

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

[1r]

Q. What may one call, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*?

A. Tis well expressed by Sir *Charles Wolseley*.

“This Epistle is a *Funeral Sermon*, preached at the Interment of the *Law*: The maternal Body of *Moses*, God Himself Buried long before, and no Man ever knew the Place of his Sepulture; and now, his mystical Body, his Doctrine, growing old & ready to vanish away, ripe for Abolition, or rather Dissolution, not so much by being Repeated or Rescinded, but its Use ceasing, the End and Substance of it appearing, & its Glory being of course swallowed up into a greater Glory: the Holy Ghost Himself, by this Epistle layes it Honourably in the Grave; And so wee have the Sepulchre of the mystical Body of *Moses*, abiding with us to this day.”¹

Q. Why is the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, written in *Greek*?

A. If you consider several Passages, of the *Jerusalem Gemarists* about the *Greek* Language, quoted by Dr. *Lightfoot*, you’ll see the Reason of it.²

Upon that Prophecy, *God shall enlarge Japhet, & hee shall dwell in the Tents of Shem*, they say, *They shall speak the Language of Japhet, in the Tents of Shem*. And the *Babylon Gemara*, tells us, That the *Greek Tongue*, is the *Beauty of Japhet, which shall bee in the Tents of Shem*. They do moreover mention Four Languages, *The Vulgar, the Roman, the Syrian, & the Hebrew*. And *Midras Tillin* tells us, That the *Greek Tongue*, is intended by, *The Vulgar*. Furthermore, They

1 From the work of Sir Charles Wolseley, *The Mount of Spirits, that glorious & honorable State to which Believers are called by the Gospel* (1691), pp. 1–2. Sir Charles (1629/30–1714), second baronet, was appointed Lord Wolseley under the Protectorate and was a leading politician under Cromwell. Even for an Independent, he was a strong advocate of religious toleration in post-Restoration England and published a number of theological and apologetical works, including attacks on Hobbes and a defense of divorce (*ODNB*).

2 Mather draws this passage from John Lightfoot, *The Harmony, Chronicle, and Order of the New Testament* (1655) in *Works* (1:340). A member of the Westminster Assembly and later vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, Lightfoot (1602–1675) was one of the greatest English Hebraists and biblical scholars of the period. He bequeathed his library of Old Testament books and documents to Harvard.

Lightfoot argues that Hebrews was primarily addressed to the “believing Jews of Judea” but written in Greek as the “common tongue” of the time, which allowed it to reach a broad audience and facilitate evangelization among the diasporic Jews. Lightfoot references a Talmudic tradition (and the Gemara on it), according to which “the most beautiful thing which Japheth has – that is, the Greek language – shall dwell in the tents of Shem”; see the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Megillah 9b (Soncino, p. 50). Reference is also made to the Midrash Tehillim, probably the commentary on Ps. 1:2, which discusses the legitimacy of learning Greek. See Braude’s translation: *The Midrash on Psalms*, vol. 1, pp. 23–24. Finally, Lightfoot refers to a Gemara in the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sotah 49b (Soncino, pp. 268–70).

recite, the Traditions of *Rabbi's*; That the Law cannot be Interpreted compleatly, but only in the Greek. Yea, The *Talmuds* affirm, That at *Cæsarea*, they rehearsed their *Phylacteries* in the Greek Tongue; tho' in *Cæsarea* there were as learned Schools, as any where in the Nation. The *Greek*, was now planted throughout the World, by means of the *Græcian* Monarchy; & the *Hebrew* was a Stranger to all but Scholars; yea, it seems, the *Greek* was used in an University of *Judæa* itself. Well might our Apostle then write as hee did.³

Q. Who were, *The Hebrews*; and why is the Epistle thus endorsed, rather than to, *The Jewes*?

A. It must be supposed, that the Apostle sends the Epistle, to be delivered at some *certain Place*; for the *Bearer* could not possibly deliver it unto all the Dispersion, and the *Writer* also saies, hee would come to see them.⁴ Now, the Direction, to, *The Hebrewes*, will determine the Place. Hee calls them so, not only because the Name of *Jewes*, was apace becoming odious, but because hee would point out the *Jewes*, which dwelt in the Land of *Israel*. Wee read in Act. 6.1. about, *A Murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrew*, where, by the

³ While Mather engages in debates over the authorship and canonicity of other books of the Bible, he does not do so here, apparently considering the consensus on its divine inspiration and Pauline authorship safe enough. This consensus was unambiguously defended by the most important interpreters in the Reformed-Puritan tradition of the seventeenth century. For example, in his posthumous *magnum opus*, the three-volume *Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (3 vols., [1655] 1866), the Westminster divine William Gouge (1575–1653) asserted that the epistle was of “divine authority” and its “penman . . . Paul the Apostle” (1:3). Similarly, the famous Puritan divine and expositor John Owen (1616–1683) devoted “Exertitation I” (1–23) of his *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Also Concerning the Messiah* (1668) to defending the “canonical authority” and “divine original” of the Epistle to the Hebrews and seeking to “evinced *St. Paul* to have been the Author of it.”

Partly drawing on debates in the early days of the church (where some had suggested Barnabas, some Luke, and some Clemens Romanus as the author), a number of prominent critics of the early modern period, however, were again questioning that broad consensus. The Dutch Christian scholar and Renaissance polymath Erasmus of Rotterdam (Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus; 1466–1536) cast doubt on the matter. The great Dutch jurist, historian, theologian, and humanist scholar of the Bible, Hugo Grotius (Huig de Groot; 1583–1645), thought that the style, idiom, and some contextual clues pointed to Luke rather than Paul. See Erasmus’s and Grotius’s prefatory remarks in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:4075 and 4097–98). Weighing all the evidence, Grotius’s English disciple, the Anglican theologian and exegete, Henry Hammond (1605–1660), concluded that both the authorship and the place of origin could not be determined with certainty but believed that it was not improbable that Paul had written the original in Hebrew and that Luke then translated it into Greek. See his *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* ([1653] 1845), 4:328. One of Mather’s most trusted authorities in critical New Testament studies, the Anglican theologian Daniel Whitby (1638–1726), on the other hand, found the evidence against the Pauline authorship inconclusive and thus saw no reason to challenge the received assumption. See his *A Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament* (1703), 2:41–43.

⁴ Also from Lightfoot, *The Harmony, Chronicle, and Order of the New Testament* (1655) in *Works* (1:340).

Hellenists, are meant the *Jewes*, which dwelt in foreign Countreyes, among the *Greeks*, (as Dr. *Lightfoot* supposes, tho' some take them to be gentile Proselytes) and by the *Hebrewes*, are meant the *Jewes* which dwelt in the Land of *Judæa*. To these then, is this Epistle Inscribed: a People that had been much obliged unto *Paul*, for obtaining of Collections for them, and unto *Mark*, the present Messenger, who had attended him when hee brought the Alms unto them. Indeed, hee intends, the *Jewes* throughout the whole Dispersion, as *Peter* afterwards applied it unto them all: But hee sends it unto the *Jewes* in the *Holy Land*, the principal Seat of the Circumcision, as the Center, from whence it might bee most likely to diffuse itself, thro' the whole Jewish World.

Q. Since the *Jewes* take a great Liberty (such is their Envy!) to Reproach the Apostle *Paul*, as an Ignorant Man, & Fallacious in his Disputations, lett us hear what the more Ingenuous among them will acknowledge?

A. That famous modern Critic, *Simons*, tells us, (Hist. Crit. N.T. c. 21.) That he gave to a *Jew*, the *Epistle to the Hebrewes*, to Read; and a *Jew* who was greatly acquainted with their Ancient Authors. Upon the Perusal of it, the *Jew* frankly avowed, That this *Epistle* could be writt by none but some great *Mekubal* (i. e. Man of Tradition) of his own Nation. He celebrated his profound Knowledge in the sublime Sence of the Bible, and spoke of the great *Mekubal* with Admiration.⁵

[iv]

Q. Is there not a noble Proof of our Saviours *Deity*, to be fetch'd from the Beginning of the Epistle to the *Hebrewes*?

A. Dr. *Burnet* has well observed it.⁶

All those who acknowledge, that CHRIST is to be worshipped, must say, that it is due to him, either because He is truly GOD, or because He is a Person of such an high Dignity, that GOD has upon that Consideration appointed him to be so worshipped. Now the second Notion may fall under another Distinction; That either he was of a very sublime Order by Nature as some Angelical Being, that tho' he was created, yett had this high Priviledge bestow'd upon him; or, that he was a Prophet Illuminated & Authorized in so particular a Manner beyond all others, that out of a regard unto That, he was exalted unto the Honour of a Claim to be worshipped. One of these must be chosen by all, who

⁵ A reference to Richard Simon's *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (1689), ch. 21, p. 248. A French priest and member of the Oratorians, Simon (1638–1712) was one of the most famous biblical critics and orientologists of the period. In the work cited by Mather, Simon discusses the origin and character of the various books of the New Testament, engaging with both Jewish critics and modern skeptics.

⁶ From the work of the Scottish philosopher, historian, and Bishop of Salisbury (after 1689) Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* ([1699] third ed., 1705), pp. 50–51 (on Article 2).

do not believe him to be truly GOD: And indeed one of these was the *Arian*, as the other is the *Socinian*, Hypotheses. For how much soever the *Arians* might exalt him in Words, yett if they beleevd him to be a Creature made in Time, so that once he was not; all that they said of him can amount unto no more, but that he was a Creature of a spiritual Nature; and this is plainly the Notion which the Scripture gives us of *Angels*. *Artemon*, *Samosatenus*, *Photinus*, and the *Socinians* in our Days, consider our Saviour as a great *Prophet* and *Lawgiver*, and unto this they resolve his Dignity.⁷

In Opposition to both of these, this Epistle begins with Expressions, that are the more severe because they are Negatives; which are to be understood more strictly than positive Words. CHRIST is not only præferred unto *Angels*, but also sett in Opposition to them, as one of *another Order* of Beings. From that the Writer goes on, to shew, that He was as much above *Moses*, who was above all other Prophets, as a *Son* is above a *Servant*; yea, as the *Builder* of the House, is above the House; yea, a Builder who is very GOD.⁸

7 On the debates surrounding Socinianism and Arianism in Mather's time, see the Introduction. Reference is made to: a) Artemon (or Artemas), a representative of "dynamic monarchianism" around the turn of the third century, which viewed Christ as a mere man, even though miraculously conceived, and as the Son of God only in the sense that he had been filled with divine power and wisdom to an infinitely high degree; b) Paul of Samosata (Paulus Samosatenus; ca. 200–275), who was Bishop of Antioch from 260 to 268 and taught an adoptionist variety of monarchianism, according to which Jesus was born a mere human being, but was infused with the divine Logos when, according to Scripture, the Holy Ghost descended upon him during his baptism in the River Jordan, whereby he was adopted as the Son of God, effectively becoming divine and the Christ; and c) Photinus of Sirmium (b. 376 in Ancyra), who was a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra and Bishop of Sirmium for a short time (around 343). His exact ideas are hard to reconstruct, but he seems to have emphasized the unity of the godhead in a way that precluded the notion that Christ was begotten of the Father before time. Instead, he thought that the *ousia* of the godhead expanded and contracted, and that the divine *dynamis* somehow emanated into the human person of Jesus, making him the Christ. At a synod held at Milan in 345, Photinus's teachings were rejected and condemned (RGG).

8 Mather here uses "very" as an adjective in the old theological sense of "really or truly entitled to the name or designation; possessing the true character of the person or thing named; properly so called or designated" (OED).

Q. On that, *The express Image of His Person?* v. 3.

A. Dr. *Arrowsmith* ha's an Observation upon it.¹⁰ There is a Difference between a *Shadow*, and a *Picture*, and a *Statue*. It is the last of these, that is here alluded unto. A *Shadow*, is a sleight Repræsentation of a Body; but not a *clear* one. Such a Repræsentation of God there is in all the Creatures. A *Picture* goes further; it is most lively, it gives the *Feature*; perhaps the *Colour* too. A *Picture* of God is drawn, on Angels, & on the Souls of Men. But then a *Statue*: this is a *Character* that goes further still: It exhibits the *whole Man*, from the Crown of the Head to the Sole of the Foot. It is a more *substantial* Exhibition. It gives also the *Proportion* of every Part. Thus our Saviour is the *Character of His Fathers Person*. He holds forth God, whole God, and Altogether.

Q. What special Matter may bee intimated in that Passage, *Hee upholds all things, with the Word of His Power?* v. 3.

A. The *Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It was usual for the Jewes, to express the Deity, by the Word גבורה *Power*; and therefore δύναιμις is here inserted,¹¹ to assure them, that our Lord sustains the World, and prevents its Relapse into its primitive Abyss, by the Vertue of His *Deity*.¹²

Q. Well, but what further Emphasis, may there be in the Word, φέρων,¹³ which we render, *Upholding?*

A. The Word signifies, *Governing*, and may be rendred so; as the Word /נשא/ does, from which comes /נשיא/ *A Prince*.¹⁴

⁹ See Appendix A.

¹⁰ Mather quotes from the work of the Cambridge professor of divinity and member of the Westminster Assembly, John Arrowsmith (1602–1659), *Armilla catechetica, a Chain of Principles* (1659), exerc. 4; aphor. 5, pp. 372–75. During his Cambridge years, Arrowsmith used to deliver religious aphorisms on Sunday evenings in St John's College. Some of these catechetical aphorisms were published posthumously under the title *Armilla Catechetica* (ODNB).

¹¹ From גְבוּרָה [gevurah] “strength, (God's) mighty (deeds)”; δύναιμις [dynamis] signifies “power, might.”

¹² Cf. the annotation on this verse by John Owen, in *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Also Concerning the Messiah*, pp. 58–59.

¹³ The verb φέρω [phero] basically signifies “bear, carry.” Here (Heb. 1:3) it is usually taken to mean “to cause to continue in a state or condition, sustain” (BDAG), or “uphold,” as the KJV renders it. Mather's suggestion for a “further emphasis” is cited from Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:50).

¹⁴ Reference is made to the words נשא [nasa] “lift (up), carry, take”; and נשיא [nasi], which is derived from נשא and signifies “leader, chief (BDB).”

4110

Q. Upon what Account is the *Messiah* of God called, *The Brightness of His Glory, and express Image of His Person?* v. 3.

A. The most acute *Bisterfeld* asserts, That the Apostle here uses no Phrase, but such as have a Foundation in the Old Testament. Yea, and he maintains, *In Novo Testamento, nec Phrasiis, nec Vocem aliquam, nisi planè sit Vox tantum Historica, nullum fidei mysterium significans, usurpari quin ex Veteri desumatur.*¹⁵

But I will now desert *Bisterfeld*, and consult *Witsius* rather than him, to learn what Passages of the Old Testament might be considered in these Expressions of our Apostle.¹⁶

The *Brightness of the Divine Glory* here ascribed unto our *Messiah*, why may it not refer to the *Glorious Brightness* of old seen over the *Ark*, or that seen on the Face of *Moses*, or that seen by *Ezekiel* among the *Cherubim*; This, and all the Glory signified by this, is upon our *Messiah*. The Word /נוגה/ used there answers to the *Απαύγασμα*, used here.¹⁷ Or *Witsius* would rather suppose here a Reference to the *Brightness* of the Divine Majesty, that was with astonishment beheld by the Prophets, when God Appeared in an Humane Form unto them. [See Ezek. 1.27, 28.] The Apostle would now declare, That our *Messiah* is the very same that then appeared in that Illustrious *Brightness*.

The *express Image* here called, *χαρακτήρ*, answers to the Hebrew, /תמונה/ which means the *Form* of a thing, by which tis distinguished from every other Thing.¹⁸ What if it should have an Eye to the Text, where the *Messiah* is called, Hag. 2.23. *The Signet of God*. As if it had been said, *Imprimam tibi omnimodam mei Similitudinem; Demonstrabo te esse Filium mihi* ομοουσιον και ομοδοξον,

15 "... that in the New Testament neither a phrase nor any word – unless it might be a purely historical statement that does not signify any mystery of faith – is used which is not taken from the Old." From Herman Witsius, *Exercitationes sacrae* (1689), exerc. 12, p. 212, Mather cites the work of Johannes Heinrich Bisterfeld, *De Uno Deo Patre, Filio, Spiritu Sancto contra Jo. Crellium breviter defensum* (1639), lib. 1, sect. 2, cap. 30, pp. 298–99. Professor of divinity at Franeker, Utrecht, and Leiden, Witsius (Herman Wits, 1636–1708) was renowned in the world of Reformed theology for his important work on covenant theology, *De oeconomia foederum Dei cum hominibus* (1677), but also for his exegetical writings, which Mather frequently cites in the "Biblia." Bisterfeld (1605–1655) was a German Reformed theologian and pupil of Johann Heinrich Alsted and went with him to Weissenburg (Alba Iulia) in Transylvania, where he became head of the academy (*A DB*). Bisterfeld's work apparently responds to the *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos* (1634), co-authored by the Socinian theologians Jonas Schlichting and Johannes Crell (see below).

16 From Witsius, *Exercitationes sacrae*, exerc. 12, p. 212.

17 The word נגה [nogah] means "gleam, bright light." It seems that Mather misspelled the Greek word ἀπαύγασμα [apaugasma], meaning "radiance, effulgence," while Witsius has the correct form.

18 The word χαρακτήρ [charakter] signifies a "mark engraved, impress"; while תמונה [t'munah] indeed means "form, manifestation."

*omnibusque signis te talem manifestabo.*¹⁹ Thus tis said of the *Messiah*, Zech. 3.9. *I will engrave the Engraving thereof.* As if it had been said, *Facio ut in illo appareant omnes illæ notæ, atque excellentiæ, quæ indicia sunt Messiaë, et Filii mei.*²⁰

We will call in Dr. *Whitby's* Observations!²¹

He observes, That some of the Fathers think, as *Justin Martyr*,²² that this is a Metaphor taken from the *Sun*; others, as *Tatian*,²³ that it is taken from the *Fire*, or the *Light*; from whence *Fire* and *Light* is taken, without any Diminution of that which kindles it. Perhaps they borrowed this thought, from *Philo*, who speaking of the Spirit in *Moses*, derived unto the *seventy Elders*, uses this very Comparison for it.²⁴ Accordingly, the *Niceae Council* styled our Lord, *Light of Light*. The like Notions the Jewes do seem to have of their λογος, or, *Wisdome*. For in the *Book of Wisdome*, tis said of her, [Ch. 7.25, 26.] *That she is an Efflux of the sincere Glory of the Almighty, and ἀπαύγασμα φωτός αιδιου, the Splendor of eternal Light.*²⁵ Probably, they | took it, from the *Glory*, that conducted them out of *Egypt*, and was afterwards in the *Tabernacle*, and in the *Temple*. [2v]

This Δόξα,²⁶ *Glory*, (the *Shechinah*) so often mentioned in the *Old Testament*, & in the Writings of the *Jewes*, was not the *Cloud* itself; that being only the Cover of it; but it was the *Light*, *Fire*, or *Splendor*, that issued from it. Consider, Exod. 24.16.

19 "I will impress [or imprint] on you a perfect likeness to me. I will demonstrate that you are the son who is consubstantial with me and of the same mind. And by all the signs I will make manifest that you are of this kind." The Greek words are ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὁμόδοξον [homoousion kai homodoxon]: "consubstantial and of the same mind."

20 "I make it so that in him appear all the features and forms of excellence that are signs of the messiah and my son."

21 From *Whitby, A Paraphrase* (2:48–49). See Appendix A.

22 From *Whitby*, a reference to the Greek philosopher, apologist, and Christian martyr, *Justin Martyr* (Iustinus Martyr, c. 100–165), *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo* [PG 6. 776. 53–54; *Patristische Texte und Studien* 47].

23 From *Whitby*, a reference to the early Syrian Christian apologist, *Tatian the Assyrian* (c. 120–c. 180/190), *Oratio adversus Græcos* [PG 6. 817. 47].

24 From *Whitby*, a reference to *Philo of Alexandria, Librum De Gigantes*, 6.25: "... when they [the seventy elders, cf. Num. 11:16–18] take fire from fire, for though the fire should kindle a thousand torches, it is still as it was and is diminished not a whit." Transl.: *LCL* 227, p. 477. *Philo of Alexandria* (c. 15 BCE–c. 50 CE) was a leading Jewish philosopher of classical antiquity who attempted a synthesis between Jewish tradition and Greek philosophy in numerous apologetical, exegetical, and systematic works. *Philo* assumed that the Tanakh already encapsulated all the wisdom of Greek philosophy (often in allegorical form) and that therefore the latter could be used to explicate the former. Postulating the radical transcendence of God, *Philo* appropriated the Platonic concept of an intermediary divine being, the Logos, through whom the material world was created and in whose image man was made. The Church Fathers greatly appreciated not only *Philo's* Logos-theology but also his hermeneutics of allegorization through which scriptural texts could be read as speaking of philosophical ideas on a higher level of signification (*RGG*).

25 From *Whitby*, *Mather* offers a translation for the phrase ἀπαύγασμα φωτός αιδιου [apaugasma photos aidiou]. Reference is made to *Wis. 7:25–26*.

26 The word δόξα [doxa] means "notion, opinion" but also "glory."

And this *Glory* is called, *The Glory of the Lord*, not as being itself a *Divine Thing*, or a Ray of Divinity; but as being the Symbol of the glorious Presence and Abode of God, where it appeared. It was therefore called, *The Cloud of Jehovah*. [Exod. 40.38.]

Our Lord Jesus Christ, after His Ascension, appeared still in or with the *Glory* of the Lord: And when He was *Transfigured*, it attended Him.

Because of Gods Residence in this *Glory*, the Word *Glory* doth often signify, *God* Himself. [See Jer. 2.11.]

From this *Glory*, when any wondrous Works of Power, and Mercy, and Judgment, were done by God, there is said to be an Emanation or Shining forth of *Glory*. *Fire* came forth from the *Glory*, to testify an Acceptance of the *Sacrifices*. [Lev. 9.23, 24.] And to consume *Transgressors*. [Lev. 10.2.]

Well, The *Son* of God, may be called, Απογασμα της δόξης²⁷ *An Emanation from the Glory of the Father*; as being before all things, *Prolatus à Patre, sive generatus*, as *Irenaeus* expresses it.²⁸ Being alwayes in Him, but, *coming forth before all things*, *he be των υλικων ξυμπαντων ιδεα και ενεργεια*. *The Idea and active Power of all material Beings*; as tis express'd by *Athenagoras*.²⁹ Or, as *Tertullian* has it, *He was the Word brought forth by the Father, and by that Prolation generated; and therefore the Son of God*.³⁰

Q. *This Day?*] v. 5.

A. An Hebraism, frequently added unto speeches wherein some Remarkable Matter is either done, or given, or promised, or commanded; unto the End, that

27 The phrase *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης* [apauasma tes doxes] means “the radiance of the glory” (Heb. 1:3); Mather again misspells the word as *ἀπαύγασμα*.

28 From Whitby, a reference to Irenaeus of Lyon (c. 130/140–c. 200/203), *Adversus Haereses*, lib. 2, cap. 28 [PG 7. 809. 34; SC 153]. Born in Asia Minor, Irenaeus, following his conversion, transplanted himself to Gaul, where he became Bishop of Lyon in 177. He wrote some of the earliest works of systematic theology as well as apologies (chief among which is *Adversus haereses*) against a variety of early Christian movements he regarded as heresies, including Valentianism (a form of Gnosticism) and the Docetism propagated by, among others, the followers of Marcion.

29 From Whitby, Mather offers a valid translation of the phrase *υλικῶν ξυμπαντων ιδεα και ενεργεια* [hylikon xympanton idea kai ενεργεια]. Reference is made to the work of Athenagoras of Athens (c. 133–190), *Legatio pro Christianis* [PG 6. 909. 68]. A philosopher and early convert to Christianity, Athenagoras wrote influential apologetics of the faith.

30 From Whitby, a reference to Tertullian *Apologeticus*, cap. 21 [PL 1. 395–96; CSEL 69; CCSL 1]; transl.: *LCL* 250, p. 106. Born and educated in Carthage, Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullian converted to Christianity sometime before 195, subsequently turning toward the prophetic movement of Montanism and eventually breaking with the mainstream church around 210. Besides numerous catechetical and homiletical works, he is the author of some of the earliest apologies of Christianity, most of which were written during the period of Christian persecution in the late second century. These works defend and advocate Christianity often in polemical terms vis-à-vis Greco-Roman culture but also Judaism. His *Apology* was written during the persecution of the early Christians, ca. 197/198 (RGG). See Appendix B.

the Day may be kept in Memory & perhaps remain for a Day of Commemoration.³¹

Q. *And Again, when He bringeth in the First-begotten into the World?* v. 6.

A. *Again*, may well be referr'd unto His *Bringing in*. For our Saviour was expelled [from]³² the World by His Death & Burial. But God *brought Him into the World Again* by His Resurrection.³³

Q. *Spirits & a Flame of Fire?* v. 7.

A. The Passage is in Psal. CIV.4. The Manner of the *Angelical Ministry* is here pointed at. It is like a *Spirit*, or *Wind*; very Forcible, and yett Invisible. And like a *Flame of Fire*, or *Lightning*; very Penetrating, & of such Agility, as to move almost in an Instant, from one Part of Heaven to another.³⁴

Q. *The Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows?* v. 9.

A. It alludes to the *anointing of Kings*, or, if you please, of *Guests* at Feasts. Tis called, *The Oyl of Gladness*, because the Spirits were exhilarated with it.

Solomon was endowed by God, with *Wisdom*, & *Riches*, & *Honour*, above other Men. Particularly *above his Fellowes*, or the rest of the Sons of *David*.

But this is most gloriously fulfilled in our JESUS, a Greater than *Solomon*.³⁵

{105*}

Q. The Apostle is proving, The *Messiah* to bee *God* and *Jesus* to bee the *Messiah*. In Confirmation of the former Assertion, hee cites, that Passage, in Psal. 102.25. *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the foundation of the Earth.*- Suppose, a

³¹ This philological explanation comes from the work of the Socinian theologians Jonas Schlichting and Johann Crell, anonymously published in England as *The Expiation of a Sinner in a Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrewes* (1646), p. 6. (On Schlichting and Crell, see the annotation at Heb. 5:8.) Mather's citation here is a striking instance of silent omission, for *The Expiation* in the annotation on Heb. 1:5 offers a fully developed Unitarian reading of Christ's sonship and his generation by the Father: Christ is "singularly entituled and named the Sonne of God, because God in a singular manner hat begotten him, raised him from the dead ... and made him most resemblant and like to God himselfe, by giving him Immortality and universall Royalty to bee King over his people. ... For God is called God by reason of his supream power and dominon; whereof they also are called God and the sons of god, that have power and dominion, and the greater their power if, or the nearer it resembles Gods power, so much the rather, and more nearly are they his sonnes. ... Christ was the Sonne of God before his resurrection; for during his prophetick function, he was a great Potentate, and wrought powerfull miracles; but after his Resurrection upon his Regal office, he became most nearly and highly the Sonne of God, because then God made him an immortal and universall Potentate; for then all Power was given him in heaven and earth (5-6)."

³² Editorial insertion: Mather accidentally omitted the word "from" in this sentence.

³³ From *The Expiation*, p. 6. Similarly, also, Owen, in *Exercitations*, p. 89.

³⁴ From *The Expiation*, p. 7.

³⁵ From *The Expiation*, p. 9.

Jew now objecting, *This is to bee understood of God the Father*; How were the Objection to bee Answered? v. 10.

A. It might bee Answered, out of their own Concessions, upon which the Apostle now argues. For, that Passage, in Gen. 1.2. *The Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters*; they so Interpret, *This is the Spirit of the King Messiah*. Thus you have their Mind spoken, in *Zohar*, in *Bereshith Rabba*,³⁶ and in diverse others. Now, if the *Spirit of Christ*, was the great Agent in the Creation, they could not but grant this Allegation, to bee very pertinent.

Q. It is said of the *Angels*, *Are they not ministring Spirits?* Give us a good Note upon it? v. 14.

A. I have somewhere mett with such a Note as this. The Style of the *good Angels* is, *ministring Spirits*; but the Style of the *evil Angels*, is, *The Prince of the Powers of the Air*, and, *The God of this World*. To *serve* God, is not only the *Duty*, but the *Honour* of the Highest Creatures; It is more *Honour to serve* God, than to *Rule* the World.³⁷

³⁶ A reference to the Book of Zohar, Vayehi, 240a. See the transl. of the Soncino ed.: "The 'spirit of God which hovered over the face of the waters' (Gen. 1:2) is the spirit of the Messiah" (364), and the Bereshit Rabbah, at Gen. 1:2 [16]. See also the Soncino *Midrash Rabbah*, Genesis: "AND THE SPIRIT OF GOD HOVERED: this alludes to the spirit of Messiah" (17).

³⁷ See Increase Mather, *Angelographia, or A discourse concerning the nature and power of the holy angel* (1696), pp. 28, 65, 82, 111.

Q. Unto what Alludes the Apostle, in his Expression of, *letting slip, the Things which wee have heard?* v. 1.

A. Interpreters have generally concurred, with the venerable *Beza*, in supposing these Words and Allusion, to *leaky Vessels*.³⁸ Now if you have Recourse to the *Pirke Avoth*, a Book which contains various Traditions of the Ancient *Hebrewes*, you shall find a Passage very much Illustrating this of the Apostle to the *Hebrewes*. In cap. 5. § 15. *Quatuor sunt Genera eorum, qui sedent Coram Sapientibus: Quidam sunt, ut Spongia; alij ut Clepsydra; alij, ut Saccus facinacius; alij ut Cribrum.* Spongia, *quia illa sugendo attrahit omnia;* Clepsydra; *QUIA UNA EX PARTE ATTRAHIT, ET ALIÀ EX PARTE EFFUNDIT;* Saccus Fæcinaceus, *quia effundit Vinum et colligit Fæces:* Cribrum, *quia emittit Farinam et colligit simi-lam.*³⁹ The Apostle now cautions the Hearers of the Word, that they bee none of those three last Sorts of Hearers. And I add, It were well that they who do with so much Impatience regard the *Hourglass*, while Hearing, would bee themselves less like the *Hourglass*.⁴⁰

|
1235.

[3v]

Q. What is that *World to come*, which God *hath not putt in Subjection unto the Angels?* v. 5.

A. It cannot bee, the *present State of the World*; for that is in Subjection to the Government of *Holy Angels*; who are therefore stiled, *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, & Powers*. Nevertheless, The *World to come*, is a State upon Earth, as the Greek Word for *World* here, plainly intimates; οἰκουμένη, *designat τόπον*

³⁸ A reference to the work of the French Reformed Protestant reformer and disciple of John Calvin, Theodore Beza (1519–1605), *Annotationes majores in Novum Dn Nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum* (1594), p. 489.

³⁹ "... that there are four kinds of those who sit next to the wise: there are those that are like a sponge; others like a clepsydra [a water clock]; others like a bag for residues; others like a sieve. A sponge because it takes in everything by sucking it up; a clepsydra because it takes in through one part and ejects through the other; a bag of residues because it emits the vine and collects the dregs; a sieve because it emits flour and holds back fine wheat flour." The citation comes from the work of the English theologian, Hebraist, and apologist Christopher Cartwright (1602–1658), *Mellificium hebraicum* ("Hebrew honey-making"), published in vol. 9 of the 1660 ed. of Pearson, *Critici Sacri*, and in vol. 8 of the 1698 Amsterdam ed., pp. 1271–426, here 8:1350. Cartwright's source is the *Pirke Avoth* ("Chapters of the Fathers"), in *Nezikin* (the fourth order of the *Mishnah*), cap. 5:15; transl. *Pirke Aboth, The Ethics of the Talmud*, p. 137.

⁴⁰ A reference to the hourglass used by preachers in New England and elsewhere to keep time.

οικήσεως.⁴¹ It remains then, That the *World to come*, should be the State of Things during the Day of Judgment, or, after the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Ministry of *Holy Angels*, will not then be wanted; for the *Evil Angels* will be chained up; and the *Raised Saints* then shall do the Work which is now done by the *Holy Angels*.

Besides, you may observe, the Apostle adds, *whereof we speak*. And where was that, but in Chap. 1.6. where, we do much amiss to read the Words, *And again, when Hee brings the First-begotten into the World*; for they should be read, *And when Hee brings Again, the First-begotten, into the (Habitable) World, Hee saith, lett all the Angels of God worship Him*. Τis, ὅταν δε πάλιν εισαγάγη, not, πάλιν δε ὅταν εισαγάγη. And, *Aoristus secundus subjunctivi, significationem habet Futuri*.⁴² Now these Words evidently point at the Day of Judgment; and the Ninety-seventh Psalm, out of which the Apostle takes these Words, manifestly refers to this Day of the Lord.

Q. The Intention of the Text cited here, *what the Son of Man, that thou visitest him?* v. 6.

A. One writes at this rate. God gave *Adam*, the Dominion over this Earthly World; yett not personally for himself only, but for him & his Sons, or Posterity after him. For, tho' he were sole Lord over his Sons during their Minority, yett afterwards as they grew up into Maturity, then the Right was also to be communicated unto them, to be Lords over this Earthly World. [Psal. CXV. 16.]

Thus, the Faithful, are the Sons of our glorious JESUS. God has given Him Dominion over the Heavenly World. But it is for His Children to have a Share in it, when they have pass'd thro' their Non-age under His Tuition, & are come to the Maturity of Immortality, then a Share in the Dominion shall be imparted unto them also. [2. Tim. II. 12.]⁴³

⁴¹ The word οἰκουμένη [oikoumene] means “inhabited world” and the phrase τόπον οικήσεως [topon oikeseos] “place of dwelling.”

⁴² “An aorist that follows a conjunction has a future meaning.” From Joseph Mede, “De regno Επιφάνειας Christi accipiendum illud Apostoli ad Hebraeos cap. 2. vers. 5,” in idem, *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-learned Joseph Mede* (1677), bk. 3, p. 577. The English Hebraist and biblical exegete Joseph Mede (Mead, Meade, 1586–1639) had a major influence on Puritan millennialism, especially through his *Clavis Apocalyptica* (1627), which calculated that the end times would begin in 1716 or 1736 (*ODNB*). Drawing on Mede, Mather here discusses the translation of Heb. 1:6, a verse which he interprets as looking ahead to to Second Coming and the Last Judgment. While the KJV has “and again, when he brings,” Mede and Mather suggest “and when he brings again,” switching around the word order from πάλιν δε ὅταν εισαγάγη [palin de hotan eisagage] to ὅταν δε πάλιν εισαγάγη [hotan de palin eisagage] to underline this alternative interpretation. Mede’s (and Mather’s) argument that a conjunctive or subjunctive aorist (eventualis) suggests a future tense is correct. Indeed, a number of modern Bible translations support this alternative interpretation, including the NAS (“and when He again brings”) and a number of German translations, while the ESV, NIV, and NRS, among others, uphold the KJV translation.

⁴³ From *The Expiation*, p. 22.

4502

Q. Upon that Passage; *Thou hast made Him a little lower than the Angels*: what Remark? v. 7.

A. *Luther* in his *Table-Talk*, observes, That it should be rendred; as in the Original tis, *Thou hast made Him a little while, lower than the Angels*: That is, until He had *Tasted of Death*. It was, by being made Subject unto *Death*; for the *Angels Dy not*.⁴⁴

| ⁴⁵

Q. It is said, *Jesus doth Taste Death for every Man*; why is that Expression, *Tasting Death*, made Use of? v. 9.

A. 'Tis an elegant Allusion to the Way, whereby, *Death* at first came into the World; This was by *Tasting* the Forbidden Fruit. And this Phrase being used here, does intimate, That the *Death* of the Second *Adam*, was for the *Sin* of the First.

Briefly, I find in *Bellarmino*, this Gloss upon it. *Quasi dicere voluisset; primus Homo deglutiens dulce Pomum vetitum, omnem Posteritatem Morti addixit: secundus Homo deglutiens Mortis Pomum amarissimum, omnes, qui ex illo renascuntur, ad Vitam æternam adduxit*.⁴⁶

Q. How was the *Captain* of our Salvation made *perfect thro' Sufferings*? v. 10.

A. The Word, *τελειουν* is used for the *Consecration of a Priest*.⁴⁷ God being about the gracious Work of bringing many Sons unto Glory, *Consecrated*, or *Inaugurated* our Saviour unto that Work, by *Sufferings*. He being so *Consecrated*, [*τελειωθεις*]⁴⁸ became the *Author of eternal Salvation*.

⁴⁴ A reference to Luther's gloss on Heb. 1:6–7 in *Doctoris Martini Lutheri Colloquia Mensalia: Or, Dr Martin Luther's Divine Discourses at His Table* (1659), p. 114; see *Tischreden, Sammlungen Aurifabers*, (WA 6:69).

⁴⁵ See Appendix B.

⁴⁶ "As if he had wanted to say: the first man tasting a sweet and forbidden fruit has condemned all of his posterity to death. The second man tasting the most bitter fruit of death has led all those to eternal life who are born again through him." Mather cites Robert Bellarmine, *De septem verbis a Christo in cruce prolatis libri duo* (1668), lib. 2, cap. 20, p. 209. This reference is certainly unusual, for the Italian Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (Italian: Roberto Francesco Romolo Bellarmino; 1542–1621) was a professor of theology and later rector of the Roman College, Archbishop of Capua (1602), and a Cardinal of the Catholic Church who championed the reform decrees of the Council of Trent and was infamously involved in the trial of Giordano Bruno and the Galileo affair.

⁴⁷ The present infinitive of *τελειόω* [*teleioo*] "make perfect, accomplish"; Mather proposes that the word is used in a cultic sense in this passage, a possibility which is still being debated among modern exegetes (*EDNT*).

⁴⁸ The passive participle of *τελειόω* (see above).

[4r]

Thus we Christians must expect our *τελειωσις*,⁴⁹ our Consecration is unto the Dignity, of *Kings* and *Priests*, by *Sufferings*.⁵⁰

One observes, *τελειωσαι*, in a *sacrificial* Sense, is either to *Consecrate*, or to *Purge perfectly* from Sins. In an *Agonistical* Sense, it is, to *Crown* and *Reward*.⁵¹

Q. That Expression, *I will putt my Trust in Him*; How does this prove that the Faithful are the *Brethren* of Christ? v. 13.

A. Thus. Christ and the Faithful, putt their Trust in the same God. This proves, that they are of *One*. They are Dependents on the *same God*, and Father. Having the *same Father* for the Object of their Dependence, they must needs be *Brethren*.⁵²

Q. In what Sense may it be said, That *the Divel had the Power of Death*? v. 14.

A. What think you of the Gloss, which Dr. *Turner* in his *Boylæn Lectures* ha's upon it? The *Divel* had *Power* and *Authority* over *the Dead*, to Torment and Afflict and Punish them for their Sins.⁵³

492.

Q. There may be Cause to think yett a little further?⁵⁴

A. I have often considered it; and at last, from some closer Considerations, founded on many Observations credited, the Words of our Mr. *Walter Cross*, a late Writer.⁵⁵

“For any thing, I know (saith hee) that Scripture intimates, that the *Divel* ha's an active Influence on the *Death* of every Man. Wee call it, a *Natural Death*, but it is the *Divel*, with as active Causalitie, as if the Executioner cutt our Throat.”⁵⁶

Lett us pursue the Thought!

49 The word *τελειωσις* [teleiosis] means “completion, fulfillment.”

50 The first part of this entry seems to be derived from Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:59). Similarly, also, Owen, *Exercitations*, p. 231.

51 The aorist infinitive *τελειώσαι* [teleiosai] (from *τελείωω*, see above) is the biblical form of Heb. 2:10. This paragraph is in a different ink and was presumably added later. Mather seems to take this note from Henry Hammond's annotation on Phil. 3:12, in *A Paraphrase* (4:228–29).

52 From *The Expiation*, p. 30.

53 Mather cites John Turner, *The Wisdom of God in the Redemption of Man, Eight Sermons preach'd in the Year 1708, of the Lecture founded by R. Boyle* (1708), pp. 142–43. A D. D. from Trinity, Cambridge, Turner (1660–1720) was vicar of Greenwich and chaplain to George I; he wrote a number of apologetical works.

54 See Appendix A.

55 Mather references the work of Walter Cross (d. 1701), *An Exposition of the second verse of the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (1694), p. 95. Cross was an English Nonconformist minister at Moorfield (London) and preacher at Utrecht (*ODNB*). The word “late” was added by Mather, an indication that this entry must have been originally composed before Cross's death. There also seems to be a crossed out “X” to the right of the column.

56 See Appendix A.

{7903}

By seducing *Adam* to eat of the Fobidden Fruit, the *Divel*, whom the Jewes called, *Samael*, had Power to Accuse Men, and to demand, that they might Dy, according to the Threatning pronounced against them: This is the constant Opinion of the *Jewes*. Their wise Men say, It is a Tradition, That *Satan*, the Adversary, the *Angel of Death*, *descendeth & seduceth, ascendeth & accuseth, receives Power, & takes away the Soul or Life*. Hence they say of him, That *he causes Death to the whole World*.

Καταργειν τον διαβολον. Is to Frustrate,⁵⁷ & bring to nought, the Design of the Divel, to subject all Men unto the Power of *Death*, & keep them under the Dominion of it. And thus our Saviour does καταργειν θανατον.⁵⁸ *Abolish Death*: [2. Tim. 1.10.] That therefore we are subject unto Death, say the *Fathers*, tis not that we are now punished with it, but out of Mercy, that *Sin* might not be Immortal in us: The Time of the Resurrection being that, wherein *Death* shall be totally *Abolished*. [1. Cor. 15. 26.]

|
363

[4v]

Q. Wee read concerning our Lord, *Hee took on Him the Seed of Abraham*; what Emphasis do you observe, in the Greek Word for, *Took?* v. 16.

A. The Greek, ἐπιλαμβάνεται, thus rendred signifies, The *Catching Hold of a thing*, that is, *in magno Discrimine*, in extreme Danger of Perishing, to save it from Ruine.⁵⁹ This was the Condition of Mankind when our Lord mercifully *Took* our Nature on Him.⁶⁰

In a Sermon of my Fathers, in a Book entituled, *Important Truths*, I find this Matter thus expressed:

“The Words may be read, *He taketh not Hold of the Angels*: saith the Apostle; CHRIST saw the Reprobate Angels falling into the Pitt of Destruction, but He did not *take Hold* on them, to recover them. No, but *the Seed of Abraham He taketh Hold of*. He doth not say, *The Seed of Adam*, but, *The Seed of Abraham*: Thereby intimating, that CHRIST did not come to Redeem

57 As Mather suggests, the phrase καταργεῖν τὸν διάβολον [katargein ton diabolon] signifies “to abolish/bring to nought the Devil.”

58 As Mather suggests, the phrase καταργεῖν θάνατον [katargein thanaton] means “to abolish death.” The second part of this entry is derived from Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:60).

59 Literally ἐπιλαμβάνομαι [epilambanomai] means “take, receive.” In the context of Heb. 2:16, the word can be interpreted as “be concerned with/about. ... in the sense of *help*” (BDAG). The Latin phrase signifies “in great peril.”

60 Mather seems to get this from the annotations of the Scottish Reformed divine John Cameron (1579–1625), contained in *Critici Sacri* (6:4121). Cameron’s biblical annotations were originally published as *Myrothecium evangelicum. Hoc est Novi Testamenti loca quamplurima ab eo, post aliorum labores, aptè & commodè vel illustrata, vel explicata, vel vindicate* (1632). Similarly, also, *The Expiation*, p. 33.

all Men whatsoever, but the Elect of GOD; who are none by that Expression,⁶¹
The Seed of Abraham.”⁶²

Q. When it is said of our Lord, *Hee is able to succour them which are Tempted*, what Emphasis may there be on the *Succour* here proposed? v. 18.

A. The Greek Word here, *To succour*; Βοηθεω, is as much as to say, επι βοην θεω, to {Run} *in at the Cry of another to help him*; to {rescue} one upon his *Outcry* for Help. An Intimation of what is the Duty of *Tempted* Persons, what should be their Method, if they would obtain *Succour* from the Lord Jesus Christ in their *Temptations*.⁶³

⁶¹ Mather probably meant to write “known.”

⁶² A citation from the work of Cotton Mather’s father, the Boston minister and theologian, Increase Mather (1639–1723), *Some Important Truths concerning Conversion, delivered in Several Sermons* (1674), p. 193.

⁶³ Mather paraphrases the word βοηθέω [boetheo] “come to aid, render assistance, help” with the phrase επι βοην θεω [epi boen theo] which literally signifies “I run upon a cry” (cf. the word επιβοηθέω [epiboetheo] “come to aid, succor”). Mather seems to quote this etymological explanation from the work of the Swiss Reformed Pietist, Samuel Heinrich König (1671–1750), *Etymologicon Helleno-Hebraeum: seu primitiva Graeca ex Hebraeo fonte vicinisque orientis linguis, uti Chaldaea, Syra, Arabica atque Aethiopica deducta* (1722), p. 64.

Q. On the *Building* of the *House*? v. 4.

A. Some observe, That κατασκευάζω,⁶⁴ signifies, either to *Build*, or to *Order* and *Govern*. And they think the Latter Sense here to be most Natural, tho' the Former be most Received. The House here, seems to be, the *Family* dwelling in the *House*.⁶⁵

Q. Whose *Voice* is here spoken of? v. 7.

A. The Apostle had just before said, That CHRIST as a *Son*, and *Lord*, was over *His House*. It immediately follows, *Hear HIS Voice*. It is CHRIST who was *Tempted* by the *Israelites* in the *Wilderness*. Compare, 1. Cor. X.9.

This Consideration, will give you a *Key*, that lets you into a *View* of Things, which perhaps you had not so fully before.⁶⁶

Q. On that Passage, *To Day, if yee will hear His Voice*? v. 7.

A. The Words here used by the Apostle, are found, in Psal. XLV.7.

One observes; The literal Sense of them is this. On the *Festival Day*, it was the Custome of the People, to enter, the *Temple*, and attend, the *Worship*, of God. Hereupon *David* composed the Psalm for such a Festival. And he exhorts & excites the People, that since they did on such a *Day*, hear the *Law of God* read unto them, which is the *Voice of God*, they would obey it, & not *harden their Hearts* against it. The mystical Sense is this. The *Voice of Christ*, by which we have the Gospel delivered unto us, is the *Voice of God*. The Time of the Dispensation of the Gospel, is the *Festival Day of Grace*; wherein God makes an Offer of Salvation, & invites us to it, by the Preaching of the Gospel. This Time will not last alwayes unto particular Persons; it will be but a *Day*; and last unto them no longer than their own *Dayes* at the furthest; & unto some, not so long. The Apostle, in the Words of the Psalmist, admonishes the Jewes that they would speedily show themselves teachable, & harken to the *Voice of God*

⁶⁴ As Mather suggests, κατασκευάζω [kataskeuazo] means “furnish, build, construct.”

⁶⁵ From Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:65). Similarly, also, the annotation in the work of the Anglican cleric and scholar, Thomas Pyle (1674–1756), *A Paraphrase with some Notes on the Acts of the Apostles, and upon all the Epistles of the New Testament* (1715), vol. 2, p. 229. Pyle was an outspoken Arian and close associate of the English theologian, historian, and mathematician, William Whiston (1667–1752) (*ODNB*).

⁶⁶ Mather seems to derive this from the work of the prominent English Presbyterian minister and Westminster divine, Thomas Manton (1620–1677), *Christ's Temptation and Transfiguration practically explained and improved, in several sermons* (1685), pp. 87–89. With its reference to Ex. 17:7, this interpretation highlights the presence of the pre-incarnate Christ during the Old Testament dispensation and hence the full divinity of the Son.

in the Gospel; & yeeld Obedience without any *Delay* of the Matter from Day to Day; without any Procrastination.⁶⁷

Q. *While it is called, To Day?*] v. 13.

A. In *Erubin*, it is observed by R. *Levi ben Josua*, that wee read, in Deut. VIII.11. *The Commandments which I command thee This Day*. And he notes upon it; *Hodiè ea sunt facienda, non cras; hodiè sunt facienda, et cras Merces eorum est accipienda.*⁶⁸

In *Pirke Aboth*, a celebrated Saying of *Hillel* is mentioned; *si non Nunc, Quandò?*

Of the same Tendency, the Saying of R. *Eleazar*. *Resipisce uno Die ante Mortem tuam.*⁶⁹ In *Midras Tillim* the same Saying is ascribed unto another, with this Gloss upon it; *lett a Man say, perhaps I shall Dy tomorrow, and then he will not lett one Day of his Life pass without Repentance.*⁷⁰

[5v] | [blank]

⁶⁷ From *The Expiation*, p. 46.

⁶⁸ “This day these things are to be done, not tomorrow, today they are to be done, and tomorrow the reward for them is to be taken.” From Cartwright, *Mellificium Hebraicum*, lib. 3, *Critici Sacri* (8:1350), a reference to the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Erubin, 22a (Soncino, p. 152).

⁶⁹ “If not now, when?” and “Repent one day before your death.” From Cartwright, references to Rabbi Hillel and Rabbi Eliezer in *Pirke Avoth*, cap. 1:14 and cap. 2:15; see *Pirke Aboth*, *The Ethics of the Talmud*, pp. 33–34 and p. 55.

⁷⁰ From Cartwright, a reference to the Midrash Tehillim, probably the commentary on Ps. 90:16; see Braude’s translation (*The Midrash on Psalms*, vol. 2, pp. 96–97).

Q. What may be meant by, *Seeming to come short of the promised Rest?* v. 1.

A. I have heard whole Sermons preached upon that, *Seeming*, and a deal of Distinction used about it. But the Greek Word here, δοκῆ, does not signify always, *To seem*; it signifies also, *To Do as one thinks fit*, or, *To Do ones Pleasure*.⁷¹ I then so read the Text, *Fear, – lest any of you take your Liberty to come short; – or, think Good to come short.*

But there is one, who observes, that the Clause, *lest a Promise being left us*, ought to be read, *lest the Promise being left*. The *Promise* is then *Left*, Forsaken, Relinquished, when it is no longer Credited and Relied upon. This was the Crime of the *Israelites* in the Wilderness, after they had for a While embraced the *Promise*. Now, we must be so far from *leaving* of the Gospel, that we must not *seem* to do so, or give any Man Occasion to think we do so. We must not give any one Occasion to *suspect*, in us, the least Inclination to Revolt. A Man may raise this Opinion in others, by abating & remitting of his Fervency in Piety.⁷²

Q. How is it said, *unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them?* v. 2.

A. The Greek runs, *we have had the good News [of a Rest] preached unto us, as they likewise had*.⁷³

Q. A Paraphrase on, *He that hath entred into Rest, hath ceased from his own Works?* v. 10.

A. Mr. Pyle so paraphrases.⁷⁴

“Nor indeed could the Happiness and Reward of a true Servant of God be properly compared to *Gods Rest from all His Work*, unless it be a Final and Compleat Deliverance from all the Labours & Troubles of this Life.”

1521.

Q. What is the *Sense*, and *Force*, of the Apostles Discourse to the *Hebrewes*, about the *Sabbatism Remaining for the People of God?* v. 10.

⁷¹ From Grotius in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:4163). The word δοκέω [dokeo] has a variety of meanings: “expect, think, seem.” Sometimes δοκέω means “it seems good to me, or it is my pleasure” (cf. Luke 1:3, Acts 15:22), as Mather points out. In the context of Heb. 4:1, however, such a translation seems questionable.

⁷² From John Owen, *Exercitiations on the epistle to the Hebrews, ... with a Continuation of the exposition on the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of said epistle to the Hebrews* (1674), p. 184.

⁷³ From Owen, *Exercitiations*, pp. 195–96.

⁷⁴ From Pyle, *A Paraphrase* (2:234).

A. There is a State of glorious and wonderful *Rest*, which our Blessed JESUS, will give unto His Church in the great *millennial Sabbath*.⁷⁵ Our Apostle therefore urges the *Hebrewes* to *Hear the Voice of the Lord Jesus Christ*, offering this *Rest*, lest *they fell after the Exemple of Unbeleef in their Fathers*, who perished in the Wilderness, ere they arrived at the *Land of Promise*. Hee now asserts, that this *promised Rest*, had been preached throughout the whole Book of God; and that *Beleever*s are to bee Admitted thereinto, but the *Disobedient*, & the *Unperswadeable* shutt out forever. – This hee does, with a Demonstration, that every *Rest* mentioned in the Scripture, as already obtained by the People of God, was but a Type of the *Rest*, which *yett Remains* to bee expected & obtained.

First, There was the *Rest* of the *Works Finished*, or, the *Sabbath* at the *Finishing* of the *Creation*. But this was not the Intended, nor an Effectual *Rest*, for after this, God Threatens His People in the Desart, about missing to, *enter into Rest*. So then, they were not already in the Possession of it!⁷⁶

Nor, was the *Rest*, whereto they arrived by *Joshua*, that which was Effectual or Intended; for After This, wee have *David* most affectionately calling upon the People, of the present & after Times, to *Hear the Voice of God*, lest they missed of the *Rest*, which had been proposed.⁷⁷

It followes then, that there must *Remain*, a *Rest*, beyond all this, which our Lord Jesus Christ, will bring His People into, even That *Rest*, whereof all this was a Figure.⁷⁸

In *Zohar*, in *Gen.* fol. 5. col. 2. there is a Saying; *Dies Sabbati quid est? Figura Terræ Viventium, nempè Sæculi Futuri, Sæculi Animarum, Sæculi Consolationum*.⁷⁹

Buxtorf in his *Florilegium* ha's that Saying of the Hebrews. *Non datum est Sabbatum, nisi et esset Typus Sæculi futuri; seu, Vita Æternæ*.⁸⁰

75 See Appendix A. Mather here originally ascribed a special share of the millennial blessings to the “Church of the *Hebrewes*,” but revised the passage following his change of opinions concerning the eschatological conversion of the Jews.

Interestingly, Whitby's regard for the original context and audience of the epistle leads him to dismiss any millennialist reading of the references to “the rest” in Hebrews. See Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:72–73).

76 See *Gen.* 2:2 and *Deut.* 12:10, 25:19.

77 See *Josh.* 21:44, 22:4 and *Ps.* 95:8–11.

78 Derived from Owen's annotations on *Heb.* 4:6 in *Exercitationes*, pp. 232–34.

79 “What is the day of Sabbath? A type for those living on earth, certainly of the future world, the world of souls, the world of consolations.” Drawn from Cartwright, *Mellificium Hebraicum*, lib. 3, as printed in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (8:1351). Reference is made to the Book of *Zohar*, Prologue (Soncino, p. 4).

80 “The Sabbath is not given [or mentioned], if it is not also the type of the future age, or, the eternal life.” From Cartwright a reference to the work of the famous Basel Hebraist, Johannes Buxtorf, the Younger (1599–1664), *Florilegium hebraicum: continens elegantes sententias, pro-verbia, apophthegmata, similitudines* (1648), p. 299. These last two paragraphs were added later.

[6v]

Q. What may be peculiarly meant by, *The Word of God, which is Quick & Powerful*? v. 12.

A. From the Consideration of the Context, some are induced to beleieve, that by the *Word of God* here, is meant,⁸¹ His decree and {menace?} of Judgment, which assigns a Punishment unto the Unbeleieving and the Disobedient. Of that Kind was the *Wrath* of God. Which He swore, to exclude the unbeleiving Fathers of the Jewes from entring into *Rest*. This *Word* is *Quick*: it never dies; it growes not exolete with Time or Age.⁸² It is *Powerful*. God will not Revoke it, or lett it fall thro' Oblivion or Inconstancy; and it is full of Force to execute the Will of God contained in it. And *sharper than any two edged Sword*. It wounds more fearfully. It pierces into the most *secret Parts* of Men; it reaches their most *secret Sins*, & those which are committed in the most *Interiour Faculties*; which no Sword of any civil Magistrate can do. It binds over the very *Thoughts & Intentions of the Heart*, unto Punishment. There is no lying Hid from its terrible Efficacy.

[▽Insert from 7r-7v]⁸³

[▽7r-7v]

But lett us consider a litle further; and we shall find the Context plainly leading us to a glorious CHRIST, as this Word here spoken of. The Apostle advises a stedfast Adhærence unto our JESUS, as the *Apostle & High-Priest of our Profession*. He declares, that since he exceeded Moses as far as a *Son* exceeds a *Servant*, the Danger which the *Israelites* incurred by Disobedience unto *Moses*, to be shutt out of a *Temporal Rest*, was not greater than our Danger to be shutt out of the Heavenly Rest, if we disobey the Word; which by the SON of GOD has been delivered unto us. For, says he, we have now to do with the SON of GOD Himself, who is one from whom our most secret Inclinations to Revolt from His Religion cannot be conceled & who lives forever & never wants Power enough to Revenge us and at the same time is perfectly acquainted with all our Difficulties, & is able to help us in all of our Distresses.

⁸¹ Mather here enters a long-standing exegetical debate on whether this verse was to be understood as the personal Word of God, the Logos, or the written word or decrees of God, as the majority of Protestant divines argued. The debate is surveyed in Owen, *Exercitations*, pp. 269–72, who in turn relies on the summary of the debate offered in *Critici Sacri*. Mather first offers a version of the first interpretation, for which he, surprisingly, seems again to rely on *The Expiation*, pp. 66–67. Drawing directly on Owen, *Exercitations*, pp. 72–77, Mather then elaborates on the second, emphasizing, like Owen, that the two readings are not mutually exclusive but in fact depend on one another.

⁸² “Exolete” means something that has lost its virtue; effete, insipid (*OED*).

⁸³ This page is a lengthy cut-out glued to the margin of the folio page and folded together.

The Apostle plainly describes a Real Person,⁸⁴ and such a Connection there is between the several Parts of his Account, that it is plain the Person he describes from the beginning to the End of, is one & the same.

Now, tis our glorious CHRIST who is, the Person, denoted in the New Testament, by, *The Word of God*.

[7v] And it is no Wonder, that the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, gives Him this Title; since it is evident from *Philo's* Writings about this time, that some of them did apply the Title, in | a Sense not much different from the Apostles.⁸⁵

Behold, how he proceeds.

The *Word of GOD is living*; and lives forever to Revenge the Contempt of His *promised Rest*.

And He is *powerful*; yea, *sharper than any two-edged Sword*; which the Priest makes Use of, to lay open the *Sacrifice*.

– *Piercing, even to the Dividing asunder of Soul and Spirit*; Ransacking all the secretest Parts of the Humane Composition, separating those that are most nearly connected, even the *Soul* & the *Spirit*. [See 1. Thess. V. 23.]

And of the Joints, or Nerves (by which other Parts are held together) *and Marrow*; and under which those Parts that lie hid, and are enclosed in others, are comprehended.

And is a Discerner, or, Judge of the *Thoughts & Intents of the Heart*; As the Priest sits Judge of the Sacrifice thus laid open before him, whether entire, & without Blemish, or no.

And not only are *we* thus laid open before Him, in Order to His Passing a Judgment on us; but *neither is there any Creature that is not manifest in His Sight, but all things are naked & open before the Eyes of Him with whom we have to do*; or, to whom our *Account* is to be given: *Naked & Open*, and as perfectly discovered unto Him, as the *Sacrifice* is unto the *Priest*, when it is flay'd, & cutt down the Back, & laid open before him, in order to his Passing a Judgment on the Soundness of it.

Quære: why may not the Import of the last Clause be, *To whom He is with us* (owned as) *the Logos*?

[△] [△Insert ends]

3136.

Q. Upon that Passage, *The Word of God is sharper than any two-edged Sword*; have you mett with no Passage in the old Jewish Writers, that may afford something of Illustration? v. 12.

⁸⁴ Mather originally had “The Word of God” instead of “The Apostle.”

⁸⁵ From Owen, Mather cites Philo of Alexandria, *On the Cherubim*, 9.28 and *Who is the Heir of Divine Things*, 26.131 (see below).

A. Philo, discoursing on the *Cherubim* and the *Flaming Sword*, in the Third Chapter of *Genesis*, hath a very Remarkable Passage.⁸⁶

“To the truly *one God*, there are *two* supreme and primary Powers belonging, *Goodness* and *Power*: By *Goodness* all things were made, and governed by *Power*: There was still a *Third*, as a Conciliator in the *Midst* of the *Two* former, namely *Λογος*, *The Word*. – The *Cherubims* are Symbols of these two *Powers*, of *Government* and *Goodness*; *Λογου δε την φλογινην ρομφαιαν*. and the *Flaming Sword*, of, *The Word*.⁸⁷ For the, *Λογος* the *Word*, was very swift & fervent; especially that of the *First Cause*; it being before all things understood, and appearing above all.”

Philo in yett another Place, makes that *Flaming Sword* a Symbol of, the *Word*, when he speaks of Gods *Cutting* and *Dividing* the united Natures of things, he adds, That He does it, *τω τομει των συμπαντων αυτω λογω*, *By His λογος*, or *Word*, *Dividing all things*. How agreeable is this to our Apostle!⁸⁸

And so is what we read in the *Apocryphal Book of Wisdome*. Ch. 18. v. 15, 16. *Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce Man of War, into the Midst of a Land of Destruction, & brought thine unfeigned Commandment as a sharp Sword*.⁸⁹ Compare what we now have in our *Book of Revelation*, Ch. 19.13, 15, 21 & Ch. 1.16. and Ch. 2.16. where the *Word of God* is described, with a *sharp Sword* going out of His Mouth.

And one of the Christian Ancients long since observed, how agreeable this is, to the Prophecies of *Isaiah* about the *Messiah*.⁹⁰

Origen on *John*, ha's a Passage of this Importance.⁹¹ “It is said in *Isaiah* [Ch. 49.2.] The Father hath *made his Mouth, like a sharp Sword*. The *Mouth* of

86 This entry is derived from Richard Kidder, *A Demonstration of the Messiah* ([1684] 1726), part 3, ch. 6, pp. 94–95. The Anglican churchman Richard Kidder (1633–1703) was Bishop of Bath and Wells and a well-known apologist. The *Demonstration* was his most popular work, going through at least four editions in Mather's lifetime.

87 The phrase *λόγου δε την φλογινην ρομφαιαν* [logou de ten phloginen rhomphaian] means “and the flaming sword of [the] word.” From Kidder, Mather cites Philo of Alexandria, *On the Cherubim*, 9.28; transl.: LCL 227, p. 24.

88 The phrase *τῷ τομεί τῶν συμπάντων αὐτῷ λόγῳ* [to tomei ton sympanton auto logo] signifies “through the severer of all things, namely [the] word itself.” Mather paraphrases Philo of Alexandria, *Who is the Heir of Divine Things*, 26.131; transl.: LCL 261, p. 345.

89 Wis. 18:15–16.

90 Isa. 49:2.

91 From Kidder, a reference to the fragmentary exegetical work of Origen (Origenes Adamantius, c. 185/86–c. 253/54), *Commentaria in Evangelium Joannis* [PG 14. 1. 85]. Born into a Christian family in Tyre, Origen became headmaster of the Christian Catechetical School at Alexandria. A conflict with the local bishop led to his move to Caesarea in Palestine (230/31). He died a few years after the persecutions of Christians under Decius, during which he had to suffer heavy torture. Well-versed in the Greek philosophical traditions, especially (Neo-)Platonism, Origen produced highly influential and homiletical exegetical works that engaged in sophisticated allegorical readings of Scripture aimed to uncover the higher spiritual meaning. He also produced a critical edition of the OT (the *Hexapla*), an early attempt at systematizing Christian doctrine (*De principiis*), and an important apologetic work, *Contra*

the Son of God is a sharp Sword μαχαίρα ὀξεῖα.⁹² *The Word of God is Quick & Powerful, piercing even to the Dividing asunder of Soul and Spirit.* He comes not to send Peace upon the Earth, that is upon corporeal and sensible Things, but a Sword; cutting asunder the hurtful Friendship between the Soul and Body, that the Soul permitting itself to the Spirit, that wars against the Flesh, might be at Friendship with God.”

I think, I have here laid before you, some things, worthy of a deep Contemplation.

Alardus observes, τετραχῆλισμένα,⁹³ to be a Metaphor fetched à Re Palæstricâ.⁹⁴ In Wrestling, he did τραχηλιζειν his Antagonist, who so siezed upon his Neck, *ut objiciat Spectatorum Oculis, nudum, et undiquaque resectum.*⁹⁵

Q. *Yett without Sin.*] Why is that Clause added? v. 15.

A. Partly to answer the Calumny of those Wretches, who said that our JESUS deserved the Punishment inflicted on Him; and partly to admonish Christians, that they should study Innocence, & not suffer as Malefactors; but then also not wonder at it, if notwithstanding their Innocence they were exposed to Sufferings.⁹⁶

Q. *The Throne of Grace.*] Whose Throne? v. 16.

A. We are directed to come unto the *Throne*, because we have an *High-Priest* sensible of our Infirmities, and ready to succour us. It is then the *Throne* which our *High-Priest* sits upon. Yett it is a *Throne of Grace*. He that sits on it, is full of Love unto us.⁹⁷

[7r–7v inserted into their designated place]⁹⁸

Celsum. With his teachings on the *Apokatastasis* (“the restitution of all”), the pre-existence of souls, and the subordinate role of Christ in the Trinity, Origen left a highly controversial legacy to the church.

92 Mather offers a correct translation for the phrase μάχαῖρα ὀξεῖα [machaira oxeia].

93 The perfect participle τετραχῆλισμένα [tetrachelismena] of the verb τραχηλιζω [trachelizo], which normally means “bend or twist the neck (e.g. in wrestling).” In the context of Heb. 4:13 and in conjunction with “γυμνά” (naked), it can signify “to be laid open.” Mather cites the work of the German Lutheran theologian and poet, Lambert Alard (Lampertus Alardus; 1602–1672), *Pathologia sacra novi testamenti continens significantiora ejusdem & cum emphasi singulari usurpata loca* (1635), p. 224. This last section is a later addition.

94 “From the subject matter of wrestling.”

95 “wrestle”; the present infinitive τραχηλιζειν [trachelizein], see above. The Latin phrase translates: “to expose [the antagonist] to the eyes of the spectators, naked and uncovered on every side.”

96 From *The Expiation*, p. 73.

97 From *The Expiation*, pp. 73–74.

98 These pages were stuck to 6v and thus probably added later.

Q. On the *Prayers and Supplications* with the *strong Crying and Tears*, which our Saviour offered up unto His Father, to be *saved from Death?* v. 7.

A. I find some Discourse at this note upon it. A *Deliverance from Death* was that which our Saviour desired. For this, He commended His expiring *Spirit* unto His Father.⁹⁹ This was to pray, that He would Præserve it, and Restore it; & *Recall Him from Death to Life*. The History of the Gospel saies nothing of His *Tears* on this Occasion; However t'was well-known to the Author of this Epistle. But the *strong Crying* with which He gave up the Ghost, is particularly mentioned. We read of that Action accompanying of it; His *Bowing of His Head*. Which was not a simple Action of a *Dying Man*, as Interpreters commonly carry it; but an Action of *Worship*, and [εὐλαβεία] the *Reverence* of a pious Man, that was offering *Supplications* unto God.¹⁰⁰

Q. That Passage, *He learned Obedience by the Things which He suffered?* v. 8.

A. Dr. *Whitby* in his Additional Notes, does upon second Thoughts prefer this Translation. *Tho' He was a Son, yett He taught us Obedience, by the things which He suffered.*¹⁰¹

But I meet elsewhere with another Interpretation.¹⁰² In the Year, 1646. there was published, a thin *Folio*, entituled, *The Expiation of a Sinner, in a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. In a Leaf before the Title-Page, there is an Attestation signed by *John Downname*, that saies, He “has perused it, & finds it Learned, | Judicious, Profitable, & allows it to be published.” When I read the Book over, I could not but wonder at this Attestation, and suspect it a Forgery. For the Author was an *Arian*, and *Arianism* in its full System, (indeed a fuller than I have ever yett seen any where else) reigns every where in it, from first to last. However, there be some Illustrations in this Composure, very worthy to be considered.¹⁰³

[8v]

⁹⁹ From *The Expiation*, pp. 82–85.

¹⁰⁰ From εὐλάβεια [eulabeia] “discretion, caution, reverence.” See Appendix A.

¹⁰¹ From Daniel Whitby, *Additional Annotations to the New Testament: With Seven Discourses; and an Appendix Entituled Examen Variantium Lectionum Johannis Millii, S. T. P. in Novum Testamentum* (1710), p. 129.

¹⁰² The next two paragraphs are in a different ink and were probably added later.

¹⁰³ Mather's cautiousness is understandable. The work he refers to is *The Expiation of a Sinner in a Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrewes* (1646). Published under the title *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos* (1634), the Latin original of this work was co-authored by Jonas Schlichting (Jonasz Szlichtyng, Schlichtingus; 1592–1661) and Johannes Crell (Johannes Krell, Jan Krell, Crellius; 1590–1633), two seventeenth-century Socinian theologians associated with the Polish Brethren. The English edition appeared anonymously, but the preface is signed with “G. M.” The prefatory note commending the work and signed with “John Downname” was

Such an one there is (tho' others have also had it) on the Clause now before us. What we translate, *Obedience*, is to be translated, *Giving of Audience*. Our Saviour, upon his Prayers unto His Father to be saved from Death, *had Audience* of God; He did thereby learn to *give Audience* unto His People, which in their Distresses, they offer up their Prayers unto Him. Yea, the Word, *ὑπακοή*,¹⁰⁴ carries in it, an elegant Symplote of Sense; both of the *Audience*, and of *Obedience* in it. The Compassion of our Saviour in hearing the Prayers of His People, is both His *Audience* of them, & His *Obedience* to His Father, who constituted Him an High-Priest for that Purpose.

Q. Why is that Clause added, *Tho' He were a Son?* v. 8.

A. God might have taught a *Son*, the Lessons of Obedience, in some other School, than that of *Afflictions*. Yett He chose *this Way*, & would not excuse Him from the common Condition of His *Brethren*. Behold, the Love of God unto Mankind, is thus providing for our Succour in our Distresses!

But here is a plain Intimation, That the *Fatherly Love of God* unto the Faithful, is not impaired, when He exercises their Faith and Patience with various *Afflictions*.¹⁰⁵

Q. *Yee are become such as have need of Milk, & not of strong Meat.* What is meant by *Milk*, and what by strong *Meat*? v. 12.

A. Compare 1. Cor. 2. 1, 2.

I am very well pleased, with a Gloss of *Grotius: Lac sunt elementa Christianæ Religionis, cibus verò explicatio mysteriorum in veteri Historia latentium*.¹⁰⁶

likely a forgery. John Downname or Downham (1571–1652) was an orthodox English clergyman and theologian with Puritan leanings who came to prominence in the 1640s when he worked closely with the Westminster Assembly. It is assumed that the rather free translation and publication of the *Commentarius* was undertaken by Thomas Lushington (1590–1661), an Anglican cleric who became known for his anti-Trinitarian views during the Civil War period. For more on this source and Mather's use of it, see the Introduction.

¹⁰⁴ The word *ὑπακοή* [hypakoe] signifies "obedience, answer to prayer" just as Mather suggests. From *The Expiation*, pp. 85–86.

¹⁰⁵ See Owen, *Exercitations*, pp. 376–81.

¹⁰⁶ "The elements of the Christian religion are the milk, the food [represents] the true explication of the mysteries hidden in the old history [testament]." Mather cites Grotius's annotation on 1 Cor. 3:1 in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:2868). Mather seems to have confused the chapter of 1 Cor. here.

Q. What means the Apostle, by the *Doctrine of Baptisms, & of Laying on of Hands?* v. 2.

A. Let it not seem strange, if I tell you, That hee means his *Repentance from Dead Works*, and *Faith towards God*, which hee had newly mentioned.

Some think, These were called, *The Doctrine of Baptisms, and Laying on of Hands*, because, when Persons were *Baptised* and *Confirmed*, which was with *Imposition of Hands*, in the primitive Times, they were Instructed in these Points; and in those two that follow, namely, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, and, *eternal Judgment*.¹⁰⁷

But I'll give you the Words of my Uncle, *Nathanael Mather*, in a little Book of his, newly published.¹⁰⁸

“Beleeving is called *Leaning, Staying, Resting*, on Christ, and on God. This I conceive, was Taught Them, & Us, by that Ordinance, which enjoined him, that brought the *Sacrifice*, to *lay his Hand*, or, *lean* with his *Hand*, upon his *Sacrifice*. [Exod. 29.10. Lev. 1.4. & 3.2, 8, 13. and 4.4, 15, 24, 29, 33. and 16.21.] I know, that Rite is by many Interpreted as signifying, the Transferring of the Sin of him that brought the Sacrifice, unto or upon the Sacrifice, which was to bee offered for him. But the Laying of our Sins upon Christ, is not *our* Act, but *Gods*. [Isa. 53.11.] And the Word used in *Exodus* and *Leviticus*, doth signify a *Leaning* with Stress and Might, and is rendred [Ps. 88.8.] *lyeth Hard*; and [Ezek. 24.2.] *Beket*; that is, pressed upon, with Force and Strength.

And the Apostle (if I mistake not the Meaning of the Place, which I think, I do not) tells us, Heb. 6.1, 2. That *Faith on God*, is the *Doctrine of Laying on of Hands*; that is, the Thing Taught, by that Rite & Ceremony: even as, *Repentance from Dead Works*, is the *Doctrine* of, or Thing Taught by their *Levitical Washings*, which I take to bee there meant, by *Baptisms*.”

Q. Why is it said of them that are *Apostates* from Christianity, *It is impossible to Renew them again unto Repentance?* v. 6.

A. The *Oxford* Paraphrase, would have the Meaning to be; Tis Impossible for *us* to Renew them. It is Labour in Vain for *us*, to Review Principles for them.

¹⁰⁷ From Owen, *A Continuation of the Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews viz, on the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth Chapters* (1680), pp. 32–33.

¹⁰⁸ From the work of Cotton Mather's uncle, the English Independent minister and lecturer at Pinner's Hall, Nathanael (or Nathaniel) Mather (1631–1697), *The Righteousness of God Through Faith Upon All Without Difference who Believe* (1694), pp. 42–43. A second ed. of this work was publ. in 1710; maybe that is what the remark “newly published” is referring to.

In short; They forsake the *only Means* of being *Renew'd*, Releev'd, Restored, as *Repenting Sinners* use to be. No *other Means* can be proposed; No *other Sacrifice* remains, if that of our glorious CHRIST be Refused. Nor is there any other *Holy Spirit*, than that, whom they cast Contempt upon. [Compare, 1. Cor. 3.11. 2. Cor. 11.4. Heb. 10.27.] This does not exclude them absolutely from Salvation, upon their Returning to the same *Christian Principles*, which they have deserted.¹⁰⁹

Q. Why is it said of the *unfruitful Earth*; *It is nigh unto Cursing*? Why not, already *cursed*? v. 8.

A. Unfruitful Men deserve the present *Curse* of God; yett He does not presently lay His *Curse* on them. For some time He delays their Punishment. He waits for Fruit from them. As in the Case of the *Barren Fig-tree*.¹¹⁰

Q. The watered *Earth*, which bears *Thorns & Briars*, its *End* is to *be burned*. With what *Burning*? v. 8.

A. The *Oxford Paraphrase*, is, Tis forsaken to be *scorched*. [Psal. 107.34.]¹¹¹
Or, The *Fruits* of it, The *Thorns*, and *Briars*, are to be *Burned*.

Briefly, when a Piece of Ground fails of its Crops, & brings forth only *Thorns* and *Briars*, or light *Straw* without *Corn*, the Manner of Husbandmen is, to kindle *Fire* upon it, and Burn it. A Church full of such Things, ha's horrible *Fires* kindled upon it, by the Vengeance of God. As for the *Briars* and *Thorns* themselves, they are thrown into eternal Burnings.¹¹²

Q. An *Oath* the *End of Strife*? v. 16

A. Lett the Passage in the Roman Law, be a Gloss upon this of the Apostle; *Dig.* 12.2, 1.

*Maximum Remedium, expediendarum Litium, in Usum venit Jurisjurandi Religio.*¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ From Abraham Woodhead, Richard Allestree, and Obadiah Walker, *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul, done by several eminent Men at Oxford* (1708), p. 387. The first ed. of 1675 was only a partial paraphrase; the 1684 ed. covered all of the Pauline epistles. The 1702 ed. included the affixed subtitle, hence it became known as the "Oxford Paraphrase." Woodhead (1609–1678) and Walker (1616–1699) were Anglican divines teaching at Oxford; both converted to Catholicism. Allestree (1619–1681) was a royalist soldier and chaplain during the Civil War; in 1663, he was made a chaplain for the king and, in 1665, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. He remained a loyal Anglican (*ODNB*).

¹¹⁰ From *The Expiation*, p. 102.

¹¹¹ Woodhead, Allestree, and Walker, *A Paraphrase*, p. 387.

¹¹² This last section is a later addition from *The Expiation*, pp. 102–03.

¹¹³ "A very important means for promptly disposing of litigation has come into use, the religious character of an oath." A citation from the *Digesta Iustiniani Augusti*, 12.2.1. Transl.

Q. On that, *For this Melchisedec?* v. 1.

A. It may be read, *For He* (i. e. Christ) *is the Melchisedec.* That is the Antitype of that *Melchisedec*, who was King of *Salem*.¹¹⁴

Q. Upon what Account is it said of *Melchisedec*, That he was *without Father, without Mother?* v. 3.

A. Because his Pedigree is unknown; which was a most significant Way of Expression to the *Jews* (as Mr. *Jenkyns* observes,) who were so careful & exact in their *Genealogies*.¹¹⁵ But the very same Sort of Expression, is used by *Livy*. (l. 4. c. 3.) *Patre nullo, Matre Serva*.¹¹⁶ By *Horace*: (l. 1. Sat. V.) *Nullis majoribus ortos*.¹¹⁷ By *Seneca*; (ep. 8) *Duos Romanos Reges esse, quorum alter Patrem non habet, alter Matrem. Nam de Servii Matre dubitatur. Anci Pater nullus; Numæ nepos dicitur*.¹¹⁸

Q. Why is it said of *Melchisedech*, He was *without Descent?* v. 3.

adapted from *The Civil Law*, vol. 4, p. 113. The Digest (Digesta), or Pandects (Pandectae), was a part of a reduction and codification of all Roman laws up to that time, which later came to be known as the Corpus Iuris Civilis. The collection was ordered by the Eastern Roman emperor Justinian I in the sixth century (530–533 CE) and issued in 533 under the direction of the imperial quaestor Tribonian. It compiled the writings of the great Roman jurists along with current edicts.

¹¹⁴ From Pyle, *A Paraphrase* (2:144).

¹¹⁵ From Robert Jenkin, *The Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion* ([1696–1697] 1715), vol. 2, p. 55. This book was a defense of revealed religion and the fundamental dogmas of Protestant Christianity against contemporary skeptics, such as Thomas Hobbes or the English Deist Charles Blount, and against proponents of an “overconfident” rationalism, such as John Locke, whom Jenkin attacked both in *The Reasonableness* (vol. 1) and in a tract entitled *Remarks on some Books lately publish'd; viz. Basnage's "History of the Jews," Whiston's "Eight Sermons," Lock's Paraphrase and Notes on St. Paul's epistles, Le Clerc's "Bibliothèque Choisie* (1709). His two-volume *magnum opus* enjoyed great popularity throughout the eighteenth century and went through multiple editions; Mather probably used the fourth edition printed in 1715. The Anglican divine Robert Jenkin (bapt. 1656, d. 1727) was a prominent Anglican divine and non-juror after the Glorious Revolution who later became a Master of St. John's College, Cambridge (since 1711), as well as Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity (*ODNB*).

¹¹⁶ “Nobody for his father and a bond-woman for his mother.” From Jenkin, Mather cites the work of the Roman historian Livy (Titus Livius, 59–17 BCE), *History of Rome*, 4.3.12; transl.: *LCL* 133, p. 266.

¹¹⁷ “From ancestors of no account.” Mather cites the Roman poet Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus, c. 65–8 BCE), *Satires* 1.6.7–11; transl.: *LCL* 194, p. 77.

¹¹⁸ “There were two Roman kings – one without a father and one without a mother. For we cannot settle who was Servius's mother, and Ancus, the grandson of Numa, has no father on record.” Mather refers to the Roman Stoic philosopher, Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE–65 CE), *Epistles* 108.30; transl.: *LCL* 77, p. 249.

A. It is *not* said so! He is not said to be ἀγένητος, but, ἀγενεαλόγητος, *without any Registered Genealogy*.¹¹⁹ By this one Word, the whole Verse appears to be a Parable, and we have the best Key to that Passage, *without Father, without Mother*.

Indeed, it is an admirable Consideration, as Dr. *Grew* well observes, That throughout the whole New Testament, there is not any one Instance to be mett withal, wherein the sacred Writers do not use, for to express what they intend, the most proper Words in the World.

The Jews objected, That our *Jesus* was not of the *priestly Race*. Our Apostle shewes, of *what Order* He was.

4068.

Q. Well, but how could *Melchisedech* be *without Father, without Mother*?

A. He was not so, as he was a *Man*, but as he was a *Priest*. That is to say, His Priesthood, was not like the *Levitical*, tied to come of such a *Father*, & such a *Mother*, & such a *Kindred*. The *Aaronical* Priest must have his *Father* and *Mother* of the Tribe of *Levi*. Nor, was *Melchisedech* without *Beginning of Dayes* or *End of Life*. But his *Priesthood* was not stinted, for to *begin* at such a Time, [at Thirty Years,] or to *end* at such a Time, [at Fifty Years,] as the *Levitical* Priesthood was. And in this, it was a brighter Type of our Saviours *Priesthood*. M. *Limborch* adds, It was as a *Priest*, that *Melchisedek* was *without Beginning or End*; he had neither Predecessors nor Successors; no Limits were sett unto His Priesthood.¹²⁰

[▽11r–11v]

[▽Insert from 11r–11v]¹²¹

Q. The Antiquity and Original of *Tithes*? v. 5.

A. *Tertullian* in his *Apologetic*, mentions the, *Decima Herculis*, paid among the Pagans.¹²²

¹¹⁹ The word ἀγένητος [agenetos] signifies “uncreated, not having happened,” whereas ἀγενεαλόγητος [agenealogetos] means “of unrecorded descent.” The latter is a neologism that is used in this verse of Hebrews. ESV proposes: “He is without father or mother or genealogy.” Mather cites the work of the English physician and natural philosopher, Dr. Nehemiah Grew (1641–1712), *Cosmologia sacra: Or a Discourse of the Universe as it is the Creature and Kingdom of God* (1701), bk. 5, p. 296.

¹²⁰ Much of this entry closely corresponds with *The Expiation*, pp. 117–20. Further reference is made to the work of the Dutch Arminian theologian, Philippus van Limborch (1633–1712), *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum et in Epistolas ad Romanos et Hebraeos* (1711), p. 611. Van Limborch was a Remonstrant pastor at Gouda, and in 1667, he was transferred to Amsterdam, where, in the following year, the office of professor of theology in the Remonstrant seminary was added to his pastoral charge. He was a friend of John Locke, whose *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) was likely addressed to and first published by him. His most important work is the *Institutiones theologiae christianae, ad praxin pietatis et promotionem pacis, christianae unice directae* (Amsterdam, 1686, fifth ed., 1735), transl. into English in 1702.

¹²¹ This manuscript page is attached to 11r but was clearly intended to be included here.

¹²² The first two paragraphs of this entry are based on annotations on Tertullian, *Apologeticus adversus gentes*, cap. 14 [PL 1. 348A; CSL 69], as available to Mather in William Reeves, *The*

Pliny in his *Natural History*, l. 12. c. 14. mentions a Law in *Arabia*, which obliged every Merchant, to offer the Tenth of his *Frankincense*, to the God *Sabis*. And, l. 12. c. 19. he reports, that the *Ethiopians*, paid their Tenth, to their God *Assabinus*.¹²³ We find in *Justin*, l. 18. c. 7. That the *Carthaginians* devoted the Tenth of their Spoils taken in the *Carthaginian War*, to *Hercules of Tyre*.¹²⁴ *Plutarch* in *Sylla*, & *Crassus*, informs us, That the Roman General *Sylla*, devoted the Tenth of all this Estate unto *Hercules*, and the same was done by *Crassus*.¹²⁵ A Variety of such Instances are to be seen in *Selden's History of Tithes*; c. 3.¹²⁶ In *Montagues Diatriba* p. 1. c. 3.¹²⁷ In *Spencer, De Leg. Hebr.* l. 3. c. 10.¹²⁸

An Annotator on *Tertullian*, enquires, How it is possible, that Nations so remote, & who never seem to have had the least Commerce or Acquaintance with each other, should come to hitt upon the same Notion, as to Dedicate a *Tenth*, exactly, neither more nor less. This Proportion is in itself, one would think, a Thing Indifferent; and consequently, the Light of Nature discovered it not. And the Practice was too Constant, & Regular, & Universal, to be ascribed only unto Humour & Fancy, nor can it be thought with any Probability, to have spread over the World from the Jewish Nation; a Nation debarred from correspond[ing] | with the Gentile World, and mortally hated for the Singularities of their Religion. Besides, the Custome of Dedicating a Tenth, was a Custome long before the Jews were an established People.¹²⁹ Wherefore, as this Gentle-

[12v]

Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minutius Felix in Defence of the Christian Religion (1709), vol. 1, pp. 226–27. The Latin phrase means “tenth of Hercules.” On the topic of tithes, compare also Mather’s entry on Gen. 14:20 (*BA* 1:896–97).

123 From the work of the Roman historian and orator, Pliny the Elder (Plinius, 23/24–79 CE), *Natural History*, 12.32 and 42; transl.: *LCL* 370, p. 46 and p. 66.

124 A reference to the work of the Roman historian Marcus Junianus Justinus (fl. 3rd cent. CE), *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum*, lib. 18, cap. 7.

125 References to the work of the Hellenic Roman historian, biographer, and philosopher Plutarch (c. 45–after 120 CE), *Lives, Sulla*, cap. 35; transl.: *LCL* 80, p. 436; and *Lives, Crassus*, cap. 2; transl.: *LCL* 65, p. 316.

126 A reference to John Selden’s *A History of of Tithes* (1618), ch. 3, pp. 24–35. The English polymath John Selden (1584–1654) was best known as a legal and constitutional scholar, but he also wrote important comparative studies on pagan mythology (*ODNB*).

127 A reference to the work of the English cleric, Bishop of Norwich (1639), and Anglican apologist Richard Montagu (or Mountague; 1577–1641), *Diatribae upon the first part of the late History of Tithes* (1621), pt. 1. ch. 3, pp. 406–579. This book was a critical response to Selden’s work. On this debate, see Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth Century Republic of Letters* (2017), pp. 152–81.

128 A reference to John Spencer, *De legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus et earum rationibus* (1685), lib. 3, cap. 10, diss. 1 (“Morem Gentium, occasionem dedisse Legibus de Solutione Decimarum”), pp. 99–106. The work of the Cambridge Hebraist, John Spencer (1630–1693), was highly controversial in Mather’s day, for it suggested that many religious laws and customs of the Israelites did not have their origins in immediate divine revelation but had historically developed from Egyptian origins under divine providence (*ODNB*).

129 See Gen. 14:20, where Abraham accords “tithes of all” to Melchizedek, “the priest of the most high God.”

man observes, It seems most Reasonable, to beleeve, That this Custome, like *Sacrifice*, & *Priesthood*, & *Marriage*, was derived from *Adam* to *Noah*, and from him continued by his Posterity to the Confusion at *Babel*, and by Means of that universal Dispersion, spred over all the World.

In the mean time, the great Quæstion, about the, *Quota Pars*.¹³⁰ How much of a Mans Income, is to be devoted unto *pious Uses*? Methinks, Tis here beyond all Contestation determined. A *Tenth Part* is the least, that we can bring under a more *solemn Dedication*, unto the glorious Lord; for whom indeed, after some Sort, we are to lay out our All. A Farthing less, would make an enlightened & considerate Christian, suspicious of his Coming under the Danger of a *Sacriledge*. Since there is a *Part* of every Mans *Revenues* due to the more Immediate Service of the God, who bestowes our *All* upon us, it is not fitt, that the Determination of *what Part* it must be, should be left unto such Hearts as ours. If the Lord Himself, to whom we are but *Stewards*, ha's fixed any *Part* of our usual *Revenues* for Himself, as tis most Reasonable that He should have the fixing of it, certainly a *Tenth* will be found the least that He ha's called for. Behold, an Argument, fetch'd out of the Context. The Rights of *Melchizedek* belong to our JESUS, the *Royal High-Priest* now concerned in the Heavens for us. The *Tenths* were the Rights of *Melchizedek*. Therefore the *Tenths* belong to our JESUS. My present Thoughts are, That *this Argument cannot be answered*. Go, strait-handed Christian, go, & consider of it!

[△] [△Insert ends]

Q. But how could it be said of *Melchizedek*, if he were a mortal Man; *It is witnessed of him, that he liveth?* v. 8.¹³¹

A. Tho' the Arguments of *Molinaeus* & of *Cunaeus*, to prove, That *Melchizedek* was the *Messiah*, occasionally appearing unto *Abraham*, in the *Likeness*, of that *Man*, which was afterwards born of the *Virgin*, look very plausible and persuasive; yett *Heidegger* ha's abundantly answered them.¹³²

The Notion of *Melchizedek* being *Shem*, tho' *Capellus* call it, *Nuperum Judæorum commentum*, yett it is very Ancient.¹³³ It is in the *Targum of Jonathan*;

¹³⁰ "How many parts." The following paragraph also appears with slight variations in Cotton Mather's *Bonifacius. An Essay upon the Good* (1710), ch. 9 ("Rich Men"), pp. 108–10.

¹³¹ This entry is derived from the work of the Swiss Reformed theologian, Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633–1698), *Rashe 'avot, sive de historia sacra patriarcharum exercitationes select* (1667–1671), vol. 2, exerc. 2 ("De Melchisedeco"), pp. 38–70.

¹³² From Heidegger, p. 45, references to the work of the French Huguenot minister, Petrus Molinaeus (Pierre Du Moulin; 1568–1658), *Vates, sev De praeognitione futurorum & Bonis Malique Prophetis Libri V* (1640), lib. 4, cap. 11–16, pp. 299–322; and the work of the Dutch philologist and jurist, Petrus Cunaeus (Peter van der Kun, 1586–1638), *De republica Hebraeorum* [1617] 1703), lib. 3, cap. 3, pp. 404–15.

¹³³ "A recent fiction of the Jews." From Heidegger, p. 56, a reference to the work of the French Hebraist and professor of theology at Saumur, Louis Capellus (1585–1658), *Chronologia Sacra a condito mundo* (1650), p. 113.

as well as that of *Jerusalem*: which as *Buxtorf* in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* tells us, is, *Liber antiquissimus Hebræorum omnium*; for *Jonathan* flourished before the Incarnation of our Saviour.¹³⁴ That which tempted the *Jewes* to this Notion, was their Aversion to the Thought of it, That a *Gentile* should be a greater Man, than their Father *Abraham*. And many *Christians*, both among the *Romanists*, as *Lyra*, *Tostaius*, *Cajetanus*, *Suarez*, *Villalpandus*, *Turniellus*, and *Boulducus*, and among the *Reformed*, as *Broughton*, *Cloppenburg*, and G. H. *Vorstius*; have espoused this Opinion.¹³⁵ The Refutation which old *Epiphanius* bestowes on this Opinion; (called by him, *καταγέλαστος Ridendam*,¹³⁶) is what he would make the Opinion itself to be; namely, That *Shem* was now dead; the Victory of *Abraham* falling out a Thousand and Thirty Years after *Shem* came into the World. For *Shem* survived *Abraham*, at least above Twenty Years. Much better will the Opinion be refuted, by Observing; That the *Genealogy* of *Shem* is well-known. And the *Priesthood* of our Saviour would not be so diverse from the *Levitical*, if *Shem* were *Melchisedec*; for the *Levites* were descended from *Shem*. *Levi* was in the Loins of *Shem*, as well as in the Loins of *Abraham*. And so *Levi* would require and receive *Tythes*, as well as render them; if *Shem* were *Melchisedec*. Nor would a *Father* have taken *Tythes* from his own Offspring, but rather have laid up for them, and laid out on them. And what would *Shem* do, as a Prince ruling among the Sons of *Cham*? His own Son *Abraham* would not have sojourned as a Stranger in the Land, if his Father *Shem*, | had been a Ruler there. It is enough to say, That the Pen of *Moses* directed by the Spirit of God, introduces an eminent Person, in the *History*, as both a *King* and a *Priest*, unto whom the Patriarch *Abraham* offers his *Homage*, & carries away a *Blessing* from him.¹³⁷ And in this *History*, there is no Consideration of the Family, or Mortality, or Succession of this wonderful *Priest*. The Spirit of God would have none of those things considered in him. There was an *Illustrious Allegory*, in the *History*; and the very *Silence* in the *History* was a most *speaking Silence*. The same Spirit, enlightened the Psalmist of *Israel*, to propose and expect the *Messiah*, Psal. 110.4. As a *Priest forever*, after the Order of *Melchisedek*. The *Glories* of this our great *High-Priest*, are shadow'd out unto us, in the *History* of *Melchisedek*. The *History* is composed in such a Manner, as to lead us unto an Apprehension of these *Glories*; & unto the Abolition of the *Levitical Priesthood*, when the *Messiah* should come to bring & be our *Sacrifice*. [10v]

134 "The oldest of all the Hebrew books." From Heidegger, p. 56, a reference to the work of the famous Basel Hebraist, Johannes Buxtorf, the Elder (1564–1629), *De Abbreviaturis Hebraicis liber novus & copiosus ... Item Bibliotheca Rabbinica nova* ([1613] 1696), p. 6.

135 This list of exegetes comes from Heidegger, pp. 56–57.

136 The word *καταγέλαστος* [katagelastos] means "ridiculous, absurd"; the Latin "[opinionem] ridendam" is a translation. A reference to the tract on Melchizedek by the Bishop of Constantia (Salamis) in Cyprus, Epiphanius (c. 315–403 CE), in his *Panarion*, lib. 2, tom. 1, haeresis 55 [PG 41. 982. 6; GCS 37].

137 Here the ink changes.

The chief Difficulty in the Discourse of the Apostle on these things, is in this Clause; *of whom it is witnessed, that he liveth*. Heinsius is so perplexed with the Difficulty, that, he interprets the Clause, not of *Melchisedek*, but of *our Saviour*. And indeed, *in emphasi et rei Veritate*, it belongs to Him alone.¹³⁸ The *Greek Fathers* applied it, not unto the *Priest Melchisedek*, but unto the *Priesthood of Melchisedek*. But why may not we take it thus? In the Psalm, we read of our Saviour, *He is a Priest forever after the Order of Melchisedek*. *Melchisedek* is an *eternal Priest*; He that is *eternal*, most certainly *he liveth*. The *Death of Melchisedek* is no where mention'd: our *Saviour* is now to be look'd on as the true *Melchisedek*, or the Antitype of him in the Book of *Genesis*. There is a Continuation of the *Priesthood*, without the Intimation of any Mortality to interrupt it. All that was in *Melchisedek*, does *live eternally* in *our Saviour*.

After all, Sr. *Norton Knatchbul* is in the right of it; that the Name JESUS, in the last Verse of the foregoing Chapter, is to be Repeted here, and understood. It is not *Melchisedek*, but JESUS, of whom it is said, *of whom it is witnessed, that He liveth*. Only instead of our Word of Supply, *There he receiveth them*, lett it be supplied, *There is Hee*.¹³⁹

But look back to the Illustrations on Genesis, & see me give up all.¹⁴⁰

Q. Upon, *Levi's* paying Tithes in *Abraham*. v. 9, 10.

A. It is a Rule, That such Acts of the Parents, must be extended only to those of their Successors or Posterity, to whom the Inheritance, or some notable Portion of their Good, will descend; either for Certainty, as here in *Abrahams* Case, or at least in all Probability.¹⁴¹

Q. How is it said, *under it the People received the Law?* v. 11.

A. The *Greek* Word, is not, *under it*, but, *upon it*. This Particle, $\epsilon\pi\iota$, answers to the Hebrew, לְעַל and it intends, *Of*, or, *About*; it denotes the Object.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ "By emphasis and in the truth of the matter." From Heidegger, p. 68, a reference to the annotation on Heb. 5 in the work of the famous Dutch Renaissance scholar, poet, and Leiden professor Daniel Heinsius (Heins; 1580–1655), *Sacrae exercitationes ad Novum Testamentum* (1639), pp. 563–65.

¹³⁹ From the work of the English scholar and politician, Sir Norton Knatchbull (1602–1685), *Animadversiones in libros Novi Testamenti*, pp. 162–65; see also the English translation in *Annotations upon some Difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament* (1693), pp. 266–79. This part of the entry was most likely added later.

¹⁴⁰ See Mather's entries on Gen. 14:18 (*BA* 1:892–95). This remark was most likely added later.

¹⁴¹ From *The Expiation*, p. 125.

¹⁴² The preposition $\epsilon\pi\iota$ [epi] with genitive means "upon," as Mather rightly mentions. Mather refers to the Hebrew word עַל [al] "upon, above, over" and also "with regard to" or "about." From *The Expiation*, p. 126.

Q. On That, *It is evident, our Lord sprang out of Judah?* v. 14.

A. Some have observed an Elegancy here, in so particular & emphatical a Mention of *Judah*. Look a little forward, and you will find our Saviour called, *A Surety*. It was one of the Notable Things in the History of *Judah*, that he became a *Surety* for His Brother. Our wonderful *Surety* sprang out of such an one!

Q. *The Law of a carnal Commandment.* Why called so? v. 16.

A. It refers to the particular Præcepts of the Law, which concerned the Election & Ordination of a *Priest*. The *Commandment* is called, *carnal*; because it had respect only to the *Flesh*, and considered only the *Linage*, the *Birth*, & the *Death*, of the *Priest*.¹⁴³

1467.

Q. Why is it said, our Lord *is made a Surety of a Better Testament*: whenas a *Surety* is not used in a *Testament*; neither is our Lord properly considered as a *Surety*, in His *Testament*, but Hee is the *Testator* Himself? v. 22.

A. For that Cause, I concur with *Beza*, in choosing to Read it, rather, *Covenant*, than *Testament*.¹⁴⁴

Q. What is meant by *saving to the uttermost?* v. 25.

A. It is very true, The Salvation which our *High Priest* ha's wrought out for us, is in all Points perfect and complete. But what is here principally intended by, εἰς τὸ πάντελες· is, Perfection as to Time; tis as much as to say, *continually & perpetually*.¹⁴⁵

Q. How is our High-Priest, *made Higher than the Heavens?* v. 26.

A. Dr. *Goodwin* understands it,¹⁴⁶ as, *Higher than the Angels*. The *Highness* is not meant, of *Place*, but of *personal Dignity*. *Hell* is putt for *Divels*. The *Gates of Hell*. So, *Heaven* for *Angels*. From the *Dignity* of our *High-Priest*, proceeds the Worth of the *Sacrifice* offered by Him, & the Force of His *Intercession*. (The Reverse and Reward, of Psal. 8.5.) Moreover, that apartment of the *Heavens*, into

¹⁴³ From *The Expiation*, p. 131.

¹⁴⁴ A reference to *Beza*, *Annotationes*, p. 517.

¹⁴⁵ The phrase εἰς τὸ πάντελες [eis to panteles] primarily signifies “completely” (ESV “to the uttermost”). As Mather argues, the phrase can also mean “forever” in later Greek writings; thus the VUL already translated it with “in perpetuo” (cf. NAS “forever”). From *The Expiation*, pp. 138–39.

¹⁴⁶ Mather quotes from the work of the famous English nonconformist minister, pioneer of Congregationalism, and millennialist exegete Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680), *Christ the Mediator* (1692), bk. 6, ch. 1, in *The Work of Thomas Goodwin*, vol. 5, p. 383.

which our *High-Priest* is entred for His *Intercession*, the *Holy of Holies* there, is *Higher*, and more *Holy* {*****} *Heavens*.¹⁴⁷

[▽12r] [▽Insert from 12r]

I will annex the Words of Mr. *Blackwal*, in his *Sacred Classicks*, upon it.

“When *Homer* has made a pompous Description of his *Jupiter* sitting in Majesty on the top of Mount *Ida*, how are all his bright & sparkling Expressions obscured and extinguished, if sett in Comparison with that very short but superlatively glorious Description of the Lord and Heir of all things; *υψηλοτερος των ουρανων*· which seems to be derived from that great Original, in the Psalms, a Passage of the Divinest Poetry & Sublimity. *The Lord is High above all Nations, & His Glory above the Heavens. Who is like unto the Lord our God, who dwelleth on High!* [Psal. CXIII.4,5]¹⁴⁸

[△] [△Insert ends]

[11r–11v inserted into their designated place]

[12r inserted into their designated place]

[12v] | [blank]

¹⁴⁷ The following insert is a small, folded-up cut-out that was glued to the bottom of the page where it partly covers the last words of the preceding entry.

¹⁴⁸ The phrase *υψηλοτερος των ουρανων* [hypsēloteros ton ouranon] literally signifies “higher than the heavens” (ESV “exalted above the heavens,” Heb. 7:26). Mather cites the work of the English classical scholar and schoolmaster, Anthony Blackwall (1674–1730), *The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated, or an Essay, Humbly Offer’d Towards Proving the Purity, Propriety, and True Eloquence of the Writers of the New Testament* (1725), p. 204. Reference is made to Ps. 113:4–5.

Q. *This is the Summ?* v. 1.

A. Not merely the Breviats; but rather, the main Head, the chief Point.¹⁴⁹

4504.

Q. *I Regarded them not.* If we recur to the Place, from whence these Words are taken, in the Old Testament, there they run, *I was an Husband unto them?* v. 9.

A. No. Dr. *Pocock* has informed us, that the Hebrew / בעל / not only signifies, *To Govern*, and to be an *Husband*; but also, to *Refuse*, to *Despise*, to *Nauseate*.¹⁵⁰

| [blank]

[13v]

¹⁴⁹ From *The Expiation*, p. 144.

¹⁵⁰ This entry is derived from Edward Pococke, *Notae miscellaneae philologico-biblicae: Quibus Porta Mosis Sive Praefationum R. Mosis Maimonidis in libros Mischnajoth Commentariis praemissarum & a Pocockio ex Arabico Latine versarum fascis olim stipata prodiit* (1705), cap. 1, p. 2. Pococke discusses the problem that the Masoretic Hebrew of Jer. 31:32 faithfully translates as: “Which my covenant they brake, though I was a husband to them, saith the Lord” (KJV). However, the Greek translation of the LXX has *καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν*: “And I neglected them or despised them” (NETS). Heb. 8:9 seems to cite this version. Attempting to reconcile the discrepancy, Pococke argues that the Hebrew word, בעל (ba’al), “to be a husband, or govern,” was etymologically connected to the Arabic word *babal*, which signifies to refuse, curse, or despise. The implication is that the OT citation in Heb. 8:9 is not a misreading based on the LXX but a valid interpretation of the Hebrew original. On this issue, see Mather’s entry on Heb. 10:5–7. The Anglican clergymen and Oxford scholar, Edward Pococke (bapt. 1604; d. 1691), was one of the leading orientalists and biblical scholars of the period (*ODNB*).

{4*0*}

Q. Why do we read, *The first Covenant, had Ordinances of Divine Service?* v. 1.
A. None of the Ancients read here, διαθήκη.¹⁵¹ But many of them, as *Theodoret* and *Oecumenius*, read, σκηνη.¹⁵² Dr. *Whitby* takes this to be the True Reading. For, as tis observed by the Fathers, (as well by them who read, σκηνη, as by them who read only, πρωτη;) That the Apostle having proved before from the Analogy of the *Priest* and *Priesthood* of the former Covenant, that an End was putt unto the Jewish Constitutions; he proceeds now to prove the same, from the Consideration of the *Tabernacle*, which was a *Shadow of good Things to come*. And the Contexture of the Apostles Argument, seems plainly to require this Reading. For, the *Tabernacle* consisting of Two Parts, an Outward House, called, *The Holy Place*, and an Inward House, called, *The Holy of Holies*, the Apostle here calls, the Outward House, the *First Tabernacle*; and then proceeds to the Inward House as the *Second Tabernacle*.

But why is the *First Tabernacle* called, *A worldly Sanctuary*? Both the Jewes & the Fathers tell us, It was to represent this *lower World*; the *Earth & the Sea*, saies *Josephus*.¹⁵³ It was κόσμου του αισθητου συμβολον. saies *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *A Symbol of the sensitive World*.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹ From *Whitby*, *A Paraphrase* (2:92), Mather makes reference to the fact that the word διαθήκη [diatheke] “testament, covenant” is absent in the Greek text of Heb. 9:1 (*Textus Receptus*), where only ἡ πρώτη [he prote] “the first” appears, which traditionally had been interpreted by many as “the first covenant.”

¹⁵² Some interpreters took the word σκηνή [skene], “tent, Yahweh’s tabernacle,” from Heb. 9:2 to supply the missing noun in Heb. 9:1 (see above); several Greek minuscules (6^{ms} 81 104 326 etc.) actually read it so. From *Whitby*, Mather references the influential theologian of the School of Antioch, biblical commentator, and Christian Bishop of Cyrrhus, *Theodoret* (c. 393–458/466), *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. 4, cap. 26 [PG 82. 737D] and the early Christian author of several biblical commentaries, *Oecumenius* Episcopus, *Commentarius in epistolam ad Hebraeos* [PG 119. 367–68]. In Mather’s period, it was still assumed that *Oecumenius* was a Bishop of Trikka in Thessaly writing around 990. Now it is assumed that he was active in the early seventh century or the late sixth century in Asia Minor.

¹⁵³ From *Whitby*, Mather refers to the work of the Jewish-Hellenistic historian *Flavius Josephus* (37/38–after 100), *Antiquities*, 3.8.

¹⁵⁴ The phrase κόσμου του αισθητου συμβολον [kosmou tou aisthetou symbolon] signifies “a symbol of the perceptible world.” From *Whitby*, Mather paraphrases the work of the Christian teacher and Hellenistic philosopher at the Catechetical School of Alexandria, *Titus Flavius Clemens* or *Clemens of Alexandria* (*Clemens Alexandrinus*, c. 150–d. before 215/221), *Stromata*, lib. 5, cap. 6 [PG 88. 64].

We may add, The Seat of the *Sanctuary* was in this *present World*, & stood in Opposition to the *Sanctuary* of the *World to come*, whereof it was a Figure and a Shadow. A *Worldly Sanctuary*, is as much as to say, A *Terrestrial*, & a *Temporary*.¹⁵⁵

Q. *Divine Service?*] v. 1.

A. Some observe, That the Word *λατρεία*,¹⁵⁶ used here, signifies, *Worship*, and not *Service*; and that it is amiss in most Interpreters of the Sacred Scripture, to confound them. *Worship* signifies the *Reverence* paid unto God with our Bodily Gestures; as namely, by Standing up, or Bowing down, or Kneeling down, or Falling down before Him. *Service* is an Holy *Action* performed immediately unto the Honour of God; as Praying, Praising, Sacrificing. *Worship* is determined by the Law of Nature; the Light of Nature in all Ages, & all Nations, teaches Men how to express their due *Reverence* to the Divine Majesty. But for *Service*, God ha's made special Providence in His Word; Men must not *serve* God after their own Will & Pleasure, but according to His. But both of these are so connected, that the Right of the one cannot be separated from the other. Where *Cultus douliæ* is granted, *Cultus latriæ* will be so too.¹⁵⁷

627.

Q. The Apostle, speaking about, *The Ark* of the Covenant, saies, *There were in it the golden Pott, that had Manna, and Aarons Rod that Budded, and the Tables of the Covenant?* Whereas, wee read, in 1. King. 8.9. *There was nothing in the Ark, save the Tables of Stone.* How will you Reconcile this Discrepancy? v. 4.

A. Learned Men, have often reckoned this, among the, *Insolubilia S. Scripturæ*:¹⁵⁸ and it is very True, that the *Solutions* commonly given of it, are very *Insufficient*. *Theophylact*, long ago, saies, That tho' there was at first nothing in the *Ark*, but the Two Tables, yett it may bee afterwards the Pott of *Manna* and Rod of *Aaron* were putt into it; which the Apostle might learn, from a Tradition of the Jewes.¹⁵⁹ But it is very unlikely: If they were not There, in *Solomons* Time, who can think of any such thing, afterwards occurring, to bee by the Apostle referr'd unto? And yett no less Men than *Alting* and *Ursinus*, & several others,

¹⁵⁵ The last paragraph is derived from Knatchbull, *Annotations*, pp. 279–80.

¹⁵⁶ The word *λατρεία* [latreia] signifies "service, divine worship." From *The Expiation*, p. 156.

¹⁵⁷ According to Catholic tradition, "cultus latriæ" is the highest worship due to God alone, while the "cultus douliæ" refers to forms of veneration which may be offered to saints or martyrs.

¹⁵⁸ "Insoluble mysteries of Sacred Scripture."

¹⁵⁹ A reference to the Byzantine Archbishop of Ohrid (Bulgaria) and biblical commentator, Theophylactus (ca.1055–after 1107), *Expositio in Pauli epistolas: Ad Hebraeos*, at Heb. 9:4 [PL 124. 237–38].

under the Conduct of *Theophylact*, say, That after the Days of *Solomon*, both *Golden Pott* and *Aarons Rod*, were putt into the *Ark*.¹⁶⁰

Drusius more lately, hoped that *εν η* here, does refer unto *σκηνη*, and not unto *κιβωτος*;¹⁶¹ which does indeed fully assoil the Difficulties,¹⁶² if you can allow that *εν η* hath reference to a Word so far off, when there is another nearer to it, whereto it may agree. This Consideration caused him, to quitt that Answer; and find out another: namely, That /*נ*/ which is rendred *In*, signifies here, *Ad, Propè, Juxtà*, so that it is here asserted, That those things only stood *Near the Ark*: And yett This, hee afterwards, confesses to bee Too *Forced*.¹⁶³

Wherefore a learned Man,¹⁶⁴ makes a fresh Attempt, for Accommodation; and that is This. The *Ark* is taken *strictly*, in the Text, of the *Kings*; but it is taken *largely*, in this to the *Hebrewes*. As the *Ark* signified the principal Division or Apartments of it, it had nothing in it, but the *Tables*; Hence the *Ark* had its Denomination from them, *The Ark of the Covenant*. But as the *Ark* did also comprehend, the whole Body of it, with all its Boxes, Receptacles & Concavities it contained in it, those other things, the Pot of *Manna* and the Rod of *Aaron*. Briefly These were in it, if, by the *Ark* you understand the whole sacred *Chest*; but not in it, if you understand thereby only that eminent Part of it, which gave a Name unto the Whole.

Dr. *Whitby* observes, from *Noldius*, that the Particle, *εν*, signifies, *Cum, Ad, Propè, Juxtà*.¹⁶⁵ And this Exposition agrees well, with the Tradition of the

¹⁶⁰ Reference is made to Jacob Alting's *Praelectiones ad Epistolam Hebraeos* at Heb. 9:4 in *Opera omnia* (5 vols., 1685–1687), vol. 4, pp. 247–53. Born in Heidelberg as the son of the famous Reformed divine Heinrich Alting (1583–1644), Jacob Alting (1618–1679) was a professor of Oriental languages and theology at the University of Groningen. One of the most renowned Christian Hebraists of his day, Alting was also a follower of Johannes Cocceius and became embroiled in the controversies with the *Voetians* (*RGG*). Mather also refers to the famous Heidelberg theologian Zacharias Ursinus (1534–1584), principal author of the Heidelberg Catechism. He likely cites Ursinus's commentary on Heb. 9 in *Opera theologica* (1612), vol. 2, pp. 1645–46.

¹⁶¹ The phrase *ἐν ἧ* [*en he*] “in which (feminine singular)” opens a relative clause, whose antecedent should be—according to *Drusius*—*σκηνη* [*skene*] “tent, tabernacle” and not the *κιβωτος* [*kibotos*] “box/chests, the *ark* of Moses” (*LXX*). Reference is made to the annotation on Heb. 9:4 by the Flemish exegete and orientalist, Johannes *Drusius* (Jan van den Driessche, 1550–1616), contained in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:4251).

¹⁶² Mather here uses the verb “assoil” in the archaic sense of “to clear up, solve, or resolve” (*OED*).

¹⁶³ Hebrew *ב* [*b*] meaning “in, at, (near)by.” This is the meaning of the Latin prepositions.

¹⁶⁴ Mather here seems to draw on Johannes Buxtorf the Younger, *Exercitationes ad historiam I. arcae foederis, II. ignis sacri et coelestis, III. Urim et Thummim, IV. Mannae, V. petrae in deserto, VI. serpentis aenei* (1659), cap. 5, pp. 70–77.

¹⁶⁵ The preposition *ἐν* [*en*] has many meanings, including “in, on, within” (*BDAG*), which Mather gives in Latin: “cum” (“with”), “ad” (“at”), “prope/iuxta” (“by,” “near,” “within the range of”).

Jewes.¹⁶⁶ *Buxtorf* tells us from the *Talmuds*, That there were *Capsulas* about the *Ark*, for the Uses aforesaid.¹⁶⁷ *Maimonides* | tells us, There was a *Stone*, in the west [14v] Part of the *Holy of Holies*, on which the *Ark* was placed, and before it, the *Pott of Manna*, and the *Rod of Aaron*. *Moses Mikkotsi* saies the same; and *Abarbinel* confirms the Tradition.

Q. But how is it said, *The Holiest of all had the golden Censer?* v. 4.

A. The *golden Altar*; for the frame of it, was an *Altar*; but for the Use of it, a *Censer*; and therefore here called so. This was indeed in the *Holy Place*, or the First Tabernacle; but it was placed close up to the Veil, which parted the *Holiest of all*, or the Second Tabernacle, from the First; and the Incense burnt thereon, was principally to perfume the Second; therefore it is here said, the *Sanctum Sanctorum* had it.¹⁶⁸

Q. On the *High-Priest*, entering the *most Holy Place*, *once* in a Year? v. 7.

A. It must be interpreted of, but *one Day* in the Year: Tho' on the same Day, he entred *Three*, or perhaps *Four* times; as tis evident from *Leviticus*.¹⁶⁹

4507.

Q. What is meant by, *The Time of Reformation?* v. 10.

A. The Coming of the *Messiah*.

Tis Remarkable, That at the Coming of the *Messiah*, the Jewes themselves do expect a *Reformation of the Law*. They have a Saying, *That the Law which was learned in that Age, was Vanity, in respect of the Law of the Age to come*. That is, as the Gloss upon Eccles. 11.8. ha's it; *In respect of the Law of the Messiah*. And then, they say, *The Law will be Renewed*. For, saies the Author of *Sepher Ikkarim*, our Doctors declare, *That all Israel shall receive a second Law from the Mouth of*

¹⁶⁶ Whitby, *A Paraphrase and Commentary* (2:93). Whitby refers to the work of the Danish divine and Hebraist, Christianus Noldius (Christian Nolde, 1626–1683), professor of theology at the University of Copenhagen, *Concordantiae particularum ebraeo chaldaicarum* (1679), pp. 144–45. See Appendix A.

¹⁶⁷ From Whitby, Mather again refers to Buxtorf, *Exercitationes*, cap. 5, p. 72, who cites the work of the great Jewish philosopher and biblical and talmudic scholar, Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides, acronym: Rambam, 1135–1204), *Mishneh Torah, Avodah* (bk. 8, “The Book of Temple Services”), Tractate *Beit Habechirah* (“The Temple”), ch. 4, Halachah 1 (Lewittes, p. 17); and *Sefer Mitzvoth Gadol* (first printed 1488) of R. Moses ben Jacob Kotzensis or R. Moses ben Jacob of Coucy (fl. 1240), a French Tosafist and authority on Halakha; and Abravanel in *Mikraoth Gedoloth, Kings*, pp. 87–88 at 1 Kings 8:9. The Hebrew original *Mishneh Torah* (completed in 1182) is an extensive compendium of Jewish law, which includes many philosophic-theological deliberations. It has continued to be one of the most important Jewish legal sources until today (*TRE*).

¹⁶⁸ From *The Expiation*, p. 158.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Lev. 16:2, 29. From Owen, *A Continuation*, p. 334, who draws on Grotius in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:4269).

*God immediate, as formerly.*¹⁷⁰ And this all prove, as our Apostle does, from Jer. 31. 31, 32, 33.

Q. How is it said of the *greater Tabernacle*; It is *not of this Building?* v. 11.

A. It belongs not to the Class of the visible Creation. It is not to be reckoned in the Number of the visible Creatures.¹⁷¹

Q. For what *Cause?* v. 15.

A. *Δια τουτο* *By this Blood.*¹⁷²

Q. *Blood with Water.*] Why mingled with *Water?* v. 19.

A. The *Blood*, was mingled with *Water*, that it might without growing stiff, the more easily be *sprinkled.*¹⁷³

But here was a Mystery, relating to the Coming & the Dying of our Saviour. Compare, 1. Joh. 5.6.

Q. It is said, *Moses took the Blood of Calves & of Goats, & Water, & scarlet Wool, & Hyssop, & sprinkled both the Book, & all the People.* A famous, & a wicked Jew,¹⁷⁴ ha's most wickedly cavilled against these Words of our Apostle; For the Apostle refers to Exod. 24.7, 8. Where we have nothing of the *Water*, of the *Wool*, and of the *Hyssop*; nor was the *Book* sprinkled with the *Blood*, but only upon the *People*, (or, as our Jew saies, upon the {*All*} for the Cleansing of the *People*;) Nor the *Blood of Calves* & of *Goats*, but only of *Bulls*, there mentioned? v. 19.

¹⁷⁰ From Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:94), Mather references the *Midrash Rabbah, Ecclesiastes*, at 11:8 (Soncino, p. 295), and the work of the Spanish rabbi and philosopher Joseph Albo (c. 1380–1444) *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* (“Book of Principles”), ch. 19. For a German transl., see *Buch Ikkarim: Grund- und Glaubenslehren der Mosaischen Religion* (1844), p. 310.

¹⁷¹ See *The Expiation*, p. 167.

¹⁷² From Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:95). The phrase *διὰ τοῦτο* [*dia touto*] means “therefore or thereby.” The blood of Christ is mentioned in the preceding verse of Heb. 9:14. Thus, Mather refers this neuter pronoun back to the word blood (*τὸ αἷμα* [*to haima*], likewise neuter).

¹⁷³ From Pyle, *A Paraphrase* (2:258).

¹⁷⁴ This entry is drawn from Kidder, *A Demonstration of the Messiah*, part 3, ch. 7, p. 74. In the third part of his *Demonstration*, Kidder engages with the criticism of Christianity put forth by a Jacob Aben Amram in a manuscript work titled *Porta Veritatis, sive compendiaria at beatitudinem*, which points out numerous purported inconsistencies and problems in the New Testament writings. On Heb. 9:19, the *Porta* argues, according to Kidder, that the Apostle's suggestion that Moses “sprinkled the book” is “both *false* and *foolish*,” as this citation twisted the meaning of Ex. 24:7. Written around 1634, the *Porta* was never published. Following Kidder's own identification, it has been generally assumed that Amram was a pseudonym taken by the famous Amsterdam rabbi, Manasseh ben Israel (1604–1657), who traveled to England in the mid-1650s to negotiate the re-entry of Jews into England. Manasseh is said to have sold the manuscript to the Cambridge Hebraist, Ralph Cudworth (1617–1688), who then bequeathed it to Kidder in 1688. Kidder's copy is now in Balliol College Library. See David S. Katz, *Philosemitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603–1655* (1982).

A. *Moses* (who did it), as well as *Paul*, saies, That the *People* were *sprinkled*; If the *Representatives* of the *People* were so, that is enough. Tho' the *Water*, & the *Wool*, and the *Hyssop* are not mentioned for that particular Action in *Exodus*, yett we find all those things mention'd elsewhere, when a *Sprinkling* of this Nature was called for. But as for the *Sprinkling of the Book*, if we examine the Matter a little more thoroughly, we shall not find our Apostle affirming, That *Moses* did *sprinkle the Book*. The Words of the Apostle, may be exactly thus translated; *Taking the Blood of Calves and Goats, with Water & scarlet Wool, & Hyssop, and the Book, he sprinkled all the People*. The *αυτο τε το βιβλιον*, will admirably well refer to *λαβων*, as is well observed by Dr. *Kidder*.¹⁷⁵ And this perfectly agrees with what we read in *Exodus*; where tis said, That *Moses* TOOK the BOOK. The *και* before *παντα*, is Redundant, as it is very commonly in other Places.¹⁷⁶ The *Vulgar Latin* seems to countenance our Translation; *Accipiens Sanguinem Vitulorum et Hircorum, cum Aqua, et Lana coccinea, et Hyssopo, ipsum quoque Librum, et omnem Populum aspersit*.¹⁷⁷ *Librum* here may refer to *Accipiens*; and, *et*, which appears as a *Copulative*, may be no more than an *Expletive*. And then, what tho' *Moses* does not expressly mention the *Blood of Calves and Goats*? There is all the reason imaginable to beleieve, That *Sin-Offerings* did accompany the *Peace-Offerings* then used. (We expressly find, it was the Manner to join them, Lev. 9.3, 4. and Lev. 8. and Chap. 14. 7, and 52.) Especially when, the *People* for whom the Oblation was made, were to be cleansed. Now there was the *Blood of Goats* in the *Sin-Offerings*, as well as of *Calves* (or *Bullocks*) in the other. (Lev. 4.23, 24. Ch. 9.3. Ch. 16.15.)

In fine, our Apostle professes to Tell, what was *Done* by *Moses*, not what was *Writt* by him. And if he had hereupon inserted the *commom Tradition* of his Countreymen about it, it were impossible for any of them, at this time of Day to confute them.

|¹⁷⁸

[15r]

175 From the viewpoint of modern biblical studies, Kidder's argument seems problematic. Grammatically, the phrase *αυτό τε τὸ βιβλίον (καί)* [*auto te to biblion (kai)*] "both the book itself (and)" in Heb. 9:15 cannot refer to *λαβών (λαμβάνω)* [*lambano*] "take, catch". The conjunction "τε . . . και . . ." (both) closely connects "the book" and "the people" as objects that are being sprinkled. Still, the question remains what the sprinkled book might refer to. Some modern exegetes explain that the book symbolizes the altar in Ex. 24:6.

176 Greek *καί* [*kai*] means "and"; *πᾶς* [*pas*] "all, every."

177 VUL: "[lecto enim omni mandato legis a Mose universo populo] accipiens sanguinem vitulorum et hircorum cum aqua et lana coccinea et hysopo ipsum quoque librum et omnem populum aspersit." DRA has: "[For when every commandment of the law had been read by Moses to all the people,] he took the blood of calves and goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people . . ." Mather suggests as a translation: "Taking the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and the book, he sprinkled all the people." To support this solution, he interprets the "et" before "omnem populum" as a grammatical expletive.

178 See Appendix B.

Q. Why must the *Heavenly Things themselves*, be purified with Sacrifices? v. 23.

A. Tis true, the Heavenly World was never polluted.

But the *Heavenly Sanctuary* must by the *Sacrifice* of our Saviour be so consecrated, that an Access is thereby opened for us into it; and as we may say, *Dedicated for our Use* hereafter. The *Tabernacle* of old, must undergo such a *Consecration*, before it was Open and *Free for the Use* of Men; because of an *Uncleanness* imputed thereinto. But it is our *Uncleanness* that must be taken away, before a Right and Use of the Heavenly Sanctuary can be granted us. This, by an Abusion common in Speeches, where Comparisons are carried on, is called, *A Purifying of the Heavenly Things themselves*. It may be added, That by the Access of sinful Men, who are called by the Gospel, to take Possession of the Kingdome of Heaven, it seems to be polluted. This is what our Saviour seems to express in other Terms, Matth. XI.12. *The Kingdome of Heaven suffereth Violence, & the Violent take it by Force*. As of old, the Tabernacle must be expiated, under the apprehension of its being *polluted* by the Sins of the *unclean People*, who lived round about it; Thus (as my Nameless Author expresses it) “Christ restored Heaven to its due Honour, when He offered Himself there unto God, & thereby took Order, that Men guilty of Sins, having first deposed their Sins by a lively Faith and Repentance, might not be thought unworthy of Heaven.”¹⁷⁹

[15v]

Q. On that, *After Death Judgment?* v. 27.

A. The Hebrews, in *Midras Ruth*, suppose a Man after Death, demanding a further Space of Repentance, and saying, *Sinite me, ut eam et Resipiscam*. But there is this Answer given him.¹⁸⁰

Stultissime hominum; Nonnè nosti hunc Mundum (the World of Souls,) *similem esse Sabbato*, (in quo Hebræis non licuit parare cibos,) *Mundum autem ex quo venisti, similem esse Vesperiis Sabbati? Si homo non parat in Vesperiis Sabbati, quid comedet in Sabbato? Prætereà, Mundus hic similis est Mari; Mundus autem ex quo venisti, similis est Aridæ. Si quis non parat in Aridà, quid comedet in Mari? Adhæc, Mundus hic similis est Deserto; et Mundus ex quo venisti similis Terræ quæ habitatur. Si quis non parat in Terra quæ habitatur, quid comedet in Deserto?*¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ From *The Expiation*, p. 190.

¹⁸⁰ “Allow me, that I may go and become reasonable.”

¹⁸¹ “You most stupid person. Don’t you know that this world (the World of Souls) is like the Sabbath (on which it was not allowed for the Jews to prepare food), but the world out of which you have come, is like the eves of the Sabbath? If man does not prepare anything on the eves of the Sabbath, what will he eat on the Sabbath? Furthermore, this world is like the sea. However, the world out of which you have come is like the dry land. If you do not prepare anything while on the dry land, what will you eat out on the sea? In addition, this world is like the desert, and the world out of which you have come is like the habitable land. If you do not prepare anything in the habitable land, what will you eat in the desert?” This entry is drawn

Q. The *second Appearance* of our Saviour, how is it said to be, *without Sin?* v. 28.

A. It may be taken for an, *Offering for Sin*. When our Saviour appears the *second time*, it will not be as a *Sin-Offering*: But it may also signify, That there shall then be not more Guilt of *Sin*, on the People of God.

The *High-Priest* of old, went into the Holy Place, to take away *Sin*; and returned from thence *without Sin*; for He had now by His Offering taken it away.

Our Saviour appearing in the Presence of God in Heaven, ha's abolished the Guilt of our *Sin*; He will now Return from thence, & Appear unto His People, to give them the Effect of their having their Guilt removed from them.

The People of God, are here compared, unto the People of *Israel*, without the Tabernacle, expecting the High-Priest, after their Manner, *unto Salvation*; that he having obtained the Remission of their Sins, they might hear his Benediction in the Name of God upon them.¹⁸²

from Cartwright, *Mellificium Hebraicum*, lib. 3, as printed in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (8:1351–52).
Transl. adapted from *Midrash Rabbah, Ruth*, p. 45.

¹⁸² From *The Expiation*, pp. 201–02.

Q. In Psal. 40.6. the Psalmist, in Type of our Saviour, sais, *Mine Ears hast thou Opened*, or *Digged*; why do's the Apostle, render it, *A Body hast thou prepared for mee?* v. 5.

A. Lett it bee considered, That the Hebrew Word, signifies, *To prepare*, as well as, *To pierce*.¹⁸⁴ And lett it bee Remembered, That the *Boring of the Ear* with an Awl, was of *Mosaical* Institution, for such *Israelites*, who having served *six* Years with their *Brethren-Masters*, were willing to continue in that State of Servitude, until Death Freed them. By which *Boring of an Ear*, the Servant as it were took on him a New Political *Body*, whereof, being thus Inaugurated, hee could not bee divested, until hee Dy'd.

Our Lord thus took on Him, the *Form of a Servant*; It was on the brink of the *seventh Day*, at the Creation, that this *Righteous Servant* of God, was discovered, as undertaking to purchase our Blessedness.¹⁸⁵

Q. How could it be said by *David*, *Lo I come*, (*in the Volumn of the Book it is written of me*) *to do thy Will?* v. 7

A. I find an Expositor on this Epistle, writing to this Purpose.

The Greek intimates a particular *Chapter*. Now lett us enquire, what *Chapter* it may be. Certainly, it must be that, wherein the very thing is handled, which *David* said, he *came to do*; namely, the Will of God. But where is it said, That *David* must *do the Will of God*? It is where the *Kings* of the People of God are commanded so to do. Now this you find, in Deut. XVII.14. – to the End.

In a peculiar Way was *David* ordained by God Himself to be the *First King* over His People; & the Kingdome was to remain with His Posterity. It is not written of him as *David*, but it is written of him, as a *King*. In this, he was an admirable Type of our Saviour. Him we may look upon, as even by Name so

¹⁸³ There are traces of seal wax on the margins of this page, suggesting that an insert was at one point attached to it, which, however, is no longer extant.

¹⁸⁴ Ps. 40:6 has אָזְנַיִם כָּרַיתָ לִי [ʾoznayim karita li]: “my ears you have opened” (NIV). But many manuscripts of the LXX (incl. Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus) have: σώμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι (“but a body have you prepared me”), which is referenced in Heb. 10:5. Again, Mather, following Whitby, is attempting to reconcile the discrepancy, arguing that the Hebrew word in question כָּרַיתָ [karita] from כָּרַה [karah] means not only “dig, open, pierce” but, because of the association with enslavement, could also be understood as “prepare,” in the sense of making somebody ready for servitude. Interestingly, Whitby freely acknowledges that the NT text here cites the LXX, while arguing that the LXX-translators, perhaps under divine inspiration, came up with an interpretation of Ps. 40:6 that was linguistically sound and fitting the new context. Mather, on the other hand, does not mention the LXX. See also the annotation below.

¹⁸⁵ From Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:102–03).

written of. The *King* of the People of God, must be obedient unto the Will of God. This is the Thing *written* of him. Our Blessed JESUS, is the *King* of His People. He therefore comes to Obey and Answer the Law. The Will of God, relating to an *expiatory* Sacrifice, was one of the Things, whereon the Law was to be answered.¹⁸⁶

966.

Q. When the Words of the Psalmist, *mine Ears hast thou Bored*, are by the Apostle rendred, *A Body hast thou prepared for mee*: Is it not that so hee might conform, to the Reading of the *Septuagint*? v. 5, 6, 7.

A. I am glad of this Occasion, to give you once for all, an *Observation*, shall I call it? Or, an *Admonition*, of no little Consequence.

Wee have in our Hands, a Greek Translation of the *Old Testament*, which, they (falsely) Report, was made by *Seventy Two* Interpreters.¹⁸⁷ And there are in the *New Testament*, several Quotations out of the Old, which wee now find more Agreeable to the *present Septuagint*, than unto the *Hebrew Original*. Hence many Exquisite and Accurate Criticks, imagine the *Hebrew Original* to bee corrupted, & go to Reform it by the *present Septuagint*. This now is a great Wrong, most rashly done to the Oracles of God. It was for more glorious Ends, than that of Agreeing with a *Fallacious & Erroneous*, Translation, that the Holy Spirit of God, cited Things from the Old Testament, in other Words than they were first written in. It may be proved, That some of the Primitive Christians, *Hundreds* of Years after the Writing of the New Testament, altered the *Septuagint* in many of those Places which the New Testament quotes out of the Old, & putt in the Words of the New Testament, which were not there before it. It is easy to assign the *Cause* of their doing so; and for the *Proof* of it, I need only bring this very Instance, that is now before us. In the Hebrew tis, *my | Ears hast thou bored*. In the Septuagint, it is, *A Body hast thou prepared for mee*. Well, And so tis in the New Testament. Some Divines will now make no Bones to tell you, *The Apostle took his Words out of the Seventy, & the Seventy did not Read the Original, as wee do, in our Dayes*. But this is a Wrong to the Holy Pages. No, T'was the *Spirit* of God that made that Paraphrase, by the Apostle on the Psalmist; and you shall find in *Jeroms Works*, and even in *Jeroms Dayes*, that the *Seventy* did not so Read the Words, as now they do: The *New Testament* by no means did conform to the *Seventy*, but somebody did more lately *Reform* the *Seventy* by the *New Testament*.¹⁸⁸

[16v]

¹⁸⁶ From *The Expiation*, pp. 214–16.

¹⁸⁷ “(falsely)” was added later.

¹⁸⁸ Mather’s argument here is similar to that of John Owen in *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, exerc. 5 (“Testimonies Cited by the Apostle out of the Old Testament”), pp. 51–53. Owen argues against Louis Capell (see his 1650 *Critica Sacra*, esp. pp. 489–558) and other critics, who assumed that a) given the many discrepancies between the Hebrew Bible and the LXX translation, there must have been a Hebrew original that diverged in many places from the now canonical Masoretic text, suggesting that in ancient times there was a variety of copies that

As for the Occasion of this Translation; when the Psalmist says, *mine Ears hast thou bored*, it means, that He was to become the *perpetual Servant* of GOD. It is very Natural & Obvious to find a *Body præpared* here; because the *Body* of the Servant was no longer his own, but his Masters: which was the very thing implied in the *Boring of the Ear*.¹⁸⁹

1711.

Q. The Christian Religion, here acknowledges an *High-Priest*, who saves us, by the *Sacrifice* of Himself: Is there any thing in *Judaism*, to countenance it? v. 14.

A. The modern *Jewes* wholly deny this main Article of the *Christian Religion*. But *Philo*, that learned *Jew*, in his Book, *De Exulibus*, ha's this wonderful Passage:

*By Tradition, wee have it (saith hee) that wee must expect the Death of an High Priest, which Priest shall bee the very Word of God, void of all Sin; His Father shall bee God, and this Word shall bee the Fathers Wisdome, by which all things in this World were created.*¹⁹⁰

Behold, the whole *Christian Religion*, dropt from the Pen of a *Jew*, all at once!

[▽17r] [▽Insert from 17r]¹⁹¹

Q. On that, *Their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more?* v. 17.

A. There shall be *one* perfect and compleat Atonement made for them.¹⁹²

differed in many places; or b) that all of the OT references in the Pauline letters were derived from the LXX. Against this, Owen argued that the Apostle was not always citing the LXX when referencing the OT: In most citations, Paul, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, “varieth from it, either in the use of his own Liberty, or in the more exact rendring of the Original Text.” And where there was an exact congruence of words between Paul’s OT citations and the LXX, and where both were departing from the Masoretic text in exactly the same way, as in the case of Heb. 8:9 or 10:5, this was to be explained as follows: Paul was “reporting the sense and importance of the places in words of his own, [and] the Christian Transcribers of the Greek Bible inserted his expressions into the Text, either as judging them a more proper Version of the Original, whereof they were ignorant, than that of the LXX, or out of a preposterous zeal to take away the appearance of a diversity between the text and the Apostles citation of it. And thus in those Testimonies where there is a real variation from the Hebrew original, the Apostle took not his words from the Translation of the LXX, but his words were afterwards inserted into that Translation.” For similar reflections on these discussions, see also the work of the French Catholic ecclesiastical historian Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719), *A Compleat History of the Canon and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testament* (1699), vol. 1, ch. 6, sect. 7, pp. 190–92. Whitby, by contrast, argued that “the Apostle did not change the Translation of the *Septuagint*” (2:103). The reference to Jerome is probably to his letter to Augustine, *Epistola CXII*, 19–22 [PL 22. 928–31].

¹⁸⁹ This last paragraph seems to have been added later. It appears to be derived from *The Expiration*, p. 211. See also Kidder, *A Demonstration of the Messias*, pt. 2, ch. 4, pp. 90–92.

¹⁹⁰ A reference to Philo of Alexandria, *Of Flight and Finding*, 108–09; transl.: *LCL* 275, pp. 68–69.

¹⁹¹ See Appendix B.

¹⁹² From Pyle, *A Paraphrase* (2:264).

4108.

Q. We read of, *A New and Living Way, consecrated for us, thro' the Veil, that is to say, the Flesh of our Lord.* How are we to understand it? v. 20.

A. The Way into the *Third Heaven*, was, Ἀβατος (as *Josephus* calls it,) *unpassable*.¹⁹³ There was no Entrance for us into it, until our *Fore-runner had entered* into it, & until He had *prepared* it for us, by His *Better Sacrifice*. This, as Dr. *Whitby* observes, was the Doctrine of all the Primitive Christians; That our Saviour by His Death opened this *Veil* for the Just, that were from *Adam, αποκλεισμενοι*, (tis old *Cyrils* Word) *excluded* from those Blessed Regions.¹⁹⁴ διεσχισε πραγματον τον εξ αιωνος μη σχισθεντα· *rent open the Enclosure, which from the Beginning had not been laid open*: Tis the Expression of another in *Eusebius*.¹⁹⁵ Hence *Tertullian* saies, The Patriarchs were, *Dominicæ Resurrectionis appendices*; The Appendants of our Lords Resurrection.¹⁹⁶

The Flesh, or Body, of our Saviour, broken on the Cross, and so letting out the Blood that procures our Entrance, into the *Holy of Holies*, as the Blood, the High Priest carried with him, did procure this Entrance: This was the Veil, which till it was Rent, we could not enter there.

Tis called, *A living Way*. That is, as *Grotius* glosses it, ζωοποιησαν, *leading to Life*, and, *giving of Life*.¹⁹⁷ Our Saviour *Dyed* for us, that we might *Live* thro' Him. [1. Joh. 4.9.] *Bread that gives Life*, is called, *living Bread*.

I add, Here may be a reference to the Holy Places under the Law. The *Way* into them was a *Deadly Way*. It was *Death* for any Man to enter them, except the High-Priest; and He but once a Year.¹⁹⁸

[△Insert ends]

[△]

| [blank]

[17v]

¹⁹³ From ἄβατος [abatos] “untrodden, impassable.” This entry is derived from Whitby, *A Paraphrase* (2:106–07). Via Whitby, Mather cites Josephus, *Antiquities*, 3.123; transl.: *LCL* 242, p. 374.

¹⁹⁴ Perf. participle of ἀποκλείω [apokleio] “shut up, excluded from.” From Whitby, a citation from Cyril of Alexandria (Cyrillus Alexandrinus, c. 375–444 CE), Bishop of Antioch and an important theologian in the christological discussion of the Council of Ephesus (431 CE), *De adoratione et cultu in Spiritu et veritate*, cap. 17 [PG 68. 1076].

¹⁹⁵ From Whitby, Mather offers a viable translation of the phrase διεσχισε φραγμόν τὸν ἐξ αἰώνος μὴ σχισθέντα [dieschise phragmon ton ex aionos me schisthenta], citing the church historian and Bishop, Eusebius of Caesarea (Eusebius Pamphili, after 260–c. 337/40 CE), *Historia ecclesiastica*, 1.13 [PG 20. 123. 78; SC 31]. Mather misspelled “φραγμόν” (‘φ’ with ‘π’).

¹⁹⁶ Mather cites Tertullian, *De anima*, cap. 55 [PL 2. 744A]. A less literal translation would be “in the retinue of the Lord’s resurrection,” *ANF* (3:4867).

¹⁹⁷ From ζῶοποιέω [zoopoieo] “make alive, preserve alive.” See Grotius in Pearson, *Critici Sacri* (6:4310).

¹⁹⁸ This paragraph was added later.

[▽18r–18v] [▽Insert from 18r–18v]¹⁹⁹

I will annex the Words of Dr. *Tho. Sherlock* on this Matter.²⁰⁰

“Allowing the Maxim of the Jewish Church to have been good from the First Institution of *Sacrifice*, *That without Blood there is no Remission*, the Case may possibly be This. *Abel* came a Petitioner for Grace & Pardons & brought the *Atonement* appointed for Sin. *Cain* appears before GOD as a *Just Person wanting no Repentance*: he brings an *Offering* in Acknowledgment of GODs Goodness & Bounty; but no *Atonement* in Acknowledgment of his own Wretchedness. The Expostulation of GOD with *Cain* favours, *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou dost not well, Sin liveth at thy Door*. i. e. If thou art Righteous, thy Righteousness shall save thee; If thou art not, by what Expiation is thy Sin purged? It lieth still at thy Door.

– What could this *Faith* (of *Abel*) be, but a Reliance on the Promises & Appointments of GOD; which *Faith Cain* wanted, relying on his own *Well-doing*.”

[△] [△Insert ends]

[18v] | [blank]

[resumed on 16v]

Q. *Not Forsaking the Assembling of ourselves together?* v. 25.

A. One thus paraphrases it. “Keep close to Christ, as the *Chickens* do to the *Hen* that clucks them. Such an Allusion there seems to be in the Original. *επισυναγωγή*.”²⁰¹

4244

Q. How may one understand that Passage, which ha’s driven so many poor Sinners to Desperation: *If we Sin willfully, after that we have received the Truth there remains no more Sacrifice for Sins; But a certain fearful Looking for of Judgment?* v. 26, 27.

A. The Word, *εκουσιως*, most properly signifies, *willingly*. So *Beza* translates it, *ultrò*.²⁰² And what Man is there that sins not *so*? Nay, No Man ever sins, but it is in a Measure *so*.

¹⁹⁹ This small separate cut-out was at one time attached to the bottom margin of [16v] but subsequently came loose.

²⁰⁰ From the work of the Church of England theologian and Bishop of Bangor and Salisbury, Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761), *The Use and Intent of Prophecy in the several Ages of the World* (1725), vol. 1, disc. 3, pp. 84–85.

²⁰¹ The word *επισυναγωγή* [episynagoge] means “gathering/being gathered together, meeting.” Similarly, Gouge, *Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (2:343).

²⁰² The word *εκουσιως* [hekousios] signifies “willingly, deliberately,” which can be a figurative meaning of the Latin “ultrò.” This entry is derived from the work of the irenic Anglican cleric, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, and attendee of the Synod of Dort, John Hales

The Design of the Apostle here is to show the Necessity of Beleeving on the Lord JESUS CHRIST, concerning whom he had newly said *This Man after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for Sins, forever satt down on the Right Hand of God:* whereas under the Law of old, *The Priest offered oftentimes the same Sacrifices, which can never take away Sins.* Well; we have received this glorious Truth of the Gospel. If now we *sin willingly*, as, alas, we do every day, what will become of us, if we do not fly to this ONE SACRIFICE of our Lord Jesus Christ? It is not said, *There is no Sacrifice for Sins.* But it is said, *There remains no more Sacrifice for Sins;* If we do not Beleeve in that ONE SACRIFICE as most sufficient for us, but Refuse *That*, and Reject *That*, then there remains *nothing but a certain fearful Looking for of Judgment, & fiery Indignation.*

This is the Gloss of Mr. *John Hales*, upon this Passage, which ha's been so perverted unto Despair, as if our *Willing* or *wilful Sins*, after we have received *the Knowledge of the Truth*, rendred us incapable of Benefit, by the *Sacrifice* of our Lord Jesus Christ. Saies he, "my Comfort is, that if the Text be advisedly considered, there is no such thing as the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, or any other desperate Conclusion, to be found in it. The Scope of the precedent Verses, evidently expound the Apostles Meaning to be to lett the Jewes know, the Case was not now with them as under the Law. Then they had a *Daily Sacrifice*; but now we have *One Sacrifice*, once for all."

Q. What Sort of *Adversaries*, may especially be intended, where we read of, *A Fiery Indignation*, that shall devour the *Adversaries*? v. 27.

A. Tis a Criticism in Dr. *Lightfoots* Remains; That ὑπεναντιους more properly signifies, the *Under-adversaries*, as one may call them; that is to say, *Adversaries* under an {Hood} or some Colour and Pretence.²⁰³

Q. It is said of the Apostate, *Hee hath trodden under foot, the Son of God, & counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith hee was sanctify'd, an unholy thing.* How can hee said, That the Apostate was ever *sanctify'd by the Blood of the Covenant*? v. 29.

A. Tis not said so at all. The *Blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ, not only washes away our Sins, but also cleared the Innocency of our Bl. Lord Himself: it was attended with so many rare Circumstances, and it fulfilled so many Prophecies. Besides, There was the Shedding of *Blood* at the Sanctification, or Consecration

(1584–1656), *Of the Blasphemie against the Holy-Ghost* (1646), pp. 11–12. Hales references Beza, *Annotations*, p. 530.

²⁰³ From ὑπεναντιος [hupenantios] "opposed, hostile." From *Meditations upon Some Abstruser Points of Divinity, and Explanations of Divers Difficult Places of Scripture in Some genuine remains of the late pious and learned John Lightfoot* (1700), pp. 158–63, Mather offers this etymological explanation, making reference to the combination of ὑπό [hypo] "under" and ἐναντιος [enantios] "opposite (in a neutral sense)."