as he is God, is the highest idolatry. But an offering, an expiatory sacrifice for sin, is made to God as God, under a peculiar notion or consideration. For God is therein considered as the author of the law against which sin is committed, as the supreme ruler and governor of all, unto whom it belongs to inflict the punishment which is due unto sin. For the end of such sacrifices is “averruncare malum,” — to avert displeasure and punishment, by making atonement for sin. With respect hereunto, the divine nature is considered as peculiarly subsisting in the person of the Father. For so is he constantly represented unto our faith, as “the judge of all,” <sup><3023></sup>Hebrews 12:23. With him, as such, the Lord Christ had to do in the offering of himself; concerning which, see our exposition on <sup><3020></sup>Hebrews 5:7. It is said, ‘If Christ were God himself, how could he offer himself unto God? That one and the same person should be the offerer, the oblation, and he unto whom it is offered, seems not so much a mystery as a weak imagination.’

*Ans.* **(1.)** If there were *one nature only* in the person of Christ, it may be this might seem impertinent. Howbeit there may be cases wherein the same individual person, under several capacities, — as of a good man on the one hand, and a ruler or judge on the other, — may, for the benefit of the public, and the preservation of the laws of the community, both give

and take satisfaction himself. But whereas in the one person of Christ there are two natures so infinitely distinct as they are, both acting under such distinct capacities as they did, there is nothing unbecoming this mystery of God, that the one of them might be offered unto the other. But, —

(2.) It is not the *same person* that offereth the sacrifice and unto whom it is offered. For it was the person of the Father, or the divine nature considered as acting itself in the person of the Father, unto whom the offering was made. And although the person of the Son is partaker of the same nature with the Father, yet that nature is not the object of this divine worship as in him, but as in the person of the Father. Wherefore the Son did not formally offer himself unto himself, but unto God, as acting supreme rule, government, and judgment, in the person of the Father.

As these things are plainly and fully testified unto in the Scripture, so the way to come unto a blessed satisfaction in them, unto the due use and comfort of them, is not to consult the cavils of carnal wisdom, but to pray “that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, would give unto us the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, that the eyes of our understandings being enlightened,” we may come unto “the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.”

3. How he offered himself is also expressed; it was “by the eternal Spirit.” “By,”  $\delta\iota\acute{\omicron}$ . It denotes a concurrent operation, when one works with another. Nor doth it always denote a subservient, instrumental cause, but sometimes that which is *principally efficient*, <sup><400></sup>John 1:3; <sup><513></sup>Romans 11:36; <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 1:2. So it doth here; the eternal Spirit was not an interior instrument whereby Christ offered himself, but he was the principal efficient cause in the work.

The variety that is in the reading of this place is taken notice of by all. Some copies read, “by the eternal Spirit;” some, “by the Holy Spirit;” the latter is the reading of the Vulgar translation, and countenanced by sundry ancient copies of the original. The Syriac retains “the eternal Spirit;” which also is the reading of most ancient copies of the Greek. Hence follows a double interpretation of the words. Some say that the Lord Christ offered himself unto God in and by the acting of the *Holy Ghost in his human*

*nature*; for by him were wrought in him that fervent zeal unto the glory of God, that love and compassion unto the souls of men, which both carried him through his sufferings and rendered his obedience therein acceptable unto God as a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savor: which work of the Holy Spirit in the human nature of Christ I have elsewhere declared.<sup>f20</sup> Others say that his own eternal Deity, which supported him in his sufferings and rendered the sacrifice of himself effectual, is intended. But this will not absolutely follow to be the sense of the place upon the common reading, “by the eternal Spirit;” for the Holy Spirit is no less an eternal Spirit than is the Deity of Christ himself.

The truth is, both these concurred in, and were absolutely necessary unto the offering of Christ. The acting of his own eternal Spirit was so, as unto the *efficacy and effect*; and the acting of the Holy Ghost in him was so, as unto the *manner* of it. Without the first, his offering of himself could not have “purged our consciences from dead works.” No sacrifice of any mere creature could have produced that effect. It would not have had in itself a worth and dignity whereby we might have been discharged of sin unto the glory of God. Nor without the subsistence of the human nature in the divine person of the Son of God, could it have undergone and passed through unto victory what it was to suffer in this offering of it.

Wherefore this sense of the words is true: Christ offered himself unto God, through or by his own eternal Spirit, the divine nature acting in the person of the Son. For, —

**(1.)** It was an act of his *entire person*, wherein he discharged the office of a priest. And as his human nature was the sacrifice, so his person was the priest that offered it; which is the only distinction that was between the priest and sacrifice herein. As in all other acts of his mediation, the taking our nature upon him, and what he did therein, the divine person of the Son, the eternal Spirit in him, acted in love and condescension, so did it in this also of his offering himself.

**(2.)** As we observed before, hereby he *gave dignity*, worth, and efficacy unto the sacrifice of himself; for herein “God was to purchase his church with his own blood.” And this seems to be principally respected by the apostle; for he intends to declare herein the dignity and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, in opposition unto those under the law. For it was in

the will of man, and by material fire, that they were all offered; but he offered himself by the eternal Spirit, voluntarily giving up his human nature to be a sacrifice, in an act of his divine power.

(3.) The *eternal Spirit* is here opposed unto the *material altar*, as well as unto the fire. The altar was that whereon the sacrifice was laid, which bore it up in its oblation and ascension. But the eternal Spirit of Christ was the altar whereon he offered himself. This supported and bore it up under its sufferings, whereon it was presented unto God as an acceptable sacrifice. Wherefore this reading of the words gives a sense that is true and proper unto the matter treated of.

But on the other side, it is no less certain that he offered himself in his human nature by the Holy Ghost. All the gracious actings of his mind and will were required hereunto. The “man Christ Jesus,” in the gracious, voluntary acting of all the faculties of his soul, offered himself unto God. His human nature was not only the matter of the sacrifice, but therein and thereby, in the gracious actings of the faculties and powers of it, he offered himself unto God. Now all these things were wrought in him by the Holy Spirit, wherewith he was filled, which he received not by measure. By him was he filled with that *love and compassion* unto the church which acted him in his whole mediation, and which the Scripture so frequently proposeth unto our faith herein: “He loved me, and gave himself for me.” “He loved the church, and gave himself for it.” “He loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” By him there was wrought in him that *zeal unto the glory of God* the fire whereof kindled his sacrifice in an eminent manner. For he designed, with ardency of love to God above his own life and present state of his soul, to declare his righteousness, to repair the diminution of his glory, and to make such way for the communication of his love and grace to sinners, as that he might be eternally glorified. He gave him such *holy submission unto the will of God*, under a prospect of the bitterness of that cup which he was to drink, as enabled him to say in the height of his conflict, “Not my will, but thine be done.” He filled him with that *faith and trust in God*, as unto his supportment, deliverance, and success, which carried him steadily and safely unto the issue of his trial, <sup>2307</sup> Isaiah 50:7-9. Through the actings of these graces of the Holy Spirit in the human nature, his offering of himself was a free, voluntary oblation and sacrifice.

I shall not positively determine on either of these senses unto the exclusion of the other. The latter hath much of spiritual light and comfort in it on many accounts; but yet I must acknowledge that there are two considerations that peculiarly urge the former interpretation: —

**(1.)** The most, and most ancient copies of the original, read, “by the eternal Spirit;” and are followed by the Syriac, with all the Greek scholiasts. Now, although the Holy Spirit be also an eternal Spirit, in the unity of the same divine nature with the Father and the Son, yet where he is spoken of with respect unto his own personal actings, he is constantly called “the Holy Spirit,” and not as here, “the eternal Spirit.”

**(2.)** The design of the apostle is to prove the efficacy of the offering of Christ above those of the priests under the law. Now this arose from hence, partly that he offered himself, whereas they offered only the blood of bulls and goats; but principally from the dignity of his person in his offering, in that he offered himself by his own eternal Spirit, or divine nature. But I shall leave the reader to choose whether sense he judgeth suitable unto the scope of the place, either of them being so unto the analogy of faith.

The Socinians, understanding that both these interpretations are equally destructive to their opinions, the one concerning the person of Christ, the other about the nature of the Holy Ghost, have invented a sense of these words never before heard of among Christians. For they say that by “the eternal Spirit,” “a certain divine power” is intended, “whereby the Lord Christ was freed from mortality, and made eternal;” that is, no more obnoxious unto death. “By virtue of this power,” they say, “he offered himself unto God when he entered into heaven;” —than which nothing can be spoken more fond or impious, or contrary unto the design of the apostle. For, —

**(1.)** Such a power as they pretend is nowhere called “the Spirit,” much less “the eternal Spirit;” and to feign significations of words, without any countenance from their use elsewhere, is to wrest them at our pleasure.

**(2.)** The apostle is so far from requiring a divine power rendering him immortal antecedently unto the offering of himself, as that he declares that



he offered himself by the eternal Spirit in his death, when he shed his blood, whereby our consciences are purged from dead works.

(3.) This divine power, rendering Christ immortal, is not peculiar unto him, but shall be communicated unto all that are raised unto glory at the last day. And there is no color of an opposition herein unto what was done by the high priests of old.

(4.) It proceeds on their *πρῶτον ψεύδος* in this matter; which is, “that the Lord Christ offered not himself unto God before he was made immortal:” which is utterly to exclude his death and blood from any concernment therein; which is as contrary unto the truth and scope of the place as darkness is to light.

(5.) Wherever there is mention made elsewhere in the Scripture of the Holy Spirit, or the eternal Spirit, or the Spirit absolutely, with reference unto any actings of the person of Christ, or on it, either the Holy Spirit or his own divine nature is intended. See <sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 61:1, 2; <sup><6100></sup>Romans 1:4; <sup><6105></sup>1 Peter 3:18.

Wherefore Grotius forsakes this notion, and otherwise explains the words: “*Spiritus Christi qui non tantum fuit vivus ut in vita terrena, sed in aeternum corpus sibi adjunctum vivificans.*” If there be any sense in these words, it is the rational soul of Christ that is intended. And it is most true, that the Lord Christ offered himself in and by the actings of it; for there are no other in the human nature as to any duties of obedience unto God. But that this should be here called “the eternal Spirit,” is a vain conjecture; for the spirits of all men are equally eternal, and do not only live here below, but shall quicken their bodies after the resurrection for ever. This, therefore, cannot be the ground of the especial efficacy of the blood of Christ.

This is the second thing wherein the apostle opposeth the offering of Christ unto the offerings of the priests under the law: —

(1.) They offered *bulls and goats*; he offered *himself*.

(2.) They offered by a *material altar and fire*; he by the *eternal Spirit*.

That Christ should thus offer himself unto God, and that by the eternal Spirit, is the center of the mystery of the gospel. All attempts to corrupt,

to pervert this glorious truth, are designs against the glory of God and faith of the church. The depth of this mystery we cannot dive into, the height we cannot comprehend. We cannot search out the greatness of it; of the wisdom, the love, the grace that is in it. And those who choose rather to reject it than to live by faith in a humble admiration of it, do it at the peril of their souls. Unto the reason of some men it may be *folly*, unto faith it is *full of glory*. In the consideration of the divine actings of the eternal Spirit of Christ in the offering of himself, of the holy exercise of all grace in the human nature that was offered, of the nature, dignity, and efficacy of this sacrifice, faith finds life, food, and refreshment. Herein doth it contemplate the wisdom, the righteousness, the holiness, and grace of God; herein doth it view the wonderful condescension and love of Christ; and from the whole is strengthened and encouraged.

**4.** It is added that he thus offered himself, “without spot.” This adjunct is descriptive not of the priest, but of the sacrifice; it is not a qualification of his person, but of the offering.

Schlichtingius would have it, that this word denotes not what Christ was in himself, but what he was freed from. For now in heaven, where he offered himself, he is freed from all infirmities, and from every spot of mortality; which the high priest was not when he entered into the holy place. Such irrational fancies do false opinions force men to take up withal. But, —

**(1.)** There was no spot in the mortality of Christ, that he should be said to be freed from it when he was made immortal. A spot signifies not so much a defect as a fault; and there was no fault in Christ from which he was freed.

**(2.)** The allusion and respect herein unto the legal institutions is evident and manifest. The lamb that was to be slain and offered was antecedently thereunto to be “without blemish;” it was to be neither lame, nor blind, nor have any other defect. With express respect hereunto, the apostle Peter affirms that we were

“redeemed ..... with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot,” ◀MS 1 Peter 1:18.

And Christ is not only called

“the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,”

<sup><R12></sup>John 1:29,

— that is, by his being slain and offered, — but is represented in the worship of the church as “a Lamb slain,” <sup><R10></sup>Revelation 5:6. It is therefore to offer violence unto the Scripture and common understanding, to seek for this qualification anywhere but in the human nature of Christ, antecedently unto his death and blood-shedding.

Wherefore this expression, “without spot,” respects in the first place the *purity of his nature* and the *holiness of his life*. For although these principally belonged unto the necessary qualifications of his person, yet were they required unto him as he was to be the sacrifice. He was “the Holy One of God;” — “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners.” “He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth;” — he was “without spot.” This is the moral sense and signification of the word. But there is a legal sense of it also. It is that which is meet and fit to be a sacrifice. For it respects all that was signified by the legal institutions concerning the integrity and perfection of the creatures, lambs or kids, that were to be sacrificed. Hence were all those laws fulfilled and accomplished. There was nothing in him, nothing wanting unto him, that should any way hinder his sacrifice from being accepted with God, and really expiatory of sin. And this was the church instructed to expect by all those legal institutions.

It may be not unuseful to give here a brief scheme of this great sacrifice of Christ, to fix the thoughts of faith the more distinctly upon it: —

**1.** God herein, in the person of the Father, is considered as the lawgiver, the governor and judge of all; and that as on a throne of judgment, the throne of grace being not as yet erected. And two things are ascribed, or do belong unto him: —

**(1.)** A *denunciation* of the sentence of the law against mankind: “Dying, ye shall die;” and, “Cursed be every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.”

**(2.)** A *refusal* of all such ways of atonement, satisfaction, and reconciliation, as might be offered from any thing that all or any creatures could perform. “Sacrifice and offering, and whole burnt-offerings for sin,

he would not have,” <sup><3016></sup>Hebrews 10:5, 6. He rejected them as insufficient to make atonement for sin.

**2.** Satan appeared before this throne with his prisoners. He had the power of death, <sup><3024></sup>Hebrews 2:14; and entered into judgment as unto his right and title, and therein was judged, <sup><3161></sup>John 16:11. And he put forth all his power and policy in opposition unto the deliverance of his prisoners, and to the way or means of it. That was his hour, wherein he put forth the power of darkness, <sup><2253></sup>Luke 22:53.

**3.** The Lord Christ, the Son of God, out of his infinite love and compassion, appears in our nature before the throne of God, and takes it on himself to answer for the sins of all the elect, to make atonement for them, by doing and suffering whatever the holiness, righteousness, and wisdom of God required thereunto: “Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second,” <sup><3807></sup>Hebrews 10:7-9.

**4.** This stipulation and engagement of his, God accepteth of, and withal, as the sovereign lord and ruler of all, prescribeth the way and means whereby he should make atonement for sin, and reconciliation with God thereon. And this was, that “he should make his soul an offering for sin,” and therein “bear their iniquities,” <sup><2510></sup>Isaiah 53:10, 11.

**5.** The Lord Christ was prepared with a sacrifice to offer unto God, unto this end. For whereas “every high priest was ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, it was of necessity that he also should have somewhat to offer,” <sup><3805></sup>Hebrews 8:3. This was not to be the blood of bulls and goats, or such things as were “offered according to the law,” verse 4; but this was and was to be himself, his human nature, or his body. For, —

**(1.)** This body or human nature was *prepared for him* and given unto him for this very end, that he might have somewhat of his own to offer, <sup><3805></sup>Hebrews 10:5.

**(2.)** He *took it*, he assumed it unto himself to be his own, for this very end, that he might be a sacrifice in it, <sup><3024></sup>Hebrews 2:14.

**(3.)** He *had full power and authority over his own body*, his whole human nature, to dispose of it in any way, and into any condition, unto the glory of God. “No man,” saith he, “taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again,” <608>John 10:18.

**6.** This, therefore, he *gave up to do and suffer* according unto the will of God. And this he did, —

**(1.)** In the will, grace, and love of his divine nature, he offered himself unto God through the eternal Spirit.

**(2.)** In the gracious, holy actings of his human nature, in the way of zeal, love, obedience, patience, and all other graces of the Holy Spirit, which dwelt in him without measure, acted unto their utmost glory and efficacy. Hereby he gave himself up unto God to be a sacrifice for sin; his own divine nature being the altar and fire whereby his offering was supported and consumed, or brought unto the ashes of death. This was the most glorious spectacle unto God, and all his holy angels. Hereby he “set a crown of glory on the head of the law,” fulfilling its precepts in matter and manner unto the uttermost, and undergoing its penalty or curse, establishing the truth and righteousness of God in it. Hereby he glorified the holiness and justice of God, in the demonstration of their nature and by compliance with their demands. Herein issued the eternal counsels of God for the salvation of the church, and way was made for the exercise of grace and mercy unto sinners. For, —

**7.** Herewith God was well pleased, satisfied, and reconciled unto sinners. Thus was he “in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing our trespasses unto us,” in that “he was made sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in him.” For in this tender of himself a sacrifice to God, —

**(1.)** God was well pleased with and delighted in his obedience; it was “a sacrifice unto him of a sweet-smelling savor.” He was more glorified in that one instance of the obedience of his only Son, than he was dishonored by the sin of Adam and all his posterity, as I have elsewhere declared.

**(2.)** All the demands of his justice were satisfied, unto his eternal glory. Wherefore, —

**8.** Hereon Satan is judged, and destroyed as unto his power over sinners who receive this atonement; all the grounds and occasions of it are hereby removed, his kingdom is overthrown, his usurpation and unjust dominion defeated, his goods spoiled, and captivity led captive. For of the anger of the Lord against sin it was that he obtained his power over sinners, which he abused unto his own ends. This being atoned, the prince of this world was judged and cast out.

**9.** Hereon the poor condemned sinners are discharged. God says, “Deliver them, for I have found a ransom.” But we must return to the text.

**Secondly**, The *effect* of the blood of Christ, through the offering of himself, is the “purging of our consciences from dead works.” This was somewhat spoken unto in general before, especially as unto the nature of this purging; but the words require a more particular explication And, —

The word is in the future tense, “shall purge.” The blood of Christ as offered hath a double respect and effect: —

**1.** *Towards God*, in making atonement for sin. This was done once, and at once, and was now past. Herein “by one offering he for ever perfected them that are sanctified.”

**2.** *Towards the consciences of men*, in the application of the virtue of it unto them. This is here intended. And this is expressed as future; not as though it had not had this effect already on them that did believe, but upon a double account: —

**(1.)** To declare the certainty of the event, or the infallible connection of these things, the blood of Christ, and the purging of the conscience; that is, in all that betake themselves thereunto. ‘It shall do it;’ that is, effectually and infallibly.

**(2.)** Respect is had herein unto the generality of the Hebrews, whether already professing the gospel or now invited unto it. And he proposeth this unto them as the advantage they should be made partakers of, by the relinquishment of Mosaical ceremonies, and betaking themselves unto the faith of the gospel. For whereas before, by the best of legal ordinances, they attained no more but an outward sanctification, as unto the flesh, they should now have their conscience infallibly purged from dead works

Hence it is said, “your conscience.” Some copies read ἡμῶν, “our.” But there is no difference in the sense. I shall retain the common reading, as that which refers unto the Hebrews, who had been always exercised unto thoughts of purification and sanctification, by one means or another.

For the explication of the words we must inquire,

1. What is meant by “dead works.”
2. What is their relation unto “conscience.”
3. How conscience is “purged” of them by the blood of Christ.

**First**, By “dead works,” sins as unto their *guilt and defilement* are intended, as all acknowledge. And several reasons are given why they are so called; as, —

1. Because they proceed from *a principle of spiritual death*, or are the works of them who have no vital principle of holiness in them, <sup><HBB></sup>Ephesians 2:1, 5; <sup><HBB></sup>Colossians 2:13.
2. Because they are *useless and fruitless*, as all dead things are.
3. They *deserve death, and tend thereunto*. Hence they are like rotten bones in the grave, accompanied with worms and corruption.

And these things are true. Howbeit I judge there is a peculiar reason why the apostle calls them “dead works” in this place. For there is an allusion herein unto dead bodies, and legal defilement by them. For he hath respect unto purification by the ashes of the heifer; and this respected principally uncleanness by the dead, as is fully declared in the institution of that ordinance. As men were purified, by the sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer mingled with living water, from defilements contracted by the dead, without which they were separated from God and the church; so unless men are really purged from their moral defilements by the blood of Christ, they must perish for ever. Now this defilement from the dead, as we have showed, arose from hence, that death was the effect of the curse of the law; wherefore the guilt of sin with respect unto the curse of the law is here intended in the first place, and consequently its pollution.

This gives us the state of all men who are not interested in the sacrifice of Christ, and the purging virtue thereof. As they are dead in themselves,

“dead in trespasses and sins,” so all their works are “dead works.” Other works they have none. They are as a sepulcher filled with bones and corruption. Every thing they do is unclean in itself, and unclean unto them.

“Unto them that are defiled nothing is pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled,” <sup><3015></sup>Titus 1:15.

Their works come from spiritual death, and tend unto eternal death, and are dead in themselves. Let them deck and trim their carcasses whilst they please, let them rend their faces with painting, and multiply their ornaments with all excess of bravery; within they are full of dead bones, — of rotten, defiled, polluting works. That world which appears with so much outward beauty, lustre, and glory, is all polluted and defiled under the eye of the Most Holy.

**Secondly**, These dead works are further described by their *relation unto our persons*, as unto what is peculiarly affected with them, where they have, as it were, their seat and residence: and this is the *conscience*. He doth not say, “Purge your souls, or your minds, or your persons,” but “your conscience.” “And this he doth, —

**1.** In general, in opposition unto the purification by the law. There it was the dead body that did defile; it was the body that was defiled; it was the body that was purified; those ordinances “sanctified to the purifying of the flesh.” But the defilements here intended are *spiritual*, internal, relating unto conscience; and therefore such is the purification also.

**2.** He mentions the respect of these dead works unto conscience in particular, because it is conscience which is concerned in peace with God and confidence of approach unto him. Sin variously affects all the faculties of the soul, and there is in it a *peculiar defilement of conscience*, <sup><3015></sup>Titus 1:15. But that wherein conscience in the first place is concerned, and wherein it is alone concerned, is a sense of guilt. This brings along with it fear and dread; whence the sinner dares not approach into the presence of God. It was conscience which reduced Adam unto the condition of hiding himself from God, his eyes being opened by a sense of the guilt of sin. So he that was unclean by the touching of a dead body was excluded from all approach unto God in his worship Hereunto the apostle alludes in the following words, “That we may serve the living God;” for the word



**λατρεύω** properly denotes that service which consists in the observation and performance of solemn worship. As he who was unclean by a dead body might not approach unto the worship of God until he was purified; so a guilty sinner, whose conscience is affected with a sense of the guilt of sin, dares not to draw nigh unto or appear in the presence of God. It is by the working of conscience that sin deprives the soul of peace with God, of boldness or confidence before him, of all right to draw nigh unto him. Until this relation of sin unto the conscience be taken away, until there be “no more conscience of sin,” as the apostle speaks, <sup>3810</sup>Hebrews 10:2, — that is, conscience absolutely judging and condemning the person of the sinner in the sight of God, — there is no right, no liberty of access unto God in his service, nor any acceptance to be obtained with him. Wherefore the purging of conscience from dead works, doth first respect the *guilt of sin*, and the virtue of the blood of Christ in the removal of it. But, secondly, there is also an *inherent defilement of conscience by sin*, as of all other faculties of the soul. Hereby it is rendered unmeet for the discharge of its office in any particular duties. With respect hereunto conscience is here used synecdochically for the whole soul, and all the faculties of it, yea, our whole spirit, souls, and bodies, which are all to be cleansed and sanctified, <sup>3811</sup>1 Thessalonians 5:23. To purge our conscience, is to purge us in our whole persons.

**Thirdly**, This being the state of our conscience, this being the respect of dead works and their defilement to it and us, we may consider the relief that is necessary in this case, and what that is which is here proposed: —

Unto a complete relief in this condition, two things are necessary: —

1. A *discharge of conscience from a sense of the guilt of sin*, or the condemning power of it, whereby it deprives us of peace with God, and of boldness in access unto him.
2. The *cleansing of the conscience*, and consequently our whole persons, from the inherent defilement of sin.

The first of these was typified by the blood of bulls and goats offered on the altar to make atonement. The latter was represented by the sprinkling of the unclean with the ashes of the heifer unto their purification.

Both these the apostle here expressly ascribes unto “the blood of Christ;” and we may briefly inquire into three things concerning it:

1. On *what ground* it doth produce this blessed effect.
2. The *way of its operation and efficacy* unto this end.
3. The *reason* whence the apostle affirms that it shall much more do this than the legal ordinances could, sanctifying unto the purifying of the flesh: —

1. The grounds of its efficacy unto this purpose are three: —

(1.) That it was *blood* offered unto God. God had ordained that blood should be offered on the altar to make atonement for sin, or to “purge conscience from dead works” That this could not be really effected by the blood of bulls and goats is evident in the nature of the things themselves, and demonstrated in the event. Howbeit this must be done by blood, or all the institutions of legal sacrifices were nothing but means to deceive the minds of men, and ruin their souls. To say that at one time or other real atonement is not to be made for sin by blood, and conscience thereby to be purged and purified, is to make God a liar in all the institutions of the law. But this must be done by the blood of Christ, or not at all.

(2.) It was the *blood of Christ*, of “Christ, the Son of the living God,” <sup><16></sup>Matthew 16:16, whereby “God purchased his church with his own blood,” <sup><28></sup>Acts 20:28. The dignity of his person gave efficacy unto his office and offering. No other person, in the discharge of the same offices that were committed unto him, could have saved the church; and therefore all those by whom his divine person is denied do also evacuate his offices. By what they ascribe unto them, it is impossible the church should be either sanctified or saved. They resolve all into a mere act of sovereign power in God; which makes the cross of Christ of none effect.

(3.) He offered this blood, or himself, by the *eternal Spirit*. Though Christ in his divine person was the eternal Son of God, yet was it the human nature only that was offered in sacrifice. Howbeit it was offered by and with the concurrent actings of the divine nature, or eternal Spirit, as we have declared.

These things make the blood of Christ, as offered, meet and fit for the accomplishment of this great effect.

**2.** The second inquiry is concerning the *way* whereby the blood of Christ doth thus purge our conscience from dead works. Two things, as we have seen, are contained therein: —

**(1.)** The expiation, or taking away the guilt of sin, that conscience should not be deterred thereby from an access unto God.

**(2.)** The cleansing of our souls from vicious, defiling habits, inclinations, and acts, or all inherent uncleanness

Wherefore, under two considerations doth the blood of Christ produce this double effect: —

**(1.)** As it was *offered*; so it made atonement for sin, by giving satisfaction unto the justice and law of God. This all the expiatory sacrifices of the law did prefigure, this the prophets foretold, and this the gospel witnesseth unto. To deny it, is to deny any real efficacy in the blood of Christ unto this end, and so expressly to contradict the apostle. Sin is not purged from the conscience unless the guilt of it be so removed as that we may have peace with God and boldness in access unto him. This is given us by the blood of Christ as offered.

**(2.)** As it is *sprinkled*, it worketh the second part of this effect. And this sprinkling of the blood of Christ is the communication of its sanctifying virtue unto our souls. See <sup><405></sup>Ephesians 5:26, 27; <sup><504></sup>Titus 2:14. So doth “the blood of Jesus Christ, God’s Son, cleanse us from all sin,” <sup><600></sup>1 John 1:7; <sup><301></sup>Zechariah 13:1.

**3.** The *reason* why the apostle affirms that this is much more to be expected from the blood of Christ than the purification of the flesh was from legal ordinances hath been before spoken unto.

The Socinians plead on this place, that this effect of the death of Christ doth as unto us depend on our own duty. If they intended no more but that there is duty required on our part unto an actual participation of it, namely, faith, whereby we receive the atonement, we should have no difference with them. But they are otherwise minded. This purging of the conscience from dead works, they would have to consist in two things:

1. Our own relinquishment of sin.
2. The freeing us from the punishment due to sin, by an act of power in Christ in heaven.

The first, they say, hath therein respect unto the blood of Christ, in that thereby his doctrine was confirmed, in obedience whereunto we forsake sin, and purge our minds from it. The latter also relates thereunto, in that the sufferings of Christ were antecedent unto his exaltation and power in heaven. Wherefore this effect of the blood of Christ, is what we do ourselves in obedience unto his doctrine, and what he doth thereon by his power; and therefore may well be said to depend on our duty. But all this while there is nothing ascribed unto the blood of Christ as it was offered in sacrifice unto God, or shed in the offering of himself, which alone the apostle speaks unto in this place.

Others choose thus to oppose it: This purging of our consciences from dead works is not an immediate effect of the death of Christ, but it is a benefit contained therein; which upon our faith and obedience we are made partakers of. But, —

1. This is not, in my judgment, to interpret the apostle's words with due reverence. He affirms expressly, that “the blood of Christ doth purge our conscience from dead works;” that is, it doth make such an atonement for sin, and expiation of it, as that conscience shall be no more pressed with it, nor condemn the sinner for it.
2. The blood of Christ is the *immediate cause* of every effect assigned unto it, where there is no concurrent nor intermediate cause of the same kind with it in the production of that effect.
3. It is granted that the *actual communication* of this effect of the death of Christ unto our souls is wrought according unto the method which God in his sovereign wisdom and pleasure hath designed. And herein,
  - (1.) The Lord Christ by his blood made actual and absolute atonement for the sins of all the elect.
  - (2.) This atonement is proposed unto us in the gospel, ~~see~~ Romans 3:25.

(3.) It is required of us, unto an actual participation of the benefit of it, and peace with God thereby, that we receive this atonement by faith, <sup><51B></sup>Romans 5:11; but as wrought with God, it is the immediate elect of the blood of Christ.

**Thirdly**, The last thing in these words, is the *consequent* of this purging of our consciences, or the advantage which we receive thereby: “To serve the living God.” The words should be rendered, “that we may serve;” that is, have right and liberty so to do, being no longer excluded from the privilege of it, as persons were under the law whilst they were defiled and unclean. And three things are required unto the opening of these words; that we consider,

1. Why God is here called “the living God;”
2. What it is to “serve him;”
3. What is required that we may do so.

**First**, God in the Scripture is called “the living God,” —

1. *Absolutely*, and that,

- (1.) As he alone hath life in himself and of himself;
- (2.) As he is the only author and cause of life unto all others.

2. *Comparatively*, with respect unto idols and false gods, which are dead things, such as have neither life nor operation.

And this title is in the Scripture applied unto God,

1. To beget faith and trust in him, as the author of temporal, spiritual, and eternal life, with all things that depend thereon, <sup><50B></sup>1 Timothy 4:10.
2. To beget a due fear and reverence of him, as him who lives and sees, who hath all life in his power; so “it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.” And this epistle being written principally to warn the Hebrews of the danger of unbelief and apostasy from the gospel, the apostle in several places makes mention of God with whom they had to do under this title, as <sup><50C></sup>Hebrews 3:12, 10:31, and in this place.

But there is something peculiar in the mention of it in this place. For,

1. The due consideration of God as “the living God,” will discover how necessary it is that we be purged from dead works, to serve him in a due manner.

2. The nature of gospel-worship and service is intimated to be such as becomes the living God, “our reasonable service,” <sup>ROM</sup>Romans 12:1.

**Secondly**, What is it to “serve the living God?” I doubt not but that the whole life of faith in universal obedience is consequently required hereunto. That we may live unto the living God in all ways of holy obedience, not any one act or duty of it can be performed as it ought without the antecedent purging of our consciences from dead works. But yet it is sacred and solemn worship that is intended in the first place. They had of old sacred ordinances of worship, or of divine service. From all these those, that were unclean were excluded, and restored unto them upon their purification. There is a solemn spiritual worship of God under the new testament also, and ordinances for the due observance of it. This none have a right to approach unto God by, none can do so in a due manner, unless their conscience be purged by the blood of Christ. And the whole of our relation unto God depends hereon. For as we therein express or testify the subjection of our souls and consciences unto him, and solemnly engage into universal obedience, (for of these things all acts of outward worship are the solemn pledges,) so therein doth God testify his acceptance of us and delight in us by Jesus Christ.

**Thirdly**, What is required on our part hereunto is included in the manner of the expression of it, *Εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν*, — “that we may serve.” And two things are required hereunto:

1. Liberty;
2. Ability.

The first includes right and boldness, and is expressed by *παρρησία*: our holy worship is *προσαγωγή ἐν παρρησίᾳ*, — “an access with freedom and confidence.” This we must treat of on <sup>HEB</sup>Hebrews 10:19-21. The other respects all the supplies of the Holy Spirit, in grace and gifts. Both these we receive by the blood of Christ, that we may be meet and able in a due manner to serve the living God. We may yet take some observations from the words: —

**Obs. VI.** Faith hath ground of triumph in the certain efficacy of the blood of Christ for the expiation of sin: “How much more!” The Holy Ghost here and elsewhere teacheth faith to argue itself into a full assurance. — The reasonings which he proposeth and insisteth on unto this end are admirable, <sup><B></sup>Romans 8:31-39. Many objections will arise against believing, many difficulties do lie in its way. By them are the generality of believers left under doubts, fears, and temptations, all their days. One great relief provided in this case, is a direction to argue “a minore ad majus:” If the blood of bulls and goats did so purify the unclean, how much more will the blood of Christ purge our consciences! How heavenly, how divine is that way of arguing unto this end which our blessed Savior proposeth unto us in the parable of the unjust judge and the widow, <sup><B></sup>Luke 18:1-8; and in that other, of the man and his friend that came to seek bread by night, <sup><B></sup>Hebrews 11:5-9. Who can read them, but his soul is surprised into some kind of confidence of being heard in his supplication, if in any measure compliant with the rule prescribed? And the argument here managed by the apostle leaves no room for doubt or objection. Would we be more diligent in the same way of the exercise of faith, by arguings and expostulations upon Scripture principles, we should be more firm in our assent unto the conclusions which arise from them, and be enabled more to triumph against the assaults of unbelief.

**Obs. VII.** Nothing could expiate sin and free conscience from dead works but the blood of Christ alone, and that in the offering himself to God through the eternal Spirit. — The redemption of the souls of men is precious, and must have ceased for ever, had not infinite wisdom found out this way for its accomplishment. The work was too great for any other to undertake, or for any other means to effect. And the glory of God is hid herein only unto them that perish.

**Obs. VIII.** It was God, as the supreme ruler and lawgiver, with whom atonement for sin was to be made: “He offered himself unto God.” It was he whose law was violated, whose justice was provoked, to whom it belonged to require and receive satisfaction. — And who was meet to tender it unto him, but “the man that was his fellow,” who gave efficacy unto his oblation by the dignity of his person? In the contemplation of the glory of God herein the life of faith doth principally consist.

**Obs. IX.** The souls and consciences of men are wholly polluted, before they are purged by the blood of Christ. And this pollution is such as excludes them from all right of access unto God in his worship; as it was with them who were legally unclean.

**Obs. X.** Even the best works of men, antecedently unto the purging of their consciences by the blood of Christ, are but “dead works.” — However men may please themselves in them, perhaps think to merit by them, yet from death they come, and unto death they tend.

**Obs. XI.** Justification and sanctification are inseparably conjoined in the design of God’s grace by the blood of Christ: — “Purge our consciences, that we may serve the living God.”

**Obs. XII.** Gospel-worship is such, in its spirituality and holiness, as becometh “the living God;” and our duty it is always to consider that with him we have to do in all that we perform therein.

### VERSE 15.

Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἔστιν, ὅπως ζανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραζάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάζωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι, τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας.

Διὰ τοῦτο. Vulg., “et ideo,” “and therefore.” Syr., אֲנִי הַמְּוֹלֵךְ, “propter hoc,” “for this;” or “propterea,” “itaque ob id,” “and for this cause.”

Μεσίτης ἔστιν. Syr., אֲנִי הַמְּוֹלֵךְ, “he himself was the mediator.” “He is the mediator.” Heb., אִישׁ בֵּינָם, “a man coming between.”

Ὅπως ζανάτου γενομένον. Vulg., “ut morte intercedente,” “by the interposition of death.” The Syriae reads the passage, “Who by his death was a redeemer unto them who had transgressed against the first testament;” probably, to avoid the difficulty of that expression, “for the redemption of transgressions.” The Ethiopic corrupts the whole text.

Εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν παραζάσεων, “in redemptionem eorum praevaricationum.” Vulg., “ad redemptionem eorum transgressionum;”



properly, “for the redemption of transgressions,” or those transgressions which were.

Ἐπαγγελίαν λάζωσιν. Vulg., Syr., “that they may receive the promise who are called to the eternal inheritance.” But in the Original and in the Vulgar “eternal inheritance” is joined unto and regulated by “the promise;” —“the promise of an eternal inheritance.”<sup>f 21</sup>

**Ver. 15.** —And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

The things which are to be considered in this verse are,

1. The *note of connection* in the conjunction, “and.”
2. The *ground* of the ensuing assertion: “For this cause.”
3. The *assertion* itself: “He is the mediator of the new testament.”
4. The *especial reason* why he should be so: “For the redemption of transgressions under the first testament.”
5. The *way* whereby that was to be effected: “By means of death.”
6. The *end* of the whole: “That they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.”

But before we proceed unto the exposition of the whole or any part of it, a difficulty must be removed from the words as they lie in our translation. For an inquiry may be justly moved, why we render the word **διαθήκη** by a “testament” in this place, whereas before we have constantly rendered it by a “covenant.” And the plain reason of it is, because from this verse unto the end of the chapter the apostle argues from the nature and use of a testament among men, as he directly affirms in the next verse. Hereby he confirms our faith in the expectation of the benefits of this **διαθήκη**, — that is, “covenant” or “testament.” We may answer, he doth it because it is the true and proper signification of the word. **Διαθήκη** is properly a “testamentary disposition of things;” as **συνθήκη** is a “covenant.” For in the composition of the word there is nothing to intimate a mutual compact or agreement, which is necessary unto a

covenant, and is expressed in **συνθήκη**. However, there is a great affinity in the things themselves: for there are covenants which have in them free grants and donations, which are of the nature of a testament; and there are testaments whose force is resolved into some conventions, conditions, and agreements, which they borrow from the nature of covenants. So there is such an affinity between them as one name may be expressive of them both.

But against this it will be replied, ‘That what the apostle speaks unto is in the Hebrew called **בְּרִית**, —that is, a “covenant,” and it nowhere signifies a testament; so that from thence the apostle could not argue from the nature of a testament what is required thereunto and what doth depend thereon.’ Hereunto it is answered, That the LXX. constantly rendering **בְּרִית**, “berith,” by **διαθήκη**, and not by **συνθήκη**, the apostle made use of that translation and that signification of the word. But this will not solve the difficulty; for it would resolve all the apostle’s arguings in this great and important mystery into the authority of that translation, which is fallible throughout, and (at least as it is come to us) filled with actual mistakes. We must therefore give another answer unto this objection. Wherefore I say, —

1. The word **בְּרִית** could not be more properly rendered by any one word than by **διαθήκη**. For it being mostly used to express the covenant between God and man, it is of such a nature as cannot properly be termed **συνθήκη**, which is a covenant or compact upon equal terms of *distributive justice* between distinct parties; but God’s covenant with man is only the way and the declaration of the terms whereby God will *dispose and communicate* good things unto us, which hath more of the nature of a testament than of a covenant in it.
2. The word **בְּרִית** is often used to express a *free promise*, with an effectual donation and communication of the thing promised, as hath been declared in the foregoing chapter; but this hath more of the nature of a testament than of a covenant.
3. There is no word in the Hebrew language whereby to express a testament but **בְּרִית** only. Nor is there so in the Syriac: their **דִּיתִיקִן** is nothing but **διαθήκη**. The Hebrews express the thing by **צְנָה לְבֵית**, to

“order, dispose, give command concerning the house or household of a dying man,” <sup><381></sup>Isaiah 38:1; <sup><172></sup>2 Samuel 17:23. But they have no other word but berith to signify it; and therefore, where the nature of the thing spoken of requires it, it is properly rendered a “testament,” and ought so to be.

Wherefore there is no force used unto the signification of the word in this place by the apostle. But that which makes the proper use of it by him evident in this place, is that he had respect unto its signification in the making of the covenant with the people at Sinai; for this he compares the new testament unto in all its causes and effects. And in that covenant there were three things: —

- 1.** The *prescription of obedience* unto the people on the part of God; which was received by their consent in an express compliance with the law and terms of it, <sup><51></sup>Deuteronomy 5:1-27. Herein the nature of it, so far as it was a covenant, did consist.
- 2.** There was a *promise and conveyance of an inheritance* unto them, namely, of the land of Canaan, with all the privileges of it. God declared that the land was his, and that he gave it unto them for an inheritance. And this promise or grant was made unto them without any consideration of their previous obedience, out of mere love and grace. The principal design of the book of Deuteronomy is to inlay this principle in the foundation of their obedience. Now the free grant and donation of an inheritance of the goods of him that makes the grant, is properly a testament. A free disposition it was of the goods of the testator.
- 3.** There was in the confirmation of this grant the *intervention of death*. The grant of the inheritance of the land that God made was confirmed by death and the blood of the beasts offered in sacrifice; whereof we must treat on verses 18-20. And although covenants were confirmed by sacrifices, as this was, so far as it was a covenant, namely, with the blood of them; yet as in those sacrifices death was comprised, it was to confirm the testamentary grant of the inheritance. For death is necessary unto the confirmation of a testament; which then could only be in type and representation; the testator himself was not to die for the establishment era typical inheritance.

Wherefore the apostle having discoursed before concerning the covenant as it prescribed and required obedience, with promises and penalties annexed unto it, he now treats of it as unto the donation and communication of good things by it, with the confirmation of the grant of them by death; in which sense it was a testament, and not a covenant properly so called. And the arguing of the apostle from this word is not only just and reasonable, but without it we could never have rightly understood the typical representation that was made of the death, blood, and sacrifice of Christ, in the confirmation of the new testament, as we shall see immediately.

This difficulty being removed, we may proceed in the exposition of the words.

**First.** That which first occurs is the *note of connection*, in the conjunction “and.” But it doth not here, as sometimes, infer a reason of what was spoken before, but is emphatically expletive, and denotes a progress in the present argument; as much as “also,” “moreover.”

**Secondly.** There is the *ground* of the ensuing assertion, or the manner of its introduction: “For this cause.” Some say that it looks backward, and intimates a reason of what was spoken before, or why it was necessary that our consciences should be purged from dead works by the blood of Christ, namely, because “he was the mediator of the new covenant;” others say it looks forward, and gives a reason why he was to be the mediator of the new testament, namely, “that by means of death for the transgressions,” etc.

It is evident that there is a reason rendered in these words of the necessity of the death and sacrifice of Christ, by which alone our consciences may be purged from dead works. And this reason is intended in these words, *Διὰ τοῦτο*, — “For this cause.” And this necessity of the death of Christ the apostle proves, both from the nature of his office, namely, that he was to be “the mediator of the new covenant,” which, being also a testament, required the death of the testator; and from what was to be effected thereby, namely, the “redemption of transgressions” and the purchase of an “eternal inheritance.” Wherefore these are the things which he hath respect unto in these words, “For this cause.”

But withal the apostle in this verse enlargeth his discourse, as designing to comprehend in it the whole dispensation of the will and grace of God unto the church in Christ, with the ground and reason of it. This reason he layeth down in this verse, giving an account of the effects of it in those that follow. Hereunto respect is had in this expression.

For the exposition of the words themselves, — that is, the declaration of the mind of the Holy Ghost, and nature of the things contained in them, — we must leave the order of the words and take that of the things themselves. And the things ensuing are declared in them: —

1. That God designed *an eternal inheritance* unto some persons.
2. The way and manner of conveying a right and title thereunto was *by promise*.
3. That the persons unto whom this inheritance is designed are *those that are called*.
4. That there was an obstacle unto the enjoyment of this inheritance, which was *transgression against the first covenant*.
5. That this obstacle might be removed, and the inheritance enjoyed, God made a *new covenant*; because none of the rites, ordinances, or sacrifices of the first covenant, could remove that obstacle, or expiate those sins.
6. The ground of the efficacy of the new covenant unto this end was, that it had *a mediator*, a high priest, such as had been already described.
7. The way and means whereby the mediator of the new covenant did expiate sins under the old was *by death*; nor could it otherwise be done, seeing this new covenant, being a testament also, required the death of the testator.
8. This death of the mediator of the new testament did take away sins *by the redemption of them*: “For the redemption of transgressions.” All which must be opened, for the due exposition of these words.
1. God designed unto some an “eternal inheritance.” And both the reason of this grant with the nature of it must be inquired into: —

(1.) As unto the *reason* of it: God in our first creation gave unto man, whom he made his son and heir, as unto things here below, a great inheritance, of mere grace and bounty. This inheritance consisted in the use of all the creatures here below, in a just title unto them and dominion over them. Neither did it consist absolutely in these things, but as they were a pledge of the present favor of God, and of man's future blessedness upon his obedience. This whole inheritance man forfeited by sin. God also took the forfeiture, and ejected him out of the possession of it, and utterly despoiled him of his title unto it. Nevertheless he designed unto some another inheritance, even one that should not be lost, that should be eternal. It is altogether vain and foolish to seek for any other cause or reason of the preparation of this inheritance, and the designation of it unto any person, but only his own grace and bounty, his sovereign will and pleasure. What merit of it, what means of attaining it, could be found in them who were considered under no other qualification but such as had woefully rejected that inheritance which before they were instated in? And therefore is it called an "inheritance," to mind us that the way whereby we come unto it is gratuitous adoption, and not purchase or merit.

(2.) As unto the *nature* of it, it is declared in the adjunct mentioned; it is "eternal." And it is so called in opposition unto the inheritance which by virtue of the first testament God granted unto the Israelites in the land of Canaan. That was an inheritance, and was conveyed by a promise. And when God threatened to deprive them of that land, he said he would "disinherit them," <sup>4042</sup>Numbers 14:12. And this inheritance consisted not only in the land itself, but principally in the privileges of holy worship and relation unto God which they enjoyed therein, <sup>4000</sup>Romans 9:4, 5. But yet all things that belonged unto it were in themselves carnal and temporary, and only types of good things to come. In opposition hereunto God provided an "eternal inheritance." And as the state of those who are to receive it is twofold, namely, that in this life, and that in the life to come, so there are two parts of their inheritance, namely, grace and glory; for although grace be bestowed and continued only in this life, yet the things we enjoy by virtue of it are eternal. The other part of their inheritance is glory; which is the way of the full, unchangeable possession and enjoyment of it. This, therefore, is not to be excluded from this inheritance, at least as the end and necessary consequent of it. But that

which is principally and in the first place intended by it, is that state of things whereinto believers are admitted in this life. The whole inheritance of grace and glory was in the first place given and committed unto Jesus Christ. He was “appointed heir of all things,” <sup><KJB></sup> Hebrews 1:2. By him is it communicated unto all believers; who thereby become “*heirs* of God, and joint heirs with Christ,” <sup><KJB></sup> Romans 8:15-17. For the Lord Christ, as the great testator, did in and by his death bequeath unto them all his goods, as an eternal legacy. All that grace, mercy, and glory, all the riches of them which are prepared in the covenant, are comprised herein. And a goodly inheritance it is; the lines are fallen unto believers in pleasant places. And the way whereby we *become* interested in this inheritance is by gratuitous adoption. “If sons, then heirs.”

This is that which is the end of all, and regulates all that precedes in this verse. It declares the way whereby God would communicate unto some persons the inheritance which in free grace and bounty he had provided. And, —

**Obs. I.** It is an act of mere sovereign grace in God to provide such a blessed inheritance for any of them who had sinfully cast away what they were before intrusted withal. — And into this are all God’s following dealings with the church to be resolved. If there was nothing in us to move God to provide this inheritance for us, no more is there of the communication of any part of it unto us; as we shall see further on the next words.

**2.** The *way* whereby God did convey or would communicate this inheritance unto any, was by promise: “Might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance.” The Syriac translation refers the inheritance unto the “called:” “Those that are called to an eternal inheritance.” But in the original it respects the “promise:” “The promise of an eternal inheritance;” for by the promise is assurance given of it, and it is the means of the actual conveyance of it unto us. And the apostle hath respect unto what he had discoursed about the promise of God, and the confirmation of it by his oath, <sup><KJB></sup> Hebrews 6:15-18. So he declares it also, <sup><KJB></sup> Galatians 3:18. The promise made unto Abraham, and confirmed by the oath of God, was concerning the eternal inheritance by Christ. The

inheritance of Canaan was by the law, or the first covenant; but this was by promise. And we may consider three things:

- (1.) *What is the promise intended.*
- (2.) *How and why it was by promise.*
- (3.) *How we do receive the promise of it.*

(1.) The “promise” principally intended is that which was given unto Abraham, and confirmed by the oath of God: for the inheritance, that is, the eternal inheritance, was of the promise, <sup><B></sup>Galatians 3:18, namely, that in the seed of Abraham all nations should be blessed. It includes, indeed, the first promise, made unto our first parents, which was the spring and foundation of it, and respects all the following promises concerning the Lord Christ and the benefits of his mediation, with all the grace which is administered by them, which were further declarations and confirmations of it; but that great solemn promise is principally intended: for the apostle designs to convince the Hebrews that neither by the law nor by the sacrifices and ordinances of it they could come unto the inheritance promised unto Abraham and his seed. This was “the promise of eternal inheritance,” whereof that of the land of Canaan was a type only.

(2.) We must inquire how and why this inheritance is conveyed by promise. And God made this settlement by promise for these ends; —

[1.] To evince the absolute freedom of the preparation and grant of it. The promise is everywhere opposed unto every thing of works or desert in ourselves. It hath no respect unto what we were or did deserve. The land of Canaan was given to the posterity of Abraham by promise. And therefore doth God so often mind them of the freedom of it, — that it was an act of mere love and sovereign grace, which in themselves they were so far from deserving, as that they were altogether unworthy of it, <sup><B></sup>Deuteronomy 9:4, 5, 7:7, 8. Much less hath the promise of the eternal inheritance respect unto any thing of works in ourselves.

[2.] To give security unto all the heirs of it unto whom it was designed. Hence in this promise and the confirmation of it, there was the highest engagement of the faithfulness and veracity of God. There was so, “to the end that the promise might be sure unto all the seed,” <sup><B></sup>Romans 4:16.



Wherefore God doth not only declare the relation of it unto his essential truth, — ‘God, who cannot lie, hath given this promise of eternal life,’ <sup><500></sup>Titus 1:2, — but hath ‘confirmed it with his oath; that by two immutable things, wherein it was impossible that God should lie, it might be established.’ The reasons of the use and necessity hereof have been declared on <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 6:17, 18.

[3.] It was thus conveyed, and is communicated by promise unto all the heirs of it in their successive generations, that the way of obtaining this inheritance on our part might be by faith, and no otherwise; for what God hath only promised doth necessarily require faith unto its reception, and faith only. There is nothing can contribute aught unto an interest in the promise, but the mixing of it with faith, <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 4:2. And “it is of faith, that it may be by grace,” <sup><500></sup>Romans 4:16; namely, that it may be evidenced to be of the mere grace of God, in opposition unto all worth, works and endeavors of our own. And if all grace and glory, all benefits of the mediation of Christ, our sanctification, justification, and glorification, be an inheritance prepared in grace, conveyed by promise, and received by faith, there is no place left for our own works, with reference unto the procurement of an interest in them. Freely it was provided, freely it is proposed, and freely it is received.

(3.) We may inquire what it is to “receive” the promise. And it hath a double sense:

[1.] As the promise may be considered formally or materially. To receive the promise *formally* as a promise, is to have it declared unto us, and to mix it with faith, or to believe it. This it is to receive the promise, in opposition unto them by whom it is rejected through unbelief. So Abraham is said to “receive the promises,” <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 11:17, in that when they were given unto him,

“he staggered not through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God,” <sup><500></sup>Romans 4:20.

[2.] As the promise is *materially* considered, so to receive it is to receive the thing promised. So it is said of the saints under the old testament, that “they obtained a good report through faith,” but “received not the promise,” <sup><500></sup>Hebrews 11:39. They received the promises by faith in them

as proposed; but the principal thing promised, which was the coming of Christ in the flesh, they received not. The receiving of the promise here mentioned is of both kinds, according to the distinct parts of this inheritance. As unto the future state of glory, we receive the promise in the first way; that is, we believe it, rest upon it, trust unto the truth of God in it, and live in the expectation of it. And the benefit we receive hereby, as unto our spiritual life and consolation, is inexpressible. As unto the foundation of the whole inheritance, in the oblation and sacrifice of Christ, and all the grace, mercy, and love, with the fruits of them, whereof in this life we are made partakers, and all the privileges of the gospel, believers under the new testament receive the promise in the second sense; namely, the things promised. And so did they also under the old testament, according to the measure of the divine dispensation towards them. And we may observe, —

**Obs. II.** All our interest in the gospel inheritance depends on our receiving the promise by faith. — Though it be prepared in the counsel of God, though it be proposed unto us in the dispensation of the gospel, yet, unless we receive the promise of it by faith, we have no right or title unto it.

**Obs. III.** The conveyance and actual communication of the eternal inheritance by promise, to be received by faith alone, tends exceedingly unto the exaltation of the glory of God, and the security of the salvation of them that do believe. — For, as unto the latter, it depends absolutely on the veracity of God, confirmed by his oath. And faith, on the other hand, is the only way and means of ascribing unto God the glory of all the holy properties of his nature, which he designs to exalt in this dispensation of himself.

**3.** The *persons* unto whom this inheritance is designed, and who do receive the promise of it, are “those that are called.” It is to no purpose to discourse here about outward and inward calling, effectual and ineffectual, complied with or not: no others are intended but those that actually receive the promise. It was the design of God, in this whole dispensation, that all the called should receive the promise; and if they do not so, his counsel, and that in the greatest work of his wisdom, power, and grace, is frustrated. They are the “called according to his purpose,” ~~see~~ Romans

8:28; — those who obtain the inheritance “being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,” <sup><4011></sup>Ephesians 1:11. God here puts forth his almighty power, that his purpose, or the counsel of his will, may be established, in giving the inheritance unto all that are called: “Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified,” or gave them the whole eternal inheritance, <sup><4012></sup>Romans 8:30. Hence Estius, an expositor of the Roman church, chargeth the contrary opinion in Catharinus as unorthodox. It is not a general call, wherein those who are so called may or may not receive the inheritance; but what God designs unto them that are intended, they are so called as that they shall assuredly be made partakers of it. This is the end that God designed in the dispensation of himself by Jesus Christ here declared, and therefore respect is had thereunto in the whole of it.

Some think that by “the called” here, those only are intended who were so *under the old testament*: for mention is made only of the redemption of transgressions under that covenant; in what sense shall be immediately declared. But this is contrary both unto the design of the apostle and the use of the word. For on that supposition, he says no more but that Christ was the mediator of the new testament, that those might be saved who lived and died under the old. But his principal design is to prove the advantage that we now have, even above the elect themselves under the old testament; yet so as not to exclude them from the same benefit with us by the mediation of Christ, as unto the substance of it. And “the called,” in the language of this apostle, doth principally signify the “called in Christ Jesus.”

**Obs. IV.** Effectual vocation is the only way of entrance into the eternal inheritance; for it is accompanied with adoption, which gives us right and title thereunto, <sup><4012></sup>John 1:12. In vain do they expect it who are not so called.

**4.** Things being thus prepared in the counsel and grace of God, yet there was an obstacle in the way of actually receiving the promise; namely, the “transgressions that were under the first testament.” God designed unto the elect an eternal inheritance; yet can they not be made partakers of it, but in such a way as was suited unto his glory. It was unjust and

unreasonable that it should be otherwise. Whereas, therefore, they were all of them guilty of sin, their sins must be expiated and taken out of the way, or they cannot receive the promise of the inheritance.

Παραβάσεις, פְּשָׁעִים עֲוֹנִים. Our word “transgressions” doth properly express the original word. And in the distribution of sins by their names into פְּשָׁעִים עֲוֹנִים, and חַטָּאִים, <sup><Bib></sup>Leviticus 16:21, we render פְּשָׁעִים by it. But it compriseth all sorts of sins whereby the law is transgressed, be they great or small. Every thing that hath the nature of sin must be expiated, or the inheritance cannot be enjoyed.

**Obs. V.** Though God will give grace and glory unto his elect, yet he will do it in such a way as wherein and whereby he may be glorified also himself. — Satisfaction must be made for transgression, unto the honor of his righteousness, holiness, and law.

There are yet sundry difficulties in this expression, which must be inquired into. For, —

**(1.)** “The redemption” or expiation “of sins” is confined unto those under the old testament; whence it should seem that there is none made for those under the new.

*Ans.* The emphasis of the expression, “sins under the old testament,” respects either the *time* when the sine intended were committed, or the *testament* against which they were committed. And the preposition ἐπί will admit of either sense. Take it in the first way, and the argument follows “a fortiori,” as unto the sins committed *under* the new testament; though there be no expiation of sins *against* it, which properly are only final unbelief and impenitency. For the expiation intended is made by the mediator of the new testament: and if he expiated the sins that were under the first testament, that is, of those who lived and died whilst that covenant was in force, much more doth he do so for them who live under the administration of that testament whereof he is the mediator; for sins are taken away by virtue of that testament whereunto they do belong. And it is with peculiar respect, unto them that the blood of Christ is called “the blood of the new testament, for the redemption of sins.”

But yet more probably the meaning may be, the sins that were and are committed against that first covenant, or the law and rule of it. For whereas that covenant did in its administration comprise the moral law, which was the substance and foundation of it, all sins whatever have their form and nature with respect thereunto. So “sins under the first covenant,” are all sins whatever; for there is no sin committed under the gospel but it is a sin against that law which requires us to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and all our strength.

Either way, the sins of them who are called under the new testament are included.

(2.) It is inquired whether it is the *nature of the sins* intended that is respected, or the *persons guilty* of them also under that testament. The Syriac translation avoids this difficulty, by rendering the words of the abstract, “the redemption of transgressions,” in the concrete, “a redeemer unto them who had transgressed.” That it is a certain sort of sins that is intended, Socinus was the first that invented. And his invention is the foundation of the exposition not only of Schlichtingius, but of Grotius also on this place. Such sins they say they are, as for which no expiation was to be made by the sacrifices of the law, — sins of a greater nature than could be expiated by them; for they only made expiation of some smaller sins, as sins of ignorance, or the like. But there is no respect unto the persons of them who lived under that testament; whom they will not grant to be redeemed by the blood of Christ. Wherefore, according unto them, the difference between the expiation of sin by the sacrifices of the law and that by the sacrifice of Christ, doth not consist in their nature, that the one did it only typically, and in an external representation, by the purifying of the flesh, the other really and effectually; but in this, that the one expiated lesser sins only, the other greater also.

But there is nothing sound or consonant unto the truth in this interpretation of the words. For,-

[1.] It *proceeds on a false supposition*, — that there were sins of the people (not only presumptuous sins, and which had impenitency in them) for which no atonement was made, nor expiation of them allowed; which is expressly contrary unto <sup>Exodus</sup> Leviticus 16:16, 21. And whereas some offenses were capital amongst them, for which no atonement was allowed

to free the sinner from death, yet that belonged unto the political rule of the people, and hindered not but that typically all sorts of sins were to be expiated.

[2.] It is *contrary unto the express design of the apostle*. For he had proved before, by all sorts of arguments, that the sacrifices of the law could not expiate any sin, could not purge the conscience from dead works; that they “made nothing perfect.” And this he speaks not of this or that sin, but of every sin wherein the conscience of a sinner is concerned, <sup><800></sup>Hebrews 10:1, 2. Hence two things follow: —

**1st.** That they did not, in and of themselves, *really expiate any one sin*, small or great. It was impossible, saith the apostle, that they should do so, <sup><800></sup>Hebrews 10:4; only they “sanctified to the purifying of the flesh:” which overthrows the foundation of this exposition.

**2dly.** That they did *typify and represent the expiation of all sorts of sins* whatever, and made application of it unto their souls. For if it was so, that there was no atonement for their sins, that their consciences were not purged from dead works, nor themselves consummated, but only had some outward purification of the flesh, it cannot be but they must all eternally perish; but that this was not their condition the apostle proves from hence, because they were called of God unto an eternal inheritance, as he had proved at large concerning Abraham, Hebrews 6. Hence he infers the necessity of the mediation and death of Christ, as without the virtue whereof all the called under the first covenant must perish eternally, there being no other way to come to the inheritance.

(3.) Whereas the apostle mentions only the sins under the first covenant, as unto the time past before the exhibition of Christ in the flesh, or the death of the mediator of the new testament, what is to be thought of them who lived during that season who belonged not unto the covenant, but were strangers from it, such as are described <sup><800></sup>Ephesians 2:12? I answer, The apostle takes no notice of them; and that because, taking them generally, Christ died not for them. Yea, that he did not so, is sufficiently proved from this place. Those who live and die strangers from God’s covenant have no interest in the mediation of Christ.

Wherein the redemption of those transgressions did consist shall be declared in its proper place. And we may observe, —

**Obs. VI.** Such is the malignant nature of sin, of all transgression of the law, that unless it be removed, unless it be taken out of the way, no person can enjoy the promise of the eternal inheritance.

**Obs. VII.** It was the work of God alone to contrive, and it was the effect of, infinite wisdom and grace to provide, a way for the removal of sin, that it might not be an everlasting obstacle against the communication of an eternal inheritance unto them that are called.

**5.** We have declared the design of God here represented unto us, who are the persons towards whom it was to be accomplished, and what lay in the way as a hinderance of it. That which remains in the words, is the way that God took and the means that he used for the removal of that hinderance, and the effectual accomplishment of his design.

This in general was, first, the *making of a new testament*. He had fully proved before that this could not be done by that covenant against which the sins were committed, neither by the priests, nor sacrifices, nor any other duties of it. Therefore had he promised the abolition of it, because of its weakness and insufficiency unto this end, as also the introduction of a new to supply its defects, as we have seen at large in the exposition of the foregoing chapter. For it became the wisdom, goodness, and grace of God, upon the removal of the one for its insufficiency, to establish another that should be every way effectual unto his purpose, namely, the communication of an eternal inheritance unto them that are called. But then the inquiry will be, how this covenant or testament shall effect this end; what is in it, what belongs unto it that should be so effectual, and by what means it might attain this end. All these are declared in the words. And, —

**6.** In general, all this arose from hence, that it *had a mediator*, and that the Lord Christ, the Son of God, was this mediator. The dignity of his person, and thereon both the excellency and efficacy of his priestly office, — whereunto alone respect is had in his being called here a mediator, — he had abundantly before demonstrated. Although the word in general be of a larger signification, as we have declared on <sup>xxxv</sup> Hebrews 8:6, yet here it is restrained unto his priestly office, and his acting therein. For whereas he

had treated of that alone in the foregoing chapter, here, declaring the grounds and reasons of the necessity of it, he says, “For this cause is he the mediator.” And proceeding to show in what sense he considers him as a mediator, he doth it by his being a testator and dying; which belongs to his priestly office alone. And the sole end which in this place he assigns unto his mediatory office, is his death: “That by means of death.”

Whereas, therefore, there were sins committed under the first covenant, and against it, and would have been so for ever, had it continued, which it was no way able so to take away as that the called might receive the inheritance, the Lord Christ undertook to be the mediator of that covenant, which was provided as a remedy against these evils. For herein he undertook to answer for and expiate all those sins. Whereas, therefore, expiation of sin is to be made by an act towards God, with whom alone atonement is to be made, so as that it may be pardoned, the mediation of Christ here intended is that whereby, suffering death in our stead, in the behalf of all that are called, he made atonement for sin.

But moreover, God had a further design herein. He would not only free them that are called from that death which they deserved by their sins against the first covenant, but give them also a right and title unto an eternal inheritance, — that is, of grace and glory; wherefore the procurement hereof also depends on the mediation of Christ. For by his obedience unto God in the discharge thereof he *purchased* for them this inheritance, and *bequeathed* it unto them, as the mediator of the new testament.

The provision of this mediator of the new testament is the greatest effect of the infinite wisdom, love, and grace of God. This is the center of his eternal counsels. In the womb of this one mercy all others are contained. Herein will he be glorified unto eternity.

- (1.) The *first covenant of works* was broken and disannulled, because it had no mediator.
- (2.) The *covenant at Sinai* had no such mediator as could expiate sin. Hence, —
- (3.) *Both* of them became *means of death* and condemnation.



(4.) God saw that, in the making of the new covenant, it was necessary to put *all things into the hand of a mediator*, that it also might not be frustrated.

(5.) This mediator was not in the *first* place to *preserve* us in the state of the *new covenant*, but to *deliver* us from the guilt of the breach of the *former*, and the curse thereon. To make provision for this end was the effect of infinite wisdom.

7. The especial way and means whereby this effect was wrought by this mediator, was *by death*: “Morte obita,” “facta,” “interveniente,” “intercedente. “By means of death,” say we. Death was the means, that whereby the mediator procured the effect mentioned. That which in the foregoing verse is ascribed unto the blood of Christ, which he offered as a priest, is here ascribed unto his death as a mediator. For both these really are the same: only in the one, the *thing itself* is expressed, it was death; in the other, the *manner* of it, it was by blood: in the one, *what he did and suffered*, with respect unto the curse of the first covenant, it was death; in the other, the *ground* of his making expiation for sin by his death, or how it came so to do, name]y, not merely as it was death or *penal*, but as it was a *voluntary sacrifice* or oblation.

It was therefore necessary unto the end mentioned that the mediator of the new testament should die: not as the high priests of old died, a natural death for themselves; but as the sacrifice died that was slain and offered for others. He was to die that death which was threatened unto transgressors against the first covenant; that is, death under the curse of the law. There must therefore be some great cause and end why this mediator, being the only begotten of the Father, should thus die.

“This was,” say the Socinians, “that he might confirm the doctrine that he taught. He died as a *martyr*, not as a *sacrifice*.” But, —

(1.) There was no need that he should die unto that end; for his doctrine was sufficiently confirmed by the scriptures of the Old Testament, the evidence of the presence of God in him, and the miracles which he wrought.

(2.) Notwithstanding their pretense, they do not assign the confirmation of his doctrine unto his death, but unto his resurrection from the dead.

Neither indeed do they allow any gracious effect unto his death, either towards God or men, but only make it something necessarily antecedent unto what he did of that kind. Nor do they allow that he acted any thing at all towards God on our behalf. Whereas the Scripture constantly assigns our redemption, sanctification, and salvation, to the death and blood of Christ, these persons

[1.] Deny that of itself it hath any influence into them: wherefore,

[2.] They say that Christ by his death confirmed the new covenant; but hereby they intend nothing but what they do also in the former, or the *confirmation of his doctrine*, with an addition of somewhat worse. For they would have him to confirm the promises of God as by him declared, and no more; as though he were God's surety to us, and not a surety for us unto God. Neither do they assign this unto his death, but unto his resurrection from the dead. But suppose all this, and that the death of Christ were in some sense useful and profitable unto these ends, which is all they plead, yet what use and advantage was it of, with respect unto them, that he should die an accursed death, under the curse of the law and a sense of God's displeasure? Hereof the Socinians, and those that follow them, can yield no reason at all. It would become these men, so highly pretending unto reason, to give an account upon their own principles of the death of the only-begotten Son of God, in the highest course and most intense acts of obedience, that may be compliant with the wisdom, holiness, and goodness of God, considering the kind of death that he died. But what they cannot do, the apostle doth in the next words.

8. The death of the mediator of the new testament was "for the redemption of transgressions;" and for this end it was necessary. Sin lay in the way of the enjoyment of the inheritance which grace had prepared. It did so in the righteousness and faithfulness of God. Unless it were removed, the inheritance could not be received. The way whereby this was to be done, was by *redemption*. The "redemption of transgressions," is the deliverance of the transgressors from all the evils they were subject unto on their account, by the payment of a satisfactory price. The words used to express it, *λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον, λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, λυτροῦσθαι*, will admit of no other signification. Here it must answer "the purging of conscience by the blood of Christ." And he calls his life "a

ransom," or price of redemption. And this utterly destroys the foundation of the Socinian redemption and expiation for sin; for they make it only a freedom from punishment by *an act of power*. Take off the covering of the words, which they use in a sense foreign to the Scripture and their proper signification, and their sense is expressly contradictory unto the sense and words of the apostle. *He* declares Christ to have been the *high priest and mediator of the new testament* in the same acts and duties; they teach that *he ceased to be a mediator when he began to be a priest*. *He* affirms that *the blood of Christ doth expiate sin*; *they*, that he doth it by an *act of power in heaven*, where there is no use of his blood. *He* says that his *death was necessary* unto, and was the means or cause of the redemption of transgressions, — that is, to be a price of redemption, or just compensation for them; *they* contend that no such thing is required thereunto. And whereas the *Scriptures* do plainly assign the expiation of sin, redemption, reconciliation and peace with God, sanctification and salvation, unto the death and blood-shedding of Christ; *they* deny them all and every one to be in any sense effects of it, only they say it was an *antecedent sign* of the truth of his doctrine in his resurrection, and an *antecedent condition of his exaltation and power*: which is to reject the whole mystery of the gospel.

Besides the particular observations which we have made on the several passages of this verse, something may yet in general be observed from it; as, —

**Obs. VIII.** A new testament providing an eternal inheritance in sovereign grace; the constitution of a mediator, such a mediator, for that testament, in infinite wisdom and love; the death of that testator for the redemption of transgressions, to fulfill the law, and satisfy the justice of God; with the communication of that inheritance by promise, to be received by faith in all them that are called; are the substance of the mystery of the gospel. And all these are with wonderful wisdom comprised by the apostle in these words.

**Obs. IX.** That the efficacy of the mediation and death of Christ extended itself unto all the called under the old testament, is an evident demonstration of his divine nature, his pre-existence unto all these things, and the eternal covenant between the Father and him about them.

**Obs. X.** The first covenant did only forbid and condemn transgressions; redemption from them is by the new testament alone.

**Obs. XI.** The glory and efficacy of the new covenant, and the assurance of the communication of an eternal inheritance by virtue of it, depend hereon, that it was made a testament by the death of the mediator; which is further proved in the following verses.

### VERSES 16, 17.

“Οπου γὰρ διαθήκη, ζῆνατον ἀνάγκη θέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεζαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθέμενος.

Θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι. Syr., **מִתְּהִי הַ מְוִתָּהּ** “the death of him is declared,” showed, argued, or proved. “Mors intercedat necesse est;” “necesse est mortem intercedere.” Ar., “Necesse est mortem ferri;” which is not proper in the Latin tongue: however, there is an emphasis in **φέρεσθαι**, more than is expressed by “intercedo.” **Διαθεμένον**. Syr., **דְּהוּ דְּעִבְדָּהּ**, “of him that made it;” “of the testator.” **Ἐπὶ νεκροῖς**. Syr., **עַל מִתְּהִי הוּ**, “in him that is dead;” “in mortuis,” “among them that are dead.” **Βεζαία**. Vulg., “confirmatum est;” and so the Syriac, “ratum est,” more proper. **Μήποτε ἰσχύει**. Syr., **לֹא יֵית בָּהּ חֲשָׁחוּ**, “there is no use, profit, or benefit in it.” Ar., “nunquam valet;” “quandoquidem nunquam valet;” “nondum valet;” “it is not yet of force.”<sup>f22</sup>

**Ver. 16, 17.** — For where a testament [*is,*] there must also of necessity be brought in the death of the testator. For a testament [*is*] firm [*or ratified*] after men are dead; otherwise it is of no force whilst the testator liveth.

There is not much more to be considered in these verses, but only how the observation contained in them doth promote and confirm the argument which the apostle insists upon. Now this is to prove the necessity and use of the death of Christ, from the nature, ends, and use of the covenant whereof he was the mediator; for it being a testament also, it was to be confirmed with the death of the testator. This is proved in these verses from the *notion of a testament*, and the only use of it amongst men. For the apostle in this epistle doth argue several times from such usages amongst

men as, proceeding from the principles of reason and equity, were generally prevalent among them. So he doth in his discourse concerning the assurance given by the oath of God, <sup><small>Rom</sup> Hebrews 6. And here he doth the same from what was commonly agreed upon, and suitable unto the reason of things, about the nature and use of a testament. The things here mentioned were known to all, approved by all, and were the principal means of the preservation of peace and property in human societies. For although testaments, as unto their *especial regulation*, owe their original unto the Roman civil law, yet as unto the *substance* of them, they were in use amongst all mankind from the foundation of the world. For a testament is the just determination of a man's will concerning what he will have done with his goods after his decease; or, it is the will of him that is dead. Take this power from men, and you root up the whole foundation of all industry and diligence in the world. For what man will labor to increase his substance, if when he dies he may not dispose of it unto those which by nature, affinity, or other obligations, he hath must respect unto? Wherefore the foundation of the apostle's arguing from this usage amongst men is firm and stable.

Of the like nature is his observation, that “a testament is of no force whilst the testator liveth.” The nature of the thing itself, expounded by constant practice, will admit no doubt of it. For by what way soever a man disposeth of his goods, so as that it shall take effect whilst he is alive, as by sale or gift, it is not a testament, nor hath any thing of the nature of a testament in it; for that is only the *will of a man concerning his goods when he is dead*.

These things being unquestionable, we are only to consider whence the apostle takes his argument to prove the necessity of the death of Christ, as he was the mediator of the new testament.

Now this is not merely from the signification of the word *διαθήκη*, — which yet is of consideration also, as hath been declared, — but whereas he treats principally of the two covenants, it is the affinity that is between a solemn covenant and a testament that he hath respect unto. For he speaks not of the death of Christ merely as it was death, which is all that is required unto a testament properly so called, without any consideration of what nature it is; but he speaks of it also as it was a sacrifice, by the

effusion of his blood, which belongs unto a covenant, and is no way required unto a testament. Whereas, therefore, the word may signify either a *covenant* or a *testament* precisely so called, the apostle hath respect unto both the significations of it. And having in these verses mentioned his death as the death of a testator, which is proper unto a testament, in the 4th verse, and those that follow, he insists on his blood as a sacrifice, which is proper unto a covenant. But these things must be more fully explained, whereby the difficulty which appears in the whole context will be removed.

Unto the confirmation or ratification of a *testament*, that it may be βεζαία, “sure, stable, and of force;” there must be *death*, “the death of the testator.” But there is no need that this should be by *blood*, the blood of the testator, or any other. Unto the consideration of a *covenant*, *blood* was required, the blood of the sacrifice, and death only consequentially, as that which would ensue thereon; but there was no need that it should be the blood or death of him that made the covenant. Wherefore the apostle, declaring the necessity of the death of Christ, both as to the nature of it, that it was really death; and as to the manner of it, that it was by the effusion of his blood; and that from the consideration of the two covenants, the old and the new testament, and what was required unto them; he evinceth it by that which was essential unto them both, in a covenant as such, and in a testament precisely so called. That which is most eminent and essential unto a *testament*, is, that it is confirmed and made irrevocable by the *death of the testator*; and that which is the excellency of a solemn *covenant*, whereby it is made firm and stable, is, that it was confirmed with the *blood of sacrifices*, as he proves in the instance of the covenant made at Sinai, verses 18-20. Wherefore, whatever is excellent in either of these was to be found in the mediator of the new testament. Take it as a testament, which, upon the bequeathment made therein of the goods of the testator unto the heirs of promise, of grace and glory, it hath the nature of, and he died as the testator; whereby the grant of the inheritance was made irrevocable unto them. Hereunto no more is required but his death, without the consideration of the nature of it, in the way of a sacrifice. Take it as a covenant, as, upon the consideration of the promises contained in it, and the prescription of obedience, it hath the nature of a covenant, though not of a covenant strictly so called, and so it

was to be confirmed with the blood of the sacrifice of himself; which is the eminency of the solemn confirmation of this covenant. And as his death had an eminency above the death required unto a testament, in that it was by blood, and in the sacrifice of himself, which it is no way necessary that the death of a testator should be, yet it fully answered the death of a testator, in that he truly died; so had it an eminency above all the ways of the confirmation of the old covenant, or any other solemn covenant whatever, in that whereas such a covenant was to be confirmed with the blood of sacrifices, yet was it not required that it should be the blood of him that made the covenant, as here it was.

The consideration hereof solves all the appearing difficulties in the nature and manner of the apostle's argument. The word בְּרִית, whereunto respect is here had, is, as we have showed, of a large signification and various use. And frequently it is taken for a "free grant and disposition" of things by promise, which hath the nature of a testament. And in the old covenant there was a free grant and donation of the inheritance of the land of Canaan unto the people; which belongs unto the nature of a testament also. Moreover, both of them, a covenant and a testament, do agree in the general nature of their confirmation, the one by blood, the other by death. Hereon the apostle, in the use of the word διαθήκη, doth diversely argue both unto the nature, necessity, and use of the death of the mediator of the new testament. He was to die in the confirmation of it as it was a testament, he being the testator of it; and he was to offer himself as a sacrifice in his blood, for the establishment of it, as it had the nature of a covenant. Wherefore the apostle doth not argue, as some imagine, merely from the signification of the word, whereby, as they say, that in the original is not exactly rendered. And those who have from hence troubled themselves and others about the authority of this epistle, have nothing to thank for it but their own ignorance of the design of the apostle, and the nature of his argument. And it were well if we all were more sensible of our own ignorance, and more apt to acknowledge it, when we meet with difficulties in the Scripture, than for the most part we are. Alas! how short are our lines, when we come to fathom the depths of it! How inextricable difficulties do appear sometimes in passages of it, which when God is pleased to teach us, are all pleasant and easy!

These things being premised, to clear the scope and nature of the apostle's argument, we proceed unto a brief exposition of the words.

**Ver. 16.** — “For where a testament [is,] there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.”

There are two things in the words:

1. *A supposition of a testament.*
2. *What is required thereunto.*

1. In the first place there is,

- (1.) The *note of inference*;
- (2.) The *supposition itself*.

(1.) The first is the particle “for.” This doth not infer a reason to ensue of what he had before affirmed, which is the common use of that illative; but only the introduction of an illustration of it, from what is the usage of mankind in such cases, on supposition that this covenant is also a testament. For then there must be the death of the testator, as it is in all testaments amongst men.

(2.) The supposition itself is in these words, “*Οπου διαθήκη*.” The verb substantive is wanting. “Where a testament *is*,” so it is by us supplied, it may be, not necessarily. For the expression, “Where a testament is,” may suppose that the death of the testator is required unto the *making of a testament*; which, as the apostle showeth in the next verse, it is not, but only unto its *execution*. ‘In the case of a testament, namely, that it may be executed,’ is the meaning of the word “where;” that is, ‘wherever.’ Amongst all sorts of men, living according unto the light of nature and the conduct of reason, the making of testaments is in use; for without it neither can private industry be encouraged nor public peace maintained. Wherefore, as was before observed the apostle argueth from the common usage of mankind, resolved into the principles of reason and equity.

2. What is required unto the *validity of a testament*; and that is, the *death of the testator*. And the way of the introduction of this death unto the validity of a testament is, by “being brought in,” — *φέρεισθαι*; that it enter, namely, after the ratifying of the testament, to make it of force, or to



give it operation. The testament is made by a living man; but whilst he lives it is dead, or of no use. That it may operate and be effectual, death must be brought into the account. This death must be the death of the testator, — τοῦ διαθεμένου. Ὁ διαθέμενος is he who disposeth of things; who hath right so to do, and actually doth it. This in a testament is the testator. And διαθήκη and διαζήμενος have in the Greek the same respect unto one another as “testamentum” and “testator” in the Latin.

Wherefore, if the new covenant hath the nature of a testament, it must have a testator, and that testator must die, before it can be of force and efficacy; which is what was to be proved.

This is further confirmed, —

**Ver. 17.** — “For a testament [*is*] of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all, while the testator liveth.”

It is not of the making and *constitution of a testament*, but of the force and *execution* of it, that he speaks. And in these words he gives a reason of the necessity of the death of the testator thereunto. And this is because the validity and efficacy of the testament depend solely thereon. And this reason he introduceth by the conjunction γάρ, “for.”

A testament ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεζαία, — “is of force,” say we; that is, firm, stable, not to be disannulled. For “if it be but a man’s testament, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereunto,” Galatians 3:15. It is ratified, made unalterable, so as that it must be executed according unto the mind of the testator. And it is so ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, “among them that are dead,” “after men are dead;” that is, those who make the testament: for it is opposed unto ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθέμενος, “whilst the testator liveth;” for testaments are the wills of dead men. Living men have no heirs. And this sense is declared in these words, ἐπεὶ μῆποτε ἰσχύει, “quandoquidem,” “quoniam,” “seeing that;” “otherwise,” say we, — without this accession unto the making of a testament, as yet it prevaieth not, it is not of force for the actual distribution of the inheritance or the goods of the testator.

Two things must yet further be declared:

1. What are the grounds or general reasons of this assertion.
2. Where lies the force of the argument from it: —

**1.** The force of a testament depends on the death of the testator, or the death of the testator is required to make it effectual, for these two reasons:

---

**(1.)** Because a testament is no act or deed of a man whereby he presently, and in the making of it, conveys, gives, or grants, any part of his possession unto another, or others, so as that it should immediately thereon cease to be his own, and become the property of those others: all such instruments of contract, bargain, sale, or deeds of gift, are of another nature, they are not testaments. A testament is only the signification of the will of a man as unto what he will have done with his goods after his death. Wherefore unto the force and execution of it his death is necessary.

**(2.)** A testament, that is only so, is alterable at the pleasure of him that makes it whilst he is alive. Wherefore it can be of no force whilst he is so; for he may change it or disannul it when he pleaseth. The foundation, therefore, of the apostle's argument from this usage amongst men is firm and stable.

**2.** Whereas the apostle argueth from the proportion and similitude that is between this new testament or covenant and the testaments of men, we may consider what are the things wherein that similitude doth consist, and show also wherein there is a dissimilitude, whereunto his reasonings are not to be extended. For so it is in all comparisons; the comparates are not alike in all things, especially where things spiritual and temporal are compared together. So was it also in all the types of old. Every person or every thing that was a type of Christ, was not so in all things, in all that they were. And therefore it requires both wisdom and diligence to distinguish in what they were so, and in what they were not, that no false inferences or conclusions be made from them. So is it in all comparisons; and therefore, in the present instance, we must consider wherein the things compared do agree, and wherein they differ.

**(1.)** They agree principally in the *death of the testator*. This alone makes a testament among men effectual and irrevocable. So is it in this new testament. It was confirmed and ratified by the death of the testator, Jesus Christ; and otherwise could not have been of force. This is the fundamental agreement between them, which therefore alone the apostle

expressly insisteth on, although there are other things which necessarily accompany it, as essential unto every testament; as, —

(2.) In every testament amongst men there are *goods disposed* and bequeathed unto heirs or legatees, which were the property of the testator. Where a man hath nothing to give or bequeath, he can make no testament; for that is nothing but his will concerning the disposal of his own goods after his decease. So is it in this new testament. All the goods of grace and glory were the property, the inheritance of Christ, firmly instated in him alone; for he was “appointed heir of all things.” But in his death, as a testator, he made a bequeathment of them all unto the elect, appointing them to be heirs of God, co-heirs with himself. And this also is required unto the nature and essence of a testament.

(3.) In a testament there is always an absolute *grant* made of the goods bequeathed, without condition or limitation. So is it here also; the goods and inheritance of the kingdom of heaven are bequeathed absolutely unto all the elect, so as that no intervenience can defeat them of it. And what there is in the gospel, which is the instrument of this testament, that prescribes conditions unto them, that exacts terms of obedience from them, it belongs unto it as it is a covenant, and not as a testament. Yet, —

(4.) It is in the will and power of the testator, in and by his testament, to assign and determine both the *time*, season, and way, whereby those to whom he hath bequeathed his goods shall be admitted unto the actual possession of them. So it is in this case also. The Lord Christ, the great testator, hath determined the way whereby the elect shall come to be actually possessed of their legacies, namely, “by faith that is in him,” <sup>Acts</sup> Acts 26:18. So also he hath reserved the time and season of their conversion in this world, and entrance into future glory, in his own hand and power.

And these things belong unto the illustration of the comparison insisted on, although it be only one thing that the apostle argues from it, touching the necessity of the death of the testator. But notwithstanding these instances of agreement between the new testament and the testaments of men, whereby it appears to have in it, in sundry respects, the nature of a testament, yet in many things there is also a disagreement between them,

evidencing that it is also a covenant, and abideth so, notwithstanding what it hath of the nature of a testament, from the death of the testator; as, —

**(1.)** A testator amongst men *ceaseth to have any right in or use of the goods* bequeathed by him, when once his testament is of force. And this is by reason of death, which destroys all title and use of them. But our testator divests himself neither of right nor possession, nor of the use of any of his goods. And this follows on a twofold difference, the one in the persons, the other in the goods or things bequeathed: —

**[1.]** In the *persons*. For a testator amongst men dieth absolutely; he liveth not again in this world, but “lieth down, and riseth not, until the heavens be no more.” Hereon all right unto, and all use of the goods of this life, cease for ever. Our testator died actually and really, to confirm his testament: but, *1st.* He died not in his *whole person*; *2dly.* In that nature *wherein he died* he lived again, “and is alive for evermore.” Hence all his goods are still in his own power.

**[2.]** In the *things themselves*. For the goods bequeathed in the testaments of men are of that nature as that the propriety of them cannot be vested in many, so as that every one should have a right unto and the enjoyment of all, but in one only. But the spiritual good things of the new testament are such, as that in all the riches and fullness of them they may be in the possession of the testator, and of those also unto whom they are bequeathed. Christ parts with no grace from himself, he diminisheth not his own riches, nor exhausts any thing from his own fullness, by his communication of it unto others. Hence also, —

**(2.)** In the wills of men, if there be a bequeathment of goods made unto many, no one can enjoy the whole inheritance, but every one is to have his own share and portion only. But in and by the new testament, every one *is made heir to the whole inheritance*. All have the same, and every one hath the whole; for God himself thence becomes their portion, who is all unto all, and all unto every one.

**(3.)** In human testaments, the goods bequeathed are such only as either descended unto the testators from their progenitors, or were acquired during their lives by their own industry. By their death they obtained no new right or title unto any thing; only what they had before is now

disposed of according unto their wills. But our testator, according unto an antecedent contract between God the Father and him, *purchased the whole inheritance by his own blood*, “obtaining for us eternal redemption.”

(4.) They differ principally in this, that a testament amongst men is no more but merely so; it is not moreover a solemn covenant, that needs a confirmation suited thereunto. The bare signification of the will of the testator, witnessed unto, is sufficient unto its constitution and confirmation. But in this mystery the testament is not merely so, but a covenant also. Hence it was not sufficient, unto its force and establishment, that the testator should die only, but it was also required that he should *offer himself in sacrifice by the shedding of his blood*, unto its confirmation.

These things I have observed, because, as we shall see, the apostle in the progress of his discourse doth not confine himself unto this notion of a testament, but treats of it principally as it had the nature of a covenant. And we may here observe, —

**Obs. I.** It is a great and gracious condescension in the Holy Spirit, to give encouragement and confirmation unto our faith by a representation of the truth and reality of spiritual things in those which are temporal and agreeing with them in their general nature, whereby they are presented unto the common understanding of men. — This way of proceeding the apostle calls a speaking *κατ' ἄνθρωπον*, <sup><415</sup>Galatians 3:15, “after the manner of men.” Of the same kind were all the parables used by our Savior; for it is all one whether these representations be taken from things real or from those which, according unto the same rule of reason and right, are framed on purpose for that end.

**Obs. II.** There is an irrevocable grant of the whole inheritance of grace and glory made unto the elect in the new covenant. — Without this, it could not in any sense have the nature of a testament, nor that name given unto it. For a testament is such a free grant, and nothing else. And our best plea for them, for an interest in them, for a participation of them, before God, is from the free grant and donation of them in the testament of Jesus Christ.

**Obs. III.** As the grant of these things is free and absolute, so the enjoyment of them is secured from all interveniencies by the death of the testator.

### VERSES 18-22.

“Ὅθεν οὐδ’ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται. Λαληθει.σης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμου ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαζῶν τὸ αἶμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων, μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐρῥάντισε, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός· Καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκευὴ τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐρῥάντισε. Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, αἱ χωρὶς αἵματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.

“Ὅθεν, “unde;” “hence,” “therefore.” Syr., **הַנְּחִי לְמַעַן**, “propter hoc,” “quia,” “propter.” “For this cause.” “And hence it is,” Arab.

Ἐγκεκαίνισται Syr., **תִּקְדַּשׁ**, “was confirmed;” “dedicatum fuit,” “was dedicated,” “consecrated,” “separated unto sacred use.”

**Λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον.** Syr., “when the whole command was enjoined.” Vulg. Lat., “lecto omni mandato legis,” “the command of the law being read;” taking ἐντολή and νόμος for the same. Arias, “exposito secundum legem.” Most, “cum recitasset;” “having repeated,” “recited,” namely, out of the book.

**Μόσχων καὶ τράγων.** The Syriac reads only **סְחִי לְמַעַן**, “of an heifer;” as the Arabic omits **τράγων** also, “of goats;” it may be in compliance with the story in Moses, without cause, as we shall see. **Σχεδόν** is omitted in the Syriac.

**Ver. 18-22.** — Whereupon neither the first [*testament*] was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This [*is*] the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry: and almost all things

are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

What we have before observed is fully confirmed in this discourse, namely, that the apostle intended not to argue absolutely and precisely from the name and nature of a testament properly so called, and the use of it among men. For he makes use of these things no further but as unto what such a testament hath in common with a solemn covenant; which is, that they are both confirmed and ratified by death. Wherefore it was necessary that the new testament, as it was a testament, should be confirmed by death; and as it had the nature of a covenant, it was to be so by such a death as was accompanied by bloodshedding. The former was proved before, from the general nature and notion of a testament; the latter is here proved at large from the way and manner whereby the first covenant was confirmed or dedicated.

But the apostle in this discourse doth not intend merely to prove that the first covenant was dedicated with blood, which might have been despatched in a very few words; but he declares moreover, in general, what was the *use of blood* in sacrifices on all occasions under the law; whereby he demonstrates the use and efficacy of the blood of Christ, as unto all the ends of the new covenant. And the ends of the use of blood under the old testament he declares to have been two, namely, purification and pardon; both which are comprised in that one of the expiation of sin. And these things are all of them applied unto the blood and sacrifice of Christ in the following verses.

In the exposition of this context we must do three things: \

1. Consider the difficulties that are in it.
2. Declare the scope, design, and force of the argument contained in it.
3. Explain the particular passages of the whole.

FIRST. Sundry difficulties there are in this context; which arise from hence, that the account which the apostle gives of the dedication of the first covenant and of the tabernacle seems to differ in sundry things from that given by Moses, when all things were actually done by him, as it is recorded, Exodus 24. And they are these that follow: —

1. That the blood which Moses took was the blood of *calves and goats*, whereas there is no mention of any goats or their blood in the story of Moses.
2. That he took *water, scarlet wool, and hyssop*, to sprinkle it withal; whereas none of them are reported in that story.
3. That he *sprinkled the book* in particular; which Moses doth not affirm.
4. That he *sprinkled all the people*; that is, the people indefinitely, for all the individuals of them could not be sprinkled.
5. There are some differences in the words which Moses spake in the dedication of the covenant, as laid down verse 20.
6. That he *sprinkled the tabernacle* with blood, and all the vessels of it; when at the time of the making and solemn confirmation of the covenant the tabernacle was not erected, nor the vessels of its ministry yet made.

For the removal of these difficulties some things must be premised in general, and then they shall all of them be considered distinctly: —

*First*, This is taken as fixed, that the apostle wrote this epistle by divine inspiration. Having evidence hereof abundantly satisfactory, it is the vainest thing imaginable, and that which discovers a frame of mind disposed to cavil at things divine, if from the difficulties of any one passage we should reflect on the authority of the whole, as some have done on this occasion. But I shall say with some confidence, he never understood any one chapter of the epistle, nay, nor any one verse of it aright, who did or doth question its divine original. There is nothing human in it, — that savors, I mean, of human infirmity, — but the whole and every part of it is animated by the wisdom and authority of its Author. And those who have pretended to be otherwise minded on such slight occasions as that before us, have but proclaimed their own want of experience in things divine. But, —

*Secondly*, There is nothing, in all that is here affirmed by the apostle, which hath the least appearance of contradiction unto any thing that is recorded by Moses in the story of these things; yea, as I shall show, without the consideration and addition of the things here mentioned by the apostle, we cannot aright apprehend nor understand the account that is



given by him. This will be made evident in the consideration of the particulars, wherein the difference between them is supposed to consist.

*Thirdly*, The apostle doth not take his account of the things here put together by him from any one place in Moses, but gathers up what is declared in the Law, in several places unto various ends. For, as hath been declared, he doth not design only to prove the *dedication of the covenant by blood*, but to show also the *whole use of blood* under the law, as unto purification and remission of sin. And this he doth to declare the virtue and efficacy of the blood of Christ under the new testament, whereunto he makes an application of all these things in the verses ensuing. Wherefore he gathers into one head sundry things wherein the sprinkling of blood was of use under the law, as they are occasionally expressed in sundry places. And this one observation removes all the difficulties of the context; which all arise from this one supposition, that the apostle gives here an account only of what was done at the dedication of the first covenant. So, in particular, by the addition of those particles, *καὶ δέ*, verse 21, which we well render “moreover,” he plainly intimates that what he affirms of the tabernacle and the vessels of its ministry was that which was done afterwards, at another time, and not when the covenant was first confirmed.

On these grounds we shall see that the account given of these things by the apostle is a necessary exposition of the record made of them by Moses, and no more.

**1.** He affirms that Moses took the blood *μόσχων καὶ τράγων*, “of calves and goats,” And there is a double difficulty herein: for,

(1.) The blood that Moses so used was the blood of oxen, <sup><1215</sup>Exodus 24:5; which seems not to be well rendered by *μόσχων*, “of calves.” But this hath no weight in it. For *בְּרִי*, the word there used, signifies all cattle of the herd, great and small, every thing that is “generis bovini.” And there is no necessity from the words that we should render *בְּרִי* there by “oxen,” nor *μόσχων* here by “calves;” we might have rendered both words by “bullocks.” But,

(2.) There is no mention at all of goats in the story of Moses; and, as we observed, it is here omitted by the Syriac translator, but without cause.

*Ans.* [1.] There were two sorts of offerings that were made on this occasion;

**1st**, Burnt-offerings;

**2dly**, Peace-offerings: <sup><OR24></sup>Exodus 24:5, “They offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings.”

The distinct expression of them proves the offerings to have been distinct: **וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלֹת וַיִּזְבְּחוּ זִבְחִים שְׁלָמִים**, — “they offered burnt-offerings, and they sacrificed,” or “slew peace-offerings.” And as for the peace-offerings, it is said that they were of bullocks or oxen; but it is not said of what sort the burnt-offerings were. Yea, and it may be that although bullocks only are mentioned, yet that goats also were sacrificed in this peace-offering; for it is so far from being true what Ribera observes on the place, that a goat was never offered for a peace-offering, that the contrary unto it is directly expressed in the institution of the peace-offering, <sup><OR25></sup>Leviticus 3:12. Wherefore the blood of goats might be used in the peace-offering, though it be not mentioned by Moses. But, —

[2.] The apostle observes, that one end of the sacrifice at the dedication of the first covenant was purging and making atonement, verses 22, 23; for in all solemn sacrifices blood was sprinkled on the holy things, to purify them and make atonement for them, <sup><OR26></sup>Leviticus 16:14, 19, 20. Now this was not to be done but by the blood of an expiatory sacrifice; it was not to be done by the blood of peace-offerings. Wherefore the burnt-offerings mentioned by Moses were expiatory sacrifices, to purge and make atonement. And this sacrifice was principally of goats, <sup><OR27></sup>Leviticus 16:9. Wherefore the text of Moses cannot be well understood without this exposition of the apostle. And we may add hereunto, also, that although the blood of the peace-offering was sprinkled on the altar, <sup><OR28></sup>Leviticus 3:13, yet was it not sprinkled on the people, as this blood was; wherefore there was the use of the blood of goats also, as a sin-offering, in this great sacrifice.

**[3.]** In the dedication of the priests these two sorts of offerings were conjoined, namely, peace-offerings and sin-offerings, or burnt-offerings for sin, as here they were. And therein expressly the blood of goats was used, namely, in the sin-offering, as the blood of bullocks was in the peace-offering, <sup><RUB></sup>Leviticus 9:3, 4. Neither is there mention anywhere of burnt-offerings or sin-offerings and peace-offerings to be offered together, but that one of them was of goats; and therefore was so infallibly at this time, as the apostle declares.

**2.** It is affirmed in the text, that he took the blood with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled it; but there is mention of none of these things in the story of Moses, but only that he sprinkled the blood. But the answer hereunto is plain and easy. Blood under the law was sprinkled either in less or greater quantities. Hereon there were two ways of sprinkling. The one was with the finger; when a small quantity of blood, it may be, some few drops of it, were to be sprinkled, it was done with the finger, <sup><RUB></sup>Leviticus 8:15, 16:14. The quantity being small, though the blood were unmixed, and almost congealed, it might be so sprinkled. But there was a sprinkling whereunto a greater proportion of blood was required; as namely, when a house was to be sprinkled, and thereby purified. This was done by mixing running water with the blood, and then sprinkling it with scarlet wool and hyssop, <sup><RUB></sup>Leviticus 14:50-52. For these things were needful thereunto. The water prevented the blood from being so congealed as that it could not be sprinkled in any quantity; the scarlet wool took up a quantity of it out of the vessel wherein it was; and the bunch of hyssop was the sprinkler. Whereupon, when Moses sprinkled the altar, book, and people, he did it, by one of these two ways, for other there was none. The first way he could not do it, namely, with his finger, because it was to be done in a great quantity; for Moses took that half of it that was to be sprinkled on the people and put it into basins, <sup><RUB></sup>Exodus 24:6, 8. It was therefore infallibly done this latter way, according as our apostle declares.

**3.** It is added by the apostle that he sprinkled the book; which is not expressed in the story. But the design of the apostle is to express at large the whole solemnity of the confirmation of the first covenant, especially not to omit any thing that blood was applied unto; because in the application he refers the purification and dedication of all things belonging unto the new covenant unto the blood of Christ. And this was the order of

the things which concerned the book: Moses coming down from the mount, told the people by word of mouth all things which God had spoken unto him, or the sum and substance of the covenant which he would make with them: <sup><1218></sup>Exodus 24:3, “And Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD,” — that is, the words spoken on mount Sinai, the ten commandments; “and all the judgments,” — that is, all the laws contained in Exodus 21-23, with this title, אֵלֵּי הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים, “These are the judgments,” <sup><1219></sup>Exodus 21:1. Upon the oral rehearsal of these words and judgments, the people gave their consent unto the terms of the covenant: “All the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the LORD hath said, will we do,” <sup><1220></sup>Exodus 24:3. Hereon Moses made a record, or “wrote all the words of the LORD” in a book, verse 4. This being done, the altar and pillars were prepared, verse 4. And it is evident that the book which he had written was laid on the altar, though it be not expressed. When this was done, “he sprinkled the blood on the altar,” verse 6. After which, when the book had been sprinkled with blood as it lay on the altar, it is said, “He took the book,” that is, from off the altar, “and read in the audience of the people,” verse 7. The book being now sprinkled with blood, as the instrument and record of the covenant between God and the people, the very same words which were before spoken unto the people are now recited or read out of the book. And this could be done for no other reason, but that the book itself, being now sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, was dedicated to be the sacred record thereof.

**4.** In the text of Moses it is said that he sprinkled the people; in explanation whereof the apostle affirms that he sprinkled *all* the people. And it was necessary that so it should be, and that none of them should be excluded from this sprinkling; for they were all taken into covenant with God, men, women, and children. But it must be granted, that for the blood to be actually sprinkled on all individuals in such a numberless multitude is next unto what is naturally impossible: wherefore it was done in their representatives; and what is done towards representatives as such, is done equally towards all whom they do represent. And the whole people had two representatives that day:

- (1.) The twelve pillars of stone, that were set up to represent their twelve tribes; and, it may be, to signify their hard and stony heart

under that covenant, verse 4. Whereas those pillars were placed close by the altar, some suppose that they were sprinkled, as representing the twelve tribes.

(2.) There were the heads of their tribes, the chief of the houses of their fathers, and the elders, who drew nigh unto Moses, and were sprinkled with blood in the name and place of all the people, who were that day taken into covenant.

5. The words which Moses spake unto the people upon the sprinkling of the blood are not absolutely the same in the story and in the repetition of it by the apostle. But this is usual with him in all his quotations out of the Old Testament in this epistle. He expresseth the true sense of them, but doth not curiously and precisely render the sense of every word and syllable in them.

6. The last difficulty in this context, and that which hath an appearance of the greatest, is in what the apostle affirms concerning the tabernacle and all the vessels of it; namely, that Moses sprinkled them all with blood. And the time which he seems to speak of, is that of the dedication of the first covenant. Hence a twofold difficulty doth arise; first, as unto the *time*; and secondly, as unto the *thing* itself. For at the time of the dedication of the first covenant, the tabernacle was not yet made or erected, and so could not then be sprinkled with blood. And afterwards, when the tabernacle was erected, and all the vessels brought into it, there is no mention that either it or any of them was sprinkled with blood, but only anointed with the holy oil, <sup>(DIII)</sup> Exodus 40:9-11. Wherefore, as unto the first, I say the apostle doth plainly distinguish what he affirms of the tabernacle from the time of the dedication of the first covenant. The manner of his introduction of it, **καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δέ**, — “And moreover the tabernacle,” — doth plainly intimate a progress unto another time and occasion. Wherefore the words of verse 21, concerning the sprinkling of the tabernacle and its vessels, do relate unto what follows, verse 22, “and almost all things are by the law purged with blood;” and not unto those that precede, about the dedication of the first covenant: for the argument he hath in hand is not confined unto the use of blood only in that dedication, but respects the whole use of the blood of sacrifices under the law; which in these words he proceeds unto, and closeth in the next verse. And this wholly removes the

first difficulty. And as unto the second, expositors generally answer, that *aspersion* or sprinkling with blood did commonly precede *unction* with the holy oil. And as unto the garments of the priests, which were the vessels or utensils of the tabernacle, it was appointed that they should be sprinkled with blood, <sup>(1229)</sup>Exodus 29:21; and so it may be supposed that the residue of them were also. But to me this is not satisfactory. And be it spoken without offense, expositors have generally mistaken the nature of the argument of the apostle in these words. For he argues not only from the first dedication of the tabernacle and its vessels, — which, for aught appears, was by unction only, — but making, as we observed before, a progress unto the further use of the blood of sacrifices in purging, according to the law, he giveth an instance in what was done with respect unto the tabernacle and all its vessels, and that constantly and solemnly every year; and this he doth to prove his general assertion in the next verse, that “under the law almost all things were purged with blood.” And Moses is here said to do what he appointed should be done. By his institution, — that is, the institution of the law, — the tabernacle and all the vessels of it were sprinkled with blood. And this was done solemnly once every year; an account whereof is given, <sup>(1234)</sup>Leviticus 16:14-16, 18-20. On the solemn day of atonement, the high priest was to sprinkle the mercy-seat, the altar, and the whole tabernacle with blood, to make an atonement for them, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, the tabernacle remaining among them in the midst of their uncleanness, verse 16. This he takes notice of, not to prove the dedication of the first covenant and what belonged thereunto with blood, but the use of blood in general to make atonement, and the impossibility of expiation and pardon without it. This is the design and sense of the apostle, and no other. Wherefore we may conclude, that the account here given concerning the dedication of the first covenant, and the use of blood for purification under the law, is so far from containing any thing opposite unto or discrepant from the records of Moses concerning the same things, that it gives us a full and clear exposition of them.

SECONDLY. The second thing to be considered, is the *nature of the argument* in this context; and there are three things in it, neither of which must be omitted in the exposition of the words.

He designeth,

1. To prove yet further *the necessity of the death of Christ*, as he was the mediator of the new testament, both as it had the nature of a testament and that also of a solemn covenant.
2. To declare the necessity of the *kind of his death*, in the way of a sacrifice by the effusion of blood; because the testament, as it had the nature of a solemn covenant, was confirmed and ratified thereby.
3. To manifest the *necessity of shedding of blood* in the confirmation of the covenant, because of the expiation, purging, and pardon of sin thereby.

How these things are proved, we shall see in the exposition of the words.

THIRDLY, There are in the words themselves,

1. A proposition of the principal truth asserted, verse 18.
2. The confirmation of that proposition: which is twofold;
  - (1.) From what Moses did, verse 19;
  - (2.) From what he said, verse 20.
3. A further illustration of the same truth, by other instances, verse 21.
4. A general inference or conclusion from the whole, comprising the substance of what he intended to demonstrate, verse 22.

In the proposition there are five things considerable:

1. A *note of introduction*; “whereupon.”
  2. The *quality* of the proposition, it is negative; “*neither* was.”
  3. The *subject* spoken of; “the first.”
  4. *What is affirmed* of it; it was “*dedicated*.”
  5. The *way and manner* thereof; it was “not without blood.”
1. The note of introduction is in the particle ὃθεν, which the apostle frequently makes use of in this epistle, as a note of inference in those discourses which are argumentative. We render it by “therefore,” and “wherefore;” here, “whereupon.” For it intimates a confirmation of a general rule by especial instances. He had before laid it down as a general

maxim, that a testament was to be confirmed by death. For thereupon the first testament was confirmed with the blood of sacrifices shed in their death. ‘Wherefore let not any think it strange that the new testament was confirmed by the death of the testator; for this is so necessary, that even in the confirmation of the first there was that which was analogous unto it. And moreover, it was death in such a way as was required unto the confirmation of a solemn covenant.’

**2.** The proposition hath a double negative in it, οὐδέ, and χωρὶς αἵματος, — “neither was it without blood;” that is, it was with blood, and could not otherwise be.

**3.** The *subject* spoken of is ἡ πρώτη, “the first;” that is διαθήκη, “testament,” or “covenant.” And herein the apostle declares what he precisely intended by the first or old covenant, whereof he discoursed at large, <sup>508</sup>Hebrews 8. It was the covenant made with the people at Horeb; for that and no other was dedicated in the way here described. And, to take a brief prospect into this covenant, the things ensuing may be observed: —

**(1.)** The *matter of it*, or the terms of it materially considered, before it had the formal nature of a covenant. And these were all the things that were written in the book before it was laid on the altar; namely, it was that epitome of the whole law which is contained in chapters 20-23, of Exodus. And other commands and institutions that were given afterwards belonged unto this covenant reductively. The substance of it was contained in the book then written.

**(2.)** The *manner of the revelation* of these terms of the covenant. Being proposed on the part of God, and the terms of it being entirely of his choosing and proposal, he was to reveal, declare, and make them known. And this he did two ways:

**[1.]** As unto the foundation and substance of the whole in the decalogue. He spake it himself on the mount, in the way and manner declared, Exodus 19, 20.

**[2.]** As unto the following judgments, statutes, and rites, directive of their walking before God, according to the former fundamental rule of



the covenant. These he declared by revelation unto Moses; and they are contained in chapters 21-23.

**(3.)** The *manner of its proposal*. And this also was twofold:

**[1.]** *Preparatory*. For before the solemn covenanting between God and the people, Moses declared all the matter of it unto the people, that they might consider well of it, and whether they would consent to enter into covenant with God on those terms; whereon they gave their approbation of them.

**[2.]** *Solemn*, in their actual and absolute acceptance of it, whereby they became obliged throughout their generations. This was on the reading of it out of the book, after it was sprinkled with the blood of the covenant on the altar, <sup><0241></sup>Exodus 24:7.

**(4.)** The *author* of this covenant was God himself: “The covenant which the Lord hath made with you,” verse 8. And immediately after, he is thereon called “the God of Israel,” verse 10; which is the first time he was called so, and it was by virtue of this covenant. And the pledge or token of his presence, as covenanting, was the altar, the altar of Jehovah; as there was a representative pledge of the presence of the people in the twelve pillars or statues.

**(5.)** *Those with whom* this covenant was made were “the people;” that is, “all the people,” as the apostle speaks, none exempted or excluded. It was made with the “men, and women, and children,” <sup><0512></sup>Deuteronomy 31:12; even all on whom was the blood of the covenant, as it was on the women; or the token of the covenant, as it was on the male children in circumcision; or both, as in all the men of Israel.

**(6.)** The *manner on the part of the people* of entering into covenant with God, was in two acts before mentioned:

**[1.]** In a previous approbation of the matter of it;

**[2.]** In a solemn engagement into it. And this was the foundation of the church of Israel.

This is that covenant whereof there is afterwards in the Scripture such frequent mention, between God and that people, the sole foundation of all

especial relation between him and them. For they took the observation of its terms on themselves for their posterity in all generations, until the end should be. On their obedience hereunto, or neglect hereof, depended their life or death in the land of Canaan. No farther did the precepts and promises of it in itself extend. But whereas it did not disannul the promise that was made unto Abraham, and confirmed with the oath of God, four hundred years before, and had annexed unto it many institutions and ordinances prefigurative and significant of heavenly things, the people under it had a right unto, and directions for the attaining of an eternal inheritance. And something we may hence observe.

**Obs. I.** The foundation of a church-state among any people, wherein God is to be honored in ordinances of instituted worship, is laid in a solemn covenant between him and them. — So it was with this church of Israel. Before this they served God in their families, by virtue of the promise made unto Abraham, but now the whole people were gathered into a church-state, to worship him according to the terms, institutions, and ordinances of the covenant. Nor doth God oblige any unto instituted worship but by virtue of a covenant. Unto natural worship and obedience we are all obliged, by virtue of the law of creation and what belongs thereunto. And God may, by a mere act of sovereignty, prescribe unto us the observation of what rites and ordinances in divine service he pleaseth. But he will have all our obedience to be voluntary, and all our service to be reasonable. Wherefore, although the prescription of such rites be an act of sovereign pleasure, yet God will not oblige us unto the observance of them but by virtue of a covenant between him and us, wherein we voluntarily consent unto and accept of the terms of it, whereby those ordinances of worship are prescribed unto us, And it will hence follow, —

**(1.)** That men mistake themselves, when they suppose that they are interested in a church-state by tradition, custom, or as it were by chance, — they know not how. There is nothing but covenanting with God that will instate us in this privilege. And therein we do take upon ourselves the observance of all the terms of the new covenant. And they are of two sorts:

**[1.]** Internal and moral, in faith, repentance, and obedience;

[2.] Such as concern the external worship of the gospel, in the ordinances and institutions of it.

Without such a covenant formally or virtually made, there can be no church-state. I speak not at all of any such covenants as men may make or have made among themselves, and with God, upon a mixture of things sacred, civil and political, with such sanctions as they find out and agree upon among themselves. For whatever may be the nature, use, or end of such covenants, they no way belong unto that concerning which we treat. For no terms are to be brought hereinto but such as belong directly unto the obedience and ordinances of the new testament. Nor was there any thing to be added unto or taken from the express terms of the old covenant. whereby the church-state of Israel was constituted And this was the entire rule of God's dealing with them. The only question concerning them was, whether they had kept the terms of the covenant or no. And when things fell into disorder among them, as they did frequently, as the sum of God's charge against them was that they had broken his covenant, so the reformation of things attempted by their godly kings before, and others after the captivity, was by inducing the people to renew this covenant, without any addition, alteration, or mixture of things of another nature.

(2.) That so much disorder in the worship of God under the gospel hath entered into many churches, and that there is so much negligence in all sorts of persons about the observance of evangelical institutions, so little conscientious care about them, or reverence in the use of them, or benefit received by them; it is all much from hence, that men understand not aright the foundation of that obedience unto God which is required in them and by them. This, indeed, is no other but that solemn covenant between God and the whole church, wherein the church takes upon itself their due observance. This renders our obedience in them and by them no less necessary than any duties of moral obedience whatever. But this being not considered as it ought, men have used their supposed liberty, or rather, fallen into great licentiousness in the use of them, and few have that conscientious regard unto them which it is their duty to have.

**Obs. II.** Approbation of the terms of the covenant, consent unto them, and solemn acceptance of them, are required on our part, unto the

establishment of any covenant between God and us. and our participation of the benefits of it. — Thus solemnly did the people here enter into covenant with God, whereby a peculiar relation was established between him and them. The mere proposal of the covenant and the terms of it unto us, which is done in the preaching of the gospel, will not make us partakers of any of the grace or benefits of it. Yet this is that which most content themselves withal. It may be they proceed to the performance of some of the duties which are required therein; but this answers not the design and way of God in dealing with men. When he hath proposed the terms of his covenant unto them, he doth neither compel them to accept of them nor will be satisfied with such an obedience. He requires that upon a due consideration of them, we do approve of them, as those which answer his infinite wisdom and goodness, and such as are of eternal advantage unto us; that they are all equal, holy, righteous, and good. Hereon he requires that we voluntarily choose and consent unto them, engaging ourselves solemnly unto the performance of them all and every one. This is required of us, if we intend any interest in the grace and glory prepared in the new covenant.

**Obs. III.** It has been the way of God from the beginning, to take children of covenanters into the same covenant with their parents. — So he dealt with this people in the establishment of the first covenant; and he hath made no alteration herein in the establishment of the second. But we must proceed with the exposition of the words.

**4.** Of this covenant it is affirmed, that it “was consecrated with blood,” or “was not dedicated without blood.” *Ἐγκαινίζω* is “solemnly to separate any thing unto a sacred use.” *קָדַשׁ* is the same in Hebrew. But it is not the *sanction* of the covenant absolutely that the apostle intends in this expression, but the *use* of it. The covenant had its sanction, and was confirmed on the part of God, in offering of the sacrifices. In the killing of the beasts, and offering of their blood. did the ratification of the covenant consist. This is included and supposed in what is signified by the dedication of it. But this is not an effect of the shedding and offering of blood, but only of the sprinkling of it on the book and the people. Thereby had it its *ἐγκαινισμος*, its “consecration” or “dedication unto sacred use,” as the instrument of the peculiar church relation between God and that people, whereof the book was the record. So was every thing

consecrated unto its proper use under the law, as the apostle declares. This, therefore, is the meaning of the words: ‘That first covenant, which God made with the people at mount Sinai, wherein he became their God, the God of Israel, and they became his people, was dedicated unto sacred use by blood, in that it was sprinkled on the book and the people, after part of the same blood had been offered in sacrifice at the altar.’ Hence it follows that this, which belongs so essentially unto the solemn dedication and confirmation of a covenant between God and the church, was necessary also unto the dedication and confirmation of the new covenant, — which is that which is to be proved.

**Obs. IV** It is by the authority of God alone that any thing can be effectually and unchangeably dedicated unto sacred use, so as to have force and efficacy given unto it thereby. — But this dedication may be made by virtue of a general rule, as well as by an especial command.

**5.** The assertion of the apostle concerning the dedication of the first covenant with blood is confirmed by an account of the matter of fact, or, —

First, What Moses *did* therein, verse 19.

**Ver. 19.** — “For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people.”

There are two things considerable in the words:

**1.** The *person* made use of in the dedication of the covenant; which was Moses.

**2.** *What he did therein*; which is referred unto two heads:

**(1.)** His speaking or reading the terms of the covenant, every precept out of the book;

**(2.)** His sprinkling of the book and people with blood.

**1.** Moses was the internuncius between God and the people in this great transaction. On God’s part he was immediately called unto this employment, Exodus 3: And on the part of the people he was chosen, and

desired by them to transact all things between God and them, in the making and confirmation of this covenant; because they were not able to bear the effects of God's immediate presence, <sup><B></sup>Exodus 20:19; <sup><B></sup>Deuteronomy 5:22-27. And this choice of a spokesman on their part God did approve of, verse 28. Hence he became in a general sense a **μεσίτης**, a mediator between God and men, in the giving of the law, <sup><B></sup>Galatians 3:19. Whatever, therefore, was done by Moses in this whole affair of the dedication of the covenant, on the part of God or of the people, was firm and unalterable, he being a public person authorized unto this work. And, —

**Obs. I.** There can be no covenant between God and men but in the hand or by virtue of a mediator. The first covenant, in the state of innocency, was immediately between God and man. But since the entrance of sin it can be so no more. For,

- (1.) Man hath neither *meetness* nor confidence to treat immediately with God. Nor,
- (2.) Any *credit* or reputation with him, so as to be admitted as an undertaker in his own person. Nor,
- (3.) Any ability to perform the conditions of any covenant with God.

**Obs. II.** A mediator may be either only an internuncius, a messenger, a daysman; or also a surety and an undertaker. Of the first sort was the mediator of the old covenant; of the latter, that of the new.

**Obs. III.** None can interpose between God and a people in any sacred office, unless he be called of God and approved of the people, as was Moses.

**2.** That which Moses *did* in this affair was *first* in way of *preparation*. And there are three things in the account of it:

- (1.) What he did precisely.
- (2.) With respect unto whom.
- (3.) According to what rule or order he did it: —

(1.) He “spake every precept.” Vulg. Lat., “lecto omni mandato,” “having read every command;” which is the sense intended. *Λαληθείσης* is as much in this place as “recited.” So it is rendered by most translators, “cum recitasset;” that is, when he had read in the book. For his first speaking unto the people, <sup><1241></sup>Exodus 24:3, is not here intended, but his reading in the audience of the people, verse 7. He spake what he read, — that is, audibly; so it is in the story, “He read it in the audience of the people,” so as that they might hear and understand. It is added by the apostle, that he thus read, spake, recited “every precept” or “command.” “He took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people,” saith the text; that is, the whole book, and all that was contained in it, or “every precept.” And the whole is reduced by the apostle unto precepts, It was *νόμος ἐντολῶν*, <sup><1245></sup>Ephesians 2:15; “a law, a system of precepts.” And it is so called to intimate the nature of that covenant. It consisted principally in precepts or commandments of obedience, promising no assistance for the performance of them. The new covenant is of another nature; it is a “covenant of promises.” And although it hath precepts also requiring obedience, yet is it wholly founded in the promise, whereby strength and assistance for the performance of that obedience are given unto us. And the apostle doth well observe that Moses read “every precept unto all the people;” for all the good things they were to receive by virtue of that covenant depended on the observation of every precept. For a curse was denounced against every one that continued not “in all things written in the book of the law to do them,” <sup><1272></sup>Deuteronomy 27:26; <sup><1310></sup>Galatians 3:10. And we may observe, —

**Obs. IV.** A covenant that consisted in mere precepts, without an exhibition of spiritual strength to enable unto obedience, could never save sinners. — The insufficiency of this covenant unto that end is that which the apostle designs to prove in all this discourse. But thereon a double inquiry may be made:

[1.] Why God gave this covenant, which was so insufficient unto this great end? This question is proposed and answered by the apostle, <sup><1319></sup>Galatians 3:19.

[2.] How then did any of the people yield obedience unto God, if the covenant exhibited no aid or assistance unto it? The apostle answereth

in the same place, that they received it by faith in the promise, which was given before, and not disannulled by this covenant.

**Obs. V.** In all our dealings with God respect must be had unto every one of his precepts. — And the reason hereof is given by the apostle James, namely, that the authority of God is the same in every one of them, and so may be despised in the neglect of the least as well as of the greatest, <sup><sup>James 2:10, 11.</sup>

**(2.)** To whom did Moses thus read every precept? It was, saith the apostle, “to all the people.” In the story it is said indefinitely, “In the audience of the people;” as afterwards, “He sprinkled the people.” The apostle adds the note of universality in both places; “all the people.” For whereas these things were transacted with the representatives of the people, (for it was naturally impossible that the one-half of the individuals of them should hear Moses reading,) they were all equally concerned in what was said and done. Yet I do believe, that after Moses first “told the people,” — that is, the elders of them, — “all the words of the LORD ,” <sup><sup>Exodus 24:3,</sup> there were means used by the elders and officers to communicate the things, yea, to repeat the words unto all the people, that they might be enabled to give their rational consent unto them. And we may observe, —

**Obs. VI.** The first eminent use of the writing of the book of the law, (that is, of any part of the Scripture, for this book was the first that was written,) was, that it might be read unto the people. — He gave not this book to be shut up .by the priests; to be concealed from the people, as containing mysteries unlawful to be divulged, or impossible to be understood. Such conceits befell not the minds of men, until the power and ends of religion being lost, some got an opportunity to order the concerns of it unto their own worldly interest and advantage.

**Obs. VII.** This book was both written and read in the language which the people understood and commonly spake. — And a rule was herein prescribed unto the church in all ages; if so be the example of the wisdom and care of God towards his church may be a rule unto us.

**Obs. VIII.** God never required the observance of any rites or duties of worship without a previous warranty from his word. — The people took



not on them, they were not obliged unto obedience, with respect unto any positive institutions, until Moses had read unto them every precept out of the book.

**Obs. IX.** The writing of this book was an eminent privilege, now first granted unto the church, leading unto a more perfect and stable condition than formerly it had enjoyed. — Hitherto it had lived on oral instructions, from traditions, and by new immediate revelations; the evident defects whereof were now removed, and a standard of divine truth and instruction set up and fixed among them.

(3.) There is the rule whereby Moses proceeded herein, or the warranty he had for what he did: “According unto the law.” He read every precept according to the law. It cannot be the law in general that the apostle intends, for the greatest part of that doctrine which is so called was not yet given or written; nor doth it in any place contain any precept unto this purpose. Wherefore it is a particular law, rule, or command, that is intended; — according unto the ordinance or appointment of God. Such was the command that God gave unto Moses for the framing of the tabernacle: “See thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.” Particularly, it seems to be the agreement between God and the people, that Moses should be the internuncius, the interpreter between them. According unto this rule, order, or divine constitution, Moses read all the words from God out of the book unto the people. Or it may be, “the law” may here be taken for the whole design of God in giving of the law; so as that “according unto the law,” is no more but, according unto the sovereign wisdom and pleasure of God in giving of the law, with all things that belong unto its order and use. And it is good for us to look for God’s especial warranty for what we undertake to do in his service.

The *second* thing in the words is, what Moses did *immediately* and directly towards the dedication or consecration of this covenant. And there are three things to this purpose mentioned:

- (1.) What he made use of.
- (2.) How he used it.
- (3.) With respect unto what and whom: —

**(1.)** The first is expressed in these words: “He took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop.” He took the blood of the beasts that were offered for burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, <sup><1245></sup>Exodus 24:5, 6, 8. Unto this end, in their slaying he took all their blood in basins, and made an equal division of it. The one half he sprinkled on the altar, and the other half he sprinkled on the people. That which was sprinkled on the altar was God’s part; and the other was put on the people. Both the mutual stipulation of God and the congregation in this covenant, and the equality of it, or the equity of its terms, were denoted hereby. And herein lies the principal force of the apostle’s argument in these words: ‘Blood was used in the dedication of the first covenant. This was the blood of the beasts offered in sacrifice unto God. Wherefore both death, and death by blood-shedding, was required unto the confirmation of a covenant So also, therefore, must the new covenant be confirmed; but with blood and a sacrifice far more precious than they were.’

This distribution of blood, that half of it was on the altar, and half of it on the people, — the one to make atonement, the other to purify or sanctify, — was to teach the twofold efficacy of the blood of Christ, in making atonement for sin unto our justification, and the purifying of our natures in sanctification.

**(2.)** With this blood he took the things mentioned with respect unto its use, which was sprinkling. The manner of it was in part declared before. The blood being put into basins, and having water mixed with it to keep it fluid and aspersible, he took a bunch or bundle of hyssop bound up with scarlet wool, and dipping it into the basins, sprinkled the blood, until it was all spent in that service.

This rite or way of sprinkling was chosen of God as an expressive token or sign of the effectual communication of the benefits of the covenant unto them that were sprinkled. Hence the communication of the benefits of the death of Christ unto sanctification is called the sprinkling of his blood, <sup><1012></sup>1 Peter 1:2. And our apostle compriseth all the effects of it unto that end under the name of “the blood of sprinkling,” <sup><3224></sup>Hebrews 12:24 And I fear that those who have used the expression with some contempt, when applied by themselves unto the sign of the communication of the benefits

of the death of Christ in baptism, have not observed that reverence of holy things that is required of us. For this symbol of sprinkling was that which God himself chose and appointed, as a meet and apt token of the communication of covenant mercy; that is, of his grace in Christ Jesus unto our souls. And, —

**Obs. X.** The blood of the covenant will not benefit or advantage us without an especial and particular application of it unto our own souls and consciences. — If it be not as well sprinkled upon us as it was offered unto God, it will not avail us. The blood of Christ was not divided, as was that of these sacrifices, the one half being on the altar, the other on the people; but the efficacy of the whole produced both these effects, yet so, as that the one will not profit us without the other. We shall have no benefit of the atonement made at the altar, unless we have its efficacy on our own souls unto their purification. And this we cannot have unless it be sprinkled on us, unless particular application be made of it unto us by the Holy Ghost, in and by an especial act of faith in ourselves.

**(3.)** The object of this act of sprinkling was “the book” itself “and all the people.” The same blood was on the book wherein the covenant was recorded, and the people that entered into it. But whereas this sprinkling was for purifying and purging, it may be inquired unto what end the book itself was sprinkled, which was holy and undefiled. I answer, There were two things necessary unto the dedication of the covenant, with all that belonged unto it:

**[1.]** Atonement;

**[2.]** Purification. And in both these respects it was necessary that the book itself should be sprinkled.

**[1.]** As we observed before, it was sprinkled as it lay upon the altar, where atonement was made. And this was plainly to signify that atonement was to be made by blood for sins committed against that book, or the law contained in it. Without this, that book would have been unto the people like that given to Ezekiel, that was “written within and without; and there was written therein lamentations, and mourning, and woe,” <sup><3010></sup>Ezekiel 2:10. Nothing but curse and death could they expect from it. But the sprinkling of it with blood as it lay upon the altar was a testimony and assurance that

atonement should be made by blood for the sins against it; which was the life of the things.

[2.] The book in itself was pure and holy, and so are all God's institutions; but unto us every thing is unclean that is not sprinkled with the blood of Christ. So afterwards the tabernacle and all the vessels of it were purified every year with blood, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions," <sup><RB1></sup>Leviticus 16:16. Wherefore on both these accounts it was necessary that the book itself should be sprinkled.

The blood thus sprinkled was mingled with water. The natural reason of it was, as we observed, to keep it fluid and aspersible. But there was a mystery in it also. That the blood of Christ was typified by this blood of the sacrifices used in the dedication of the old covenant, it is the apostle's design to declare. And it is probable that this mixture of it with water might represent that blood and water which came out of his side when it was pierced. For the mystery thereof was very great. Hence that apostle which saw it, and bare record of it in particular, <sup><RB1></sup>John 19:34, 35, affirms likewise that "he came by water and blood," and not by blood only, <sup><RB1></sup>1 Epist. 5:6. He came not only to make atonement for us with his blood, that we might be justified, but to sprinkle us with the efficacy of his blood, in the communication of the Spirit of sanctification, compared unto water.

For the sprinkler itself, composed of scarlet wool and hyssop, I doubt not but that the human nature of Christ, whereby and through which all grace is communicated unto us, ("for of his fullness we receive, and grace for grace,") was signified by it; but the analogy and similitude between them are not so evident as they are with respect unto some other types. The hyssop was a humble plant, the meanest of them, yet of a sweet savor, <sup><RB1></sup>1 Kings 4:33; so was the Lord Christ amongst men in the days of his flesh, in comparison of the tall cedars of the earth. Hence was his complaint, that he was as "a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people," <sup><RB1></sup>Psalms 22:6. And the scarlet wool might represent him as red in the blood of his sacrifice. But I will not press these things, of whose interpretation we have not a certain rule.

Secondly, The principal truth asserted is confirmed by what Moses *said*, as well as what he did: —

**Ver. 20.** — “Saying, This [*is*] the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.”

The difference between the words of Moses and the repetition of them by the apostle is not material, as unto the sense of them. **הִנֵּה**, “behold,” in Moses, is rendered by **τοῦτο**, “this;” both demonstrative notes of the same thing. For in pronouncing of the words Moses showed the blood unto the people; and so, “Behold the blood,” is all one as if he had said, “This is the blood.” The making of the covenant in the words of Moses is expressed by **כָּרַת**, “hath cut,” “divided,” solemnly made. This the apostle renders by **ἐνετείλατο** “hath enjoined” or “commanded you.” And this he doth partly to signify the foundation of the people’s acceptance of that covenant, which was the authority of God enjoining them or requiring them so to do; partly to intimate the nature of the covenant itself, which consisted in precepts and injunctions principally, and not absolutely in promises, as the new covenant doth. The last words of Moses, “Concerning all these words,” the apostle omits; for he includes the sense of them in that word, “Which God hath commanded you.” For he hath respect therein both unto the words themselves written in the book, which were precepts and injunctions, as also the command of God for the acceptance of the covenant.

That which Moses said is, “This is the blood of the testament.” Hence the apostle proves that death, and the shedding of blood therein, was necessary unto the consecration and establishment of the first testament. For so Moses expressly affirms in the dedication of it, “This is the blood of the covenant;” without which it could not have been a firm covenant between God and the people. Not, I confess, from the nature of a covenant in general, for a covenant may be solemnly established without death or blood; but from the especial end of that covenant, which in the confirmation of it was to prefigure the confirmation of that new covenant which could not be established but with the blood of a sacrifice. And this adds both force and evidence unto the apostle’s argument. For he proves the necessity of the death and blood-shedding or sacrifice of Christ in the confirmation of the new covenant from hence, that the old covenant, which

in the dedication of it was prefigurative hereof, was not confirmed without blood. Wherefore, whereas God had solemnly promised to make a new covenant with the church, and that different from, or not according unto the old (which he had proved in the foregoing chapter), it follows unavoidably that it was to be confirmed with the blood of the mediator (for by the blood of beasts it could not be); which is that truth wherein he did instruct them. And nothing was more cogent to take off the scandal of the cross and of the sufferings of Christ.

For the enunciation itself, “This is the blood of the covenant,” it is *figurative* and *sacramental*. The covenant had no blood of its own; but the blood of the sacrifices is called “the blood of the covenant,” because the covenant was dedicated and established by it. Neither was the covenant really established by it; for it was the truth of God on the one hand, and the stability of the people in their professed obedience on the other, that the establishment of the covenant depended on. But this blood was a confirmatory sign of it, a token between God and the people of their mutual engagement in that covenant. So the paschal lamb was called “the LORD’S passover,” because it was a sign and token of God’S passing over the houses of the Israelites when he destroyed the Egyptians, <sup>(1021)</sup>Exodus 12:11, 12. With reference it was unto those sacramental expressions which the church under the old testament was accustomed unto, that our Lord Jesus Christ, in the institution of the sacrament of the supper, called the bread and the wine, whose use he appointed therein, by the names of his body and blood; and any other interpretation of the words wholly overthrows the nature of that holy ordinance.

Wherefore this blood was a *confirmatory sign of the covenant*. And it was so,

1. From *God’s institution*; he appointed it so to be, as is express in the words of Moses.
2. From an *implication* of the interest of both parties in the blood of the sacrifice; *God*, unto whom it was *offered*; and the *people*, on whom it was *sprinkled*. For it being the blood of beasts that were slain, in this use of it each party as it were engaged their lives unto the observation and performance of what was respectively undertaken by them.

**3.** Typically, in that it represented the blood of Christ, and fore-signified the necessity of it unto the confirmation of the new covenant. See <sup><381></sup>Zechariah 9:11; <sup><105></sup>Matthew 26:28; <sup><221></sup>Luke 22:20; <sup><615></sup>1 Corinthians 11:25. So was it “the blood of the covenant,” in that it was a sign between God and the people of their mutual consent unto it, and their taking on themselves the performance of the terms of it, on the one side and the other.

**Obs. XI.** The *condescension* of God in making a covenant with men, especially in the ways of the confirmation of it, is a blessed object of all holy admiration. — For,

- 1.** The infinite distance and disproportion that is between him and us, both in nature and state or condition;
- 2.** The ends of this covenant, which are all unto our eternal advantage, he standing in no need of us or our obedience;
- 3.** The obligation that he takes upon himself unto the performance of the terms of it, whereas he might righteously deal with us in a way of mere sovereignty;
- 4.** The nature of the assurance he gives us thereof, by the blood of the sacrifice, confirmed with his oath; do all set forth the ineffable glory of this condescension. And this will at length be made manifest in the eternal blessedness of them by whom this covenant is embraced, and the eternal misery of them by whom it is refused.

The apostle having given this full confirmation unto his principal assertion, he adds, for the illustration of it, the use and efficacy of blood, that is, the blood of sacrifices, unto purification and atonement.

**Ver. 21.** — “Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry.”

The manner of the introduction of this observation, verse 21, by **καὶ ὁμοίως**, “and in like manner,” doth manifest that this is not a continuation of the former instance, in that which belongs thereunto; but that there is a proceed unto another argument, to evince the further use of the sprinkling of blood unto purification and atonement under the old testament. For the design of the apostle is not only to prove the necessity of the blood of

Christ in sacrifice, but also the efficacy of it in the taking away of sins. Wherefore he shows that as the covenant itself was dedicated with blood, which proves the necessity of the blood of Christ unto the confirmation of the new covenant; so all the ways and means of solemn worship were purged and purified by the same means, which demonstrates its efficacy.

I will not absolutely oppose the usual interpretation of these words; namely, that at *the erection of the tabernacle*, and the dedication of it with all its vessels and utensils, there was a sprinkling with blood, though not expressly mentioned by Moses, for he only declares the unction of them with the holy oil, <sup><1200></sup>Exodus 40:9-11. For as unto the garments of Aaron and his sons, which belonged unto the service of the tabernacle, and were laid up in the holy place, it is expressly declared that they were sprinkled with blood, <sup><1200></sup>Exodus 29:21; and of the altar, that it was sprinkled when it was anointed, though it be not said wherewith. And Josephus, who was himself a priest, affirms that “all the things belonging unto the sanctuary were dedicated with the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifices;” which things are usually pleaded for this interpretation.

I shall not, as I said, absolutely reject it; yet because it is evident that the apostle makes a progress in these words, from the necessity of the dedication of the covenant with blood unto the use and efficacy of the sprinkling of blood in all holy administrations, that they might be accepted with God, I choose rather to refer the words unto that solemn sprinkling of the tabernacle and all the vessels of it by the high priest with blood of the expiatory sacrifice which was made *annually*, on the day of atonement. This the introduction of these words by *καί* and *ὁμοίως*; doth declare. As the covenant was dedicated with the sprinkling of blood, so in like manner afterwards, the tabernacle and all the vessels of it were sprinkled with blood unto their sacred use.

All the difficulty in this interpretation is, that Moses is said to do it, but that which we intend was done by Aaron and his successors. But this is no way to be compared with that of applying it unto the dedication of the tabernacle, wherein there is no mention made of blood or its sprinkling, but of anointing only. Wherefore Moses is said to do what he appointed to be done, what the law required which was given by him. So “Moses” is frequently used for the law given by him: <sup><4452></sup>Acts 15:21, “For Moses of



old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day;” that is, the law. Moses, then, sprinkled the tabernacle, in that by an everlasting ordinance he appointed that it should be done. And the words following, verse 22, declare that the apostle speaks not of dedication, but of expiation and purification.

This sprinkling, therefore, of the tabernacle and its vessels, was that which was done annually, on the day of atonement, <sup><Bible></sup> Leviticus 16:14-16, 18. For thereon, as the apostle speaks, “both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry were sprinkled with blood;” as the ark, the mercy-seat, and the altar of incense. And the end of it was to purge them because of the uncleannesses of the people; which is that the apostle intends. And that which we are taught herein is, that, —

**Obs. I.** In all things wherein we have to do with God, whereby we approach unto him, it is the blood of Christ, and the application of it unto our consciences, that gives us a gracious acceptance with him. — Without this all is unclean and defiled.

**Obs. II.** Even holy things and institutions, that are in themselves clean and unpolluted, are relatively defiled, by the unholiness of them that use them; defiled unto them. — So was the tabernacle, because of the uncleannesses of the people among whom it was. For unto the unclean all things are unclean.

From this whole discourse the apostle makes an inference which he afterwards applies at large unto his present purpose.

**Ver. 22.** — “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.”

There are two parts of this verse, or there is a double assertion in it:

1. That “almost all things are by the law purged with blood.”
2. That “without shedding of blood is no remission.”

1. In the first of these there is considerable the assertion itself, and the limitation of it.

(1.) The *assertion* itself is, that “by the law all things were purged with blood; *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* — according unto the law;” the rules, the

commands, the institutions of it; in that way of worship, faith, and obedience, which the people were obliged unto by the law. According unto the law, there was a necessity of the blood of sacrifices, for the purging of sin and making of atonement. This he infers and concludes from what he had said before, concerning the dedication of the covenant and the purification of the tabernacle with all the vessels of its ministry. And from hence he designs to prove the *necessity of the death of Christ*, and the *efficacy of his blood for the purging of sin*, whereof those legal things were types and representations. Of these legal purifications, or purgings by blood, we have treated already.

(2.) The *limitation* of this assertion is in the word **σχεδόν**, “almost.” Some few purifications there were under the law that were not by blood. Such, as some judge, was that by the ashes of a heifer mingled with water; whereof we have treated on verse 13. But I am not certain that this may be esteemed a purification without blood. For the heifer whose ashes were used in it was first slain, and its blood poured out; afterwards the blood as well as the flesh was burnt and reduced unto ashes. Wherefore that way of purification cannot be said to be without blood. And it was a type of the purifying efficacy of the blood of Christ, who offered himself a whole burnt-offering unto God, through the fire of the eternal Spirit. But there were two sorts of purifications under the law wherein blood was neither formally nor virtually applied or used. The one was by fire, in things that would endure it, <sup><062></sup>Numbers 31:23 (and the apostle speaks of things as well as persons, as the word **πάντα** declares); the other was by water, whereof there were many instances. See <sup><090></sup>Exodus 19:10; <sup><060></sup>Leviticus 16:26, 28, 22:6, 7. All other purifications were **ἐν αἵματι**, “in blood;” **ἐν διὰ; δι’ αἵματος**, by the offering and sprinkling of blood.

From the consideration of the purifications mentioned, the apostle adds the limitation of “almost.” For the conceit of some of the ancients, that **σχεδόν** is as much as *ferè*, and is to be joined with “purged,” “were almost purged,” — that is, they were so only ineffectually, — is most improper; for it is contrary to the natural construction of the words and the direct intention of the apostle. Only we may observe, that the purifications which were by fire and water were of such things as had no immediate influence into the worship of God, or in such cases as wherein the worship of God was not immediately concerned; nor of such things

wherewith conscience was defiled. They were only of external pollutions, by things in their own nature indifferent, and had nothing of sin in them. And the sacred institutions which were not concerning the immediate worship of God, nor things which in themselves did defile the consciences of men, were as hedges and fences about those which really did so. They served to warn men not to come near those things which had a real defilement in themselves. See <sup>4154</sup>Matthew 15:16-20.

Thus “almost all things,” — that is, absolutely all which had any inward, real moral defilement, — “were purged with blood,” and directed unto the purging efficacy of the blood of Christ. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. I.** There was a *great variety of legal purifications*. For as all of them together could not absolutely purge sin, but only direct unto what would do so, so none of them by themselves could fully represent that one sacrifice by blood whereby all sin was to be purged; therefore were they multiplied.

**Obs. II.** This variety argues that in ourselves we are ready to be polluted on all occasions. Sin cleaveth unto all that we do, and is ready to defile us even in our best duties.

**Obs. III.** This variety of institutions was a great part of the bondage state of the church under the old testament; a yoke that they were not able to bear. For it was almost an insuperable difficulty to attain an assurance that they had observed them all in a due manner; the penalties of their neglect being very severe. Besides, the outward observation of them was both burdensome and chargeable. It is the glory of the gospel, that we are directed to make our address by faith on all occasions unto that one sacrifice by the blood of Christ, which cleanseth us from all our sins. Howbeit many that are called Christians, being ignorant of the mystery thereof, do again betake themselves unto other ways for the purification of sin, which are multiplied in the church of Rome.

**Obs. IV.** The *great mystery* wherein God instructed the church from the foundation of the world, especially by and under legal institutions, was, that *all purging of sin was to be by blood*. This was that which by all sacrifices from the beginning, and all legal institutions, he *declared* unto mankind. Blood is the only means of purging and atonement. This is the

language of the whole law. All was to manifest that the washing and purging of the church from sin was to be looked for from the blood of Christ alone.

2. The second assertion of the apostle is, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission.” Some would have these words to contain an application of what was spoken before unto the blood of Christ; but it is manifest that the apostle yet continues in his account of things under the law, and enters on the application of them not before the next verse. Wherefore these words, *κατὰ τὸν νόμου*, “according to the law,” or by virtue of its institutions, are here to be repeated: “By the law, without shedding of blood,” that is, in sacrifice, “there is no remission.” Yet though that season be particularly intended, the axiom is universally true, and applicable unto the new covenant; — even under it, without shedding of blood is no remission.

The curse of the law was, that he that sinned should die; but whereas there is no man that liveth and sinneth not, God had provided that there should be a testification of the remission of sins, and that the curse of the law should not be immediately executed on all that sinned. This he did by allowing the people to make atonement for their sins by blood; that is, the blood of sacrifices,” <sup><ORNT></sup>Leviticus 17:11. For hereby God signified his will and pleasure in two things:

(1.) That by this blood there should be a *political remission* granted unto sinners, that they should not die under the sentence of the law as it was the rule of the government of the nation. And in this sense, for such sins as were not politically to be spared no sacrifice was allowed.

(2.) That *real spiritual forgiveness*, and gracious acceptance with himself, were to be obtained alone by that which was signified by this blood; which was the sacrifice of Christ himself.

And whereas the sins of the people were of various kinds, there were particular *sacrifices* instituted to answer that variety. This variety of sacrifices, with respect unto the various sorts or kinds of sins for which they were to make atonement, I have elsewhere discussed and explained. Their institution and order are recorded, <sup><ORNT></sup>Leviticus 1:7. And if any person neglected that especial sacrifice which was appointed to make

atonement for his especial sin, he was left under the sentence of the law, politically and spiritually; — there was no remission. Yea also, there might be, there were, sins that could not be reduced directly unto any of those for whose remission sacrifices were directed in particular. Wherefore God graciously provided against the distress or ruin of the church on either of these accounts. For whether the people had fallen under the neglect of any of those especial ways of atonement, or had contracted the guilt of such sins as they knew not how to reduce unto any sort of them that were to be expiated, he had graciously prepared the great anniversary sacrifice, wherein public atonement was made for all the sins, transgressions, and iniquities of the whole people, of what sort soever they were, <sup>(CR62)</sup> Leviticus 16:21. But in the whole of his ordinances he established the rule, that “without shedding of blood was no remission.”

There seems to be an exception in the case of him who was so poor that he could not provide the meanest offering of blood for a sin-offering; for he was allowed by the law to offer “the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour” for his sin, and it was forgiven him, <sup>(CR51)</sup> Leviticus 5:11-13. Wherefore the word *σχεδόν*, “almost,” may be here again repeated, because of this single case. But the apostle hath respect unto the general rule of the law. And this exception was not an ordinary constitution, but depended on the impossibility of the thing itself, whereunto it made a gracious condescension. And this necessity oftentimes of itself, without any constitution, suspends a positive law, and gives a dispensation unto the infringers of it. So was it in the case of David when he ate of the shew-bread in his hunger; and as to works of necessity and mercy on the Sabbath-day: which instances are given by our Savior himself. Wherefore the particular exception on this consideration did rather strengthen than invalidate the general rule of the law. Besides, the nearest approach was made unto it that might be. For fine flour is the best of the bread whereby man’s life is sustained; and in the offering of it the offerer testified that by his sin he had forfeited his own life and all whereby it was sustained: which was the meaning of the offering of blood.

The expositors of the Roman church do here greatly perplex themselves, to secure their sacrifice of the mass from this destroying sentence of the apostle. For a sacrifice they would have it to be, and that for the remission of the sins of the living and the dead; yet they say it is an unbloody

sacrifice. For if there be any blood shed in it, it is the blood of Christ, and then he is crucified by them afresh every day; as indeed in some sense he is, though they cannot shed his blood. If it be unbloody, the rule of the apostle is, that it is no way available for the remission of sins. Those that are sober have no way to deliver themselves, but by denying the mass to be a proper sacrifice for the remission of sins: which is done expressly by Estius upon the place. But this is contrary unto the direct assertions contained in the mass itself, and raseth the very foundation of it.

Now, if God gave them so much light under the old testament, as that they should know, believe, and profess, that “without shedding of blood is no remission,” how great is the darkness of men under the new testament, who look, seek, or endeavor any other way after the pardon of sin, but only by the blood of Christ!

**Obs. V.** This is the great demonstration of the demerit of sin, of the holiness, righteousness, and grace of God. — For such was the nature and demerit of sin, such was the righteousness of God with respect unto it, that without shedding of blood it could not be pardoned. They are strangers unto the one and the other who please themselves with other imaginations. And what blood must this be? That the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin was utterly impossible, as our apostle declares. It must be the *blood of the Son of God*, <sup><412></sup>Romans 3:24, 25; <sup><413></sup>Acts 20:28. And herein were glorified both the love and grace of God, in that he spared not his only Son, but gave him up to be a bloody sacrifice in his death for us all.

### VERSE 23.

In the following verses, unto the end of the chapter, the apostle makes an application of all that he had discoursed, concerning the services and sacrifices of the tabernacle, with their use and efficacy, on the one hand, and the sacrifice of Christ, its nature, use, and efficacy, on the other, unto his present argument. Now this was to demonstrate the excellency, dignity, and virtue of the priesthood of Christ, and the sacrifice of himself that he offered thereby, as he was the mediator of the new covenant. And he doth it in the way of comparison, as unto what there was of similitude between them; and of opposition, as unto what was singular in the person

and priesthood of Christ, wherein they had no share; declaring on both accounts the incomparable excellency of him and his sacrifice above the priests of the law and theirs, And hereon he concludes his whole discourse with an elegant comparison and opposition between the law and the gospel, wherein he compriseth in few words the substance of them both, as unto their effects on the souls of men.

That wherein in general there was a similitude in these things is expressed, verse 23.

**Ver. 23** — Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι ζυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας.

There is no difference of importance in the translation of these words by any interpreters of reputation, and singly they have been all of them before spoken unto. Only the Syriac renders ὑποδειγματα by ܢܩܝܡܬܐ “similitudes;” not unaptly.

**Ver. 23.** — It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

An entrance is made in these words into the comparison intended. For as unto both sorts of sacrifices compared, it is here granted in general that they purged the things whereunto they were applied. But there is a difference also laid down in this verse, namely, as unto the things that were purified by them, and consequently in the nature of their respective purifications.

There are in the words,

1. A *note of inference*, or dependence on the former discourse; “therefore.”
2. A *double proposition* of things of diverse natures compared together.
3. The *modification* of both these propositions; “it was necessary.”
4. In the *first proposition* there is,

(1.) The *subject-matter* spoken of; “the patterns of things in the heavens.”

(2.) *What is affirmed* of them as necessary to them; that they “should be purified.”

(3.) The *means* whereby; “with these.”

5. The same things are proposed in the *second*, namely,

(1.) The things spoken of, or the “heavenly things themselves.”

(2.) *What is affirmed of them* is traduced from the other proposition; they also were “purified.”

(3.) The *means* whereby they were so; “with better sacrifices than these.”

1. That which first occurs is the note of inference, or dependence on the former discourse; “therefore.” And it hath an equal respect unto both parts of the assertion. And it is not the being of the things, but their manifestation, that is intended: ‘From what hath been said concerning the legal purification of all things, and the spiritual purification that is by the sacrifice of Christ, these things are evident and manifest.’

2. Of both the things affirmed it is said that “it was necessary” they should be so; that is, it was so from God’s institution and appointment. There was no necessity in the nature of the things themselves, that the patterns of heavenly things should be purged with these sacrifices; but on supposition that God would in and by them represent the purification of the heavenly things, it was necessary that they should be thus purged with blood. And on the supposition of the same divine ordination that the heavenly things themselves should be purified, it was necessary that they should be purified with better sacrifices than these, which were altogether insufficient unto that end.

3. The subject of the first proposition is, “The patterns of things in the heavens.” The *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* are the *τὰ ἐπουράνια* in the next words. “Things in the heavens” are “heavenly things.” And they are the same with *ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*, in the next verse; “figures of the true things.

(1.) The things intended are those which the apostle hath discoursed of; the covenant, the book, the people, the tabernacle, with all the vessels of



its ministry. These he calls ὑποδείγματα, which we well render “patterns.” And patterns are of two sorts:

[1.] Such as are πρωτότυπα, “exemplaria;” those from and according unto which any other thing is framed. That is the pattern of any thing, according unto which it is contrived, made and fashioned. So a scheme or frame drawn and delineated, is the pattern of — an edifice.

[2.] Such as are ἔκτυπα, “exemplata;” that are framed according unto other things which they do resemble and represent. These also are ὑποδείγματα.

The things mentioned were not patterns of the heavenly things in the first sense; the heavenly things were not framed by them, to answer, resemble, and represent them. But they were so in the latter only. And therefore in the first constitution of them, those which were durable and to abide, as the tabernacle with all its utensils and vessels, with the posture and disposal of them, were made and erected according to an original pattern showed in the mount; or they were framed according unto the idea of the heavenly things themselves, whereof he made a representation unto Moses, and communicated a resemblance of them unto him, according unto his own good pleasure.

This is the order of these things: The heavenly things themselves were designed, framed, and disposed in the mind of God, in all their order, courses, beauty, efficacy, and tendency unto his own eternal glory. This was the whole mystery of the wisdom of God for the redemption and salvation of the church by Jesus Christ. This is that which is declared in the gospel, being before hid in God from the foundation of the world, ~~ERR~~ Ephesians 3:8-10. Of these things did God grant a typical resemblance, similitude, and pattern, in the tabernacle and its services. That he would make such a kind of resemblance of those heavenly things, as unto their kind, nature, and use, that he would instruct the church by them, was an act of his mere sovereign will and pleasure. And this is that effect of his wisdom which was manifest under the old testament; whereon the faith and obedience of the church were wholly to acquiesce in his sovereignty. And this their resemblance of heavenly things, which they had not from their own nature, but merely from the pleasure of God, gave them all their glory and worth; which the saints under the old testament did in some

measure understand. The present Jews do, as their forefathers did, under the degeneracy of their church, conceive their glory to consist in the materials and curious structure of them; things that the wealth and art of men might exceed. But in themselves they were all earthly, carnal, perishing, and liable unto all sorts of corruption. Much inferior they were in nature and glory unto the souls of men, which were conversant in their highest and most noble acts about them. But herein alone consisted their honor, worth, and use, — they were “patterns of heavenly things,” And we may observe, that —

**Obs. I.** The glory and efficacy of all ordinances of divine worship which consist in outward observance (as it is with the sacraments of the gospel) consist in this, that they represent and exhibit heavenly things unto us. — And this power of representation they have from divine institution alone.

(2.) *What they were patterns of* is expressed; namely, of “things in the heavens.” What these were in particular must be spoken unto in the exposition of the next proposition, whereof they are the subject, “The heavenly things themselves.”

(3.) Of these things it is affirmed that they were “*purified*.” The apostle had treated before of a double purification:

[1.] Of that which consisted in a cleansing from defilements of its own; “sprinkling the unclean,” and “sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh,” verses 13, 22.

[2.] That which consisted in a dedication unto sacred use. But this also had some respect unto uncleanness: not unto any that the things so dedicated had in themselves, but because of the uncleanness of them that were to make use of them. This was such, as that God would have the intervention of the sprinkling of blood between him and them in all their services, as he declares, <sup>CRISIS</sup> Leviticus 16:15-17. And this he would do, that he might teach them the absolute and universal necessity of the purifying efficacy of the blood of Christ, in all things between him and sinners. Of this purification he gives us in this discourse two instances:

[1.] That which was initial, at the first solemnization of the covenant, verses 18-20.

[2.] That which was annual, in the sprinkling of the tabernacle and its vessels, because of the uncleannesses of the people, verse 21. This latter purification is that which is intended.

(4.) The *means* whereby they were thus to be purified is, “with these.” In the next proposition, the heavenly things themselves are said to be purified ζυσίαις, “with sacrifices.” But the purification of these patterns was not absolutely confined unto sacrifices. Water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and the ashes of an heifer, in some cases, were required thereunto. “With these;” that is, with all those things which were appointed by the law to be used in their purification or dedication unto sacred use.

(5.) If inquiry be made why these patterns were thus purified, the apostle affirms that “it was necessary” it should be so. This, as it respects both propositions in this verse equally, was spoken unto in general before. The grounds of this necessity with respect unto these patterns were these:

[1.] The *will and command of God*. This is that which originally, or in the first place, makes any thing necessary in divine worship. This is the only spring of rational obedience in instituted worship; whatever is without it, whatever is beyond it, is no part of sacred service. God would have them thus purified. Yet also was there herein this manifest reason of his will, namely, that thereby he might represent the purification of heavenly things. On this supposition, that God would so represent heavenly things by them, it was necessary that they should be purified.

[2.] Seeing he would have them purified, *there was a meetness that they should be so with these things*. For being themselves carnal and earthly, as were the tabernacle and all the vessels of it, it was meet they should be purified with things carnal also; such as were the blood of beasts, water, hyssop, and scarlet wool.

[3.] In particular, it was necessary that they should be purified with the blood of sacrifices; because they were *types of those things which were to be purified with the only proper expiatory sacrifice*. These were the foundations of the whole system of Mosaical rites and ordinances; and on them they stood until they were removed by God himself.

**Obs. II.** And that which we should learn from hence is, a due consideration of that respect which we ought to have to the holiness of God in his

worship and service. He did manifest it unto us, to beget in us a due reverence of it. He would never admit of any thing therein but what was purified according unto his own institution. All other things he always rejected as unclean and profane. Without a due apprehension hereof, and endeavoring to have both our persons and our services purified by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. neither they nor we can be accepted before him.

**4.** The other proposition in the text is, that “the heavenly things themselves were to be purified with better sacrifices”

**(1.)** The first thing in the words is the subject of the proposition, “the heavenly things themselves;” that is, the things whereof the other were the patterns, by which God represented them unto the church. But what these things are is not easy to determine. Some say that *heaven* itself is intended, the superethereal heavens; the place of the present residence of Christ, and of the souls of them that are saved by him. But taking the heavens absolutely, especially for that which is called “the heaven of heavens,” with respect unto their fabric, and as the place of God’s glorious residence, and it is not easy to conceive how they stood in need to be purified by sacrifice. Some say it is *spiritual things*, that is, the souls and consciences of men, that are intended. And they are called “heavenly” in opposition unto the things of the law, which were all carnal and earthly. And it is certain they are not to be excluded out of this expression; for unto their purification is the virtue of the sacrifice of Christ directly applied, verse 14. Yet the whole context, and the antithesis in it between the types and the things typified, make it evident that they alone are not intended.

To clear the mind of the apostle in this expression, sundry things must be observed out of the context: —

**[1.]** The apostle treats of a *double purification*, as was immediately before declared. In this application of his discourse he intends them both. But whereas some things stood in need of the one only, namely, of that of dedication unto God; and some of the other, namely, purging from defilements, as the souls and consciences of men; they are distinctly to be applied unto the things spoken of, according to their capacity. Some were purified by dedication, some by actual cleansing from real defilements;

both which are included in the notion of sacred purification, or sanctification.

[2.] These heavenly things must be all those, and only those, whereof the other were patterns or resemblances This is plain in the context and antithesis. Wherefore, —

[3.] By “heavenly things,” I understand all the effects of the counsel of God in Christ, in the redemption, worship, salvation, and eternal glory of the church; that is, Christ himself in all his offices, with all the spiritual and eternal effects of them on the souls and consciences of men, with all the worship of God by him according unto the gospel. For of all these things those of the law were the patterns. He did in and by them give a representation of all these things, as we may see in particular: —

**1st.** *Christ himself, and the sacrifice of himself,* were typed out by these things To prove this, is the principal purpose of the apostle. They were the “shadow,” he the “body” or substance, as he speaks elsewhere. He was “the Lord from heaven;” “who is in heaven;” “who speaketh from heaven;” <sup><RB></sup>1 Corinthians 15:47; <sup><RB></sup>John 3:13; <sup><RB></sup>Hebrews 12:25.

**2dly.** *All spiritual and eternal grace,* mercy, blessings, whereof the souls of men are made partakers by the mediation and sacrifice of Christ, are “heavenly things,” and are constantly so called, <sup><RB></sup>Hebrews 3:1; <sup><RB></sup>John 3:12; <sup><RB></sup>Ephesians 1:3, 2:6.

**3dly.** *The church itself* and its worship are of the same kind; the things principally to be purified by these sacrifices It is God’s heavenly kingdom, <sup><RB></sup>Ephesians 5:25, 26.

**4thly.** *Heaven itself* is comprised herein, not absolutely, but as it is the mansion of Christ and the redeemed in the presence of God for evermore.

(2.) Hereon the inquiry will be, how these things are said to be “purified;” for of real purification from uncleanness not one of them is capable but only the church, — that is, the souls and consciences of men. I answer, that we are to have recourse unto that twofold sense of purification before laid down, namely, of *external dedication,* and *internal purging;* both

which are expressed by the name of “sanctification” in the Scripture. Most of the things that were purified by the blood of the sacrifices at the giving of the law were so in the first sense, and no otherwise. The covenant, the book of the law, and the tabernacle with all its vessels, were purified in their sacred dedication unto God and his service. Thus were all the heavenly things themselves purified. Christ himself was sanctified, consecrated, dedicated unto God, in his own blood. He “sanctified himself,” <sup><B7B></sup>John 17:19; and that by “the blood of the covenant,” <sup><B0B></sup>Hebrews 10:29; even when he was “consecrated” or “made perfect through sufferings,” <sup><B0B></sup>Hebrews 2:10. So was the church and the whole worship of it dedicated unto God, made holy unto him, <sup><B5B></sup>Ephesians 5:25, 26. And heaven itself was dedicated to be a habitation for ever unto the mystical body of Christ, in perfect peace with the angels above, who had never sinned, <sup><B0B></sup>Ephesians 1:10; <sup><B2B></sup>Hebrews 12:22-25.

But yet there was, moreover, a *real purification* of the most of these things. The church, or the souls and consciences of men, were really cleansed, purified, and sanctified, with an internal, spiritual purification, <sup><B5B></sup>Ephesians 5:25, 26; <sup><B0B></sup>Titus 2:14. It was washed in the blood of Christ, <sup><B0B></sup>Revelation 1:5; and is thereby cleansed from sin, <sup><B0B></sup>1 John 1:7. And heaven itself was in some sense so purified, as the tabernacle was because of the sins of the people among whom it was, <sup><B0B></sup>Leviticus 16:16. Sin had entered into heaven itself, in the apostasy of angels; whence it was not pure in the sight of God, <sup><B5B></sup>Job 15:15. And upon the sin of man, a state of enmity ensued between the angels above and men below; so that heaven was no meet place for a habitation unto them both, until they were reconciled; which was done only in the sacrifice of Christ, <sup><B0B></sup>Ephesians 1:10. Hence, if the heavenly things were not defiled in themselves, yet in relation unto us they were so; which is now taken away.

The sum is: As the covenant, the book, the people, the tabernacle, were all purified, and dedicated unto their especial ends, by the blood of calves and goats, wherein was laid the foundation of all gracious intercourse between God and the church, under the old covenant; so all things whatever, that in the counsel of God belonged unto the new covenant, the whole mediation of Christ, with all the spiritual and eternal effects of it, were confirmed, dedicated unto God, and made effectual unto the ends of the covenant, by the blood of the sacrifice of Christ, which is the spring from whence

efficacy is communicated unto them all. And moreover, the souls and consciences of the elect are purified and sanctified from all defilements thereby; which work is gradually carried on in them, by renewed applications of the same blood unto them, until they are all presented unto God glorious, “without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.” And we are taught that, —

**Obs. III.** The one sacrifice of Christ, with what ensued thereon, was the only means to render effectual all the counsels of God concerning the redemption and salvation of the church. ~~1000~~ Ephesians 1:3-7, ~~1000~~ Romans 3:24-26.

**(3.)** Of these heavenly things it is said, that they were purified “with better sacrifices than these,” — *κρείττοσι ζυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας*. Παρά is added to increase the signification. All sober expositors agree that here is an enallage of number, the plural put for the singular. The one sacrifice of Christ is alone intended. But because it answered all other sacrifices, exceeded them all in dignity, was of more use and efficacy than they all, it is so expressed. That one sacrifice comprised the virtue, benefit, and signification of all others. The gloss of Grotius on these words is intolerable, and justly offensive unto all pious souls: *Θυσίαις*, saith he, “quia non tantum Christi perpassiones intelligit, sed eorum qui ipsum sectantur, una cum precibus et operibus misericordiae.” Is it possible that any Christian should not tremble to join the sufferings of men and their works with the sacrifice of Christ, as unto the same kind of efficacy in purifying of these heavenly things? Do they make atonement for sin? Are they offered unto God for that end? Are they sprinkled on these things for their purification?

**(4.)** The modification of the former proposition belongs unto this also. “It was necessary” these things should be thus purified:

**[1.]** As that which the holiness of God required, and which therefore in his wisdom and grace he appointed;

**[2.]** As that which in itself was meet and becoming the righteousness of God., ~~1000~~ Hebrews 2:10. Nothing but the sacrifice of Christ, with the everlasting efficacy of his most precious blood, could thus purify the heavenly things, and dedicate the whole new creation unto God.

(5.) The last thing we shall observe hereon is, that it was ζυσία that this dedication and purification is ascribed unto. Now ζυσία is a “slain sacrifice,” a sacrifice as slain; a sacrifice by mactation, killing, or shedding of blood. So is קָרַב, also. Wherefore it is the sacrifice of Christ in his death and blood-shedding that is the cause of these things. Other ζυσία of him there was none, he offered none. For the vindication hereof we must examine the comment of Schlichtingius on this place. His words are, —

“Licet enim non sanguinem suum Christus Deo obtulerit, sed se ipsum; tamen sine sanguinis effusione offerre se ipsum non potuit neque debuit. Ex eo vero quod diximus fit, ut auctor divinus Christum cum victimis legalibus confrens, perpetuo fugiat dicere Christi sanguinem fuisse oblatum; et nihilominus ut similitudini serviat, perpetuo Christi sanguinis fusionem insinuet, quae nisi antecessisset, hand quaquam tam plena, tamque concinna inter Christum et victimas antiquas comparatio institui potuisset. Ex his ergo manifestum est in ilia sancta celestia ad eorum dedicationem emundationemque peragendam, victimam pretiosissimam, proinde non sanguinem hircorum et vitulorum, imo ne sanguinem quidem ullum, sed ipsum Dei Filium, idque omnibus mortalis naturae exuviis de-positis, quo nulla pretiosior et sanctior victima cogitari potuit, debuisse inferri.”

*Ans.* [1.] The distinction between Christ offering [his blood and offering himself to God (the foundation of this discourse), is coined on purpose to pervert the truth. For neither did Christ offer his blood unto God but in the offering of himself, nor did he offer himself unto God but in and by the shedding and offering of his blood. There is no distinction between Christ offering of himself and offering of his blood, other than between the being of any thing and the form and manner of its being what it is

[2.] That “he could not offer himself without the antecedent effusion of his blood,” seems a kind concession; but it hath the same design with the preceding distinction. But in the offering of himself he was ζυσία, “a slain sacrifice,” which was in and by the effusion of his blood; in the very shedding of it, it was offered unto God.

[3.] It is a useless observation, that the apostle, in comparing the sacrifice of Christ with the legal victims, doth (as it is said) “carefully avoid the



saying that he offered his blood.” For in those legal sacrifices the beasts themselves were always said to be offered, although it was the blood alone wherewith atonement was made on the altar, <sup><B71></sup>Leviticus 17:11. And this the apostle expressly ascribes unto the blood of Christ, in answer unto the blood of bulls and goats, verses 13, 14.

[4.] The apostle doth not “insinuate the mention of the shedding of the blood of Christ only to make up a full and fit comparison with the legal victims,” as is impudently insinuated; but he directly ascribes the whole effect of reconciliation, peace, atonement, remission of sins, and sanctification, unto the blood of Christ, as shed and offered unto God. And this he doth not only in this epistle, where he insists on this comparison, but in other places also, where he hath no regard unto it, <sup><B85></sup>Romans 3:25; <sup><B00></sup>Ephesians 1:7, 5:2, 25, 26; <sup><B14></sup>Titus 2:14; <sup><B01></sup>Colossians 1:20.

[5.] Having advanced thus far, in the close of his exposition he “excludes the blood of Christ from any more interest or efficiency in the purification of these heavenly things than the blood of goats and calves;” which is such an open contradiction unto the whole design and express words of the apostle, as that the assertion of it exceeds all the bounds of sobriety and modesty.

From the words thus opened, we may observe unto our own use, —

**Obs. IV.** Neither could heavenly things have been made meet for us or our use, nor we have been meet for their enjoyment, had they not been dedicated and we been purged by the sacrifice of Christ. — There was no suitableness either in them unto us, or in us unto them, until it was introduced by the blood of Christ. Without the efficiency hereof, heavenly things would not be heavenly unto the minds and souls of men; they would neither please them nor satisfy them, nor make them blessed. Unless they themselves are purged, all things, even heavenly things themselves, would be unclean and defiled unto them, <sup><B15></sup>Titus 1:15.

**Obs. V.** Every eternal mercy, every spiritual privilege, is both purchased for us and sprinkled unto us by the blood of Christ.

**Obs. VI.** There is such an uncleanness in our natures, our persons, our duties, and worship, that unless they and we are all sprinkled with the blood of Christ, neither we nor they can have any acceptance with God.

**Obs. VII.** The sacrifice of Christ is the one, only, everlasting fountain and spring of all sanctification and sacred dedication; whereby the whole new creation is purified and dedicated unto God.

### VERSE 24.

The opposition between the high priests of the law and their sacrifices, with their efficacy, and the Lord Christ with his sacrifice and its efficacy, is further carried on in this verse. And this is done in an instance of a dissimilitude between them, as it was showed in general before in how many things they did agree. And this dissimilitude consists in the place and manner of the discharge of their office, after the great expiatory sacrifice which each of them did offer.

The causal connection of the words doth also intimate that a further evidence is given unto what was before laid down, namely, that heavenly things were purified by the blood of Christ: ‘For, as an assurance thereof, upon the dedication of the new covenant he entered into heaven itself.’ Had he purified the things only on the earth, he could have entered only into an earthly sanctuary, as did the high priest of old. But he is entered, as the apostle now declares, into heaven itself; which, in the gracious presence of God therein, is the spring and center of all the things purified by his sacrifice.

**Ver. 24.**—Οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ’ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν νῦν ἐμρανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

**Εἰς ἅγια.** Syr., **לְבֵית מְקַדְשָׁא**, “into the house of the sanctuary.”

“Sancta;” “sacrarium;” “sanctuarium;” “sancta sanctorum;” “the most holy place.” **Χειροποίητα.** “Manufact;” “manibus exstructa;” “built with hands.”

**Ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν.** Syr., **דְּאִיתְיָהּ דְּמוֹתָא דְּהוּ שְׁיִרָא**, “which is the similitude of that which is true.” Vulg., “exemplaria verorum;” “exemplar respondens veris illis;” “an example answering unto

the true,” a “resemblance of the true.” Τῷ προσώπῳ. Syr., כְּרִצּוּפָהּ  
 קִדְמָה, “before the face;” “faciei,” “vultui,” “conspectui;” “in the presence.”

**Ver. 24.** — For Christ is not entered into the holy places [*the sanctuary*] made with hands, the figures of the true; but into heaven itself; now to appear in the presence of God for us.

There is in the words a dissimilitude between the Lord Christ and the priests of the law, or an opposition between what was done by the one and the other. And one branch of the antithesis, as unto affirmation on the one hand, is included in the negation on the other; for in that he says, “He is not entered into the holy places made with hands,” it is affirmed that the high priest did so of old, and no more.

In the words there is,

1. The *subject* spoken of; that is “Christ.”
2. A *double proposition* concerning him:
  - (1.) *Negative*; that “he is not entered into the holy places made with hands.”
  - (2.) *Affirmative*; that he is so “into heaven itself.”
3. The end of what is so affirmatively ascribed unto him; “to appear in the presence of God for us.”

First, The subject spoken of is “Christ.” “Jesus,” saith the Vulgar Latin; but all Greek copies, with the Syriac, have “Christ.” From the 15th verse he had spoken indefinitely of the mediator of the new covenant, what he was to be, and what he had to do, whoever he were. This mediator and the high priest of the church are one and the same. He makes application of all he had said unto one singular person, — Christ, our high priest.

Secondly, That which in general is ascribed unto him, or spoken of him, both negatively and affirmatively, is an *entrance*. That which was the peculiar dignity of the high priest of old, wherein the principal discharge of his duty did consist, and whereon the efficacy of his whole ministration did depend, was, that he, and he alone, did enter into the holy place, the

typical representation of the presence of God. Wherefore such an entrance must our high priest have, after he had offered himself once for all.

This entrance of our high priest, as unto the place whereinto he entered, is expressed *first* negatively: “Not into the holy places made with hands.” The place intended is the sanctuary, or most holy place in the tabernacle. It is here expressed in the plural number, to answer the Hebrew קִדְשֵׁי קִדְשֵׁי; for so the LXX. render their reduplications wherewith they supply their want of superlatives. These holy places Christ entered not into.

A double description is here given of this place;

1. As unto its nature;

2. As unto its use: —

1. As unto its *nature*, it was “made with hands,” built by the hands of men. The manner of this building was part of its glory; for it relates unto the framing and erection of the tabernacle in the wilderness. And as this was wholly directed by God himself, so he endowed them in an extraordinary manner with singular skill and wisdom by whom the work was wrought. But as unto the thing itself, it is a diminution from its glory, not absolutely, but comparatively; — yet was still made by the hands of men, and so had no glory in comparison of that which doth excel, namely, “heaven itself.”

2. As unto the *use* of these “holies,” they were ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληξινῶν. Ἀντίτυπον is sometimes used for πρᾶγμα ἀντὶ τοῦ τύπου, — “that which is signified by the type;” and this we commonly call the antitype. So is the word used by the apostle Peter, <sup>GR21</sup>1 Peter 3:21; — the substance of what is typified. Sometimes it is used for τύπος ἀντι τοῦ πράγματος, — “the type and resemblance of the thing signified.” So is it here used, and well rendered “figures. And what the apostle calls ὑποδείγματα in the foregoing verse, he here calls ἀντίτυπα. They are therefore the same; only they express different respects and notions of the same things. As the delineation and representation of heavenly things in them were obscure and dark, they were ὑποδείγματα, “similitudes,” resemblances of heavenly things; as that representation which they had and made of them

was a transcript from the original pattern and idea in the mind of God, and showed unto Moses in the mount, they were ἀντίτυπα, or express “figures.”

And they were thus “figures of the true;” that is, the true holies. “True” in these expressions is opposed unto shadowy and typical, not unto that which is false or adulterated. So <sup><B17></sup>John 1:17, 18, “real,” “substantial;” the things originally signified in all these institutions.

This is a brief description of the place whereinto the high priest under the law did enter, wherein his great privilege did consist, and whereon the efficacy of all his other administrations did depend. And it is described,

- 1.** With respect unto its institution; it was “the most holy place,” peculiarly dedicated unto the reception of the especial pledges of the presence of God.
- 2.** As unto its fabric; it was “made with hands;” though of an excellent structure, directed by God himself, and framed by his especial command, yet was it in itself no more but the work of men’s hands.
- 3.** As unto its principal end and use; it was a “figure” and “resemblance” of heavenly things.” All God’s appointments in his service have their proper season, beauty, glory, and use; which are all, given them by his appointment. Even the things that were made with men’s hands had so, whilst they had the force of a divine institution. To enter into the presence of God, represented by the typical pledges of it in this place, was the height of what the high priest under the law attained unto. And this he did on the ground of the dedication and purification of the tabernacle by the blood of the sacrifices of goats and calves. And it may be said, ‘If the Lord Jesus Christ be the high priest of the church, hither or into this place he ought to have entered.’ I answer, He ought indeed so to have done, if by his sacrifice he had purified only earthly things; but whereas he had no such design, nor were the temporal things of the whole creation worth the purification with one drop of his blood, but they were things spiritual and heavenly that were purified by his sacrifice, he was not to “enter into the holy places made with hands, the figures of the true, but into heaven itself.”

*Secondly*, In opposition unto what is denied of him, and which is therein ascribed unto the high priest of the law, the place whereinto he did enter is called “heaven itself.” The entrance spoken of was *sacerdotal*, not triumphant and *regal*, as I have elsewhere declared. And by this “heaven itself,” a peculiar place is intended. The apostle hath in several places affirmed that in his ascension he “passed through the heavens,” and “was made higher than the heavens.” Wherefore by this “heaven itself,” some place that is called so by the way of eminency is intended. This in the Scripture is sometimes called “the heaven of heavens,” and “the third heaven;” the place of the peculiar residence of the presence, majesty, and glory of God, and of his throne; where all the blessed saints enjoy his presence, and all his holy angels minister unto him; — a place above all these aspect-able heavens, the heavens which we do behold.

The entrance of Christ into heaven as our high priest was into it as the temple of God; wherein the chief thing considerable is the throne of grace. For it is that which answers unto and was signified by the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place in the tabernacle: and there was nothing therein but the ark and the mercy-seat, with the cherubim of glory overshadowing them; which, as we have declared, was a representation of a throne of grace. He entered likewise into heaven triumphantly, as, it was the palace of God, the throne of the great King, and sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high; but this he did with respect unto the execution of his kingly office with authority and power. For as the offices of Christ are distinct, and their exercise is so also, so heaven itself, wherein he now dischargeth them all, is proposed unto us under diverse considerations, distinctly answering unto the work that the Lord Christ hath yet to perform therein.

**Obs. I.** And this serves unto the direction and encouragement of faith. — When we apply ourselves unto Christ to seek for aid for the subduing and destruction of our spiritual adversaries by his ruling power, — that mighty power “whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself,” — we consider him on the throne of majesty, in the full possession of “all power in heaven and in earth.” Hereby is faith both encouraged and directed in its acting or approach unto him. And when we go unto him for relief under our temptations, with a sense of the guilt of sin, which requires tenderness

and compassion, we consider him as in the temple of God, appearing as our high priest before the throne of grace, <sup><3014></sup>Hebrews 4:14-16.

**Obs. II.** This representation is the spring of all spiritual consolation. — God on a throne of grace, the Lord Christ before it in the exercise of his office with faithfulness, compassion, and power, is the spring and center of all the comforts of the church.

Schlichtingius affirms on this place, that these things are spoken of Christ only in “a neat and handsome metaphor, under which he is compared unto the priests of old.” And the whole of his discourse tends unto this, that it is a comparison framed or coined by the apostle for the illustration of what he intends. But this is not to interpret the meaning of his words, but directly to oppose his whole design. For it is not a fancied, framed comparison that the apostle insists on, but a declaration of the typical significancy of legal institutions; and his purpose is to manifest the accomplishment of them all in Christ alone.

Thirdly. The *end* of this sacerdotal entrance of Christ into heaven is expressed: “Now to appear in the presence of God for us.”

A further degree of opposition between our high priest and those of the law is expressed in these words. They entered into the holy place, to appear for the people, and to present their supplications unto God; but this was only in an earthly tabernacle, and that before a material ark and mercy-seat. In what is here ascribed unto Christ there are many differences from what was so done by them.

**1.** In the *time* of what he did or doth; **νῦν**, “now,” — at this present season, and always. What those others did was of no continuance; but this “NOW” is expressive of the whole season and duration of time from the entrance of Christ into heaven unto the consummation of all things. So he declares it in the next verse. He never departs out of the sanctuary to prepare for a new sacrifice, as they did of old. There is no moment of time, wherein it may not be said, ‘He now appeareth for us.’

**2.** In the *end* of his entrance into this heavenly sanctuary; **ἐμφανισθῆναι**, — that is, **εἰς τό**; “to appear.” Absolutely his entrance into heaven had other ends, but this is the only end of his entering into heaven as God’s temple, the seat of the throne of grace, as our high priest. And the whole

discharge of the remaining duties of his sacerdotal office are comprised in this word, as we shall immediately demonstrate.

**3.** In that he doth thus appear τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, — “vultui,” “conspectui,” “faciei Dei;” that is, the immediate presence of God, in opposition unto the typical symbols of it in the tabernacle, before which the high priest presented himself. The high priest appeared before the ark, the cherubim and mercy-seat, composed into the form of a throne: Christ enters into the real presence of God, standing in his sight, before his face; and this expresseth his full assurance of his success in his undertaking, and his full discharge from that charge of the guilt of sin which he underwent. Had he not made an end of it, had he not absolutely been freed from it, he could not have thus appeared with confidence and boldness in the presence of God.

**4.** This is said to be done ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, — “for us.” This refers only to “appear,” — to appear for us; that is, as we shall see, to do all things with God for us at the throne of grace, that we may be saved.

The words being opened, the nature of the thing itself, namely, of the present appearance of Christ in heaven, must be further inquired into. And it may be declared in the ensuing observations: —

**1.** It is an act of his *sacerdotal office*. Not only he who *is* our high priest doth so appear, but he so doth *as* the high priest of the church. For such was the duty of the high priest under the law, whereby it was typified and represented. His entrance into the holy place, and presentation of himself before the mercy-seat, was in the discharge of his office, and he did it by virtue thereof. And this is one principal foundation of the church’s comfort, namely, that the present appearance of Christ in the *presence* of God is a part of his office, a duty in the discharge of it.

**2.** It is such an act and duty of our high priest as *supposeth the offering of himself a sacrifice for sin* antecedently thereunto; for it was with the blood of the expiatory sacrifices offered before on the altar that the high priest entered into the holy place. It hath therefore regard unto his antecedent sacrifice, or his offering himself in his death and blood-shedding unto God. Without a supposition hereof he could not, as our high priest, have entered



into the sanctuary and have appeared in the presence of God. Wherefore,

---

**3.** It supposeth the *accomplishment of the work of the redemption of the church*. His words in this appearance before God are expressed, <sup><B704></sup>John 17:4, “I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do; and now I come unto thee.” He was sent of God into the world on this great errand, for this great work; and he returned not unto him, he appeared not in the presence of him that sent him, until he had fulfilled it, and was ready in all things to give an account of it unto the eternal glory of God.

**4.** In this his appearance *he presents himself unto God as a Lamb that had been slain*, <sup><B705></sup>Revelation 5:6. He is now alive, and lives for ever. But there must, as unto efficacy in this appearance, be a representation of his sacrifice, his suffering, his death, his blood, — of himself as a Lamb slain and offered unto God. And this was to be so in answer unto the blood of the expiatory sacrifice which the high priest carried into the holy place. For he was himself both the priest and the sacrifice, the offerer and the lamb. And as that blood was sprinkled before the ark and the mercy-seat, to apply the atonement made unto all the sacred pledges of God’s presence and good-will; so from this representation of the offering of Christ, of himself as “a Lamb that had been slain,” in this his appearance before God, doth all the application of its benefits unto the church proceed.

**5.** He thus appears *for us*. He is therein, therefore, the great representative of the church, or he represents the whole church of his redeemed unto God. There is more in it than *merely for our good*. It is as it were the appearance of an advocate, a law-appearance in the behalf of others. So is it declared <sup><B706></sup>1 John 2:1, 2. He will at the end of all present his whole church unto God, with the whole work of his love and grace accomplished towards them. He first so presents it unto himself, and then to God, <sup><B707></sup>Ephesians 5:26, 27. Now he presents them as the portion given unto him of God out of fallen mankind to be redeemed and saved; saying, “Behold I and the children which thou gavest me; thine they were, and thou gavest them to me.” I present them unto thy love and care, holy

Father, that they may enjoy all the fruits of thine eternal love, all the benefits of my death and sacrifice.’

**6.** This is the great *testimony* of the continuation of his love, care, and compassion towards the church, now he is in the height of his own glory. Love, care, and compassion, belong unto him in an especial manner as he is a high priest; which we have declared on many occasions. They are the spring of all his sacerdotal actings. And they are all witnessed unto in his perpetual appearance in the presence of God for us.

**7.** This also compriseth his being an *advocate*. He is hereby in a continual readiness to plead our cause against all accusations, which is the especial nature of his work as an advocate; which is distinct from his intercession, whereby he procures supplies of grace and mercy for us.

**8.** This account of the *appearance* of Christ before God on the throne of grace gives direction into a right apprehension of the way of the dispensation of all saving grace and mercy unto the church. The spring and fountain of it is God himself, not absolutely considered, but as on a throne of grace. Goodness, grace, love, and mercy, are natural unto him; but so also are righteousness and judgment. That he should be on a throne of grace is an act of his sovereign will and pleasure, which is the original spring of the dispensation of all grace unto the church. The procuring cause of all grace and mercy for the church, as issuing from this throne of grace, is the sacrifice of Christ, whereby atonement was made for sin, and all heavenly things purified unto their proper end. Hence he is continually represented before this throne of God, “as a Lamb that had been slain.” The actual application of all grace and mercy unto the church, and every member of it, depends on this his appearance before God, and the intercession wherewith it is accompanied.

Schlichtingius grants on the place, that Christ doth indeed “solicitously take care of the salvation of the church;” but “yet God,” saith he, “doth grant it of mere mercy, without any regard unto satisfaction or merit; which,” saith he, “we exclude.” And the Only reason he gives for their so doing is this, that “where there is satisfaction or merit, there is no need of oblation, appearance, or intercession.” But this fancy (opposed unto the wisdom of God in the dispensation of himself and his grace) ariseth from their corrupt notion of these things. If the oblation of Christ, with his

appearance in heaven and intercession, were nothing but what they imagine them to be, — that is, his appearance in heaven with all power committed unto him, and the administration of it for our good, — his satisfaction and merit could not directly be thence proved. Yet also on the other hand are they no way disproved thereby; for they might be antecedently necessary unto the exercise of this power. But the argument is firm on the other hand. There is in the dispensation of grace and mercy respect had unto satisfaction and merit, because it is by the blood and sacrifice of Christ, as it is the design of the apostle to declare. For whereas he was therein an “offering for sin,” was “made sin for us,” and “bare our sins,” undergoing the penalty or curse of the law due unto them, which we call his satisfaction or sufferings in our stead; and whereas all that he did antecedently unto the oblation of himself for the salvation of the church, he did it in a way of obedience, unto God, by virtue of the compact or covenant between the Father and him for our salvation unto his glory, which we call his merit: unto these there is respect in the dispensation of grace, or the Lord Christ lived and died in vain.

But to declare their apprehension of these things, the same author adds:

“Porro in pontifice legali, apparitio distincta erat ab oblatione, licet utraque erat conjuncta et simul fieret; nempe quia alius erat pontifex, alia victima; et apparebat quidem pontifex, offerebatur autem victima, seu sanguis victimae: at nostri pontificis et oblatio et apparitio, quemadmodum et interpellatio, reipsa idem sunt; quia nimirum idem est pontifex et victima. Dum enim apparet Christus, seipsum offert; et dum seipsum offert, apparet; dum autem et offert et apparet, interpellat.”

1. It is not true that the oblation or offering of the sacrifice by the high priest, and his appearance in the holy place, “was at the same time;” for he offered his sacrifice at the altar without, and afterwards entered with the blood into the holy place.
2. He grants that the blood of the sacrifice was offered; but will not allow that the blood of Christ was offered at all, nor that Christ offered himself before he had laid aside both flesh and blood, having no such thing belonging unto him.

3. That the sacrifice of Christ, his oblation, appearance, and intercession, are all one and the same, and that nothing but his power and care in heaven for the salvation of the church are intended by them, is an imagination expressly contradictory unto the whole design and all the reasonings of the apostle in the context. For he carefully distinguisheth these things one from the other, showeth the different and distinct times of them under the old testament, declareth their distinct natures, acts, and effects, with the different places of their performance. Violence also is offered unto the signification of the words, and the common notion of things intended by them, to make way for this conceit. In common use and force, *προσφορά* or *ζυσία* are one thing, and *ἐμφανισμός* and *ἔντευξις* are others. It is true, the Lord Christ is in him self both the priest and the sacrifice; but it doth not thence follow that his offering of himself and his appearance in the presence of God for us are the same, but only that they are the acts of the same person.

This continual appearance of the Lord Christ for us, as our high priest in the presence of God, in the way explained, is the foundation of the safety of the church in all ages, and that whereon all our consolation doth depend; whence relief is derived by faith on all occasions. The consideration hereof being rightly improved will carry us through all difficulties, temptations, and trials, with safety unto the end.

### VERSE 25.

Οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ.

Οὐδέ. Syr., *לְךָ אֵין*, “and not also;” “*neque,*” “*neither;*” “nor yet.”

Ἐαυτόν. Syr., *נַפְשׁוֹ*, “his soul;” he made his soul an offering for sin.

Πολλάκις. Syr., *אִתְּרַבְּנָא אִתְּרַבְּנָא*, “many times.” Ἐν αἵματι

ἄλλοτρίῳ. Syr., *בְּדָמָא דְלֵיהּ*, “in” or “with blood that was not his own,” properly, Heb., *בְּדָמַם אֲחֵרִים*, “with other blood,” or the blood of another.

**Ver. 25.** — Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others.

In the foregoing verse there is an opposition in the comparison between the Lord Christ and the high priest of the law; yet is it such as hath its foundation in a similitude that is between them, and therefore respects not so much the things themselves opposed as, the manner of them. For as the Lord Christ entered not into the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself; so the high priest had an entrance also, yet not into heaven, but into that other holy place. But in this verse there is an opposition in the comparison that hath no foundation in any similitude between them, and that is absolutely denied of Christ which belonged essentially unto the discharge of the office of the high priest of old. Many things ensued on the weakness and imperfection of the types which would not allow that there should be a perfect, complete resemblance in them of the substance itself, that all things between them should exactly answer unto one another. Hence they did at best but obscurely represent the good things to come, and in some things it was not possible but there should be a great discrepancy between them.

The assertion in these words proceeds on a supposition of the duty of the high priest, which had that reason for it, as that it was absolutely necessary that our high priest should not do after the same manner. The high priest ended not his work of offering sacrifice by his entrance into the holy place with the blood of it, but he was to repeat the same sacrifice again every year. This, therefore, in correspondence with this type, might be expected from Christ also, namely, that whereas he offered himself unto God through the eternal Spirit, and afterwards entered into the holy place, or heaven itself, he should offer himself again, and so have another entrance into the presence of God. This the apostle denies him to have done; and in the next verse gives a demonstration, proving it was impossible he should so do. And hereof he gives the reason both in the remaining verses of this chapter and the beginning of the next. The repetition of the annual sacrifices under the law was mainly from hence, because they were not able *perfectly to effect* that which they did signify; but the one sacrifice of Christ did at once perfectly accomplish what they did represent. Herein, therefore, of necessity there was to be a difference, a dissimilitude, an opposition between what those high priests did as unto the repetition of sacrifices, and what was done by our high priest, which is expressed in this verse.

The introduction of the apostle's assertion is by the disjunctive negative, οὐδέ, "nor yet." It answers the negative in the first part of the preceding verse: 'He entered not into the holy place made with hands, as the high priest; nor yet did what the high priest did afterwards.'

In the words themselves there are two things:

1. *What is denied* of the Lord Christ.
2. The *limitation of that denial* unto the other part of the comparison, as unto what the high priest did: —

First, It is denied of him that he did thus enter into heaven that he should offer himself often. 'It doth not follow,' saith the apostle, 'that because as a high priest he entered into heaven, as the high priest of the law entered into the holy place made with hands, he should therefore offer himself often, as that high priest offered every year.' It was not required of him; there was no need of it, for the reasons mentioned; it was impossible he should. For this offering of himself was not his appearance in the presence of God; but the one sacrifice of himself by death, as the apostle declares in the next verse. That he should so offer himself often, more than once, was needless, from the perfection of that one offering, — "By one offering he hath for ever perfected them that were sanctified;" and impossible, from the condition of his person, — he could not die often. What remains for the exposition of these words will be declared in the removal of those false glosses and wrestings of them whereby some endeavor to pervert them.

The Socinians plead from hence that the *sacrifice of Christ*, or his offering of himself, is the same with his *appearance* in heaven and the presentation of himself in the presence of God; and they do it out of hatred unto the atonement made by his blood. For, say they, "it is here compared unto the entrance of the high priest into the holy place every year; which was only an appearance in the presence of God."


*Ans.* 1. There is no such comparison intended in the words. The apostle mentioning the entrance of the high priest with blood into the holy place, intends only to evince the imperfection of that service, in that after he had done so he was again to offer renewed sacrifices every year; a sufficient evidence that those sacrifices could never make them perfect who came unto God by them. With Christ it was not so, as the apostle declares. So

that there is not herein a comparison between the things themselves, but an opposition between their effects.

**2.** It is granted that the entrance of the high priest into the holy place belonged unto the complement or perfection of his service in the expiatory sacrifice. But the sacrifice itself did not consist therein. So likewise did the entrance of Christ into heaven belong unto the perfection of the effects and efficacy of his sacrifice, as unto the way of its application unto the church. So far there is a comparison in the words, and no farther.

**3.** That the sacrifice of Christ, or his offering himself once for all, *once, and not often*, is the same with his continual presentation of himself in the presence of God, is both false in itself and contrary to the express design of the apostle. For, —

**(1.)** It is *ζυσία*, a *slain or bloody sacrifice*, whereof he treats, as he expressly calls it, verse 26; but there is no shedding of blood in the appearance of Christ in heaven; nor, according to these men, any such thing appertaining unto his nature.

**(2.)** These things are *distinguished* in the Scripture, from their different natures and effects,  1 John 2:1, 2.

**(3.)** His *sacrifice*, or the offering of himself, is so affirmed to be one, as to consist in one individual act. It is not only said that it was “one offering,” but that. it was “once” only “offered,” verses 26, 28. This is no way reconcilable unto his *continual appearance* in the presence of God.

**(4.)** His *offering* is mentioned by the apostle as that which was then *past*, and no more to be repeated: “He hath by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”

**(5.)** His oblation was accompanied with, and inseparable from suffering; so he declares in the next verse, proving that he could not often oiler himself, because he could not often suffer. But his presentation of himself in heaven is not only inconsistent with *actual suffering*, but also with any obnoxiousness thereunto. It belongs unto his state of exaltation and glory.

**(6.)** The *time of the offering of himself* is limited unto the end of the world, “Now once in the end of the world,” in opposition unto the season that

passed before; denoting a certain determinate season in the dispensation of times; of which afterwards.

(7.) This imagination is destructive of the principal design and argument of the apostle. For he proves the imperfection of the sacrifices of the law, and their insufficiency to consummate the church, from their *annual repetition*; affirming, that if they could have perfected the worshippers they would have ceased to have been offered: yet was that sacrifice which he respects repeated only once a-year. But on this supposition, the sacrifice of Christ must be offered always, and never cease to be actually offered; which reflects a greater imperfection on it than was on those which were repeated only once a year. But the apostle expressly affirms that the sacrifice which could effect its end must “cease to be offered,” ~~scilicet~~ Hebrews 10:2. Whereas, therefore, “by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,” he doth not continue to offer himself; though he doth continue to appear in the presence of God to make application of the virtue of that one offering unto the church.

The expositors of the Roman church do raise an objection on this place, for no other end but that they may return an answer unto it perniciously opposite unto and destructive of the truth here taught by the apostle; though some of them do acknowledge that it is capable of another answer. But this is that which they principally insist upon as needful unto their present cause. They say, therefore, “That if Christ cease to offer himself, then it seems that his sacerdotal office ceaseth also; for it belongs unto that office to offer sacrifices continually.” But there is no force in this objection; for it belonged to no priest to offer any other or any more sacrifices but what were sufficient and effectual unto the end of them and their office. And such was the one sacrifice of Christ. Besides, though it be not *actually repeated*, yet it is *virtually applied* always; and this belongs unto the present discharge of his sacerdotal office. So doth also his appearance in heaven for us, with his intercession; where he still continues in the actual exercise of his priesthood, so far as is needful or possible. But they have an answer of their own unto their own objection. They say, therefore, that “Christ continueth to offer himself every day in the sacrifice of the mass, by the hands of the priests of their church.” And, “This sacrifice of him, though it be unbloody, yet is a true, real sacrifice of Christ; the same with that which he offered on the cross.”



It is better never to raise objections than thus to answer them. For this is not to expound the words, but to dispute against the doctrine of the apostle, as I shall briefly evince: —

**1.** That the Lord Christ hath “by the *one offering of himself* for ever perfected them that are sanctified,” is a fundamental article of faith. Where this is denied or overthrown, either directly or by just consequence, the church is overthrown also. But this is expressly denied in the doctrine of the frequent repetition of his sacrifice, or of the offering of himself. And there is no instance wherein the Romanists do more expressly oppose the fundamental articles of religion.

**2.** The *repetition* of sacrifices arose solely from their imperfection, as the apostle declares, <sup>5800</sup>Hebrews 10:1, 2. And if it undeniably proved an imperfection in the sacrifices of the law that they were repeated once every year, in one place only, how great must the imperfection of the sacrifice of Christ be esteemed, if it be not effectual to take away sin and perfect them that are sanctified unless it be *repeated every day, and that, it may be, in a thousand places!*

**3.** To say that Christ offereth himself often, is expressly and in terms contradictory to the assertion of the apostle. Whatever, therefore, they may apprehend of the offering of him by their priests, yet most certain it is that he doth not every day offer himself. But as the faith of the church is concerned in no offering of Christ but that which he offered himself, of himself, by the eternal Spirit, once for all, so the pretense to offer him often by the priests is highly sacrilegious.

**4.** The infinite actings of the divine nature in supporting and influencing of the human, the inexpressible operation of the Holy Ghost in him unto such a peculiar acting of all grace, especially of zeal unto the glory of God and compassion for the souls of men, as are inimitable unto the whole creation, were required unto the offering of himself a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savor unto God. And how can a poor sinful mortal man, such as are the best of their priests, pretend to offer the same sacrifice unto God?

**5.** An *unbloody sacrifice* is,

**(1.)** A *contradiction in itself*. *Θυσία*, which is the only sacrifice which the apostle treats of, is “*victimae mactatio*,” as well as “*victimae mactatae*

oblatio.” It is a sacrifice by death, and that by blood-shedding; other ζυσία there never was any.

(2.) If it might be supposed, yet is it *a thing altogether useless*; for “without shedding of blood there is no remission.” The rule, I acknowledge, is firstly expressed with respect unto legal sacrifices and oblations: yet is it used by the apostle, by an argument drawn from the nature and end of those institutions, to prove the necessity of blood-shedding in the sacrifice of Christ himself for the remission of sin. An unbloody sacrifice for the re-minion of sin overthrows both the law and the gospel

(3.) It is directly *contrary unto the argument of the apostle* in the next verse; wherein he proves that Christ could not offer himself often. For he doth it by affirming, that if he did so then must he “often suffer;” that is, by the effusion of his blood, which was absolutely necessary in and unto his sacrifice. Wherefore an unbloody sacrifice, which is without suffering, whatever it be, is not the sacrifice of Christ; for if he be often offered, he must often suffer, as the apostle affirms. Nor is it unto any purpose to say, that this unbloody sacrifice of the mass receiveth its virtue and efficacy from the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross, as is pleaded by the defenders of it; for the question is not what value it hath, nor whence it hath it, but whether it be the sacrifice of Christ himself or no.

To sum up the substance of this whole controversy: The sacrifice or offering of Christ was,

1. By *himself alone*, through the eternal Spirit.
2. Was of *his whole human nature*, as to the matter of it. He made his soul an offering for sin.
3. Was by *death and blood-shedding*; whereon its entire efficacy as unto atonement, reconciliation, and the sanctification of the church, do depend.
4. Was *once only offered*, and could be so no more, from the glory of his person and the nature of the sacrifice itself.
5. Was offered with such *glorious internal actings* of grace as no mortal creature can comprehend.

**6.** Was accompanied with his *bearing the curse of the law* and the punishment due unto our sins; which were taken away thereby. And in all this the human nature was supported, sustained, and acted by the divine in the same person; which gave the whole duty its efficacy and merit. That pretended in the mass is,

**1.** *Offered by priests*, without him, or those which call themselves so; who therefore rather represent them by whom he was crucified than himself who offered himself alone.

**2.** Is only of *bread and wine*, which have nothing in them of the soul of Christ, allowing their transubstantiation.

**3.** Can have no influence into the remission of sins, being confessedly *unbloody*, whereas “without the shedding of blood there is no remission.”

**4.** Is *often offered*, — that is, every day; declaring a greater imperfection in it than was in the great expiatory sacrifice of the law, which was offered only once a year.

**5.** Requires unto it no *grace* in the offerer, but only an intention to do his office.

**6.** Doth in nothing answer the *curse of the law*, and therefore makes no atonement. Wherefore these things are so far from being the same sacrifice, as that they are opposite, inconsistent, and the admission of the one is the destruction of the other.

Some observations we may take from the text.

**Obs. I.** Such is the absolute perfection of the one offering of Christ, that it stands in need of, that it will admit of no repetition in any kind. Hence the apostle affirms that if it be despised or neglected, “there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin.” There is none of any other kind, nor any repetition to be made of itself, as there was of the most solemn legal sacrifices. Neither of them is consistent with its perfection. And this *absolute perfection* of the one offering of Christ ariseth,

**1.** From the *dignity of his person*, ~~Acts~~ Acts 20:28. There needs no new offering after that, wherein he who offered and who was offered was God and man in one person. The repetition of this offering is inconsistent with

the glory of the wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and grace of God, and would be utterly derogatory to the dignity of his person.

**2.** From the *nature of the sacrifice* itself:

(1.) In the internal *gracious actings* of his soul; He “offered himself unto God through the eternal Spirit.” Grace and obedience could never be more glorified.

(2.) In the *punishment* he underwent, answering and taking away the whole curse of the law; any further offering for atonement is highly blasphemous.

(3.) From the *love of the Father* unto him, and delight in him. As in his person, so in his one offering, the soul of God resteth and is well pleased.

(4.) From its *efficacy* unto all the ends of a sacrifice. Nothing was ever designed therein but was at once accomplished by this one offering of Christ. Wherefore, —

**Obs. II.** This one offering of Christ is always effectual unto all the ends of it, even no less than it was in the day and hour when it was actually offered. — Therefore it needs no repetition like those of old, which could affect the conscience of a sinner only for a season, and until the incursion of some new sin. This is always fresh in the virtue of it, and needs nothing but renewed application by faith for the communication of its effects and fruits unto us. Wherefore, —

**Obs. III.** The great call and direction of the gospel is to guide faith, and *keep* it up unto this one offering of Christ, as the spring of all grace and mercy. — This is the immediate end of all its ordinances of worship. In the preaching of the word, the Lord Christ is set forth as evidently crucified before our eyes; and in the ordinance of the supper especially is it represented unto the peculiar *exercise* of faith.

Secondly. But we must proceed to a brief exposition of the remainder of this verse. The one offering of Christ is not here proposed *absolutely*, but in opposition unto the high priest of the law, whose entrance into the holy place did not put an end unto his offering of sacrifices, but his whole service about them was to be annually repeated. This sacrifice of the high priest we have treated of before, and shall therefore now only open these words wherein it is expressed: —

1. The *person* spoken of is “the high priest;” that is, any one, every one that is so, or that was so in any age of the church from the institution of that priesthood unto the expiration of it. “As the high priest;” in like manner as he did.
2. It is affirmed of him, that he “entereth,” in the present tense. Some think that respect is had unto the continuance of the temple-service at that time. “lie entereth;” that is, he continueth so to do. And this the apostle sometimes admits of, as <sup><380B></sup>Hebrews 8:4. But in this place he intends no more but the constitution of the law. ‘According unto the law, he entereth. This is that which the law requires.’ And hereby, as in other instances, the apostle lays before their consideration a scheme of their ancient worship, as it was at first established, that it might be the better compared with the dispensation of the new covenant and the ministry of Christ.
3. This entrance is limited unto “the holy place;” the most holy place in the tabernacle or temple, the holy place made with hands.
4. There is the *season* of his entrance; “yearly:” once in an annual revolution, on the day fixed by the law, the tenth day of the month Tizri, or our September.
5. The *manner* of his entrance was, “with the blood of others;” “blood that was not his own,” as the Syriac expresseth it. The blood of the sacrifice of Christ was his own. He “redeemed the church διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος” <sup><40B></sup>Acts 20:28. Hereunto ἀλλότριον is opposed, — רַבִּי אֱלֹהִים, “other blood,” “the blood of others;” that is, the blood of bulls and goats offered in sacrifice: “in” for “cum,” say most expositors; which is not unusual. See <sup><61B></sup>1 John 5:6; <sup><12B></sup>Genesis 32:10; <sup><30B></sup>Hosea 4:3. The meaning is, by virtue of the blood of others, which he carried with him into the holy place.

That which is denied of Christ, the antitype, is the repetition of this service, and that because of the perfection of his sacrifice; the other being repeated because of their imperfection. And we may observe, that —

**Obs. IV.** Whatever had the greatest glory in the old legal institutions, carried along with it the evidence of its own imperfection, compared with the thing signified in Christ and his office. — The entrance of the high priest into the holy place was the most glorious solemnity of the law;

howbeit the annual repetition of it was a sufficient evidence of its imperfection, as the apostle disputes in the beginning of the next chapter.

### VERSE 26.

Ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταζολῆς κόσμου· νῦν δὲ ἄπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς ζυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφασέρωται.

Ἐπεὶ is properly causal; “quia,” “quandoquidem, quoniam.” But it is generally rendered in this place by all expositors, “alioquin,” by concession, — ‘If it were so that he would offer, offer himself;’ “for otherwise.” Ἐδει. Syr., ܕܥܝܢܐ ܫܢܝܐ, “he would have been a debtor;” it would have been due from him. “Oportebat,” “oportuisset;” “he ought.” Πολλάκις. Vulg., “frequenter pati.” Others, “saepe,” “saepius passum fuisse;” “to have suffered often,” “more often,” “frequently;” that is, once every year. Syriac, ܫܢܝܢܝܐ ܫܢܝܢܝܐ, “many times,” and not once only.

Ἀπὸ καταζολῆς κόσμου. Vulg., “aborigine mundi;” others, “a condito mundo,” “from the foundation of the world;” that is, after the entrance of sin. Ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων. Syr., ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ, “in the end of the world.” Vulg., “in consummatione saeculorum;” “sub consummationem saeculorum;” “towards the consummation of all things.” “In the fullness of time.” Εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, “ad peccatum abolendum,” “ad abolitionem peccati.” Vulg., “ad destructionem peccati;” Rhem., “the destruction of sin.” Πεφασέρωται, “apparuit,” “patefactus est.” “He was made manifest.” Διὰ τῆς ζυσίας αὐτοῦ. The Vulgar renders the words, “per hostiam suam apparuit;” which the Rhemists translate, “he hath appeared by his own host;” most absurdly, both as unto words and sense. Syr., “at one time he offered his soul by the sacrifice” or “immolation of himself.” What πεφασέρωται doth relate unto, we must inquire in the exposition of the words.<sup>f23</sup>

**Ver. 26.** — For then [*if otherwise*] must he [*he ought*] often [*to*] have suffered since [*from*] the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world [*in the consummation of times*] hath he appeared, [*been made manifest,*] to put away [*to abolish, or for the destruction of.*] sin by the sacrifice of himself.

There are sundry difficulties in these words, both as to the signification and construction of them, as also as unto their sense and importance, with the nature of the argument contained in them and the things treated of. I shall not repeat the various conjectures of expositors, most of which are alien from the mind of the apostle and easy to be refuted, if that belonged any way unto the edification of the reader; but I shall only give that account of the whole and the several parts of it which, according unto the best of my understanding, doth represent the mind of the Holy Ghost with perspicuity and clearness.

There are two parts of the words:

1. A *reason* confirming the foregoing assertion, that Christ was not often to offer himself, as the high priest did offer sacrifice every year when he entered into the holy place: “For then must he,” etc.
2. A *confirmation of that reason*, from the nature and end of the sacrifice of Christ, as stated in matter of fact according unto the appointment of God: “But now once in the end,” etc.

In the FIRST, we may consider,

1. The *note of connection* and of the introduction of the reason insisted on.
2. The *signification* or sense of the words.
3. The *ground and nature* of the argument contained in them.

First, The note of connection is ἐπεὶ, which we render, “for then:” ‘If it were so, namely; that Christ should often offer himself;’ ‘Had it been otherwise, that Christ had so offered himself:’ so we observed that most translate the word by “alioquin.” Either way the intention of the apostle is expressed, which is to confirm what he had before affirmed, by the introduction of a new reason of it.

Secondly, From a supposition of the contrary unto what he had affirmed, the apostle proves not only the truth but the necessity of his assertion.

“For then,”

1. “He must,” “he ought,” “he would have been a debtor,” as the Syriac speaks; it would have been due from him, and indispensably required of him. It would have been so “necessitate medii,” which is the greatest in divine institutions and duties. There could have been no such thing, unless that which he now infers from it be allowed, which was utterly impossible.
2. That which he ought so to have done, is “to suffer” in the offering of himself. All the sufferings of Christ, in the whole course of his humiliation and obedience, are sometimes expressed by this word, as <sup><4308></sup>Hebrews 5:8. But the suffering here intended is that of his death, and the shedding of his blood therein alone; that which accompanied and was inseparable from his actual sacrifice, or the mactation of himself; — ‘to have died, to have shed his blood, to have underwent the penalty and curse of the law.’
3. “Often,” “frequently,” as the high priest offered sacrifice of old once every year.
4. “Since,” or rather, “from the foundation of the world.” This expression is sometimes used absolutely for the original of the world in its creation, for the absolute beginning of time and all things measured by it., <sup><4004></sup>Ephesians 1:4; <sup><4153></sup>Matthew 25:34; <sup><4172></sup>John 17:24; <sup><4101></sup>1 Peter 1:20; — sometimes for what immediately succeeded on that beginning, <sup><4135></sup>Matthew 13:35; <sup><4151></sup>Luke 11:50; <sup><3008></sup>Hebrews 4:3; <sup><4138></sup>Revelation 13:8. And it is in the latter sense that it is here used. “From the foundation of the world;” that is, from the first entrance of sin into the world, and the giving of the first promise, which was immediately after the creation of it, or its foundation and constitution in its original frame. This is the first thing on record in the Scripture. So “God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began, <sup><4170></sup>Luke 1:70; that is, the first revelation of God unto the church concerning the Messiah, with all that succeeded. So Christ is said to be a “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” <sup><4138></sup>Revelation 13:8; because of the efficacy of his sacrifice extending itself unto the first entrance of sin, and the promise thereon, immediately on the foundation of the world. Wherefore, “The foundation of the world” absolutely is in its creation. “Before the foundation of the world,” is an expression of eternity, and the counsels of God therein, <sup><4004></sup>Ephesians 1:4;



¶ Peter 1:20. “From the foundation of the world,” is mostly from the first entrance of sin, and God’s dispensation of grace in Christ thereon.

Thirdly, The third thing considerable in the words is the nature and force of the argument contained in them. And it is taken from the most cogent topics; for it is founded on these evident suppositions: —

**1.** That *the suffering and offering of Christ are inseparable*. For although, abstracted from the present subject-matter, suffering is one thing and offering another, yet the Lord Christ offered himself unto God in and by his suffering of death. And the reason hereof is, because he himself was both the priest and the sacrifice. The high priest of old offered often, yet never once suffered therein. For he was not the sacrifice itself. It was the lamb that was slain that suffered. Christ being both, he could not offer without suffering; no more than the high priest could offer without the suffering of the beast that was slain.

And herein doth the force of the argument principally consist. For he proves that Christ did not, nor could offer himself often; not absolutely, as though the reiteration of any kind of oblation were impossible, but from the nature of his especial offering or sacrifice, which was with and by suffering, — that is, his death and blood-shedding. And this wholly explodes the Socinian imagination of the nature of the offering of Christ. [For if his offering might be separated from his suffering, and were nothing but the presentation of himself in the presence of God in heaven, it might have been reiterated without any inconvenience, nor would there have been any force in the arguing of the apostle; for if his oblation be only that presentation of himself, if God had ordered that it should have been done only at certain seasons, as once every year, nothing inconvenient would have ensued.

But the argument of the apostle against the repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, from the necessity of his suffering therein, is full of light and evidence; for, —

**(1.)** It was inconsistent with the wisdom, goodness, grace, and love of God, that Christ should often suffer in that way which was necessary unto the offering of himself, namely, by his death and blood-shedding. It was not consistent with the wisdom of God to provide that as the ultimate

and only effectual means of the expiation of sin which was insufficient for it; for so it would have been if the repetition of it had been necessary. Nor was it so with his unspeakable love unto his Son, namely, that he should frequently suffer an ignominious and cursed death. It is the eternal object of the admiration of men and angels, that he should do it *once*. Had it been done *often*, who could have understood the love of the Father unto the Son, and not rather have conceived that he regarded him not in comparison of the church? whereas indeed his love to him is greater than that unto all others, and the cause of it. And moreover, it would have been highly dishonorable unto the Son of God, giving an appearance that his blood was of no more value or excellency than the blood of beasts, the sacrifice whereof was often repeated.

(2.) It was impossible, from the dignity of his person. Such a repetition of suffering was not consistent with the glory of his person, especially as it was necessary to be demonstrated unto the salvation of the church. That he once “emptied himself, and made himself of no reputation,” that he might be “obedient unto death, the death of the cross,” proved a stumbling-block unto the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles. The faith of the church was secured by the evident demonstration of his divine glory which immediately ensued thereon. But as the frequent repetition hereof would have been utterly inconsistent with the dignity of his divine person, so the most raised faith could never have attained a prospect of his glory.

(3.) It was altogether needless, and would have been useless. For, as the apostle demonstrates, “by one offering” of himself, and that *once offered*, “he put away sin,” and “for ever perfected them that are sanctified.”

Wherefore the argument of the apostle is firm on this supposition, that if he were often to offer himself then was he often to suffer also. But that he should so do, was, as inconsistent with the wisdom of God and the dignity of his own person, so altogether needless as unto the end of his offering. And, —

**Obs. I.** As the sufferings of Christ were necessary unto the expiation of sin, so he suffered neither more nor oftener than was necessary.

2. The argument is also built on another supposition, namely, that *there was a necessity for the expiation of the sin of all that were to be saved from*

*the foundation of the world.* For otherwise it might be objected, that there was no need at all that Christ should either offer or suffer before he did so, and that now it may be yet necessary that he should often offer himself, seeing that all sins before were either punished absolutely, or their sins were expiated and themselves saved some other way. And those by whom this supposition is rejected, as it is by the Socinians, can give no color of force unto the argument of the apostle, although they invent many *allusions*, whereby they endeavor to give countenance unto it. But whereas he discourseth of the only way and means of the expiation of sin, to prove that it was done at once, by the one offering of Christ, which needed no repetition, he supposeth,

- (1.) That sin entered into the world from the foundation of it, or immediately upon its foundation, namely, in the sin and apostasy of our first parents.
- (2.) That notwithstanding this entrance of it, many who were sinners, as the patriarchs from the beginning, and the whole Israel of God under the old testament, had their sins expiated, pardoned, and were eternally saved.
- (3.) That none of the sacrifices which they offered themselves, none of the religious services which they performed,, either before or under the law, could expiate sin, or procure the pardon thereof, or consummate them in conscience before God.
- (4.) That all this, therefore, was effected by virtue of the sacrifice or one offering of Christ. Hence it follows unavoidably, that if the virtue of this one offering did not extend unto the taking away of all their sins, then he must often have suffered and offered from the foundation of the world, or they must all have perished, at least all but only those of that generation wherein he might have once suffered. But this he did not, he did not thus often offer himself; and therefore there was no need that he should so do, though it was necessary that the high priest under the law should repeat his every year. For if the virtue of his one offering did extend itself unto the expiation of the sins of the church from the foundation of the world, before it was offered, much more might and would it extend itself without any repetition unto the expiation of the sins of the whole church unto the end of the world, now it is actually offered. This is the true force and

reason of the argument in these words, which is cogent and conclusive. And we may hence observe, that, —

**Obs. II.** The assured salvation of the church of old from the foundation of the world, by virtue of the one offering of Christ, is a strong confirmation of the faith of the church at present to look for and expect everlasting salvation thereby. To this end we may consider, —

(1.) That *their* faith had all the difficulties to conflict withal that *our* faith is to be exercised with, and yet it carried them through them all, and was victorious. This argument, for the strengthening of our faith, the apostle insists upon in the whole 11th chapter throughout. In particular,

[1.] They had *all the trials, afflictions, and temptations*, that we have; — some of them unto such a degree as the community of believers met not withal. Yet was not their faith by any of them prevailed against. And why should we despond under the same trials?

[2.] They had all of them the *guilt of sin*, in the same or the like kind with us. Even Elijah was a man subject unto the like passions with others. Yet did not their sins hinder them from being brought unto the enjoyment of God. Nor shall ours, if we walk in the steps of their faith.

[3.] They had all the *same enemies* to conflict withal that we have. Sin, the world, and Satan, made no less opposition unto them than they do unto us. Yet were they victorious against them all. And following their example, we may look for the same success.

(2.) They wanted many advantages of faith and holiness which we enjoy. For,

[1.] They had not a clear revelation of the nature of God's way of salvation. This is that which gives life and vigor unto gospel-faith. Yet did they follow God through the dark representation of his mind and grace unto the eternal enjoyment of him. We cannot miss our way, unless we wilfully "neglect so great salvation."

[2.] They had not such plentiful communications of the Holy Spirit as are granted under the gospel; but being faithful in that little which they received, they missed not of the reward.

[3.] They had not that light, those directions for the actings of faith unto consolation and assurance, with many more advantages unto all the ends of faith and obedience, which believers now enjoy; yet in this state and condition, by virtue of the one offering of Christ, they were all pardoned and eternally saved. The consideration hereof tends greatly to the confirmation of the faith of them who truly believe.

SECONDLY, The latter part of this verse contains the confirmation of the argument proposed in the former. And it consists in a declaration of the true state, nature, efficacy, and circumstances of the one offering of Christ, now accomplished according unto the will of God.

There are three things in the words:

1. An opposition unto, or a rejection of the supposition of Christ's offering himself often since the foundation of the world.
2. An assertion of the use, end, and efficacy of that offering, manifesting the uselessness of its repetition.
3. The means of accomplishing that end, or whereby he came to offer himself.

The opposition unto the rejected supposition is in these words, "But now once in the end of the world." And every word hath its distinct force in the opposition: —

1. As unto the time in general: "But now." *Nῦν*," now, generally is a limitation of time unto the present season; opposed to *τότε*, "then." But sometimes it is only a note of opposition, when joined with *δέ*, "but," as in this place. It may be taken in either sense, or include both. In the latter, "But now," is no more, 'But it is not so, it is otherwise, and so declared to be; he did not offer himself often since the world began.' A limitation of time may also be included in it. 'Now, at this time and season, it is declared that things are otherwise ordered and disposed.' This makes the opposition more emphatical. 'Now it is, and now only, that Christ hath suffered, and not before.'

2. He did this "once," *ἅπαξ*; which is opposed unto *πολλάκις*, "often." The apostle useth this word on this occasion, verse 28, <sup><380D></sup>Hebrews 10:2. So <sup><412B></sup>1 Peter 3:18. So he doth *ἐφάπαξ*, "once for all," <sup><380D></sup>Hebrews 10:10.

He hereby confines our thoughts about the offering of Christ unto that time and action wherein he offered himself unto God in his death. He speaks of it as a thing once performed, and then past; which cannot be referred unto the continual presentation of himself in heaven. ‘Thus it is,’ saith he, in matter of fact, ‘he hath not often, but once only, offered himself.’

**3.** He confirms his opposition unto the rejected supposition by an especial denotation of the time when he once offered himself. He did it “in the end of the world,” — ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων: in opposition unto ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. ‘Not then, but now; not often, but once; not from the foundation of the world, but in the end of it.’

There is no question as unto the thing itself, or the time intended in this exposition. It was the time when our Lord Jesus Christ appeared in the flesh, and offered himself unto God. But why he should express that time by “the end of the world,” in the words that our Savior designeth the end of the world absolutely by, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>Matthew 28:20, is not so plain; for there was after this a long continuance and duration of the world to succeed, — so far as any knows, not less than what was past before it.

Various are the conjectures of learned men about this expression; I shall not detain the reader with their repetition. My thoughts are determined by what I have discoursed on <sup>Ⓜ</sup>Hebrews 1:1, 2; the exposition of which place the reader may consult on this occasion, I hope unto his satisfaction. In brief, to give a short account of what more largely I have explained and fully confirmed in the place referred unto, αἰών and αἰῶνες do answer unto the Hebrew עֲלֵיָם and עַלְמֵיָם. And “the world,” not absolutely with respect unto its essence or substance, but its duration and the succession of ages therein, is signified by them. And the succession of the times of the world is considered with reference unto God’s distinction and limitation of things in his dealing with the church, called οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>Ephesians 1:10. And God’s distinction of time with respect unto the dispensation of himself in his grace to the church, may be referred unto three general heads: first, *the time before the law*; secondly, *that which was spent under the law*; thirdly, *that of the exhibition of Christ in the flesh*, with all that doth succeed it unto the end of the world. This last season, absolutely considered, is called πλήρωμα

τῶν καιρῶν, “the fullness of time,” when all that God had designed in the dispensation of his grace was come unto that head and consistency wherein no alteration should be made unto the end of the world. This is that season which, with respect unto those that went before, is called συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, “the end of the world,” or the last age of the world, the consummation of the dispensation of time, no change being afterwards to be introduced, like those which were made before in the dispensation of God. This season, with respect unto the coming of Christ unto the Judaical church, is called יְמֵי הַיְיָ, the “latter days,” or the “end of the days;” namely, of that church-state, of the dispensation of God in that season. With respect unto the whole dispensation of God in the עוֹלָמִים, all the allotted ages of the church, it was the last or end of them all; it was that wherein the whole divine disposition of things had its consummation. Wherefore both the entrance and the end of this season are called by the same name, — the beginning of it here, and the end of it <sup>1893</sup>Matthew 28:20; for the whole is but one entire season. And the preposition ἐπὶ, in this construction with a dative case, signifies the entrance of any thing; as ἐπὶ ζανάτῳ is “at the approach of death” Wherefore, whatever hath been, or may be in the duration of the world afterwards, the appearance of Christ to offer himself was ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, “in the end of the world;” that is, at the entrance of the last season of God’s dispensation of grace unto the church. ‘Thus it was,’ saith the apostle, ‘in matter of fact; then did Christ offer himself, and then only.’

With respect unto this season so stated, three things are affirmed of Christ in the following words:

1. *What he did*; “he appeared.”
2. *Unto what end*; “to take away sin.”
3. *By what means*; “by the sacrifice of himself.”

But there is some difficulty in the distinction of these words, and so variety in their interpretation, which must be removed. For these words, διὰ τῆς ζυσίας “by the sacrifice of himself,” may be referred either unto εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας “the putting away of sin,” that goes before; or unto πεφανέρωται, “was manifest,” that follows after. In the first way

the sense is, ‘He was manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;’ — in the latter, ‘He appeared by the sacrifice of himself to put away sin;’ which confines his appearance unto his sacrifice; which sense is expressed by the Vulgar translation, “per hostiam suam apparuit.” “He appeared by his own host,” say the Rhemists. But the former reading of the words is evidently unto the mind of the apostle; for his appearance was what he did in general with respect unto the end mentioned, and the way whereby he did it.

**1.** There is what he did, — “he appeared,” “he was manifested.” Some say that this appearance of Christ is the same with his appearance in the presence of God for us, mentioned in the foregoing verse. But it is, as another word that is used, so another thing that is intended. That appearance was after his sacrifice, this is in order unto it; that is in heaven, this was on earth; that is still continued, this is that which was already accomplished, at the time limited by the apostle. Wherefore this “appearance,” this **φανερωσις** or “manifestation” of Christ in the end of the world, is the same with his being “manifested in the flesh,” <sup><S0B6>1</sup> Timothy 3:16; or his coming into the world, or taking on him the seed of Abraham, to this end, that he might suffer and offer himself unto God. For what is affirmed is opposed unto what is spoken immediately before, namely, of his suffering often since the foundation of the world. This he did not do, but appeared, was manifested, (that is, in the flesh,) in the end of the world, to suffer and to expiate sin. Nor is the word ever used to express the appearance of Christ before God in heaven. His **φανερωσις** is his coming into the world by his incarnation, unto the discharge of his office; his appearance before God in heaven is his **ἐμφανισμός**; and his illustrious appearance at the last day is his **ἐπιφάνεια**, though that word be used also to express his glorious manifestation by the gospel, <sup><S110>2</sup> Timothy 1:10. See <sup><S0B6>1</sup> Timothy 3:16; <sup><A88>1</sup> John 3:8; <sup><S12>1</sup> Titus 2:13. This, therefore, is the meaning of the word: ‘Christ did not come into the world, he was not manifested in the flesh, often since the foundation of the world, that he might often suffer and offer; but he did so, he so appeared, was so manifested, in the end of the world.’

**2.** The *end* of this appearance of Christ was to “put away sin.” And we must inquire both what is meant by “sin,” and what by the “putting of it away.” Wherefore by “sin,” the apostle intends the whole of its nature and



effects, in its root and fruits, in its guilt, power, and punishment; sin *absolutely and universally*; sin as it was an apostasy from God, as it was the cause of all distance between God and us, as it was the work of the devil; sin in all that it was and all that it could effect, or all the consequents of it; sin in its whole empire and dominion, — as it entered by the fall of Adam, invaded our nature in its power, oppressed our persons with its guilt, filled the whole world with its fruits, gave existence and right unto death and hell, with power to Satan to rule in and over mankind; sin, that rendered us obnoxious unto the curse of God and eternal punishment. In the whole extent of sin, “he appeared to put it away;” — that is, with respect unto the church, that is sanctified by his blood, and dedicated unto God..

Ἀθέτησις, which we render “*putting away*,” is “abrogatio,” “dissolutio,” “destructio;” an “abrogation,” “disannulling,” “destroying,” “disarming.” It is the name of taking away the force, power, and obligation of a law. The power of sin, as unto all its effects and consequents, whether sinful or penal, is called its *law*, the “law of sin,” <sup><480></sup>Romans 8:2. And of this law, as of others, there are two parts or powers:

(1.) Its *obligation unto punishment*, after the nature of all penal laws; hence it is called “the law of death,” that whereon sinners are bound over unto eternal death. This force it borrows from its relation unto the law of God and the curse thereof.

(2.) Its *impelling, ruling power*, subjectively in the minds of men, leading them captive into all enmity and disobedience unto God, <sup><482></sup>Romans 7:23. Christ appeared to abrogate this law of sin, to deprive it of its whole power,

(1.) That it should not *condemn* us any more, nor bind us over to punishment. This he did by making atonement for it, by the expiation of it, undergoing in his own suffering the penalty due unto it; which of necessity he was to suffer as often as he offered himself. Herein consisted the ἀθέτησις or “abrogation” of its law principally.

(2.) By the *destruction of its subjective power*, purging our consciences from dead works, in the way that hath been declared. This was the principal end of the appearance of Christ in the world, <sup><488></sup>1 John 3:8.

**3.** The way whereby he did this, was “by the sacrifice of himself,” — διὰ τῆς ζυσίας αὐτοῦ for ἑαυτοῦ: that sacrifice wherein he both suffered and offered himself unto God. For that both are included, the opposition made unto his often suffering doth evince.

This, therefore, is the design and meaning of these words: — to evidence that Christ did not offer himself unto God often, more than once, as the high priest offered every year, before his entrance into the holy place, the apostle declares the end and effect of his offering or sacrifice, which rendered the repetition of it needless. It was one, once offered, in the end of the world; nor need be offered any more, because of the total abolition and destruction of sin at once made thereby. What else concerns the things themselves spoken of will be comprised under the ensuing observations.

**Obs. III.** It is the prerogative of God, and the effect of his wisdom, to determine the times and seasons of the dispensation of himself and his grace unto the church. — Hereon it depended alone that Christ “appeared in the end of the world,” not sooner nor later, as to the parts of that season. Many things do evidence a condecency unto divine wisdom in the determination of that season; as,

- 1.** He testified his displeasure against sin, in suffering the generality of mankind to lie so long under the fatal effects of their apostasy, without relief or remedy, <sup><4446></sup> Acts 14:16, 17:30; <sup><4029></sup> Romans 1:21-24, 26.
- 2.** He did it to exercise the faith of the church, called by virtue of the promise, in the expectation of its accomplishment. And by the various ways whereby God cherished their faith and hope was he glorified in all ages, <sup><4107></sup> Luke 1:70; <sup><4037></sup> Matthew 13:17; <sup><4029></sup> Luke 10:24; <sup><4101></sup> 1 Peter 1:10, 11; <sup><4029></sup> Haggai 2:7.
- 3.** To prepare the church for the reception of him, partly by the glorious representation made of him in the tabernacle and temple with their worship, partly by the burden of legal institutions laid on them until his coming, <sup><4029></sup> Galatians 3:24.
- 4.** To give the world a full and sufficient trial of what might be attained towards happiness and blessedness by the excellency of all things here below. Men had time to try what was in wisdom, learning, moral virtue, power, rule, dominion, riches, arts, and whatever else is valuable unto

rational natures. They were all exalted unto their height, in their possession and exercise, before the appearance of Christ; and all manifested their own insufficiency to give the least real relief unto mankind from under the fruits of their apostasy from God. See <sup><4005></sup>1 Corinthians 1:5. To *give time unto Satan* to fix and establish his kingdom in the world, that the destruction of him and it might be the more conspicuous and glorious. These, and sundry other things of a like nature, do evince that there was a condecency unto divine wisdom in the determination of the season of the appearance of Christ in the flesh; howbeit it is ultimately to be resolved into his sovereign will and pleasure.

**Obs. IV.** God had a design of infinite wisdom and grace in his sending of Christ, and his appearance in the world thereon, which could not be frustrated. “He appeared to put away sin.” The footsteps of divine wisdom and grace herein I have inquired into in a peculiar treatise, and shall not here insist on the same argument. <sup>f24</sup>

**Obs. V.** Sin had erected a dominion, a tyranny over all men, as by a law. — Unless this law be abrogated and abolished, we can have neither deliverance nor liberty. Men generally think that they serve themselves of sin, in the accomplishment of their lusts and gratification of the flesh; but they are indeed servants of it and slaves unto it. It hath gotten a power to command their obedience unto it, and a power to bind them over to eternal death for the disobedience unto God therein. As unto what belongs unto this law and power, see my discourse of Indwelling Sin. <sup>f25</sup>

**Obs. VI.** No power of man, of any mere creature, was able to evacuate, disannul, or abolish this law of sin; for, —

**Obs. VII.** The destruction and dissolution of this law and power of sin, was the great end of the coming of Christ for the discharge of his priestly office in the sacrifice of himself; No other way could it be effected. And, —

**Obs. VIII.** It is the glory of Christ, it is the safety of the church, that by his one offering, by the sacrifice of himself once for all, he hath abolished sin as unto the law and condemning power of it.

## VERSES 27, 28.

Καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις· οἴτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

Καὶ καθ' ὅσον, “et sicut,” “et quemadmodum.” Ἀπόκειται, “statutum,” “constitutum est.” Τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Syr., לְבָנֵי אָדָם, “to the sons of men;” of Adam, all his posterity.” Ἀπαξ. Syr., בְּיָמֵי אֶחָד, “that at one time,” “a certain appointed time.” Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο. Vulg., “post hoc autem.” “Postea vero;” “and afterward.” Syr., וְאַחַר מוֹתָם, “and after their death,” the death of them.

So also Christ ἅπαξ. Syr., בְּיָמֵי אֶחָד, “one time,” “at one time.” Εἰς τὸ ἀνενεγκεῖν. Vulg., “ad exhaurienda peccata;” Rhem., “to exhaust the sins of many;” without any sense. Ἀναφέρω may signify “to lift” or “bear up;” not at all “to draw out of any deep place,” though there may be something in that allusion. Syr., וְבָרַךְ בְּחָפְזוֹ אֶת הַכֹּתֵף, “and in himself he slew” (or “sacrificed”) “the sins of many.” “In himself;” that is, by the sacrifice of himself he took them away. Beza, “ut in seipso attolleret multorum peccata;” that he might “lift” or “beat” up” the sins of many in himself: he took them upon himself as a burden, which he bare upon the cross; as opposed to χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, afterwards, “not burdened with sin.” Others, “ad attollendum peccata multorum in semet ipsum;” “to take up unto himself” (that is, “upon himself”) “the sins of many.”

The Syriac reads the first clause, “He shall appear the second time unto the salvation of them that expect” or “look for him.” All others, “He shall appear unto” (or “be seen by”) “them that look for him, unto salvation:” unto which difference we shall speak afterwards.

**Ver. 27, 28.** — And [*in like manner*] as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this [*afterwards*] the judgment: so also Christ was once offered to bear [*in himself*] the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.

These verses put a close unto the heavenly discourse of the apostle concerning the *causes, nature, ends, and efficacy, of the sacrifice of Christ*, wherewith the new covenant was dedicated and confirmed. And in the words there is a treble confirmation of that singularity and *efficacy* of the sacrifice of Christ which he had pleaded before:

1. In an elegant *instructive similitude*, “And as it is appointed,” etc. verse 27.
2. In a *declaration of the use and end* of the offering of Christ; “He was once offered to bear the sins of many.”
3. In the *consequent of it*; his second appearance, unto the salvation of believers, verse 28.

In the comparison, we must first consider the force of it in general, and explain the words. That, as we have observed, which the apostle designeth to confirm and illustrate, is what he had pleaded in the foregoing verses concerning the singularity and efficacy of the offering of Christ; whereon also he takes occasion to declare the blessed consequent of it. Hereof he gives an illustration, by comparing it unto what is of absolute and unavoidable necessity, so as that it cannot otherwise be, namely, the death of all the individuals of mankind by the decretory sentence of God. As they must die every one, and every one but once; so Christ was to die, to suffer, to offer himself, and that but once. The instances of those who died not after the manner of other men, as Enoch and Elijah, or those who, having died once, were raised from the dead and died again, as Lazarus, give no difficulty herein. They are instances of exemption from the common rule by mere acts of divine sovereignty; but the apostle argues from the general rule and constitution, and thereon alone the force of his comparisons doth depend, and they are not weakened by such exemptions. As this is the certain, unalterable law of human condition, that every man must die once, and but once, as unto this mortal life; so Christ was once, and but once, offered.

But there is more in the words and design of the apostle than a bare similitude and illustration of what he treats of, though expositors own it not. He doth not only illustrate his former assertion by a fit comparison, but gives the *reason of the one offering of Christ*, from what it was

necessary for and designed unto. For that he introduceth a reason for his former assertion, the causal connection, *καί*, doth demonstrate; especially as it is joined with *καθ' ὅσον*, — that is, “in quantum,” “inasmuch as: in which sense he constantly useth that expression, <sup><small>HEB</small></sup> Hebrews 3:3, <sup><small>HEB</small></sup> 7:20, 8:6. ‘And inasmuch as it was so with mankind, it was necessary that Christ should suffer once for the expiation of sin and the salvation of sinners.’ How was it with mankind in this matter? On the account of sin they were all subject unto the law and the curse thereof. Hereof there were two parts:

**1.** *Temporal death*, to be undergone penally on the sentence of God.

**2.** *Eternal judgment*, wherein they were to perish for evermore. In these things consist the effects of sin, and the curse of the law. And they were due unto all men unavoidably, to be inflicted on them by the judgment and sentence of God. ‘It is appointed, decreed, determined of God, that men, sinful men, shall once die, and after that come to judgment for their sins.’ This is the sense, the sentence, the substance of the law. Under this sentence they must all perish eternally, if not divinely relieved. But inasmuch as it was thus with them, the one offering of Christ, once offered, is prepared for their relief and deliverance. And the relief is, in the infinite wisdom of God, eminently proportionate unto the evil, the remedy unto the disease. For, —

**1.** As man was to die once legally and penally for sin, by the sentence of the law, and no more; so Christ died, suffered, and offered once, and no more, to bear sin, to expiate it, and thereby to take away death so far as it was penal.

**2.** As after death men must appear again the second time unto judgment, to undergo condemnation thereon; so after his once offering, to take away sin and death, Christ shall appear the second time to free us from judgment, and to bestow on us eternal salvation.

In this interpretation of the words I do not exclude the use of the comparison, nor the design of the apostle to illustrate the one offering of Christ once offered by the certainty of the death of men once only; for these things do illustrate one another as so compared. But withal I judge there is more in them than a mere comparison between things no way

related one to another, but only having some mutual resemblance in that they fall out but once; yea, there seems not to be much light nor any thing of argument in a comparison so arbitrarily framed. But consider these things in their mutual relation and opposition one unto the other, which are the same with that of the law and the gospel, and there is much of light and argument in the comparing of them together. For whereas the end of the death, suffering, and offering of Christ, was to take away and remove the punishment due unto sin, which consisted in this, that men should once die, and but once, and afterwards come to judgment and condemnation, according to the sentence of the law; and it was convenient unto divine wisdom that Christ for that end should die, suffer, offer once only, and afterwards bring them for whom he died unto salvation.

And this is the proper sense of  $\kappa\alpha\theta' \ \acute{\omicron}\sigma\omicron\nu$ , “in quantum,” which interpreters know not what to make of in this place, but endeavor variously to change and alter. Some pretend that some copies read  $\kappa\alpha\theta' \ \acute{\omicron}$ , and one  $\kappa\alpha\theta' \ \acute{\omicron}$ ; which they suppose came from  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ . But the only reason why the word is not liked, is because the sense is not understood. Take the mind of the apostle aright, and his expression is proper unto his purpose. Wherefore there is in these verses an entire opposition and comparison between the law and the gospel; the curse due to sin, and the redemption that is by Christ Jesus. And we may observe, that —

**Obs. I.** God hath eminently suited our relief, the means and causes of our spiritual deliverance, unto our misery, the means and causes of it, so that his own wisdom and grace may be exalted and our faith established. — That which is here summarily represented by our apostle in this elegant antithesis, he declares at large, Rein. v., from verse 12 to the end of the chapter.

But we proceed with the interpretation of the words. In the first part of the antithesis and comparison, verse 27, there are three things asserted:

1. The death of men,
2. The judgment that ensues, and,
3. The cause of them both. The last is first to be explained.

First, “It is appointed,” “determined,” “enacted,” “statutum est.” It is so by him who hath a sovereign power and authority in and over these things; and hath the force of an unalterable law, which none can transgress. God himself hath thus appointed it; none else can determine and dispose of these things. And the word equally respects both parts of the assertion, death and judgment. They are both equally from the constitution of God, which is the cause of them both.

The Socinians do so divide these things, that one of them, namely, death, they would have to be *natural*; and the other, or judgment, from *the constitution of God*: which is not to interpret, but to contradict the words. Yea, death is that which in the first place and directly is affirmed to be the effect of this divine constitution, being spoken of as it is penal, by the curse of the law for sin; and judgment falls under the same constitution, as consequential thereunto. But if death, as they plead, be merely and only natural, they cannot refer it unto the same divine constitution with the future judgment, which is natural in no sense at all.

Death was so far natural from the beginning, as that the frame and constitution of our nature were in themselves liable and subject thereunto; but that it should actually have invaded our nature unto its dissolution, without the intervention of its meritorious cause in sin, is contrary unto the original state of our relation unto God, the nature of the covenant whereby we were obliged unto obedience, — the reward promised therein, with the threatening of death in case of disobedience. Wherefore the law, statute, or constitution here related unto, is no other but that of <sup><OED7></sup>Genesis 2:17, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;” with that addition, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,” <sup><OED9></sup>Genesis 3:19. God enacted it, as an everlasting law concerning Adam and all his posterity, that they should die, and that once, as they were once taken out of the dust. But in the words of God before mentioned there are two things:

1. A *penal law* enacted, <sup><OED7></sup>Genesis 2:17;
2. A *judicial sentence* denounced, <sup><OED9></sup>Genesis 3:19; — not only death, but future judgment also was appointed thereby.



Thus “it is appointed to men;” that is, to all men, or men indefinitely, without exception, — it is their lot and portion. It is appointed unto men, not; merely as men, but as sinners, as sinful men; for it is of sin and the effects of it, with their removal by Christ, that the apostle discourseth.

It is appointed unto them “*to die;*” — that is, penally for sin, as death was threatened in that penal statute mentioned in the curse of the law; and death under that consideration alone is taken away by the death of Christ. The sentence of dying naturally is continued towards all; but the moral nature of dying, with the consequents of it, is removed from some by Christ. The law is not *absolutely reversed;* but what *was formally penal* in it is taken away. Observe, —

**Obs. II.** Death in the first constitution of it was penal. — And the entrance of it as a penalty keeps the fear of it in all living. Yea, it was by the law eternally penal. Nothing was to come after death but hell. And, —

**Obs. III.** It is still penal, eternally penal, unto all unbelievers. — But there are false notions of it amongst men, as there are of all other things. Some are afraid of it when the penalty is separated from it. Some, on the other hand, regardless of the penalty, look on it as a relief, and so either seek it or desire it; — unto whom it will prove only an entrance into judgment. It is the interest of all living to inquire diligently *what death will be unto them.*

**Obs. IV.** The death of all is equally determined and certain in God’s constitution. It hath various ways of approach unto all individuals, — hence is it generally looked on as an accident befalling this or that man, — but the law concerning it is general and equal.

The second part of the assertion is, that “after this is the judgment.” This, by the same divine, unalterable constitution, is appointed unto all. “God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness.” Death makes not an end of men, as some think, others hope, and many desire it should: “*Ipsa mors nihil, et post mortem nihil.*” But there is *something* yet remaining, which death is subservient unto. Hence it is said to be “after this.” As surely as men die, it is sure that somewhat else follows after death. This is the force of the particle *δέ*, “but,” — “but after it.” Now this “after” doth not denote the *immediate succession*, of

one thing unto another; — if one go before, and the other certainly follow after, whatever length of time be interposed between them, the assertion is true and proper. Many have been long dead, probably the most that shall die, and yet judgment is not come after. But it shall come in its appointed season; and so as that nothing shall interpose between death and judgment to make any alteration in the state or condition of the persons concerned in them. The souls of them that are dead are yet alive, but are utterly incapable of any change in their condition between death and judgment. “As death leaves men, so shall judgment find them.”

The second part of this penal constitution is *judgment*, “After death the judgment.” It is not a particular judgment on every individual person immediately on his death, although such a judgment there be, for in and by death there is a declaration made concerning the eternal condition of the deceased; but “judgment” here is opposed unto the second appearance of Christ unto the salvation of believers, which is the great or general judgment of all at the last day. **Κρίσις** and **κρίμα**, used with respect unto this day, or taken absolutely, do signify *a condemnatory sentence* only.

<sup>7</sup> **Ἀνάστασις κρίσεως**, “the resurrection of” or “unto judgment, is opposed unto **ἀνάστασις ζωῆς**, “the resurrection of” or “unto life,” <sup><819></sup>John 5:29. See verses 22, 24. So is it here used; “judgment,” that is, *condemnation for sin*, follows after death, in the righteous constitution of God, by the sentence of the law. And as Christ by his death doth not take away death absolutely, but only as it is *penal*; so on his second appearance, he doth not take away judgment absolutely, but only as it is a *condemnatory sentence*, with respect unto believers. For as we must all die, so “we must all appear before his judgment-seat,” <sup><840></sup>Romans 14:10. But as he hath promised that those that believe in him “shall not see death,” for “they are passed from death unto life,” — they shall not undergo it as it is penal; so also he hath, that they “shall not come **εἰς κρίσιν**,” (the word here used) “into judgment,” <sup><852></sup>John 5:24, — they shall be freed from the condemnatory sentence of the law. For the nature and manner of this judgment, see the exposition on <sup><861></sup>Hebrews 6:1, 2. This, then, is the sense of the words: ‘Whereas, therefore, or inasmuch as this is the constitution of God, that man, sinful man, shall once die, and afterwards be judged, or condemned for sin:’ — which would have been the event with all, had not a relief been provided, which in opposition

hereunto is declared in the next verse. And no man that dies in sin shall ever escape judgment.

**Ver. 28.** — This verse gives us the relief provided in the wisdom and grace of God for and from this condition. And there is in the words,

1. The *redditive note of comparison and opposition*, “so.”
2. The *subject spoken of*; “the offering of Christ.”
3. The *end of it*; “to bear the sins of many.”
4. The *consequent of it*, which must be spoken to distinctly.

First, The redditive note is οὕτω, “so,” “in like manner,” in answer unto that state of things, and for the remedy against it, in a blessed *condecency* unto divine wisdom, goodness, and grace.

Secondly, The *subject* spoken of is the offering of Christ. But it is here mentioned *passively*; “he was offered.” Most frequently it is expressed by his offering of himself, the sacrifice he offered of himself. For as the virtue of his offering depends principally on the dignity of his person, so his human soul, his mind, will, and affections, with the fullness of the graces of the Spirit resident and acting in them, did concur unto the efficacy of his offering, and were necessary to render it an act of *obedience*, “a sacrifice unto God of a sweet-smelling savor,” <sup><HND></sup>Ephesians 5:2; yea, herein principally depended his own glory, which arose not merely from his suffering, but from his *obedience therein*, <sup><IMP></sup>Philippians 2:7-11. Wherefore he is most frequently said to offer himself,

1. Because of the virtue *communicated unto his offering* by the dignity of his person.
2. Because he was *the only priest* that did offer.
3. Because *his obedience therein was so acceptable unto God*.
4. Because this expresseth *his love unto the church*. “He loved it, and gave himself for it.”

But as himself offered, so his offering was himself. His whole entire human nature was that which was offered. Hence it is thus passively

expressed, “Christ was offered;” that is, he was not only *the priest* who offered, but *the sacrifice* that was offered. Both were necessary, — that Christ *should offer*, and that Christ *should be offered*. And the reason why it is here so expressed, is *because* his offering is spoken of as it was by death and suffering. For having affirmed that if he must often offer he must often suffer, and compared his offering unto the once dying of men penally, it is plain that the offering intended is in and by suffering and death. “Christ was offered,” is the same with “Christ suffered,” “Christ died.” And this expression is utterly irreconcilable unto the Socinian notion of the oblation of Christ. For they would have it to consist in the presentation of himself in heaven, eternally free from and above all sufferings; which cannot be the sense of this expression, “Christ was offered.”

The circumstance of his being thus offered is, that it was “once” only. This, joined as it is here with a word in the present tense, can signify nothing but an action or passion then past and determined. It is not any present continued action, such as is the presentation of himself in heaven, that can be signified hereby.

Thirdly, The *end* of Christ’s being thus once offered, and which his one offering did perfectly effect, was “to bear the sins of many.” There is an antithesis between *πολλῶν*, “of many,” and *ἀνθρώποις*, “unto men,” in the verse foregoing. “Men,” expressed indefinitely in that necessary proposition, intends *all men* universally; nor, as we have showed, is there any exception against the rule by a few instances of exemption by the interposition of divine sovereignty. But the relief which is granted by Christ, though it be unto men *indefinitely*, yet it extends not to all universally, but to “many” of them only. That it doth not so extend unto all eventually, is confessed. And this expression is declarative of the intention of God, or of Christ himself in his offering. See <sup>HERE</sup> Ephesians 5:25, 26.

He was thus offered for those “many,” to “bear their sins,” as we render the words. It is variously translated, as we have seen before, and various senses are sought after by expositors. Grotius wholly follows the Socinians in their endeavors to pervert the sense of this word. It is not from any difficulty in the word, but from men’s hatred unto the truth, that

they put themselves on such endeavors. And this whole attempt lies in finding out one or two places where ἀναφέρω signifies “to take away;” for the various signification of a word used absolutely in any other place is sufficient for these men to confute its necessary signification in any context. But the matter is plain in itself; Christ did bear sin, or take it away, as he was offered, as he was a sacrifice for it. This is here expressly affirmed: “He was offered to bear the sins of many.” This he did as the sacrifices did of old, as unto their typical use and efficacy. A supposition hereof is the sole foundation of the whole discourse of the apostle. But they bare sin, or took away sin (not to contend about the mere signification of the word) no otherwise but by the imputation of the sin unto the beast that was sacrificed, whereon it was slain, that atonement might be made with its blood. This I have before sufficiently proved. So “Christ bare the sins of many.” And so the signification of this word is determined and limited by the apostle Peter, by whom alone it is used on the same occasion <sup><1024></sup> 1 Peter 2:24, “Ὁς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, — “Who himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” That place, compared with this, doth utterly evert the Socinian fiction of the oblation of Christ in heaven. He was offered ἀνενεγκεῖν, “to bear the sins of many.” When did he do it? how did he do it? Ἀνήνεγκεν, “He bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” Wherefore *then* he offered himself for them; and this he did in his suffering.

Moreover, wherever in the Old Testament נָשָׂא is translated by ἀναφέρω in the LXX., as <sup><0449></sup> Numbers 14:33, <sup><2510></sup> Isaiah 53:12, or by φέρω, with reference unto sin, it constantly signifies to “bear the punishment of it.” Yea, it doth so when, with respect unto the event, it is rendered by ἀφαιρεῖν, as it is <sup><6017></sup> Leviticus 10:17. And the proper signification of the word is to be taken from the declaration of the thing signified by it. “He shall bear their iniquities,” <sup><2511></sup> Isaiah 53:11; — הִסָּבֵל, “bear them as a burden upon him.” He was “once offered,” so as that he suffered therein. As he suffered, he bare our iniquities; and as he was offered, he was made atonement for them. And this is not opposed unto the *appearance* of men before God at the last day, but unto their *death*, which they were once to undergo. Wherefore, —

**Obs. V.** The ground of the expiation of sin by the offering of Christ is this, that therein he bare the guilt and punishment due unto it.

Fourthly, Upon this offering of Christ the apostle supposeth what he had before declared, namely, that “he entered into heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us;” and hereon he declares what is the end of all this dispensation of God’s grace: “Unto them that look for him he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.” And he shows,

1. What “de facto” Christ shall yet do: “He shall appear.”
2. To whom he shall so appear: “Unto them that look, for him.”
3. In what manner: “Without sin.”
4. Unto what end: “Unto salvation.”
5. In what order: “The second time.”

1. The last thing mentioned is first expressed, and must first be explained: “The second time.” The Scripture is express unto a *double* appearing or coming of Christ. The first was his *coming in the flesh*, coming into the world, coming unto his own, — namely, to discharge the work of his mediation, especially to make atonement for sin in the sacrifice of himself, unto the accomplishment of all promises made concerning it, and all types instituted for its representation; the second is *in glory*, unto the judgment of all, when he shall finish and complete the eternal salvation of the church. Any other personal appearance or coming of Christ the Scripture knows not, and in this place expressly excludes any imagination of it. His first appearance is past; and appear the second time he will not until that judgment comes which follows death, and the salvation of the church shall be completed. Afterward there will be no further appearance of Christ in the discharge of his office; for “God shall be all in all.”

2. That which he affirms of him is, “He shall appear,” “he shall be seen.” There shall be a public vision and sight of him. He was seen on the earth in the days of his flesh: he is now in heaven, where no mortal eye can see him, within the veil of that glory which we cannot look into. “The heaven must receive him until the times of restitution of all things.” He can, indeed, appear unto whom he pleaseth, by an extraordinary dispensation. So he was seen of Stephen standing at the right hand of God, <sup>4176</sup>Acts 7:56.

So he appeared unto Paul, <sup>☞</sup>1 Corinthians 15:8. But as unto the state of the church in general, and in the discharge of his mediatory office, he is not seen of any. So the high priest was not seen of the people, after his entrance into the holy place, until he came forth again. Even concerning the person of Christ we live by faith, and not by sight. And, —

**Obs. VI.** It is the great exercise of faith, to live on the invisible actings of Christ on the behalf of the church. So also the foundation of it doth consist in our infallible expectation of his second appearance, of our seeing him again, <sup>☞</sup>Acts 1:11. “We know that our Redeemer liveth;” and we shall see him with our eyes. Whilst he is thus invisible, the world triumpheth, as if he were not. “Where is the promise of his coming?” The faith of many is weak. They cannot live upon his invisible actings. But here is the faith and patience of the church, of all sincere believers: — in the midst of all discouragements, reproaches, temptations, sufferings, they can relieve and comfort their souls with this, that “their Redeemer liveth,” and that “he shall appear again the second time,” in his appointed season. Hence is their continual prayer, as the fruit and expression of their faith, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus.”

The present long-continued absence of Christ in heaven is the great trial of the world. God doth give the world *a trial by faith in Christ*, as he gave it *a trial by obedience in Adam*. Faith is tried by difficulties. When Christ did appear, it was under such circumstances as turned all unbelievers from him. His state was then a state of infirmity, reproach, and suffering. He appeared in the flesh. Now he is in glory, he appeareth not. As many refused him when he appeared, because it was in outward weakness; so many refuse him now he is in glory, because he appeareth not. Faith alone can conflict with and conquer these difficulties. And it hath sufficient evidences of this return of Christ,

(1.) In his *faithful word of promise*. The promise of his coming, recorded in the Scripture, is the ground of our faith herein.

(2.) In the *continual supplies of his Spirit* which believers do receive. This is the great pledge of his mediatory life in heaven, of the continuance of his love and care towards the church, and consequently the great assurance of his second coming.

**(3.)** In the *daily evidences of his glorious power*, put forth in eminent acts of providence for the protection, preservation, and deliverance of the church; which is an uninterrupted assurance of his future appearance. He hath determined the day and season of it; nor shall all the abuse that is made of his seeming delay in coming hasten it one moment. And he hath blessed ends of his not appearing before the appointed season, though the time seems long to the church itself: as,

**(1.)** That the world may “fill up the measure of its iniquities,” to make way for its eternal destruction:

**(2.)** That the whole number of the elect may be gathered in; though days of trouble are sometimes shortened for their sakes, that they may not faint after they are called, <sup>4B2</sup>Matthew 24:22, yet are they also in general continued, that there may be time for the calling of them all:

**(3.)** That all the graces of his people may be exercised and tried unto the utmost:

**(4.)** That God may have his full revenue of glory from the new creation, which is the first-fruits of the whole:

**(5.)** That all things may be ready for the glory of the great day.

**3.** To whom shall he thus appear? Of whom shall he be thus seen? “To them that look for him.” But the Scripture is plain and express in other places that he shall appear unto all; shall be seen of all, even of his enemies, <sup>600</sup>Revelation 1:7. And the work that he hath to do at his appearance requires that so it should be; for he comes to judge the world in general, and in particular to plead with ungodly men about their ungodly deeds and speeches, Jude 15. So therefore must and shall it be. His second illustrious appearance shall fill the whole world with the beams of it; the whole rational creation of God shall see and behold him. But the apostle treats of his appearance hero with respect unto the *salvation* of them unto whom he doth appear: “He shall appear unto salvation.” And this word, “unto salvation,” is capable of a double explication. For it may refer unto “them that look for him,” — “that look for him unto salvation;” that is, that look to be saved by him: or it may do so unto his appearance; “he shall appear unto the salvation of them that look for him.” The sense is good either way.



This looking for the coming of Christ, — which is a description of faith by a principal effect and fruit of it, called also waiting, expecting, longing, earnest expectation, — consists in five things:

(1.) *Steadfast faith of his coming and appearance.* This is in the foundation of Christian religion. And whatever the generality of hypocritical, nominal Christians profess, there are uncontrollable evidences and demonstrations that they believe it not.

(2.) *Love unto it,* as that which is most desirable, which contains in it every thing wherein the soul takes delight and satisfaction: “That love his appearing,” <sup>5008</sup>2 Timothy 4:8.

(3.) *Longing for it,* or desires after it: “Even so, come, Lord Jesus;” that is, “come quickly,” <sup>6021</sup>Revelation 22:20. If the saints of the old testament longed after his appearance in the flesh, how shall not we do so for his appearance in glory? See <sup>5010</sup>Titus 2:13. “Looking for and hasting unto,” etc., <sup>6080</sup>2 Peter 3:12.

(4.) *Patient waiting for it,* in the midst of all discouragements. These the world is filled withal; and it is the great trial of faith, Jude 20, 21.

(5.) *Preparation for it,* that we may be ready and meet for his reception; which is the substance of what we are taught in the parable of the virgins, Matthew 25. Unto those that thus “look for him” shall the Lord Christ “appear unto salvation.”

4. The manner of his appearance is, “without sin.” This may either respect *himself* or the *church*, or *both*. In his first appearance in the flesh *he was absolutely* in himself without sin; but his great work was about sin. And in what he had to do for us he was “made sin,” “he bare our iniquities,” and was treated both by God and man as the greatest sinner. He had all the penal effects and consequents of sin upon him; all dolorous infirmities of nature, as fear, sorrow, grief, pain; all sufferings that sin deserved, that the law threatened, were in him and upon him. Nothing, as it were, appeared with him or upon him but sin; that is, the effects and consequents of it, in what he underwent for our sakes. But now he shall appear perfectly free from all these things, as a perfect conqueror over sin, in all its causes, effects, and consequents. It may respect the church. He will then have made an utter end of sin in the whole church for ever. There shall not then

be the least remainder of it. All its filth, and guilt, and power; and its effects, in darkness, fear, and danger, shall be utterly abolished and done away. The guilt of sin being done withal, the whole church shall then be perfectly purified, “without spot or wrinkle,” every way glorious. Sin shall be no more. Respect may be had to both himself and the church. 5. The end of his appearance is the “salvation” of “them that look for him.” If this word relate immediately unto his *appearance*, the meaning is, to bestow, to collate salvation upon them, eternal salvation. If it respect *them that look for him*, it expresseth the qualification of their persons by the object of their faith and hope. They look for him, to be perfectly and completely saved by him. Where both senses are equally true, we need not limit the signification of the words to either of them. But we may observe,

---

**Obs. VII.** Christ’s appearance the second time, his return from heaven to complete the salvation of the church, is the great fundamental principle of our faith and hope, the great testimony we have to give against all his and our adversaries. And, —

**Obs. VIII.** Faith concerning the second coming of Christ is sufficient to support the souls of believers, and to give them satisfactory consolation in all difficulties, trials, and distresses.

**Obs. IX.** All true believers do live in a waiting, longing expectation of the coming of Christ. It is one of the most distinguishing characters of a sincere believer so to do.

**Obs. X.** To such alone as so look for him will the Lord Christ appear unto salvation.

**Obs. XI.** Then will be the great distinction among mankind, when Christ shall appear unto the everlasting confusion of some, and the eternal salvation of others; — a thing that the world loves not to hear of.

**Obs. XII.** At the second appearance of Christ there will be an end of all the business about sin, both on his part and ours.

**Obs. XIII.** The communication of actual salvation unto all believers, unto the glory of God, is the final end of the office of Christ.

Μόνω τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.

## CHAPTER 10.

THERE are two parts of this chapter. The first concerneth the *necessity* and *efficacy* of the sacrifice of Christ; from the beginning unto verse 18. The other is an *improvement of the doctrine* of it unto faith, obedience, and perseverance; from verse 19 to the end of the chapter.

Of the first general proposition of the subject to be treated of there are two parts:

**1.** A demonstration of the insufficiency of legal sacrifices for the expiation of sin, verses 1-4;

**2.** A declaration of the necessity and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ unto that end, verses 5-18. Of this declaration there are two parts:

**(1.)** The substitution of the sacrifice of Christ in the place and room of all legal sacrifices, because of its efficacy unto the end which they could not attain, and without which the church could not be saved, verses 5-10.

**(2.)** A final comparison of his priesthood and sacrifice with those of the law, and their absolute preference above them, unto verse 18.

In the first particular of the first general part, there are three things:

**[1.]** An *assertion* of the insufficiency of legal sacrifices unto the expiation of sin, wherein a reason of it also is included, verse 1.

**[2.]** A *confirmation of the truth* of that assertion, from the consideration of the frequency of their repetition, which manifestly evidenceth that insufficiency, verses 2, 3.

**[3.]** A *general reason* taken from the nature of them, or the matter whereof they did consist, verse 4. The first of these is contained in the first verse.

### VERSE 1.

Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαντὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς ζυγαῖαις ἄς

προσφε.ρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, οὐδέποτε δὺναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι.

There is no difficulty in the reading, nor much difference about the translation of the words. Syr., **בְּהָאֵת הַזֶּה אֵינֶנּוּ אֵת הַחֹלֶם** “for the law, a shadow was in it;” **לֹא הוּא קְנוּמָא**, “not the substance itself.” **Προσερχομένους**, **דְּמַקְנִיבִין לְהוֹן**, “that shall offer them.” **Εἰς τὸ διηνεκές** that translator omits, supposing it the same with **κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν**. But it hath its own signification: “Continenter,” “in assiduum,” “in perpetuum.” “**Ἔχων**, “habens,” “obtinens,” “continens.” **Αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα**, “ipsam expressam formam,” “ipsam imaginem.” **Τελειῶσαι**, “sanctificare,” “perfecte sanctificare,” “perfectos facere,” Vulg. Lat.; “make perfect;” “perficere,” “confirmare;” “to perfect,” “to confirm.”

**Ver. 1.** — For the law having a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto [*the worshippers*] perfect.

There are in these words,

1. A *note of inference*, giving a connection unto the preceding discourse; “for.”
2. The *subject spoken of*; “the law.”
3. An *ascription* made unto it; it had “a shadow of good things to come.”
4. A *negation concerning it*, derogatory unto its perfection; it had “not the very image of the things” themselves.
5. An *inference* or conclusion from both; “can never with those sacrifices,” etc.

First, The conjunctive particle **γάρ**, “for,” intimates that what follows or is introduced thereby is an inference from what he had before discoursed, or a conclusion made thereon. And this is the necessity of the sacrifice of Christ. For having declared that he had perfectly expiated sin thereby, and confirmed the new covenant, he concludes from thence and proves the necessity of it, because the legal sacrifices could not effect those ends

which they seemed to be appointed for. Wherefore they must be taken away, to give place unto that whereby they were perfectly accomplished. This, therefore, he now proceeds to prove. God having designed the complete consummation or sanctification of the church, that which only made a representation of it, and of the way whereby it was to be done, but could not effect it, was to be removed. For there was an appointed time wherein he would perfectly fulfill the counsel of his infinite wisdom and grace towards the church herein. And at this time, which was now come, a full, clear understanding of the insufficiency of all legal sacrifices for that end was to be given unto it. For he requires not faith and obedience in any, beyond the means of light and understanding which he affords unto them. Therefore the full revelation and demonstration hereof were reserved for this season, wherein he required express faith in the way whereby these things were effected.

Secondly, The subject spoken of is **ὁ νόμος**, the law, — **הַתּוֹרָה**. That which he immediately intends is the sacrifices of the law, especially those which were offered yearly by a perpetual statute, as the words immediately following do declare. But he refers what he speaks unto the law itself, as that whereby those sacrifices were instituted, and whereon all their virtue and efficacy did depend. They had no more of the one or other but what they had by and from the law. And “the law” here, is the covenant which God made with the people at Sinai, with all the institutions of worship thereunto belonging. It is not the moral law, which originally, and as absolutely considered, had no expiatory sacrifices belonging unto it; nor is it the ceremonial law alone, whereby all the sacrifices of old were either appointed or regulated: but it is the first testament, the first covenant, as it had all the ordinances of worship annexed unto it, as it was the spring and cause of all the privileges and advantages of the church of Israel; and whereunto the moral law as given on mount Sinai, and both the ceremonial law and the judicial also did belong. This he calls “the law,” <sup><307></sup>Hebrews 7:19; and the “covenant” or “testament” completely, <sup><308></sup>Hebrews 9.

Thirdly, Concerning this law or covenant the apostle declares two things:

1. Positively, and by way of concession, it had “a shadow of good things to come;”

**2.** Negatively, that it had “not the very image of the things” themselves: which we must consider together, because they contribute light unto one another.

These expressions are metaphorical, and have therefore given occasion unto various conjectures about the nature of the allusions in them, and their application unto the present subject-matter. I shall not trouble the reader with a repetition of them; they may be found in most commentators. I shall therefore only fix on that sense of the words which I conceive to be the mind of the Holy Ghost, giving the reasons why I conceive it so to be.

Both the expressions used and the things intended in them, a “shadow,” and “the very image,” have respect unto the “good things to come.” The relation of the law unto them is that which is declared. Wherefore the true notion of what these good things to come are, will determine what it is to have a shadow of them, and not the very image of the things themselves.

*First*, The “good things” intended may be said to be μέλλοντα, either with respect unto the *law* or with respect unto the *gospel*; and were so either when the law was given or when this epistle was written. If they were yet to come with respect unto the gospel, and were so when he wrote this epistle, they can be nothing but the good things of heaven and eternal glory. These things were then, are still, and will always be, unto the church militant on the earth, “good things to come;” and are the subject of divine promises concerning future times: “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began,” <sup>500B</sup> Titus 1:2. But this cannot be the sense of the words. For, —

**1.** The gospel itself hath not the very image of these things, and so should not herein differ from the law. For that “the very image” of these things is the things themselves shall be immediately declared.

**2.** The apostle in this whole discourse designs to prove that the law, with all the rites of worship annexed unto it, was a type of the good things that were really and actually exhibited in and by the gospel, or by the Lord Christ himself in the discharge of his office. Wherefore they are called “good things to come” with respect unto the time of the administration of the law. They were so whilst the law or first covenant was in force, and

whilst the institutions of it were continued. They had, indeed, their original in the church, or were “good things to come,” from the first promise. They were more declared so to be, and the certainty of their coming more confirmed, by the promise made unto Abraham. After these promises, and their various confirmations, the law was given unto the people. Howbeit the law did not bring in, exhibit, or make present, the good things so promised, that they should no more yet be to come. They were still “good things to come” whilst the law was in force. Nor was this absolutely denied by the Jews; nor is yet so to this day. For though they place more in the law and covenant of Sinai than God ever placed in them, yet they acknowledge that there are good things to come promised and fore-signified in the law, which, as they suppose, are not yet enjoyed. Such is the coming of the Messiah; in which sense they must grant that “the law had a shadow of good things to come.”

Hence it is evident what are those “good things to come;” namely, Christ himself, with all the grace, and mercy, and privileges, which the church receiveth by his actual exhibition and coming in the flesh, upon the discharge of his office. For he himself firstly, principally, and evidently, was the subject of all promises; and whatever else is contained in them is but that whereof, in his person, office, and grace, he is the author and cause. Hence he was signally termed ὁ ἔρχόμενος, — “he who was to come,” “he that should come:” “Art thou he who is to come?” And after his actual exhibition, the denying of him to be so come is to overthrow the gospel, <sup>☩</sup>1 John 4:3.

And these things are called τὰ ἀγαθὰ, “these good things,”

1. Because they are *absolutely* so, without any alloy or mixture. All other things in this world, however in some respect, and as unto some peculiar end, they may be said to be good, yet are they not so absolutely. Wherefore,
2. These things only are *good things*: nothing is good, either in itself or unto us, without them, nor but by virtue of what it receives from them. There is nothing so but what is made so by Christ and his grace.
3. They are eminently “good things;” those good things which were promised unto the church from the foundation of the world, which the

prophets and wise men of old desired to see; the means of our deliverance from all the evil things which we had brought upon ourselves by our apostasy from God.

These being evidently “the good things” intended, the relation of the law unto them, namely, that it had the “shadow,” but “not the very image” of them, will also be apparent. The allusion, in my judgment, unto the art of painting, wherein a shadow is first drawn, and afterwards a picture to the life, or the very image itself, hath here no place, nor doth our apostle anywhere make use of such curious similitudes taken from things artificial, and known to very few; nor would he use this among the Hebrews, who of all people were least acquainted with the art of painting. But he declares his intention in another place, where, speaking of the same things, and using some of the same words, their sense is plain and determined:

Colossians 2:17 “They are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” “They are a shadow of things to come,” is the same with this, “The law hath a shadow of good things to come;” for it is the law with its ordinances and institutions of worship concerning which the apostle there discourseth, as he doth in this place. Now the “shadow” there intended by the apostle, from whence the allusion is taken, is the shadow of a body in the light or sunshine, as the antithesis declares, “But the body is of Christ.” Now such a shadow is,

1. A *representation of the body*. Any one who beholds it, knows that it is a thing which hath no subsistence in itself, which hath no use of its own; only it represents the body, follows it in all its variations, and is inseparable from it.
2. It is a *just representation of the body*, as unto its proportion and dimensions. The shadow of any body represents that certain individual body, and nothing else: it will add nothing unto it, nor take anything from it, but, without an accidental hinderance, is a just representation of it; much less will it give an appearance of a body of another form and shape, different from that whereof it is the shadow.
3. It is but an *obscure representation* of the body; so as that the principal concernments of it, especially the vigor and spirit of a living body, are not figured nor represented by it.



Thus is it with the law, or the covenant of Sinai, and all the ordinances of worship wherewith it was attended, with respect unto these “good things to come.” For it must be observed, that the opposition which the apostle makes in this place is not between the law and the gospel, any otherwise but as the gospel is a full declaration of the person, offices, and grace of Christ; but it is between the sacrifices of the law and the sacrifice of Christ himself. Want of this observation hath given us mistaken interpretations of the place.

This shadow of good things the law had: ἔχων, — “having it.” It obtained it, it was in it, it was inlaid in it, it was of the substance and nature of it; it contained it in all that it prescribed or appointed, some of it in one part, some in another, — the whole in the whole. It had the whole shadow, and the whole of it was this shadow. It was so, —

**1.** Because, in the *sanction, dedication, and confirmation* of it, by the blood of sacrifices; in the tabernacle, with all its holy utensils; in its high priest, and all other sacred administrations; in its solemn sacrifices and services; it made a *representation* of good things to come. This hath been abundantly manifested and proved in the exposition of the foregoing chapter. And according unto the first property of such a shadow, without this use it had no bottom, no foundation, no excellency of its own. Take the significancy and representation of Christ, his offices and grace, out of the legal institutions, and you take from them all impressions of divine wisdom, and leave them useless things, which of themselves will vanish and disappear. And because they are no more now a shadow, they are absolutely dead and useless.

**2.** They were a *just representation* of Christ only, the second property of such a shadow. They did not signify any thing more or less but Christ himself, and what belongs unto him. He was the idea in the mind of God, when Moses was charged to make all things according to the pattern showed him in the mount. And it is a blessed view of divine wisdom, when we do see and understand aright how every thing in the law belonged unto that shadow which God gave in it of the substance of his counsel in and concerning Jesus Christ.

**3.** They were but an *obscure representation* of these things, which is the third property of a shadow. The glory and efficacy of these good things

appeared not visible in them. God by these means designed no further revelation of them unto the church of the old testament but what was in types and figures; which gave a shadow of them, and no more.

*Secondly*, This being granted unto the law, there is added thereunto what is denied of it, wherein the argument of the apostle doth consist. It had “not the very image of the things.” The *πράγματα* are the same with the *τὰ ἄγαθὰ μελλοντα* before mentioned. The negation is of the same whereof the concession was made, the grant being in one sense, and the denial in another. It had not *αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα*, — “the very image” itself; — that is, it had not the things themselves; for that is intended by this “image” of them. And the reasons why I so interpret the words are these: —

**1.** Take “the image” only for a clear, express delineation and description of the things themselves, as is generally conceived, and we invalidate the argument of the apostle. For he proves that the law by all its sacrifices could not take away sin, nor perfect the church, because it had not this image. But suppose the law to have had this full and clear description and delineation of them, were it never so lively and complete, yet could it not by its sacrifices take away sin. Nothing could do it but the very substance of the things themselves, which the law had not, nor could have.

**2.** Where the same truth is declared, the same things are expressly called “the body,” and that “of Christ;” that is, the substance of the things themselves, and that in opposition unto “the shadow” which the law had of them, as it is here also: <sup><sup></sup>Colossians 2:17, “Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” And we are not without cogent reasons to depart from the explication of the metaphor there given us; for these expressions are every way the same. They had not the body, which is Christ.

**3.** That is intended which doth completely expiate sin, which doth consummate and perfect the church; which is denied unto the law. Now this was not done by an express and clear declaration of these things, which we acknowledge to be contained in the gospel; but it was done by the things themselves, as the apostle hath proved in the foregoing chapter, and doth further confirm in this; that is, it was done by Christ alone, in the sacrifice of himself.

4. It is confessed by all that there is an εἰκὼν ἀρχέτυπος, a “substantial image;” so called, not because it is a representation of what it is not, but because it is that whereof somewhat else is an image and representation, as the law in its institutions and sacrifices was of these good things. And this the apostle directs us unto by his emphatical expression, αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα, “ipsissimam rerum imaginem;” “the things themselves.” So it is rendered by the Syriac translation, “ipsam rem,” or “ipsam substantiam;” the “substance itself.” And εἰκὼν is frequently used in the New Testament in this sense: <sup><A12></sup>Romans 1:23, Ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, — “Into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man;” that is, into the likeness of a corruptible man. The image of the man is not something distinct from him, something to represent him, but the man himself. See <sup><A13></sup>Romans 8:29; <sup><A14></sup>2 Corinthians 4:4; <sup><A15></sup>Colossians 1:15, 3:10.

This, therefore, is that which the apostle *denies* concerning the law: It had not the actual accomplishment of the promise of good things; it had not Christ exhibited in the flesh; it had not the true, real sacrifice of perfect expiation: it represented these things, it had a shadow of them, but enjoyed not, exhibited not the things themselves. Hence was its imperfection and weakness, so that by none of its sacrifices it could make the church perfect.

**Obs. I.** Whatever there may be in any religious institutions, and the diligent observation of them, if they come short of exhibiting Christ himself unto believers, with the benefits of his mediation, they cannot make us perfect, nor give us acceptance with God. — For,

1. It was he himself in his own person that was the principal subject of all the promises of old. Hence they who lived not to enjoy his exhibition in the flesh are said to “die in faith,” but “not to receive the promise,” <sup><A19></sup>Hebrews 11:39. But it is through the promise that all good things are communicated unto us.

2. Nothing is good or useful unto the church but through its relation unto him. So was it with the duties of religious worship under the old testament. All their use and worth lay in this, that they were shadows of him and his mediation. And that of those in the new testament is, that

they are more efficacious means of his exhibition and communication unto us.

**3.** He alone could perfectly expiate sin and consummate the state of the church by the sacrifice of himself.

Fourthly, This being the state of the law, or first covenant, the apostle makes an application of it unto the question under debate in the last words of the verse: “Can never with those sacrifices, which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.” We must first speak unto the reading of the words, and then unto the sense and meaning.

Expositors generally take notice that in the original there is a trajection in the words, or that they are placed out of their proper order; which translators do rectify: *Κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς ζυσίαις*, — “Every year” (or “yearly”) “with the sacrifices which they offer;” for *Ταῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ζυσίαις*, — “With those sacrifices which they offer year by year,” as we have rendered the words. But the apostle seems to place *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν* in the entrance of the words to signalize the annual sacrifice, which he principally intended. But there is a great difficulty in the distinction and pointing of the words that follow: *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, “in perpetuum,” “continually,” or “for ever;” that is, say some, which they were so to do indispensably by the law whilst the tabernacle or temple was standing, or those ordinances of worship were in force.

But neither the signification of the word nor the use of it in this epistle will allow it in this place to belong unto the words and sentence going before; for it doth not anywhere signify a duration or continuance with a limitation. And the apostle is far from allowing an absolutely perpetual duration-unto the law and its sacrifices, were they of what use soever, especially in this place, where he is proving that they were not perpetual, nor had an efficacy to accomplish any thing perfectly; which is the other signification of the word. And it is used only in this epistle, <sup>810B</sup> Hebrews 7:3, in this place, and verses 12, 14, of this chapter. But in all these places it is applied only unto the office of Christ, and the efficacy of it in his personal ministry. It is of the same signification with *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, <sup>810C</sup> Hebrews 7:25, “for ever,” “to the uttermost,” “perfectly.” Wherefore that which is affirmed of Christ and his sacrifice, verses 12, 14, of the chapter, is here denied of the law. And the words should be joined with

those that follow: “The law by its sacrifices could not perfect for ever” (or “unto the utmost”) “the comers thereunto.”

In the words thus read there are three things:

1. The impotency of the law; **Οὐδέποτε δύναται**, — “It can never.”
2. That with respect whereunto this impotency is charged on it; that is, “the sacrifices which it offered.”
3. The effect itself denied with respect unto that impotency; which is, “to perfect for ever the comers thereunto.”

1. The *impotency of the law* as unto the end mentioned is emphatically expressed, **Οὐδέποτε δύναται**, — “It can never do it:” ‘it can do it by no means, no way; it is impossible it should.’ And it is thus expressed to obviate all thoughts in the minds of the Hebrews of all expectations of perfection by the law. For thus they were apt to think and hope, that, by one way and means or another, they might have acceptance with God by the law. Wherefore it was necessary thus to speak unto them who had an inveterate persuasion unto the contrary.

2. *That with respect whereunto this impotency is ascribed unto the law* is its “sacrifices” For from them was the perfect expiation of sin to be expected, or from nothing prescribed by the law. To deny this power unto them, is to deny it absolutely unto the whole law, and all its institutions. And these sacrifices are expressed with respect unto their *nature*, the *time* of their offering, and *those* by whom they were offered.

(1.) For their *nature*, he says, **Ταῖς αὐταῖς ζυσίαις**: “Iisdem sacrificiis;” “iis ipsis hostiis” or “sacrificiis.” Our translation rendereth not the emphasis of the expression. “Iis hostiis quas quotannis, — “with the same sacrifices,” or “those sacrifices which were of the same kind and nature.” **Αὐταῖς** is omitted in our translation. **Ταῖς ζυσίαις**, is “with those sacrifices;” the article being demonstrative. “The same;” — not individually the same, for they were many, and offered often, or every year, when a sacrifice was offered again materially the same; but they were of the same kind. They could not by the law offer a sacrifice of one kind one year, and a sacrifice of another the next; but the same sacrifices in their substance and essence, in their matter and manner, were annually repeated,

without variation or alteration. And this the apostle urgeth, to show that there was no more in any one of them than in another; and what one could not do, could not be done by its repetition, for it was still the same. Great things were effected by these sacrifices: by them was the first covenant consecrated and confirmed; by them was atonement and expiation of sin made, — that is, typically and declaratively; by them were the priests themselves dedicated unto God; by them were the people made holy. Wherefore this impotency being ascribed unto them, it absolutely concludes unto the whole law, with all other privileges and duties of it.

(2.) He describes them from the *time and season* of their offering. It was *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, “yearly, every year, year by year.” It is hence manifest what sacrifices he principally intends, namely, the *anniversary sacrifices of expiation*, when the high priest entered into the most holy place with blood, Leviticus 16. And he instanceth therein, not to exclude other sacrifices from the same censure, but as giving an instance for them all in that which was most solemn, had the most eminent effects, at once respecting the whole church, and that which the Jews principally trusted unto. Had he mentioned sacrifices in general, it might have been replied, that although the sacrifices which were *daily offered*, or those on especial occasions, might not perfect the worshippers, at least not the whole congregation, yet the church itself might be perfected by that *great sacrifice* which was offered *yearly*, with the blood whereof the high priest entered into the presence of God. Accordingly, the Jews have such a saying among them, “That on the day of expiation all Israel was made as righteous as in the day wherein man was first created.” But the apostle, applying his argument unto those sacrifices, and proving their insufficiency unto the end mentioned, leaves no reserve unto any thoughts that it might be attained by other sacrifices which were of another nature and efficacy. And besides, to give the greater cogency unto his argument, he fixeth on those sacrifices which had the least of what he proves their imperfection by. For these sacrifices were repeated only once a-year. And if this repetition of them once a-year proves them weak and imperfect, how much more were those so which were repeated every day, or week, or month!

(3.) He refers unto the *offerers* of those sacrifices: “Which they offer,” — that is, the high priests, of whom he had treated in the foregoing chapter.

And he speaks of things in the present tense. “The law cannot,” and “which they offer:” not “The law could not,” and “which they offered.” The reason hereof hath been before declared. For he sets before the Hebrews a scheme and representation of all their worship at its first institution, that they might discern the original intention of God therein. And therefore he insists only on the tabernacle, making no mention of the temple. So he states what was done at the first giving of the law, and the institution of all its ordinances of worship, as if it were now present before their eyes. And if it had not the power mentioned at their first institution, when the law was in all its vigor and glory, no accession could be made unto it by any continuance of time, any otherwise but in the false imagination of the people.

**3.** That which remains of the words is an account of what the law could not do or effect by its sacrifices: “It could not make the comers thereunto perfect for ever.”

There are in the words,

- (1.) The effect denied.
- (2.) The persons with respect unto whom it is denied.
- (3.) The limitation of that denial.

(1.) *The effect denied;* what it cannot do, is **τελειῶσαι**, — “dedicate,” “consummate,” “consecrate,” “perfect,” “sanctify.” Of the meaning of the word in this epistle I have spoken often before. As also, I have showed at large what that **τελείωσις** is which God designed unto the church in this world, wherein it did consist, and how the law could not effect it. See the exposition on <sup><301></sup>Hebrews 7:11. Here it is the same with **τελειῶσαι κατὰ συνείδησιν**, <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:9, — “perfect as pertaining unto the conscience;” which is ascribed unto the sacrifice of Christ, verse 14. Wherefore the word principally in this place respects the expiation of sin, or the taking away the guilt of it by atonement; and so the apostle expounds it in the following verses, as shall be declared.

(2.) *Those with respect unto whom this power is denied unto the law* are **προσερχόμενοι**; say we, “the comers thereunto; “accedentes.” The expression is every way the same with that of <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:9,

Τελειῶσαι κατὰ συνείδησιν τὸν λατρεύοντα. Οἱ λατρεύοντες and οἱ προσερχόμενοι, “the worshippers” and “the comers,” are the same, as is declared verses 2, 3; those who make use of the sacrifices of the law in the worship of God, who approach unto him by sacrifices. And they are thus expressed by Lord comers,” partly from the original direction given about the observation, and partly from the nature of the service itself. The first we have, <sup>Leviticus 1:2</sup> אָמַן בְּיָדֵינוּ מִכֶּם קָרְבָּן.

The word signifies “to draw nigh,” “to come near with an oblation:” These are the “comers,” those who draw nigh with, and bring their oblations unto the altar. And such was the nature of the service itself.. It consisted in coming with their sacrifice unto the altar, with the priests approaching unto the sacrifice; in all which an access was made unto God. Howbeit the word here is of a larger signification, nor is it to be limited unto them who brought their own sacrifices, but extends unto all that came to attend unto the solemnity of them; whereby, according to God’s appointment, they had a participation in the benefit of them. For respect is had unto the anniversary sacrifice, which was not brought by any, but was provided for all. But as the priests were included in the foregoing words, “which they offer;” so by these “comers,” the people are intended, for whose benefit these sacrifices were offered. For, as was said, respect is had unto the great anniversary sacrifice, which was offered in the name and on the behalf of the whole congregation. And those, if any, might be made perfect by the sacrifices of the law, namely, those that came unto God by them, or through the use of them, according unto his institution.

**(3.)** That wherein the law failed, as unto the appearance it made of the expiation of sin, was that it could not effect it εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, “absolutely, completely,” and “for ever.” It made an expiation, but it was *temporary only*, not for ever. It did so both in respect unto the consciences of the worshippers and the outward effects of its sacrifices. Their effect on the consciences of the worshippers was temporary; for a sense of sin returned on them, which forced them unto a repetition of the same sacrifices again, as the apostle declares in the next verse. And as unto the outward effects of them, they consisted in the removal of temporal punishments and judgments, which God had threatened unto the transgressors of the old covenant. This they could reach unto, but no farther. To expiate sin fully, and that with respect unto eternal



punishment, so as to take away the guilt of sin from the consciences, and all punishments from the persons of men, — which is to “perfect them for ever,” which was done by the sacrifice of Christ, — this they could not do, but only represent what was to be done afterwards.

If any shall think meet to retain the ordinary distinction of the words, and refer εἰς τὸ διηνεκέξ to what goes before, so taking the word *adverbially*, “they offer them year by year continually,” then the necessity of the annual repetition of those sacrifices is intended in it. This they did, and this they were to do always whilst the tabernacle was standing, or the worship of the law continued. And from the whole verse sundry things may be observed.

**Obs. II.** Whatever hath the least representation of Christ, or relation unto him, the obscurest way of teaching the things concerning his person and grace, whilst it is in force, hath a glory in it. — He alone in himself originally bears the whole glory of God in the worship and salvation of the church; and he gives glory unto all institutions of divine worship. The law had but a shadow of him and his office, yet was the ministration of it glorious. And much more is that of the gospel and its ordinances so, if we have faith to discern their relation unto him, and experience of his exhibition of himself and the benefits of his mediation unto us by them. Without this they have no glory, whatever order or pomp may be applied unto their outward administration.

**Obs. III.** Christ and his grace were the only good things, that were absolutely so, from the foundation of the world, or the giving of the first promise. — In and by them there is not only a deliverance from the curse, which made all things *evil*; and a restoration of all the *good* that was lost by sin, in a sanctified, blessed use of the creatures; but an increase and addition is made unto all that was good in the state of innocency, above what can be expressed. Those who put such a valuation on the meaner, uncertain enjoyment of other things, as to judge them their “good things,” their “goods,” as they are commonly called, so as not to see that all which is absolutely good is to be found in him alone; much more they who seem to judge almost all things good besides, and Christ with his grace good for nothing; will be filled with the fruit of their own ways, when it is too late to change their minds.

**Obs. IV.** There is a great difference between the shadow of good things to come, and the good things themselves actually exhibited and granted unto the church. This is the fundamental difference between the two testaments, the law and the gospel, from whence all others do arise, and whereinto they are resolved. Some, when they hear that there was justification, sanctification, and eternal life, to be obtained under the old covenant and its administrations, by virtue of the promise which they all had respect unto, are ready to think that there was no material difference between the two covenants. I have spoken at large hereunto in the eighth chapter. I shall now only say, that he who sees not, who finds not a glory, excellency, and satisfaction, producing peace, rest, and joy in his soul, from the actual exhibition of these good things, as declared and tendered in the gospel, above what might be obtained from an obscure representation of them as future, is a stranger unto gospel light and grace.

**Obs. V.** The principal interest and design of them that come to God, is to have assured evidence of the perfect expiation of sin. — This of old they came unto God by the sacrifices of the law for; which could only represent the way whereby it was to be done. Until assurance be given hereof, no sinner can have the least encouragement to approach unto God. For no guilty person can stand before him. Where this foundation is not laid in the soul and conscience, all attempts of access unto God are presumptuous. This, therefore, is that which the gospel in the first place proposeth unto the faith of them that do receive it.

**Obs. VI.** What cannot be effected for the expiation of sin at once by any duty or sacrifice, cannot be effected by its reiteration or repetition. — Those generally who seek for atonement and acceptation with God by their own duties, do quickly find that no one of them will effect their desire. Wherefore they place all their confidence in the repetition and multiplication of them; what is not done at one time, they hope may be done at another; what one will not do, many shall. But after all, they find themselves mistaken. For, —

**Obs. VII.** The repetition of the same sacrifices doth of itself demonstrate their insufficiency unto the end sought after. — Wherefore those of the Roman church who would give countenance unto the sacrifice of the mass, by affirming that it is not another sacrifice, but the very same that Christ

himself offered, do prove, if the argument of the apostle here insisted on be good and cogent, an insufficiency in the sacrifice of Christ for the expiation of sin; for so he affirms it is with all sacrifices that are to be repeated, whereof he esteems the repetition itself a sufficient demonstration.

**Obs. VIII.** God alone limiteth the ends and efficacy of his own institutions. — It may be said, that if these sacrifices did not make perfect them that came unto God by them, then their so coming unto him was lost labor, and to no purpose. But there were other ends and other uses of this their coming unto God, as we have declared; and unto them all they were effectual. There never was, there never shall be, any loss in what is done according unto the command of God. Other things, however we may esteem them, are but hay and stubble, which have no power or efficacy unto any spiritual ends.

### VERSES 2, 3.

Ἐπεὶ ἄν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι  
 συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους,  
 ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν.

The Syriac translation refers that unto the persons which is affirmed of their offerings, אֱלוֹ גִיר גְּמִינִן חֲוָה “for if they had been perfect,” or “made perfect,” — referring unto what went before, that they were not made perfect, — מִן קִוָּר בְּנִיְהוֹן כְּבָר דִּין אֲתִנְיָחוּ, “they would have long since ceased” or “rested from their oblations” or “offerings.” “They would have offered them no more.” And although it doth not at all express τοὺς λατρεύοντας, which follows in the verse, yet it regulates the sense of the whole by that word, as it more plainly declares in rendering the following words, מְכִיל טִיבָא הֶהָת לְהוֹן תְּאַרְתְּהוֹן בְּחֶטְאָא לְאִילִין, דְּחֶדְא זָבֵן אֲתַדְכְּבִיו לְהוֹן מְטוּל דְּלֵא, “because their conscience would no more have tossed” or “disquieted them for their sins, who had at one time been purified;” which is a good exposition, though not an exact translation of the words. And so it renders the next verse, “but in these sacrifices their sins are remembered (called to mind) every year.” Ἐπεὶ ἄν ἐπαύσαντο. Many ancient copies add the negative, οὐκ, — ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄν, whereof we shall speak immediately. Ἐπεὶ. Vulg., “alioquin;” and so

others generally. Of the word, see <sup>302</sup> Hebrews 9:26. “For if so,” **ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι**, “cessassent (semel) oblata;” “they would have ceased, being once offered.” Most render the participle by the infinitive mood, “desiissent offerri,” “they would have ceased to be offered.” **Τοὺς λατρεύοντας**, “cultores,” “the worshippers:” “sacrificantes,” “the sacrificers,” say some, I think improperly, both as to the proper sense of the word and the things intended. The priests only properly were “sacrificantes,” but the people are here intended. **Κεκαθαρμένους**, (Mss., **κακαθαρισμένους**,) “mundati,” “purificati,” “purgati;” “cleansed,” “purified,” “purged.” **Διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἀμαρτιῶν**. “Ideo quod nullam habent ultra conscientiam peccati.” Vulg. Lat., “ideo quod,” for “propterea;” “peccati,” for “peccatorum.” “Nullorum peccatorum amplius sibi essent conscii,” Beza; “they should no more be conscious unto themselves of any sin.” The sense is given in the Syriac before mentioned. Arab., “they would have made more mention of the commemoration of sins,” with respect unto the words following. **Ἀνάμνησις**. Syr., “but in these they remembered their sins.” “Recommemoratio,” “repetita mentio;” a calling to remembrance by acknowledgment.

There is, as was observed, a different reading in the ancient copies of the first words in the second verse. The Syriac and the Vulgar Latin take no notice of the negative particle **οὐκ**, but read the words positively, “then would they have ceased.” Those who follow other copies take **οὐκ** for **οὐχί**, — “non” for “nonne,” and render the words interrogatively, as doth our translation; “for then would they not have ceased?” that is, they would have done so. And then **ἐπεὶ** is to be rendered adversatively, by “alioquin,” as it is by most, “for otherwise.” But it may be rendered causally, by “for then,” if an interrogation be allowed. But the sense is the same in both readings, as we shall see. <sup>f26</sup>

**Ver. 2.** — For otherwise they would have ceased to be offered; because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.

The words contain a confirmation, by a new argument, of what was affirmed in the verse foregoing. And it is taken from the frequent repetition of those sacrifices. The thing to be proved is the insufficiency of the law

to perfect the worshippers by its sacrifices. This he proves in the foregoing verse, from the formal cause of that insufficiency; which is, that in them all it had but “a shadow of good things to come,” and so could not effect that which was to be done only by the good things themselves. Here the same truth is proved “ab effectu,” or “a signo,” from a demonstrative sign and evidence of it in their repetition.

The present argument, therefore, of the apostle is taken from a sign of the *impotency* and *insufficiency* which he had before asserted. There is, as was observed, a variety in the original copies, some having the negative particle οὐκ, others omitting it. If that note of negation be allowed, the words are to be read by way of interrogation, “Would they not have ceased to be offered?” that is, they would have done so, or, God would not have appointed the repetition of them. If it be omitted, the assertion is positive, “They would have then ceased to be offered;” there was no reason for their continuance, nor would God have appointed it. And the notes of the inference, ἐπεὶ ἄν, are applicable unto either reading: ‘For then in that case, on this supposition that they could perfect the worshippers, would they not (or, they would) have ceased to be offered? There would have been rest given unto them, a stop put to their offering.’ That is, God would have appointed them to have been offered once, and no more. So the apostle observes signally of the sacrifice of Christ, that he “once offered” himself, that he offered “once for all;” because by one offering, and that once offered, he did perfect them that were sanctified or dedicated unto God thereby.

That which the apostle designs to prove, is that they did not by their own force and efficacy for ever perfect the church, or bring it unto that state of justification, sanctification, and acceptance with God, which was designed unto it, with all the privileges and spiritual worship belonging unto that state. That this they did not do he declares in the words following, by a notable instance included in their repetition. For all means of any sort, as such, do cease when their end is attained. The continuance of their use is an evidence that the end proposed is not effected.

In opposition unto this argument in general it may be said, ‘That this reiteration or repetition of them was not because they did not perfectly expiate sins, the sins of the offerers, all that they had committed and were

guilty of before their offering; but because those for whom they were offered did again contract the guilt of sin, and so stood in need of a renewed expiation hereof.’

In answer unto this objection, which may be laid against the foundation of the apostle’s argument, I say there are two things in the expiation of sin: first, The effects of the sacrifice towards God, in making atonement; secondly, The application of those effects unto our consciences. The apostle treats not of the latter, or the means of the application of the effects and benefits of the expiation of sin unto our consciences, which may be many, and frequently repeated. Of this nature are still all the ordinances of the gospel; and so also are our own faith and repentance. The principal end, in particular, of that great ordinance of the supper of the Lord, which by his own command is frequently to be repeated, and ever was so in the church, is to make application unto us of the virtue and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ in his death unto our souls. For a renewed participation of the thing signified is the only use of the frequent repetition of the sign. So renewed acts of faith and repentance are continually necessary, upon the incursions of new acts of sin and defilement. But by none of these is there any atonement made for sin, or an expiation of it; only the one, the great sacrifice of atonement, is applied unto us, not to be repeated by us. But the apostle treats only of that we mentioned in the first place, the efficacy of sacrifices to make reconciliation and atonement for sin before God; which the Jews expected from them. And acts towards God need no repetition, to make application of them unto him. Wherefore God himself being the only object of sacrifices for the expiation of sin, what cannot be effected towards him and with him by one and at once, can never be done by repetition of the same.

Supposing, therefore, the end of sacrifices to be the *making of atonement* with God for sin, and the procurement of all the privileges wherewith it is accompanied, — which was the faith of the Jews concerning them, — and the repetition of them doth invincibly prove that they could not of themselves effect what they were applied unto or used for; especially considering that this repetition of them was enjoined to be perpetual, whilst the law continued in force. If they could at any time have perfected the worshippers, they would have ceased to be offered; for unto what end

should that continuance serve? To abide in a show or pretense of doing that which is done already, doth no way answer the wisdom of divine institutions.

And we may see herein both the obstinacy and miserable state thereon of the present Jews. The law doth plainly declare, that without atonement by blood there is no remission of sins to be obtained. This they expect by the sacrifices of the law, and their frequent repetition; not by any thing which was more perfect, and which they did represent. But all these they have been utterly deprived of for many generations; and therefore must all of them, on their own principles, die in their sins and under the curse. The woful, superstitious follies whereby they endeavor to supply the want of those sacrifices, are nothing but so many evidences of their obstinate blindness.

And it is hence also evident, that the superstition of the church of Rome in their mass, wherein they pretend to offer, and every day to repeat, a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, doth evidently demonstrate that they disbelieve the efficacy of the one sacrifice of Christ, as once offered, for the expiation of sin. For if it be so, neither can it be repeated, nor any other used for that end, if we believe the apostle.

The remaining words of this verse confirm the argument insisted on, namely, that those sacrifices would have ceased to be offered if they could have made the church perfect; for, saith he, “The worshippers being once purged, they should have had no more conscience of sins.” And we must inquire,

1. Who are intended by “the worshippers.”
2. What it is to be “*purged*.”
3. What is the *effect* of this purging, in “having no more conscience of sins.”
4. *How the apostle proves* his intention hereby.

1. The “worshippers,” οἱ λατρεύοντες, are the same with οἱ προσερχόμενοι, the “comers,” in the verse foregoing: and in neither place the priests who offered the sacrifices, but the people for whom they were

offered, are intended. They it was who made use of those sacrifices for the expiation of sin.

**2.** Concerning these persons it is supposed, that if the sacrifices of the law could make them “perfect” then would they have been” purged; wherefore **καθαρίζεσθαι** is the effect of **τελειῶσαι**, — to be “purged,” of being “made perfect.” For the apostle supposeth the negation of the latter from the negation of the former: ‘If the law did not make them perfect, then were they not purged.’

This sacred **καθαρισμός** respects either the *guilt* of sin or the *filth* of it. The one is removed by justification, the other by sanctification. The one is the effect of the sacerdotal actings of Christ towards God in making atonement for sin; the other of the application of the virtue and efficacy of that sacrifice unto our souls and consciences, whereby they are purged, cleansed, renewed, and changed. It is the purging of the first sort that is here intended; such a purging of sin as takes away the condemning power of sin from the conscience on the account of the guilt of it. ‘If they had been purged, (as they would have been had the law made the comers unto its sacrifices perfect);’ that is, if there had been a complete expiation of sin made for them.

And the supposition denied hath its qualification and limitation in the word **ἅπαξ**, “once.” By this word he expresseth the *efficacy* of the sacrifice of Christ, which being one, *at once* effected what it was designed unto. And it doth not design only the doing of a thing at one time, but the so doing of it as that it should never more be done.

**3.** That these worshippers were not thus purged by any of the sacrifices which were offered for them the apostle proves from hence, because they had not the necessary effect and consequence of such a purification. For if they had been so purged, “they would have had no more conscience of sins;” but that they had so he proves in the next verse, from the legal recognition that was made of them every year. And if they had had no more conscience of sins, there would have been no need of offering sacrifices for their expiation any more.

**(1.)** The introduction of the assertion is by the particles “because that;” which direct unto the argument that is in the words, “they would have



ceased to be offered," because their end would have been accomplished, and so themselves taken away.'

(2.) On the supposition made, there would have been an *alteration* made in the state of the worshippers. When they came unto the sacrifices, they came with conscience of sin. This is unavoidable unto a sinner before expiation and atonement be made for it. Afterwards, if they were purged, it should be so no more with them; they should no more have conscience of sin. "They should no more have conscience of sins;" or rather, "they should not any more" (or "further") "have any conscience of sins; or, "they should have no conscience of sins any more." The meaning of the word is singularly well expressed in the Syriac translation: "They should have no conscience agitating, tossing, disquieting, perplexing for sins;" no conscience judging and condemning their persons for the guilt of sin, so depriving them of solid peace with God. It is conscience with respect unto the guilt of sin, as it binds over the sinner unto punishment in the judgment of God. Now this is not to be measured by the apprehension of the sinner, but by the true causes and grounds of it. Now these lie herein alone, that sin was not perfectly expiated; for where this is not, there must be a conscience of sin, that is, disquieting, judging, condemning for sin.

4. The apostle speaks on the one side and the other of them, who were really interested in the sacrifices whereunto they might trust for the expiation of sin. The way hereof, as unto them of old, and the legal sacrifices, was the due attendance unto them, and performance of them according unto God's institution. Hence are the persons so interested called the "comers" to them, and the "worshippers." The way and means of our interest in the sacrifice of Christ are by faith only. In this state it often falls out that true believers have a conscience judging and condemning them for sin, no less than they had under the law; but this trouble and power of conscience doth not arise from hence, that sin is not perfectly expiated by the sacrifice of Christ, but only from an apprehension that they have not a due interest in that sacrifice and the benefits of it. Under the old testament they questioned not their due interest in their sacrifices, which depended on the performance of the rites and ordinances of service belonging unto them; but their consciences charged them with the guilt of sin, through an apprehension that their sacrifices could not perfectly expiate it. And this they found themselves

led unto by God's institution of their repetition; which had not been done if they could ever make the worshippers perfect.

It is quite otherwise as unto *conscience for sin* remaining in believers under the new testament; for they have not the least sense of fear concerning any *insufficiency* or *imperfection* in the sacrifice whereby it is expiated. God hath ordered all things concerning it so as to satisfy the consciences of all men in the perfect expiation of sin by it; only they who are really purged by it may be in the dark sometimes as unto their personal interest in it.

But it may be objected, 'That if the sacrifices neither by their native efficacy, nor by the frequency of repetition, could take away sin, so as that they who came unto God by them could have peace of conscience, or be freed from the trouble of a continual condemnatory sentence in themselves, then was there no true, real peace with God under the old testament, for other way of attaining it there was none. But this is contrary unto innumerable testimonies of Scripture, and the promises of God made then unto the church.' In answer hereunto, I say, The apostle did not, nor doth in these words, declare what they did and could, or could not attain unto under the old testament; only what they could not attain by the means of their sacrifices (so he declares it in the next verse); for in them "remembrance is made of sins." But in the use of them, and by their frequent repetition, they were taught to look continually unto the great expiatory sacrifice, whose virtue was laid up for them in the promise; whereby they had peace with God.

**Obs. I.** The discharge of conscience from its condemning right and power, by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ, is the foundation of all other privileges we receive by the gospel. Where this is not, there is no real participation of any other of them.

**Obs. II.** All peace with God is resolved into a purging atonement made for sin: "Being once purged."

**Obs. III.** It is by a principle of gospel light alone that conscience is directed to condemn all sin, and yet to acquit all sinners that are purged. Its own natural light can give it no guidance herein.

**Ver. 3.** — But in those [*sacrifices there is*] a remembrance again [*made*] of sins every year.

It is the latter part of the foregoing assertion, namely, that the worshippers were not purged or perfected by them, in that they had still remaining a conscience for sins, which is proposed unto confirmation; for this being a matter of fact might be denied by the Hebrews. Wherefore the apostle proves the truth of his assertion from an inseparable adjunct, of the yearly repetition of these sacrifices, according unto divine institution.

There are four things to be opened in the words:

1. The introduction of the reason intended, by an adversative conjunction, ἀλλά, “but.”
2. The subject spoken of; “those sacrifices.”
3. What belonged unto them by divine institution; which is, a renewed remembrance of sin.
4. The seasons of it; it was to be made every year.

1. The *note of introduction* gives us the nature of the argument insisted on: ‘Had the worshippers been perfect, they would have had no more conscience for sins. But,’ saith he, ‘it was not so with them; for God appoints nothing in vain, yet he had not only appointed the repetition of these sacrifices, but also that in every repetition of them there should be a *remembrance made of sin*, as of that which was yet to be expiated.’

2. The *subject spoken of* is expressed in these words, ἐν αὐταῖς, “in them.” But this relative is remote from the antecedent, which is in the first verse, by the interposition of the second, wherein it is repeated. We transfer it hither from the first verse in our translation, “but in those *sacrifices*,” and we supply the defect of the verb substantive by “there is:” for there is no more in the original than “but in them a remembrance again of sins.” The sacrifices intended are principally those of the solemn day of expiation: for he speaks of them that were repeated *yearly*; that is, “*once every year*.” Others were repeated every day, or as often as occasion did require; these only were so yearly. And these are peculiarly fixed on, because of the peculiar solemnity of their offering, and the interest of the whole people at once in them. By these, therefore, they looked for the perfect expiation of sin.

**3.** That which is affirmed of these sacrifices is, *their inseparable adjunct*, that in them there was a “remembrance of sins again;” that is, there was so by virtue of divine institution, whereon the force of the argument doth depend. For this remembrance of sin by God’s own institution was such as sufficiently evidenced that the offerers had yet a conscience condemning them for sins. Respect is had unto the command of God unto this purpose, <sup><1862></sup>Leviticus 16:21, 22. Ἀνάμνησις is an “express remembrance,” or a remembrance expressed by confession or acknowledgment. See <sup><0409></sup>Genesis 41:9, 42:21. For where it respects sin, it is a recalling of it unto the sentence of the law, and a sense of punishment. See <sup><0485></sup>Numbers 5:15; <sup><1178></sup>1 Kings 17:18. And hereby the apostle proves effectually that these sacrifices did not make the worshippers perfect; for notwithstanding their offering of them, a sense of sin still returned upon their consciences, and God himself had appointed that every year they should make such an acknowledgment and confession of sin as should manifest that they stood in need of a further expiation than could be attained by them.

But a difficulty doth here arise of no small importance. For what the apostle denies unto these offerings of the law, that he ascribes unto the one only sacrifice of Christ. ‘Yet notwithstanding this sacrifice and its efficacy, it is certain that believers ought not only once a-year, but every day, to call sins to remembrance, and to make confession thereof; yea, our Lord Jesus Christ himself hath taught us to pray every day for the pardon of our sins, wherein there is a calling of them unto remembrance. It doth not, therefore, appear wherein the difference lies between the efficacy of their sacrifices and that of Christ, seeing after both of them there is equally a remembrance of sin again to be made.’

*Ans.* The difference is evident between these things. Their confession of sin was in order unto, and preparatory for, a new atonement and expiation of it; — this sufficiently proves the insufficiency of those that were offered before; for they were to come unto the new offerings as if there had never been any before them: our remembrance of sin and confession of it respect only the application of the virtue and efficacy of the atonement once made, without the least desire or expectation of a new propitiation. In their remembrance of sin respect was had unto the curse of the law which was to be answered, and the wrath of God which was to be

appeased; it belonged unto the sacrifice itself, whose object was God: ours respects only the application of the benefits of the sacrifice of Christ unto our own consciences, whereby we may have assured peace with God. The sentence or curse of the law was on them, until a new atonement was made; for the soul that did not join in the sacrifice was to be cut off: but the sentence and curse of the law was at once taken away, <sup>4015</sup>Ephesians 2:15-16. And we may observe, —

**Obs. IV.** An obligation unto such ordinances of worship as could not expiate sin, nor testify that it was perfectly expiated, was part of the bondage of the church under the old testament.

**Obs. V.** It belongs unto the light and wisdom of faith so to remember sin, and make confession of it, as not therein or thereby to seek after a new atonement for it, which is made “once for all.” Confession of sin is no less necessary under the new testament than it was under the old; but not for the same end. And it is an eminent difference between the spirit of bondage and that of liberty by Christ: the one so confesseth sin as to make that very confession a part of atonement for it; the other is encouraged unto confession because of the atonement already made, as a means of coming unto a participation of the benefits of it. Wherefore the causes and reasons of the confession of sin under the new testament are,

- 1.** To affect our own minds and consciences with a sense of the guilt of sin in itself, so as to keep us humble and filled with self-abasement. He who hath no sense of sin but only what consists in dread of future judgment, knows little of the mystery of our walk before God, and obedience unto him, according unto the gospel.
- 2.** To engage our souls unto watchfulness for the future against the sins we do confess; for in confession we make an abrenunciation of them.
- 3.** To give unto God the glory of his righteousness, holiness, and aversation from sin. This is included in every confession we make of sin; for the reason why we acknowledge the evil of it, why we detest and abhor it, is its contrariety unto the nature, holy properties, and will of God.
- 4.** To give unto him the glory of his infinite grace and mercy in the pardon of it.

**5.** We use it as an instituted means to let in a sense of the pardon of sin into our own souls and consciences, through a fresh application of the sacrifice of Christ and the benefits thereof, whereunto confession of sin is required.

**6.** To exalt Jesus Christ in our hearts, by the application of ourselves unto him, as the only procurer and purchaser of mercy and pardon; without which, confession of sin is neither acceptable unto God nor useful unto our own souls. But we do not make confession of sin as a part of a compensation for the guilt of it; nor as a means to give some present pacification unto conscience, that we may go on in sin, as the manner of some is.

#### VERSE 4.

Ἄδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα τάυρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας.

There is no difficulty in the words, and very little difference in the translations of them. The Vulgar renders ἀφαιρεῖν by the passive: “Impossibile est enim sanguine taurorum et hircorum auferri peccata,” — “It is impossible that sins should be taken away by the blood of bulls and goats.” The Syriac renders ἀφαιρεῖν by ܐܘܪܝܢܐ, which is to “purge” or “cleanse,” unto the same purpose.

**Ver. 4.** — For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

This is the last determinate resolution of the apostle concerning the insufficiency of the law and its sacrifices for the expiation of sin, and the perfecting of them who come unto God, as unto their consciences. And there is in the argument used unto this end an inference from what was spoken before, and a new enforcement from the nature or subject-matter of these sacrifices.

Something must be observed concerning this assertion in general, and an objection that it is liable unto. For by “the blood of bulls and goats,” he intends all the sacrifices of the law. Now if it be impossible that they should take away sin, for what end then were they appointed? especially

considering that, in the institution of them, God told the church that he had given the blood to make atonement on the altar, <sup><B711></sup>Leviticus 17:11. It may therefore be said, — as the apostle doth in another place with respect unto the law itself, ‘If it could not by the works of it justify us before God, to what end then served the law?’ — To what end served these sacrifices, if they could not take away sin?

The answer which the apostle gives with respect unto the law in general may be applied unto the sacrifices of it, with a small addition from a respect unto their special nature. For as unto the law, he answers two things:

1. That it was “added because of transgressions,” <sup><R88></sup>Galatians 3:19.
2. That it was “a schoolmaster to guide and direct us unto Christ,” because of the severities wherewith it was accompanied, like those of a schoolmaster; not in the spirit of a tender father. And thus it was as unto the end of these sacrifices.

1. They were added unto the promise *because of transgressions*. For God in them and by them did continually represent unto sinners the curse and sentence of the law; namely, that the soul that sinneth must die, or that death was the wages of sin. For although there was allowed in them a commutation, that the sinner himself should not die, but the beast that was sacrificed in his stead, — which belonged unto their second end, of leading unto Christ, — yet they all testified unto that sacred truth, that it is “the judgement of God that they who commit sin are worthy of death.” And this was, as the whole law, an ordinance of God to deter men from sin, and so put bounds unto transgressions. For when God passed by sin with a kind of connivance, winking at the ignorance of men in their iniquities, not giving them continual warnings of their guilt and the consequent thereof in death, the world was filled and covered with a deluge of impieties. Men saw not judgment speedily executed, nor any tokens or indications that so it would be; therefore was their heart wholly set in them to do evil. But God dealt not thus with the church. He let no sin pass without a representation of his displeasure against it, though mixed with mercy, in a direction unto the relief against it in the blood of the sacrifice. And therefore, he did not only appoint these sacrifices on all the especial occasions of such sins and uncleannesses as the consciences of particular

sinner were pressed with a sense of, but also once a-year there was gathered up a remembrance of all the sins, iniquities, and transgressions of the whole congregation, Leviticus 16.

**2.** They were added as the *teaching of a schoolmaster* to lead unto Christ. By them was the church taught and directed to look continually unto and after that sacrifice which alone could really purge and take away all iniquity. For God appointed no sacrifices until after the promise of sending the Seed of the woman to break the head of the serpent. In his so doing was his own heel to be bruised, in the suffering of his human nature, which he offered in sacrifice unto God; which these sacrifices did represent.

Wherefore the church knowing that these sacrifices did call sin to remembrance, representing the displeasure of God against it, which was their first end; and that although there was an intimation of grace and mercy in them, by the commutation and substitution which they allowed, yet that they could not of themselves take away sin; it made them the more earnestly, and with longing desires, look after him and his sacrifice who should perfectly take away sin and make peace with God; wherein the principal exercise of grace under the old testament did consist.

**3.** As unto their *especial nature*, they were added as the great instruction in the way and manner whereby sin was to be taken away. For although this arose originally from God's mere grace and mercy, yet was it not to be executed and accomplished by sovereign grace and power alone. Such a taking away of sin would have been inconsistent with his truth, holiness, and righteous government of mankind, as I have elsewhere at large demonstrated.<sup>f27</sup> It must be done by the interposition of a ransom and atonement; by the substitution of one who was no sinner in the room of sinners, to make satisfaction unto the law and justice of God for sin. Hereby they became the principal direction of the faith of the saints under the old testament, and the means whereby they acted it on the original promise of their recovery from apostasy.

These things do evidently express the wisdom of God in their institution, although of themselves they could not take away sin. And those by whom these ends of them are denied, as they are by the Jews and Socinians, can



give no account of any end of them which should answer the wisdom, grace, and holiness of God.

This objection being removed, I shall proceed unto the exposition of the words in particular. And there are four things in them as a negative proposition:

1. The illative conjunction, declaring its respect unto what went before.
2. The subject-matter spoken of; “the blood of bulls and goats.”
3. What is denied concerning it; “it could not take away sins.”
4. The modification of this negative proposition; “it was impossible they should do so.”

1. The *illative conjunction*, “for,” declares what is spoken to be introduced in the proof and confirmation of what was before affirmed. And it is the closing argument against the imperfection and impotency of the old covenant, the law, priesthood, and sacrifices of it, which the apostle maketh use of. And indeed it is comprehensive of all that he had before insisted on; yea, it is the foundation of all his other reasonings unto this purpose. For if in the nature of the thing itself it was impossible that the sacrifices consisting of the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin, then however, whensoever, and by whomsoever they were offered, this effect could not be produced by them. Wherefore in these words the apostle puts a close unto his argument, and resumes it no more in this epistle, but only once or twice makes mention of it in the way of an illustration to set forth the excellency of the sacrifice of Christ; as verses 11, 12, of this chapter, and <sup>SCB</sup>Hebrews 13:10-12.

2. The *subject spoken of* is “the blood of bulls and goats.” The reason why the apostle expresseth them by “bulls and goats,” which were calves and kids of the goats, hath been declared on <sup>SCB</sup>Hebrews 9:11, 12. And some things must be observed concerning this description of the old sacrifices:

—

(1.) That he makes mention of the “blood” of the sacrifices only, whereas in many of them the whole bodies were offered, and the fat of them all was burned on the altar. And this he doth for the ensuing reasons:

[1.] Because it was the blood alone whereby atonement was made for sin and sinners. The fat was burned with incense, only to show that it was accepted as a sweet savor with God.

[2.] Because he had respect principally unto the anniversary sacrifice, unto the consummation whereof, and atonement thereby, the carrying the blood into the holy place did belong.

[3.] Because life natural is in an especial manner in the blood, which signified that atonement was to be made by death, and that by the effusion of blood, as it was in the sacrifice of Christ. See <sup><871f></sup>Leviticus 17:11, 12. And in the shedding of it there was an indication of the desert of sin in the offerer.

(2.) He recalls them, by this expression of their sacrifices, “the blood of bulls and goats,” unto a due consideration of what effect might be produced by them. They were accompanied with great solemnity and pomp of ceremony in their celebration. Hence arose a great esteem and veneration of them in the minds of the people. But when all was done, that which was offered was but “the blood of bulls and goats.” And there is a tacit opposition unto the matter of that sacrifice whereby sin was really to be expiated, which was “the precious blood of Christ,” as <sup><803></sup>Hebrews 9:13, 14.

3. That *which is denied of these sacrifices*, is ἀφαιρῆν ἁμαρτίας, the “taking away of sins.” The thing intended is variously expressed by the apostle, as by ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, <sup><801></sup>Hebrews 2:1 7; καθαρισμόν ποιῆσαι, <sup><803></sup>Hebrews 1:3; καθαρῖζεσθαι, <sup><804></sup>Hebrews 9:14; ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας, verse 26; ἀναφέρειν ἁμαρτίας, verse 28; — to “make reconciliation,” to “purge sin,” to “purge the conscience,” to “abolish sin,” to “bear it.” And that which he intendeth in all these expressions, which he denies to the law and its sacrifices, and ascribes unto that of Christ, is the whole entire effect thereof, so far as it immediately respected God and the law. For all these expressions respect the guilt of sin, and its removal, or the pardon of it, with righteousness before God, acceptance and peace with him. To “take away sin,” is to make atonement for it, to expiate it before God by a satisfaction given, or price paid, with the procurement of the pardon of it, according unto the terms of the new covenant.

The interpretation of these words by the Socinians is contrary unto the signification of the words themselves, and the whole design of the context: “‘Impossibile est,’ saith Schlichtingius, ‘ut sanguis taurorum et hircorum peccata tollat;’ hoc est, efficiat ut homines in posterum a peccatis abstinerent, et sic nullam amplius habeant peccatorum conscientiam, sive ullas eorum poenas metuant; quam enim quaeso vim ad haec praestandum sanguis animalium habere potest? Itaque hoc dicit, taurorum et hircorum sanguinem eam vim nequaquam habere, et ut habeat, impossibile esse, ut homines a peccatis avocet, et ne in posterum peccent efficiat.” And Grotius after him speaks to the same purpose: “‘ Ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας, quod supra ἀθετεῖν et ἀναφέρειν, est *extinguere peccata, sive facere ne ultra peccetur.* Id sanguis Christi facit, tum quia fidem in nobis parit, tum quia Christo jus dat nobis auxilia necessaria impetrandi. Pecudum sanguis nihil efficit tale.”

**(1.)** Nothing can be more alien from the design of the apostle and scope of the context. They are both of them to prove that the sacrifices of the law could not expiate sins, could not make atonement for them, could not make reconciliation with God, — could not produce the effect which the sacrifice of Christ alone was appointed and ordained unto. They were only signs and figures of it. They could not effect that which the Hebrews looked for from them and by them. And that which they expected by them was, that by them they should make atonement with God for their sins. Wherefore the apostle denies that it was possible they should effect what they looked for from them, and nothing else. It was not that they should be arguments to turn them from sin unto newness of life, so as they should sin no more. By what way, and on what consideration they were means to deter men from sin, I have newly declared. But they can produce no one place in the whole law to give countenance unto such an apprehension that this was their end; so that the apostle had no need to declare their insufficiency with respect thereunto. Especially, the great anniversary sacrifice on the day of expiation was appointed so expressly to make atonement for sin, to procure its pardon, to take away its guilt in the sight of God, and from the conscience of the sinner, that he should not be punished according unto the sentence of the law, as that it cannot be denied. This is that which the apostle declares that of themselves they

could not effect or perform, but only typically and by way of representation.

(2.) He declares directly and positively what he intends by this taking away of sin, and the ceasing of legal sacrifices thereon, verses 17, 18, “Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.” The cessation of offerings for sin follows directly on the remission of sin, which is the effect of expiation and atonement; and not upon the turning away of men from sin for the future. It is therefore our justification, and not our sanctification, that the apostle discourseth of.

(3.) The words themselves will not bear this sense. For the object of ἀφαιρέειν, that which it is exercised about, is ἁμαρτία. It is an act upon sin itself, and not immediately upon the sinner. Nor can it signify any thing but to take away the guilt of sin, that it should not bind over the sinner unto punishment; whereon conscience of sins is taken away. But to return.

4. The *manner of the negation* is, that “it was impossible” that it should be otherwise. And it was so, —

(1.) From *divine institution*. Whatever the Jews apprehended, they were never designed of God unto that end; and therefore had no virtue or efficacy for it communicated unto them. And all the virtue of ordinances of worship depends on their designation unto their end. The blood of bulls and goats, as offered in sacrifice, and carried into the most holy place, was designed of God to represent the way of taking away sin, but not by itself to effect it; and it was therefore impossible that so it should do.

(2.) It was impossible from the *nature of the things themselves*, inasmuch as there was not a condecency unto the holy perfections of the divine nature that sin should be expiated and the church perfected by the blood of bulls and goats. For,

[1.] There would not have been so unto his infinite wisdom. For God having declared his severity against sin, with the necessity of its punishment unto the glory of his righteousness and sovereign rule over his creatures, what condecency could there have been herein unto infinite wisdom? what consistency between the severity of that declaration and

the taking away of sin by such an inferior, beggarly means, as that of the blood of bulls and goats? A great appearance was made of infinite displeasure against sin, in the giving of the fiery law, in the curse of it, in the threatening of eternal death; but should all have ended in an outward show, there would have been no manner of proportion to be discerned between the demerit of sin and the means of its expiation. So that,

[2.] It had no conde-cency unto divine justice. For,

**1st.** As I have elsewhere proved at large,<sup>f28</sup> sin could not be taken away without a price, a ransom, a compensation and satisfaction made unto justice for the injuries it received by sin. In satisfaction unto justice, by way of compensation for injuries or crimes, there must be a proportion between the injury and the reparation of it, that justice may be as much exalted and glorified in the one as it was depressed and debased in the ether. But there could be no such thing between the demerit of sin and the affront put on the righteousness of God on the one hand, and a reparation by the blood of bulls and goats on the other. No man living can apprehend wherein any such proportion should lie or consist. Nor was it possible that the conscience of any man could be freed from a sense of the guilt of sin, who had nothing to trust unto but this blood to make compensation or atonement for it.

**2dly.** The apprehension of it (namely, a suitableness unto divine justice in the expiation of sins by the blood of bulls and goats) must needs be a great incentive unto profane persons unto the commission of sin. For if there be no more in sin and the guilt of it but what may be expiated and taken away at so low a price, but what may have atonement made for it by the blood of beasts, why should they not give satisfaction unto their lusts by living in sin?

**3dly.** It would have had no consistency with the sentence and sanction of the law of nature, “In the day thou eatest thou shalt die.” For although God reserved unto himself the liberty and right of substituting a surety in the room of a sinner, to die for him, — namely, such an one as should by his suffering and dying bring more glory unto the righteousness, holiness, and law of God, than either was derogated from them by the sin of man, or could be restored unto them by his eternal ruin, —yet was it not consistent with the veracity of God in

that sanction of the law that this substitution should be of a nature no way cognate, but ineffably inferior unto the nature of him that was to be delivered. For these, and other reasons of the same kind, which I have handled at large elsewhere, “it was impossible,” as the apostle assures us, “that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.” And we may observe, —

**Obs. I.** It is possible that things may usefully represent what it is impossible that, in and by themselves, they should effect. — This is the fundamental rule of all institutions of the old testament. Wherefore, —

**Obs. II.** There may be great and eminent uses of divine ordinances and institutions, although it be impossible that by themselves, in their most exact and diligent use, they should work out our acceptance with God. — And it belongs unto the wisdom of faith to use them unto their proper end, not to trust unto them as unto what they cannot of themselves effect.

**Obs. III.** It was utterly impossible that sin should be taken away before God, and from the conscience of the sinner, but by the blood of Christ. — Other ways men are apt to betake themselves unto for this end, but in vain. It is the blood of Jesus Christ alone that cleanseth us from all our sins; for he alone was the propitiation for them.

**Obs. IV.** The declaration of the insufficiency of all other ways for the expiation of sin is an evidence of the holiness, righteousness, and severity of God against sin, with the unavoidable ruin of all unbelievers.

**Obs. V.** Herein also consists the great demonstration of the love, grace, and mercy of God, with an encouragement unto faith, in that when the old sacrifices neither would nor could perfectly expiate sin, he would not suffer the work itself to fail, but provided a way that should be infallibly effective of it, as is declared in the following verses.

### VERSES 5-10.

The provision that God made to supply the defect and insufficiency of legal sacrifices, as unto the expiation of sin, peace of conscience with himself, and the sanctification of the souls of the worshippers, is declared in this context; for the words contain the blessed undertaking of our Lord Jesus Christ to do, fulfill, perform, and suffer, all things required in the

will, and by the wisdom, holiness, righteousness, and authority of God, unto the complete salvation of the church, with the reasons of the efficacy of what he so did and suffered unto that end. And we must consider both the words themselves, so far especially as they consist in a quotation out of the Old Testament, and the validity of his inferences from the testimony which he chooseth to insist on unto this purpose.

**Ver. 5-10.** — Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, λέγει, Θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ὑμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας. Τότε εἶπον, Ἴδου ἤκω (ἐν κεφαλίδι βιζιλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ) τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ ζέλημά σου. Ἀνώτερον λέγων, Ὅτι ζυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν καὶ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας, οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας· (αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται·) τότε εἶρηκεν, Ἴδου ἤκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ ζέλημά σου· ἀναირεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ· ἐν ᾧ ζελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμεν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ.

Some few differences may be observed in the ancient and best translations.

Διὸ. Vulg. Lat., “ideo quapropter.” Syr., **מְטוּל הַנָּא**, “for this, for this cause.”

Θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν, “hostiam et oblationem,” “sacrificium, victimam.” The Syriac renders the words in the plural number, “sacrifices and offerings.”

Σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, “aptasti,” “adaptasti mihi,” “praeparasti,” “perfecisti.” “A body hast thou prepared;” that is, ‘fitted for me, wherein I may do thy will.’ Syr., **פָּגַנְיָא דִּין אֶלְבָּשְׁתָּנִי**, “but thou hast clothed me with a body;” very significantly, as unto the thing intended, which is the incarnation of the Son of God. The Ethiopic renders this verse somewhat strangely: “And when he entered into the world, he saith, Sacrifices and offerings! would not; thy body he hath purified unto me;” making them, as I suppose, the words of the Father.

Οὐκ εὐδόκησας. Vulg., “non tibi placuerant;” reading the preceding words in the nominative case, altering the person and number of the verb Syr., **שְׂאֵלְתָּ לִּי**, “thou didst not require,” “non approbasti;” that is, “they

were not well pleasing,” nor “accepted with God,” as unto the end of the expiation of sin.

Ἰδοὺ ἤκω. “Ecce adsum,” “venio.”

Οὐκ ἠθέλησας, οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας. The Syriac omitteth the last word, which yet is emphatical in the discourse.

Τότε εἶρηκεν. Vulg., “tunc dixi,” “then I said;” that is, εἶπον, for “he said” for the apostle doth not speak these words, but repeats the words of the psalmist.

The reading of the words out of the Hebrew by the apostle shall be considered in our passage.<sup>f29</sup>

**Ver. 5-10.** — Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared [*fitted for*] me: in burnt-offerings and [*sacrifices*] for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God; [*that I should do thy will.*] Above when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings, and [*offerings*] for sin, thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure [*therein,*] which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified,, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once [*for all.*]

A blessed and divine context this is, summarily representing unto us the love, grace, and wisdom of the Father; the love, obedience, and suffering of the Son; the federal agreement between the Father and the Son as unto the work of the redemption and salvation of the church; with the blessed harmony between the Old and New Testament in the declaration of these things. The divine authority and wisdom that evidence themselves herein are ineffable, and do cast contempt on all those by whom this epistle hath been called in question; as sundry other passages in it do in a peculiar manner. And it is our duty to inquire with diligence into the mind of the Holy Spirit herein.

As unto the general nature of the arguing of the apostle, it consists in two parts: First, The *introduction* of a pregnant *testimony* out of the Old



Testament unto his purpose, verses 5-8, and part of the 9th. Secondly, *Inferences* from that testimony, asserting and confirming all that he had pleaded for.

In the testimony he produceth we may consider, 1. The manner of its introduction, respecting the reason of what is asserted; “Wherefore.” 2. Who it was by whom the words insisted on were spoken; “He saith.” 3. When he spake them; “When he came into the world.” 4. The things spoken by him in general; which consist in a double antithesis:

(1.) Between the *legal sacrifices* and the *obedience of Christ* in his body, verse 5;

(2.) Between *God’s acceptance of the one and the other*, with their efficacy unto the end treated of, which must be particularly spoken unto.

FIRST, The *introduction of this testimony* is by the word “wherefore,” — “for which cause,” “for which end.” It doth not give an account why the words following were spoken, but why the things themselves were so ordered and disposed. And we are directed in this word unto the due consideration of what is designed to be proved: and this is, that there was such an insufficiency in all legal sacrifices, as unto the expiation of sin, that God would remove them and take them out of the way, to introduce that which was better, to do that which the law could not do. ‘Wherefore,’ saith the apostle, ‘because it was so with the law, things are thus disposed of in the wisdom and counsel of God as is declared in this testimony.’

SECONDLY, *Who* spake the words contained in the testimony: “He saith.” The words may have a three-fold respect: —

1. As they were given out by inspiration, and are recorded in the Scripture. So they were the words of the Holy Ghost, as the apostle expressly affirms of the like words, verses 15, 16, of this chapter.

2. As they were used by the penman of the psalm, who speaks by inspiration. So they were the words of David, by whom the psalm was composed. But although David spoke or wrote these words, yet is not he himself the person spoken of, nor can any passage in the whole context be applied unto him, as we shall see in particular afterwards. Or if they may be said to be spoken of him, it was only as he bare the person of another,

or was a type of Christ. For although God himself doth frequently prefer moral *obedience* before the *sacrifices* of the law, when they were hypocritically performed, and trusted unto as a righteousness, unto the neglect of diligence in moral duties; yet David did not, would not, ought not, in his own name and person, to reject the worship of God, and present himself with his *obedience* in the room thereof, especially as unto the end of sacrifices in the expiation of sin. Wherefore, —

**3.** The words are the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: “When he cometh into the world, he saith.” And it is a vain inquiry, when in particular he spake these words; unto whom or where any mention is made of them in the stoW of him. It is no way needful that they should be literally or verbally pronounced by him. But the Holy Ghost useth these words in his name, as his, because they declare, express, and represent his mind, design, and resolution, in His coming into the world; which is the sole end and use of words. On the consideration of the insufficiency of legal sacrifices (the only appearing means unto that purpose) for the expiation of sin and the making of reconciliation with God, that all mankind might not eternally perish under the guilt of sin, the Lord Christ represents his readiness and willingness to undertake that work, with the frame of his heart and mind therein.

The ascription of these words unto the Lord Christ on the reason mentioned, gives us a prospect into,

- 1.** The love of his undertaking for us, when all other ways of our recovery failed, and were disallowed as insufficient;
- 2.** Into the foundation of his undertaking for us, which was the declaration of the will of God concerning the insufficiency of these sacrifices;
- 3.** Into his readiness to undertake the work of redemption, notwithstanding the difficulties that lay in the way of it, and what he was to undergo in the stead of the legal sacrifices.

**Obs. I.** We have the solemn word of Christ, in the declaration he made of his readiness and willingness to undertake the work of the expiation of sin, proposed unto our faith, and engaged as a sure anchor of our souls.

THIRDLY, The *season* of his speaking these words in the manner declared, was on his coming into the world: “Wherefore, coming (or “when he cometh”) “into the world, he saith.” Εἰσερχόμενος, “veniens,” or “venturus;” when he was to enter into the world, when the design of his future coming into the world was declared. So ὁ ἐρχόμενος is, “he that is to come,” <sup><11></sup>Matthew 11:3; and ἔρχεται, <sup><12></sup>John 4:25. That, therefore, may be the sense of the words: — upon the first prediction of the future coming of the Son of God into the world, the design, mind, and will wherewith he came, was declared.

Refer the words unto some actual coming of the person spoken of into the world, and various interpretations are given of them. “When he came in sacrifices, typically,” say some. But this seems not to be a word accompanying the first institution of sacrifices; namely, “Sacrifices thou wouldest not have.” “His coming into the world, was his appearance and public showing of himself unto the world, in the beginning of his ministry, as David came out of the wilderness and caves to show himself unto the people as king of Israel,” saith Grotius. But the respect unto David herein is frivolous; nor are those words used with respect unto the kingly office of Christ, but merely as unto the offering himself in sacrifice to God.

The Socinians contend earnestly, that this his coming into the world is his entrance into heaven after his resurrection. And they embrace this uncouth interpretation of the words to give countenance unto their pernicious error, that Christ offered not himself in sacrifice to God in his death, or whilst he was in this world. For his sacrifice they suppose to be metaphorically only so called, consisting in the representation of himself unto God in heaven, after his obedience and suffering. Wherefore they say, that by “the world” which he came into, “the world to come,” mentioned <sup><13></sup>Hebrews 2:5, is intended. But there is nothing sound, nothing probable or specious in this wresting of the words and sense of the Scripture. For,

1. The words in the places compared are not the same. This is κόσμος only; those are οἰκουμένη, and are not absolutely to be taken in the same sense, though the same things may be intended in various respects.
2. Οἰκουμένη is the habitable part of the earth, and can on no pretense be applied unto heaven.

**3.** I have fully proved on that place, that the apostle in that expression intendeth only the days and times of the Messiah, or of the gospel, commonly called ,among the Jews, עולם העתיד, “the world to come;” that new heaven and earth wherein righteousness should dwell But they add, that κόσμος itself is used for heaven, <sup><B></sup>Romans 4:13, Τὸ κληρονόμον, — that “he should be the heir of the world;” ‘that is, of heaven, the world above.’ But this imagination is vain also. For Abraham’s being “heir of the world” is no more but his being the “father of many nations;” nor was there ever any other promise which the apostle should refer unto of his being heir of the world, but only that of his being the father of many nations, not of the Jews on[y], but of the Gentiles also; as the apostle explains it, <sup><B></sup>Romans 4:8-12. Respect also may be had unto the promised Seed proceeding from him, who was to be the “heir of all things.”

That which they intend by his *coming into the world*, is what himself constantly calleth his *leaving of the world*, and going out of it. See <sup><B></sup>John 13:1, 16:28, 17:11, 13: “I leave the world; I am no more in the world, but these are in the world.” This, therefore, cannot be his coming into the world. And this imagination is contrary, as unto the express words, so to the open design of the apostle; for as he declares his coming into the world to be the season wherein a body was fitted for him, so that which he had to do herein was what he had to do in this world, before his departure out of it, verse 12. Wherefore this figment is contrary unto common sense, the meaning of the words, the design of the place, and other express testimonies of Scripture; and is of no use, but to be an instance how men of corrupt minds can wrest the Scripture for their ends, unto their own destruction.

The general sense of the best expositors, ancient and modern, is, that by the coming of Christ into the world his *incarnation* is intended. See <sup><B></sup>John 1:11, 3:16, 17, 19, 6:14, 9:4, 39, 11:27, 12:46, 16:28. The same with his “coming in the flesh,” his being “made flesh,” his being “manifest in the flesh;” for therein and thereby he came into the world.

Neither is there any weight in the objection of the Socinians unto this exposition of the words; namely, that the Lord Christ at his first coming in

the flesh, and in his infancy, could not do the will of God, nor could these words be used of him. For,

**1.** His coming into the world, in the act of the assumption of our nature, was in obedience unto, and for the fulfilling of the word of God. For God sent him into the world, <sup>4416</sup>John 3:16. And “he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him,” <sup>4418</sup>John 6:38.

**2.** His doing the will of God is not confined unto any one single act or duty, but extends itself unto all the degrees and whole progress of what he did and suffered in compliance with the will of God, the foundation of the whole being laid in his incarnation.

But as these words were not verbally and literally spoken by him, being only a real declaration of his design and intention; so this expression of his coming into the world is not to be confined unto any one single act or duty, so as to exclude all others from being concerned therein. It hath respect unto all the solemn acts of the susception and discharge of his mediatory office for the salvation of the church. But if any shall rather judge that in this expression some single season and act of Christ is intended, it can be no other but his incarnation, and his coming into the world thereby; for this was the foundation of all that he did afterwards, and that whereby he was fitted for his whole work of mediation, as is immediately declared. And we may observe, —

**Obs. II.** The Lord Christ had an infinite prospect of all that he was to do and suffer in the world, in the discharge of his office and undertaking. — He declared from the beginning his willingness unto the whole of it. And an eternal evidence it is of his love, as also of the justice of God in laying all our sins on him, seeing it was done by his own will and consent.

FOURTHLY, The fourth thing in the words is, *what he said*. The substance of it is laid down, verse 5. Unto which the further explication is added, verses 6, 7; and the application of it unto the intention of the apostle in those that follow. The words are recorded, <sup>4416</sup>Psalms 40:6-8, being indited by the Holy Ghost in the name of Christ, as declarative of his will.

Of the first thing proposed there are two parts: First, What concerneth the sacrifices of the law. Secondly, What concerneth himself.

First, As unto what concerneth the sacrifices, there is, —

1. The expression of the subject spoken of, that is, **נִבְחַ וּמִנְחָה**; which the apostle renders by **ζυσία**, “sacrifice and offering.” In the next verse, the one of them, namely **ζυσία**, is distributed into **עֹלֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ**; which the apostle renders by **ὄλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας**, “burnt-offerings,” or “whole burnt-offerings” and “sacrifices for sin.” It is evident that the Holy Ghost in this variety of expressions compriseth all the sacrifices of the law that had respect unto the expiation of sin. And as unto all of them, their order, especial nature, and use, I have treated at large in my exercitations before the first volume of this Exposition (Exerc.24), whither the reader is referred.

2. Of these sacrifices it is affirmed, that “God would them not,” verse 5; and that “he had no pleasure in them,” verse 6. The first in the original is **לֹא חָפְצָה** which the apostle renders by **οὐκ ἐθέλησας**, “thou wouldest not.” We render it in the psalm, “thou didst not desire.” **חָפְצָה** is “to will,” but always with desire, complacency, and delight. <sup><150></sup>Psalm 51:8, “Behold, **חָפְצָה**,” “thou desirest, thou wilt,” or “art delighted with truth in the hidden part.” Verse 18, **לֹא חָפְצָה**, “thou wouldest not,” “thou desirest not sacrifice.” <sup><151></sup>Genesis 34:19, “He had delight in Jacob’s daughter.” <sup><152></sup>Psalm 147:10. So **חָפְצָה**, the noun, is “delight,” <sup><153></sup>Psalm 1:2. The LXX. render it generally by **ἐθέλω**, and **ζέλω**, “to will;” as also the noun by **ζέλημα**. And they are of the same signification, “to will freely, voluntarily, and with delight.” But this sense the apostle doth transfer unto the other word, which he renders by **εὐδόκησας**, verse 6. In the psalm it is **שְׁאֵלָה**, “thou hast not required.” **Εὐδοκέω** is “to rest in,” “to approve,” “to delight in,” “to be pleased with.” So is it always used in the New Testament, whether spoken of God or men. See <sup><154></sup>Matthew 3:17, 12: 18, 17:5; <sup><155></sup>Luke 3:22, 12:32; <sup><156></sup>Romans 15:26, 27; <sup><157></sup>1 Corinthians 1:21, 10:5; <sup><158></sup>2 Corinthians 5:8; <sup><159></sup>Colossians 1:19, etc. Wherefore if we shall grant that the words used by the apostle be not exact versions of those used in the psalmist, as they are applied the one unto the other, yet it is evident that in both of them the full and exact meaning of both those used by the psalmist is declared; which is sufficient unto his purpose.

All the difficulty in the words may be reduced unto these two inquiries:

(1.) In what sense it is affirmed that “God would not have those sacrifices,” that he “had no pleasure in them,” that “he rested not in them.”

(2.) How was this made known, so as that it might be declared, as it is in this place.

(1.) As unto the first of these we may observe, —

[1.] That this is not spoken of the will of God *as unto the institution and appointment of these sacrifices*; for the apostle affirms that they were “offered according unto the law,” verse 8; namely, which God gave unto the people. God says, indeed, by the prophet unto the people, that “he spake not unto their fathers, nor commanded them in the day that he brought them out. of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices,” <sup><3172></sup>Jeremiah 7:22. But he speaks not absolutely as unto the things themselves, but unto their manner of the observance of them.

[2.] It is not *with respect unto the obedience of the people* in their attendance unto them during the economy of the law; for God both required it strictly of them and approved of it in them, when duly performed. The whole law and prophets bear testimony hereunto. And it was the great injunction which he left with the people, when he ceased to grant any more immediate revelations of his will unto the church, <sup><3100></sup>Malachi 4:4. And the Lord Christ himself under the Judaical church did observe them.

[3.] God doth frequently *reject or disallow them in the people*, as they were attended unto and performed by them. But this he did only in the case of their gross hypocrisy, and the two great evils wherewith it was accompanied. The first was, that they did not only prefer the outward observation of them before internal moral obedience, but trusted unto them unto the total neglect of that obedience. See <sup><3112></sup>Isaiah 1:12-17. And the other was, that they put their trust in them for righteousness and acceptance with God; about which he deals, Jeremiah 7. Yet neither was this the case under consideration in the psalm; for there is no respect had unto any miscarriages of the people about these sacrifices, but unto the sacrifices themselves.

Wherefore some say that the words are prophetical, and declare what the will of God would be after the coming of Christ in the flesh, and the

offering of his sacrifice once for all. Then God would no more require them nor accept them. But yet neither is this suited unto the mind of the Holy Ghost. For,

[1.] The apostle doth not prove by this testimony that they were to cease, but that they could not take away sin whilst they were in force.

[2.] The reason given by the Lord Christ of his undertaking, is their insufficiency during their continuance according to the law.

[3.] This revelation of the will of God made unto the church was actually true when it was made and given, or it was suited to lead them into a great mistake.

The mind of the Holy Ghost is plain enough, both in the testimony itself and in the improvement of it by the apostle. For the legal sacrifices are spoken of only with respect unto that end which the Lord Christ undertook to accomplish by his mediation. And this was the perfect, real expiation of sin, and the justification, sanctification, and eternal salvation of the church, with that perfect state of spiritual worship which was ordained for it in this world. All these things these sacrifices were appointed to prefigure and represent. But the nature and design of this prefiguration being dark and obscure, and the things signified being utterly hid from them, as unto their especial nature and the manner of their efficacy, many in all ages of the church expected them from these sacrifices; and they had a great appearance of being divinely ordained unto that end and purpose. Wherefore this is that, and that alone, with respect whereunto they are here rejected. God never appointed them unto this end, he never took pleasure in them with reference hereunto; they were insufficient, in the wisdom, holiness, and righteousness of God, unto any such purpose. Wherefore the sense of God concerning them as unto this end, is, that they were not appointed, not approved, not accepted for it.

(2.) It may be inquired, how this mind and will of God concerning the refusal of these sacrifices unto this end might be known, so as that it should be here spoken of, as of a truth unquestionable in the church. For the words, “Thou wouldest not,” “Thou tookest no pleasure,” do not express a mere internal act of the divine will, but a declaration also of what



is not well-pleasing unto God. How then was this declaration made? how came it to be known? I answer, —

[1.] The words are the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, considered as to be incarnate for the redemption of the church. As such, he was always in the bosom of the Father, participant of his counsels, especially of those which concerned the church, the children of men, <sup>1082</sup>Proverbs 8:22-24, etc. He was therefore always acquainted with all the thoughts and counsels of God concerning the ways and means of the expiation of sin, and so declared what he knew.

[2.] As unto the penman of the psalm, the words were dictated unto him by immediate revelation: which if nothing had been spoken of it or intimated before, had been sufficient for the declaration of the will of God therein; for all revelations of that nature have a beginning when they were first made. But, —

[3.] In, by, and together with the institution of all these legal sacrifices, God had from the beginning intimated unto the church that they were not the absolute, ultimate way for the expiation of sin, that he designed or would approve of. And this he did partly in the nature of the sacrifices themselves, which were no way competent or suited in themselves unto this end, it being “impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin;” partly in giving *various intimations* first, and then *express declaration* of his will, that they were only prescribed for a season, and that a time would come when their observance should utterly cease, which the apostle proves, chapters 7 and 8; and partly by evidencing that they were all but types and figures of good things to come, as we have at large declared. By these, and sundry other ways of the like kind, God had, in the institution and command of these sacrifices themselves, sufficiently manifested that he did neither design them, nor require them, nor approve of them, as unto this end of the expiation of sin. Wherefore there is in the words no new revelation absolutely, but only a more express declaration of that will and counsel of God which he had by various ways given intimation of before. And we may observe, —

**Obs. III.** No sacrifices of the law, not all of them together, were a means for the expiation of sin, suited unto the glory of God or necessities of the souls of men. — From the first appointment of sacrifices, immediately

after the entrance of sin and the giving of the promise, the observation of them in one kind or another spread itself over the whole earth. The Gentiles retained them by tradition, helped on by some conviction on a guilty conscience that by some way or other atonement must be made for sin. On the Jews they were imposed by law. There are no footsteps of light or testimony that those of the former sort, namely, the Gentiles, did ever retain any sense of the true reason and end of their original institution, and the practice of mankind thereon; which was only the confirmation of the first promise by a prefiguration of the means and way of its accomplishment. The church of Israel being carnal also, had very much lost the understanding and knowledge hereof. Hence both sorts looked for the real expiation of sin, the pardon of it, and the taking away of its punishment, by the offering of those sacrifices. As for the Gentiles, “God suffered them to walk in their own ways, and winked at the time of their ignorance.” But as unto the Jews, he had before variously intimated his mind concerning them, and at length by the mouth of David, in the person of Christ, absolutely declared their insufficiency, with his disapprobation of them, as unto the end which they in their minds applied them unto.

**Obs. IV.** Our utmost diligence, with the most sedulous improvement of the light and wisdom of faith, is necessary in our search into and inquiry after the mind and will of God, in the revelation he makes of them. — The apostle in this epistle proves by all sorts of arguments, taken from the scriptures of the Old Testament, from many other things that God had done and spoken, and from the nature of these institutions themselves, as here also by the express words of the Holy Ghost, that these sacrifices of the law, which were of God’s own appointment, were never designed nor approved by him as the way and means of the eternal expiation of sin. And he doth not deal herein with these Hebrews on his apostolical authority, and by new evangelical revelation, as he did with the church of the Gentiles; but pleads the undeniable truth of what he asserts from those direct records and testimonies which themselves owned and embraced. Howbeit, although the books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, were read unto them and among them continually, as they are unto this day, they neither understood nor do yet understand the things that are so plainly revealed in them. And as the great reason hereof is the veil of blindness and darkness that is on their minds, <sup>4483</sup> 2 Corinthians 3:13, 14; so

in all their search into the Scripture they are indeed supinely slothful and negligent. For they cleave alone unto the outward husk or shell of the letter, utterly despising the mysteries of truth contained therein. And so it is at present with the most of men, whose search into the mind of God, especially as unto what concerns his worship, keeps them in ignorance and contempt of it all their days.

**Obs. V.** The constant use of sacrifices to signify those things which they could not effect or really exhibit unto the worshippers, was a great part of the bondage that the church was kept in under the old testament. — And hereon, as those who were carnal bowed down their backs unto the burden, and their necks unto the yoke, so those who had received the Spirit of adoption, did continually pant and groan after the coming of him in and by whom all was to be fulfilled. So was the law their schoolmaster unto Christ.

**Obs. VI.** God may in his wisdom appoint and accept of ordinances and duties unto one end, which he will refuse and reject when they are applied unto another. — So he doth plainly in these words those sacrifices which in other places he most strictly enjoins. How express, how multiplied are his commands for good works, and our abounding in them! yet when they are made the matter of our righteousness before him, they are as unto that end, namely, of our justification, rejected and disapproved.

Secondly, The first part of verse 5 declares the will of God concerning the sacrifices of the law. The latter contains the supply that God in his wisdom and grace made of the defect and insufficiency of these sacrifices. And this is not any thing that should help, assist, or make them effectual, but somewhat brought in, in opposition unto them, and for their removal. This he expresseth in the last clause of this verse: “But a body hast thou prepared me.” The adversative  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , “but,” declares that the way designed of God for this end was of another nature than those sacrifices were. But yet this way must be such as should not render those sacrifices utterly useless from their first institution; which would reflect on the wisdom of God by whom they were appointed. For if God did never approve of them, never delight in them, unto what end were they ordained? Wherefore, although the real way of the expiation of sin be in itself of another nature than those sacrifices were, yet was it such as those

sacrifices were meet to prefigure and represent unto the faith of the church. The church was taught by them that without a sacrifice there could be no atonement made for sin; wherefore the way of our deliverance must be by a sacrifice. ‘It is so,’ saith the Lord Christ; ‘and therefore the first thing God did in the preparation of this new way, was the preparation of a body for me, which was to be offered in sacrifice.’ And in the antithesis, intimated in this adversative conjunction, respect is had unto the will of God. As sacrifices were that which he *would not* unto this end, so this preparation of the body of Christ was that which he *would*, which he delighted in and was well pleased withal. So the whole of the work of Christ and the effects of it are expressly referred unto this will of God, verses 9, 10.

And we must first speak unto the apostle’s rendering of these words out of the psalmist. They are in the original, אֲזַנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, “mine ears hast thou digged,” “bored,” “prepared.” All sorts of critical writers and expositors have so labored in the resolution of this difficulty, that there is little to be added unto the industry of some, and it were endless to confute the mistakes of others. I shall therefore only speak briefly unto it, so as to manifest the oneness of the sense in both places. And some things must be premised thereunto: —

**1.** That the reading of the words in the psalm is incorrupt, and they are the precise words of the Holy Ghost. Though of late years sundry persons have used an unwarrantable boldness in feigning various lections in the Hebrew text, yet none of any judgment has attempted to conjecture at any word that might be thought to be used in the room of any one of them. And as for those which some have thought the LXX. might possibly mistake, that signify “a body,” as גְּדֻנָה, — which sometimes signifies “a body” in the Chaldee dialect, — or גְּוִיָה, there is in neither of them any the least analogy unto אֲזַנַיִם, so that they are ridiculously suggested.

**2.** It doth not seem probable unto me that the LXX. did ever translate these words as they are now extant in all the copies of that translation, Σῶμα δὲ κατηρίσω μοι. For,

- (1.) It is not a translation of the original words, but an interpretation and exposition of the sense and meaning of them; which was no part of their design.
- (2.) If they made this exposition, they did so either by chance, as it were, or from a right understanding of the mystery contained in them. That they should be cast upon it by a mere conjecture, is altogether improbable; and that they understood the mystery couched in that metaphorical expression (without which no account can be given of the version of the words) will not be granted by them who know any thing of those translators or their translation.
- (3.) There was of old a different reading in that translation. For instead of **σῶμα**, “a body,” some copies have **ὠτία**, “the ears;” which the Vulgar Latin follows: an evidence that a change had been made in that translation, to comply with the words used by the apostle.

8. The words, therefore, in this place are the words whereby the apostle expressed the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost in those used in the psalmist, or that which was intended in them. He did not take them from the translation of the LXX., but used them himself, to express the sense of the Hebrew text. For although we should not adhere precisely unto the opinion that all the quotations out of the Old Testament in the-New, which agree in words with the present translation of the LXX., were by the scribes of that translation transferred out of the New Testament into it, — which yet is far more probable than the contrary opinion, that the words of the translation are made use of in the New Testament, even when they differ from the original, — yet sundry things herein are certain and acknowledged; as,

- (1.) That the penmen of the New Testament do not *oblige themselves unto that translation*, but in many places do precisely render the words of the original text, where that translation differs from it.
- (2.) That they do oftentimes *express* the sense of the testimony which they quote *in words of their own*, neither agreeing with that translation nor exactly answering the original Hebrew.
- (3.) That *sundry passages have been unquestionably taken out of the New Testament, and inserted into that translation*; which I have elsewhere

proved by undeniable instances. And I no way doubt but it hath so fallen out in this place, where no account can be given of the translation of the LXX. as the words now are in it. Wherefore, —

**4.** This is certain, that the sense intended by the psalmist and that expressed by the apostle are the same, or unto the same purpose. And their agreement is both plain and evident. That which is spoken of is an act of God the Father towards the Son. The end of it is, that the Son might be fit and meet to do the will of God in the way of obedience. So it is expressed in the text, “Mine ears hast thou bored,” or, “A body hast thou prepared me ..... Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.” This is the sole end why God so acted towards him. What this was, is so expressed in the psalmist, “Mine ears hast thou bored,” with a double figure:

**(1.)** A metaphor from the ear, wherewith we hear the commands we are to obey. Obedience being our compliance with the outward commands of God, and the ear being the only means of our receiving those commands, there is nothing more frequent in the Scripture than to express obedience by “hearing” and “hearkening,” as is known. Wherefore the ascription of ears unto the Lord Christ by an act of God, is the preparation of such a state and nature for him as wherein he should be meet to yield obedience unto him.

**(2.)** By a synecdoche, wherein the part is put for the whole. In his divine nature alone it was impossible that the Lord Christ should come to do the will of God in the way whereby he was to do it. Wherefore God prepared another nature for him, which is expressed synecdochically, by the ears for the whole body; and that significantly, because as it is impossible that any one should have ears of any use but by virtue of his having a body, so the ears are that part of the body by which alone instruction unto obedience, the thing aimed at, is received. This is that which is directly expressed of him, <sup>2800</sup>Isaiah 50:4, 5, “He wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned. The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious;” or, ‘I was obedient.’ And so it is all one in what sense you take the word **כָּרַח**; whether in the more common and usual, to “dig” or “bore, or in that whereunto it is sometimes applied, to “fit and perfect.” For I do not judge there is any allusion in the expression unto the law of

boring the ear of the servant that refused to make use of his liberty at the year of release. Nor is the word used in that case כָּרָה, but רָצַע,

<sup><227></sup>Exodus 21:6. But it respects the framing of the organ of hearing, which is as it were bored; and the internal sense, in readiness unto obedience, is expressed by the framing of the outward instrument of hearing, that we may learn to obey thereby.

Wherefore this is, and no other can be, the sense of the words in the psalmist, namely, that God the Father did so order things towards Jesus Christ, that he should have a nature wherein he might be free and able to yield obedience unto the will of God; with an intimation of the quality of it, in having ears to hear, which belong only unto a body.

This sense the apostle expresseth in more plain terms now, after the accomplishment of what before was only declared in prophecy; and thereby the veil which was upon divine revelations under the old testament is taken away.

There is therefore nothing remaining but that we give an exposition of these words of the apostle, as they contain the sense of the Holy Ghost in the psalm. And two things we must inquire into:

1. What is meant by this “body.”
2. How God “prepared” it.

1. A “body” is here a synecdochical expression of *the human nature of Christ*. So is the “flesh” taken, where he is said to be “made flesh;” and the “flesh and blood” whereof he was partaker. For the general end of his having this body was, that he might therein and thereby yield obedience, or do the will of God; and the especial end of it was, that he might have somewhat to offer in sacrifice unto God. But neither of these can be confined unto his body alone. For it is the soul, the other essential part of human nature, that is the principle of obedience. Nor was the body of Christ alone offered in sacrifice unto God. He “made his soul an offering for sin,” <sup><250></sup>Isaiah 53:10; which was typified by the life that was in the blood of the sacrifice. Wherefore it is said that “he offered himself unto God,” <sup><504></sup>Hebrews 9:14, <sup><482></sup>Ephesians 5:2; that is, his whole entire human nature, soul and body, in their substance, in all their faculties and powers.

But the apostle both here and verse 10 mentions only the body itself, for the reasons ensuing:

(1.) To *manifest that this offering* of Christ was to be by *death*, as was that of the sacrifices of old; and this the body alone was subject unto.

(2.) Because, as the *covenant was to be confirmed by this offering*, it was to be by *blood*, which is contained in the body alone, and the separation of it from the body carries the life along with it.

(3.) To *testify that his sacrifice was visible and substantial*; not an outward appearance of things, as some have fancied, but such as truly answered the real bloody sacrifices of the law.

(4.) To show the *alliance and cognation* between *him that sanctifieth* by his offering, and *them that are sanctified* thereby: or that because “the children are partakers of flesh and blood he also took part of the same,” that he might taste of death for them. For these and the like reasons doth the apostle mention the human nature of Christ under the name of a “body” only, as also to comply with the figurative expression of it in the psalm. And they do what lies in them to overthrow the principal foundation of the faith of the church, who would wrest these words unto a new ethereal body given him after his ascension, as do the Socinians.

2. Concerning this body, it is affirmed that God *prepared it* for him, “Thou hast prepared for me:” that is, God hath done it, even God the Father; for unto him are these words spoken, “I come to do thy will, O God; a body hast thou prepared me.” The coming of Christ, the Son of God, into the world, his coming in the flesh by the assuming of our nature, was the effect of the mutual counsel of the Father and the Son. The Father proposed to him what was his will, what was his design, what he would have done. This proposal is here repeated, as unto what was negative in it, which includes the opposite positive: “Sacrifices and burnt-offerings thou wouldest not have;” but that which he would, was the obedience of the Son unto his will. This proposal the Son closeth withal: “Lo,” saith he, “I come.” But all things being originally in the hand of the Father, the provision of things necessary unto the fulfilling of the will of God is left unto him. Among those the principal was, that the Son should have a body prepared for him, that so he might have somewhat of his own to offer.



Wherefore the preparation of it is in a peculiar manner assigned unto the Father: “A body hast thou prepared me.” And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. VII.** The supreme contrivance of the salvation of the church is in a peculiar manner ascribed unto the person of the Father. — His will, his grace, his wisdom, his good pleasure, the purpose that he purposed in himself, his love, his sending of his Son, are everywhere proposed as the eternal springs of all acts of power, grace and goodness, tending unto the salvation of the church. And therefore doth the Lord Christ on all occasions declare that he came to do his will, to seek his glory, to make known his name, that the praise of his grace might be exalted. And we through Christ do believe in God, even the Father, when we assign unto him the glory of all the holy properties of his nature, as acting originally in the contrivance and for the effecting of our salvation.

**Obs. VIII.** The furniture of the Lord Christ (though he was the Son, and in his divine person the Lord of all) unto the discharge of his work of mediation was the peculiar act of the Father. — He prepared him a body; he anointed him with the Spirit; it pleased him that all fullness should dwell in him. From him he received all grace, power, consolation. Although the human nature was the nature of the Son of God, not of the Father, (a body prepared for him, not for the Father,) yet was it the Father who prepared that nature, who filled it with grace, who strengthened, acted, and supported it in its whole course of obedience.

**Obs. IX.** Whatever God designs, appoints, and calls any unto, he will provide for them all that is needful unto the duties of obedience whereunto they are so appointed and called. — As he prepared a body for Christ, so he will provide gifts, abilities, and faculties suitable unto their work, for those whom he calleth unto it. Others must provide as well as they can for themselves.

But we must yet inquire more particularly into the nature of this preparation of the body of Christ, here ascribed unto the Father. And it may be considered two ways: —

(1.) In the *designation and contrivance* of it. So “preparation” is sometimes used for “predestination,” or the resolution for the effecting any thing that is future in its proper season, <sup>203</sup>Isaiah 30:33; <sup>413</sup>Matthew

20:23; <sup><802></sup>Romans 9:23; <sup><803></sup>1 Corinthians 2:9. In this sense of the word God had prepared a body for Christ; he had in the eternal counsel of his will determined that he should have it in the appointed time. So he was “foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for us,” <sup><804></sup>1 Peter 1:20.

(2.) In the *actual effecting*, ordering, and creating of it, that it might be fitted and suited unto the work that it was ordained unto.

In the former sense the body itself is alone the object of this preparation. “A body hast thou prepared me;” that is, ‘designed for me.’ The latter sense compriseth the use of the body also; it is fitted for its work. This latter sense it is that is proper unto this place; only it is spoken of by the psalmist in a prophetic style, wherein things certainly future are expressed as already, performed. For the word signifies such a preparation as whereby it is made actually fit and meet for the end it is designed unto. And therefore it is variously rendered, “to fit, to adapt, to perfect, to adorn, to make meet,” with respect unto some especial end. ‘Thou hast adapted a body unto my work; fitted and suited a human nature unto that I have to perform in it and by it.’ A body it must be; yet not every body, nay, not any body brought forth by carnal generation, according to the course of nature, could effect or was fit for the work designed unto it. But God prepared, provided such a body for Christ, as was fitted and adapted ‘unto all that he had to do in it. And this especial manner of its preparation was an act of infinite wisdom and grace. Some instances thereof may be mentioned; as, —

[1.] He prepared him such a body, such a human nature, *as might be of the same nature with ours*, for whom he was to accomplish his work therein. For it was necessary that it should be cognate and allied unto ours, that he might be meet to act on our behalf, and to suffer in our stead. He did not form him a body out of the dust of the earth, as he did that of Adam, whereby he could not have been of the same race of mankind with us; nor merely out of nothing, as he created the angels, whom he was not to save. See <sup><805></sup>Hebrews 2:14-16, and the exposition thereon. He took our flesh and blood, proceeding from the loins of Abraham.

[2.] He so prepared it *as that it should be no way subject unto that depravation and pollution* that came on our whole nature by sin. This

could not have been done had his body been prepared by carnal generation, the way and means of conveying the taint of original sin which befell our nature, unto all individual persons; for this would have rendered him every way unmeet for his whole work of mediation. See <sup><4135></sup>Luke 1:35; <sup><3026></sup>Hebrews 7:26.

[3.] He prepared him a body *consisting of flesh and blood, which might be offered as a real substantial sacrifice, and wherein he might suffer for sin,* in his offering to make atonement for it.' Nor could the sacrifices of old, which were real, bloody, and substantial, prefigure that which should be only metaphorical and in appearance. The whole evidence of the wisdom of God in the institution of the sacrifices of the law depends on this, that Christ was to have a body consisting of flesh and blood, wherein he might answer all that was prefigured by them.

[4.] It was such a body as was *animated with a living, rational soul.* Had it been only a body, it might have suffered as did the beasts under the law, — from which no act of obedience was required, only they were to suffer what was done unto them. But in the sacrifice of the body of Christ, that which was principally respected, and whereon the whole efficacy of it did depend, was his obedience unto God. For he was not to be offered by others, but he was to offer himself, in obedience unto the will of God, <sup><3034></sup>Hebrews 9:14; <sup><4110></sup>Ephesians 5:2. And the principles of all obedience lie alone in the powers and faculties of the rational soul.

[5.] This body and soul were *obnoxious unto all the sorrows and sufferings which our nature is liable unto,* and we had deserved, as they were penal, tending unto death. Hence was he meet to suffer in our stead the same things which we should have done. Had they been exempted by special privilege from what our nature is liable unto, the whole work of our redemption by his blood had been frustrated.

[6.] This body or human nature, thus prepared for Christ, was *exposed unto all sorts of temptations* from outward causes. But yet it was so sanctified by the perfection of grace, and fortified by the fullness of the Spirit dwelling therein, as that it was not possible it should be touched with the least taint or guilt of sin. And this also was absolutely necessary unto the work whereunto it was designed, <sup><4102></sup>1 Peter 2:22; <sup><3026></sup>Hebrews 7:26.

[7.] This body was *liable unto death*; which being the sentence and sanction of the law with respect unto the first and all following sins, (all and every one of them,) was to be undergone actually by him who was to be our deliverer, <sup><3824></sup> Hebrews 2:14, 15. Had it not died, death would have borne rule over all unto eternity; but in the death thereof it was swallowed up in victory, <sup><4655></sup> 1 Corinthians 15:55-57.

[8.] As it was subject unto death, and died actually, so it was *meet to be raised again from death*. And herein consisted the great pledge and evidence that our dead bodies may be and shall be raised again unto a blessed immortality. So it became the foundation of all our faith, as unto things eternal, <sup><4657></sup> 1 Corinthians 15:17-23.

[9.] This body and soul being capable of a real separation, and being actually separated by death, though not for any long continuance, yet no less truly and really than they who have been dead a thousand years, a *demonstration was given therein of an active subsistence of the soul in a state of separation from the body*. As it was with the soul of Christ when he was dead, so shall it be with our souls in the same state. He was alive with God and unto God when his body was in the grave; and so shall our souls be.

[10.] This body was *visibly taken up into heaven, and there resides*; which, considering the ends thereof, is the great encouragement of faith, and the life of our hope.

These are but some of the many instances that may be given of the divine wisdom in so preparing a body for Christ as that it might be fitted and adapted unto the work which he had to do therein. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. X.** Not only the love and grace of God in sending his Son are continually to be admired and glorified, but the acting of this infinite wisdom in fitting and preparing his human nature so as to render it every way meet unto the work which it was designed for, ought to be the especial object of our holy contemplation. — But having treated hereof distinctly in a peculiar discourse unto that purpose, I shall not here again insist upon it.

The last thing observable in this verse is, that this preparation of the body of Christ is ascribed unto God, even the Father, unto whom he speaks these words, “A body hast thou prepared me.” As unto the operation in the production of the substance of it, and the forming its structure, it was the peculiar and immediate work of the Holy Ghost, <sup>130</sup> Luke 1:35. This work I have at large elsewhere declared. <sup>f30</sup> Wherefore it is an article of faith, that the formation of the human nature of Christ in the womb of the Virgin was the peculiar act of the Holy Ghost. The holy taking of this nature unto himself, the assumption of it to be his own nature by a subsistence in his person, the divine nature assuming the human in the person of the Son, was his own act alone. Yet was the preparation of this body the work of the Father in a peculiar manner; it was so in the infinitely wise, authoritative contrivance and ordering of it, his counsel and will therein being acted by the immediate power of the Holy Ghost. The Father *prepared* it in the authoritative disposition of all things; the Holy Ghost *actually wrought* it; and he himself *assumed* it. There was no distinction of time in these distinct actings of the holy persons of the Trinity in this matter, but only a disposition of order in their operation. For in the same instant of time, this body was prepared by the Father, wrought by the Holy Ghost, and assumed by himself to be his own. And the actings of the distinct persons being all the actings of the same divine nature, understanding, love, and power, they differ not fundamentally and radically, but only terminatively, with respect unto the work wrought and effected. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. XI.** The ineffable but yet distinct operations of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in, about, and towards the human nature assumed by the Son, are, as an uncontrollable evidence of their distinct subsistence in the same individual divine essence, so a guidance unto faith as unto all their distinct actings towards us in the application of the work of redemption unto our souls. — For their actings towards the members is in all things conform unto their actings towards the Head; and our faith is to be directed towards them according as they act their love and grace distinctly towards us.

**Ver. 6, 7.** — “In burnt-offerings and [*sacrifices*] for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.”

Two things are asserted in the foregoing verse in general:

1. The rejection of sacrifices for the end of the complete expiation of sin;
2. The provision of a new way or means for the accomplishment of that end. Both these things are spoken unto apart and more distinctly in these two verses; the former, verse 6; the latter, verse 7: which we must also open, that they may not appear a needless repetition of what was before spoken.

**Ver. 6.** He resumes and further declares what was in general before affirmed, verse 5, “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not.” Hereof we have yet a further confirmation and explication; which it stood in need of. For notwithstanding that general assertion, two things may yet be inquired about:

1. What were those “sacrifices and offerings which God would not?” for they being of various sorts, some of them only may be intended, seeing they are only mentioned in general.
2. What is meant by that expression, that “God would them not,” seeing it is certain that they were appointed and commanded by him?

Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ, whose words in the psalm these are, doth not only reassert what was spoken before in general, but also gives a more particular account of what sacrifices they were which he intended. And two things he declares concerning them: —

1. That they were not such sacrifices as men had found out and appointed. Such the world was filled withal; which were offered unto devils, and which the people of Israel themselves were addicted unto. Such were their sacrifices unto Baal and Moloch, which God so often complaineth against and detesteth. But they were such sacrifices as were appointed and commanded by the law. Hence he expresseth them by their legal names, as the apostle immediately takes notice, — they were “offered by the law,” verse 8.

2. He shows what were those sacrifices appointed by the law which in an especial manner he intended; and they were those which were appointed for the legal and typical expiation of sin. The general names of them in the

original are **זָבַח וּמִנְחָה**. The first was the general name of all victims or sacrifices by blood; the other of all offerings of the fruits of the earth, as flour, oil, wine, and the like. For herein respect is had unto the general design of the context, which is the removal of all legal sacrifices and offerings, of what sort soever, by the coming and office of Christ. In compliance therewith they are expressed under these two general names, which comprehend them all. But as unto the especial argument in hand, it concerns only the bloody sacrifices offered for the atonement of sin, which were of the first sort only, or **זָבַחִים**. And this kind of sacrifices, whose incompetency to expiate sin he declares, is referred unto two heads: —

(1.) “Burnt-offerings.” In the Hebrew it is **עֹלָה**, in the singular number; which is usually rendered by **ὄλοκαυτώματα**, in the plural. And sacrifices of this kind were called **עֲלוֹת**, or “ascensions,” from their adjunct, the rising up or ascending of the smoke of the sacrifices in their burning on the altar; a pledge of that sweet savor which should arise unto God above from the sacrifice of Christ here below. And sometimes they are called **אִשִּׁים**, or “firings,” from the way and means of their consumption on the altar, which was by fire. And this respects both the **תָּמִיד**, or the continual sacrifice, morning and evening, for the whole congregation, which was a burnt-offering, and all those which on especial occasions were offered with respect unto the expiation of sin.

(2.) The other sort is expressed by **זֶבַח־חַטָּאת**; which the Greek renders by **περὶ ἁμαρτίας**, “for” or “concerning sin.” For **חַטָּאת** the verb in Kal, signifieth “to sin;” and in Piel, “to expiate sin.” Hence the substantive, **זֶבַח־חַטָּאת**, is used in both these senses; and where it is to be taken in either of them, the circumstances of the text do openly declare. Where it is taken in the latter sense, the Greek renders it by **περὶ ἁμαρτίας**, “a sacrifice for sin;” which expression is retained by the apostle, <sup>488</sup>Romans 8:3, and in this place. And the sacrifices of this kind were of two sorts, or this kind of sacrifices had a double use. For,

[1.] The great anniversary sacrifice of expiation for the sins of the whole congregation, Leviticus 16, was a **זֶבַח־חַטָּאת**, or **περὶ ἁμαρτίας**, “a sin offering.”

[2.] The same kind of offering was also appointed unto and for particular persons, who had contracted the guilt of particular sins, Leviticus 4. This sacrifice, therefore, was appointed both for the sins of the whole congregation, namely, all their sins, of what sort soever, <sup><1621></sup>Leviticus 16:21, and the especial sins of particular persons. The one offering of Christ was really to effect what by all of them was represented.

Concerning all these sacrifices it is added, **Οὐκ εὐδόκησας**, — “Thou hadst no pleasure.” In opposition hereunto, God gives testimony from heaven concerning the Lord Christ and his undertaking, “This is my beloved Son, **ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα**,” — “in whom I am well pleased,” <sup><1817></sup>Matthew 3:17, <sup><1715></sup>17:5. See <sup><3011></sup>Isaiah 42:1; <sup><4006></sup>Ephesians 1:6. This is the great antithesis between the law and the gospel: “Sacrifices and offerings for sin **οὐκ εὐδόκησας**.” “This is my beloved Son, **ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα**.” The word signifies “to approve of with delight,” “to rest in with satisfaction;” the exercise of **εὐδοκία**, the divine good-will. The original word in the psalm is **שָׁאַל** which signifies “to ask, to seek, to inquire, to require.” Wherefore, as we observed before, although the apostle doth directly express the mind and sense of the Holy Ghost in the whole testimony, yet he doth not exactly render the words in their precise signification, word for word. Thus he renders **שָׁאַל** by **ἠθέλησας**, and **שָׁאַל** by **εὐδόκησας**, when an exact translation would have required the contrary application of the words But the meaning is the same, and the two words used by the psalmist are exactly represented in these used by the apostle.

There are two reasons of this seeming repetition, “Thou wouldest not,” “Thou hadst no pleasure:”

1. A repetition of the same words, or words almost of the same signification, about the same subject, signifies the determinate certainty of the removal of these sacrifices, with the disappointment and ruin of them who should continue to put their trust in them.
2. Whereas there were two things pretended unto in the behalf of these sacrifices and offerings; first, their institution by God himself; and, secondly, his acceptance of them, or being well pleased with them; one of these words is peculiarly applied unto the former, the other unto the



latter. God did neither institute them, nor ever accepted of them, unto this end of the expiation of sin, and the salvation of the church thereby. And we may observe, —

**Obs. XII.** It is the will of God that the church should take especial notice of this sacred truth, that nothing can expiate or take away sin but the blood of Christ alone. — Hence is the vehemency of the rejection of all other means in the repetition of these words. And it is necessary for us so to apprehend his mind, considering how prone we are to look after other ways of the expiation of sin and justification before God. See ~~511~~ Romans 10:3, 4.

**Obs. XIII.** Whatever may be the use or efficacy of any ordinances of worship, yet if they are employed or trusted unto for such ends as God hath not designed them unto, he accepts not of our persons in them, nor approves of the things themselves. — Thus he declares himself concerning the most solemn institutions of the old testament. And those under the new have been no less abused in this way than those of old.

**Ver. 7.** — “Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.”

This is the close of the testimony used by the apostle out of the psalmist, which in the next verses he interprets and makes application of unto his purpose. And it contains the second branch of the antithesis that he insists on. The Lord Christ having declared the will of God, and what God said unto him concerning legal sacrifices, and their insufficiency unto the expiation of sin and the salvation of the church, he expresseth his own mind, will, and design, unto God the Father thereon. For it was the will and grace of God that this great work should be wrought, however he disapproved of legal sacrifices as the means thereof. For there is herein represented unto us as it were a consultation between the Father and the Son with respect unto the way and means of the expiation of sin, and the salvation of the church.

In the words we may consider,

**1.** How the Son expressed his mind in this matter: “He saith,” “I said.”

2. When or on what consideration he so expressed himself; it was *then*: “Then I said.”

3. A remark put upon what he said, in the word “Behold.”

4. What he undertakes, or tenders himself to do in what he said; it was to do the will of God: “I come to do thy will,” as unto that work and end with respect whereunto sacrifices were rejected.

5. The warranty that he had for this undertaking; it was no more than what the Holy Ghost had before left on record in the Scripture: “In the volume of the book it is written of me;” for these words do represent the mind and will of Christ upon his actual undertaking of his work, or his coming into the world, when many prophecies and divine predictions had gone before concerning it.

1. The expression of his mind is in that word εἶπον, “I said.” There is no necessity, as was before observed, that these very words should at any one season have been spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ. The meaning is, ‘This is my resolution, this is the frame of my mind and will.’ The representation of our mind, will, and desires, unto God, is our speaking to him. He needs not our words unto that end; nor absolutely do we so ourselves, upon the account of his omniscience. However, this is the work that the Lord Christ engaged his truth and faithfulness to undertake. And in these words, “I said,” he engageth himself in the work now proposed unto him. Hereon, whatever difficulties afterwards arose, whatever he was to do or suffer, there was nothing in it but what he had before solemnly engaged unto God.

And we ought, in like manner, to be faithful in all the engagements that we make to him and for him. “Surely,” saith he, they are my people, children that will not lie.”

2. There is *the season* wherein he thus said: τότε, “then,” or “thereon.” For it may respect either the order of the time, or the stating of the case in hand. First, it may respect an *order of time*. He said, “Sacrifices and burnt-offerings thou wouldest not have. Then said I.” But it is, as I judge, better extended unto the *whole case in hand*. When things were come to this pass; when all the church of God’s elect were under the guilt of sin, and the curse of the law thereon; when there was no hope for them in

themselves, nor in or by any divine institution; when all things were at a loss, as unto our recovery and salvation; *then* did Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in infinite wisdom, love, and grace, interpose himself in our behalf, in our stead, to do, answer, and perform, all that God, in infinite wisdom, holiness, and righteousness, required unto that end. And we may observe, that —

**Obs. XIV.** There is a signal glory put upon the undertaking of Christ to make reconciliation for the church by the sacrifice of himself.

**3.** This undertaking of Christ is *signalized by the remark* that is put on the declaration of it, Ἴδοὺ, “Behold.” A glorious spectacle it was, to God, to angels, and to men. To God, as it was filled with the highest effects of infinite goodness, wisdom, and grace; which all shone forth in their greatest elevation and were glorified therein. It was so unto angels, as that whereon their confirmation and establishment in glory did depend, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>Ephesians 1:10; which therefore they endeavored with fear and reverence to look into, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>1 Peter 1:12. “And as unto men, that is, the church of the elect, nothing could be so glorious in their sight, nothing so desirable. By this call of Christ, “Behold, I come,” the eyes of all creatures in heaven and earth ought to be fixed on him, to behold the glorious work he had undertaken, and the accomplishment of it.

**4.** There is *what he thus proposed himself for*, saying, “Behold me.”

**(1.)** This in general is expressed by himself, “I come.” This coming of Christ, what it was and wherein it did consist, was declared before. It was by assuming the body that was prepared for him. This was the foundation of the whole work he had to do, wherein he came forth like the rising sun, with light in his wings, or as a giant rejoicing to run a race.

The faith of the old testament was, that he was thus to come: and this is the life of the new, that he is come. They by whom this is denied do overthrow the faith of the gospel. This is the spirit of antichrist, <sup>Ⓜ</sup>1 John 4:1-3. And this may be done two ways:

**[1.]** Directly and expressly;

**[2.]** By just consequence. Directly it is done by them who deny the reality of his human nature, as many did of old, affirming that he had on'y an

ethereal, aerial, or phantastical body; for if he came not in the flesh, he is not come at all. So also it is by them who deny the divine person of Christ, and his pre-existence therein, before the assumption of the human nature; for they deny that these are the words of him when resolved, and spoken before his coming. He that did not exist before in the divine nature, could not promise to come in the human. And indirectly it is denied by all those who, either in doctrines or practices, deny the ends of his coming; and they are many, — which I shall not now mention.

It may be objected against this fundamental truth, ‘That if the Son of God would undertake this work of reconciliation between God and man, why did he not do the will of God by his mighty power and grace, and not by this way of coming in the flesh, which was attended with all dishonor, reproaches, sufferings, and death itself.’ But besides what I have at large elsewhere discoursed concerning the necessity and suitableness of this way of his coming unto the manifestation of all the glorious properties of the nature of God, I shall only say, that God, and he alone, knew what was necessary unto the accomplishment of his will; and if it might have been otherwise effected, he would have spared his only Son, and not have given him up unto death.

**(2.)** The end for which he thus promiseth to come, is to do the will of God: “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.”

The will of God is taken two ways: First, for his eternal purpose and design, called “the counsel of his will,” <sup><40b></sup>Ephesians 1:11; and most commonly his “will” itself, — the will of God as unto what he will do, or cause to be done. Secondly, for the declaration of his will and pleasure as unto what he will have us to do in a way of duty and obedience; that is, the rule of our obedience. It is the will of God in the former sense that is here intended; as is evident from the next verse, where it is said that “by this will of God we are sanctified;” that is, our sins were expiated according to the will of God. But neither is the other sense absolutely excluded; for the Lord Christ came so to fulfill the will of God’s purpose, as that we may be enabled to fulfill the will of his command. Yea, and he himself had a command from God to lay down his life for the accomplishment of this work.

Wherefore this will of God, which Christ came to fulfill, is that which elsewhere is expressed by εὐδοκία, πρόθεσις, βουλή τοῦ ζελήματος, <sup><H01></sup>Ephesians 1:5, 11 etc.; — his “good pleasure,” his” purpose, the “counsel of his will,” his “good pleasure which he purposed in himself;” that is, freely, without any cause or reason taken from us, to call, justify, sanctify, and save to the uttermost, or to bring them unto eternal glory. This he had purposed from eternity, to the praise of the glory of his grace. How this might be effected and accomplished, God had hid in his own bosom from the beginning of the world, <sup><H02></sup>Ephesians 3:8, 9; so as that it was beyond the wisdom and indagation of all angels and men to make a discovery of. Howbeit, even from the beginning he declared that such a work he had graciously designed; and he gave in the first promise, and otherwise, some obscure intimations of the nature of it, for a foundation of the faith in them that were called. Afterwards God was pleased, in his sovereign authority over the church, for their good, and unto his own glory, to make a representation of this whole work in the institutions of the law, especially in the sacrifices thereof. But hereon the church began to think (at least many of them did so) that those sacrifices themselves were to be the only means of accomplishing this will of God, in the expiation of sin, with the salvation of the church. But God had now, by various ways and means, witnessed unto the church that indeed he never appointed them unto any such end, nor would rest in them; and the church itself found by experience that they would never pacify conscience, and that the strict performance of them was a yoke and burden. In this state of things, when the fullness of time was come, the glorious counsels of God, namely, of the Father, Son, and Spirit, brake forth with light, like the sun in its strength from under a cloud, in the tender made of himself by Jesus Christ unto the Father, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.” This, this is the way, the only way, whereby the will of God might be accomplished. Herein were all the riches of divine wisdom displayed, all the treasures of grace laid open, all shadows and clouds dispelled, and the open door of salvation evidenced unto all.

**(3.)** This will of God Christ came to do, τοῦ ποιῆσαι, to effect, “to establish and perfectly to fulfill it.” How he did so the apostle fully declareth in this epistle. He did it in the whole work of his mediation, from the susception of our nature in the womb, unto what he doth in his

supreme agency in heaven at the right hand of God. He did all things to accomplish this eternal purpose of the will of God.

This seems to me the first sense of the place. Howbeit I would not, as I said before, exclude the former mentioned also; for our Lord in all that he did was the servant of the Father, and received especial command for all that he did. "This commandment," saith he, "have I received of my ]Father." Hence in this sense also he came to do the will of God. He fulfilled the will of his purpose, by obedience unto the will of his command. Hence it is added in the psalm, that he "delighted to do the will of God;" and that "his law was in the midst of his bowels." His delight in the will of God, as unto the laying down of his life at the command of God, was necessary unto this doing of his will. And we may observe, —

**Obs. XV.** The foundation of the whole glorious work of the salvation of the church was laid in the sovereign will, pleasure, and grace of God, even the Father. Christ came only to do his will.

**Obs. XVI.** The coming of Christ in the flesh was, in the wisdom, righteousness, and holiness of God, necessary to fulfill his will, that we might be saved unto his glory.

**Obs. XVII.** The fundamental motive unto the Lord Christ, in his undertaking the work of mediation, was the will and glory of God: "Lo, I come to do thy will."

**5.** The last thing in this context is the *ground and rule of this undertaking* of the Lord Christ and this is the glory of the truth of God in his promises recorded in the Word: "In the volume of the book it is written of me, that I should fulfill thy will, O God." There is a difficulty in these words, both as to the translation of the original text and as unto the application of them. And therefore critical observations have been multiplied about them; which it is not my way or work to repeat. Those that are learned know where to find them, and those that are not so will not be edified by them. What is the true meaning and intention of the Holy Spirit in them is what we are to inquire into.

The Socinian expositors have a peculiar conceit on this place. They suppose the apostle useth this expression, ἐν κεφαλίδι, to denote some especial chapter or place in the law. This they conjecture to be that of

<sup><578></sup>Deuteronomy 17:18, 19: “And it shall be, when he” (the king to be chosen) “sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book, out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them.” David, they say, spoke those words in the psalm; and it is nowhere said that he should come to do the will of God but in this place of Deuteronomy, as he was to be the king of that people. But there can be nothing more fond than this empty conjecture. For, —

**(1.)** David is not at all intended in these words of the psalmist, any otherwise but as he was the penman of the Holy Ghost, and a type of Christ, on which account he speaks in his name. They are the words of Christ, which David was inspired by the Holy Ghost to declare and utter. Neither would David speak these words concerning himself; because he that speaks doth absolutely prefer his own obedience, as unto worth and efficacy, before all God’s holy institutions: he presents it unto God, as that which is more useful unto the church than all the sacrifices which God had ordained. This David could not do justly.

**(2.)** There is nothing spoken in this place of Deuteronomy concerning the *sacerdotal office*, but only of the *regal*. And in this place of the psalmist there is no respect unto the kingly office, but only unto the priesthood; for comparison is made with the sacrifices of the law. But the offering of these sacrifices was expressly forbidden unto the kings; as is manifest in the instance of king Uzziah, <sup><1238></sup>2 Chronicles 26:18-20. Besides, there is in that place of Deuteronomy no more respect had unto David than unto Saul, or Jeroboam, or any other that was to be king of that people. There is nothing in it that belongs unto David in a peculiar manner.

**(3.)** The words there recorded contain a mere prescription of duty, no prediction of the event; which for the most part was contrary unto what is required. But the words of the psalmist are a prophecy, a divine prediction and promise, which must be actually accomplished. Nor doth our Lord Christ in them declare what was prescribed unto him, but what he did undertake to do, and the record that was made of that undertaking of his.

(4.) There is not one word in that place of Moses concerning the removal of sacrifices and burnt-offerings; which, as the apostle declares, is the principal thing intended in those of the psalmist. Yea, the contrary, as unto the season intended, is expressly asserted; for the king was to read in the book of the law continually, that he might observe and do all that is written therein, a great part whereof consists in the institution and observation of sacrifices.

(5.) This interpretation of the words utterly overthrows what they dispute for immediately before; that is, that the entrance mentioned of Christ into the world, was not indeed his coming into this world, but his going out of it, and entering into heaven. For it cannot be denied but that the obedience of reading the law continually, and doing of it, is to be attended unto in this world, and not in heaven; and this they seem to acknowledge, so as to recall their own exposition. Other absurdities, which are very many in this place, I shall not insist upon.


” *Ἐν κεφαλίδι*, we with many others render, in answer unto the Hebrew, “in the volume” or “roll.” Ribera contends that this translation of the word, “the volume” or “roll of the book,” is absurd ““Because,” saith he, “the book itself was a volume or a roll; and so it is as if he had said, in the roll of the roll.” But סֵפֶר, which we translate a “book,” doth not signify a book as written in a roll, but only an enunciation or declaration of any thing. We now call any book of greater quantity a volume. But מְגִלָּה is properly a “roll;” and the words used by the psalmist do signify that the declaration of the will of God made in this matter was written in a roll, the roll which contains all the revelations of his mind. And the word used by the apostle is not remote from this signification, as may be seen in sundry classic authors; — *κεφαλίς*, “volumen;” because a roll is made round, after the fashion of the head of a man.

As the book itself was one roll, so the head of it, the beginning of it, amongst the first things written in it, is this recorded concerning the coming of Christ to do the will of God. This includeth both senses of the word; in the head, in the beginning of the roll, namely, of that part of the Scripture which was written when David penned this psalm. Now this can be no other but the first promise, which is recorded, <sup>GEN</sup>Genesis 3:15. Then it was first declared, then it was first written and enrolled, that the Lord



Christ, the Son of God, should be made of the seed of the woman, and in our nature come to do the will of God, and to deliver the church from that woful estate whereinto it was brought by the craft of Satan. In this promise, and the writing of it in the head of the volume, lies the verification of the psalmist's assertion, "In the volume of the book it is written." Howbeit the following declarations of the will of God herein are not excluded, nor ought so to be. Hence are we herein directed unto the whole volume of the Law; for indeed it is nothing but a prediction of the coming, of Christ, and a presignification of what he had to do. 'That book which God has given to the church as the only guide of its faith, — the Bible; (that is, *the book*, all other books being of no consideration in comparison of it;) that book wherein all divine precepts and promises are enrolled or recorded: in this book, in the volume of it, this is the principal subject, especially in the head of the roll, or the beginning of it, namely, in the first promise, it is so written of me.' God commanded this great truth of the coming of Christ to be so enrolled, for the encouragement of the faith of them that should believe. And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. XVIII.** God's records in the roll of his book are the foundation and warranty of the faith of the church, in the Head and members.

**Obs. XIX.** The Lord Christ, in all that he did and suffered, had continual respect unto what was written of him. See  Matthew 26:24.

**Obs. XX.** In the record of these words,

- (1.) God was glorified in his truth and faithfulness,
- (2.) Christ was secured in his work, and the undertaking of it.
- (3.) A testimony was given unto his person and office.
- (4.) Direction is given unto the church, in all wherein they have to do with God, what they should attend unto, — namely, what is written.
- (5.) The things which concern Christ, the mediator, are the head of what is contained in the same records.

**Ver. 8-10.** — "Above when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings, and [*offerings*] for sin, thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure [*therein*]; (which are offered by the law;) then said he, Lo, I

come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once [*for all*].”

The use and signification of most of the words of these verses have already in our passage been spoken unto.

There are two things in these three verses:

1. The *application* of the testimony taken out of the psalmist unto the present argument of the apostle, verses 8, 9.
2. An *inference* from the whole, unto the proof of the only cause and means of the sanctification of the church, the argument he was now engaged in, verse 10.

As to the first of these, or the application of the testimony of the psalmist, and his resuming it, we may consider, —

1. What he designed to prove thereby: and this was, that by the introduction and establishment of the sacrifice of Christ in the church there was an end put to all legal sacrifices. And he adds thereunto, that the ground and reason of this great alteration of things in the church, by the will of God, was the utter insufficiency of those legal sacrifices in themselves for the expiation of sin and sanctification of the church. In verse 9 he gives us this sum of his design, “He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.”

2. The apostle doth not here directly argue from the *matter* or substance of the testimony itself, but from the *order* of the words, and the regard they have in their order unto one another. For there is in them a twofold proposition; one concerning the rejection of legal sacrifices, and the other an introduction and tender of Christ and his mediation. And he declares, from the order of the words in the psalmist, that these things are inseparable; namely, the taking away of legal sacrifices, and the establishment of that of Christ.

3. This order in the words of the apostle is declared in that distribution of *ἄνωτερον* and *τότε*, “above” and “then.” *Ἀνώτερον*, “above;” — that is, in the first place, — these his words or sayings, recorded in the first place.

4. There are in the words themselves these three things: —

(1.) There is a *distribution* made of the legal sacrifices into their general heads, with respect unto the will of God concerning them all: “Sacrifices and offering, and whole burnt-offerings, and sacrifice for sin.” And in that distribution he adds another property of them, namely, they were required according to the law.

[1.] He had respect not only unto the removal of the sacrifices, but also of the law itself, whereby they were retained; so he enters on his present disputation with the imperfection of the law itself, verse 1.

[2.] Allowing these sacrifices and offerings all that they could pretend unto, namely, that they were established by the law, yet notwithstanding this, God rejects them as unto the expiation of sin and the salvation of the church. For he excludes the consideration of all other things which were not appointed by the law, as those which God abhorred in themselves, and so could have no place in this matter And we may observe, that, —

**Obs. XXI.** Whereas the apostle doth plainly distinguish and distribute all sacrifices and offerings into those on the one side which were offered by the law, and that one offering of the body of Christ on the other side, the pretended sacrifice of the mass is utterly rejected from any place in the worship of God.

**Obs. XXII.** God, as the sovereign lawgiver, had always power and authority to make what alteration he pleased in the orders and institutions of his worship.

**Obs. XXIII.** That sovereign authority is that; alone which our faith and obedience respect in all ordinances of worship.

(2.) After this was stated and delivered, when the mind of God was expressly declared as unto his rejection of legal sacrifices and offerings, **τότε**, “then he said;” — after that, in order thereon, upon the grounds before mentioned, “he said, Sacrifice,” etc. In the former words he declared the mind- of God, and in the latter his own intention and resolution to comply with his will, in order unto another way of atonement for sin: “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God;” — which words have been opened before.

**(3.)** In the last place, he declares what was intimated and signified in this order, or in those things being thus spoken unto; sacrifices, on the one hand, which was the first; and the coming of Christ, which was the second, in this order and opposition. It is evident, —

[1.] That these words, Ἀναίρει τὸ πρῶτον, “He taketh away the first,” do intend sacrifices and offerings. But he did not so do it immediately at the speaking of these words, for they continued for the space of some hundreds of years afterwards; but he did so declaratively, as unto the indication of the time, namely, when the “second” should be introduced.

[2.] The end of this removal of the “first,” was “the establishment of the second.” This “second,” say some, is the will of God; but the opposition made before is not between the will of God and the legal sacrifices, but between those sacrifices and the coming of Christ to do the will of God. Wherefore it is the way of the expiation of sin, and of the complete sanctification of the church by the coming, and mediation, and sacrifice of Christ., that is this “second,” the thing spoken of in the second place; this God would “establish,” approve, confirm, and render unchangeable.

**Obs. XXIV.** As all things from the beginning made way for the coming of Christ in the minds of them that did believe, so every thing was to be removed out of the way that would hinder his coming, and the discharge of the work he had undertaken law, temple, sacrifices, must all be removed to give way unto his coming. So is it testified by his forerunner, <sup>◀LXX</sup>Luke 3:4-6, “As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.” So it must be in our own hearts; all things must give way unto him, or he will not come and make his habitation in them.

**Ver. 10.** — “By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once [*for all.*]”

From the whole context the apostle makes an inference, which is comprehensive of the substance of the gospel, and the description of the grace of God which is established thereby.

Having affirmed, in Christ's own words, that he came to do the will of God, he shows what was that will of God which he came to do, what was the design of God in it and the effect of it, and by what means it was accomplished; which things are to be inquired into: as,

1. What is the will of God which he intends; "By the which will."
2. What was the design of it, what God aimed at in this act of his will, and what is accomplished thereby; "We are sanctified."
3. The way and means whereby this effect proceedeth from the will of God; namely, "Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ," in opposition to legal sacrifices.
4. The manner of it, in opposition unto their repetition; it was "once for all." But the sense of the whole will be more clear, if we consider,

—

1. The end aimed at in the first place, namely, the *sanctification* of the church. And sundry things must be observed concerning it: —

(1.) That the apostle changeth his phrase of speech into the first person, "We are sanctified;" that is, all those believers whereof the gospel church-state was constituted, in opposition unto the church-state of the Hebrews and those that did adhere unto it: so he speaks before, as also <sup><301></sup> Hebrews 4:3, "We who have believed do enter into rest." For it might be asked of him, 'You who thus overthrow the efficacy of legal sacrifices, what have you yourselves attained in your relinquishment of them?' 'We have,' saith he, 'that sanctification, that dedication unto God, that peace with him, and that expiation of sin, that all those sacrifices could not effect.' And observe, —

**Obs. XXV.** Truth is never so effectually declared, as when it is confirmed by the experience of its power in them that believe it and make profession of it. This was that which gave them the confidence which the apostle exhorts them to hold fast and firm unto the end.

**Obs. XXVI.** It is a holy glorying in God, and no unlawful boasting, for men openly to profess what they are made partakers of by the grace of God and blood of Christ. Yea, it is a necessary duty for men so to do,

when any thing is set up in competition with them or opposition unto them.

**Obs. XXVII.** It is the best security in differences in and about religion, (such as these wherein the apostle is engaged, the greatest and highest that ever were,) when men have an internal experience of the truth which they do profess.

(2.) The words he useth are in the preterperfect tense, ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν, and relate not only unto the things, but the time of the offering of the body of Christ. For although all that is intended herein did not immediately follow on the death of Christ, yet were they all in it, as the effects in their proper cause, to be produced by virtue of it in their times and seasons; and the principal effect intended was the immediate consequent thereof.

(3.) This end of God, through the offering of the body of Christ, was the sanctification of the church: “We are sanctified.” The principal notion of sanctification in the New Testament, is the effecting of real, internal holiness in the persons of them that do believe, by the change of their hearts and lives. But the word is not here so to be restrained, nor is it used in that sense by our apostle in this epistle, or very rarely. It is here plainly comprehensive of all that he hath denied unto the law, priesthood, and sacrifices of the old testament, with the whole church-state of the Hebrews under it, and the effects of their ordinances and services; as,

[1.] A complete dedication unto God, in opposition unto the typical one which the people were partakers of by the sprinkling of the blood of calves and goats upon them, Exodus 24.

[2.] A complete church-state for the celebration of the spiritual worship of God, by the administration of the Spirit, wherein the law could make nothing perfect.

[3.] Peace with God upon a full and perfect expiation of sin; which he denies unto the sacrifices of the law, verses

[4.] Real, internal purification or sanctification of our natures and persons from all inward filth and defilement of them; which he proves at large that

the carnal ordinances of the law could not effect of themselves, reaching no farther than the purification of the flesh.

[5.] Hereunto also belong the privileges of the gospel, in liberty, boldness, immediate access unto God, the means of that access, by Christ our high priest, and confidence therein; in opposition unto that fear, bondage, distance, and exclusion from the holy place of the presence of God, which they of old were kept under. All these things are comprised in this expression of the apostle, “We are sanctified.”

The designation of such a state for the church, and the present introduction of it by the preaching of the gospel, is that whose confirmation the apostle principally designs in this whole discourse; the sum whereof he gives us, <sup><814></sup>Hebrews 11:40, “God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.”

2. The whole fountain and principal cause of this state, this grace, is *the will of God*, even that will which our Savior tendered to accomplish, “By the which will we are sanctified.” In the original it is, “In which will;” “in” for “by,” which is usual. Wherefore we say properly, “by which will;” for it is the supreme efficient cause of our sanctification that is intended. And in that expression of our Savior, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” it is evident,

(1.) That it was the will, that is, the counsel, the purpose, the decree of God, that the church should be sanctified.

(2.) That our Lord Christ knew that this was the will of God, the will of the Father, in whose bosom he was. And,

(3.) That God had determined (which he also knew and declared) that legal sacrifices could not accomplish and make effectual this his will, so as the church might be sanctified thereon. Wherefore the will of God here intended (as was intimated before) is nothing but the eternal, gracious, free act or purpose of his will, whereby he determined or purposed in himself to recover a church out of lost mankind, to sanctify them unto himself, and to bring them unto the enjoyment of himself hereafter, See <sup><800></sup>Ephesians 1:4-9.

And this act of the will of God was,

(1.) *Free and sovereign*, without any meritorious cause, or any thing that should dispose him thereunto without himself: “He purposed in himself.” There are everywhere blessed effects ascribed to it, but no cause anywhere. All that is designed unto us in it, as unto the communication of it in its effects, were its effects, not its cause. See <sup>400</sup>Ephesians 1:4, and this place. The whole mediation of Christ, especially his death and suffering, was the means of its accomplishment, and not the procuring cause of it.

(2.) It was accompanied with *infinite wisdom*, whereby provision was made for his own glory, and the means and way of the accomplishment of his will. He would not admit the legal sacrifices as the means and way of its accomplishment, because they could not provide for those ends; for “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.”

(3.) It was *immutable and irrevocable*, it depended not upon any condition in any thing or person without himself: “He purposed in himself.” Nor was it capable of any change or alteration from oppositions or interveniencies.

(4.) It follows hereon that it must be *infallibly effectual*, in the actual accomplishment of what was designed in it, — every thing in its order and season; it cannot in any thing be frustrated or disappointed. The whole church in every age shall be sanctified by it. This will of God some would have not to be any internal act of his will, but only the thing willed by him, name]y, the sacrifice of Christ; and that for this reason, because it is opposed to legal sacrifices, which the act of God’s will cannot be. But the mistake is evident; for the will of God here intended is not at all opposed unto the legal sacrifices, but only as to the means of the accomplishment of it, which they were not, nor could be.

**Obs. XXVIII.** The sovereign will and pleasure of God, acting itself in infinite wisdom and grace, is the sole, supreme, original cause of the salvation of the church, <sup>410</sup>Romans 9:10, 11.

3. The means of accomplishment and making effectual of this will of God, is the “offering of the body of Jesus Christ.” Some copies after ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν read οἶ, and then the sense must be supplied by the repetition of ἡγιασμένοι in the close of that verse, “who by the offering



of the body of Jesus Christ were once sanctified.” But there is no color for this supply, for the word “once” doth directly respect the offering of Christ, as the following verses, wherein it is explained, and the dignity of this sacrifice thence demonstrated, do prove. Wherefore this article belongs not unto the text, for it is not in the best copies, nor is taken notice of in our translation. Why and in what sense the sacrifice of Christ is called the “offering of his body,” was before declared. And “by which,” διὰ τῆς, refers not to the cause of our sanctification, which is the will of God, but unto the effect itself. Our sanctification is wrought, effected, accomplished by the offering of the body of Christ,

**(1.)** In that the expiation of our sin and reconciliation with God were perfectly wrought thereby:

**(2.)** In that the whole church of the elect was thereby dedicated unto God; which privilege they are called into the actual participation of through faith in the blood of Christ:

**(3.)** In that thereby all the old legal sacrifices, and all that yoke, and burden, and bondage wherewith they were accompanied, are taken out of the way, <sup><4015></sup>Ephesians 2:15, 16:

**(4.)** In that he redeemed us thereby from the whole curse of the law, as given originally in the law of nature, and also renewed in the covenant of Sinai:

**(5.)** In that thereby he ratified and confirmed the new covenant, and all the promises of it, and all the grace contained in them, to be effectually communicated unto us:

**(6.)** In that he thereby procured for us, and received into his own disposition, in the behalf of the church, effectually to communicate all grace and mercy unto our souls and consciences. In brief, whatever was prepared in the will of God for the good of the church, it is all communicated unto us through the offering of the body of Christ, in such a way as tendeth unto the glory of God and the assured salvation of the church.

This “offering of the body of Jesus Christ” is the glorious center of all the counsels of the wisdom of God, of all the purposes of his will for the sanctification of the church. For,

(1.) No other way or means could effect it:

(2.) This will do it infallibly; for Christ crucified is the wisdom of God and the power of God unto this end. This is the anchor of our faith, whereon alone it rests.

4. The last thing in the words gives us the *manner* of the offering of the body of Christ. It was done ἐφάπαξ: “once for all,” say we, — once only; it was never before that one time, nor shall ever be afterwards, — “there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” And this demonstrates both the dignity and efficacy of his sacrifice. Of such worth and dignity it was, that God absolutely acquiesced therein, and smelled a savor of eternal rest in it: and of such efficacy, that the sanctification of the church was perfected by it, so that it needed no repetition. It also made way for the following state of Christ himself, which was to be a state of glory, absolute and perfect, inconsistent with the repetition of the same sacrifice of himself. For, as the apostle shows, verses 12, 13, after this sacrifice offered, he had no more to do but to enter into glory. So absurd is that imagination of the Socinians, that he offered his expiatory sacrifice in heaven, that he did not, he could not enter into glory, until he had completely offered his sacrifice, the memorial whereof he carried into the holy place. And the apostle lays great weight on this consideration, as that which is the foundation of the faith of the church. He mentions it often, and argues from it as the principal argument to prove its excellency above the sacrifices of the law. And this very foundation is destroyed by those who fancy unto themselves a renewed offering of the body of Christ every day in the mass. Nothing can be more directly contrary unto this assertion of the apostle, whatever color they may put upon their practice, or whatever pretense they may give unto it.

Wherefore the apostle in the next verses argues from the dignity and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, by its difference from and opposition unto the legal sacrifices, which were often repeated.

**VERSES 11-14.**

Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἔστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων ζυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας· αὐτὸς δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας ζυσίαν, εἰς τὸ διησεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μίᾳ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους.<sup>f31</sup>

**Ver. 11-14.** — And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

These words are an entrance into the close of that long blessed discourse of the apostle concerning the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, their dignity and efficacy, which he shuts up and finisheth in the following verses, confirming the whole with the testimony of the Holy Ghost before produced by him.

Four things doth he here instruct us in, by way of recapitulation of what he had declared and proved before:

- 1.** The state of the legal priests and sacrifices, as unto the repetition of them; by which he had proved before their utter insufficiency to take away sin, verse 11.
- 2.** In that one offering of Christ, and that once offered, in opposition thereunto, verse 12.
- 3.** The consequence thereof on the part of Christ; whereof there are two parts:

**(1.)** His state and condition immediately ensuing thereon, verse 12, manifesting the dignity, efficacy, and absolute perfection of his offering;

(2.) As unto the continuance of his state and condition afterwards, verse 13. 4. The absolute effect of his sacrifice, which was the sanctification of the church, verse 14.

In the first of these we have,

1. The *note* of its introduction, **καί**, “and.”
2. The *subject* of the proposition in it, “every priest.”
3. What is ascribed unto them in the discharge of their office; which is expressed,

(1.) *Generally*, they “stood ministering day by day;”

(2.) *Particularly*, as unto that part of their office which is now under consideration; “they often” (that is, every day) “offered the same sacrifices.”

4. The *inefficacy* of those sacrifices, though often offered; “they could not take away sin.” Besides this work of daily offering the same sacrifices, which could not take away sin, there was nothing ensued on them of glory and dignity unto themselves, or benefit unto the church. This the apostle insinuates, although it be left out in the comparison, insisting especially on the contrary in the opposite sacrifice of Christ, both as unto his own glory and the eternal salvation of the church.

First, The *introduction* is by **καί**, mostly a copulative, sometimes redditive, as it is here taken by us and rendered. In this latter way it gives a further reason of what was before declared of the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, by a comparison of it with those of the priests, which were often repeated. In the other sense it denotes a progress in the same argument, by a repetition of the consideration of the old sacrifices, and a new comparison of them with that of Christ. Both come to the same, and either may be allowed.

Secondly, The *subject* spoken of, that is **πᾶς ἱερέως**, “every priest.” ‘That is,’ say some, ‘every high priest;’ and so they interpret the words, “standeth daily,” by ‘a certain day once a-year,’ referring the whole unto the anniversary sacrifice on the day of expiation. And it is not denied but that the apostle hath a special regard thereunto, and mentioneth it

expressly, as we have showed on <sup><8007></sup>Hebrews 9:7, 25. But it cannot be here so restrained: for he makes application herein of what he had spoken before of all the sacrifices of the law; and therein he reckons up all sorts of them, as we have seen, some of which, as the whole burnt-offerings, and all offerings in distinction from bloody sacrifices, were not offered by the high priest on that day, but by other priests on all occasions.

And the following expression, ἔστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν, “standeth ministering every day,” declares the constant discharge of the priestly office in every daily ministration. This was the work that all the priests were designed unto in their courses. Wherefore the words, as they do not exclude the annual sacrifice of the high priest, so they include the daily and occasional sacrifices of all the other priests; for these offerings of blood were also types of the sacrifice and offering of Christ. For all sacrifices by blood were to make atonement for sin, <sup><8071></sup>Leviticus 17:11; and they were of no use but by virtue of their typical representation of the sacrifice of Christ. Therefore all the priests, and their whole office, as unto all that belonged unto the offering of sacrifices, are comprised in this assertion. And it was necessary to extend the comparison unto them all, that there might be no exception unto the argument from it. And the following words, which give a description of the general way of their ministration, do enforce this interpretation, which is the third thing in them.

Thirdly, “Standeth daily ministering,” — ἔστηκε, “standeth,” or rather “stood.” They did so while their office was in force; it was their duty by the law so to do. For the apostle respecteth not what was their present acting as to matter of fact, but speaks of the whole service of the priests indistinctly, as past or present, with regard unto what was to be done by virtue of the first institution of them and the service which the tabernacle was erected for.

**1.** “Stood,” or “standeth,” ready for and employed in the work of their office, — λειτουργῶν, “ministering;” a general name of employment about all sacred duties, services, and offices whatever, and therefore it compriseth all the service of the priests about the tabernacle and altar, wherein they ministered unto God according to his appointment. And this extends unto all that were partakers of the priesthood, and was not

confined unto the high priest. See <sup><300></sup>Hebrews 9:1. This they did καθ' ἡμέραν, — that is, “day by day,” as occasion did require, according to the appointment of the law. Not only the daily sacrifice morning and evening is intended, nor yet the doubling of them on the Sabbath and other festivals, but all the occasional offerings for the people, as their necessities did require. For any man might bring his sin-offering, and trespass-offering, his peace-offering, his vow, or free-will-offering, unto the priest at any time, to be offered on the altar. For this cause they came to be always in a readiness to stand ministering daily, and hereunto was their office confined. There was no end of their work, after which they should enter into another and better state, as the apostle shows it of the LORD Christ in the next verse. And this is a high argument for the imperfection of their sacrifices, they were never brought unto that state by them as that the high priest might cease from ministering, and enter into a condition of rest.

2. Their *general ministry* is described by the especial duty which is under present consideration, — they “offered oftentimes the same sacrifices.” They were the same sacrifices that were offered, of the same general nature and kind. They were, indeed, distributed into several sorts, according unto their occasions and institutions, as, whole burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and the like; but their general nature was one and the same, falling all under the same censure, that they could not take away sin. They had not any one peculiar service that could effect this end. And they offered them often, daily, monthly, occasionally, annually, according unto divine institution. In this defect as unto the efficacy and frequency in the repetition, is the sacrifice of Christ directly opposed unto them. Hence, —

Fourthly, In the last place, the apostle passeth that sentence concerning them all, whose truth he had before sufficiently confirmed, “They cannot,” they never could, “take away sins.” They could not περιελεῖν, “take them out of the way;” that is, absolutely, perfectly, as the word denotes. They could not do it before God, the judge, by making a sufficient atonement for them, verse 4; they could not do it as unto the conscience of the sinner, giving him assured peace with God thereon. ‘It may be they could not do it at any one time, but in the constant continuance in the use and observation of them they might do it; if they were multiplied, if they were costly, if they were observed in an

extraordinary manner, they might effect this end?' No, saith the apostle, "they could not do it," — οὐδέποτε δύνανται. The defect was in their own nature and lower, — "they cannot do it." They could not do it by any means, nor at any time. The word is a vehement negation, respecting all the powers of those sacrifices, and all the times wherein they were used. And therefore, as unto those things which might seem to give them their efficacy, as their multiplication, their constancy, their cost, extraordinary care about them, God doth reject them in a peculiar manner, when trusted unto for the taking away of sin, <sup><2311</sup>Isaiah 1:11; <sup><3015</sup>Micah 6:6, 7.

**Obs. I.** If all those divine institutions, in the diligent observation of them, could not take away sin, how much less can any thing do so that we can betake ourselves unto for that end! — There are innumerable things invented in the Papacy to take away sin and its guilt, especially of those sins which they are pleased to call venial. And all men, on the conviction of sin, are apt to entertain thoughts that by some endeavors of their own they may so take them away. To comply with this presumption are all the papal inventions of confession, absolution, indulgences, masses, penances, purgatory, and the like, accommodated. Others trust solely unto their own repentance and following duties, as do the Socinians, and all men in their unrenewed estate. But certainly if the apostle proveth this assertion beyond contradiction, that none of them could ever take away any sin, that their legal institutions of divine worship and their observations could not do it; how much less can the inventions of men effect that great end! This account he gives us of the inefficacy of the sacrifices of the priests, notwithstanding their diligent attendance on their offerings, verse 11.

**Ver. 12-14.** — In these verses the apostle opposeth that one sacrifice of Christ unto the legal offerings that the priests attended unto; and that in three things:

- 1.** In the nature of it, and its perfection, ver. 12.
- 2.** The consequence on the part of Christ, by whom it was offered, ver. 12, 13.
- 3.** In the effect of it towards the church, ver. 14.

**Ver. 12.** — “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.”

First, There is a note of opposition, answering the **καί**, “and,” in the verse foregoing; **δέ**, “but.” It is not exceptive, but alternative.

Secondly, The person spoken of, **αὐτός**, “he;” that is, ‘he of whom we speak,’ he whose body was offered once for all, Jesus Christ, the high priest of the new testament. “But this man,” say we.

Thirdly, What is ascribed unto him in these words, **ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας ζυσίαν**, — “After he had offered one sacrifice for sins.” lie offered as the priests did; he offered for sin as they did also: so far there was an agreement. But,

1. He offered only *one sacrifice*, not many. And what is included therein? — that this sacrifice was of himself, and not the blood of bulls and goats.
2. It was but *once offered*; and it is principally called: ‘one sacrifice’ because it was but once offered. And the time when he offered this sacrifice is also proposed, not absolutely, but with respect unto what ensued: it was *before* he “sat down on the right hand of God;” that is, before his entrance into glory, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin. And the way of mentioning these things doth manifest that the principal intention of the apostle is to speak unto the different consequences of this offering of the priests of old and of Christ. And this observation, of his offering “one sacrifice” only for sin, is mentioned in opposition unto the frequent repetition of their sacrifices; but he mentioneth it only transiently, to make a way for the great ensuing differences in the consequents of them. Howbeit in these words, thus transiently mentioned, he judgeth and condemneth the two grand oppositions that at this day are made against that one sacrifice of Christ, and efficacy of it. The first is that of the Papists, who in the mass pretend to multiply the sacrifices of him every day, whereas he offered but “once;” so as that the repetition of it is destructive unto it. The other is that of the Socinians, who would have the offering and sacrifice of Christ to be only his appearance before God to receive power to keep us from the punishment of sin, upon his doing of the will of God in the world. But the words are express as unto the order of these things; namely, that he offered his sacrifice for sins before his



exaltation in glory, or his sitting down on the right hand of God. And herein doth the apostle give glory unto that offering of Christ for sins, in that it perfectly accomplished what all legal sacrifices could not effect. This, therefore, is the only repose of troubled souls.

Fourthly, The consequent hereof on the part of Christ is twofold:

1. What immediately ensued on this offering of his body, verse 12;
2. What continueth to be his state with respect thereunto, verse 13: both of them evidencing God's high approbation and acceptance of his person, and what he had done; as also the glory and efficacy of his office and sacrifice above those of the law, wherein no such privilege nor testimony was given unto them upon the discharge of their office.

1. The immediate consequent of his offering was, **ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, — that “he sat down on the right hand of God.” This glorious exaltation of Christ hath been spoken unto and opened before, on <sup><000></sup>Hebrews 1:3, 8:1. Here it includes a double opposition unto and preference above the state of the legal priests upon their oblations. For although the high priest, in his anniversary sacrifice for the expiation of sin, did enter into the most holy place, where were the visible pledges of the presence of God, yet he stood in a posture of humble ministration; he sat not down with any appearance of dignity or honor. Again, his abode in the typical holy place was for a short season only; but Christ sat down at the right hand of God “for ever,” — **εἰς τὸ διηνεκές**, “in perpetuum;” in an unalterable state and condition. He sat down, never to offer sacrifice any more. And this is the highest pledge, the highest assurance of these two things, which are the pillars and principal foundations of the faith of the church:

(1.) That God was absolutely pleased, satisfied, and highly glorified, in and by the offering of Christ; for had it not been so, the human nature of Christ had not been immediately exalted into the highest glory that it was capable of. See <sup><000></sup>Ephesians 5:1, 2; <sup><000></sup>Philippians 2:7-9.

(2.) That he had by his offering perfectly expiated the sin of the world, so as that there is no need for ever of any other offering or sacrifice unto this end.

**Obs. II.** Faith in Christ doth jointly respect both his oblation of himself by death and the glorious exaltation that ensued thereon. — He so offered one sacrifice for sin, as that thereon he sat down on the right hand of God for ever. Neither of these separately is a full object for faith to find rest in; both in conjunction are a rock to fix it on. And, —

**Obs. III.** Christ in this order of things is the great exemplar of the church. He suffered, and then entered into glory. “If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him.”

**Ver. 13.** — “From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.”

2. The state and condition of Christ after his sitting down at the right hand of God, not absolutely, but with respect unto his enemies, is declared in these words. The whole testimony is taken from <sup><sup>EBB</sup>Psalm 110:1, and here explained in these verses. It is produced in the confirmation of what the apostle asserts concerning the impossibility as well as the needlessness of the repetition of his sacrifice. For as it is no way necessary, as in the verses following he declares, so it is impossible in his present state and condition, which was ordained for him from the beginning: this was, that he should sit at the right hand of God, expecting his enemies to be made his footstool; that is, in a state of majesty and glory. But offer himself he could not, without suffering and dying, whereof in this state he is no way capable. And besides, as was before observed, it is an evidence both of the dignity and eternal efficacy of his one sacrifice, whereon at once his exaltation did ensue.

I acknowledge my thoughts are inclined unto a peculiar interpretation of this place, though I will not oppose absolutely that which is commonly received; though in my judgment I prefer this other before it. The assertion is introduced by τὸ λοιπόν: “henceforth,” say we: “as unto what remains;” that is, of the dispensation of the personal ministry of Christ. He was here below, he came unto his own, he dwelt amongst them; that is, in the church of the Hebrews. Some very few believed on him, but the generality of the people, the rulers, priests, guides of the church, engaged against him, persecuted him, falsely accused him, killed him, hanged him on a tree. Under the veil of their rage and cruelty he carried on his work of “making his soul an offering for sin,” or “taking away sin by the sacrifice

of himself.” having fulfilled this work, and thereby wrought out the eternal salvation of the church, he sits down on the right hand of God. In the meantime those stubborn enemies of his, who hated, rejected, and slew him, continued raging in the fierceness of their implacable tumults against him and them that believed in him. They hated his person, his office, his work, his gospel; many of them expressly sinning against the Holy Ghost. Yet did they triumph that they had prevailed against him, and destroyed him; as some of their accursed posterity do to this day. It was the judgment of God, that those his obstinate enemies should by his power be utterly destroyed in this world, as a pledge of the eternal destruction of those who will not believe the gospel. That this was the end whereunto they were designed himself declares, <sup><427></sup>Matthew 22:7; <sup><427></sup>Luke 19:27, “Those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.”

After our Lord Christ left this world, there was a mighty contest between the dying apostate church of the Jews and the rising gospel church of believers. The Jews boasted of their success, in that by fraud and cruelty they had destroyed him as a malefactor; the apostles and the church with them gave testimony unto his resurrection and glory in heaven. Great expectation there was what would be the end of these things, which way the scale would turn. After a while, a visible and glorious determination was made of this controversy; God sent forth his armies and destroyed those murderers, burning up their city. Those enemies of the King, which would not have him to reign over them, were brought forth and slain before his face. So were all his enemies made his footstool. I do judge that these are the enemies of Christ, and the making of them his footstool, which are peculiarly here intended, namely, the destruction of the hardened, unbelieving Jews, who had obstinately rejected his ministry, and opposed it unto the end. Then were those his enemies who so refused him slain and destroyed thereon. For, —

**(1.)** This description of his enemies, as *his* enemies peculiarly, directs us unto this sense, the enemies of his person, doctrine, and glory, with whom he had so many contests, whose blasphemies and contradictions he underwent. They were his enemies in a peculiar manner.

(2.) This the word ἐκδεχόμενος, “expecting,” better answers unto than unto the other sense. For the glorious visible propagation of the gospel and kingdom of Christ thereon, began and was carried on gloriously upon and after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the church of the Jews, his enemies. With reference hereunto, expectation may be no less distinctly ascribed unto him than if we extend the word unto the whole time unto the end of the world.

(3.) The act of vengeance on these his enemies is not said to be his own, but is peculiarly assigned unto God the Father, and those employed by him. In the original promise, the words of God the Father to him are, “I will make thine enemies thy footstool;” — ‘I take it upon me (vengeance is mine) to revenge the injuries done unto thee, and the obstinacy of those unbelievers.’ Here in this place respect is had unto the means that God used in the work of their destruction, which was the Roman army, by whom they were, as the footstool of Christ, absolutely trodden under his feet, with respect unto this special act of God the Father; who in the execution of it proclaims that “vengeance is his.” For in the following words the Lord Christ is said only to “expect” it, as that wherein his own cause was vindicated, and revenged, as it were, by another hand, while he pleaded it himself in the world by that mild and gentle means of sending his Spirit to convince them of sin, righteousness, and judgment.

(4.) This is that which the apostle constantly threatens the obstinate Hebrews and apostate professors of the gospel withal, throughout this epistle, the time of their destruction being now at hand. So he doth, <sup>1665</sup>Hebrews 6:5-8; and in this chapter, verses 26-31, where it must be spoken to.

(5.) This was that τὸ λοιπὸν, or “what remained,” as unto the personal ministry of Christ in this world.

**Obs. IV.** The horrible destruction of the stubborn, obstinate enemies of the person and office of Christ, which befell the nation of the Jews, is a standing security of the endless destruction of all who remain his obstinate adversaries.

I leave this interpretation of the words unto the thoughts of them that are judicious, and shall open the mind of the Holy Ghost in them according unto the generally received opinion of their sense. And to this end, —

**(1.)** The subject spoken of is the enemies of Christ, — οἱ ἐχθροί, “his enemies.” He hath had many enemies ever since his exaltation; and so shall have unto the consummation of all things, when they shall all of them be triumphed over.

For his enemies are of two sorts: first, Such as are so immediately and directly unto his person; secondly, Such as are so to his office and work, with the benefits of the salvation of the church. Those of the first sort are either devils or men. All the devils are in a combination, as sworn enemies unto the person of Christ and his kingdom. And for men, the whole world of unbelieving Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans, are all his enemies, and do put forth all their power in opposition unto him. The enemies unto his office, grace, and work, and the benefits of it, are either persons or things.

**[1.]** The head of this opposition and enmity unto his office is Antichrist, with all his adherents; and in a special manner, all worldly power, authority, and rule, acting themselves in subserviency unto the antichristian interest.

**[2.]** All pernicious heresies against his person and grace;

**[3.]** All others which make profession of the gospel, and live not as becomes the gospel, they are all enemies of Christ and his office.

The things which rise up in enmity and opposition to him and the work of his grace, are, sin, death, the grave, and hell. All these endeavor to obstruct and frustrate all the ends of Christ’s mediation, and are therein his enemies.

**(2.)** There is the disposal of this subject, of these enemies of Christ. They shall be made his footstool.” Ἔως τεθῶσιν — “until they be put” and “placed” in this condition. It is a state which they would not be in; but they shall be made, put, and placed in it, whether they will or no, as the word signifies. ὡς ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. A footstool is used in a threefold sense in the Scripture: —

[1.] For the visible pledge of God's presence and his worship. God's throne, as we have showed, was represented by the ark, mercy-seat, and cherubim, in the most holy place; wherein the sanctuary itself was his footstool, <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 28:2; <sup><1305></sup>Psalm 99:5, 132:7. So it is applied unto God, and his presence in the church; as the ark was his throne, so the sanctuary was his footstool.

[2.] It is applied unto God and his presence in the world. So heaven above is called his throne, and this lower part of the creation is his footstool, <sup><1301></sup>Isaiah 66:1.

In neither of these senses are the enemies of Christ to be his footstool; therefore it is taken, —

[3.] For a despised, conquered condition; a state of a mean, subjected people, deprived of all power and benefit, and brought into absolute subjection. In no other sense can it be applied unto the enemies of Christ, as here it is. Yet doth it not signify the same condition absolutely as unto all persons and things that are his enemies; for they are not of one nature, and their subjection to him is such as their natures are capable of. But these things are intended in it:

**1st.** The deprivation of all power, authority, and glory. They sat on thrones, but now are under the seat of him who is the only potentate.

**2dly.** An utter defeat of their design, in opposing either his person or the work of his grace in the eternal salvation of his church. They shall not hurt nor destroy any more in the mountain of the Lord.

**3dly.** Their eternal disposal by the will of Christ, according as his glory shall be manifested therein. Sin, death, the grave, and hell, as unto their opposition to the church, shall be utterly destroyed, 1 Corinthians 15:55-57; and "there shall be no more death." Satan and Antichrist shall be destroyed two ways:

**(1st.)** Initially and gradually.

**(2dly.)** Absolutely and completely.

The first they are in all ages of the church, from the time of Christ's glorious ascension into heaven. They were then immediately put in

subjection to him, all of them, because that they should not defeat any one end of his mediation. And he maketh continual instances, as he pleases, of his power over them, in the visible destruction of some of his principal and most implacable enemies. And secondly, it will be complete at the last day, when all these enemies shall be utterly destroyed.

(3.) The word ἕως, “until,” here hath respect unto both these, the gradual and final destruction of all the enemies of Christ.

(4.) This Christ is said to *expect*; “henceforth expecting.” Expectation and waiting are improperly ascribed to Christ, as they are in the Scripture unto God himself, so far as they include hope or uncertainty of the event, or a desire of any thing, either as to matter, manner, or time, otherwise than as they are foreknown and determined. But it is the rest and complacency of Christ in the faithfulness of God’s promises, and his infinite wisdom as unto the season of their accomplishment, that is intended. He doth not so expect these things, as though there were any thing wanting to his own blessedness, glory, power, or authority, until it be actually and completely finished; but saith the apostle, ‘As to what remains to the Lord Christ in the discharge of his office, he henceforth is no more to offer, to suffer, no more to die, no more to do any thing for the expiation of sin or by way of sacrifice; all this being absolutely and completely perfected, he is for ever in the enjoyment of the glory that was set before him; satisfied in the promises, the power, and wisdom of God, for the complete effecting of his mediatory office, in the eternal salvation of the church, and by the conquest and destruction of all his and their enemies in the proper times and seasons for it.’ And from this interpretation of the words we may take these observations: —

**Obs. V.** It was the entrance of sin which raised up all our enemies against us. From thence took they their rise and beginning; as death, the grave, and hell. Some that were friendly before became our enemies thereon; as the law: and some that had a radical enmity, got power thereby to execute it; as the devil. The state in which we were created was a state of universal peace; all the strife and contention rose from sin.

**Obs. VI.** The Lord Christ, in his ineffable love and grace, put himself between us and all our enemies; and took into his breast all their swords, wherewith they were armed against us: so they are his enemies.

**Obs. VII.** The Lord Christ, by the offering of himself, making peace with God, ruined all the enmity against the church, and all the enemies of it. For all their power arose from the just displeasure of God, and the curse of his law.

**Obs. VIII.** It is the foundation of all consolation to the church, that the Lord Christ, even now in heaven, takes all our enemies to be his; in whose destruction he is infinitely more concerned than we are.

**Obs. IX.** Let us never esteem any thing, or any person, to be our enemy, but only so far and in what they are the enemies of Christ.

**Obs. X.** It is our duty to conform ourselves to the Lord Christ, in a quiet expectancy of the ruin of all our spiritual adversaries.

**Obs. XI.** Envy not the condition of the most proud and cruel adversaries of the church; for they are absolutely in his power, and shall be cast under his footstool at the appointed season.

**Ver. 14.** — “For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”

The apostle,

**1.** Gives the great reason of this state of things with reference unto the Lord Christ in the discharge of his office, namely, that he did not repeat his offering, as the priests under the law did theirs, every year, and every day; and that he is set down at the right hand of God, expecting his enemies to be made his footstool, — wherein they had no share after their oblations: and this is, because “by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” This being done, there is no need of any daily sacrifice, nothing that should detain the Lord Jesus out of the possession of his glory. So the particle γάρ “for,” infers a reason in these words of all that was assigned before unto him, in opposition unto what was done by the priests of the law: it was “by one offering.”



2. What he did so effect, which rendered all future offerings and sacrifices impossible: “he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”

1. for the first, what he did of the nature of the thing spoken of, was **μὶ ἅ προσφορᾷ**, “by one offering;” as what the priests of old did was also by offerings and sacrifices. The eminency of this offering the apostle had before declared, which here he refers unto. It was not of bulls or goats, but of himself, — he “offered himself to God;” of his body, — that is, his whole human nature. And this offering, as he had observed before, was only “once offered;” in the mention whereof the apostle includes all the opposition he had made before between the offering of Christ and those of the priests, as to its worth and dignity.

2. That which is effected hereby is, that “he perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” Those on whom his work is effected are thereby “sanctified.” They that are dedicated unto God, those who are sanctified or purged by virtue of this sacrifice, unto them all the other effects are confined. First to sanctify them, then to perfect them, was the design of Christ in offering of himself; which he purposed not for all men universally. So in the foundation of the church of Israel, they were first sanctified and dedicated unto God in and by the sacrifices wherewith the covenant was confirmed, Exodus 24; and afterwards were perfected, so far as their condition was capable thereof, in the prescription of laws and ordinances for their church-state and worship. The word here, **τετελείωκεν**, was used before.

He hath brought them into the most perfect and consummate church-state and relation unto God, as unto all his worship, that the church is capable of in this world. It is not an absolute, subjective, virtual, internal perfection of grace, that is intended; the word signifies not such a perfection, “made perfect,” nor is ever used to that purpose; nor is it the perfection of glory, for he treats of the present church-state of the gospel in this world: but it is a state and condition of that grace and those privileges which the law, priests, and sacrifices, could never bring them unto. He hath by his “one offering” wrought and procured for them the complete pardon of sin, and peace before God thereon, that they should have no more need of the repetition of sacrifices; he hath freed them from the yoke of carnal ordinances, and the bondage which they were kept in by

them, prescribing unto them a holy worship, to be performed with boldness in the presence of God, by an entrance into the holy place; he hath brought them into the last and best church-state, the highest and nearest relation unto God that the church is capable of in this world, or the glory of his wisdom and grace hath assigned unto it. And this he hath done εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, “for ever,” so as that there shall never be any alteration in that estate whereunto he hath brought them, nor any addition of privilege or advantage be ever made unto it.

**Obs. XII.** There was a glorious efficacy in the one offering of Christ.

**Obs. XIII.** The end of it must be effectually accomplished towards all for whom it was offered; or else it is inferior unto the legal *sacrifices*, for they attained their proper end.

**Obs. XIV.** The sanctification and perfection of the church being the end designed in the death and sacrifice of Christ, all things necessary unto that end must be included therein, that it be not frustrated.

### VERSES 15-18.

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι· Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ, Τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθᾶ ἔτι. Ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἀμαρτίας.<sup>f32</sup>

**Ver. 15-18.** — [*Whereof*] the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them: And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these [*is, there is*] no more offering for sin.

The foundation of the whole preceding discourse of the apostle, concerning the glory of the priesthood of Christ, and the efficacy of his sacrifice, was laid in the description of the new covenant, whereof he was the mediator; which was confirmed and ratified by his sacrifice, as the old

covenant was by the blood of bulls and goats, ~~scrib~~ Hebrews 8:10-13. Having now abundantly proved and demonstrated what he designed concerning them both, his priesthood and his sacrifice, he gives us a confirmation of the whole from the testimony of the Holy Ghost, in the description of that covenant which he had given before. And because the crisis which he had brought his argument and disputation unto was, that the Lord Christ, by reason of the dignity of his person and office, with the everlasting efficacy of his sacrifice, was to offer himself but “once,” — which virtually includes all that he had before taught and declared, including in it an immediate demonstration of the insufficiency of all those sacrifices which were often repeated, and consequently their removal out of the church, — he returns unto those words of the Holy Ghost, for the proof of this particular also. And he doth it from the order of the words used by the Holy Ghost, as he had argued before from the order of the words in the psalmist, verses 8, 9.

Wherefore there is an ellipsis in the words, which must have a supplement, to render the sense perfect. For unto that proposition, “After he had said before,” verse 15, with what follows, verse 16, there must be added in the beginning of the 17th verse, “he said;” after he had said or spoken of the internal grace of the covenant, *he said* this also, that “their sins and iniquities he would remember no more.” For from these words doth he make his conclusive inference, verse 18, which is the sum of all that he designed to prove.

There is in the words, first, the introduction of the testimony insisted on, “The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us.” The Hebrews might object unto him, as they were ready enough to do it, that all those things were but his own conclusions and arguings; which they would not acquiesce in, unless they were confirmed by testimonies of the Scripture. And therefore I did observe, in my first discourses on this epistle, that the apostle dealt not with these Hebrews as with the churches of the Gentiles, namely, by his *apostolical authority* (for which cause he prefixed not his name and title unto it); but upon their own *acknowledged principles and testimonies of the Old Testament*; so manifesting that there was nothing now proposed unto them in the gospel but that which was foretold, promised, and represented in the Old Testament, and was therefore the object of the faith of their forefathers. The same way doth he here proceed in, and calls in the

testimony of the Holy Ghost, bearing witness unto the things that he had taught and delivered. And there is in the words, —

**1.** The *author of this testimony*; that is, “the Holy Ghost.” And it is ascribed unto him, as all that is written in the Scripture is so, not only because holy men of old wrote as they were acted by him, and so he was the author of the whole Scripture; but because also of his presence and authority in it and with it continually. Hence whatever is spoken in the Scripture is, and ought to be unto us, as the immediate word of the Holy Ghost. He continues therein to speak unto us; and this gives the reason of—

**2.** The *manner of his speaking in this testimony*; μαρτυρεῖ, “he beareth witness to us.” He doth it actually and constantly in the Scriptures, by his authority therein. And he doth so *unto us*; that is, not unto us only who preach and teach those things, not unto the apostles and other Christian teachers of the gospel, but unto all of us of the church of Israel, who acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, and own them as the rule of our faith and obedience. So doth he often join himself unto them to whom he wrote and spake of, by reason of the common alliance between them as Hebrews. See <sup><301B></sup> Hebrews 2:3, and the exposition of that place: ‘This is that which the Holy Ghost in the Scripture testifies unto us all; which should put an end unto all controversies about these things. Nothing else is taught you but what is testified beforehand by God himself.’

**Obs. I.** It is the authority of the Holy Ghost alone, speaking unto us in the Scripture, whereinto all our faith is to be resolved.

**Obs. II.** We are to propose nothing in the preaching and worship of the gospel but what is testified unto by the Holy Ghost: not traditions, not our own reasons and inventions.

**Obs. III.** When an important truth consonant unto the Scripture is declared, it is useful and expedient to confirm it with some express testimony of Scripture.

**3.** Lastly, the manner of the expression is emphatical: Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, — “Even also the Holy Spirit himself.” For herein we are directed unto his *holy divine person*, and not to an *external operation of divine power*, as the Socinians dream. It is that Holy Spirit himself that continueth to speak to us in the Scripture.

This is the first thing, or the introduction of the testimony. Secondly, There are two things in this testimony of the Holy Ghost; the first is the matter or substance of it; the second, the order of the things contained in it, or spoken by him. The introduction of the former is in the words we have spoken unto; that of the latter, in the close of the verse, in these words, "For after he had spoken before."

Of the testimony itself, which is declarative of the nature of the new covenant made with Christ and confirmed in him, there are two general parts: First, that which concerns the sanctification of the elect, by the communication of effectual grace unto them for their conversion and obedience. The second is concerning the complete pardon of their sins, and the casting them into everlasting oblivion.

The first of these the Holy Ghost witnesseth in the first place. But he stays not there; afterwards he adds the latter, concerning the pardon of sins and iniquities. This being that alone wherein at present the apostle is concerned, and from whence he confirms his present argument, he distinguisheth it from the other, as that which was of particular use in itself. And therefore verse 17 is to be supplied by, "he said," or "thereon also, Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."

The words themselves have, in both parts of them, been explained at large on Hebrews 8, where they are first produced as the great foundation of the ensuing discourses of the apostle, so that they are not here again to be opened. We are only to consider the argument of the apostle from the latter part of them; and this is, that the covenant being confirmed and established, that is, in the blood and by the one sacrifice of Christ, there can be no more offering for sin. For God will never appoint nor accept of any thing that is needless and useless in his service, least of all in things of so great importance as is the offering for sin. Yea, the continuation of such sacrifices would overthrow the faith of the church, and all the grace of the new covenant. For, saith the apostle, in the new covenant, and by it, the Holy Ghost testifieth, that, as it was confirmed by the one sacrifice of Christ, perfect pardon and forgiveness of sin is prepared for and tendered unto the whole church, and every one that believes. To what purpose, then, should there be any more offerings for sin? Yea, they who look for and trust unto any other, they fall into that sin for which there is no

remission provided in this covenant, nor shall any other offering be accepted for them for ever; for they despise both the wisdom and grace of God, the blood of Christ, and the witness of the Holy Ghost; whereof there is no remission: so he disputes, verses 28, 29, of this chapter.

And here we are come unto a full end of the dogmatical part of this epistle, a portion of Scripture filled with heavenly and glorious mysteries, — the light of the church of the Gentiles, the glory of the people Israel, the foundation and bulwark of faith evangelical.

I do therefore here, with all humility, and sense of my own weakness and utter disability for so great a work, thankfully own the guidance and assistance which have been given me in the interpretation of it, so far as it is or may be of use unto the church, as a mere effect of sovereign and undeserved grace. From that alone it is, that, having many and many a time been at an utter loss as to the mind of the Holy Ghost, and finding no relief in the worthy labors of others, he hath graciously answered my poor weak supplications, in supplies of the light and evidence of truth.

### VERSES 19-23.

Ἐχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς· καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινη· (πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος.)

**Ver. 19-23.** — Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and [*having*] an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of [*our*] faith without wavering: (for he [*is*] faithful that promised.)

In these words the apostle enters on the last part of the epistle, which is wholly parenetical, or hortatory. For though there be some occasional intermixtures of doctrines consonant unto them before insisted on, yet the professed design of the whole remainder of the epistle is to propose unto and press on the Hebrews such duties, of various sorts, as the truths he had insisted upon do direct unto and make necessary unto all that believe. And in all his exhortations there is a mixture of the ground of the duties exhorted unto, of their necessity, and of the privilege which we have in being admitted unto them and accepted with them; all taken from the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, with the effects of them, and the benefits which we receive thereby.

In these words there are three things: —

1. The ground and reason of the duty exhorted unto, with the foundation of it, as the special privilege of the gospel, verses 19-21.
2. The way and manner of our using this privilege unto that end, verse 22.
3. The special duty exhorted unto, which is, perseverance and constancy in believing, verse 23.

In the first we have,

1. A note of inference, or deduction of the following exhortation from what was before discoursed; οὖν, “therefore.”
2. A friendly compellation of them to whom he spake, used formerly, but now repeated after a long interruption; ἀδελφοί, “brethren.”
3. The privilege itself, which is the foundation of the exhortation; ἔχοντες παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων, “having boldness to enter into the holiest.”
4. The means whereby we attain the privilege which fits us for this duty; ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, “by the blood of Jesus,” verse 19.
5. The means of using and exercising it as a privilege in a way of duty; “the way is consecrated for us,” verse 20.

**6.** A further encouragement unto it, from the consideration of our high priest; “having an high priest,” verse 21.

**1.** The apostle repeats his obliging compellation, “Brethren.” And herein he hath a peculiar respect unto those among the Hebrews who had received the gospel in sincerity. For although there was a natural brotherhood between him and the whole people of Israel, and they were always wont to call themselves, “brethren” in general, on the account of their original stock and separation from the rest of the world, as ~~482~~ Acts 28:21, yet this word and name is used by the apostle on the account of that spiritual relation which was between them “which believe in God through Jesus Christ.” See ~~580~~ Hebrews 3:1, and the exposition of it. And the apostle by the use of it here testifies unto two things:

**(1.)** That although they had not as yet a full understanding of the nature and use of all legal institutions and sacrifices, nor of their abolishing by the coming of Christ, and the discharge of his office, yet this had not forfeited their interest in the heavenly calling; on account whereof he dealt with them as with brethren.

**(2.)** That this difference, so far as it had yet continued, had no way alienated his mind and affections from them, though he knew how great their mistake was, and what danger, even of eternal ruin, it exposed them unto. Hereby were the minds of those Hebrews secured from prejudice against his person and his doctrine, and inclined unto a compliance with his exhortation. Had he called them heretics and schismatics, and I know not what other names of reproach, — which are the terms in use upon the like occasions amongst us, — he had, in all probability, turned that which was lame quite out of the way. But he had another Spirit, was under another conduct of wisdom and grace, than most men are now acquainted withal.

**Obs. I.** It is not every mistake, every error, though it be in things of great importance, while it overthrows not the foundation, that can divest men of a fraternal interest with others in the heavenly calling.

**2.** There is a note of inference from the preceding discourse, declaring it the ground of the present exhortation; **oŭv**, “therefore:” ‘Seeing that these things are now made manifest unto you, — seeing it is so evidently



testified unto that the old covenant, sacrifices, and worship, could not make us perfect, nor give us an access unto God, whereon they are removed and taken away, which the Scripture fully testifies unto; and seeing all this is effected or accomplished in the office and by the sacrifice of Christ, which they could not effect, and privileges are thereon granted unto believers which they were not before made partakers of; let us make use of them unto the glory of God and our own salvation, in the duties which they necessarily require.’ And we may observe, that the apostle applies this inference from his discourse unto the use and improvement of the liberty and privileges granted unto us in Christ, with the holy worship belonging thereunto, as we shall see in opening of the words, Howbeit there is another conclusion implied in the words, though not expressed by him; and this is, that they should cease and give over their attendance unto the legal worship and sacrifices, as those which now were altogether useless, being indeed abolished. This is the principal design of the apostle in the whole epistle, namely, to call off the believing Hebrews from all adherence unto and conjunction in Mosaical institutions; for he knew the danger, both spiritual and temporal, which would accompany and arise from such an adherence. For, —

**(1.)** It would insensibly weaken their faith in Christ, and give them a disregard of evangelical worship; which did indeed prove unto many of them a cause of that apostasy and final destruction which he so frequently warns them against.

**(2.)** Whereas God had determined now speedily to put an utter end unto the city, temple, and all its worship, by a universal desolation, for the sins of the people, if they did obstinately adhere unto the observance of that worship, it was justly to be feared that they would perish in that destruction that was approaching; which probably many of them did. To instruct them in that light and knowledge of the truth that might deliver them from these evils, was the first design of the apostle in the doctrinal part of this epistle: yet doth he not plainly and in terms express it anywhere in this epistle, not even in this place, where it was most properly and naturally to be introduced; yet he doth that which evidently includes it, namely, exhort them unto those duties which, on the principles he hath declared, are utterly inconsistent with Mosaical worship, — and this is, our free entrance into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. For an

entrance, in any sense, with our worship into the most holy place, is inconsistent with, and destructive of all Mosaical institutions. And this was an effect of the singular wisdom wherewith the apostle was furnished to write this epistle. For had he directly and in terms opposed their observation, no small tumult and outcry would have been made against it, and great provocation had been given unto the unbelieving Jews. But, notwithstanding, he doth the same thing no less effectually in these words, wherein there is scarce a word which that application of his discourse doth not follow upon. And his wisdom herein ought to be an instructive example unto all those that are called unto the instruction of others in the dispensation of the gospel, especially such as through any mistakes do oppose themselves unto the truth. Such things as will give exasperation unto the spirits, or advantage unto the temptations of men, ought to be avoided, or treated on with that wisdom, gentleness, and meekness, as may be no prejudice unto them. This way of procedure doth the same apostle expressly prescribe unto all ministers of the gospel, <sup><5122></sup>2 Timothy 2:23-26.

**3.** There is in the words the privilege which is the foundation of the duty exhorted unto: “Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest,” — for a regular entrance into or of the most holy. The privilege intended is directly opposed unto the state of things under the law; and from the consideration of it is the nature of it to be learned. For the entrance into the holiest, in the tabernacle, belonged unto the worship of the church, it was the principal part thereof; but it had many imperfections attending it:

**(1.)** It was not into the *special presence* of God, but only into a place made with hands, filled with some representations of things that could not be seen.

**(2.)** None might ever enter into it but the *high priest* alone, and that only once a-year.

**(3.)** The body of the people, the *whole congregation*, were therefore jointly and severally utterly excluded from any entrance into it.

**(4.)** The *prohibition* of entrance into this holy place belonged unto that bondage wherein they were kept under the law, which hath been before declared. The privilege here mentioned being opposed to this state of things among them, which respected their present worship, it is certain

that it doth concern the present worship of God by Christ under the gospel. And they are therefore utterly mistaken who suppose the entrance into the most holy to be an entrance into heaven after this life for all believers; for the apostle doth not here oppose the glorious state of heaven unto the church of the Hebrews and their legal services, but the privileges of the gospel-state and worship only. Nor would it have been to his purpose so to have done; for the Hebrews might have said, that although the glory of heaven after this life doth exceed the glories of the services of the tabernacle, which none ever questioned, yet the benefit, use, and efficacy of their present ordinances and worship might be more excellent than any thing that they could obtain by the gospel. Neither were believers then also excluded from heaven after death, any more than now. Therefore the privilege mentioned is that which belongs unto the gospel church in its perfect state in this world. And the exercise and use of it doth consist in our drawing nigh unto God in holy services and worship through Christ, as the apostle declares, verse 22.

There is, then, a twofold opposition in these words unto the state of the people under the law:

- (1.) As *unto the spirit* and frame of mind in the worshippers; and,
- (2.) As *unto the place of the worship*, from whence they were excluded, and whereunto we are admitted.

(1.) The first is in the word **παρρησίαν**, “boldness.” There were two things with respect unto those worshippers in this matter:

[1.] *A legal prohibition from entering into the holy place*; whereon they had no liberty or freedom so to do, because they were forbidden on several penalties;

[2.] *Dread and fear*, which deprived them of all boldness or holy confidence in their approaches unto God: therefore the apostle expresseth the contrary frame of believers under the new testament by a word that signifieth both liberty, or freedom from any prohibition, and boldness with confidence in the exercise of that liberty. I have spoken before of the various use and signification of this word **παρρησία**, which the apostle both in this and other epistles useth frequently to express both the right, and liberty, and confidence, unto and in their access unto God, of believers

under the new testament, in opposition to the state of them under the old. We have a right unto it, we have liberty without restraint by any prohibition, we have confidence and assurance without dread or fear.

(2.) This liberty we have εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον, προσαγωγή, “aditus,” “introitus,” τῶν ἁγίων, — that is, the true sanctuary, the holy place not made with hands; the immediate gracious presence of God himself in Christ Jesus. See <sup>scilicet</sup> Hebrews 9:11, 12. Whatever was typically represented in the most holy place of old, we have access unto; that is, unto God himself we have an access in one Spirit by Christ

**Obs. II.** This is the great fundamental privilege of the gospel, that believers, in all their holy worship, have liberty, boldness, and confidence, to enter with it and by it into the gracious presence of God.

(1.) They are not hindered by any prohibition. God set bounds unto mount Sinai, that none should pass or break through into his presence in the giving of the law. He hath set none to mount Zion, but all believers have right, title, and liberty to approach unto him, even unto his throne. There is no such order now, that he who draws nigh shall be cut off; but on the contrary, that he that doth not so do shall be destroyed.

(2.) Hence there is no dread, fear, or terror in their minds, hearts, or consciences, when they make their approaches unto God. This was a consequent of the same interdict of the law, which is now taken away. They have not received the spirit of bondage unto fear, but the Spirit of the Son, whereby with holy boldness they cry, “Abba, Father;” for “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,” — they have freedom unto, and confidence in their duties: and therein consists the greatest evidence of our interest in the gospel and privileges thereof.

(3.) The nature of gospel worship consists in this, that it is an entrance with boldness into the presence of God. However men may multiply duties, of what sort or nature soever they be, if they design not in and by them to enter into the presence of God, if they have not some experience that so they do, if they are taken up with other thoughts, and rest in the outward performance of them, they belong not unto evangelical worship. The only exercise of faith in them is in an entrance into the presence of God.

**(4.)** Our approach unto God in gospel worship, is unto him as evidencing himself in a way of grace and mercy. Hence it is said to be an “entrance into the holiest;” for in the holy place were all the pledges and tokens of God’s grace and favor, as we have manifested upon the foregoing chapter. And as the taking off of the old prohibition gives us liberty, and the institution of the worship of the gospel gives us title unto this privilege, so the consideration of the nature of that presence of God whereunto we approach gives us boldness thereunto.

**4.** The procuring cause of this privilege is in the next place expressed; we have it *ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ*: “by the blood of Jesus,” say we. It is the procuring cause of this privilege that is intended, which is often so proposed. “The blood of Jesus Christ” is the same with his “sacrifice,” the “offering of himself,” or “the offering of his body once for all.” For he offered himself in and by the effusion of his blood, whereby he made atonement for sin; which could not be otherwise effected. And it is here opposed, as also in the whole preceding discourse, unto the blood of the legal sacrifices. They could not procure, they did not effect any such liberty of access unto God in the holy place. This was done by the blood of Jesus only; whereby he accomplished what the sacrifices of the law could not do. And it is a cause of this privilege on a twofold account:

**(1.)** In its respect unto God, in its oblation.

**(2.)** In respect unto the consciences of believers, in its application.

**(1.)** By its *oblation* it removed and took away all causes of distance between God and believers. It made atonement for them, answered the law, removed the curse, broke down the partition wall, or “the law of commandments contained in ordinances,” wherein were all the prohibitions of approaching unto God with boldness. Hereby also he rent the veil which interposed and hid the gracious presence of God from us. And these things being removed out of the way by the blood of the oblation or offering of Christ, peace being thereby made with God, he procured him to be reconciled unto us, inviting us to accept and make use of that reconciliation by receiving the atonement. Hence believers have boldness to appear before him, and approach unto his presence. See ~~HEB~~ Romans 5:11; ~~ROM~~ 2 Corinthians 5:18-21; ~~HEB~~ Ephesians 2:13-18. Hereon was it the procuring, the purchasing cause of this privilege.

**(2.)** It is the cause of it *with respect unto the consciences of believers, in the application of it unto their souls*. There are not only all the hinderances mentioned, on the part of God, lying in the way of our access unto him, but also the consciences of men, from a sense of the guilt of sin, were filled with fear and dread of God, and durst not so much as desire an immediate access unto him. The efficacy of the blood of Christ being through believing communicated unto them, takes away all this dread and fear. And this is done principally by his bestowing on them the Holy Spirit, which is a Spirit of liberty, as our apostle shows at large, 2 Corinthians 3. Wherefore “we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,” on these three accounts: —

**[1.]** In that atonement is made thereby for sin, and peace made with God, so as that he is reconciled unto us; all that anger being turned away that did deter us from any such approach.

**[2.]** Fear, dread, and bondage, are taken away, so that the acting of faith on God through the blood of Jesus doth expel them, and remove them out of our mind.

**[3.]** We receive the Holy Spirit therewithal; who is a Spirit of liberty, power, holy boldness, enabling us to cry, “Abba, Father.”

**Obs. III.** Nothing but the blood of Jesus could have given this boldness; nothing that stood in the way of it could otherwise have been removed; nothing else could have set our souls at liberty from that bondage that was come upon them by sin.

**Obs. IV.** Rightly esteem and duly improve the blessed privilege which was purchased for us at so dear a rate. What shall we render unto him? How unspeakable are our obligations unto faith and love!

**Obs. V.** Confidence in an access unto God not built on, not resolved into the blood of Christ, is but a daring presumption, which God abhors.

**Ver. 20.** — Having told us that we have *τὴν εἴσοδον*, “an entrance” into the holiest, he now declares what the way is whereby we may do so. The way into the holiest under the tabernacle was a passage with blood through the sanctuary, and then a turning aside of the veil, as we have declared before. But the whole church was forbidden the use of this way;

and it was appointed for no other end but to signify that in due time there should be a way opened unto believers into the presence of God, which was not yet prepared. And this the apostle describes,

1. From the preparation of it; “which he hath consecrated.”
2. From the properties of it; it was “a new and living way:”
3. From the tendency of it; which he expresseth,

(1.) Typically, or with respect unto the old way under the tabernacle, it was “through the veil;”

(2.) In an exposition of that type, “that is, his flesh.” In the whole, there is a description of the exercise of faith in our access unto God by Christ Jesus: “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.”

1. The *preparation* of this way is by an **ἐγγαίνισμος**, by a “dedication.” The word hath a double signification, one in things natural, the other in things sacred; which yet are of no affinity unto one another. In things natural, it is to new make, so as to be ready for use; in things sacred, it is to dedicate or consecrate any thing, at the first erection or making of it, unto sacred services. The latter sense of the word, which we receive in our translation, is here to be embraced, yet so as it includes the former also. For it is spoken in opposition unto the dedication of the tabernacle, and way into the most holy place, by the blood of sacrifices, whereof we have treated in the ninth chapter. So was this way into the holy place consecrated, dedicated, and set apart sacredly for the use of believers, so as that there neither is, nor ever can be, any other way but by the blood of Jesus. Or there is this also in it, that the way itself was *new prepared and made*, not being extant before.

**Obs. VI.** The way of our entrance into the holiest is solemnly dedicated and consecrated for us, so as that with boldness we may make use of it. He hath done it “for us,” for our use, our benefit, and advantage.

2. The *properties of this way* are two: —

(1.) That it is **πρόσφατος**, “new:”

[1.] Because it was but *newly made and prepared*;

[2.] Because it *belongs unto the new covenant*;

[3.] Because it *admits of no decays*, but is always new, as unto its efficacy and use, as in the day of its first preparation. Whereas that of the tabernacle waxed old, and so was prepared for a removal, this way shall never be altered nor changed, never decay, — it is always new.

(2.) Ζῶσαν, it is “living.” This epithet is placed *by apposition*, without any note of distinction or conjunction. And it is said to be living,

[1.] In opposition unto the way into the holiest under the tabernacle, which was, *1st.* By *death*. Nothing could be done in it without the *blood of the sacrifices*. *2dly.* It was the cause of death unto any one that should make use of it, the high priest only excepted, and he but once a-year.

[2.] It is living as unto its *efficacy*; it is not a dead thing, it is that which hath a spiritual, vital efficacy in our access unto God.

[3.] It is living from its *effects*; it leads to life, and effectually brings us thereunto, and is the only way of entering into everlasting life.

**Obs. VII.** All the privileges we have by Christ are great, glorious, and efficacious; all tending and leading unto life. This new and living way of our approach unto God, is nothing but the exercise of faith for acceptance with God by the sacrifice of Christ, according unto the revelation made in the gospel

**3.** He shows *which way it thus leads to the holiest*, or what is the tendency of it: it is “through the veil.” The apostle shows here expressly what he alludeth unto in the declaration he makes of our entrance into the holiest. The veil here intended by him was that between the sanctuary and the most holy place, whose description we have given on <sup>301</sup> Hebrews 9; for there was no possible entrance thereinto but through that veil, which was turned aside when the high priest entered. What this veil was unto the high priest in his entrance into that holy place, that is the flesh of Christ unto us in ours; as in the last place is described in exposition of this type, “that is, his flesh.”



For the opening of these words, and the vindication of the apostle's application of this type, we may observe, —

- (1.) The flesh of Christ, the body of Christ, the blood of Christ, Christ himself, are all mentioned distinctly, as the matter of his sacrifice. See <sup><304></sup>Hebrews 9:14, 25, 28, 10:10.
- (2.) This is done on various respects, to express either the dignity or the efficacy of the nature and manner of his offering.
- (3.) In the sacrifice of Christ, the flesh was that which suffered peculiarly, as the great token and evidence of his real sufferings.
- (4.) The whole efficacy of his sacrifice is ascribed unto every essential part of the human nature of Christ, in that which either acted or suffered therein; — to his soul, <sup><250></sup>Isaiah 53:10; his blood, <sup><304></sup>Hebrews 9:14; his body, verse 10; his flesh, as in this place. For these things were not distinctly operative, one in one effect, another in another, but all of them concurred in his nature and person, which he offered *once* wholly to God. So that where any of them is mentioned, the whole human nature of Christ, as unto the efficacy of it in his sacrifice, is intended.
- (5.) Yet were these things distinctly typified and foresignified in the sacrifices and service of old. So was the flesh of Christ by the veil, as his whole nature by the tabernacle, his soul by the scapegoat, his body and blood by the sin-offering on the day of expiation, when the sacrifice was burnt without the camp.
- (6.) Herein in an especial manner was the whole a type of the flesh of Christ, in that there was no entrance to be laid open into the holy place but by the rending of the veil. The time when the high priest entered into it, it was indeed turned aside; whereon it immediately closed again, and forbade an entrance and a prospect unto others. Wherefore there could be no entrance into that holy place abiding, unless the veil was rent and torn in pieces, so that it could close no more. For it came to pass on the death of the Lord Jesus, that “the veil of the temple was rent from the top to the bottom.” And that which is signified hereby is only this, that by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ, wherein his flesh was torn and rent, we have a full entrance into the holy place, such as would have been of old upon the rending of the veil. This, therefore, is the genuine interpretation of this

place, ‘We enter with boldness into the most holy place through the veil; that is to say, his flesh:’ we do so by virtue of the sacrifice of himself, wherein his flesh was rent, and all hinderances thereby taken away from us; of all which hinderances the veil was an emblem, and principal instance, until it was rent and removed.

The sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ unto all the ends of the perfection of the church, in all duties and privileges, is that which the apostle instructs us unto herein. And there is great instruction given us, in this comparison of the type and antitype, into the way and nature of our access unto God in all our solemn worship. It is God as he was represented in the holy place to whom we address ourselves peculiarly; that is, God the Father as on a throne of grace: the manner of our access is with holy confidence, grounded solely on the efficacy of the blood or sacrifice of Christ. The way is *by faith*, as to the removal of the obstacles, and the view of God as reconciled. This is given us by the suffering of Christ in the flesh, which laid open the entrance into the holy place. Wherefore the apostle says not, that the veil was the flesh of Christ, as some pretend who have hence cavilled at the authority of this epistle on no other ground but because they could not apprehend the spiritual light and wisdom that is therein; only he says, we have our entrance into the holy place by virtue of the flesh of Christ, which was rent in his sacrifice, as through the rending of the veil a way was laid open into the holiest.

This is the first encouragement unto the duty exhorted unto, from the benefit and privilege we have by the blood of Christ. Another to the same purpose follows.

**Ver. 21.** — “And [*having*] a great high priest over the house of God.” “Having,” is understood from verse 19; — the word whereby the apostle expresseth our relation unto Christ, <sup>SC015</sup> Hebrews 4:15. He is *our priest*, he exerciseth that office on our behalf; and our duty it is in all things to be such as becometh this great high priest to own in the discharge of his office. What became him that he might be our high priest, as it is expressed, <sup>SC029</sup> Hebrews 7:26, shows what we ought to be in our measure that belong unto his care, and that we may say with boldness, “We have an high priest;” which is another encouragement unto the diligent attendance to the duties we are here exhorted unto. For it may be said,

‘That notwithstanding the provision of a new way into the holiest, and boldness given us to enter thereinto, yet in ourselves we know not how to do it, unless we are under the conduct of a priest, as the church of old was in their worship. All those priests being removed, how shall we do now to draw nigh unto God, without such a conduct, such a countenance?’ The apostle removes this from them, and gives encouragement for what he had proved to be a duty before, namely, that “we have a great high priest.”

Three things are in the words:

1. That we have a priest;
2. That he is a great priest;
3. That part of his office wherein in this duty we are concerned, which is, that he is over the house of God.

The first hath been spoken unto on many occasions: only the apostle calls him not here, “our high priest,” which he doth most frequently; but “a priest,” with the addition of *great*, “a great priest,” which answers directly to the Hebrew expression, **כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל**, as the high priest was called: yet the apostle hath a respect unto his eminency above all other priests whatsoever. He is great in his *person*, God and man, as he had described him, <sup><R00></sup>Hebrews 1:2, 3; great in his *glorious exaltation*, <sup><R01></sup>Hebrews 8:1, 2; great in his *power and the efficacy of his office*, <sup><R02></sup>Hebrews 7:25; great in *honor, dignity, and authority*; — the consideration whereof leads both unto the confirmation of our faith and the ingenerating of a due reverence in our hearts towards him. For as he is so great as that he can save us unto the uttermost, or give us acceptance before God as unto our persons and our duties; so he is so glorious that we ought to apply ourselves to him with reverence and godly fear.

That which, unto the particular end designed in this place, we ought to consider in his office, is, that he is “over the house of God.” The apostle doth not herein consider the sacrifice of himself, which he proposed as the foundation of the privilege whence the ensuing duty is inferred, but what he is and doth after his sacrifice, now he is exalted in heaven; for this was the second part of the office of the high priest. The first was, to offer sacrifice for the people; the other was, to take the oversight of the house of God: for so it is particularly expressed with respect unto Joshua, who

was an eminent type of Christ, ~~380~~ Zechariah 3:6, 7. The whole care of ordering all things in the house of God was committed to the high priest: so is it now in the hand of Christ; he is over the house of God, to order all things unto the glory of God and the salvation of the church. “The house of God;” that is, the whole house of God, the family of heaven and earth, — that part of the church above and that here below, which make up, but one house of God. The church here below is comprised in the first place; for unto them it is that this encouragement is given, unto whom this motive of drawing nigh is proposed, namely, as they have a high priest. And it is in the heavenly sanctuary wherein he administereth, or in the house of God above; into which also we do enter by our prayers and sacred worship; so is he for ever over his own house.

**Obs. VIII.** The Lord Christ doth peculiarly preside over all the persons, duties, and worship of believers in the church of God:

1. In that all their worship is of his appointment, and what is not so belongs not to the house of God;
2. In that he assists the worshippers by his Spirit or the performance of this duty;
3. That he makes their services accepted with God;
4. In rendering their worship glorious by the administration of his Spirit, and effectual through the addition of the incense of his intercession. For other things that may be hence educed, see our exposition of ~~381~~ Hebrews 4:14.-16.

**Ver. 22** — “Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.”

The duty is here expressed whereunto these encouragements and privileges do direct and lead. And this duty is described,

1. By the nature of it; “Let us draw near.”
2. The qualification of the persons by whom it is to be performed; “With a true heart.”
3. The manner of its performance; “In full assurance of faith.”

**4.** The preparation for it: which is twofold;

**(1.)** That “our hearts be sprinkled from an evil conscience;”

**(2.)** That “our bodies be washed with pure water.”

**1.** The duty itself is expressed by *προσερχόμεθα*, the word whereby the *whole performance of all divine, solemn worship was constantly expressed*. For God having fixed the residence of the signs of his presence unto a certain place, namely, that of the tabernacle and altar, none could worship him but it was by an approach, an access, a drawing nigh unto that place, the means of their worship, and the pledges of God’s presence therein. So were they to bring their gifts, their offerings, their sacrifices; every thing wherewith they worshipped in it was an approximation unto God. Now all these things, tabernacle, temple, altar, as we have showed, were types of Christ and the gracious presence of God in him; and they were appointed only unto this end, to teach the church to look for an access to God in and by him alone. Wherefore the apostle tells the Hebrews, that as they had under the old testament an approach unto God, and were then *οἱ προσερχόμενοι*, “those that came and drew nigh unto him,” yet it was defective in three things:

**(1.)** That it was by carnal means, “the blood of bulls and goats”

**(2.)** That it was not unto God himself, but only some outward pledges of his presence.

**(3.)** That in this access they were always excluded from an entrance into the holiest. This way being now removed, there is that appointed in the room thereof which is liable to none of these defects For,

**(1.)** It is not by things carnal, but in a holy, spiritual way and manner, as the ensuing description of it doth manifest.

**(2.)** It is not unto any outward pledges of the divine presence, but immediately unto God himself, even the Father.

**(3.)** It is into the most holy place itself, the special residence of God, and of our high priest, Christ Jesus. Wherefore this drawing near containeth all the holy worship of the church, both public and private, all the ways of our access unto God by Christ. And the charge given for this duty is the

first inference the apostle maketh from the consideration of the benefits we receive by the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ.

**2.** The *principal qualification* of the persons exhorted unto this duty, is “a true heart.” God in an especial manner requireth “truth in the inward parts” in all that come unto him, <sup><350></sup>Psalm 51:6. Especially he doth so in his worship, <sup><402></sup>John 4:24. Now truth respects either the mind, and is opposed unto falsehood; or respects the heart and affections, and is opposed to hypocrisy. In the first way all false worship is rejected, all means of the worship of God not of his own institution. But the truth of the heart here intended, is the sincerity of heart which is opposed unto all hypocrisy. Two things are therefore comprised in this qualification: —

**Obs. IX.** That the heart is that which God principally respects in our access unto him. — The Hebrews, in their degenerate condition, rested in the outward performance of duties: so as they made their access outwardly according to the institutions and directions of the law, they were regardless of themselves and of the inner man, and of the frame thereof. But it is the heart that God requires; and accordingly, that it be under the conduct of doctrinal truth in the light of the mind, and not only that it be true and free from hypocrisy in the acts of worship that it goes about, but also that in its habitual frame it be holy, and throughout leavened with sincerity. Thence it is denominated “a true heart.” If men be sincere in the acts of worship, but fail of it in point of walking and conversation, they will not be accepted in it.

**Obs. X.** Universal, internal sincerity of heart is required of all those that draw nigh unto God in his holy worship. — It is so,

- (1.) From the nature of God;
- (2.) From the nature of the worship itself;
- (3.) From the conscience of the worshippers, which can have neither boldness nor confidence without it. What is required unto that sincerity, or “true heart,” without which we cannot freely draw nigh unto God in any duty of his worship, I cannot now declare.

**3.** There is *the way and manner*, together with the principle to be acted in all our accesses unto God: *Ἐν πληροφορίᾳ τῆς πίστεως*, — “In the full assurance of faith.”

**(1.)** “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” Wherefore faith is required in this access on a twofold account:

**[1.]** Of the *qualification of the person*. He must be a true believer who hath this access, all others are utterly excluded from it:

**[2.]** Of its *actual exercise in every particular duty of access*. Abel by faith offered his sacrifice; and there is no duty acceptable unto God which is not quickened and enlivened by faith.

**(2.)** As unto this access unto God by Christ, the apostle requires that there be “a full assurance of faith.” Many have disputed wherein this assurance of faith doth consist, what it is that belongs thereunto. We must consider the design of the apostle and scope of the place, and what they do require. The word is used only in this place, though the verb, *πληροφορέω*, be used elsewhere, <sup><612></sup>Romans 4:21, <sup><614></sup>14:5, to signify a full satisfaction of mind in what we are persuaded of. Here two things seem to be included in it.

**[1.]** That which in other places the apostle expresseth by *παρρησία* which is the word constantly used to declare the frame of mind which is or ought to be in gospel worshippers, in opposition unto that of the law. And it hath two things in it:

**1st.** An *open view of the spiritual glories*, of the way and end of our approach unto God; which they had not.

**2dly.** *Liberty and confidence*, — liberty of speech, and confidence of being accepted; which in their bondage condition they had not.

Therefore the apostle thus expresseth the way and manner of our approaching to God by Christ, in opposition unto that under the law, and affirms it to be in the full assurance and spiritual boldness of faith. This is the “plerophory” of it; which frame of mind is plainly directed unto.

**[2.]** A *firm and unmovable persuasion concerning the priesthood of Christ*, whereby we have this access unto God, with the glory and efficacy

of it; faith without wavering. For many of the Hebrews who had received in general the faith of the gospel, yet wavered up and down in their minds about this office of Christ, and the glorious things related of it by the apostle; supposing that there might some place be yet left for the administration of the legal high priest. This frame the apostle confutes; and shows that under it men could have no access to God, nor acceptance with him.

Wherefore the “full assurance of faith” here, respects not the assurance that any have of their own salvation, nor any degree of such an assurance; it is only the full satisfaction of our souls and consciences in the reality and efficacy of the priesthood of Christ to give us acceptance with God, in opposition unto all other ways and means thereof, that is intended. But withal this persuasion is accompanied with an assured trust of our own acceptance with God in and by him, with an acquiescence of our souls therein.

**Obs. XI.** The actual exercise of faith is required in all our approaches unto God, in every particular duty of his worship. Without this no outward solemnity of worship, no exercise of it will avail us.

**Obs. XII.** It is faith in Christ alone that gives us boldness of access unto God.

**Obs. XIII.** The person and office of Christ are to be rested in with full assurance in all our accesses to the throne of grace.

**4.** There is a *twofold preparation* prescribed unto us for the right discharge of this duty:

**(1.)** That “our hearts be sprinkled from an evil conscience.”

**(2.)** That “our bodies be washed with pure water.” It is plain that the apostle in these expressions alludeth unto the necessary preparations for divine service under the law. For whereas there were various ways whereby men were legally defiled, so there were means appointed for their legal purification, which we have declared on <sup>300</sup>Hebrews 9. Without the use and application of those purifications, if any of them that were so defiled did draw nigh unto the worship of God, he was to die, or be “cut off.” These institutions the apostle doth not only allude unto, and make



application of things outward and carnal unto things inward and spiritual, but withal declares what was their nature and typical administration. They were not appointed for their own sakes, but to typify and represent the spiritual grace, and its efficacy, which we receive by the sacrifice of Christ.

The subject spoken of is twofold:

(1.) The *heart*;

(2.) The *body*; — that is, the inward and outward man.

(1.) As unto the first, it is required that, with respect unto it, it be separated from an evil conscience. There is no doubt but in this place, as in many others, the “heart” is taken for all the faculties of our souls, with our affections; for it is that wherein conscience is seated, wherein it acts its power, which it doth especially in the practical understanding, as the affections are ruled and guided thereby.

This conscience is affirmed to be “evil,” antecedently unto the means proposed for the taking it away. Conscience, as conscience, is not to be separated from the heart; but as it is evil, it must be so.

Conscience may be said to be evil on two accounts:

[1.] As it disquieteth, perplexeth, judgeth, and condemneth for sin. In this sense the apostle speaks of conscience, verse 2, a conscience condemning us for sin, which the sacrifices of the law could not take away. So a heart with an evil conscience, is a heart terrified and condemning for sin.

[2.] On account of a vitiated principle in the conscience, — not performing its duty, but secure when it is filled with all unclean, vicious habits. And hereon it signifies also all those secret, latent sins in the heart, which are known only to a man’s own conscience; opposed unto the “body,” or external, known sins, which he speaks of afterwards. I take it here in the latter sense: *1st.* Because it is said to be “evil,” which it cannot be with respect unto its former acts and power, for it doth therein but perform its duty, and is evil not in itself, but unto them in whom it is. And, *2dly.* The *way of its removal is by*, “sprinkling,” and not by an oblation or offering; now sprinkling is the efficacious application of the blood of atonement unto sanctification, or internal purification.

And this is the first thing in particular, namely, the way or means of the removal of this evil conscience; which is by *sprinkling of our hearts*. The expression is taken from the sprinkling of blood upon the offering of the sacrifices, <sup><1236></sup>Exodus 29:16, 21; <sup><1237></sup>Leviticus 4:17, 14:7: the spiritual interpretation and application whereof is given us, <sup><1238></sup>Ezekiel 36:25. And whereas this sprinkling from sin, and cleansing thereby, is in Ezekiel ascribed unto pure water, and whereas it was in the type the blood of the sacrifice that was sprinkled, it gives us the sense of the whole. For as the blood of the sacrifice was a type of the blood and sacrifice of Christ as offered unto God, so it is the Holy Spirit and his efficacious work that are denoted by “pure water,” as is frequently promised. Wherefore, this sprinkling of our hearts is an act of the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost, by virtue of the blood and sacrifice of Christ, in making of that application of them unto our souls wherein the blood of Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from all our sins. Hereby are “our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience;”

[1.] *Originally*, in the communication of regenerating, sanctifying grace;

[2.] *Continually*, in fresh applications of the virtue of the blood of Christ, for the taking away of the defilement by internal, actual sin.

**Obs. XIV.** Although that worship whereby we draw nigh unto God be performed with respect to institution and rule, yet without internal sanctification of heart we are not accepted in it.

**Obs. XV.** Due preparation, by fresh applications of our souls unto the efficacy of the blood of Christ for the purification of our hearts, that we may be meet to draw nigh to God, is required of us. This the apostle hath especial respect unto; and the want of it is the bane of public worship. Where this is not, there is no due reverence of God, no sanctification of his name, nor any benefit to be expected unto our own souls.

**Obs. XVI.** In all wherein we have to do with God, we are principally to regard those internal sins we are conscious of unto ourselves, but which are hidden from all others.

(2.) The last thing required of us in order to the duty exhorted unto, is, that “our bodies be washed with pure water.” This at first view would seem to refer unto the outward administration of the ordinance of baptism,

required of all antecedently unto their orderly conjunction unto a church-state in the causes of it; and so it is carried by many expositors. But,

[1.] The apostle Peter tells us that saving baptism doth not consist in the washing away of the filth of the body, <sup><REF></sup>1 Peter 3:21; therefore the expression here must be figurative, and not proper.

[2.] Although the sprinkling and washing spoken of do principally respect *our habitual, internal qualification*, by regenerating, sanctifying grace, yet they include also the *actual, gracious, renewed preparation* of our hearts and minds, with respect unto all our solemn approaches unto God; but baptism cannot be repeated.

[3.] Whereas the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience respects the *internal* and unknown sins of the mind; so this of washing the body doth the sins that are outwardly acted and perpetrated. And the body is said to be washed from them,

**1st.** Because they are outward, in opposition unto those that are only inherent, in the mind.

**2dly.** Because the body is the instrument of the perpetration of them; hence are they called “deeds of the body;” the “members of the body;” our “earthly members,” <sup><REF></sup>Romans 3:13-15, 8:13, <sup><REF></sup>Colossians 3:3-5.

**3dly.** Because the body is defiled by them, by some of them in an especial manner, 1 Corinthians 6.

Pure water, wherewith the body is to be washed, is that which is promised, <sup><REF></sup>Ezekiel 36:25, 26; — the assistance of the sanctifying Spirit, by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ. Hereby all those sins which cleave unto our outward conversation are removed and washed away; for we are sanctified thereby in our whole spirits, souls, and bodies. And that scripture respects the deeds of sin; as unto a continuation of their commission, he shall keep and preserve us. We are so by the grace of Christ, and thereby we keep and preserve ourselves from all outward and actual sins, that nothing may appear upon us, as the bodies of them who, having wallowed in the mire, are now washed with pure water; for the body is placed as the instrument of the defilement of the soul in such sins.

**Obs. XVII.** Universal sanctification, upon our whole persons, and the mortification in an especial manner of outward sins, are required of us in our drawing nigh unto God.

**Obs. XVIII.** These are the ornaments wherewith we are to prepare our souls for it, and not the gaiety of outward apparel.

**Obs. XIX.** It is a great work to draw nigh unto God, so as to “worship him in spirit and in truth.”

**Ver. 23.** — “Let us hold fast the profession of [*our*] faith without wavering; (for he [*is*] faithful that promised.)”

This is the second exhortation which the apostle educeth by way of inference from the principles of truth which he had before declared and confirmed. And it is the substance or end of the whole parenetical or hortatory part of the epistle; that for the obtaining whereof the whole doctrinal part of it was written, which gives life and efficacy unto it. Wherefore he spends the whole remainder of the epistle in the pressing and confirming of this exhortation; on a compliance wherewith the eternal condition of our souls doth depend. And this he doth, partly by declaring the means whereby we may be helped in the discharge of this duty; partly by denouncing the eternal ruin and sure destruction that will follow the neglect of it; partly by encouragements from our own former experiences, and the strength of our faith; and partly by evidencing unto us in a multitude of examples, how we may overcome the difficulty that would occur unto us in this way, with other various cogent reasonings; as we shall see, if God pleaseth, in our progress.

In these words there is a duty prescribed, and an encouragement added unto it.

First, As unto the duty itself, we must inquire,

1. What is meant by “the profession of our faith.”
2. What is meant by “holding it fast.”
3. What it is to “hold it fast without wavering.”

1. Some copies read *τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, the “profession of our hope;” which the Vulgar follows, “the profession of the hope that is in

us:” and so it may have a respect unto the exhortation used by the apostle, <sup><388E></sup>Hebrews 3:6. And it will come unto the same with our reading of it; for on our faith our hope is built, and is an eminent fruit thereof. Wherefore holding fast our hope, includes in it the holding fast of our faith, as the cause is in the effect, and the building in the foundation. But I prefer the other reading, as that which is more suited unto the design of the apostle, and his following discourse; and which his following confirmations of this exhortation do directly require, and which is the proper subject of our **ὁμολογία**, or “profession.” See <sup><388E></sup>Hebrews 3:1.

“Faith” is here taken in both the principal acceptations of it, namely, that faith whereby we believe, and the faith or doctrine which we do believe. Of both which we make the same profession; of one as the inward principle, of the other as the outward rule. Of the meaning of the word itself, **ὁμολογία**, or joint profession, I have treated largely, <sup><388E></sup>Hebrews 3:1.

This solemn profession of our faith is twofold:

(1.) *Initial.*

(2.) By *the way of continuation*, in all the acts and duties required thereunto.

(1.) The first is a solemn giving up of ourselves unto Christ, in a professed subjection unto the gospel, and the ordinances of divine worship therein contained. This of old was done by all men, at their first accession unto God, in the assemblies of the church. The apostle calls it “the beginning of our confidence,” or subsistence in Christ and the church, <sup><388E></sup>Hebrews 3:14. And it was ordinarily, in the primitive times, accompanied with excellent graces and privileges. For, —

[1.] God usually gave them hereon great joy and exultation, with peace in their own minds: <sup><388E></sup>1 Peter 2:9, “Hath translated us out of darkness into his marvellous light.” The glorious, marvellous light whereinto they were newly translated out of darkness, the evidence which they had of the truth and reality of the things that they believed and professed, the value they had for the grace of God in their high and heavenly calling, the greatness and excellency of the things made known unto them, and believed by them, were the means whereby they were “filled with joy unspeakable and full

of glory.” And respect is had unto this frame of heart in this exhortation. For it is apt on many accounts to decay and be lost; but when it is so we lose much of the glory of our profession.

[2.] They had hereon some such communication of the Spirit in gifts or graces, as was a seal unto them of the promised inheritance, <sup><3013></sup> Ephesians 1:13. And although what was extraordinary herein is ceased, and not to be looked after, yet if Christians, in their initial dedication of themselves unto Christ and the gospel, did attend unto their duty in a due manner, or were affected with their privileges as they ought, they would have experience of this grace, and advantage in ways suitable unto their own state and condition.

(2.) The continuation of their profession first solemnly made, in avowing the faith on all just occasions, in attendance on all duties of worship required in the gospel, in professing their faith in the promises of God by Christ, and thereon cheerfully undergoing afflictions, troubles, and persecutions, on the account thereof, is this “profession of our faith” that is exhorted unto.

2. What is it to “hold fast this profession?” The words we so render are **κατέχω**, **κρατέω**, and sometimes **ἔχω** singly, as <sup><3021></sup> 1 Thessalonians 5:21. **Κατέχω** and **κρατέω** are indefinitely used to this end, <sup><3006></sup> Hebrews 3:6, 4:14; <sup><3025></sup> Revelation 2:25, 3:11. So that which is here **κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν**, is **κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας**, <sup><3014></sup> Hebrews 4:14.

And there is included in the sense of either of these words, —

(1.) A supposition of great difficulty, with danger and opposition, against this holding the profession of our faith.

(2.) The putting forth of the utmost of our strength and endeavors in the defense of it.

(3.) A constant perseverance in it, denoted in the word *keep*; — possess it with constancy.

3. This is to be done “without wavering;” that is, the profession must be immovable and constant. The frame of .mind which this is opposed unto is expressed, <sup><3006></sup> James 1:6, **διακρινόμενος**, — “one that is always disputing,” and tossed up and down with various thoughts in his mind, not

coming to a fixed resolution or determination. He is like a wave of the sea, which sometimes subsides and is quiet, and sometimes is tossed one way or another, as it receives impressions from the wind. There were many in those days who did hesitate in the profession of the doctrine of the gospel; sometimes they inclined unto it and embraced it; sometimes they returned again unto Judaism; and sometimes they would reconcile and compound the two covenants, the two religions, the two churches together, — with which sort of men our apostle had great contention. As men's minds waver in these things, so their profession wavers; which the apostle here condemneth, and opposeth unto that “full assurance of faith” which he requireth in us. Ἀκλινής is, “not to be bent one way or another,” by impressions made from any things or causes; but to abide firm, fixed, stable, in opposition to them. And it is opposed unto, —

- (1.) A halting between two opinions, God or Baal, Judaism or Christianity, truth or error. This is to waver doctrinally.
- (2.) Unto a weakness or irresolution of mind as unto a continuance in the profession of faith against difficulties and oppositions.
- (3.) To a yielding in the way of compliance, on any point of doctrine or worship contrary unto or inconsistent with the faith we have professed. In which sense the apostle would not give place, “no, not for an hour,” unto them that taught circumcision.
- (4.) To final apostasy from the truth, which this wavering up and down, as the apostle intimates in his following discourse, brings unto.

Wherefore it includes positively, —

- (1.) A firm persuasion of mind as to the truth of the faith whereof we have made profession.
- (2.) A constant resolution to abide therein and adhere thereunto, against all oppositions.
- (3.) Constancy and diligence in the performance of all the duties which are required unto the continuation of this profession. This is the sum and substance of that duty which the apostle with all sorts of arguments presseth on the Hebrews in this epistle, as that which was indispensably necessary unto their salvation.

**Obs. XX.** There is an internal principle of saving faith required unto our profession of the doctrine of the gospel, without which it will not avail.

**Obs. XXI.** All that believe ought solemnly to give themselves up unto Christ and his rule, in an express profession of the faith that is in them and required of them.

**Obs. XXII.** There will great difficulties arise in, and opposition be made unto, a sincere profession of the faith.

**Obs. XXIII.** Firmness and constancy of mind, with our utmost diligent endeavors, are required unto an acceptable continuance in the profession of the faith.

**Obs. XXIV.** Uncertainty and wavering of mind as to the truth and doctrine we profess, or neglect of the duties wherein it doth consist, or compliance with errors for fear of persecution and sufferings, doth overthrow our profession, and render it useless.

**Obs. XXV.** As we ought not on any account to decline our profession, so to abate of the degrees of fervency of spirit therein is dangerous unto our souls.

Secondly, Upon the proposal of this duty, the apostle in his passage interposeth an encouragement unto it, taken from the assured benefit and advantage that should be obtained thereby: “For,” saith he, “he is faithful that hath promised.” And we may observe, in the opening of these words, the nature of the encouragement given us in them.

**1.** It is God alone who promiseth. He alone is the author of all gospel promises; by him are they given unto us, ~~GOOD~~ 2 Peter 1:4, ~~GOOD~~ Titus 1:2. Hence in the sense of the gospel, this is a just periphrasis of God, “He who hath promised.”

**2.** The promises of God are of that nature in themselves, as are suited unto the encouragement of all believers unto constancy and final perseverance in the profession of the faith. They are so, whether we respect them as they contain and exhibit present grace, mercy, and consolation; or as those which propose unto us things eternal in the future glorious reward.



**3.** The efficacy of the promises unto this end depends upon the faithfulness of God who gives them. “With him is neither variableness nor shadow of turning.” “The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent.” God’s faithfulness is the unchangeableness of his purpose and the counsel of his will, proceeding from the immutability of his nature, as accompanied with almighty power for their accomplishment, as declared in the word. See <sup><8088></sup>Hebrews 6:18; <sup><5002></sup>Titus 1:2.

This, therefore, is the sense of the apostle’s reason unto the end he aims at: ‘Consider,’ saith he, ‘the promises of the gospel, their incomparable greatness and glory: in their enjoyment consists our eternal blessedness; and they will all of them be in all things accomplished towards those who hold fast their profession, seeing he who hath promised them is absolutely faithful and unchangeable.’

**Obs. XXVI.** The faithfulness of God in his promises is the great encouragement and supportment, under our continual profession of our faith against all oppositions.

#### VERSE 24.

Καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων.

**Ver. 24.** — And let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works.

Love and good works are the fruits, effects, and evidences, of the sincere profession of saving faith; wherefore a diligent attendance unto them is an effectual means of our constancy in our profession. This, therefore, the apostle in the next place exhorts unto, and thence declares the manner whereby we may be excited and enabled unto them. And there is in the words,

- 1.** A profession of a duty, as a means unto another end.
- 2.** The declaration of that end, namely, by and upon that consideration, to “provoke one another to love and good works.”

**1.** Κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους. The word hath been opened on <sup><8081></sup>Hebrews 3:1. A *diligent inspection into*, a heedful consideration of mind, intent ripen

it, in opposition unto common, careless, transient thoughts about it, is intended. The object of it here is not things, but persons; “one another.” And herein the apostle supposeth, —

(1.) That those unto whom he wrote had a deep concernment in one another, their present temporal and future eternal state. Without this, the mere consideration of one another would only be a fruitless effect of curiosity, and tend unto many evils.

(2.) That they had also communion together about those things without which this duty could not be rightly discharged. For it was not then in the world as it is now; but all Christians, who were joined in church societies, did meet together for mutual communion in those things wherein their edification was concerned, as is declared in the next verse.

(3.) That they judged themselves obliged to watch over one another as unto steadfastness in profession and fruitfulness in love and good works. Hence they knew it to be their duty to admonish, to exhort, to provoke, to encourage one another. Without this, the mere consideration of one another is of no use.

On these suppositions, this consideration respects the gifts, the graces, the temptations, the dangers, the seasons and opportunities for duty, the manner of the walking of one another in the church, and in the world. For this consideration is the foundation of all those mutual duties of warning, or admonition and exhorting, which tend to the encouragement and strengthening of one another. But these duties are now generally lost among us; and with them is the glory of the Christian religion departed.

2. The *special kind of this duty*, as here pressed by the apostle, is, that it is used εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, — “unto the provocation of love and good works;” that is, as we have rendered the words, “to provoke” (that is, “one another”) “unto love and good works.” “Provocation” is commonly used in an ill sense, namely, for the imbittering of the spirit of another, moving anger, sorrow, and disquietment and impatience of mind. So <sup>9005</sup>1 Samuel 1:6, 7. To provoke one, is to imbitter his spirit, and to stir him up unto anger. And when any provocation is high, we render it “strife,” or “contention,” such as whereby the spirits of men are imbittered one towards another, <sup>4459</sup>Acts

15:39. Howbeit it is used sometimes for an earnest and diligent excitation of the minds or spirits of men unto that which is good. See <sup><5114></sup>Romans 11:14. So it is here used, And there is more in it than a bare mutual exhortation; there is an excitation of spirit, by exhortation, example, rebuke, until it be warmed unto a duty. This is the great end of the communion that is among Christians in the mutual consideration of one another: considering the circumstances, conditions, walkings, abilities for usefulness, of one another, they do excite one another unto love and good works; which is called the provocation of them, or the stirring up of the minds of men unto them. This was the way and practice of the Christians of old, but is now generally lost, with most of the principles of practical obedience, especially those which concern our mutual edification, as if they had never been prescribed in the gospel.

The duties themselves which they are thus mutually to provoke one another unto, are, “love and good works.” And they are placed by the apostle in their proper order; for love is the spring and fountain of all acceptable good works. Of mutual love among believers, which is that here intended, as unto the nature and causes of it, and motives unto it, I have treated at large, <sup><5100></sup>Hebrews 6. The “good works” intended are called here *καλά*; usually they are *ἀγαθά*. Those which are most commendable and praiseworthy are intended, such as are most useful unto others, such as whereby the gospel is most exalted; works proceeding from the shining light of truth, wherein God is glorified.

**Obs. I.** The mutual watch of Christians, in the particular societies whereof they are members, is a duty necessary unto the preservation of the profession of the faith.

**Obs. II.** A due consideration of the circumstances, abilities, temptations, and opportunities for duties, in one another, is required hereunto.

**Obs. III.** Diligence in mutual exhortation unto gospel duties, that men on all grounds of reason and example may be provoked unto them, is required of us, and is a most excellent duty, which in an especial manner we ought to attend unto.

## VERSE 25.

Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος  
 τισὶν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε  
 ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν.

**Ver. 25.** — Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some [is;] but exhorting [*one another*.:] and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.

The words contain an enforcement of the preceding exhortation, in a caution against what is contrary thereunto, or the neglect of the general duty, which is the principal means to further us in all the things that we are exhorted unto, and without which some of them cannot at all be performed. And there is in the words, 1. The neglect and evil which they are cautioned against; that is, “forsaking the assembling of ourselves.” 2. This is exemplified,

- (1.) In an instance of some that were guilty of it; “As is the manner of some.”
- (2.) By the contrary duty; “But exhorting one another.”
- (3.) The degree of this duty; “So much the more.”
- (4.) The motive unto that degree; “As ye see the day approaching.”

In the FIRST there is,—

**1.** *The thing spoken of, ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν*, well rendered by us, “the assembling of ourselves together;” for it is not the *church-state absolutely*, but the *actual assemblies of believers*, walking together in that state, which the apostle intends. For as the church itself is originally the seat and subject of all divine worship, so the actual assemblies of it are the only way and means for the *exercise* and performance of it. These assemblies were of two sorts:

- (1.) Stated, on the Lord’s day, or first day of the week, <sup><660></sup>1 Corinthians 16:2; Acts. 20:7.
- (2.) Occasional, as the duties or occasions of the church did require, <sup><660></sup>1 Corinthians 5:4.

The *end* of these assemblies was twofold:

- (1.) The due performance of all solemn stated, orderly, evangelical worship, in prayer, preaching of the word, singing of psalms, and the administration of the sacraments.
- (2.) The *exercise* of discipline, or the watch of the church over its members, with respect unto their walking and conversation, that in all things it be such as becomes the gospel, and give no offense: so to admonish, exhort, and “provoke one another to love and good works;” to comfort, establish, and encourage them that were afflicted or persecuted; to relieve the poor, etc. Such assemblies were constantly observed in the first churches. How they came to be lost is not unknown, though how they may and ought to be revived is difficult.

Two things are evident herein: —

- (1.) That those assemblies, those comings together in one place, were the only way whereby the church, as a church, made its profession of subjection unto the authority of Christ in the performance of all those duties of sacred worship whereby God was to be glorified under the gospel. Wherefore a voluntary neglect and relinquishment of those assemblies destroys any church-state, if it be persisted in.
- (2.) That those assemblies were the life, the food, the nourishment of their souls; without which they could neither attend unto the discipline of Christ, nor yield obedience unto his commands, nor make profession of his name as they ought, nor enjoy the benefit of evangelical institutions: whereas in a due observance of them consisted the trial of their faith in the sight of God and man. For as unto God, whatever reserves men may have in their minds, that they would still continue to believe in Christ though they attended not unto his discipline in these assemblies, he regards it not; because therein men do openly prefer their own temporal safety before his glory. And as unto men, it is not so much faith itself, as the profession of it in those assemblies that they hate, oppose, and persecute. Wherefore believers in all ages have constantly ventured their lives in the observance of them through a thousand difficulties and dangers, esteeming them always aliens from their communion by whom they were neglected.

2. Wherefore, secondly, the apostle's charge concerning those assemblies is, that we should not forsake them. There is a twofold forsaking of these assemblies:

(1.) That which is *total*, which is the fruit and evidence of absolute apostasy.

(2.) That which is so *partially* only, in want of diligence and conscientious care in a constant attendance unto them according as the rule and their institution do require. It is the latter that the apostle here intends, as the word in part signifies; and of the former he speaks in the following verses. And this is usually done on some of these accounts: —

[1.] *From fear of suffering.* These assemblies were those which exposed them unto sufferings, as those whereby they made their profession visible, and evidenced their subjection unto the authority of Christ; whereby the unbelieving world is enraged. This in all ages hath prevailed on many, in the times of trial and persecution, to withdraw themselves from those assemblies; and those who have done so are those “fearful and unbelieving” ones who in the first place are excluded from the new Jerusalem, <sup>(12)</sup> Revelation 21:8. In such a season, all the arguings of flesh and blood will arise in the minds of men, and be promoted with many specious pretences: life, liberty, enjoyment in this world, will all put in to be heard; reserves concerning their state in this frame, with resolutions to return unto their duty when the storm is over; pleas and arguments that these assemblies are not so necessary, but that God will be merciful unto them in this thing. All which, and the like false reasonings, do carry them away to ruin. For notwithstanding all these vain pleas, the rule is peremptory against these persons. Those who, as to their houses, lands, possessions, relations, liberty, life, prefer them before Christ, and the duties which they owe to him, and his glory, have no interest in gospel promises. Whatever men pretend that they believe, if they confess him not before men, he will deny them before his Father which is in heaven.

[2.] *Spiritual sloth*, with the occasions of this life, is the cause in many of this sinful neglect. Other things will offer themselves in competition with the diligent attendance unto these assemblies, If men stir not up themselves, and shake off the weight that lies upon them, they will fall under a woful neglect as unto this and all other important duties. Such

persons as are influenced by them will make use of many specious pleas, taken for the most part from their occasions and necessities. These things they will plead with men, and there is no contending with them. But let them go to Christ and plead them immediately unto himself, and then ask of themselves how they suppose they are accepted. He requires that we should attend unto these assemblies diligently, as the principal way and means of doing that and observing that which he commands us, — the certain, indispensable rule of our obedience unto him. Will it be accepted with him, if, in a neglect of that, we should say unto him, we would have done so indeed, but that one thing or other, this business, this diversion, this or that attendance in our callings, would not suffer us so to do? This may, indeed, fall out sometimes where the heart is sincere; but then it will be troubled at it, and watch for the future against the like occasions. But where this is frequent, and every trivial diversion is embraced unto a neglect of this duty, the heart is not upright before God, — the man draws back in the way unto perdition.

[3.] *Unbelief working gradually towards the forsaking of all profession.*

This is the first way, for the most part, whereby “an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God” doth evidence itself; which the apostle on this consideration warns the Hebrews of, <sup>308</sup> Hebrews 3. I say, hereby usually it first evidenceth itself. It hath unquestionably put forth its power before, within, and in a neglect of private duties, but hereby it first evidenceth itself unto others. And if this course, from this principle, be persisted in, total apostasy lies at the door; whereof we have multiplied instances.

**Obs. I.** Great diligence is required of us in a due attendance unto the assemblies of the church for the ends of them, as they are instituted and appointed by Jesus Christ. — The benefit we receive by them, the danger of their neglect, sense of the authority of Christ, concernment of his glory in them, with the vanity of the pretences for their neglect, call aloud for this diligence.

**Obs. II.** The neglect of the authority and love of Christ in the appointment of the means of our edification, will always tend to great and ruinous evils.

**3.** The apostle *exemplifies* the sin which he warns them against, in an instance of those who are guilty of it: “As the manner of some is.” The

church of the Hebrews, especially that at Jerusalem, had been exposed to great trials and persecutions, as the apostle declares verses 32, 33. During this state, some of the members of it, even in those early days, began so far to decline from their profession as not to frequent the assemblies of the church. They were afraid to be taken at a meeting, or that their known persecuting neighbors should take notice of them as they went unto or came from their assemblies. And it should seem they were not a few who were fallen into this sinful neglect; for the apostle speaks of it as a thing which was well known among themselves. Again, there were among the Hebrews at that time great disputes about the continuance of the temple-worship, with the rites and ceremonies of it, which many were entangled withal; and as that error prevailed in their minds, so did they begin gradually to neglect and forsake the worship and duties of the gospel; which ended with many in fatal apostasy. To prevent the effects of these two evils was the principal design of the apostle in writing this epistle, which is filled with cogent arguments against them. This was the later cause of their declension, before intimated, namely, unbelief secretly inclining unto a-departure from the living God. And this is marked here as the ordinary beginning of an entrance into final apostasy, namely, that men do forsake the assemblies of the saints. Only observe, that it is not an occasional dote-liction of them, but that which they accustomed themselves unto; it was ἔθος, their “manner,” — it was an ordinary way and manner of walking, which they accustomed themselves unto.

**Obs. III.** No church-order, no outward profession, can secure men from apostasy. — Persons were guilty of this crime in the first, the best, the purest churches.

**Obs. IV.** Perfection, freedom from offense, scandal, and ruinous evils, is not to be expected in any church in this world.

**Obs. V.** Men that begin to decline their duty in church relations ought to be marked, and their ways avoided.

**Obs. VI.** Forsaking of church assemblies is usually an entrance into apostasy.

SECONDLY, The apostle illustrates this great evil by the *contrary duty*: Ἄλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες. All the duties of these assemblies, especially



those which are useful and needful to prevent backsliding and preserve from apostasy, are proposed under this one, which is the head and chief of them all.

The *nature* of this mutual exhortation among Christian believers in church societies hath been discoursed on ~~scri~~ Hebrews 3: Here it is opposed unto the evil dehorted from, “Forsake not, ..... but exhort one another.” Wherefore it is comprehensive of the general nature of all the duties of believers in church societies, and it hath a special respect unto constancy and perseverance in the profession of the faith, and diligent attendance unto the duties of gospel-worship, as is evident from the whole context This is the duty of all professors of the gospel, namely, to persuade, to encourage, to exhort one another unto constancy in profession, with resolution and fortitude of mind against difficulties, dangers, and oppositions; — a duty which a state of persecution will teach them, who intend not to leave any thing of Christ’s. And it is never the more inconsiderable because the practice of it is almost lost out of the world, as we said before.

The *motive* unto these duties is, “the approach of the day.” Wherein we have,

1. A degree added unto the performance of these duties from this motive, *Τοσοῦτω μᾶλλον*, — “So much the more.”
2. The motive itself, which is, “The approach of the day.”
3. The evidence they had of it, “Ye see.”

1. There is from this motive an especial *degree* to be added unto the performance of the duties before mentioned. ‘They are such as ought always to be attended unto, howbeit this is a season wherein it is our duty to double our diligence about them.’ For this, “so much the rather,” refers distinctly unto all the duties before mentioned, being to be repeated, *ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ*. Wherefore, although the word of Christ, in his institutions and commands, doth make duties constantly in their performance necessary unto us, yet there are warnings and works of Christ whose consideration ought to excite us unto a peculiar diligence in attendance unto them. And, —

**(1.)** Such warnings of Christ there are unto his church, both by his *word* and by his *providence*. For although he speaks not now immediately unto them by revelations, yet he speaks unto them mediately in his word. All the warnings he hath left on record in the Scripture, given unto his churches in the various conditions wherein they were, — as, for instance, those in the second and third of the Revelation, — are given likewise unto all the churches now that are in the same state or condition wherein they were. And he doth it by his providence, in threatenings, efficacious trials, and persecutions, <sup><413></sup>1 Corinthians 11:30-32.

**(2.)** The *principal end* of these warnings is, to stir us up unto more diligence in attendance unto the duties of his worship in the assemblies of the church; as is manifest in all his dealings with the seven churches, as types of all others. For,

**[1.]** Our neglect therein is the cause of that displeasure which he in his warnings and trials calls us unto: “For this cause many are weak and sickly, and many sleep.” “Because thou art lukewarm, I will do so and so.”

**[2.]** Because without a diligent care we cannot pass through trials of any nature, in persecution, in public calamities, unto his glory and our own safety; for by a neglect of these duties all graces will decay, carnal fears will prevail, counsel and help will be wanting, and the soul will be betrayed into innumerable dangers and perplexities.

**[3.]** Without it, it will not be to the glory of Christ to evidence his presence amongst them in their trials, or give deliverance to them.

Wherefore we may consider what belongs unto this, “and so much the rather,” what additions unto our performance of those duties is required from this motive: —

**(1.)** A recovery of ourselves from outward neglects in attendance upon church-assemblies. Such there have been amongst us, on various pretences: which if, on renewed warnings, we recover not ourselves from, we are in danger of eternal ruin; for so the case is stated in this place.

**(2.)** A diligent inquiry into all the duties which belong to the assemblies of believers is comprised here by the apostle, under the general head of mutual consideration, provocation, and exhortation, that we be not found

defective through our ignorance and unacquaintedness with what he doth require.

(3.) Spiritual diligence in stirring up our hearts and minds unto sincerity, zeal, and delight in the performance of them; in all laboring after a recovery from our decays and backslidings: which is the design of most of the epistles of Christ unto the seven churches. Wherefore, —

**Obs. VII.** When especial warnings do not excite us unto renewed diligence in known duties, our condition is dangerous as unto the continuance of the presence of Christ amongst us.

2. The *motive itself* is, “*the approach of the day.*” Concerning which we must inquire,

(1.) What day it is that is intended.

(2.) How it did approach. And then, how it did evidence itself so to be, as they saw it.

(1.) The day, τὴν ἡμέραν, “an eminent day.” The rule whereby we may determine what day is intended is this: It was such a day as was a peculiar motive unto the Hebrews, in their present circumstances, to attend diligently unto the due performance of gospel duties. It is not such a day, such a motive, as is always common to all, but only unto those who are in some measure in the same circumstances with them. Wherefore it is neither *the day of death personally* unto them, nor *the day of the future judgment absolutely* that is intended: for these are common unto all equally, and at all times, and are a powerful motive in general unto the performance of gospel duties; but not an especial, peculiar motive at some time unto peculiar diligence. Wherefore this day was no other but that fearful and tremendous day, a season for *the destruction of Jerusalem*, the temple, city, and nation of the Jews, which our Savior had forewarned his disciples of, and which they had in continual expectation.

But it may be said, ‘How should the approach of this day, wherein all things seem to be dissolved, the church to be scattered, the whole nation to be consumed with blood and fire, be a motive unto redoubled diligence in attendance unto the duties of Christian assemblies? It should now seem rather to have been a time for every one to shift for himself and his family,

than to leave all at uncertainties, and unto ruin, whilst they looked after those assemblies.’

*Ans.* [1.] Whatever desolations and destructions may be approaching, our best and wisest frame will be to trust unto God, in the discharge of our duty. All other contrivances will prove not only vain and foolish, but destructive unto our souls. The day here intended was coming on the city and nation for their neglect and contempt of the gospel; it was the revenge of their murder, unbelief, and obstinacy against Christ: wherefore if any that made profession of the gospel were now negligent and careless in the known duties of it, they could have no evidence or satisfaction in their own minds that they should not fall in the fire of that day. They who will in any degree partake of men’s sins, must in some degree or other partake of their plagues.

[2.] It is impossible that men should go or be carried through a day of public calamity, a destructive day, comfortably and cheerfully, without a diligent attendance unto those known duties of the gospel.. For,

**1st.** The guilt of this neglect will seize upon them when their trial shall come; and they will wish, when it is too late, that they had kept at a distance from it.

**2dly.** Let men pretend what they will, this decay in those duties argues and evidenceth a decay in all graces, which they will find weak, and unfit to carry them through their trials; which will bring them unto an unspeakable loss in their own minds.

**3dly.** The Lord Christ requireth this from us in a way of testimony unto him, that we are found faithful in our adherence unto his institutions upon the approach of such a day; for hereby do we evidence both the subjection of our souls unto him, as also that we value and esteem the privilege of the gospel above all other things.

**4thly.** Because the duties prescribed, in a right discharge of them, are the great means for the strengthening and supporting of our souls in that part of the trial which we are to undergo.

For such a day as that intended hath fire in it, to try every man’s work of what sort it is, and every man’s grace both as to its sincerity and power.

Therefore all ways and means whereby our works may be tried and our graces exercised are required of us in such a season. Wherefore, —

**Obs. VIII.** Approaching judgments ought to influence unto especial diligence in all evangelical duties.

(2.) How did this day approach? It was approaching, coming, drawing nigh, it was “in procinctu,” — gradually coming upon them: warnings of it, dispositions towards it, intimations of its coming, were given them every day. This I have before given an account of, and how the drawings nigh of this day were upon them when this epistle was written, and how in a short time it brake forth upon them in all its severity.

3. And these things were so evident, as that, in the last place, the apostle takes it for granted that they themselves did see openly and evidently the approaching day. And it did so in these five things:

(1.) In *the accomplishment of the signs of its coming* foretold by our Savior. Compare <sup><BIB></sup>Matthew 24:9, etc., with verses 32-34 of this chapter. And besides, all the other signs mentioned by our Savior were entering on their accomplishment.

(2.) In that *things were at a great stand as unto the progress of the gospel* among the Hebrews. At the first preaching of it “multitudes” were converted unto Christ, and the word continued in efficacy towards them for some season afterwards; but now, as our apostle plainly declares in this epistle, the case was changed among them. “The elect obtained, the rest were hardened,” <sup><BIB></sup>Romans 11:7. The number of the elect among that people was now gathered in; few additions were made unto the church, — not “daily,” nor in “multitudes,” as formerly. And believers knew full well that when their work was all accomplished, God would not leave the people in their obstinacy, but that “wrath should come upon them unto the uttermost.”

(3.) They saw it approaching in *all the causes of it*. For the body of the people, having now refused the gospel, were given up unto all wickedness, and hatred unto Christ; an account whereof is given at large by the historian of their own nation.

(4.) *The time and season did manifest itself unto them.* For whereas the body of that people were to be “cut off,” and “cast off,” as the apostle expressly declares, Romans 9-11, this could not be done until a sufficient tender of the gospel and of grace by Christ Jesus were first made unto them. Notwithstanding all their other wickednesses, God would not surprise them with an overturning destruction. He had before, as types of his dealing with them, warned the old world by Noah, and Sodom by Lot, before the one was destroyed by water and the other by fire. He would also give them their day, and make them a sufficient tender of mercy; which he had now done towards forty years. In this space, through the ministry of the apostles, and other faithful dispensers of the word, the gospel had been proposed unto all persons of that nation throughout the world, ~~and~~ Romans 10:16-20. This being now accomplished, they might evidently see that the day was approaching.

(5.) *In the preparations for it.* For at this time all things began to be filled with confusions, disorders, tumults, seditions, and slaughters, in the whole nation, being all of them entrances of that woful day, whose coming was declared in them and by them.

**Obs. IX.** If men will shut their eyes against evident signs and tokens of approaching judgments, they will never stir up themselves nor engage into the due performance of present duties.

**Obs. X.** In the approach of great and final judgments, God by his word and providence gives such intimations of their coming as that wise men may discern them. “Whoso is wise, he will consider these things,” and “they shall understand the loving-kindness of the LORD .” “The prudent foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself.” “How is it that ye discern not the signs of the times?”

**Obs. XI.** To see evidently such a day approaching, and not to be sedulous and diligent in the duties of divine worship, is a token of a backsliding frame tending unto final apostasy.

## VERSES 26, 27.

ἔκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται ζυσία, φοξερά δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως, καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.

**Ver. 26, 27.** — For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

In these verses the apostle gives a vehement enforcement of his preceding exhortation, from the dreadful consequences of a total neglect of it, or uncompliance with it. And this he doth,

1. By expressing the nature of the sin which lies therein.
2. By an impossibility of deliverance from the guilt of it.
3. The punishment that would unavoidably follow upon it.

Interpreters have greatly perplexed themselves and others in the interpretation and exposition of these verses, and those that follow. Their conjectures in great variety have proceeded principally from a want of a due attendance unto the scope of the apostle, the argument he had in hand, the circumstances of the people unto whom he wrote, and the present state of God's providence towards them. Shall not trouble the reader with their various conjectures, and censures of them; but I shall give such an evident sense of the words as themselves and the context do evince to be the mind of the Holy Ghost in them.

1. As unto the words wherein the sin and state of such men is expressed, "If we sin wilfully," he puts himself among them, as is his manner in comminations: both to show that there is no respect of persons in this matter, but those who have equally sinned shall be equally punished; and to take off all appearance of severity towards them, seeing he speaks nothing of this nature but on such suppositions as wherein, if he himself were concerned, he pronounceth it against himself also. "We sinning," or, "if we sin **ἔκουσίως** "wilfully," say we: our former translations, "willingly;" which we have now avoided, lest we should give countenance

unto a supposition that there is no recovery after any voluntary sin. “If we sin wilfully;” that is, obstinately, maliciously, and with despite; which is the nature of the sin itself, as is declared verse 29: but the word doth not require, nor will scarce bear any such sense. “*Willingly*,” is of choice, without surprisal, compulsion, or fear; and this is all that the word will bear.

The season and circumstance which state the sin intended is, “after we have received the knowledge of the truth.” There is no question but that by “the truth,” the apostle intends the doctrine of the gospel; and the “receiving” of it is, upon the conviction of its being truth, to take on us the outward profession of it. Only there is an emphasis in that word, **τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν**. This word is not used anywhere to express the mere conceptions or notions of the mind about truth, but such an acknowledgment of it as ariseth from some sense of its power and excellency. This, therefore, is the description of the persons concerning whom this sin is supposed: They were such as unto whom the gospel had been preached; who, upon conviction of its truth, and sense of its power, had taken upon them the public profession of it. And this is all that is required to the constitution of this state. And what is so required may be reduced to one of these two heads:

- (1.) The solemn dedication of themselves unto Christ in and by their baptism.
- (2.) Their solemn joining themselves unto the church, and continuance in the duties of its worship, <sup><4D1E></sup> Acts 2:41, 42.

On this opening of the words, it is evident what sin it is that is intended, against which this heavy doom is denounced; and that on these two considerations:

- (1.) That the head of the precedent exhortation is, that we should “*hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering*,” verse 23; and the means of continuing in that profession, verses 24, 25. Wherefore the sin against this exhortation is, the relinquishment and renouncing of the profession of the faith, with all acts and duties thereunto belonging.
- (2.) The state opposite unto this sin, that which is contrary unto it, is “receiving the knowledge of the truth;” which what is required thereunto



we have now declared. Wherefore the sin here intended, is plainly a relinquishment and renunciation of the truth of the gospel and the promises thereof, with all duties thereunto belonging, after we have been convinced of its truth, and avowed its power and excellency. There is no more required but that this be done **ἐκκοσίως**, “willingly;” as,

- (1.) Not upon a sudden surprisal and temptation, as Peter denied Christ;
- (2.) Not on those compulsions and fears which may work a present dissimulation, without an internal rejection of the gospel;
- (3.) Not through darkness, ignorance making an impression for a season on the minds and reasonings of men: which things, though exceedingly evil and dangerous, may befall them who yet contract not the guilt of this crime.

But it is required thereunto, that men who thus sin, do it,

- (1.) By choice, and of their own accord, from the internal pravity of their own minds, and an evil heart of unbelief to depart from the living God.
- (2.) That they do it by and with the preference of another way of religion, and a resting therein, before or above the gospel.
- (3.) That whereas there were two things which were the foundation of the profession of the gospel;

[1.] The blood of the covenant, or the blood of the sacrifice of Christ, with the atonement made thereby; and

[2.] The dispensation of the Spirit of grace; these they did openly renounce, and declared that there was nothing of God in them, as we shall see on verse 29. Such were they who fell off from the gospel unto Judaism in’ those days. Such are they whom the apostle here describeth, as is evident in the context. I will say no more unto the sin at present, because I must treat of it under its aggravations on verse 29.

**Obs. I.** If a voluntary relinquishment of the profession of the gospel and the duties of it be the highest sin, and be attended with the height of wrath and punishment, we ought earnestly to watch against every thing that inclineth or disposeth us thereunto.

**Obs. II.** Every declension in or from the profession of the gospel hath a proportion of the guilt of this great sin, according unto the proportion that it bears unto the sin itself. Hereof there may be various degrees.

**Obs. III.** There are sins and times wherein God doth absolutely refuse to hear any more from men in order unto their salvation.

2. The first thing which the apostle chargeth as an aggravation of this sin is, that it cannot be expiated, “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins;” — words not unlike those of God concerning the house of Eli, <sup>1</sup>1 Samuel 3:14, “I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli’s house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever.” An allusion is had herein unto the sacrifices of the law. As there were certain sins which — from their nature, as murder, adultery, blasphemy; or from the manner of their commission, with obstinacy and a high hand — had no sacrifice allowed for them, but those that were so guilty were to be “cut off” from the people of God, and to “die without mercy,” as the apostle declares his own mind, verse 28: so is it with them that thus “sin willingly;” there is no relief appointed for them, no means for the expiation of their sin. But yet there is an especial reason of this severity under the gospel, which the apostle hath principal respect unto. And this is, that there is now no multiplication or repetition of sacrifices for sin. That of Christ, our high priest, was “offered once for all;” henceforth “he dieth no more,”“ he is offered no more, nor can there be any other sacrifice offered for ever.

This the words express, *Οὐκ ἔτι ἀπολείπεται*, “There remaineth not;” there is not, in the counsel, purpose, or institution of God, any other sacrifice yet left, to be offered in this, or any other case. To suppose there is yet any such left, it must be on one of these two accounts:

(1.) That God would change the whole dispensation of himself and his grace by Christ, because of its weakness and insufficiency. But it may be said, ‘Whereas God did thus deal with the Mosaical law and all its sacrifices to bring in that of Christ, why may not therefore there be another way of expiation of sin yet remaining, whereby they may be purged and purified who are guilty of apostasy from the gospel?’

(2.) ‘Although men have justly forfeited all their interest and benefit by the one offering of Christ, why may he not appoint another for them, or

cause himself to be offered again for their recovery?’ But both these suppositions are not only false, but highly blasphemous; for it is certain “there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.”

**Θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν** compriseth all sorts of offerings and sacrifices whereby sin might be expiated. Wherefore the apostle plainly expresseth, that as persons, by a voluntary relinquishment of the gospel, did forfeit all their interest in the sacrifice of Christ, as he further declares, verse 29, so there was no way appointed for the relief of them by the expiation of their sin for ever.

Further to clear the mind of the Holy Ghost herein, I should answer some inquiries that may arise on this interpretation of the words, but in this place I shall only propose them: —

**1.** Whether this commination may be extended to *all ages, times, and seasons*? or whether it were confined unto the present state of the Hebrews, with the circumstances they were in? The reasons of the inquiry are,

**(1.)** Because their circumstances were eminently peculiar, and such as cannot befall others in any season.

**(2.)** Because there was a temporal destruction then impendent over them, ready to devour apostates; which cannot be applied unto them who fall into the same sin at other seasons.

**2.** Whether the sin intended may include *great actual sins* after the profession of the gospel, answering such as under the law were said to be committed “with an high hand?”

**3.** Whether there may be *hopes* for the persons here intended, though no express provision be made in the covenant for the expiation of this sin?

**4.** Whether there be any *defect* in the priesthood of Christ, that it hath but one sacrifice for sins, which if it be neglected and despised can never be repeated, nor can any other sacrifice be added unto it?

**5.** If a person who hath *voluntarily forsaken* and renounced the gospel, with a great appearance of all the circumstances that concur unto the state of the sin here mentioned, should make profession of repentance, what

may be conceived concerning his eternal condition? what is the duty of the church concerning such an one?

These things shall be spoken unto elsewhere.

**Obs. IV.** The loss of an interest in the sacrifice of Christ, on what account or by what means soever it fall out, is absolutely ruinous unto the souls of men.

**Ver. 27.** — “But a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.”

When a man under the law had contracted the guilt of any such sin as was indispensably capital in its punishment, for the legal expiation whereof no sacrifice was appointed or allowed, such as murder, adultery, blasphemy, he had nothing remaining but a fearful expectation of the execution of the sentence of the law against him. And it is evident that in this context the apostle argues from the less unto the greater: ‘If it was so, that this was the case of him who so sinned against Moses’ law, how much more must it be so with them that sin against the gospel, whose sin is incomparably greater, and the punishment more severe?’

The connection of the words with those foregoing, by the adversative **δέ** for **ἀλλά**, includes or brings along with it the verb **ἀπολείπεται**, “there remaineth:” ‘No sacrifice for sin is left or remains; but there doth remain or abide for such persons a fearful expectation of judgment.’

There are two things in these words: 1. The punishment due unto the sins of apostates, which is three ways expressed:

- (1.) By the *general* nature of it, it is “judgment;”
- (2.) By the *special* nature of that judgment, it is “fiery indignation;”
- (3.) By the *efficacy* of it unto its end, it “devours the adversaries.” 2. The *certain approach* of this judgment, “there remaineth a fearful expectation.”

**1.** This last lies first in the words. And, —

(1.) That which we render “certain,” is in the original only **τίς**. It doth not denote an assured expectation, nor the certainty of the punishment; but only a certain kind of expectation, “a kind of fearful expectation.” Nor is

this spoken in the way of diminution, but to intimate something that is inexpressible, such as no heart can conceive or tongue express. <sup>1</sup> Peter 4:17, 18, “What shall be the end of them who obey not the gospel? ..... Where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?”

(2.)’ Ἐκδοχή, an “expectation,” is the frame of mind with respect, unto any thing that is future, good or bad, wherein we are concerned, that we are to look for, whatever it be, — which we have reason and grounds to think will come unto us or befall us.

(3.) This expectation is said to be φοβερά “fearful,” tremendous, which men can neither conflict withal nor avoid, as we shall see further, verse 31; — that which fills the mind with dread and horror, depriving it of all comfort and relief. An expectation of this dreadful and terrible nature may be taken two ways:

[1.] For the *certain relation* that is between the sin and punishment spoken of; the punishment is unavoidable, as any thing is which upon the most certain grounds is looked for. So they are said only metaphorically to look for that which will certainly ensue.

[2.] As it expresseth *the frame* of the minds of them concerning it. And though the assertion may be used in the former sense, yet I doubt not but this latter also is included in it; and that also on two accounts:

**1st.** Because if they did set themselves unto the consideration of the event of their apostasy, nothing else could befall their minds, nothing could present itself unto them for their relief; their minds will not admit of other thoughts but what belongs to this dreadful expectation.

**2ndly.** On the account of that dread and terror that God sends at times into the minds and consciences of such persons.

They may bear it high, and with an ostentation of satisfaction in what they have done, yea, commonly they proclaim a self-justification, and prove desperate persecutors of them who sacredly adhere unto the truth; but as he said of old of tyrants, that if their breasts were opened, it would appear what tortures they have within, I am persuaded it is probable that God very seldom lets them pass in this world without tormenting fear and dread of approaching judgments, — which is a broad entrance into hell.

**Obs. V.** There is an inseparable concatenation between apostasy and eternal ruin.

**Obs. VI.** God oftentimes visits the minds of cursed apostates with dreadful expectations of approaching wrath.

**Obs. VII.** When men have hardened themselves in sin, no fear of punishment will either rouse or stir them up to seek after relief.

**Obs. VIII.** A dreadful expectation of future wrath, without hope of relief, is an open entrance into hell itself.

2. This dreadful punishment is described by the *general nature* of it.

(1.) It is κρίσις, “judgment.” It is not a thing that is dubious, that may fall out, or may not do so. It is not an unaccountable severity that they are threatened withal; but it is a just and righteous sentence, denouncing punishment proportionate unto their sin and crime. “Judgment” is taken sometimes for punishment itself, <sup><0016></sup>Psalm 9:16; <sup><0013></sup>James 2:13; <sup><0017></sup>1 Peter 4:17; <sup><0012></sup>2 Peter 2:3. But most commonly it is used for the sentence of judicial condemnation and trial, determining the offender unto punishment; and so it is most commonly used to express the general judgment that shall pass on all mankind at the last day, <sup><0015></sup>Matthew 10:15, 11:22, 24, 12:36; <sup><0011></sup>Mark 6:11; <sup><0012></sup>2 Peter 2:9, 3:7; <sup><0017></sup>1 John 4:17. I doubt not but that in the word as here used both these are included, namely, the righteous sentence of God judging and determining on the guilt of this sin, and the punishment itself which ensues thereon, as it is immediately described. And although respect be had herein principally to the judgment of the great day, yet is it not exclusive of any previous judgments that are preparatory unto it and pledges of it; such was that dreadful judgment which was then coming on the apostate church of the Hebrews.

**Obs. IX.** The expectation of future judgment in guilty persons is, or will be at one time or another, dreadful and tremendous.

(2.) The punishment and destruction of those sinners is described by its *particular nature*; it is a “fiery indignation,” — πυρὸς ζήλος. For these words do not relate unto ἐκδοχή, as κρίσεως doth, nor are regulated by it, (it is not the expectation of fiery indignation,) but refer immediately unto ἀπολείπεται. As there remains an expectation of judgment, so there

is a fiery indignation that remains. And so the words following, “which shall,” μέλλοντος, refer to “fire,” πυρός, and not to “indignation,” ζήλος; — the indignation, the vehemency, the power of fire.

What is this fire? and what is this indignation of it?

God himself is in the Scripture said to be “a consuming fire,”

<sup><B04></sup>Deuteronomy 4:24, 9:3; <sup><B34></sup>Isaiah 33:14; <sup><B72></sup>Hebrews 12:29. What is intended thereby is declared in a word, <sup><B04></sup>Deuteronomy 4:24, ζηλότυπος, as here ζήλος πυρός. The essential holiness and righteousness of God, whereby he cannot bear with the iniquities and provocations of men who betake not themselves unto the only atonement, and that “he will by no means quit the guilty,” are intended in this metaphorical expression.

The judgment of God concerning the punishment of sin, as an effect of his will in a way consonant unto the holiness of his nature and the exigence of his righteousness, is called “fire,” <sup><B83></sup>1 Corinthians 3:13. But that is not the fire that is here intended. It is devouring, consuming, destroying, such as answereth the severity of God’s justice unto the utmost, as <sup><B05></sup>Isaiah 9:5, 30:33, 66:15; <sup><B04></sup>Amos 7:4; <sup><B88></sup>Matthew 18:8; <sup><B03></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:8; <sup><B04></sup>Psalms 11:6; <sup><B22></sup>Deuteronomy 32:22. Therefore this “indignation,” or “fervor of fire,” hath respect unto three things:

[1.] *The holiness of the nature of God;* from whence originally this judgment doth proceed, as that which is most suitable thereunto.

[2.] *The righteous act of the will of God;* sometimes called his wrath and anger from the effects of it, being suitable unto the holiness of his nature.

[3.] *The dreadful severity of the judgment in itself,* in its nature and effects, as it is declared in the next words.

I doubt not but respect is had unto the final judgment at the last day, and the eternal destruction of apostates. But yet also it evidently includeth that sore and fiery judgment which God was bringing on the obstinate, apostate Jews, in the total destruction of them and their church-state by fire and sword. For as such judgments are compared to and called “fire” in the Scripture, so this was so singular, so unparalleled in any people of the world, as that it might well be called “fiery indignation,” or “fervor of fire.” Besides, it was an eminent pledge and token of the future judgment,

and the severity of God therein. Wherefore it is foretold in expressions that are applicable unto the last judgment. See <sup><122></sup>Matthew 24:29-31; <sup><122></sup>Peter 3:10-12.

**(3.)** This indignation, to be executed by fire, is described in the last place by its efficacy and effects. It is the fire that shall “devour” or eat up “the adversaries.” The expression is taken from <sup><331></sup>Isaiah 26:11. For, “the fire of thine enemies,” is there, not that which the enemies burn with, but wherewith they shall be burned. Concerning the *efficacy and effect of this fire* we may consider,

[1.] The *season* of its application unto this effect, **μέλλοντος**.

[2.] The *object* of it, “the adversaries.”

[3.] The *way of its operation*, “it shall devour them.”

[1.] It “shall” do so; it is not yet come to the effect, it is *future*. Hence many of them despised it, as that which would never be, <sup><122></sup>2 Peter 3:3-6. But there are three things intimated in this word:

**1st.** That it is “in procinctu,” *in readiness*; not yet come, but ready to come: so is the word used to express that which is future, but ready to make its entrance.

**2dly.** That it is *certain*, it shall and will be; whatever appearances there are of its turning aside, and men’s avoiding of it, it will come in its proper season: so speaks the prophet in a like case: <sup><331></sup>Habakkuk 2:3.

**3dly.** The *foundation* of the certainty of the coming of this fiery indignation, is the *irreversible decree of God*, accompanied with righteousness, and the measures which infinite wisdom gave unto his patience. This was the unavoidable season that was approaching, when the adversaries had filled up the measure of their sin, and God’s providence had saved the elect from this wrath to come.

**Obs. X.** There is a determinate time for the accomplishment of all divine threatenings, and the infliction of the severest judgments, which no man can abide or avoid. He hath “appointed a day wherein he will judge the world.” So at present there is a sort of men “whose damnation slumbereth



not,” concerning whom he hath sworn that “time shall be no more;” which is the present state of the antichristian world.

**Obs. XI.** The certain determination of divine vengeance on the enemies of the gospel is a motive unto holiness, and a supportment under sufferings, in them that believe. “Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.” “What manner of persons ought we to be?” See <sup><500></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:7-10.

[2.] There is a description of those on whom this fiery indignation shall have its effect, and it is “the adversaries,” — **τοὺς ὑπεναντίους**. He doth not say, those that believe not, and obey not the gospel, as he doth elsewhere, when he treats absolutely of the day of judgment, as in that place, <sup><500></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9, now mentioned; but it confines them unto those that are “adversaries,” — who, from a contrary principle, set themselves against the Lord Christ and the gospel. This is the peculiar description of the *unbelieving Jews* at that time. They did not only refuse the gospel through unbelief, but were acted by a principle of opposition thereunto; not only as unto themselves, but as unto others, even the whole world. So is their state described, <sup><500></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:15, 16, “Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary unto all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them unto the uttermost.” They laid the foundation of this enmity in killing the Lord Jesus; but they rested not therein, they continued in their unbelief, adhering to their old Judaism, and their sins therein. Nor did they rest there, but persecuted the apostles, drove them out from amongst them, and all that preached the gospel; and this not only with respect unto themselves alone, and those of their own nation, but they set themselves with fury all the world over against the preaching of the gospel unto the Gentiles, and that of cursed malice, that they might not be saved. See instances of this rage, <sup><400></sup>Acts 13:45, 22:22, 23. They were properly “the adversaries” whom the apostle intends; and therefore the judgment which was peculiar unto them and their sins, in that fearful temporal destruction which did then approach, is intended herein, as well as the equity of the sentence as extended to the general destruction of all unbelievers at the last day.

**Obs. XII.** The highest aggravation for the greatest sin, is, when men, out of a contrary principle of superstition and error, do set themselves maliciously to oppose the doctrine and truth of the gospel, with respect unto themselves and others.

**Obs. XIII.** There is a time when God will make such demonstrations of his wrath and displeasure, against all adversaries of the gospel, as shall be pledges of his eternal indignation. He will one day deal so with the antichristian, persecuting world.

[3.] What is the effect of this fiery indignation against those adversaries? “It shall eat them up,” or “devour them.” The expression is metaphorical, taken from the nature and efficacious operation of fire; it eats, devours, swallows up and consumes, all combustible matter that it is applied unto, or is put into it. That intended is destruction, inevitable, unavoidable, and terrible in the manner of it. See <sup>300</sup>Malachi 4:1, whence those expressions are taken. Only the similitude is not to be extended beyond the proper intention of it. For fire doth so consume and devour what is put into it, as that it destroys the substance and being thereof, that it shall be no more. It is not so with the “fiery indignation” that “shall consume” or “devour the adversaries” at the last day. It shall devour them as to all happiness, all blessedness, all hopes, comforts, and relief at once; but it shall not at once utterly consume their being. This is that which this fire shall eternally prey upon, and never utterly consume. But if we make the application of it unto the temporal destruction that came upon them, the similitude holds throughout, for it utterly consumed them, and devoured them, and all that belonged unto them in this world: they were devoured by it.

**Obs. XIV.** The dread and terror of God’s final judgments against the enemies of the gospel is in itself inconceivable, and only shadowed out by things of the greatest dread and terror in the world. Whence it is so, I shall now declare.

### VERSES 28, 29.

Ἄθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ  
 τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· πόσω, δοκεῖτε, χείρονος  
 ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν Ψῖδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ

τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἠγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυζήρισας;

**Ver. 28, 29.** — He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?

The apostle confirms what he had spoken of the sore and certain destruction of apostates from the gospel, by an argument “A comparatis,” and “a minori ad majus;” that is, by the consideration of the two states of the church, which he had all along compared and expressed. Wherefore, to convince the Hebrews not only of the *certainty and severity* of the judgment declared, but also of the *equity and righteousness* of it, he proposeth unto them the consideration of God's constitution of punishment under the old testament with respect unto the law of Moses, which they could not deny to be just and equal.

In verse 28 he lays down the matter of fact as it was stated under the law; wherein there are three things:

1. The sin whereunto that of apostasy from the gospel is compared, “He that despised Moses' law.”
2. The punishment of that sin according to the law; he that was guilty of it “died without mercy.”
3. The way whereby according unto the law his sin was to be charged on him; it was “under two or three witnesses.”

FIRST, Unto the first, two things did concur: —

1. It was such a sin as by the law was *capital*; as murder, adultery, incest, idolatry, blasphemy, and some others. Concerning them it was provided in the law that those who were guilty of them should be put to death. God alone, by virtue of his sovereignty, could dispense with the execution of this sentence of the law, as he did in the case of David, <sup>102B</sup>2 Samuel 12:13; but as unto the people, they were prohibited on any account to dispense with it, or forbear the execution of it, <sup>102C</sup>Numbers 35:31.

**2.** It was required that he did it “*presumptuously,*” or *with an high hand,* <sup><1214></sup>Exodus 21:14; <sup><0453></sup>Numbers 15:30, 31; <sup><5772></sup>Deuteronomy 17:12.

He that was thus guilty of sin, in sinning is said to “despise Moses’ law;” **ἀθετεῖν**, to “abolish” it, to render it useless, — that is, in himself; by contempt of the authority of it, or the authority of God in it. And it is called a contempt and abolishing of the law, as the word signifies, —

**1.** Because of God’s indulgence unto them therein. For although the general sentence of the law was a curse, wherein death was contained, against every transgression thereof, Deuteronomy 27, yet God had ordained and appointed, that for all their sins of ignorance, infirmity, or surprisals by temptations, an atonement should be made by sacrifice; whereon the guilty were freed as unto the terms of the covenant, and restored to a right unto all the promises of it. Wherein they would not abide in those terms and conditions of the covenant, but transgress the bounds annexed to them, it was a contempt of the whole law, with the wisdom, goodness, and authority of God therein.

**2.** They rejected all the promises of it which were given exclusively unto such sins; nor was there any way appointed of God for their recovery unto an interest in them. Hereby they made themselves lawless persons, contemning the threatenings and despising the promises of the law; which God would not bear in any of them, <sup><5238></sup>Deuteronomy 29:18-21.

**Obs. I.** It is the contempt of God and his authority in his law that is the gall and poison of sin. — This may be said in some measure of all voluntary sins; and the more there is of it in any sin, the greater is their guilt and the higher is their aggravation who have contracted it. But there is a degree hereof which God will not bear with; namely, when this presumptuous contempt hath such an influence into any sin, as that no ignorance, no infirmity, no special temptation can be pleaded, unto the extenuation of it. “I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief,” <sup><5013></sup>1 Timothy 1:13. And sundry things are required hereunto:

**1.** That it be known unto the sinner, both in point of right and fact, to be such a sin as whereunto the penalty of death without dispensation was annexed.

2. That therefore the sense of God in the law be suggested unto the soul in and by the ordinary means of it.
3. That the resolution of continuing in it, and the perpetration of it, doth prevail against all convictions and fear of punishment.
4. That motives unto the contrary, with reluctancies of conscience, be stifled or overcome. These things rendered a sinner “presumptuous,” or caused him to “sin with an high hand,” under the law; whereunto the apostle adds in the next verse the peculiar aggravations of sin against the gospel. This it is to despise the law of Moses, as it is explained, <sup>GENE</sup>Numbers 15:30, 31.

SECONDLY, The *punishment of this sin*, or of him that was guilty of it, was, that “he died without mercy.” He “died,” — that is, he was put to death; not always, it may be, “de facto,” but such was the constitution of the law, he was to be put to death without mercy. There were several ways of inflicting capital punishments appointed by the law, as hanging on a tree, burning, and stoning. Of all which, and the application of them unto particular cases, I have given a description in the Exercitations unto the first volume of these commentaries. And it is said that he “died without mercy,” not only because there was no allowance for any such mercy as should save and deliver him, but God had expressly forbidden that either mercy or compassion should be showed in such cases, <sup>GENE</sup>Deuteronomy 13:6-10, 19:13.

This is expressly added unto the highest instance of despising the law, namely, the decalogue in the foundation of it, whereon all other precepts of the law were built; and that which comprised a total apostasy from the whole law. Wherefore I doubt not but the apostle had an especial respect unto that sin in its punishment, which had a complete parallel with that whose heinousness he would represent. However, —

**Obs. II.** When the God of mercies will have men show no mercy, as in temporal punishment, he can and will, upon repentance, show mercy as to eternal punishment; for we dare not condemn all unto hell which the law condemned as unto temporal punishment.

THIRDLY, The *way of execution* of this judgment: it was to be done “under two or three witnesses;” that is, that were so of the fact and crime. The

law is express in this case, <sup><B770></sup>Deuteronomy 17:6, 19:13; <sup><B551></sup>Numbers 35:30. Although God was very severe in the prescription of these judgments, yet he would give no advantage thereby unto wicked and malicious persons to take away the lives of innocent men. He rather chose that those who were guilty should, through our weakness, go free for want of evidence against them, than that innocence should be exposed unto the malice of one single testimony or witness. And such abhorrency God had of false witnesses in criminal causes, as that which is most contrary unto his righteousness in the government of the world, as that he established a “lex talionis” in this case alone; — that a false witness should suffer the utmost of what he thought and contrived to bring on another. The equity of which law is still continued in force, as suitable to the law of nature, and ought to be more observed than it is, <sup><B596></sup>Deuteronomy 19:16-21.

On this proposition of the state of things under the law, by God’s appointment, as to sin and punishment, the apostle makes his inference unto the certainty and equity of the punishment he had declared with respect unto sins against the gospel, verse 29, “Of how much sorer punishment,” etc. And there is in these words three things:

1. The nature of the sin unto which the punishment is annexed.
2. The punishment itself, expressed comparatively with and unto that of the transgression of Moses’ law.
3. The evidence of the inference which he makes; for this is such as he refers it unto themselves to judge upon, “Suppose ye shall he be thought worthy.”

The sin itself is described by a threefold aggravation of it, each instance having its especial aggravation:

1. From the *object sinned against*;
  2. From the *act of the minds of men in sinning* against it.
1. The first aggravation of the sin intended is from the *object of it*, the *person* of Christ, — “the Son of God;” and that included in it is the act of their minds towards him, “they trod,” or “trampled upon him.”

**2.** The second is *against the office of Christ*, especially his sacerdotal office, and the sacrifice of his blood which he offered therein, — “the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified;” and the aggravation included therein from the act of their minds towards it is, that “they accounted it an unholy thing.”

**3.** A third aggravation as unto the object, is the *Spirit of Christ*, or “the Spirit of grace;” and the aggravation included therein is, that “they do despite unto him.”

In general, the nature and aggravation of the sin intended may be reduced unto these heads: —

**1.** The object of it, which is the sum and substance, a divine constellation of all the blessed effects of infinite wisdom, goodness, and grace, yea, the whole divine wisdom, goodness, and grace of God, in the most glorious manifestation of them. All these things are comprised in the person, office, and glory of the Son of God, as the Savior and Redeemer of the church.

**2.** The actings of the minds of men towards this object, which is in and by all the vilest affections that human nature is capable of. Contempt, scorn, and malice, are ascribed unto such sin; they “trample on,” they “despise,” and “do despite.” Wherefore, if it be possible that any thing, any sin of men, can provoke the heat of divine indignation; if any can contract such a guilt, as that the holiness, righteousness, truth, and faithfulness of God, shall be engaged unto its eternal punishment, the sin here intended must do it.

FIRST, We shall therefore consider it in its nature and distinct aggravations.

The sin in general is that which we have spoken to before, namely, sinning wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, and in an absolutely total relinquishment and rejection of the gospel.

**1.** In the description of the special object of this sin, that which is first expressed is the person of Christ, — “the Son of God.” I have on sundry occasions before showed how the apostle doth vary in his expression of Christ. Here he calls him “the Son of God;” and he maketh use of this name to give a sense of the glorious greatness of the person with whom they had to do, against whom this sin was committed. For although he is a

man also, who had blood to shed, and did shed it in the sacrifice of himself, and notwithstanding what cursed, blasphemous thoughts they might have of him, yet indeed he is and will appear to be, the eternal Son of the living God.

But how comes this “Son of God” to be concerned herein? what injury is done him by apostates from the gospel? I answer, that as the Lord Christ in his own *person* was the *special author* of the gospel; as his *authority* is the *special object* of our faith in it; as his office with all the fruits of it is the *subject*, sum, and substance of the gospel: so there is no reception of it in a due manner, unto salvation, no rejection of it unto final condemnation, but what is all of it originally, fundamentally, and virtually contained in the reception or rejection of the person of Christ. This is the life, the soul, and foundation of all gospel truth; without which it is of no power or efficacy unto the souls of men. But I have treated at large of these things elsewhere.<sup>f33</sup> I cannot but observe, that, as whosoever rejects, refuses, forsakes the gospel, rejecteth and forsaketh the person of Christ; so on what account soever men take up the profession of it, and perform the duties of it, if the foundation be not laid in a reception of Christ himself, of the person of Christ, all their profession will be in vain.

This is the first aggravation of this sin, it is committed immediately against the *person of the Son of God*, and therein his authority, goodness, and love.

But it may be thought, if the person of Christ be concerned herein, yet it is indirectly or consequently only, and in some small degree. ‘No,’ saith the apostle; ‘but he that is guilty of this sin doth trample on the Son of God, or tread him under foot.’ The word is rendered with great variety, but that of our translation is proper; and it is the highest expression of scorn, contempt, and malice amongst men. To “tread under foot,” is to despise and insult over, as is plain in the metaphor. And this contempt respects both the person of Christ and his authority. He is proposed in the gospel, was professed by this sort of sinners for a while to be the Son of God, the true Messiah, the Savior of the world. Hereon faith in him and all holy reverence unto him are required of us, as on him whom God had exalted above all principalities and powers; and whom therefore we ought to exalt and adore in our souls. But now by this sort of persons he was esteemed



an evildoer, a seducer, one not at all sent of God, but one that justly suffered for his crimes. Herein they “trod under foot the Son of God” with all contempt and scorn.

Again, it respects his *authority*. This the gospel declared; and those who had come unto any profession of it, — as those had done whereof he speaks in this place, and all must have done who contract the guilt of this sin, — did avow, and submit themselves unto. The profession they made was, to observe and do all that he had commanded them, because all power was given unto him in heaven and earth. This they now utterly rejected and despised; as unto the outward observance of his commands, ordinances, and institutions of divine worship, they openly rejected them, betaking themselves unto other modes and rites of divine service, in opposition and contradiction unto them, even those of the law. Neither did they retain any regard in their minds unto his authority.

**Obs. III.** Though there may be sometimes an appearance of great severity in God’s judgments against sinners, yet when the nature of their sins and the aggravations of them shall be discovered, they will be manifest to have been righteous, and within due measure.

**Obs. IV.** Take we heed of every neglect of the person of Christ or of his authority, lest we enter into some degree or other of the guilt of this great offense.

**Obs. V.** The sins of men can really reach neither the person nor authority of Christ; they only do that in desire which in effect they cannot accomplish. — This doth not take off or extenuate their sin; the guilt of it is no less than if they did actually trample upon the Son of God.

**2.** The second aggravation of the sin spoken of, is its *opposition to the office of Christ*, especially his priestly office, and the sacrifice that he offered thereby, called here “the blood of the covenant.” And that included in it, is the frame of their minds in that opposition, “they counted it an unholy thing;” both which have a third aggravation from the use and efficacy of that blood, — it is that “wherein he was sanctified.”

For the first, in what sense the blood of Christ was “the blood of the covenant,” hath been fully declared on <sup>800</sup>Hebrews 9; — that whereby the new covenant was ratified, confirmed, and made effectual as unto all the

grace of it unto them that do believe; and it was the foundation of all the following actings of God towards him in his exaltation, and of his intercession. See <sup><RB></sup>Hebrews 13:20. The “blood of the covenant” was the great expression of the grace of God, and of the love of Christ himself, as well as the cause of all good unto us; the center of divine wisdom in all the mediatory actings of Christ, the life and soul of the gospel. Of this blood of the covenant it is said, that they who were guilty of the sin intended, “counted it an unholy thing;” they judged it so, and dealt with it accordingly. Both the judgment of the mind, and practice thereupon are intended.

**Κοινόν** is “common,” and opposed unto any thing that is dedicated and consecrated unto God, and made sacred. Hence it is used for “profane” and “unholy,” — that which no way belongs unto divine worship. They did no longer esteem it as that blood wherewith the new covenant was sealed, confirmed, established; but as the blood of an ordinary man shed for his crimes, which is common and unholy, not sacred, — not of so much use unto the glory of God as the blood of bulls and goats in legal sacrifices: which is the height of impiety. And there are many degrees of this sin, some doctrinal, some practical; which though they arise not unto the degree here intended, yet are they perilous unto the souls of men. Those by whom the efficacy of his blood unto the expiation of sin, by making satisfaction and atonement, is denied, as it is by the Socinians, will never be able to free themselves from making this blood in some sense a common thing. Yea, the contempt which hath been cast on the blood of Christ by that sort of men will not be expiated with any other sacrifices for ever. Others do manifest what slight thoughts they have of it, in that they place the whole of their religion within themselves, and value their own light as unto spiritual’ advantages above the blood of Christ. And practically there are but few who trust unto it for their justification, for pardon, righteousness, and acceptance with God; which is in a great measure to account it a common thing, — not absolutely, but in comparison of that life, excellency, and efficacy that are in it indeed. But as Christ is precious unto them that believe, <sup><RB></sup>1 Peter 2:7, so is his blood also, wherewith they are redeemed, <sup><RB></sup>1 Peter 1:19.

**Obs. VI.** Every thing that takes off from a high and glorious esteem of the blood of Christ as “the blood of the covenant,” is a dangerous entrance

into apostasy: such is the pretended sacrifice of the mass, with all things of the like nature.

The last aggravation of this sin with respect unto the blood of Christ, is the nature, use, and efficacy of it; it is that “wherewith he was sanctified.” It is not *real* or *internal sanctification* that is here intended, but it is a *separation* and *dedication unto God*; in which sense the word is often used. And all the disputes concerning the total and final apostasy from the faith of them who have been really and internally sanctified, from this place, are altogether vain; though that may be said of a man, in aggravation of his sin, which he professeth concerning himself. But the difficulty of this text is, concerning whom these words are spoken: for they may be referred unto the person that is guilty of the sin insisted on; he counts the blood of the covenant, wherewith he himself was sanctified, an unholy thing. For as at the giving of the law, or the establishing of the covenant at Sinai, the people being sprinkled with the blood of the beasts that were offered in sacrifice, were sanctified, or dedicated unto God in a peculiar manner; so those who by baptism, and confession of faith in the church of Christ, were separated from all others, were peculiarly dedicated to God thereby. And therefore in this case apostates are said to “deny the Lord that bought them,” or vindicated them from their slavery unto the law by his word and truth for a season, <sup>6112</sup>2 Peter 2:1. But the design of the apostle in the context leads plainly to another application of these words. It is Christ himself that is spoken of, who was sanctified and dedicated unto God to be an eternal high priest, by the blood of the covenant which he offered unto God, as I have showed before. The priests of old were dedicated and sanctified unto their office by another, and the sacrifices which he offered for them; they could not sanctify themselves: so were Aaron and his sons sanctified by Moses, antecedently unto their offering any sacrifice themselves. But no outward act of men or angels could unto this purpose pass on the Son of God. He was to be the priest himself, the sacrificer himself, — to dedicate, consecrate, and sanctify himself, by his own sacrifice, in concurrence with the actings of God the Father in his suffering. See <sup>6179</sup>John 17:19; <sup>6181</sup>Hebrews 2:10, 5:7, 9, 9:11, 12. That precious blood of Christ, wherein or whereby he was sanctified, and dedicated unto God as the eternal high priest of the church, this they

esteemed “an unholy thing;” that is, such as would have no such effect as to consecrate him unto God and his office.

**Obs. VII.** However men may esteem of any of the mediatory actings of Christ, yet are they in themselves glorious and excellent. — So was the sacrifice of his own blood, even that whereby not only the church was sanctified, but himself also was dedicated as our high priest for ever.

**3.** The third aggravation of this sin is taken from its opposition unto the Spirit of Christ; they “do despite unto the Spirit of grace.” And as in the former instances, so it is here, there are two parts of this aggravation; the first taken from the *object of their sin*, “the Spirit of grace;” the second taken from the *manner of their opposition* unto him, “they do him despite.” The Holy Spirit of God, promised and communicated under the gospel by Jesus Christ from the Father, as the author and cause, actually communicating and applying of all grace unto the souls of them that believe, is this Spirit of grace. And this carries in it innumerable aggravations of this sin. This person, the Holy Spirit of God, God himself, his communication of grace and mercy, in the accomplishment of the most glorious promises of the Old Testament, was he whom these apostates renounced. But there is a peculiar notion or consideration of the Spirit, with respect whereunto he is sinned against; and that is this, that he was peculiarly sent, given, and bestowed to bear witness unto the person, doctrine, death, and sacrifice of Christ, with the glory that ensued thereon, <sup><B164></sup>John 16:14; <sup><B112></sup>1 Peter 1:12. And this he did various ways. For by him the souls of multitudes were converted unto God, — their eyes enlightened, their minds sanctified, their lives changed. By him did those who believe come to understand the Scriptures, which before were as a sealed book unto them; they were directed, encouraged, supported, and comforted, in all that they had to do and suffer for the name of Christ. By him were all those mighty works, wonders, signs, and miracles wrought, which accompanied the apostles and other preachers of the gospel at the beginning. Now all these things, and the like effects of his grace and power on all who made profession of the gospel, were owned, believed, and avowed to be the works of the Holy Spirit, as promised in the days of the Messiah; and they pleaded the evidence of them unto the confusion of all their adversaries. This, therefore, was done also by these apostates before their apostasy. But now, being fully fallen off from Christ and the gospel,

they openly declared that there was no testimony in them unto the truth, but all these things were either diabolical delusions or fanatical misapprehensions; that indeed there was nothing of truth, reality, or power in them, and therefore no argument to be taken from them unto the confirmation of the truth of Christ in the gospel. Now this proceeding from them who had once themselves made the same profession with others of their truth and reality, gave the deepest wound that could be given unto the gospel. For all the adversaries of it, who were silenced with this public testimony of the Holy Spirit, and knew not what to say, considering the many miracles that were wrought, did now strengthen themselves by the confession of these apostates, ‘That there was nothing in it but pretense: and who should better know than those who had been of that society?’

**Obs. VIII.** There are no such cursed, pernicious enemies unto religion as apostates.

Hence are they said to “do despite unto the Spirit of grace,” — **ἐνυβρίσας**. They do injure him so far as they are able. The word includes *wrong with contempt*. And this they did upon a twofold account. For,

- (1.) The works, many of them which he then wrought, were eminent and evident effects of divine power; and to ascribe such works unto another cause is to do despite unto him.
- (2.) They did so principally, in that by all his works, and in the whole dispensation of him, he gave testimony unto Christ in the gospel; and what greater despite and wrong could be done unto him, than to question his truth and the veracity of his testimony? No greater despite can be done unto a man of any reputation, than to question his truth and credit in that wherein he engageth himself as a witness. And if *lying unto the Holy Ghost* is so great a sin, what is it to *make the Holy Ghost a liar*? Herein did such persons do him despite. For notwithstanding the public testimony he gave in, with, and by the preaching of the gospel, they rejected it as a fable, in despising his person and authority.

All these great and terrible aggravations are inseparable from this sin of apostasy from the gospel, above those of any sin against the law of Moses

whatever. They were none of them in the vilest sin prohibited by the law under capital punishment.

SECONDLY, Hence, therefore, the apostle proposeth it unto the judgment of the Hebrews, “of how much sorer punishment” they suppose a sinner guilty of this sin shall be judged worthy, above what was inflicted on the wilful transgressor of the law. And there is included herein,

1. That *such a sinner shall be punished*. Apostates may flatter themselves with impunity, but in due time punishment will overtake them. How shall they escape who neglect so great salvation? Much less shall they not do so by whom it is thus despised in all the causes of it.
2. That *this shall be a sore, a great, and an evil punishment*; which is included in the note of comparison, “far greater punishment,” — such as men shall be able neither to abide nor to avoid.
3. *Comparatively*, it shall be a *sorer punishment* than that which was appointed for wilful transgressors of the law, which was death without mercy.
4. That *the degree of its exceeding that punishment is inexpressible*: “Of how much sorer?”

None can declare it, as the Holy Ghost expresseth himself when he would intimate unto our minds that which we cannot absolutely conceive and apprehend, <sup><small>1 Peter 4:17, 18.</sup> ‘But whereas that punishment was death without mercy, wherein could this exceed it?’ I answer, Because that was a temporal death only; for though such sinners under the law might and did many of them perish eternally, yet they did not so by virtue of the constitution of the law of Moses, which reached only unto temporal punishments: but this punishment is eternal (that is constantly proposed in the first place unto all impenitent unbelievers and despisers of the gospel, see <sup><small>2 Thessalonians 1:6-9,</sup> <sup><small>Mark 16:16,</sup> etc.); yet so as not to exclude any other temporal judgments, in spirituals or naturals, that may precede it; such was that whereunto the temporal destruction that was ready to come on these despisers did belong.

THIRDLY, The way whereby they are made obnoxious unto it is, that they are “counted *worthy* of it,” — ἀξιωθήσεται. They shall receive neither more nor less than their due. The judge in this case is God himself, as the apostle declares in the next verse. He alone knows, he alone can justly determine, what such apostates are worthy of. But in general, that this shall unspeakably exceed that annexed unto the transgression of the law is left unto themselves to judge, — “Suppose ye.” ‘Ye know and take it for granted, that the punishments under the law to be inflicted on its transgressors, by the constitution and sanction of it, were all of them righteous, for God was the judge of this in them all. Consider now what aggravations this sin is accompanied withal above all sins whatever against the law, and be yourselves judges of what will follow hereon. What do you think in your own hearts will be the judgment of God concerning these sinners?’ This argument the apostle doth frequently insist upon, as <sup><R1B></sup>Hebrews 2:2-4, 12:25; and it had a peculiar cogency towards the Hebrews, who had lived under the terror of those legal punishments all their days.

**Obs. IX.** The inevitable certainty of the eternal punishment of gospel-despisers depends on the essential holiness and righteousness of God, as the ruler and judge of all. It is nothing but what he in his just judgment, which is “according unto truth,” accounteth them worthy of, <sup><R1B></sup>Romans 1:32.

**Obs. X.** It is a righteous thing with God thus to deal with men. Wherefore all hopes of mercy, or the least relaxation of punishment unto all eternity, are vain and false unto apostates: “they shall have judgment without mercy.”

**Obs. XI.** God hath allotted different degrees of punishment unto the different degrees and aggravations of sin. “The wages,” indeed, of every “sin is death;” but there is unto such persons as these “a savor of death unto death,” and there shall he different degrees of eternal punishment.

**Obs. XII.** The apostasy from the gospel, here described, being the absolute height of all sin and impiety that the nature of man is capable of, it renders them unto eternity obnoxious unto all punishment that the same nature is capable of. The greatest sin must have the greatest judgment.

**Obs. XIII.** It is our duty diligently to inquire into the nature of sin, lest we be overtaken in the great offense. Such persons as they in the text, it may be, little thought what it was that they should principally be charged withal, namely, for their apostasy; and how dreadful was it when it came upon them in an evident conviction!

**Obs. XIV.** Sinning against the testimony given by the Holy Ghost unto the truth and power of the gospel, whereof men have had experience, is the most dangerous symptom of a perishing condition.

**Obs. XV.** Threatenings of future eternal judgments unto gospel-despisers belong unto the preaching and declaration of the gospel.

**Obs. XVI.** The equity and righteousness of the most severe judgments of God, in eternal punishments against gospel-despisers, is so evident, that it may be referred to the judgment of men not obstinate in their blindness.

**Obs. XVII.** It is our duty to justify and bear witness unto God in the righteousness of his judgments against gospel-despisers.

### VERSES 30, 31.

Οἶδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα, Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος. Καὶ πάλιν, Κύριον κρινεῖ τὸς λαὸν αὐτοῦ. φοξερόν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ ζῶντος.

**Ver. 30, 31.** — For we know him that hath said, Vengeance [*belongeth*] unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people, [*It is*] a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

There is in these verses the confirmation of all that was spoken before, by the consideration of what God is in himself, with whom alone we have to do in this matter, and what he assumeth unto himself in this and the like cases; as if the apostle had said, ‘In the severe sentence which we have denounced against apostates, we have spoken nothing but what is suitable unto the holiness of God, and what, indeed, in such cases he hath declared that he will do.’

The conjunction γάρ denotes the introduction of a reason of what was spoken before; but this is not all which he had discoursed on, on this



subject, but more particularly the reference he had made unto their own judgments of what sore punishment was due unto apostates: “Thus it will be with them, thus you must needs determine concerning them in your own minds; for we know him with whom we have to do in these things. Wherefore the apostle *confirms the truth* of his discourse, or rather *illustrates the evidence* of it, by a double consideration:

1. Of the person of him who is, and is to be the sole judge in this case, who is God alone: “For we know him.” And,
2. What he hath assumed unto himself, and affirmed concerning himself in the like cases; which he expresseth in a double testimony of Scripture. And then, lastly, there is the way whereby our minds are influenced from this person and what he hath said; which is, that “we know him.”

The first consideration confirming the evidence and certainty of the truth asserted, is *the person* of Him who is the only judge in this case. I confess the pronoun herein is not expressed in the original, but as it is included in the participle and article prefixed, τὸν εἰπόντα, “him that saith,” who expresseth himself in the words ensuing; but it is evident that the apostle directeth unto a special consideration of God himself, both in the manner of the expression and in the addition of these words, λέγει Κύριος, to the testimony which he writes immediately: ‘If you will be convinced of the righteousness and certainty of this dreadful destruction of apostates, consider in the first place the Author of this judgment, the only judge in the case: “We know him that hath said.”’

**Obs. I.** There can be no right judgment made of the nature and demerit of sin, without a due consideration of the nature and holiness of God, against whom it is committed. — “Fools make a mock of sin;” they have no sense of its guilt, nor dread of its punishment. Others have *slight thoughts* of it, measuring it only either by outward effects, or by presumptions which they have been accustomed unto. Some have *general notions* of its guilt, as it is prohibited by the divine law, but never search into the nature of that law with respect unto its author. Such false measures of sin ruin the souls of men. Nothing, therefore, will state our thoughts aright concerning the guilt and demerit of sin, but a deep consideration of the infinite greatness, holiness, righteousness, and power of God, against whom it is committed.

And hereunto this also is to be added, that God acts not in the effect of any of these properties of his nature, but on a preceding contempt of his goodness, bounty, grace, and mercy; as it is impossible that sin should come into the world but by the contempt of these things. Antecedently unto all possibility of sinning, God communicates the effects of his goodness and bounty unto the creation; and in those sins which are against the gospel, he doth so also of his grace and mercy. This is that which will give us a due measure of the guilt and demerit of sin: look upon it as a contempt of infinite goodness, bounty, grace, and mercy, and to rise up against infinite greatness, holiness, righteousness, and power, and we shall have a view of it as it is in itself.

**Obs. II.** Under apprehensions of great severities of divine judgments, the consideration of God, the author of them, will both relieve our faith and quiet our hearts. — Such instances are given in the eternal casting off of multitudes of angels, on their guilt in one sin; the woful sin of Adam, and the ruin of his posterity, even of those who had not sinned after the similitude of his transgression; the destruction of the old world by a universal flood; as in the fire and brimstone that God rained from heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrah; in the final rejection of the Jews, and the dreadful overthrow of the city and temple by fire; in the eternity of the torments of impenitent sinners. In all these things, and others that seem to have any thing of the same kind with them, we shall need nothing to give the most full satisfaction unto our souls, if “we know him who hath said, Vengeance is mine, I will repay.”

Secondly, This consideration is confirmed by a double testimony, wherein God assumeth unto himself that which will give assurance of the punishment of apostates. And we may consider, concerning these testimonies,

1. The apostle’s application of them unto his purpose;
2. The force that is in them unto that end.

1. They are both of them taken from <sup>41825</sup>Deuteronomy 32:35, 36. ‘But in that place they seem absolutely to intend vengeance and judgment on the adversaries of his people, to make a way for their deliverance; but here

they axe applied unto the final destruction of that same people, namely, the Jews, without hope of deliverance.’

I answer,

(1.) That it is usual with the apostle in this epistle, and all other writers of the New Testament, to make use of testimonies out of the Old without respect unto the particular cases and designs which they were originally applied unto, but with regard unto the truth and equity contained in them; whereon they are equally applicable unto all cases of a like nature. ‘Thus,’ saith he, ‘God declares himself with respect unto his stubborn enemies; whence a rule is established, that he will deal so with all that are so, who are in the same circumstances with them of whom we speak.’

(2.) What God speaks concerning his enemies, and the enemies of his people in covenant with him, is applicable unto that people itself when they absolutely break and reject the covenant. So was it done by these apostates, who thereon came into the room and place of the most cursed enemies of God and his people. And therefore God will be unto them what he was unto the worst of those his adversaries.

(3.) That which God properly in that place assumeth this title unto himself upon, is the cruelty and rage of those adversaries in the persecution and destruction of his people: and shall he not act in like manner towards them who murdered the Lord Jesus, and persecuted all his followers? Wherefore, whatever frame of mind in God is represented in the Scripture, as unto his indignation against the worst of sinners and his adversaries, is fully applicable unto these degenerate apostates.

2. The *first testimony* in the original is, לִי נִקָּם וְשָׁלַם, “to me vengeance and recompence;” which the apostle renders” by ἔνδικος μισθαποδοσία, to the same purpose. Recompence is the actual exercise of vengeance. Δικὴ, ἐκδίκησις, “vengeance,” is the actual execution of judgment on sinners according unto their desert, without mitigation or mercy. It is an act of judgment; and wherever mention is made of it, God is still proposed as a judge, it being a *just retribution*, on the consideration of the demerit of sin as sin.

(1.) This vengeance God appropriateth the right of unto himself in a peculiar manner, as that which no creature, in its full latitude, hath any

interest 3: See <sup><990></sup>Psalm 94:1, 2. For it respects only *sin in its own formal nature*, as sin against God.

[1.] Though men may inflict punishment on it, yet they do it principally on other accounts. Whatever is of vengeance in punishment is merely an emanation from divine constitution.

[2.] No creature can have the *just measures* of the desert of sin, so as to give it a just and due recompence.

[3.] The power of the creature cannot extend to the *just execution of vengeance*, sin deserving eternal punishment.

[4.] Pure vengeance, as vengeance, is not to be intrusted with our nature; nor would any man be able to manage it, but would fall into one excess or other, unto the ruin of his own soul. Wherefore God hath reserved and included all vengeance unto himself, and all just, final retribution for and unto sin. Although he hath allowed infliction of punishment on offenders, in order unto the government and peace of the world, in magistrates and public persons, yet as unto vengeance, as it denotes giving satisfaction to ourselves in the punishment of others, it is forbidden unto all persons, both private and public. God, in executing vengeance, gives satisfaction unto his own infinite holiness and righteousness; which makes it holy and just. Men cannot give satisfaction unto themselves in punishment but it is unto their evil affections; which makes it useless and unjust. Hence David blessed God that he had kept him from avenging himself on Nabal. For there is no vengeance but what is exerted by a man's self, in his own case and cause: the judgment unto punishment is for others. Wherefore the formal reason of the appropriation of all vengeance unto God is, that God alone can judge and punish in his own case, and unto his own satisfaction. "He hath made all things for himself, and the wicked for the day of evil."

(2.) In this appropriation of vengeance unto God, there is supposed and included that indeed there is vengeance with God, which in due time he will execute: "I will repay, saith the Lord." He doth oftentimes exercise great patience and forbearance, even then when vengeance might justly be expected and is called for: "How long dost thou not avenge our blood?" This commonly adds unto the security of wicked men, and they learn to despise the threatening of all the judgments of God which they have

deserved, <sup><COR></sup>2 Peter 3:3-7; <sup><COR></sup>Ecclesiastes 8:11. They are ready to conclude that either vengeance doth not belong unto God; or that it shall be executed when and where they are not concerned. But in all these cases God hath fixed a determinate time and season for the execution of deserved vengeance. Hence he calls it “the year of vengeance,” and “the day of recompence;” so here, “I will repay it, saith the Lord.”

This being so, God having said that vengeance belongeth unto him, and that it is due unto provoking sins and sinners; that it is in his power, and his alone, to inflict it when and how he pleaseth, and that he will certainly do so, — in the assurance whereof the apostle adds that word, “saith the Lord,” he will repay it; — it evidently follows, that in his appointed season, the day and year of vengeance, such horrible provoking sinners as were those treated of must fall under the most severe punishment, and that for evermore.

The *second testimony*, taken from the same place, is of the same importance with this, “The Lord shall judge his people.” In Deuteronomy it is applied unto such a judgment of them as tends unto their deliverance. But the general truth of the words is, that God is the supreme judge, “he is judge himself,” <sup><COR></sup>Psalms 50:6. This the apostle makes use of, concluding that the righteousness of God, as the supreme judge of all, obligeth him unto this severe destruction of apostates: for “shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” shall not he who is judge in a peculiar manner of those that profess themselves to be his people, punish them for their iniquities, especially such as break off all covenant-relation between him and them.

**Obs. III.** A due consideration of the nature of God, his office, that he is “the judge of all,” especially of his people, and that enclosure he hath made of vengeance unto himself, under an irrevocable purpose for its execution, gives indubitable assurance of the certain, unavoidable destruction of all wilful apostates. All their security, all their presumptions, all their hopes, will vanish before this consideration, as darkness before the light of the sun.

**Obs. IV.** Although those who are the peculiar people of God do stand in many relations unto him that are full of refreshment and comfort, yet is it their duty constantly to remember that he is the holy and righteous judge, even towards his own people.

Lastly, The ground of the application of these testimonies unto the present case, is that knowledge of God which they had unto whom he spoke: “For we know him.” ‘You have the same sense of God, his holiness and truth, as I have; and therefore it cannot be strange unto you that he will deal thus severely with apostates: you know who he is, how infinite in holiness, righteousness, and power; you know what he hath said in cases like unto this, namely, that “vengeance is his, and he will repay:” wherefore it must be evident unto you that these things will be as they are now declared.’

**Obs. V.** The knowledge of God in some good measure, both what he is in himself and what he hath taken on himself to do, is necessary to render either his promises or threatenings effectual unto the minds of men.

**Ver. 31.** — “[*It is*] a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.”

The apostle in these words winds up his whole argument against the wilful despisers of the gospel, taken from the nature and aggravations of that sin, with the severity of the punishment that will certainly befall them that are guilty thereof. And these words are, as an inference from them that go immediately before, so a recapitulation of all that he had spoken to this purpose. ‘Let men look to it, look to themselves, consider what they do; “for it is a fearful thing,” etc.’

There are three things in the words:

1. The description given of God with respect unto the present case; he is “the living God.”
2. The event of their sin with respect unto him; it is a “falling into his hands.”
3. The nature hereof in general, “it is a fearful thing.”

First, In what sense God is called the “living God,” and with respect unto what *ends*, have been declared on <sup>scribd</sup> Hebrews 3:12, 9:14. In brief, this title is ascribed unto God principally on two accounts:

1. By way of opposition unto all dead and dumb idols, those which the heathen worshipped; and which are graphically described by the psalmist, <sup><480></sup>Psalm 115:4-8; as also by the prophet, <sup><240></sup>Isaiah 44:9-11, etc. And,

2. This is to impress upon our minds a due sense of his glory and eternal power, according as we are called to trust in him or to fear him. Life is the foundation of power. He who hath life in himself, who is the cause of all life in all other things that are partakers of it, must be the only spring of infinite power. But God is here called “the living God” with respect unto his eternal power, whereby he is able to avenge the sins of men. Indeed, it calls to mind all the other holy properties of his nature, which are suited to impress dread or terror on the minds of presumptuous sinners; whose punishment is thence demonstrated to be unavoidable. He sees and knows all the evil and malice that are in their sin, and the circumstances of it. He is the “God that liveth and seeth,” <sup><064></sup>Genesis 16:14. And as he seeth, so he judgeth, because he is the living God; which also is the ground of holy trust in him, <sup><001></sup>1 Timothy 4:10.

**Obs. VI.** This name, “the living God,” is full of terror or comfort unto the souls of men.

Secondly, The *event* of the sin spoken against, as unto its demerit, with respect unto God, is called “falling into his hands.” The assertion is general, but is particularly applied unto this case by the apostle. To “fall into the hands,” is a common expression with reference unto any one falling into and under the power of his enemies.

None can be said to fall into the hands of God, as though they were not before in his power. But to fall into the hands of God absolutely, as it is here intended, is to be obnoxious to the power and judgment of God, when and where there is nothing in God himself, nothing in his word, promises, laws, institutions, that should oblige him to mercy or a mitigation of punishment. So when a man falls into the hands of his enemies, between whom and him there is no law, no love, he can expect nothing but death. Such is this falling into the hands of the living God; there is nothing in the law, nothing in the gospel, that can be pleaded for the least abatement of punishment. There is no property of God that can be implored. It is the destruction of the sinner alone whereby they will all be glorified.

There is a falling into the hands of God that respects temporal things only, and that is spoken of comparatively. When David knew that an affliction or temporal punishment was unavoidable, he chose rather to fall into the hands of God as unto the immediate infliction of it, than to have the wrath of men used as the instrument thereof, <sup><del>1</del></sup>2 Samuel 24:14. But this appertains not unto our present purpose.

Thirdly, Hereof the apostle affirms in general, that it is φοβερόν, a “fearful, dreadful thing;” that which no heart can conceive, nor tongue expresa Men are apt to put off thoughts of it, to have slight thoughts about it; but it is, and will be, dreadful, terrible, and eternally destructive of every thing that is good, and inflictive of every thing that is evil, or that our nature is capable of.

**Obs. VII.** There is an apprehension of “the terror of the Lord “ in the final judgment, which is of great use unto the souls of men, <sup><del>1</del></sup>2 Corinthians 5:11. It is so to them who are not yet irrecoverably engaged into the effects of it.

**Obs. VIII.** When there is nothing left but judgment, nothing remains but the expectation of it, its fore-apprehension will be filled with dread and terror.

**Obs. IX.** The dread of the final judgment, where there shall be no mixture of ease, is altogether inexpressible.

**Obs. X.** That man is lost for ever who hath nothing in God that he can appeal unto, nothing in the law or gospel which he can plead for himself; which is the state of all wilful apostates.

**Obs. XI.** Those properties of God which are the principal delight of believers, the chief object, of their faith, hope, and trust, are an eternal spring of dread and terror unto all impenitent sinners: “The living God.”

**Obs. XII.** The glory and horror of the future state of blessedness and misery are inconceivable either to believers or sinners.

**Obs. XIII.** The fear and dread of God, in the description of his wrath, ought continually to be on the hearts of all who profess the gospel.



Herein, by this general assertion, the apostle sums up and closeth his blessed discourse concerning the *greatest sin* that men can make themselves guilty of, and the *greatest punishment* that the righteousness of God will inflict on any sinners. Nor is there any reaching of either part of this divine discourse unto the utmost. When he treats of this sin and its aggravations, no mind is able to search into, no heart is able truly to apprehend the evil and guilt which he chargeth it withal. No one can express or declare the least part of the evil which is comprised in every aggravation which he gives us of this sin. And in like manner concerning the punishment of it, he plainly intimates it shall be accompanied with an incomprehensible severity, dread, and terror. This, therefore, is a passage of holy writ which is much to be considered, especially in these days wherein we live, wherein men are apt to grow cold and careless in their profession, and to decline gradually from what they had attained unto. To be useful in such a season it was first written; and it belongs unto us no less than unto them unto whom it was originally sent. And we live in days wherein the security and contempt of God, the despite of the Lord Christ and his Spirit, are come to the full, so as to justify the truth that we have insisted on.

### VERSES 32-34.

Ἐναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες, πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, τοῦτο μὲν, ὄνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ ζλίψεσι ζεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ, κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων γενηθέντες· Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἄρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς χρεῖττονα ὑπαρξίν ἐνμ οὐρανοῖς, καὶ μένουσαν.<sup>f34</sup>

**Ver. 32-34.** — But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly whilst ye became companions of them that were so used. For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

The words in their coherence, intimated in the adversative **δέ**, “but,” have respect unto the exhortation laid down verse 25. All the verses interposed contain a dehortation from the evil which they are warned of. Hence the apostle returns unto his former exhortation unto the duties recommended unto them, and perseverance therein against all the difficulties which they might meet withal, wherewith others were turned unto destruction. And the present argument which he makes use of unto this purpose is this now mentioned. And there are in the words,

**1.** A direction unto a means useful unto the end of his exhortation: “Call to remembrance the former days.”

**2.** A description of those days which he would have them to call to mind:

**(1.)** From the season of them, and their state therein, “after they were enlightened;”

**(2.)** From what they suffered in them, “a great fight of afflictions,” which are enumerated in sundry instances, verse 33;

**(3.)** From what they did in them, verso 34, with respect unto themselves and others;

**(4.)** From the ground and reason whereon they were carried cheerfully through what they suffered and did, “knowing in yourselves.”

FIRST, There is first the prescription of the *means* of this duty, **ἀναμνησθε**, which we have well rendered, “call to remembrance.” It is not a bare remembrance he intends, for it is impossible men should absolutely forget such a season. Men are apt enough to remember the times of their sufferings, especially such as are here mentioned, accompanied with all sorts of injurious treatment from men. But the apostle would have them so call to mind, as to consider withal what supportment they had under their sufferings, what satisfaction in them, what deliverance from them, that they might not despond upon the approach of the like evils and trials on the same account. If we remember our sufferings only as unto what is evil and afflictive in them, what we lose, what we endure and undergo; such a remembrance will weaken and dispirit us, as unto our future trials. Hereon many cast about to deliver themselves for the future by undue means and sinful compliances, in a

desertion of their profession; the thing the apostle was jealous of concerning these Hebrews But if withal we call to mind what was the cause for which we suffered, the honor that is in such sufferings outbalancing all the contempt and reproaches of the world; the presence of God enjoyed in them; and the reward proposed unto us: the calling them to mind will greatly strengthen us against future trials; provided we retain the same love unto and valuation of the things for which we suffered as we had in those former days. And these various events we find exemplified every day. Some who have endured trials, and come off from them, do grow immediately more wary, as they suppose, and more cold really as unto the causes of their sufferings. The remembrance of what was afflictive in their trials fills them with fear of the like exercise again. Hence they grow timorous and cautious as to all duties of religion and the worship of God, which may expose them unto new sufferings: and then some of them by degrees fall absolutely off from attendance unto them; as it was with some of these Hebrews. Such as these call to mind only that which is evil and afflictive in their sufferings; and taking the measure thereof in the counsel or representation made of it by flesh and blood, it proves unto their damage, and oftentimes unto their eternal ruin. Others who call to mind, with their sufferings, the causes of them, and the presence of God with them therein, are encouraged, emboldened, and strengthened unto duty with zeal and constancy.

**Obs. I.** A wise management of former experiences is a great direction and encouragement unto future obedience.

Secondly, As to the *object* of this duty, the apostle so expresseth it, “Call to mind the former days.” It is uncertain what times or seasons the apostle doth peculiarly intend. Besides those continual hazards they were in from their adversaries, and the occasional sufferings that they were exposed unto, they seem to have had some special seasons of persecution before the writing of this epistle. The first was in the stoning of Stephen, when a great persecution rose against all the church, and extended itself unto all the churches of Christ in that nation; wherein our holy apostle himself was highly concerned, ~~4RE~~ Acts 8:1, 9:1, 22:19, 26:10, 11. And the other was on the occasion of this apostle himself; for upon his last coming to Jerusalem, after his great successes in preaching the gospel among the Gentiles, the whole body of the people was filled with rage and madness against him

and all the other disciples. There is no doubt, although express mention be not made of it, but that at that time the rage and cruelty of the priests and the multitude did put forth themselves unto a general persecution of the church. And this season he seems to reflect upon in particular, because he mentions his own bonds at that time, and their compassion on him.

However, certain it is that all the churches of Judea had suffered those things here mentioned from their countrymen, as the apostle himself declares, <sup><SIB4></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:14. At this present time they seem to have had some outward peace. The occasion whereof was the tumults and disorders which were then growing in their whole nation. Their own intestine discords, and the fear of outward enemies, by which they were shortly utterly destroyed, diverted them from prosecuting their rage for a season against the church. And it may be some began to grow careless and secure hereon; as we are generally apt to do, supposing that all will be serene when one or another storm is over. These, therefore, the apostle doth press unto such a remembrance of former trials as might prepare for those they were to expect; for, as he tells them, they had still “need of patience,” verse 36.

SECONDLY, There is a description of those “former days,” —

First, From *their state and condition* in them, — “the days in which they were enlightened,” or rather, “in which having been enlightened” The mention of this their illumination being in a tense of the time past, manifests that their enlightening did precede those days of their sufferings. But yet the expression is such as argues a nearer conjunction or concurrence between these two things, their illumination and these days of affliction; the one followed as it were immediately on the other? This enlightening was that work of God’s grace mentioned <sup><SIB3></sup>1 Peter 2:9, their “translation out of darkness into his marvellous light.” They were naturally blind, as are all men; and peculiarly blinded with prejudices against the truth of the gospel. Therefore when God by his effectual call delivered them out of that state of darkness, by the renovation of their understandings, and the removal of their prejudices, the light of the knowledge of God shining into their hearts is this illumination, — the saving, sanctifying light which they received at their first effectual call, and conversion to God. This spiritual change was presently followed with days of affliction, trouble, and persecution. In itself it is, for the most part,

accompanied with joy, delight, zeal, and vigorous actings of faith and love, ~~1~~ 1 Peter 1:8. For,

1. God did usually grant unto believers some *secret pledge and sealing* of his Spirit, which filled them with joy and zeal, ~~1~~ Ephesians 1:13.
2. Their *own hearts* are exceedingly affected with the excellency, glory, and beauty of the things revealed unto them, of what they now see perfectly, whereunto they were before in darkness; that is, the love and grace of Christ Jesus in the revelation of himself unto them.
3. All graces are *new and fresh*, not yet burdened, Clogged, or wearied by temptations, but are active in their several places. Hence frequent mention is made of and commendation given unto the “first love” of persons and churches.

This was the state and condition of those Hebrews when the days of trial and affliction came upon them; it was immediately after their first conversion unto God. And it is usual with God thus to deal with his people in all ages. He no sooner calls persons to himself, but he leads them into the wilderness. He no sooner plants them, but he shakes them with storms, that they may be more firmly rooted. He doth it,

1. Utterly to *take off their expectations from this world*, or any thing therein. They shall find that they are so far from bettering their outward estate in this world by cleaving unto Christ and the church, as that the whole rage of it will be stirred up against them upon that account, and all the things enjoyed in it be exposed unto ruin. This the Lord Christ everywhere warned his disciples of, affirming that those who are not willing to renounce the world, and to take up the cross, do not belong unto him.

2. For *the trial of their faith*, ~~1~~ 1 Peter 1:6, 7,

3. For *the glory and propagation of the gospel*.

4. For *the exercise of all graces*.

5. To *breed us up into the military discipline of Christ*, as he is the captain of our salvation. They who pass through their first trials, are Christ’s veterans on new attempts.

**Obs. II.** All men by nature are darkness, and in darkness.

**Obs. III.** Saving illumination is the first-fruit of effectual vocation.

**Obs. IV.** Spiritual light in its first communication puts the soul on the diligent exercise of all graces.

**Obs. V.** It is suited unto the wisdom and goodness of God, to suffer persons on their first conversion to fall into manifold trials and temptations.

This was the state of the Hebrews in those days which the apostle would have them “call to mind.” But the words have respect unto what follows immediately, “Which ye endured.” The description of their state and condition, namely, that they were enlightened, is interposed for the ends we have spoken unto. Wherefore the season he would have them call to remembrance is described, —

Secondly, By what they *suffered* therein. This, as was observed, he expresseth two ways: first, In general; secondly, In particular instances. The *first* is in these words, “Ye endured a great fight of afflictions.”

1. That which he would have them to mind is “affliction.”
2. The aggravation of it, it was “a great fight of afflictions.”
3. Their deportment under it, in that they “endured them.”

1. We render this word by “afflictions,” although, by the particulars mentioned afterwards, it appears it was “persecutions” from men that the apostle only intended.

And if we take “afflictions” in the ordinary sense of the word, for chastisements, corrections, and trials from God, it is true that men’s persecutions are also God’s afflictions, with the special end of them in our trials; we are “chastened of the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world.” God used them as his furnace and fining pot, “for the trial of their faith; which is more precious than gold.” And under all persecutions we are to have a special regard unto the immediate hand of God in such afflictive trials. This will keep us humble, and in a constant subjection of our souls unto God, as the apostle declares, Hebrews 12: But the word in the original is *παθήματα*, which is properly “sufferings;” — the same

word that the apostle useth to express the sufferings of Christ, <sup><320></sup>Hebrews 2:10, 5:8. It is a general name for every thing that is hard and afflictive unto our nature, from what cause or occasion soever it doth arise. Even what wicked men undergo justly for their crimes is what they suffer, as well as what believers undergo for the truth and profession of the gospel. Materially they are the same, <sup><4044></sup>1 Peter 4:14-16. It is therefore the general name of all the evils, troubles, hardships, distresses, that may befall men upon the account of their profession of the truth of the gospel. This is that which we are called unto, which we are not to think strange of. Our LORD Jesus requires of all his disciples that they “take up their cross;” to be in a continual readiness to bear it, and actually so to do as they are called. And there is no kind of suffering but is included in the cross. He calls us, indeed, unto his eternal glory; but we must suffer with him, if we desire to reign also with him.

**2.** Of these trials, afflictions, persecutions, they had *πολλήν ἄθλησιν*. That labor and contention of spirit which they had in their profession, with sin and sufferings, is expressed by these words; which set forth the greatest, most earnest, vehement actings and endeavors of spirit that our nature can arise unto. It is expressed by *ἄθλησις* in this place, and by *ἀγών*, <sup><5040></sup>2 Timothy 4:7, *Ἀγωνίζομαι, ἀνταγωνίζομαι*. See <sup><5040></sup>2 Timothy 2:5; <sup><4025></sup>1 Corinthians 9:25. The allusion is taken from their striving, wrestling, fighting, who contended publicly for a prize, victory, and reward, with the glory and honor attending it. The customs of the nations as then observed are frequently alluded unto in the New Testament. Now there was never any way of life wherein men voluntarily or of their own accord engaged themselves into such hardships, difficulties, and dangers, as that, when they contended in their games and strivings for mastery. Their preparation for it was a “universal temperance,” as the apostle declares, <sup><4025></sup>1 Corinthians 9:25, and an abstinence from all sensual pleasures; wherein they offered no small violence unto their natural inclinations and lusts. In the conflicts themselves, in wrestling and fighting, with the like dangerous exercises in skill and strength, they endured all pains, sometimes death itself. And if they failed, or gave over through weariness, they lost the whole reward that lay before them. And with words which signify all this contest, doth the Holy Ghost express the fight or contention which believers have with sufferings. There is a reward

proposed unto all such persons in the promises of the gospel, infinitely above all the crowns, honors, and rewards proposed unto them in the Olympic games. No man is compelled to enter into the way or course of obtaining it, but they must make it an act of their own wills and choice; but unto the obtaining of it they must undergo a great strife, contention, and dangerous conflict. In order hereunto three things are required:

- (1.) That they *prepare* themselves for it, <sup><4025></sup>1 Corinthians 9:25. Self-denial and readiness for the cross, contempt of the world and the enjoyments of it, are this preparation; without this we shall never be able to go through with this conflict.
  - (2.) A *vigorous acting of all graces* in the conflict itself, in opposition unto and destruction of our spiritual and worldly adversaries, <sup><4100></sup>Ephesians 6:10-18; <sup><8100></sup>Hebrews 12:3. He could never prevail nor overcome in the public contests of old who did not strive mightily, putting forth his strength and skill both to preserve himself and oppose his enemy. Nor is it possible that we should go successfully through with our conflict, unless we stir up all graces, as faith, hope, trust, unto their most vigorous exercise.
  - (3.) That we *endure the hardship* and the evils of the conflict with patience and perseverance; which is that the apostle here specially intends.
- 3.** This is that which he commends in the Hebrews, with respect unto their first trials and sufferings, *ὑπεμείνατε*, “ye endured,” and bare patiently, so as not to faint or despond, or to turn away from your profession.’ They came off conquerors, having failed in no point of their conflict. This is that which they were called unto, that which God by his grace enabled them to, and through which they had that success which the apostle would have them to “call to remembrance,” that they might be strengthened and encouraged unto what yet remained of the same kind. This hath been the lot and portion of sincere professors of the gospel in most ages. And we are not to think it a strange thing if it come to be ours in a higher degree than what as yet we have had experience of. How many ways God is glorified in the sufferings of his people, what advantages they receive thereby, the prevailing testimony that is given thereby unto the truth and honor of the gospel, are commonly spoken to, and therefore shall not be insisted on.



**Ver. 33.** — “Partly whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly whilst ye became companions of them that were so used.”

*Secondly*, Having mentioned their sufferings and their deportment under them in general, he distributes them into two heads in this verse. The first is what immediately concerned their own persons; and the second, their concernment in the sufferings of others, and their participations of them. This distribution is expressed by *τοῦτο μὲν* and *τοῦτο δέ*, “on this hand, and on that.” The whole of their sufferings was made up of various parts, many things concurred thereunto; they did not consist in any one trouble or affliction, ‘but a confluence of many of various sorts did meet in them. And this, indeed, is for the most part the greatest difficulty in sufferings: many of them come at once upon us, so that we shall have no rest from their assaults. For it is the design of Satan and the world on these occasions to destroy both soul and body; and unto that end he will assault us inwardly by temptations and fears, outwardly in our names and reputations, and all that we are or have. But he that knows how to account all such things “but loss and dung, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus,” is prepared for them all.

**1.** What refers unto the first part is their suffering in their own persons; and herein he declares both what they suffered, and the manner how. That which they suffered was “reproaches and afflictions;” and for the manner of it, “they were made a gazing-stock” unto other men.

**(1.)** The first thing wherein they suffered was “reproaches,” *ὀνειδισμοῖς*, — a great aggravation of sufferings unto ingenuous minds. The psalmist, in the person of the Lord Christ himself, complains that “reproach had broken his heart,” <sup>208</sup>Psalm 69:20; and elsewhere frequently he complaineth of it as one of the greatest evils he had to conflict withal. It is that kind of reproach which proceeds from malicious hatred, and is accompanied with contempt and scorn, and vents itself in all manner of obloquies or hard speeches, such as those mentioned <sup>209</sup>Jude 1:15. And the nature of it is fully declared by the prophet Jeremiah, <sup>208</sup>Jeremiah 20:8-10. And there are two branches of reproaches:

**[1.]** False accusations, or charging of men with things vile and contemptible, such as will expose them unto public scorn and rage: “They

shall say all manner of evil against you falsely;” “They speak evil of you, as of evil-doers.” So they reproached the person of Jesus Christ himself. They said he was “a malefactor, an evil-doer, a seditious person, a glutton, a wine-bibber, a seducer, one that had a devil;” and thereby stirred up the rage, hatred, and contempt of the people against him. So they reproached the primitive Christians among the Pagans, namely, that they were atheists, confederating themselves for adultery, incest, murder, and sedition; under which notion they slaughtered them as beasts of the field. And the like reproaches have been cast on the professors of the gospel in all ages.

**[2.]** Those reproaches consist in the contempt that is cast upon what is true, and what in itself is holy, just, good, and praiseworthy. They reproached them with their faith in Christ, with their worship of him, in owning his authority. This in itself was their honor and their crown. But as it was managed with hatred and blasphemy, as it was confirmed by the common consent of all, as it received strength and countenance from their sutterings, wherein they esteemed them punished for their sins and impieties, it added unto their distress. For men thus to be traduced, aspersed, and charged, partly with things infamous, base, vile; partly by contempt and scorn cast on what they do own and profess; by their friends, neighbors, relations, and the multitude of the people; in order to their further hurt and ruin, that they may be looked on and judged as persons meet to be destroyed, not suffered to live on the face of the earth: it is a great suffering, and difficultly to be endured and undergone. Therefore all those that make profession of the name of Christ and the gospel ought to look and provide for such things.

**[1.]** Take heed of so much softness and tenderness of nature, that may give too deep a sense of reproach, scorn, and shame, which may give too deep an entrance unto these things into your minds; being such as will weaken them in their duties. This ordinarily is a frame and disposition of mind that lies at the next door to virtue, to modesty, to humility, and the like; but in this case it lies at the next door to diffidence, despondency, and carnal fear. We are in this case to harden our countenances, and to set our faces as a flint and adamant, so as to despise all reproaches and scorns on the account of our profession.

[2.] It is required that we do not put too much value on our names and reputations in the world. “A good name is better than precious ointment,” it yields a good savor; but it is so only with these two limitations: 1st. That it be obtained by things that are really good and praiseworthy; for some have made their names famous and acceptable to the multitude by ways and actions that have really nothing praiseworthy in them. And, 2dly. That they be good men who esteem their name to be good. “Laudari volo,” said one; “sod a viro laudato.” To have a good report amongst an evil multitude is of no advantage. Yet are some men very tender herein: they would be praised and spoken well of by the many; at least they would not be spoken evilly or contemptuously of. But if we have not an under-valuation of our names and reputations universally, in respect unto Christ and the gospel, if we are not contented to be made “as the filth and offscouring of all things,” it will greatly disadvantage us in the time of sufferings. And therefore in the providence of God frequently it falls out, that if there be any thing that is unto us as the apple of our eye, of all we should be tender of our names and reputations in, this shall he peculiarly attempted and reproached.

[3.] That they do not think that any new thing befalls them when they are reproached; no, not when the reproaches are new, and such as never were cast on any that went before them; for the stores of reproaches and false accusations in the treasury of Satan and hearts of wicked men will never be exhausted.

[4.] Know that where reproach goes before, persecution will follow after, in the course of the world. It thunders in reproaches, and falls in a storm of persecution. These sufferings consisted in afflictions; these afflictions did partly ensue upon and partly accompany these reproaches. For those who endeavor to bring men under contempt by reproaches, will not fail to reproach them under their sufferings. Therefore do we render the particle  $\delta\epsilon$  by “both,” referring both the “reproaches” and “afflictions” unto their being made “a gazing-stock.” And the word is of a large signification, denoting every thing that is evil and grievous to us in any kind. But as it is distinguished from “reproaches,” it denotes suffering in their persons or enjoyments; an instance whereof he gives in the next verse, in the “spoiling of their goods.”

(2.) The manner of their suffering of these things: it is said “they were made a gazing-stock,” — **ζεατριζόμενοι**. It is properly spoken of them who were brought on the public stage or theater in any city, and there exposed unto all sorts of evils and punishments And it was the way of the highest and most capital punishment. For when guilty persons were east unto beasts to be devoured, it was in the theater, where they were made a spectacle unto the people, or a “gazing-stock.” But the apostle limits the suffering of the Hebrews unto “reproaches and afflictions;” they had not yet “resisted unto blood.” So at Ephesus they drew Gaius and Aristarchus into the theater, with an intention to destroy them, <sup><40B></sup>Acts 19:29.

But yet neither doth it necessarily follow that those spoken of were actually or solemnly carried into any theater, there to be reproached, then destroyed. But because the theater was the place where persons were publicly exposed to be looked upon with scorn and contempt, the word **ζεατρίζομαι** is used to signify men’s being so exposed and made a spectacle, in any place, on any occasion. And this is the meaning of the phrase used by the apostle, <sup><40B></sup>1 Corinthians 4:9. No more is required hereunto but that they were publicly, and in the sight of all that had occasion or opportunity to behold them, exposed unto these things. So was it with them, when they haled men and women out of their meetings; who being dragged or driven in the streets, were committed some of them into prisons, <sup><40B></sup>Acts 8:3: then were they loaded with all manner of reproaches, and made a gazing-stock to all that were about them. This way and manner of their suffering was a great addition to it and an aggravation of it. It requireth excellent actings of faith and spiritual courage to carry ingenuous persons above this public contest. But their cause and their Example were sufficient to support them, and enable them unto this duty.

**Obs. VI.** All temporary sufferings, in all their aggravating circumstances, in their most dreadful preparation, dress, and appearance, are but light things in comparison of the gospel and the promises thereof.

**Obs. VII.** There is not any thing in the whole nature of temporary sufferings, or any circumstance of them, that we can claim an exemption from, after we have undertaken the profession of the gospel.

This was the first part of the contention with sufferings which those Hebrews had undergone.

**2.** The other part of their sufferings was, that “they became the companions of them that were so used.” They not only suffered in themselves, in what they gave occasion unto by their own profession of the gospel, and practice of its worship, but also came into a fellowship of sufferings with them that were so used as they were. And we may consider,

**(1.)** Who those were that were so used.

**(2.)** How they became their companions in that condition.

**(1.)** Τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων. The word signifies the way, manner, and course of our conversation in the world. And in that sense the sufferings of these persons is included as the effect in the cause. They so walked in the world as to be exposed to sufferings, We take the word in a passive sense, and render it “so used,” — ‘used after the same manner which you were.’ It is also used for “to be tossed, overturned, oppressed;” which is the sense of it in this place. But the apostle writing unto the whole church of the Hebrews, we may inquire who they were who were used in this manner with them; for they seem to be distinguished from them unto whom he wrote. And,

**[1.]** It is not impossible but the apostle might have respect unto those that were sober and moderate amongst the Jews themselves. For things were now come unto that confusion in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, that all such persons were continually exposed unto the violence and rage of robbers, oppressors, and seditious villains. The Christians, being of the same conversation with them, were not known by the multitude, nor distinguished from them. It is not therefore unlikely that they might suffer with them in those public violences; which being not immediately for the profession of the gospel, they are said in what they so underwent, to be “made the companions” of others. Or,

**[2.]** Respect may be had unto the sufferings of Christians in other places up and down the world, which they heard of, and were in no small measure affected with. But this was not peculiar unto the church of the Hebrews, and so not likely to be peculiarly ascribed unto them. Or,

**[3.]** It may be respect is had unto some that had suffered amongst themselves at Jerusalem, or in other places of Judea, who were their

countrymen, yet belonged not unto the stated church of Christ in the place unto which he wrote at present. And this hath countenance given it from the next verse, where it seems to be given as an instance of their being made companions of them that suffered, in that they had compassion of the apostle himself in his bonds, and such was the condition of others.

But I am rather inclined unto a double distribution of things and persons in the text, both included in the **τοῦτο μὲν** and the **τοῦτο δέ**. That of things is actual suffering, and a participation of the sufferings of others. That of persons is this, that all those unto whom he wrote did not actually in their own persons suffer the things which he speaks of, but some of them did so suffer, and the rest of them were companions with them that did so suffer. And for the most part it so falls out in the fiercest persecution of the gospel. All *individual* persons are not called forth unto the same actual sufferings; some in the providence of God, and through the rage of men, are singled out for trials; some are hid or do escape, at least for a season, and it may be are reserved for the same trials at another time. So it may be said of the *whole church*, that they “endured a great fight of afflictions,” while some of them were “a gazing-stock,” etc., and others of them “*were* companions of them that were so used.”

**Obs. VIII.** It is reserved unto the sovereign pleasure of God to measure out unto all professors of the gospel their especial lot and portion as unto trials and sufferings, so as that none ought to complain, none to envy one another.

(2.) Hence it appears in what sense those who suffered not in their own persons were made companions of them who did so, whereby the whole church partook of the same troubles. **Κοινωνοὶ γενηθέντες:**

[1.] They were made so by their *common interest* in the same cause for which they suffered;

[2.] By their *apprehension* that the same sufferings would reach unto themselves, seeing there was the same cause in them as in others;

[3.] By their *sorrow, trouble, and compassion*, for the suffering of the members of the same Head and body with them;

[4.] By *all duties of love and affection* which they discharged in owning and visiting of them;

[5.] By the *communication of their goods* and outward enjoyments unto them, who had suffered the loss of their own: so were they made their companions.

**Ver. 34.** — “For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.”

Thirdly, Having distributed the **παθήματα** of believers into two heads; 1. What they underwent, some of them at least, in their *own persons*; and, 2. What befell them with respect unto *others* suffering in the same cause with themselves; in this verse the apostle gives an especial instance of each kind, only he inverts the order wherein he had before laid them down. For whereas he first mentioned what they suffered in themselves, and then what they accompanied others in, here he insisteth on the latter of them in the first place, “they had compassion of him in his bonds;” and of the former in the second place, “and took joyfully the *spoiling* of their goods.” But he adds unto both the frame of their minds in what they did and suffered: as unto others, they were their “companions” in sympathy and compassion; and as unto their own losses, “they them took joyfully.”

Of the *first* the apostle gives, 1. An instance in himself, “Ye had compassion of me in my bonds.” And this he affirms as a proof and confirmation of what he had spoken before concerning their being made companions of them that suffered. This is expressed in the introductive particles **καὶ γάρ**, “for even you had,” as for example’s sake.’ I have proved before the apostle Paul was the author of this epistle, and this very passage is sufficient to confirm it. For who else could there be whose bonds for the gospel were so known, so famous among the believers of the Jews, as his own? For the other persons whom some would needs fancy to be writers of this epistle, as Luke, Barnabas, and Clemens, there is nothing in the Scripture or ecclesiastical story of any of their bonds in Judea, whereof it is plain that he here speaketh. But the sufferings of our apostle in this kind of bonds and imprisonment were peculiar above any other apostle’s whatsoever. Hence he styles himself in particular, <sup>ROM</sup> Philemon 1, the “bondman for Christ;” and gloried in his bonds as his

peculiar honor, <sup>403</sup>Acts 26:29. “An ambassador in bonds,” <sup>461</sup>Ephesians 6:20. So <sup>500</sup>Philippians 1:7, 12-16; <sup>504</sup>Colossians 4:3, which he desired the church to remember him in, <sup>501</sup>Hebrews 4:18; <sup>511</sup>2 Timothy 2:9.

Wherefore, his bonds being singularly and above all others so known, so famous, so useful, such a subject of the church’s prayers, and of their faith, having been begun and long continued among those Hebrews, and being spoken of by him as a matter known unto them all, it is unreasonable to suppose that any other is intended.

**Obs. IX.** Of what sort or kind the sufferings of any that God employs in the ministry of the gospel shall be, is in his sovereign disposal alone. — And in this apostle, unto whom, as being the apostle of the Gentiles, God had designed more work, and travelling up and down the world, than unto any of the others, it may be unto them all; yet God was pleased that much of his time should be spent in bonds and imprisonments. But although the principal reason hereof must be left hid in the wisdom and sovereign good pleasure of God, yet we may see that two inestimable advantages did redound unto the church thereby. For,

(1.) His bonds being first at Jerusalem, and afterwards at Rome, as <sup>421</sup>Acts 23:11, the two capital cities and seats of the Jews and Gentiles, and he being called out to plead the cause of the gospel openly and publicly, the report of it was carded all the world over, and occasion given unto all sorts of men to inquire what it was that a man remote from the suspicion of any crime did suffer such things for. I no way doubt but that multitudes by this means were brought to make inquiry after and into the doctrine of the gospel, which otherwise would have taken no notice of it. See <sup>501</sup>Philippians 1:12-16. And,

(2.) During his confinement under those bonds, the Holy Ghost was pleased to make use of him in writing sundry of those blessed epistles which have been the light and glory of the gospel in all ages. Wherefore, let every one of us be content and rejoice in what way soever God shall be pleased to call us to suffer for the truth of the gospel For although it may seem outwardly to be of the greatest advantage thereunto, which is the only thing we would desire, that we might enjoy our liberty, yet God can and will make them subservient unto his own glory; wherein we ought to acquiesce.



**2.** He expresseth the concernment of these Hebrews in those bonds of his: **συνεπαθήσατε**, they suffered together with him therein. They were not unconcerned in his sufferings, as being satisfied with their own freedom, as is the manner of some. Now, compassion consists in these things.

**(1.)** A *real condolency*, grief, and trouble of mind, for the bonds of others, as if we ourselves were bound.

**(2.)** *Continual prayers* for their relief, supportment, and deliverance; as it was with the church in the case of Peter in his bonds, Acts 12:

**(3.)** A *ministration unto them*, as unto the things that may be outwardly wanting; as many did to Paul, <sup><5102></sup>Acts 24:23.

**(4.)** The *owning and avowing of them*, as not being ashamed of their chains, bonds, or sufferings, <sup><5116></sup>2 Timothy 1:16, 17.

**(5.)** A *readiness to undergo hazards, difficulties, and dangers*, for them who are called thereunto, <sup><5104></sup>Romans 16:4. It is not a heartless, fruitless, ineffectual pity that the apostle intends, but such a frame of mind as hath a real concernment in the sufferings of others, and is operative in these and the like duties towards their good. These things are required in us towards all those who suffer for the gospel, according as we have opportunity for their exercise. Where this is wanting, we can have no solid evidence of our being one with them in the same mystical body. The remembrance of this frame, and the discharge of all those duties towards them who have suffered, are of singular use to prepare our minds for, and to confirm our hearts in our own sufferings, when they do approach.

*Secondly*, He minds them of their deportment under their own sufferings: “they took joyfully.”

**1.** That which they suffered in was their **μάρχοντα**, “their outward substance,” and present enjoyments. It is extended unto houses, lands, possessions, whatever rightfully belongs unto men and is enjoyed by them. But it is especially applied unto things of present use, as the goods of a man’s house, his money, corn, or cattle, which are more subject to present rapine and spoil than other real possessions, lands or inheritances. These are the things of men’s present supportment, without which ordinarily they cannot live nor subsist. And therefore, in persecutions, the

enemies of the gospel do usually fall on these in the first place; as supposing that the loss of them will reduce their owners unto all sorts of extremity, especially when they have no pretense or warranty as yet to destroy their persona They will take from them the bread that they should eat, the clothes that they should wear, the beds whereon they should lie, — whatever is of use unto them and their families And this must needs be a sore trial unto men, when not only themselves, but their relations also, their wives and children, some perhaps in their infant age, are reduced unto all extremities.

**2.** The way whereby they were deprived of their goods was **ἀρπαγή**, — it was by “rapine and spoil.” What pretense of law or constitution of the rulers they who did it had for what they did, I know not, but the way of execution was with savage rapine and spoil, as the word signifies They violently tare away from them what they did enjoy: not aiming to take all the spoil merely unto their own advantage, — wherewith yet the minds of some cursed enemies are influenced, — but at the satisfaction of their rage and malice in the ruin of the saints of Christ. This, it seems, had been the state of things with these Hebrews, which had now passed over for that season, but in all probability would quickly again return, as the warning here given them by the apostle did plainly intimate. And it is the way of the world in such persecutions, after they have vented their rage and malice for a while, and satisfied themselves with their own cruelty, to give over until some new cause, pretense, or new instigation of the devil, sets them at work again.

**3.** The frame of mind in the Hebrews as unto this part of their suffering is, that they took their losses and spoils “with joy.” Nothing doth usually more affect the minds of men than the sudden spoiling of their goods, what they have labored for, what they have use for, what they have provided for themselves and their families. We see in ordinary cases what wailings and lamentations do accompany such occasions. But these Hebrews received and accepted of this rapine of their goods, not only patiently and cheerfully, but with a certain peculiar joy.

**4.** The ground hereof the apostle declares in the close of this verse, “Knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.”

Some copies of the original, and some ancient translations, as the Vulgar Latin, read the words οὐρανοῖς. And I suppose the difference arose from the order of the words in the text, or the placing of ἐν ἑαυτοῖς not immediately after γινώσκοντες, but interposing ἔχειν between them. Hence the words may be rendered as we do, “knowing in yourselves that ye have a better substance;” or as they lie in the original, “knowing that ye have a better substance in yourselves.” In this latter way it is evident that there is no place for that addition, “in heaven,” which is necessary in the former. For it is not proper to say, “knowing that ye have in yourselves in heaven;” though it be most proper to say, “knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven.” I confess I should absolutely embrace the latter reading, “knowing that ye have in yourselves,” and so leave out that, “in heaven,” for evident reasons, did not the authority of the most ancient copies and translations of the best note require the retaining of it. However, I shall open the words according to both readings.

(1.) “Knowing that we have in ourselves.” The things which they had lost were their “goods,” or their “substance,” as they are called, <sup><D95></sup>Luke 15:13. Unto these he opposeth the “substance;” which of what nature it is he declares in comparison with those other goods. Those other “goods” were so theirs as that they were without them, things liable unto rapine and spoil, — such as they might be, such as they were deprived of; men could and men did take them away. But this “substance” is “in themselves,” which none could take away from them, none could spoil them of. Such is the peace and joy that our Lord Jesus Christ gives unto his church here below, <sup><B10></sup>John 14:27, 16:22. And if the “substance” here intended be that which was “in themselves,” in opposition unto those external “goods,” which they might be and were deprived of; then it is that subsistence in the soul and unto the experience of believers which faith gives unto the grace and love of God in Christ Jesus, with all the consequents of it here and for evermore. This is that which comforts believers under all their troubles; this fills them with “joy unspeakable and full of glory,” even in their sufferings. This will make them to “take joyfully the spoiling of their goods,” when they lay it in the balance against them. In this sense γινώσκοντες expresseth an assurance arising from experience, as the word is often used. They knew they had it in themselves, from the powerful experience which faith gave them of it. So the whole of it is

intended and at large explained by the apostle, <sup>651</sup>Romans 5:1-5. Faith gives us justification before God, access unto him, and acceptance with him; and therewithal gives joy and rejoicing unto the soul And this it doth in an especial manner under tribulations and sufferings, enabling men to “take joyfully the spoiling of their goods;” for it stirreth up all graces in such a condition unto their due exercise, issuing in a blessed experience of the excellency of the love of God, and of his glory in Christ, with a firm and stable hope of future glory. Yea, and by these things doth the Holy Ghost shed abroad the love of God in our hearts; which will give joy in any condition. And this “substance” hath both the qualifications here assigned unto it.

[1.] It is **κρείττων**, “better,” “more excellent,” incomparably so, than the outward goods that are subject to rapine and spoil. And,

[2.] It is **μένουσα**, “abiding,” — that which will not leave them in whom it is, can never be taken from them. “My joy shall no man take from you.”

**Obs. X.** Faith giving an experience of the excellency of the love of God in Christ, and of the grace received thereby, with its incomparable preference above all outward, perishing things, will give joy and satisfaction in the loss of them all, upon the account of an interest in these better things.

(2.) If we follow the ordinary reading, and retain those words, “in heaven,” the whole must be somewhat otherwise expounded; for it is not the grace of faith, but hope, that is expressed. And, —

[1.] That expression, “knowing in yourselves,” declares the evidence they had o! the grounds whereon they rejoiced in the spoiling of their goods It was manifest and evident unto themselves. The world looked on them under another notion. They took them and declared them to be persons who deserved all manner of evil in this world, and such as would perish for ever in that which is to come. So they did to Christ himself, when they reproached him with his trust in God when he was on the cross. In this case the apostle doth not direct them unto any outward defense of themselves, but only unto the uncontrollable evidence which they had in themselves of future glory. And this they had,

**1st.** From the promises of Christ;

**2dly.** From the testimony and witness of the Holy Ghost

**3dly.** From the experience which they had of the beginnings and first-fruits of this glory in themselves.

Faith in and by these means will give an infallible evidence of heavenly things, secure against all opposition; and in all these things it works by hope, because it respects things that are future.

[2.] This “substance” is said to be “in heaven.” It is there prepared, there laid up, there to be enjoyed. Wherefore it compriseth the whole of the future state of blessedness. And it is well called “substance,” as it is also “riches,” and an “inheritance,” and a “weight of glory;” for in comparison of it, all other things temporary have no substance in them.

[3.] They are said ἔχειν, to “have” this substance; not in present possession, but in right, title, and evidence. They knew in themselves that they had an undeniable title unto it, which none could deprive them of, but that they should certainly enjoy it in the appointed season. Wherefore they are said to “have” it,

**1st.** Because it is prepared for them in the will, pleasure, and grace of God. “It is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”

**2dly.** Because it is purchased for them by the blood of Christ; he hath “purchased,” or “obtained eternal redemption.”

**3dly.** It is promised unto them in the gospel.

**4thly.** It is secured for them in the intercession of Christ.

**5thly.** Granted unto them in the first-fruits.

**6thly.** All this is confirmed unto them by the oath of God. The first-fruits they had in possession and use, the whole in right and title; and continual application of it was made unto their souls by the hope which will not make ashamed.

[4.] How this “substance” is “better” than outward enjoyments, and “abiding,” needs not to be explained, they are things in themselves so plain and evident.

This twofold interpretation of the words is so far coincident and agreeing in the same sense in general, that we may draw our observations from both or either of them; as, —

**Obs. XI.** It is the glory of the gospel, that it will on a just account, from a sense of an interest in it, give satisfaction and joy unto the souls of men in the worst of sufferings for it.

**Obs. XII.** It is our duty to take care that we be not surprised with outward sufferings, when we are in the dark as unto our interest in these things. — This may often fall out through our carelessness, negligence, and want of keeping our garments about us in our walk before God: they rejoiced, as knowing they had in themselves; which otherwise they could not have done.

**Obs. XIII.** Internal evidences of the beginnings of glory in grace, a sense of God's love, and assured pledges of our adoption, will give insuperable joy unto the minds of men under the greatest outward sufferings.

**Obs. XIV.** It is our interest in this world, as well as with respect unto eternity, to preserve our evidences for heaven clear and unstained, so that we may “know in ourselves;” which is the ground of this great duty.

**Obs. XV.** There is a “substance” in spiritual and eternal things, whereunto faith gives a subsistence in the souls of believers. See <sup>810</sup>Hebrews 11:1.

**Obs. XVI.** There is no rule of proportion between eternal and temporal things. Hence the enjoyment of the one will give joy in the loss of the other.

### VERSES 35, 36.

Μὴ ἀποζάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἔχει  
μισθυποδοσίαν μεγάλην ὥσμονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν· ἵνα τὸ  
ζέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες, κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.

**Ver. 35, 36.** — Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompence of reward. For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.

In these two verses there is an inference from his former argument, and a confirmation of it from the necessity of what is required thereunto. The first is in verse 35, wherein the apostle gives us the peculiar design, use, and force of the preceding exhortation unto the consideration of what they had suffered in and for the profession of the gospel. And there are in the words,

1. A *note of inference* from the foregoing discourse, οὖν, “therefore.”
2. A *grace and duty* which in this inference he exhorts them to retain; and that is παρρησίαν.
3. The *manner of their retaining it*; “cast not away.”
4. The *reason* of the exhortation not to cast it away; because “it hath great recompence of reward.”

1. The inference is plain: ‘Seeing you have suffered so many things in your persons and goods, seeing God by the power of his grace bath carried you through with satisfaction and joy, do not now despond and faint upon the approach of the same difficulties, or those of a like nature.’ The especial force of the inference the words themselves do declare.

2. That which he exhorts them thus unto by this argument, is the preservation and continuance of their “confidence.” This παρρησία, whatever it be, was that which engaged them in and carried them through their sufferings; which alone was praiseworthy in them. For merely to suffer is ἐκ τῶν μέσων, and may be good or evil, as its causes and occasions and circumstances are. Now, this was absolutely neither their faith nor profession; but, as we have had occasion to mention several times, it is *a fruit and effect of faith*, whereby the minds of believers are made prompt, ready, free unto all duties of profession, against all difficulties and discouragements. It is a boldness of mind, with freedom from bondage and fear, in the duties of religion towards God and man, from a prevailing persuasion of our acceptance with God therein. In this frame of spirit, by this fruit and effect of faith, these Hebrews were carried cheerfully through all their sufferings for the gospel. And indeed without it, it is impossible that we should undergo any great sufferings unto the glory of God, or our own advantage. For if we are made diffident of our cause by unbelief; if the helps and succours tendered in the gospel and promises

thereof be betrayed by fear; if the shame of outward sufferings and scorns do enfeeble the mind; if we have not an evidence of “better things” to lay in the balance against present evils; it is impossible to endure any “great fight of afflictions” in a clue manner. Unto all these evil habits of the mind is this “confidence” opposed. This was that grace, that exercise of faith, which was once admired in Peter and John, <sup>441B</sup>Acts 4:13. And there can be no better account given of it, than what is evident in the behavior of those two apostles in that season. Being in bonds, under the power of their enraged enemies, for preaching the gospel, yet without fear, tergiversation, or hesitation; without at, all questioning what would be the issue, and how they would deal with them whom they charged to have murdered the Lord Jesus; with all boldness and plainness of speech they gave an account of their faith, and testified unto the truth. Wherefore those things that I have mentioned are plainly included in this confidence, as to invincible constancy of mind and boldness in the profession of the gospel, in the face of all difficulties, through a trust in God and a valuation of the eternal reward, which are the foundation of it. This frame of spirit they ought to labor to confirm in themselves, who are or may be called unto sufferings for the gospel. If they are unprepared, they will be shaken and cast down from their stability.

**3.** This confidence, which had been of such use unto them, the apostle exhorts them now “not to cast away;” μή ἀποζάλητε. He doth not say, leave it not, forego it not; but, “cast it not away.” For where any graces have been stirred up unto their due exercise, and have had success, they will not fail not be lost without some positive act of the mind in rejecting of them, and the refusal of the succours which they tender unto us. And this rejection may be only as unto its actual exercise, not as unto its radical inbeing in the soul. For as I look on this confidence as a grace, so it is not the root, but a branch from it: faith is the root, and confidence is a branch springing out of it. Wherefore it may, at least for a season, be cast away, while faith abides firm. Sometimes failing in faith makes this confidence to fail; and sometimes failing in this confidence weakens and impairs faith. When faith on any occasion is impaired and ensnared, this confidence will not abide; and so soon as we begin to fail in our confidence, it will reflect weakness on faith itself. Now unto the casting away of this confidence these things do concur:



(1.) That it do, as it were, offer itself unto us for our assistance, as in former times. This it doth in the reasonings and arguings of faith for boldness and constancy in profession; which are great and many, and will arise in the minds of them that are spiritually enlightened.

(2.) Arguments against the use of it, especially at the present season when it is called for, are required in this case. And they are of two sorts:

[1.] Such as are suggested by *carnal wisdom*., urging men unto this or that course, whereby they may spare themselves, save their lives, and keep their goods, by rejecting this confidence, although they continue firm in the faith;

[2.] From *carnal fears*, representing the greatness, difficulties, and dangers that lie in the way of an open profession with boldness and confidence.

(3.) A *resolution* to forego this confidence, upon the urgency of these arguings.

(4.) An *application* unto other ways and means inconsistent with the exercise of this grace in the discharge of this duty.

And hence it appears how great is the evil here dehorted from, and what a certain entrance it will prove into the apostasy itself so judged as before, if not timely prevented. And it is that which we ought continually to watch against; for he that was constant in this grace yet did once make a forfeiture of it unto his unutterable sorrow, namely, the apostle Peter. And it is not lost but upon the corrupt reasonings which we have now mentioned, that aggravate its guilt. He that casts away his confidence as unto his present profession, and the duties thereof, doth what lies in him cast away his interest in future salvation. Men in such cases have a thousand pretences to relieve themselves; but the present duty is as indispensably required as future happiness is faithfully promised. Wherefore the apostle adds, —

4. The reason why they should be careful in the preservation of this confidence; which is, that it hath a “great recompence of reward.”

That which the apostle as unto the *matter* of it calls here “a recompence of reward,” in the end of the next verse, from the *formal cause* of it he calls “the promise,” and that promise which we receive “after we have done the

will of God.” Wherefore the recompence of reward here intended is the glory of heaven, proposed as a “crown,” a reward in way of recompence unto them that overcome in their sufferings for the gospel. And the future glory, which, as unto its *original cause*, is the fruit of the good pleasure and sovereign grace of God, whose pleasure it is to give us the kingdom; and as unto its *procuring cause*, is the sole purchase of the blood of Christ, who obtained for us eternal redemption; and on both accounts a free gift of God, for “the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ,” so as it can be no way merited nor procured by ourselves, by virtue of any proportion by the rules of justice between what we do or suffer and what is promised; is yet constantly promised unto suffering believers under the name of a “recompence” and “reward.” For it doth not become the greatness and goodness of God to call his own people unto sufferings for his name, and unto his glory, and therein the loss of their lives many times, with all enjoyments here below, and not propose unto them, nor provide for them, that which shall be infinitely better than all that they so undergo. See <sup><small>HEB</small></sup> Hebrews 6:11, 12, and the exposition of that place; <sup><small>REV</small></sup> Revelation 3:3. Wherefore it is added,

---

That this confidence hath this “recompence of reward,” — that is, it gives a right and title unto the future reward of glory; it hath it in the promise and constitution of God. Whoever abides in its exercise shall be no loser in the issue. They are as sure in divine promises as in our own possession. And although they are yet future, faith gives them a present subsistence in the soul, as unto their power and efficacy.

**Obs. I.** In the times of suffering, and in the approaches of them, it is the duty of believers to look on the glory of heaven under the notion of a refreshing, all-sufficient reward.

**Ver. 36.** — “For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.”

The apostle in these words confirms the necessity of the exhortation he had insisted on. He had pressed them unto nothing but what was needful for them. For whereas there were two things proposed unto them; one in the way of duty, namely, that they should do the will of God; the other in the way of reward, or what they should receive upon their so doing; things

were so ordered in the sovereign pleasure and will of God that they could believe neither of them, not only without the duty which he exhorted them unto, but without a continuance therein. And indeed the exhortation not to cast away their confidence, — that is, to abide in it, and to improve it against all difficulties and dangers, — doth include in it that patience which he affirms that they stand in need of. Wherefore there axe three things in the words:

1. The *confirmation* of the preceding exhortation by this reason, that “they had need of patience.”
2. The *time* and season wherein that patience was so needful as unto them; and that was whilst they were doing the will of God.
3. The *end* whereunto it was necessary; which is the receiving of the promise.

1. The *rational enforcement* is introduced by the redditive γάρ, “for.” ‘This is that which you must apply your minds unto, or you cannot attain your end.’

2. That which he asserts in this reason is, that “they had need of patience.” He doth not charge them with want of patience, but declares the necessity of it as unto its continual exercise. “Ψομονή, is “a bearing of evils with quietness and complacency of mind, without raging, fretting, despondency, or inclination unto compliance with undue ways of deliverance.” “In patience possess your souls.” Παρρησία, or “confidence,” will engage men into troubles and difficulties in a way of duty; but if patience take not up the work and carry it on, confidence will flag and fail See <sup><5081></sup>Hebrews 6:11, 12, and our exposition thereon. Patience is the perfecting grace of suffering Christians, <sup><5004></sup>James 1:4, 5; and that which all tribulations do excite in the first place unto its proper actings, whereon the exercise of other graces doth depend, <sup><5111></sup>Romans 5:4, 5.

‘This,’ saith the apostle, ‘you have need of.’ He speaks not absolutely of the grace itself, as though they had it not; but of its continual exercise in the condition wherein they were, or whereinto they were entering. Men for the most part desire such a state wherein they may have as little need and use of this grace as possible; for it supposeth things hard and difficult, about which alone it is conversant. But this is seldom the estate of the

professors of the gospel; for besides the troubles and afflictions which are common unto, and almost inseparable from this life, they are for the most part continually exposed unto all sorts of troubles and miseries, on the account of their profession. He that will be the disciple of Christ must take up his cross. The necessity here intimated of patience is grounded on these two suppositions:

(1.) That those who profess the gospel in sincerity shall ordinarily meet with trials, tribulations, and sufferings, upon the account of that profession. This the Scripture and the experience of all ages do abundantly testify; and in particular, it was the condition of these Hebrews, as it was of all the primitive churches.

(2.) That without the constant exercise of patience, none can pass through those tribulations unto the glory of God, and their own advantage, as unto the great end of the obtaining the promise of eternal life. For without it men will either faint and give way to temptations that shall turn them aside from their profession; or will misbehave themselves under their sufferings, unto the dishonor of God and the ruin of their own souls. Patience is not a mere endurance of trouble, but it is indeed the due exercise of all graces under sufferings; nor can any grace be acted in that condition where patience is wanting. The exercise of faith, love, and delight in God; the resignation of ourselves to his sovereign will and pleasure; the valuation of things eternal above all things of this present life; whereby the soul is kept quiet and composed, free from distractions, fortified against temptations, resolved for perseverance to the end: this is patience. It is therefore indispensably necessary unto this condition.

**Obs. II.** He that would abide faithful in difficult seasons, must fortify his soul with an unconquerable patience. —

(1.) Then pray for it.

(2.) Give it its due exercise in the approaches of troubles, that it be not pressed and overwhelmed by thoughts contrary unto it

(3.) Take care to keep faith vigorous and active; it will grow on no other root but that of faith.

(4.) Especially exercise faith unto a view of eternal things; which will engage the aid of hope, and administer the food that patience lives upon. Wherefore in this case,

(5.) Remember,

[1.] That the want of it lays the soul open unto the power and efficacy of all sorts of temptations, for this is the only armor of proof against the assaults of Satan and the world in a suffering season.

[2.] It is that alone which will assuage the pain of sufferings, ease the burden of them, rebate their edge, and make them easy to be borne. All other things will fall before the sharpness of them, or give relief that shall end in ruin.

[3.] It is this alone whereby God is glorified in our sufferings, and honor given to Jesus Christ in the gospel.

3. The next thing in the words is the *season* of the necessity of the continuance of the exercise of this grace and obedience; — until we have done the will of God. There is no dismissal from the discharge of this duty until we have done the whole will of God. The will of God is twofold:

(1.) The *will of his purpose* and good pleasure, the eternal act of his counsel, which is accompanied with infinite wisdom, concerning all things that shall come to pass.

(2.) The *will of his command*, presenting unto us our duty, or what it is that he requireth of us. Respect may be, and I judge is had, unto the will of God in both these senses in this place. For respect is had unto the will of God disposing the state of the church and all believers therein into troubles, sufferings, and temptations, <sup><COR1></sup>1 Peter 3:17. He could, if it had seemed good unto him, have placed the church in such a condition in the world as that it should have been free from all outward troubles and distresses; but it is his will that it should be otherwise, and it is for the ends of his own glory, as also the good of the church in that state wherein they are to continue in this world. This, therefore, is that which we are to acquiesce in, as unto all the sufferings we may be exposed unto in this world: It is the will of God that it should be so. And he seldom leaves us

destitute, without a prospect into those holy reasons and ends of it for which it is necessary that it should be so.

But whereas this principally respects sufferings, it will be said, ‘How can we *do* this will of God, when nothing is required of us but patiently to endure what we do undergo?’ I answer,

**(1.)** Though sufferings be principally intended in this place, yet they are not so *only*. The whole state and condition of our lives in this world depends on this will of God: the time, of our doing and suffering, of living and dying, with all our circumstances, is resolved into his will concerning them. And it is weariness of the effects, of this will of God that is ha the most the cause of their departure from their profession. Wherefore this sense is not to be excluded. See <sup>4135</sup>Acts 13:36. But,

**(2.)** The will of God is that whereby our *whole duty* is presented unto us, as unto our faith, obedience, and worship; as our Lord Christ “came to do the will of him that sent him,” according to the commandment he received of him. The whole of our duty is resolved into the will of God, — that is, the will of his command; and so, to “do the will of God” in this sense, is to abide constant in all the duties of faith and obedience, worship and profession, which he requireth of us. And there is no release in this matter whilst we are .in this world. Wherefore says the apostle, ‘You have need of patience, during the whole course of obedience presented unto you, as that without which you cannot pass through it, so as thereon to inherit the promises.’

**4.** What is meant here by “the promise” is evident from the context. All the promises of grace and mercy in the covenant they had already received; God had not only given them the promises of all these things, but he had given them the good things themselves that were promised, as to the degrees and measures of their enjoyment in this world. And as unto the promise of eternal life and glory, they had received that also, and did mix it with faith; but the thing promised itself they had not received. This different notion of the promises the apostle declares Hebrews 11, as we shall see, God willing.

**Obs. III.** The glory of heaven is an abundant recompence for all we shall undergo in our way towards it.

**Obs. IV.** Believers ought to sustain themselves in their sufferings with the promise of future glory.

**Obs. V.** The future blessedness is given unto us by the promise, and is therefore free and undeserved.

**Obs. VI.** The consideration of eternal life as the free effect of the grace of God and Christ, and as proposed in a gracious promise, is a thousand times more full of spiritual refreshment unto a believer, than if he should conceive of it or look upon it merely as a reward proposed unto our own doings or merits.

### VERSES 37-39.

Ἔτι γὰρ μικρόν ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἢ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.<sup>f35</sup>

**Ver. 37-39.** — For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith: but if [*any man*] draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

The substance of the apostolical exhortation) as hath been often observed, is the constancy of the Hebrews in their profession, against persecutions and temptations. Unto this end he commends unto them the necessary use of *confidence and patience*, as those graces which would carry them through their difficulties and support them under them. But these graces are not the root whereon constancy and perseverance do grow; they are all branches of it. They do not give strength unto the soul to do and suffer according to the mind of God; but they are the way whereby it doth exercise its strength, which it hath from another grace. It is faith from whence alone all these things do spring. This the apostle knowing, he reserves the declaration of its nature, efficacy, and power, unto the close of his argument. And such an enarration of the nature and efficacy of it he intends as will certainly effect the great work of carrying them through their difficulties, even all that they may be called unto, because it hath

done the same in all true believers from the foundation of the world. Wherefore, as is usual with him, in these verses he makes a transition unto the consideration of faith itself, whereinto he resolves the whole exhortation unto constancy in profession.

And there are three things in these three verses:

1. A proposal of the object of faith; which is the coming of Christ, with the circumstances of it, verse 37.
2. The necessity and efficacy of faith on that proposal, with the certain ruin of them that are strangers unto it, confirmed by prophetic testimony, verse 38.
3. The judgment of the apostle concerning these Hebrews, as unto their faith, and the sincerity of it; from whence he proceeds to declare its nature, and confirm its efficacy, verse 39.

**Ver. 37.** — “For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.”

It might arise in the minds of these Hebrews, weakening and discouraging them from a compliance with this exhortation of the apostle, that it was a long time that they were to be exposed unto and exercised with these troubles, so as that they might justly fear that they should be worn out by them. And indeed there is nothing doth more press upon and try the minds of men in their sufferings, than that they can see no issue out of them; for we are all naturally inclined to desire some rest and peace, if it may stand with the will of God, whilst we are in this world. To encourage them against the influence of this temptation, the apostle accommodates a testimony out of the prophet Habakkuk, which leads him directly unto the consideration of the power and efficacy of faith, which he had designed:

**Hebrews 2:3, 4,** “For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; for it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up, is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith.” He speaks of a “vision;” that is, a prophetic vision of good things which God would effect in due time.

And there is the same reason in genera] of all the promises of God: wherefore what is spoken of one, namely, of the deliverance of the people, may be accommodated unto another, namely, the coming of Christ,



whereby that deliverance is to be wrought. There is in the prophet a supposition that it seems to be delayed, and the accomplishment of it to be retarded. “Though it tarry,” saith he; that is, ‘seem to you so to do.’ For believers are apt to think long under their sufferings of the seeming delays of the accomplishment of God’s promises, and long for the time of it; as wicked men and scoffers harden themselves in their sins and impieties on the same account with respect to God’s threatenings, <sup>2</sup> Peter 3:1-4. But saith he, “It will not tarry;” that is, ‘although it seem to you so to do, and you are dejected thereon about it, yet there is an appointed time for it, and that in itself no long time, beyond which it shall not be deferred one moment,’ <sup>2</sup> Isaiah 60:22; 2 Peter 3. This whole sense the apostle compriseth in this verse, though he doth not peculiarly render the words of the prophet.

**1.** He respects in this verse the *season* of the accomplishment of what he now proposeth unto them. And there are three things therein: —

**(1.)** An acknowledgment that it is not *immediately* to be looked for. ‘For it is a thing yet to be waited for, — ‘Yet there remains some time for its accomplishment.’ And this is that which renders their confidence and patience in sufferings so necessary, as he had before observed.

**Obs. I.** The delay of the accomplishment of promises is a great exercise of faith and patience; whence are all the exhortations not to faint in our minds, nor to be weary.

**(2.)** There is a *limitation of the time* for the accomplishment of what seems so to be delayed; it is μικρόν, “a little space.” ‘Though it seem to tarry, wait for it; it will come, and that ere long,’ or ‘after a short space of time.’

**(3.)** A further declaration of the nature of this season in these words, ὅσον ὅσον, “quantum quantum,” or “quantillum quantillum.” The reduplication of the word may yield a double sense:

**[1.]** A limitation of the time; ‘a very little,’ a short space, not to be feared or reckoned on.

**[2.]** On the other side, a supposition of some duration; ‘how long soever it be, yet it is but a “little while.”’ According unto either sense the design of the apostle is the same; which is, to satisfy the Hebrews that there shall be

no such delay in what they looked after and expected as should be a just cause of despondency or weariness in them. As if he had said, ‘My brethren, faint not, be not wearied nor discouraged, keep up confidence and patience; you know what you wait for and expect, which will be an abundant recompence unto you for all your sufferings. And whatever appearances there may be of its tarrying or delay, whatever it may seem to you, yet if you have but a prospect into eternity, be it what it will, it is but a very little while; and so is to be esteemed by you.’

**2.** That which is proposed unto them under this limitation is this, that “he who shall come will come, and will not tarry.” What the prophet spake of the vision he saw, the apostle applies unto the person of Christ, for the reason before mentioned. ἐρχόμενος, “he that shall come,” is a periphrasis of Christ, frequently used and applied unto him. Once it is used to express his eternity, <sup>Ⓜ</sup> Revelation 1:8; but generally it hath respect unto the promise of him. The foundation of the church was laid in the promise that he should come; and he came in his Spirit unto them from the foundation of the world, <sup>Ⓜ</sup> 1 Peter 1:11, <sup>Ⓜ</sup> 3:18-20: yet this was he that *should come*, as is expressed John 1, — this was his coming in the flesh. After his incarnation and ministry, he was now, with respect unto them, he that *was come*; yea, to deny him to be come in answer unto that promise, is anti-Christian, <sup>Ⓜ</sup> 1 John 4:3. Yet after this he was to come again, on a double account: —

**(1.)** In the *power of his Spirit* and the exercise of his royal authority, for the setting up and settling his church in the world; whereof there are two parts: —

**[1.]** The assistance of his Spirit, with his miraculous operations, unto the ministers of the gospel; which were “the powers of the world to come.” <sup>Ⓜ</sup> John 16:7, 8. This was an illustrious advent of Christ, not in his own person, but in that of his vicar and substitute, whom he promised to send in his stead. Hereby he was acquitted from all that dishonor, contempt, and reproach, that were cast on him in the world.

**[2.]** He was to come for the punishment and destruction of his stubborn and inveterate adversaries. And these also were of three sorts:

**1st.** Those that were so directly unto his own person, and by consequence unto his gospel

**2dly.** Such as were directly enemies unto his gospel, and by consequence unto his person.

**3dly.** Such as were declared enemies to them both.

**1st.** Of the first sort were the *Jews*, who slew him, who murdered him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and thereon continued their hatred against the gospel and all that made profession thereof. He was to come to “destroy those murderers, and to burn their city;” which fell out not long after the writing of this epistle, and is properly intended in this place. See <sup><B1B></sup>Matthew 24:3, 27, 30; <sup><C1B></sup>2 Peter 3:4; <sup><B14></sup>Jude 1:14; <sup><B07></sup>Revelation 1:7; <sup><142></sup>Mark 14:62; <sup><S1B></sup>James 5:7, 8. For hereon ensued the deliverance of the church from the rage and persecution of the Jews, with the illustrious propagation of the gospel throughout the world.

**2dly.** The *Pagan Roman Empire* was the second sort of his adversaries, who were immediate enemies unto his gospel, and consequently to his person. These, after the destruction of the former sort, raged with all blood and cruelty against the church for sundry ages. These, therefore, he promised he would come and destroy; and the faith of the church concerning this his coming was, that “he that should come would come, and would not tarry.” The description of this coming of Christ is given us, <sup><B07></sup>Revelation 6:7-10.

**3dly.** After this arose a third sort of enemies, who in words owning his person and gospel, opposed all his offices, and persecuted all that Would yield obedience unto him in the exercise of them, and were thereby consequentially enemies both to his person and gospel. This was the *apostate Christian Church of Rome*, or the New Testament Babylon. And in respect of these enemies of his, Christ is still “he that is to come;” and as such is believed in, and his coming prayed for by all the saints. For he is to destroy the man of sin, the head of that apostasy, “by the brightness of his coming.” For as the opposition made unto him did not arise suddenly and at once, as those forementioned did, especially that of the Jews, whose destruction was therefore speedy and at once, but in a long tract of time grew up gradually unto its height; so he will destroy it in like manner.

And therefore, although he hath set his hand unto that work, and begun the execution of his judgments on the antichristian state in some degree, yet as to the utter destruction of it by those plagues which shall befall it “in one day;” he is still **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, he that is looked for, “he that is to come.”

(2.) Christ is **ὁ ἐρχόμενος** with respect unto his *coming at the last day* unto judgment. This is known and confessed, and the business of his coming therein is the prayer of the whole church, <sup><621></sup>Revelation 22:20. And it is an article of faith, whose nature we have described on <sup><318D></sup>Hebrews 6:2.

It may be now inquired, with respect unto whether of these comings it is said here “he shall come,” that he is **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**. It is generally referred by interpreters unto his last advent, at the day of judgment. I doubt not but that also is included, but I dare not exclude the other comings mentioned, as things which were principally suited unto the relief of the church under its distress. For unto every state of the church there is a coming of Christ suited and accommodated unto their condition, whereby their faith is kept in continual exercise of desires after it. This was the life of faith under the old testament, as to his coming in the flesh, until it was accomplished. This faith, after his resurrection, they lived on, though but for a short season, until he came in the power of his Spirit, and his miraculous operations, so to “convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment.” Nor do I understand how “the just can live by faith,” without a continual expectation of the coming of Christ in a way suited to the sufferings and deliverance of his church in that season. For instance, the state was such now with those Hebrews, that if an end were not put unto it, or the days were not shortened, no flesh among them could have been saved, as our Savior speaks, <sup><1B2></sup>Matthew 24:22. In this state the church looked for such a coming of Christ as should work out their deliverance; and he came accordingly, as we have showed. Afterwards, the earth was filled with the blood of saints and martyrs, by the power of the Roman empire. In this state those that were slain, and those that were alive, appointed unto death, cried, “How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?” They exercised faith also in this word, that it was but “a little while, and he that shall come will come;” which he did accordingly. And the case is the same with those that suffer under the antichristian apostasy: they live, pray, and believe, in the expectation of the appearance of the brightness of

that coming of Christ wherewith the man of sin shall be consumed; and although it seems to tarry, they wait for it. This is “the faith and patience of the saints.”

Wherefore, the end for which this coming of Christ is proposed unto the church being the supportment and encouragement of their souls unto faith and patience, a respect must be had unto such a coming as is suited to their relief in their present state and condition. And this unto these Hebrews was then ἔτι μικρὸν ὄσον in a literal sense. So it is to be accommodated unto all other states of the church. And therein the consideration of the coming of Christ at the last day, unto the final and eternal judgment, ought not to be omitted. This is that anchor and great reserve of believers in all their distresses and sufferings, when all appearance of deliverance in the world absolutely ceaseth, to betake themselves unto this, that there is a day approaching “wherein God will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained.” That the Lord Christ shall assuredly come unto that judgment is that which they principally resolve their satisfaction into. See ~~2~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10.

**Obs. II.** It is essential unto faith to be acted on the promised coming of Christ, to all that look for his appearance.

**Obs. III.** There is a promise of the coming of Christ suited unto the state and condition of the church in all ages.

**Obs. IV.** The appearing delay of the accomplishment of any of these promises requires an exercise of the faith and patience of the saints,

**Obs. V.** Every such coming of Christ hath its appointed season, beyond which it shall not tarry.

**Obs. VI.** This divine disposition of things gives a necessity unto the continual exercise of faith, prayer, and patience, about the coming of Christ.

**Obs. VII.** Although we may not know the especial dispensations and moments of time that are passing over us, yet all believers may know the state in general of the church under which they are, and what coming of Christ they are to look for and expect. So is it with us who live under the

antichristian state, which Christ in his appointed time will come and destroy.

**Obs. VIII.** Faith in any church satisfies the souls of men with what is the good and deliverance of that state, although a man do know or is persuaded that personally he shall not see it himself, nor enjoy it. The faith of this kind is for the church, and not for men's individual persons.

**Obs. IX.** Under despondencies as to particular appearances or comings of Christ, it is the duty of believers to fix and exercise their faith on his illustrious appearance at the last day.

**Obs. X.** Every particular coming of Christ in a way suited unto the present deliverance of the church, is an infallible pledge of his coming at the last unto judgment,

**Obs. XI.** Every promised coming of Christ is certain, and shall not be delayed beyond its appointed season, when no difficulties shall be able to stand before it.

**Ver. 38, 39.** — “Now the just shall live by faith: but if [*any man*] draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.”

The apostle proceedeth in the allegation of the testimony taken out of the prophet, and the application of it unto his present purpose. And he observeth not herein the order of the words, but keeps unto the sense and meaning of them. And two things he designeth in these two verses: First, To declare the *event* of the proposal made unto them of the coming of Christ, whereby he confirmeth his exhortation unto faith and patience in their suffering condition, verse 38. Secondly, An *application* of the different events mentioned by the prophet unto these Hebrews, verse 39.

In the first there are two different events expressed of the proposal and exhortation before given and made, with the means of them; the one is, that “the just shall live by his faith;” and the other (which is built on the supposition, “if any man draw back “) is, then “my soul shall have no pleasure in him.”

**1.** In the first there are to be considered,

- (1.) The *note of connection*, in the adversative particle **δέ**;
- (2.) There is the *qualification* of the person spoken of, he is “the just;”
- (3.) The *means* of his being so, or of his obtaining the event mentioned, which is “by faith;”
- (4.) What is the *event* itself, “he shall live.”

Three times doth the apostle in his epistles make use of this prophetic testimony, <sup>ⲉⲓⲏⲓⲛ</sup>Romans 1:17, <sup>ⲉⲓⲏⲓⲛ</sup>Galatians 3:11, and in this place.

(1.) The note of inference in the exceptive particle **καί**, we render “now;” as afterwards we render **δέ**, “but.” The first, proper sense might as well have been retained; “but” in the first place, and “and” afterwards. But the difference is of no importance; **δέ** is here taken for **ⲁ** in the prophet, which is oftentimes exceptive, **ⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛ**. And in the prophet the expression is plain, because it followeth the description of the contrary frame unto what is here asserted, “he whose heart is lifted up:” but **δέ**, in the transposition of the words used by the apostle (for he first repeats the last clause of the words, and then the former afterwards, which was more accommodate unto his purpose), doth not seem to have the force of an exceptive; nor hath it so indeed, in respect unto what was affirmed in the foregoing verse; but it hath so unto the difficulties supposed in the case under consideration, which are the sufferings and temptations which professors of the gospel should in common meet withal, and in the appearance of a delay as unto their deliverance out of them, “But,” saith the apostle, “however, notwithstanding these things, “the just shall live by faith.””

(2.) The person spoken of is **ὁ δίκαιος**, “a just person,” a man really made just, or justified by faith, every one that is really and truly so. I doubt not but this is included in the word, and the *state of justification* is intended in it; to which purpose the words are elsewhere cited by the apostle. But yet that which is here principally intended, is that qualification of a righteous man which is opposed to pride and haste of spirit through unbelief, whereon men draw back from God in the profession of the gospel. The “just man,” he who is humble, meek, sincere, subdued unto the will of God, waiting for his pleasure, as all justified persons are in their several degrees, “he shall live;” for he is free from that

principle of pride and unbelief which ruins the souls of men in times of trial.

**Obs. XII.** There are especial qualifications of grace required unto steadfastness in profession in times of persecution and long-continued trials.

(3.) “Shall live by faith;” so we. Ἐκ πίστεως may be joined with δίκαιος, and so express the *instrumental cause*, way, and means, whereby a man comes to be δίκαιος, “just,” — that is, δικαιοθεΐς, “justified;” which is by faith. For it is by faith both that a man is justified, and also those gracious qualifications are wrought in him which enable him to persevere in his profession. It purifieth the heart of that leaven of pride which destroyeth all who are infected with it. Or it may denote the way and means whereby a just man doth abide and persevere in his profession unto life. And this sense I embrace, because it is the entrance of the apostle into his demonstration of the mighty things which faith will do, and which have been done and suffered through faith by believers, which he declares here in general, namely, whatever difficulties and oppositions a just man meets withal in the way to things eternal, faith will carry him through them with safety and success.

(4.) “He shall live.” Life in both the principal senses of it is here intended.

[1.] He shall not die in and from his profession; he shall not perish as trees plucked up by the roots, twice dead; he shall maintain a spiritual life, the life of God, as the psalmist speaks, “I shall not die, but live, and declare the loving-kindness of the LORD .”

[2.] He shall live, or attain the promise of eternal life; so is the word expounded in the close of the next verse, “Believe unto the saving of the soul.”

**Obs. XIII.** Many things are required to secure the success of our profession in times of difficulties and trials: as,

(1.) That our persons be righteous, or justified by grace;

(2.) That we be furnished with those graces that are appointed unto that end;



(3.) That faith be kept unto a diligent exercise.

**Obs. XIV.** The continuance of the spiritual life and eternal salvation of true believers is secured from all oppositions whatever. As it is confessed there is in these words a *prescription* of the way and means whereby they may be so, so there is a faithful *promise* of God that so they shall be.

2. In the latter part of the verse there is a description of others, on a supposition of a contrary state, frame, and event. In the former, the person is righteous; the way of his acting in the present case is by faith; and the event is life, “he shall live.” On the other hand, there is a supposition made of a person not so qualified, not so acting, not so living, not having the same success, but contrary in all these things. Wherefore they do greatly deceive themselves and others who suppose it the same person who is thus spoken of, and countenance themselves by the defect of the pronoun *τίς*, which is naturally and necessarily supplied in our translation. For this reading and sense of the words, “The just shall live by faith, and if any draw back,” etc., is contrary to the order of the words both in the prophet and the apostle, and the express declaration of the mind of the apostle in the next verse. For as the words lie in the prophet, this of the just living by faith is a direct exception unto and removal of them whose souls are lifted up so as to depart from God. ‘But,’ saith he, ‘the just, it shall not be so with him;’ that is, “the just shall live by his faith;” which is a direct opposition unto the other sort of persons. And although the order of the words be changed by the apostle, yet the opposition between the two sorts of persons is evidently continued. Wherefore in the next verse the apostle makes an express distinction of those unto whom he spake, or concerning whom he speaks in the two states, the one *ὑποστολής*, the other *πίστεως*. Of the latter he had spoken in the first words, and of the former in those that are now to be spoken unto. I shall therefore retain the supplement in our translation, “if any man, or “any one draw back,” — if there be in any an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God.

There is an appearance of a great change in the words of the prophet, *הַנְּפֹשׁ הַנִּה עֹפְלָה לֹא-יִשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ* For “his soul, which in the prophet is referred unto the person offending, is in the apostle referred unto God who is offended. For indeed the word *נַפְשׁוֹ* may be so referred in the original, if

we suppose a change of speech, and that the prophet having spoken before in the name of God, doth here speak of God, and the respect he had unto proud unbelievers. But the word **הַשָּׁחֵט** is scarce reconcilable unto this interpretation. Wherefore it is enough that the apostle gives us the plain general sense and meaning of the words, with an exposition of them, as he hath done, since he seldom keeps unto the proper words of the testimonies he quotes, but always gives the mind of the Holy Ghost in them.

There are two things in the words:

- (1.) A crime supposed with reference unto the case under consideration, which is perseverance under trials and temptations;
- (2.) A sentence pronounced upon that crime.

(1.) The first is expressed by **ὑποστείληται**. The word in the prophet denotes the *cause of the sin* intended; herein, its nature and effect. The original of all defection from the gospel is in the sinful elation of heart, not submitting unto, not acquiescing in the will of God, not satisfied with the condition of temporal sufferings on the account of the eternal reward. When men are under the power of this evil frame of heart, they will “draw back,” subduct themselves out of that state and condition wherein they are exposed to these inconveniencies.” **Εὰν ὑποστείληται**, — “‘ If any man” who hath made or doth make profession of faith in Christ and of the gospel, upon the invasion and long continuance of trials, temptations, and sufferings for them, do, through want of submission unto and acquiescence in the will of God, “withdraw” himself from that profession, and from communion therein with them who persist faithful in it, “my heart shall not,” etc.’ This is the evil which the great design of the whole epistle is to obviate and prevent, which the apostle applies himself unto with all manner of arguments, motives, exhortations, and threatenings, to make effectual For this was that sin which, by reason of their sufferings and persecutions, professors were exposed unto, and which was absolutely ruinous unto the souls of them that fell under the power of it.

**Obs. XV.** No persons whatever ought to be, on any consideration, secure against those sins which present circumstances give an efficacy unto.

**Obs. XVI.** It is an effect of spiritual wisdom, to discern what is the dangerous and prevailing temptation of any season, and vigorously to set ourselves in opposition unto it.

**Obs. XVII.** It is much to be feared that in great trials some will draw back from that profession of the gospel wherein they are engaged.

**Obs. XVIII.** This defection is commonly durable, continued by various pretences. This is included in the word ὑποστείλῃται, — gradually and covertly to subduct himself.

(2.) The *sentence* denounced against this sin is οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. The “soul” of God, is God himself; but he so speaks of himself to affect us with a due apprehension of his concernment in what he so speaks, as we are with that which our souls, that is, our minds, with all our affections, are engaged in. So God promises to the church, that he will “rejoice over them with his whole heart, and with his whole soul.” So is it here. What God thus affirms of himself is, that he hath no delight in such a person, he is not pleased with him, he shall not live before him. There is a μείωσις in the words, “he shall have no delight in him;” that is, he will abhor him, despise him, and in the end utterly destroy him. But I suppose it may be thus expressed also to obviate a pretense of the Hebrews against the apostle at that season, namely, that by deserting the truth of the gospel, and returning unto their Judaism, they did that which was pleasing unto God, and wherein they should find acceptance with him. For, as they supposed, they returned again unto those institutions of worship which he had been pleased withal, and which were of his own appointment. So all apostates have some pretense for what they do, wherewith they justify themselves, until their iniquity be found out to be hateful. Wherefore, to deprive them of this pretense, the apostle declares that the soul of God takes no pleasure in them. And in this negation all positive evils are included. When God will not, doth not delight in any persons, the consequent is, that he will utterly destroy them. See <sup>2151</sup>Jeremiah 15:1.

**Obs. XIX.** It is our great duty to look diligently that we are of that holy frame of mind, that due exercise of faith, as that the soul of God may take pleasure in us.

**Obs. XX.** Though there appear as yet no outward tokens or evidences of the anger and displeasure of God against our ways, yet if we are in that state wherein God hath no pleasure in us, we are entering into certain ruin.

**Obs. XXI.** Backsliders from the gospel are in a peculiar manner the abhorrency of the soul of God.

**Obs. XXII.** When the soul of God is not delighted in any, nothing can preserve them from utter destruction.

**Ver. 39.** — “But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.”

An application is made in these words unto the state and condition of these Hebrews at present, at least unto them whom the apostle designs in an especial manner; as also, a transition is made unto that which now lay in his eye, namely, the full demonstration of the power and efficacy of faith to make us accepted with God, and to carry us through in the course of our greatest trials and temptations with success and victory. The application he makes unto the believing Hebrews, is of the same nature and kind with that which on the same occasion he had made unto them before, Hebrews 6, 9. In both places, having treated of the danger of apostasy and the woful state of apostates, he relieves the minds of believers by letting them know, that although, for their awakening and instruction, as for other ends, he declared the dreadful judgments of God against unprofitable professors and apostates, yet was it not as though he apprehended that that was their condition, or that they were cast out of the favor of God, or cursed by the law, but he was “persuaded better things of them.” Such ministerial encouragements are needful in like cases, that persons be not exasperated through an apprehension that undue surmises are entertained against them, nor too much dejected with fears that their condition makes them obnoxious unto the threatening. Both which are diligently to be avoided.

The apostle’s reckoning himself, in his ministerial dealing with them, in their state and condition, as here, “We are not,” hath been spoken unto elsewhere, with the reasons of it. And whereas he says, “We are not,” it is frivolous to interpret it by” We ought not to be,” as is done by some; for so the words have nothing of comfort or supportment in them, which yet

is the total design of them. Nor is it an absolutely infallible declaration of the state and condition of all individuals concerning whom he speaks; but he gives the interpretation of that persuasion, on what grounds it was built, and what it was resolved into; which was spoken of in the other place, whither the reader is referred, <sup><300></sup> Hebrews 6:9.

In the words there is a double supposition, of a twofold opposite state and a twofold opposite event, whose foundation is laid in the verse foregoing. The states are *ὑποστολῆς* on the one hand, and *πίστεως* on the other. The events are *perdition* on the one hand, and *saving the soul* on the other. The first of these is denied, the latter affirmed, concerning these Hebrews.

**1.** “We are not *ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν*.” Even among them that were called in those days this twofold state was found. No small number there were who were then falling into apostasy; but they were a certain determined number which that plague should prevail against, <sup><307></sup> 2 Timothy 2:17-21. They were “appointed to stumble at the word,” being “of old ordained unto this condemnation;” — those of Israel unto whom the Lord Christ was “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense;” the reprobates among them, which were called, but not to be saved. This whole band of rovers, though in profession they were harnessed like the children of Ephraim, yet turned their backs in the day of battle. The event of this defection was “destruction.” Gradual decays and declensions there may be among true believers, from which they may be recovered; but those here intended are such as fall into eternal ruin. For although some respect may be had unto that woful fiery destruction that was coming upon them, in the desolation of the city, land, and temple, yet it is eternal ruin and destruction that is principally intended, as is manifest in the antithesis, wherein it is opposed unto “the saving of the soul.”

**Obs. XXIII.** The Scripture everywhere testifieth, that in the visible church there is a certain number of false hypocrites, whose end and lot it is to be destroyed.

**Obs. XXIV.** It is our duty to evidence unto our own consciences, and give evidence unto others, that we are not of this sort or number.

**Obs. XXV.** Nothing can free apostates from eternal ruin.

2. That which is asserted of these believing Hebrews is, that they belonged unto another state, that had another event. This state is, that they were of “the faith; so our apostle useth this expression, <sup><887></sup>Galatians 3:7, 8: that is, true believers, and heirs of the promises. He there declares, that they are not only such as make profession of the faith, but such as truly and really believe; — a state of them unto whom all the promises as unto present preservation and eternal salvation are made in the word. ‘We are of that faith which is effectual unto the saving of the soul.’ Both here and in the former clause, not only the *event*, but the *actual influence of apostasy* on the one hand unto *destruction*, and of *faith* on the other to the *saving of the soul*, are intended; so the preposition εἰς doth denote. ‘Faith that is effectual unto the acquisition of life;’ that is, to the obtaining of it as by a due means for the saving of our souls from eternal ruin, and the obtaining of eternal life, <sup><483></sup>Acts 26:18. For, —

**Obs. XXVI.** Sincere faith will carry men through all difficulties, hazards, and troubles, unto the certain enjoyment of eternal blessedness.

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>ft1</sup> TRANSLATIONS. — Literally, “of the things which are being spoken.” — *Conybeare and Howson*. “Of which we are speaking.” — *Craik*. “In the course of being spoken.” — *Turner*. “To what has been hitherto said.” — *Ebrard*. **Κεφάλ.** “The prominent point.” — *Turner*. “The crowning point.” — *Craik*. “‘Sum’ will do here, if understood not of a recapitulation, but as a product resulting from all that goes before.” — *Ebrard*. “The most important thing in regard to what we are now treating of.” — *Stuart*. — ED.
- <sup>ft2</sup> See vol. 2:232, 3:549, 4:383, of the author’s miscellaneous works. — ED.
- <sup>ft3</sup> The meaning intended seems to be, “made provision to accomplish two necessary objects.” — ED.
- <sup>ft4</sup> EXPOSITION. — *Turner* remarks that **νυνί**, *now*, is not here so much a mark of time, as a formula to introduce with earnestness something which has close, and may have even logical, connection with what precedes. See also for this use of the term, ch. 11:16, 1 Corinthians 15:20, 12:18, 20; in which passages it does not refer to time, but implies strong conviction grounded upon preceding arguments. — ED.
- <sup>ft5</sup> See vol. 1. of this Exposition, p. 446. — ED.
- <sup>ft6</sup> See vol. 3: p. 125, of his miscellaneous works. — ED.
- <sup>ft7</sup> TRANSLATION. — *Stuart and Conybeare and Howson* connect the **αὐτοῖς** with **λέγει**: “But finding fault [with the first covenant], he says to them;” *i.e.*, the Jews. **Μεμφόμενος**, according to the first of these critics, appears to reduplicate upon the **ἄμεμπτος** of the preceding verse. — ED.
- <sup>ft8</sup> EXPOSITION. — **Κὰγὼ ἡμέλησα**. This is the Septuagint rendering. The Hebrew, according to A. V., ms, though I was an husband to them.” Some explain the discrepancy by conjecturing that the Greek translators had the guttural *cheth* instead of *ayin* in their copies. As the Arabic cognate word signifies to *despise* or *reject*, *Kimchi* and *Pococke*

adopt this translation of the Hebrew word in this passage.

Hengstenberg in his Christology denies that the word can bear this sense. — ED.

<sup>ft9</sup> VARIOUS READING. — Τὸν πλησίον has been rejected, and τὸν πολίτην substituted as the proper reading, by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. All the uncial MSS., with most of the versions, vindicate the propriety of the change. —ED.

<sup>ft10</sup> See his treatise on the Holy Spirit, vol. 3 of his miscellaneous works. —ED.

<sup>ft11</sup> See Exere. xxv.-xxxiv.; and vol. 1 of the author's miscellaneous works.

<sup>ft12</sup> See vol. 6 of the author's miscellaneous words. — ED.

<sup>ft13</sup> VARIOUS READING. — An absurd jealousy against the critical amendment of the sacred text has sometimes been imputed to our author, from his controversy with Walton. The extent to which Owen's views have been misapprehended has been indicated in vol. 16 of his miscellaneous works, p. 345. In this verse we have proof that his mind was under no servile thralldom to the *textus receptus*. That text inserts σκηνή after πρώτη. Our author omits it, and argues strongly for the omission of it. Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, agree in rejecting it. In Wright's edition of this work the word was inserted in the text of the verse, although Owen himself in the original edition had omitted it. —ED.

<sup>ft14</sup> EXPOSITION. —Four solutions have been offered of the difficulty arising from the statement in the fourth verse, that the *most holy* place had the ζυμιατήριον; which is generally understood to signify, not the censer, but the altar of incense, whereas it belonged only to the *holy* place. 1. Some, among whom Bleek must be numbered, suppose the author of the epistle to have been mistaken, —a notion, of course, inconsistent with the inspiration of the apostle, and an easy method of escaping from all difficulties in exegesis. 2. Others, such as Tholuck, suppose the altar of incense may in reality have stood in the most holy place, and refer to <sup><102></sup>1 Kings 6:22, <sup><126></sup>Exodus 26:35. But see <sup><230></sup>Exodus 30:6,7. 3. Others, G. Michaelis, Kuinoel, Stuart, and Turner, translate the word by *censer*, as sometimes in the classics, the LXX., and Josephus. This view is exposed to two objections: —the high priest



would have had to enter the holy of holies, not once in the year, but every day; and why should an object so important as the altar be omitted? 4. Olshausen, Ebrard, and Conybeare and Howson, Substantially adopt Owen's explanation. "The altar of incense," says Ebrard, "stood in the holy place, but *referred* to the holy of holies." — ED.

<sup>ft15</sup> TRANSLATION. —Instead of the past tense, "*went*," it seems agreed that "*enter*," and "*entereth*" should be substituted; as also, verse 9, "*can*" instead of "*could*;" and <sup><sc10></sup>Hebrews 10:1, "*offer*" instead of "*offered*." The tense sheds light on the date of the epistle, as written before the destruction of the temple. —ED.

<sup>ft16</sup> VARIOUS READING. —Scholz, Lachmann, Tholuck, and Theile, prefer **δικαιώματα** to **δικαιώμασι**. "According to the dative reading, the translation and punctuation will run thus — '*Being* only —along with meats, and drinks, and various washings, fleshly ordinances —*things* imposed until the time of reformation.' With the nominative it will be thus: '*Being* only —along with meats, and drinks, and various washings —fleshly ordinances imposed until the time of reformation.'" Turner. — ED.

<sup>ft17</sup> VARIOUS READING. —Instead of **μελλόντων**, Lachmann reads **γενομένων**. The latter has the support of BB\*, the Italic, and the Peschito. Ebrard decides in its favor, understanding the word in reference to the good things of grace as already *secured* and *existing*, in contrast with the old testament high priest, who had to deal with the types of good things still future.

EXPOSITION. —**Τῆς μείζ. καὶ τελειοτ. σκηνῆς**. Zuingle, Bucer, Tholuck, Bleek, and Turner, understand by the phrase *the literal canopy of heaven*; Calov and Vriemont, *the new testament church*; Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and others, *the body of Christ*. Ebrard thus explains it: "Through that time in which the old covenant with its ordinances still subsisted Christ has passed, inasmuch as he was made under the law; his *act* of passing through this state, his *act* of living in a state of humiliation, *i.e.* therefore, his *perfect inward fulfillment of the law* in his *holy life*, was the **τελειοτέρα σκηνή** through which he passed into his state of exaltation. The *real fact* of holiness (in the life

of Jesus upon earth) stands opposed to the *symbolical* representation of holiness in the Mosaic *πρώτη σκηνή*.” —ED.

<sup>ft18</sup> See vol. 1: p. 273, of his miscellaneous works. — ED.

<sup>ft19</sup> VARIOUS READING. —It seems now agreed that the reading *Πνεύματος αἰωνίου* is to be preferred to the reading *Πνεύματος ἁγίου*; the authority for the latter being D, Copt., Basm., Vulg., Slav., and Lat. D, E., and Chrysostom; that for the former being A, B, Peschito, Philoxen., Armen., Ambrose, Theodoret, and Theophylact.

EXPOSITION. —Different views have been taken of the import of *πνεύματος*; —Beza, Ernesti, Cappell, Outrein, Wolf, Cramer, Carpzoff, Morus, Schulz, and others, referring it to the *divine nature* of Christ; Grotius, Limborch, Heinrichs, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, Koppe, Jaspis, and others, referring it to *endless or immortal life*; Doederlein, Storr, and others, to the *exalted and, glorified, person or condition of Christ*; Winzer, Kuinoel, Moses Stuart (see his “Excursus”), under-standng by the phrase, *divine influence*; Bleek, Tholuck, and others, *the Holy Spirit*; Ebrard, the *disposition of mind*, rendering the act not mechanical compliance with a ritual but moral in its character, and eternal as done in the eternal spirit of absolute love. —ED.

<sup>ft20</sup> See vol. 3, p. 168, of the author’s miscellaneous works. — Ed.

<sup>ft21</sup> See the note on the ensuing verse. — Ed.

<sup>ft22</sup> EXPOSITION. — Scholefield characterizes this passage “as perhaps the most perplexing in the whole New Testament.” The dispute relates to the import of *διαθήκη*, whether the translation “covenant” should be retained, as the word is commonly rendered; or whether the translation “testament” is not more suitable to the idea conveyed, particularly by verses 16, 17. Most of the Greek fathers, most of the Reformed theologians, Grotius, Pierce, Doddridge, Michaelis, Macknight, Scholefield, Tholuck, Dr Henderson, Turner, and Ebrard, pronounce in favor of “covenant.” On the other hand, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Erasmus, Wolf, Campbell, Bengel, Schleusner, Wahl, Rosenmuller, Bretschneider, Kuinoel, Stuart, Robinson, Conybeare and Howson, decide in favor of “testament” as the proper translation. The central difficulty in the passage will probably be admitted to Ale in the

meaning of **διαθέμενος**. Conybeare and Howson affirm that “the A. V. is unquestionably correct in translating **διαθήκη** “testament” in this passage. The attempts which have been made to avoid this meaning are irreconcilable with any natural explanation of **ὁ διαθέμενος**.” Macknight renders it “appointed sacrifice.” But this would involve a grammatical error: and to obviate this consideration, Scholefield proposes a rendering in an active sense, “mediating sacrifice;” but he candidly owns that there is no instance of the word being used elsewhere in this signification; and besides, there is great harshness in affixing to **διαθέμενος** a meaning so widely different from its congener, **διαθήκη**, occurring as they do in the same sentence. Whitby and Burton, accordingly, propose the phrase “covenanting party.” But from this translation results another difficulty; the death of a covenanting party dissolves rather than confirms a covenant. Ebrard’s solution of this difficulty is ingenious: “The man who will enter into a covenant with God is a sinner, and as such incapable of entering into fellowship with the holy God, nay, even of appearing before God’s presence, <sup>(HEB)</sup> Deuteronomy 5:26. He must die on account of his guilt, if a substitutionary sacrifice be not offered for him. But he must also die to his former life, in order to begin a new life in covenant with God. In short, from a simple view of the symbolical import of the covenant burnt-offering, described in verses 18-22, the following may be stated as the result: When a sinful man will enter into covenant with the holy God, the man must first die, — must first atone for his guilt by a death, (or he must produce a substitutionary burnt-offering.)” — ED.

<sup>ft23</sup> EXPOSITION. — From the fact that Christ has offered his own blood, it is inferred that he *needed* not to repeat this sacrifice; in verses 27, 28, it is inferred from the same thing that he *could not* repeat it. A man can offer the blood of another repeatedly; *his own blood he can offer* — in other words, *die* — *only once*. — Ebrard The pretense of repeating the Redeemer’s one and only offering in the sacrifice of the mass, is in most direct opposition to the doctrine of this epistle. .... The apostle speaks of men’s dying only “once” as analogous to Christ’s having been but “once offered.” There is only one death for men on earth; and there is only one offering by Christ, and that implies his death. — Turner. — ED.

- ft<sup>24</sup> See vol. 5 of miscellaneous works, on Justification.
- ft<sup>25</sup> See vol. 6 *ibid.*
- ft<sup>26</sup> VARIOUS READING. — Though the *textus receptus* omits οὐκ, it is restored in most of the critical editions. Tischendorf in its favor appeals to all the uncial Mss., by far the most of the others, most of the versions, and many fathers. This passage is one in which the A. V. differs from the *textus receptus*. — ED.
- ft<sup>27</sup> Dissertation on Divine Justice, miscellaneous works, vol. 10 p. 481. — ED.
- ft<sup>28</sup> Dissertation on Divine Justice, vol. 10 p. 481. — ED.
- ft<sup>29</sup> EXPOSITION. — Five views have been taken in regard to the difference between the Hebrew original and the LXX. rendering, as given in verse 5. 1. Even before the days of Kennicott some resolved the difficulty on the hypothesis of a corruption of the Hebrew text. Kennicott conjectured that אֶת גִּוְהַת נָתַתְּ was a corruption for אֶת גִּוְהַת נָתַתְּ, — “Then a body thou hast given.” Since אֶת, however, is an adverb of time, it cannot be taken in the sense of “therefore.” Pierce adopts the emendation so far, but leaves the verb as it stands. Pye Smith inclines to this view, and holds that אֶת־נָתַתְּ signifies “to prepare.” 2. Bleek supposes a corruption in the LXX., — σῶμα, instead of ὅτι, or ὅτι originally. 3. Rosenmiiller, with Owen, a synecdoche, “Thou hast opened mine ears;” — ‘given a capacity to hear, and therefore to obey thy commands.’ 4. Michaelis, Storr, Kuinoel, Hengstenberg, and Stuart, paraphrase it somewhat thus, “Thou hast opened, i.e., spoken closely and effectually into mine ears;” — ‘I have ears to hear, and I understand the secret meaning of the laws concerning sacrifices. I know that that requires not oxen and goats, but a BETTER SACRIFICE; and for that purpose I present myself.’ 5. Olshausen and Ebrard adhere to the explanation derived from the boring of the servant’s ear, <sup>(22)</sup>Exodus 21:6. All agree that the meaning is substantially conveyed by the LXX. — ED.
- ft<sup>30</sup> On the Holy Spirit, miscellaneous works, vol. 3, b. 2, ch. 3,4. — Ed.
- ft<sup>31</sup> VARIOUS READING. — Scholz and Lachmann, and several other critics, prefer οὗτος, verse 12. Tischendorf retains αὐτός in his text. — ED.

- ft32 VARIOUS READING. — Instead of **μνησθῶ** Lachmann and Tischendorf read **μνησθήσομαι**. — Ed.
- ft33 See on Person of Christ, vol. 1 of miscellaneous works. — ED.
- ft34 VARIOUS READINGS. — Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, agree in reading **δεσμίοις**, *prisoners*, instead of **δεσμοῖς μου**, *my bonds*. See <sup>sc10</sup> Hebrews 13 verse 3. ” **Ἐν οὐρανοῖς** inserted in the *textus receptus*, and deemed a very probable omission by Griesbach, is rejected by Lachmann and Tischendorf. The authority for it is D\*\*\* E J K, and both the Syriac versions. — ED.
- ft35 VARIOUS READING. — Lachmann and Tischendorf read **δίκαιός μου** — ED.