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In his enumeration of this holy line of descent Matthew sets up
three chronological divisions, each of fourteen individuals or persons.
The first division extends from Abraham to David and comprises fourteen
fathers who, by faith in Christ, embraced the promises of the prophets, cherished their earthly inheritance and the ceremonies and universal law of God before the promised reign of the tribe of Judah was manifested in the house of David. The second division reaches from David the king (as Matthew purposely calls him) to Jechoniah, and he sets forth fourteen of those to whom the kingship also—in addition to the prophecy and the legitimate priesthood given to their ancestors—was manifested through the grace of God in the house of David, as a sure pledge, a visible type, and a small part of the spiritual kingship of Christ. The third division, finally, covers in order the ancestors of Joseph from Jechoniah to Christ. Relying upon the superabundant records of the prophets, they, through faith, found repose in the shreds of the holy priesthood and the scanty remnants of the preceding kingship. Sustained by faith, then, they persisted in the expectation of Christ until that fulness of time when Christ came. We also have followed this division in the arrangement of three parallels. We couple together, moreover, those words which were written in the first and second chapters of I Chronicles with the words of Matthew. For, on the one hand, they are in each case a genealogical compendium drawn together from the history of the Old Testament and, on the other hand, they look to the same goal. For, in the first case, Ezra desired to consign to the returning church the fullest description of that family to whom belonged the promises, the tables of the covenant, the law, the prophecy, the kingdom, and all the pledges of
the promises, so that she might look forward to Jesus Christ as if to
their embodiment. The evangelist, in the same way, following
the same genealogy as far as Zerubbabel, calls the godly to the
knowledge and perception of the Christ who has arrived by point-
ing out in him the truth of all the things previously done and said by
that line--one by one, indeed,--to which the promises had been made.
The rationale will be explained more fully in the following parallel. In
this comparison of passages, furthermore, and in the whole diagram-
matic arrangement the individual phrases agree very well with one
another, unless perhaps it provokes uncertainty in someone that in the
one place Israel and Ram are mentioned, in the other Jacob and
Aram. Both were, in actuality, people with two names. The name, or
rather the extra name, of "Israel" was also assigned to Jacob by God,
just as Moses relates in Genesis 32:28 and 35:10. "Ram" and "Aram"
are really a single name, if you bear the same thing in mind; but the
former is characteristic of the Hebrews, the latter of the Egyptians
and Syrians. The remaining names are obviously the same; we shall,
therefore, hasten on to other points.

PARALLEL II

I Chronicles 3
5. And these were born to
David in Jerusalem: Shimea and Shobab, and Nathan, and Solomon,
four by Bathshua, the daughter of

Matthew 1
6. And David the king begot
Solomon by her who had been the wife
of Uriah.
Ammiel.

10. And the son of Solomon was Rehoboam, Abijah his son, Asa his son, Jehoshaphat his son,

11. Joram his son, Ahaziah his son, Joash his son,
12. Amaziah his son, Azariah his son, Jotham his son,
13. Ahaz his son, Hezekiah his son, Manasseh his son,
14. Amon his son, Josiah his son.

15. The sons of Josiah: the first-born Johanan, the second Jehoiakim, the third Zedekiah, the fourth Shallum.
16. And the sons of Jehoiakim: Jehonathan his son, Zedekiah his son.

11. And Josiah begot Jeconiah and his brothers, who were at the time of the deportation to Babylon.

In both these narratives the proximate goal is that the unbroken continuation of the Davidic kingship might be set forth in the church of God; the ultimate goal is that it might be shown, from this continuation, that the succession to the kingship has at last reached the Christ in whom the fulfilment of all the promises of God has been placed. Ezra concerns himself particularly with the former of these goals, while Matthew in this enumeration hastens on to the latter. Thus, there is a common posture and main point to both passages: although the kingship which previously was assigned purely to David was transferred from the family of Solomon to the posterity of Nathan (as Luke ὁ υἱὸς τῆς σπάνιας ἡμῶν shows), it still remained in the house of David. It follows from these facts that Christ, who, according to the flesh, was born of the virgin Mary, a
daughter of David, is by virtue of birth a son of David and Abraham, by virtue of the temporal law their heir as well, and by virtue of the truth and the fulfilment [of all God's promises] an everlasting king. These things are proven not only by the design of both narratives, but also by a comparison with other passages of scripture. For, although in both places the sequence of that line is set forth from which Christ was born according to the flesh, nevertheless both places point this out most clearly, that the interest here was certainly more in the legitimate succession to the kingship than in natural descent. For this reason, therefore, in Ezra Zedekiah is called the son of Jechoniah in verse 16, because he succeeded the latter to the kingship, even though he was, according to the natural order, the paternal uncle of this man. In Matthew, on the other hand, the names of certain kings are omitted from verse 8 and also the following two verses, names which can easily be supplied from the Δανιήστου λόγος passage from Ezra. We judge that these names were omitted for the following reasons: first, because Matthew was hastening on (as we have previously said) to that ultimate aim relating to the pointing out of Christ; secondly, because he was aware that this genealogy was known by everyone, even the ignorant, or, at least, that it was displayed to everyone's view by passages of scripture which are as numerous as can be and easily seen; finally, however, because he thought that a fixed number of people ought to be referred to the individual classes equally, so as to be an aid to the memory of the pious. He him-
self mentions this plan, saying, "So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations," etc., verse 17. The alterations which happen to this passage, however, are not of such a kind as to be able to excite serious misgiving. For, in the first place, if we consider the personal names, Uzziah⁴ and Azariah⁵ are the same person; for he was a man with two names, and hence is rather frequently called by both names in one and the same chapter (II Kings 15). The remaining names agree with each other, if only you bear in mind this, that the personal names of the Hebrews, when they pass over into foreign languages, are generally corrupted by the change of one letter or syllable.

Certain grounds for doubt remain which it is necessary to banish from this passage with a few words. The first is the question as to what it might mean that Zedekiah is called the son of Jechoniah.⁶ Answer: That Jechoniah had no son who obtained the kingship from him is shown by these words of Jeremiah 22:30: "Thus says Jehovah: Write this man down as childless, a man who shall not prosper in his days," etc. Consequently, neither Zedekiah nor anyone else can correctly be called a natural son of this man, as Ambrose very aptly concludes in his comments on Luke.⁷ Zedekiah, therefore, must have been spoken of as a son either by virtue of adoption or by virtue of succession to the place of a son. He could not be a son by adoption, since he was the paternal uncle of Jechoniah and older than he. It follows, therefore, that Zedekiah is called the son of Jechoniah in Chronicles because of succession to the
prerogative of kingship. The second question is how it could be said
by Matthew that Josiah begot Jechoniah and his brothers when this Jecha-
niah had no brothers, either full or half. \(^8\) Answer: Josiah is said to
beget Jechoniah in the sense that a grandfather begets a grandson through
the father who comes between them. \(^9\) For Josiah begot Jehoiakim and
Jehoiakim Jechoniah; his brothers are not, in fact, viewed as having
been children of the same parents, but rather they are understood as
paternal uncles and as relatives who are descended from Josiah the king.
For all relations and people linked by blood were customarily designated
in this way by the term "brothers," as at Genesis 13:8 and 20:12\(^\text{10}\) and
29:15; and Zedekiah himself is called the brother of Jechoniah in II Chron-
icles 36:10, even though he was Jechoniah's uncle. The third question
is why the aforementioned men should be said to have been begotten by
Josiah at the time of the Babylonian deportation. Answer: This ques-
tion is solved by means of a suitable interpretation of this passage in
Matthew, if you posit an \(\text{έλλειψις}\) of the Greek article in this man-
ner: Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ,
tοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος, that is, Josiah begot Jecho-
niah and his brothers, who were at the time of the Babylonian deporta-
tion. For if this ellipsis is accepted (and it is very frequent in all good
authors and in the New Testament), neither is Josiah, who had already
died long ago, said to have begotten someone at this time, nor are the
brothers of Jechoniah said to have lived on during the deportation when
all his relations had died. Rather, the descendants of Josiah are merely said to have existed at that time in which that miserable deportation to Babylon began—something which is made clear by the faithfulness of the history in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

PARALLEL III

I Chronicles 3 17. And the sons of Jechoniah, the captive: Salathiel his son, 18. And his, Malchiram, and Pedaiah, etc. 19. And the sons of Pedaiah: Zerubbabel and Shimei.

Matthew 1 12. And after the Babylonian deportation: Jechoniah begot Salathiel, and Salathiel begot Zerubbabel.

That which was said in the preceding parallel about the goal and main point of both passages in Ezra in relation to Matthew pertains, by equal rights, to this passage as well. These two authors, indeed, seem to agree clearly with each other in a harmonious way, if you make this exception, that Ezra states that Zerubbabel was the son of Pedaiah, but Matthew that he was begotten by Salathiel. Both things, however, are true for the reason which we have previously shown. For Zerubbabel was the son of Pedaiah and the grandson of Salathiel; consequently, he was begotten by both—by his father, to be sure, in the nearest genealogical degree, but also mediately, at the first remove,¹ by his grandfather Salathiel. It is, nevertheless, quite certain that the sacred authors nowhere, except for this passage in Chronicles, call Zerubbabel the son of Pedaiah, but call him everywhere the son of Salathiel. We
judge that this was done by Ezra\textsuperscript{2} and Haggai\textsuperscript{3} the prophet, because the following motive was very close at hand during that time: that by this means they might assert \textit{συντόμως}\textsuperscript{4} the rightful succession of Zerubbabel to the kingship through his grandfather Salathiel and that the prime dignity might remain in the possession of his family by reason of the acknowledgement of all the people. Matthew complied with this design all the more carefully because it agreed with the number of generations on which he had decided for the sake of aiding the memory. And so in these two passages there seems, in fact, to be no alteration which might arouse uncertainty in the reader.

But there is one question which arises from a comparison with chapter three of Luke, where Salathiel is called the son, not of Jeho- niah, but of Neri, who descended from Nathan.\textsuperscript{5} The answer is that both statements are true, but the one is made literally, the other figuratively. We are terming "literal" here a statement in which one is called a "father" or a "son" who is a father or son by nature, according to the mode of procreation which people call "natural." We are terming "figurative," on the other hand, a statement in which someone is called a "father" or a "son" who is not a father or son according to nature, but who assumes the place of a father or son, according to the law, by means of adoption in childhood or adulthood or legal nomination as the successor. It is in accordance with the aforesaid literal sense that Salathiel is called by Luke "the son of Neri, who was the son of Melchi,
the son of Addi," etc., from the posterity of Nathan, the son of David, as Luke recounts in this passage. It is, on the other hand, in accordance with the aforesaid figurative manner of statement that Zerubbabel is said to have been the son of Salathiel, or Salathiel to have begotten Zerubbabel; because he was not born the son of Salathiel, but was (so to speak) made his son, not by natural procreation, but by a legal fiction and substitution. We are not concerned in the least, however, as to whether this fiction or substitution was effected by Jechoniah through the adoption of a child or an adult, or whether, contrariwise, it was effected by the force--the strength (as they say)--of an eternal law pertaining to the kingship. For we do not recall, for one thing, that this point is distinctly explained by the sacred scriptures; it is sufficient, for another thing, that the nomination of Salathiel to the succession be approved as legitimate on the ground that the whole progeny of Solomon became extinct at that time and that, consequently, the succession to the kingship and the sonship, as it were, were transferred to the posterity of Nathan, as Zechariah 12:12 indicates in no obscure fashion. Moreover, the position of first place in the posterity of Nathan belonged to Salathiel, from whom it had devolved upon Zerubbabel, when the Jews, by virtue of the edict of Cyrus, returned to their homeland.
PARALLEL IV

Isaiah 7
14. Behold, a certain virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and you shall call his name Immanuel. 1

Matthew 1
23. Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which, if you translate it, is God with us.

Admittedly, at first sight the goal of the one passage is different from that of the other, but yet, in actuality, they maintain the closest conformity to one another; or, rather, they are at one in goal and theme. For both have the common goal that the pious should possess a very reliable sign by which they might be able to distinguish the son of God, our Immanuel, from other men from the time of his conception and birth according to the flesh. Moreover, one must not deny that this goal itself was revealed to the whole human race—to some, so as to effect stumbling and downfall, to others, so as to effect salvation and resurrection, Luke 2:34—and that the proclamation of that goal is for some "a fragrance leading from death to death," but for others "a fragrance leading from life to life," II Corinthians 2:16. It is for this reason, indeed, that the particular goal in either passage seems almost opposed to that in the other. For in Isaiah this sign seems to be cast, as it were, into the face of King Ahaz and his family so that the enormity of their perfidy and infidelity might be increased, because they did not rely upon such definite and unique promises of God; and that, consequently, the condemnation of that family might be sealed. In Matthew, on the other hand, the proximate goal differs as widely as can be from that of Isaiah. For
in Matthew it had to do with the reassurance either of Joseph or of the whole church concerning the truthfulness of the promises of God and their imminent fulfilment at that very time. The main point or theme, therefore (as the angel had proclaimed two verses before), is that the virgin Mary, daughter of David, had conceived because of the Holy Spirit and would give birth to a son, our Immanuel, who would set his people free from their sins—something which the truth of God had formerly predicted. And so, in actuality, there is no difficulty in regard to the subject of the passages and in fitting them together, since they conform to each other in words and, equally so, in contents.

There does seem to be one difference in the words, namely, that the Hebrew word is translated in most copies by the plural number, "And they shall call," for what is, in effect, "And he shall be called." It must be explained as an idiom of the Hebrews, and the Arabic translator explains it very well. Moreover, most of the ancients seem to have read it in this way: Justin Martyr in Trypho, Chrysostom in his twelfth homily on John, Epiphanius in Anchoratus, Augustine in the first book of De Consensu Evangelistarum, and others. Isaiah, indeed, uses an ambiguous form—of the feminine gender, to be sure, but which still can be used for the second person as well as for the third—just as Jerome took it when writing to Pammachius; and as many words of this form as there are can be cited to support this view. And so it does not greatly matter whether one resolves to read, "And you shall call his
name," as if the discourse had turned in the direction of the virgin, or
"And she shall call," as if the progress of the narrative were continuous
without any change of person. Likewise we leave undecided as well
whether you would rather read καλέσετος or καλέσουσι on the basis of the ancient copies. For however you
choose, the basic idea is always the same.

Here, however, two questions can be raised. One is whose words
these are meant to be—whether the evangelist's or, on the other hand,
the angel's. The other question is whether or not someone is literally
and necessarily designated as a "virgin" by the ascription of the Hebrew
word הָלָּם. As far as the former question is concerned, almost
everyone has considered the utterance in verses 22 and 23 to be Mat-
thew's. In this utterance [according to this view] he wanted to show
the church that the angel's revelation is the same as the prophet's reve-
lation which was already made long ago, and that ancient prediction is
joined together, as it were, with the present fulfilment by the evangelist.
But yet (I say this by everyone's good leave) these two verses seem to
me to belong to the utterance of the angel. In order to understand this
matter better, one must take note of the whole of the angel's utterance
and the occasion for it. The occasion was that the husband Joseph would
have decided to send Mary away, since she was pregnant. The angel op-
poses this plan in his utterance, the whole of which is concerned with
dissuading Joseph. Two parts are set down in this utterance: a propo-
position and its corroboration, in two verses each. The θεολη και 
αὐτοῦ—-the advice and the reason for it—belong to the proposi-
tion in verses 20 and 21. In the corroboration in verses 22 and 23, on
the other hand, the authority of the divine word is adduced. The angel
fortifies this whole utterance beforehand with a charming way of addres-
sing Joseph, "Joseph, son of David"; by this introduction his mind is
prepared for docility and faith. This is the sense of the advice which
the angel declares to Joseph: "You act justly, to be sure, as well as
kindly in that you do not wish, Joseph, to touch another man's wife, in
that you do not wish to make a public display of a virtuous girl made
pregnant by the fault perhaps (as you suppose) of someone else. But do
not fear; this wife of yours is not another's, has not been made pregnant
by her own fault or that of another, but by the blessing of God. Here
your aforesaid justice must be blended with faith and the promises of
God already made long ago to the house of David, since you are the son
and she the daughter of David." To this advice reasons are subjoined.
The first stems from the law of matrimony, for "she is your wife" by
virtue of the fact and law of engagement. The second reason stems from
the author of the pregnancy: "For that which is conceived in her is of
the Holy Spirit." The third reason stems from the status of the child
to be born: "She will bear a son," etc., verse 21. At this point the
pious Joseph certainly needed a corroboration, if anyone ever has.
Even though the appearance of the angel would seem to achieve not a
little towards a corroboration, that doubt could still attack Joseph's mind as to how God would transmit the promised seed. We read in Luke 1:34 that this doubt was also expressed by the virgin Mary herself. The angel, therefore, washes this uncertainty away in the second part of the utterance, proving that this thing is not something new or alien to pious minds, but that, rather, everything which he had previously said had been prophesied—both concerning the person, office, and benefits of the Messiah and also concerning this divine mode of conception and generation itself. These reasons impel me to think that this authorization of the prophet was adduced by the angel.

The Jews have stirred up the second question, affirming that the Hebrew noun [almāh] does not literally signify "virgin," but that rather it ought to be taken in this passage as referring to the prophet's wife. We reply to both things in a few words: That the Hebrew word literally denotes a virgin girl, not only its etymon shows but also a comparison of all occurrences in scripture. For the noun [almāh] is derived from the verb [šālam], which is "to conceal," because by it is signified a girl who hides herself away under the authority and custody of another and is not in the habit of coming out readily into the sight of men. Likewise, it is well-known that, in those ancient and very chaste times, virgins were dressed accordingly and that not even on the wedding day itself did they venture forth in public unveiled. It is from this custom that it comes about that the day which followed the wedding was called
even among the Greeks—scarcely good guardians of chastity—the day of the ἀνακαλυπτήρια or ἐπαύλια. And Tzetzes in his comments on Hesiod is evidence that, in the opinion of the Greeks, παρθένος was spoken of in the same way. A comparison of the occurrences of ἀλμάθ, moreover, is completely on our side. For there is no occurrence in the sacred scriptures which, even at first sight, can be explained otherwise than referring to a virgin, if you make the one exception in which the impiety of the Jews glories, Proverbs 30:9. A shameless harlot, they say, is termed ἀλμάθ by Solomon; therefore ἀλμάθ is not (as you think) "a virgin." I reply: A worthless man is also occasionally called "good," but ἐρωτικός. For everything in scripture, due to the practice of people in general, is customarily designated in two ways: Some things, to be sure, are designated ἀληθῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁσίας ἀλήθειας, that is, in accordance with the things themselves as they are in reality—whether the terms for these things be literal or figurative. Other things, however, are designated ἐνδόξως or δοξαστικῶς, that is, in accordance with opinion, whether because they are so regarded, although they are not so, or συγχωρητικῶς, because they wish to be so regarded—even as the idols of the Gentiles, magicians, and astrologists obtain the appellation of "gods" or "wise men," since they are nothing less than that which they are said to be. The description of the girl in the passage mentioned above in Proverbs ought to be taken in the same manner. No
Jew nor any most hostile adversary of the truth of the gospel would deny this, if he would direct his attention to the words of the Wise Man. For after he has said, "Three things are hidden from me, nay rather four I do not know: the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a serpent on a rock, the way of a ship on the high seas, and the way of a man in a virgin"—if you ask, "In what virgin?"—let us listen, I implore, to Solomon himself explaining this class of virgins in the following verse: "Such is," he says, "the way of a harlot; she eats up, next she wipes her mouth; then she says, 'I have wrought no iniquity,' that is, 'I am a virgin girl, untouched by a man.'" With these words Solomon assuredly shows in the most obvious manner that the woman who is specifically censured by him is the one who shamelessly affirms that she is a virgin and, consequently, is regarded as a virgin by human opinion. One acts unfairly, therefore, when he adduces a figurative way of speaking in order to overthrow the literal meaning of this noun.

The other argument which the Jews bring forward is that this verse of Isaiah must be taken as referring to his own wife. They think that they prove this idea by two considerations: One is that it seems strange that a sign should be used which is so remote and at so long an interval of events for the corroboration of something which is to take place soon afterward. The second consideration is that the prophet speaks about his son Shearjashub in this chapter and that, consequently, these words must be taken as referring to the latter's mother, the prophetess or wife
of the prophet, especially since there is a mention of her in chapter 8.28

We, however, deny that this verse must be taken as referring to the
prophet's wife; and we shall, therefore, shatter their fanciful consider-
ations with reliable considerations and the authority of scripture. They
say, then, that it is strange if a distant sign is used to confirm a thing
which is near at hand. We deny that such a thing is absurd when it is
done and also that such a thing has been done in this passage. As many
passages of scripture as there could be point out that it is not absurd if
a distant sign be applied to a thing near at hand. A sign of a calamity al-
ready commencing is foretold for the future to the priest Eli, I Samuel
2:34. A sign for Zedekiah and a sign for King Ahab are decreed for the
future, I Kings 22:25 and 28—similarly the messenger whom Jehoram
had sent to Elisha, II Kings 6:35.29 The prophet Jeremiah also fore-
tells a future sign for the Jews sojourning in Egypt, Jeremiah 44:30.
As a final point, lest we become too verbose, God himself decrees that
the effects of prophecies are signs, Deuteronomy 18 (verse 21 and the
following one), a principle which the prophet Jeremiah as well stated
in his own circumstances in his twenty-eighth chapter.30 We prove con-
clusively, therefore, that it is not strange if a sign of a thing which is
near at hand or already occurring is drawn into the future. To come
to the second point, the whole context of the prophet shows in the most
obvious fashion that such a thing has not been done in this passage. For
the conception and birth of Christ are not adduced as a sign peculiar to
that deliverance which Isaiah was predicting, but rather Shearjashub, the son of the prophet Isaiah, was the sign unique and peculiar to that deliverance. It was for this reason that God had commanded that the prophet should take this boy with him to the king. Thus, to state the matter clearly and in plain words, Isaiah brings forward two signs in the chapter under discussion, one pertaining to the demonstration of the disloyalty of Ahaz and the Jews, the other to the corroboration of the promise of deliverance. It is to the suppression and rebuke of disloyalty that the aforesaid universal sign and promise concerning our Christ and Saviour pertains. It is to the corroboration of deliverance that the use of the little boy Shearjashub as a pledge pertains. In verse 14 Isaiah has announced the former sign to this purpose: "With what sort of conscience, 0 king, can you doubt the promises of God, refuse the signs which he has offered, and weary God more and more? Did not God from the beginning give to the church the sign concerning the seed of the woman and the son of the virgin in whom his good-will and our faith might rest and in whom all the promises of God might be yes and amen from eternity? Nay, rather, was not that promise made to you specifically, O house of David, so that you might depend upon it in matters general and particular? If, however, the promise does not excite your faith, at least it will set the seal upon your disloyalty. And God will provide this deliverance on account of his truthfulness, but with the condition that your disloyalty will cost you dearly," even as it is set forth up to the
end of the chapter. Isaiah immediately appends the fifteenth verse:

"Nevertheless, that you may know how untroubled my mind is concerning the imminent deliverance previously declared, look you, my dearly beloved pledge, my little boy Shearjashub—I put him forward as a pledge, and I yield and award him to your judgement, if all these things do not shortly come to pass which we have predicted concerning the salvation of our people and the rout of the Syrians and Israelites." Anyone who takes note of this sequence of the prophecy will see that the aforementioned objection thrown up by the Jews is fallacious and that a sign in the distant future of a thing near at hand such as they desire is not effected.

As a result of these points their second consideration also seems to collapse of its own accord, as it were. The chapter, they say, deals with Shearjashub, the prophet's son; therefore, it also deals with the latter's mother. Answer: The universal proposition in no way follows from the particular. If one verse or a second verse or many verses deal with the boy concerned, it does not necessarily follow that he is the one theme of the whole chapter. It is well-known, moreover, that there are many themes in the aforementioned discourse which Isaiah delivered. As the next point, to continue in this same argument, surely it would have been shameful for the prophet to call his wife a virgin, or (if you like) a girl, even though she had already given birth to children by him. But certainly the most shameful thing of all is this, that Isaiah is said
to have assigned his son the name "Immanuel," who afterwards in the eighth chapter is called in verse 8 the lord of the promised land and is said in verse 10 to be arrayed with such power and wisdom that it is foretold that his counsel and word will be accomplished over all other counsels and words. Finally, to come to an end, it is absurd that the Jews should argue that the prophet's wife is referred to here on the grounds that there is a mention of her in the following chapter. For the prophecy of the following chapters is different from this one, and God would use different instruments for the purpose of such prophecy, as he enunciates in explicit words, verses 1 and 2. Consequently, it is as ridiculous if you say that those instruments pertain to this chapter as if you apply the circumstances of this chapter to the other. They are very different in almost every way. Since this is the way things are, we conclude that this verse cannot, in good faith or by reliable reasoning, be taken as referring to Isaiah's wife or to his son, but that it pertains literally and exclusively to Jesus Christ, our Immanuel, and that it reveals his birth, which Matthew relates in his first chapter.

PARALLEL V

Micah 5
1. But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, being least among the rulers of Judah, from you shall come forth to me one who should be lord in Israel.¹

Matthew 2
6. And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for from you shall come forth a ruler who will tend my people Israel.
Since here, for the first time, we are presented with a passage where there is a conspicuous change, we must, before we speak about the matter itself, say something in general terms about the reasons for changes [in quotations of the Old Testament] which have taken place in the New Testament. Some of the changes have been made by people as they are conversing, others by the writers themselves. Now, all those changes which people have made while conversing arise either from the carelessness of the speakers or from a definite design. They arise from carelessness, for instance, if something slips the mind; if something relates only slightly, or perhaps not at all, to the subject which is being discussed; or if something is related on the strength of someone else's word. They arise from a definite design, on the other hand, if the imitation of someone is undertaken; if those who are speaking adapt their language (as frequently happens) to the people, the circumstances, the times for the sake of instruction, expressing more, less, the same thing in more numerous, fewer, the same, or different words; or if, finally, someone else's language is maliciously twisted. Now, all good authors and faithful historians, on account of a fitting faithfulness, very carefully preserve these changes made by people as they converse; there are as many examples as there could be of this sort of faithfulness in the Old Testament and the New. In this category of changes, however, it is necessary for pious people to remember two rules. One is that some of the changes in proof-passages which are adduced in this manner from the
Old Testament are sound and free from any defect, as are those which are quoted by angels and holy people; others are faulty and corrupt, as are those adduced as proof by Satan and the Pharisees, Matthew 4 and 5. The second rule is that careful judgement must be applied before faith, so that such citations may be scrupulously investigated; because any man is completely stupid if he rashly and indiscriminately delights in proof-passages and citations offered by anyone at all and does not search whether the matter be so, as Luke shows by means of the example of the Beroeans. Those changes, however, which are made by the Biblical writers, even if they be made for the same reasons, still arise with the Spirit of God as a guide, who, according as he is completely free to do, always and everywhere exercises the same truthfulness but is not bound to the same words. It follows from this that, in the first place, none of these proof-passages are faulty and that, secondly, one ought to put his faith in those passages completely, and we must set aside our judgement so as to rely upon the divine word and the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Having established these things as true, let us come now to this present parallel of ours. The goal to which Micah was looking, when he delivered this prophecy to the people of God, was (I think) this, that, with the gospel promise about the coming of Christ, he might console the pious minds of the faithful, which were terrified by the reproof of sins and the threat of God's severest judgements; and, since very grievous
and singular judgements had been predicted, that he might similarly encourage them with a singular and very definite testimony concerning Christ. It was to this end that a clear description and designation of that place in which Christ was to be born seemed to the Holy Spirit to be eminently suitable. Accordingly, the main point of this prophecy is that the providence of God had appointed this birthplace for Christ and that the insignificance and obscurity of the place was no impediment to Christ arising in this place, since he was to ennoble the place and his church. The Pharisees did not look back to this goal when they replied in this manner to Herod when he was consulting them; rather, they tempered part of their response in such a way as to satisfy Herod's question, and part they added or changed according to their judgement as much as they thought that it suited that occasion. In my opinion, accordingly, one must observe two things: One is that this change did not originate from the evangelist, but from the scribes while they were conversing. The other is that this utterance is set forth here by our good Matthew with historical credibility in order to demonstrate more fully that, even in that deepest darkness of theirs, the race of the Jews did not lack the light by which they would have been about to recognize Christ as their Lord and king if malicious blindness had not taken possession of their minds.

It is now time, however, that we should weigh each of the changes carefully. First, instead of "Bethlehem Ephrathah," the men previously
mentioned called it "Bethlehem in the land of Judah." Both are, of course, the same thing and are stated διακρίτως, because there was another Bethlehem in the allotted territory of the Zebulunites, Joshua 19:15. But this was rather obvious in the period concerned, and perhaps [the scribes used this formula because the mention of Bethlehem] was even more efficacious in upsetting the tyrant's mind when they thundered in his ears the name "Judah." Secondly, instead of the "being least among the rulers of Judah," which Micah said, the men previously mentioned have said, "you are by no means least among the rulers of Judah," looking back (I believe) to that happiest of times when they saw that Herod was afflicted by the mention of the Messiah. It is as if they had said, "Bethlehem was, to be sure, least among the rulers of Judah in former times, but in this, its appointed time, when almost the whole tribe of Judah has been destroyed, Bethlehem is no longer least, but ought to be compared in size and glory with the others on account of Christ, its foster-son." I think, moreover, that this change was made by the men concerned on the basis of the theme of that well-known passage, Isaiah 60:22, "The very small one shall become thousands, and the smallest one a numerous nation," etc. The last change is that, in the place of the formerly cited words, "from you shall come forth to me one who should be lord in Israel," the scribes have substituted these, "for from you shall come forth a ruler who will tend my people Israel." All these, however, amount to the same thing. For "lords" and "rulers"
are accepted as being identical things, and both, in accordance with
the usage of scripture, are called shepherds of the people in a great
many places, just as they are called ποιμένες λαῶν by the Greeks.
If anyone is of the opinion, nevertheless, that this expression has been
taken not only from common usage but also from some specific passage
of scripture, he is at liberty, as far as I am concerned, to refer these
words to the passage Ezekiel 34:23 or another like it. Under these cir-
cumstances, therefore, there is the closest agreement of all the phrases
with each other.

PARALLEL VI

Hosea 11
1. Because he is the son of Israel, and I love him, therefore out of Egypt have I called my son.

Matthew 2
15. Jesus was in Egypt until the death of Herod, that what the Lord says by the prophet might be fulfilled, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."

According as the commonly accepted interpretation for this pas-
sage of the prophet Hosea obtains, the goal seems to be far different
from that which is set forth by Matthew in chapter 2. However, since
the words of Matthew in a measure lay hands upon us to think somewhat
differently concerning the goal, main point, and agreement of both pas-
sages, it is necessary, with the kind indulgence of all pious men, that
something be said by way of a preface to this passage with respect to the
understanding of both this passage and many similar ones--before we
undertake a separate exposition of this parallel. Now, the subject of the
whole of our prefatory discourse is going to be the allegories in scripture and their anagogical exposition; when these things have been explained, we shall speak about this passage in particular. The orthodox fathers taught that there were four methods of expounding scripture: history, ιστορία, αναλογία, and ἀλληγορία—history, when a thing done by God or man and a thing which occurred in nature at one time or another is described; aetiology, when the causes of statements or actions are reported; analogy, when the congruence of the Old Testament and the New is pointed out; allegory, finally, when statements are understood figuratively. And, to be sure, this classification is correct and not without use for the interpretation of sacred scripture. But because it can be transmitted in a manner too brief for perspicuity and is turned by many to the greatest of abuses, we shall briefly repeat the matter more thoroughly so that some more useful way to the understanding of sacred scripture may be opened up. Therefore, whatever can be expressed by one person to another is expressed by means of either things or words. If ever some things are used to signify others, they are called "types," which (if God wills) we shall discuss later in their proper place. But if words, on the other hand, are used to signify things, their nature is twofold. For, one kind of word is the natural, which, with Augustine, we call "speech" or "the language of common conversation"; the second is the literary, which is for the most part present in writing. These two are the usual signs of all those things which man can signify.
to man. There are, however, two forms of these things: for some are
simple—that is, literal—signs of those things which they signify; others
are figurative, that is, signs of simple signs which have been ornament-
ed or made more colourful in some way. All those signs are simple
which set forth the actions and statements of the creator or things creat-
ed and their causes in plain, literal, unadorned language. In this class
are historical expressions pertaining to actions and statements—true
ones as much as false ones—and aetiologies pertaining to causes and the
nature of right and wrong. The figurative signs are allegories. Analogy
is the common tool for dealing with all these things (whether they be
literal, as history and aetiology are, or figurative, as allegories are).
For this reason we shall speak first about analogy as common to all
things and the necessary tool for expounding things and signs of things,
while later we shall speak about the signs pertaining to sacred scripture.

It is well-known that any analogy is derived from things, actions,
statements, what is right, what is wrong, and the signs of such things.
For even God himself—whatever he does—acts, speaks, approves, dis-
approves, and also signifies things in a manner which corresponds to
himself. And the angels too and men as well do things according to their
measure. Every creature, in short, does the same things ἀναλόγως⁹
or in a manner which corresponds to itself, that is, (as it is usually said)
in due proportion. Now analogy or comparative relation¹⁰ is the com-
parison or correspondence of one thing which has been related to some-
thing else, in whole or only in part. There are three classes of this comparative relation; for there is the analogy of one thing to itself, of one thing to another, or of a thing to a sign. It is an analogy of one thing to itself if you establish a comparison of any person, thing, action, statement, right act, wrong act, or sign—either of the whole with the whole by virtue of the alterability of circumstances or of the whole with some part of it—if, for example, you would show that the whole is changed or that a part of it, compared with the whole, is larger, smaller, equal, unequal, like, unlike, similar, dissimilar, consistent with, or different from it. Thus, we say that Christ, when in the form of a servant, was emptied; that Christ corresponds to the church in the same way as the head to the body; that the deeds and statements of the same person correspond completely with respect to their origins, midpoints, and results; that excision or circumcision is connected very well with the foreskin of the Jews; slaughter in sacrifices, with blood. Thus (to come to matters which are more commonplace and more generally known), we observe that a cicada is something with rather large wings and a rather small body, an ostrich something with rather few feathers and a rather heavy body, a lion something with different hair and rather short eyelids, and six hundred other things. It is an analogy of one thing to another if, for example, we shall compare Moses with Christ; the Old Testament with the New; the actions, statements, and writings of the prophets with the actions, statements, and writings of the evangelists
and apostles; the lawfulness of one matter with the equal lawfulness of a second; circumcision with baptism; the passover with the Lord's Supper; the sacrifices of the old covenant with the sacrifice of the new; former ceremonies with later ones; a former passage of scripture with a later one. The analogy of a thing and a sign, however, is the most evident of all. For whether signs be perceived with the eyes, as are the manifold ceremonies in the ancient church (very few in our own church); or whether they be taken in with the ears, as is the preached word; or whether they be observed in both ways at the same time, as the thunderbolt is perceived by reason of thunder and the flashing of light; or whether it be in any other way; no one will deny that an analogy of signs to their objects is present. Moreover, all the circumstances are pertinent to the grasping of the nature of the analogy, but especially the points in time [at which the things or signs occur]; the observation of these is very useful for understanding the scriptures. For it seemed right to God to dispense his covenant and promises by stages, as it were, and little by little to make their advance public with the advance of time—just as if you were to see light approaching little by little from the distance. Accordingly, at first that very essence of the covenant and promises which pertains to all the elect was revealed in a very dark way in the period from Adam to Abraham; more plainly in the period from the latter to Moses; more fully in the period from Moses to David; more clearly in the period from David to the Babylonian deportation; more brightly
in the period from the time of the deportation to Christ; but most brilliantly in the period from Christ to his second coming. It is for this reason that those former times have been invested with the name "childhood" and "adolescence," while to these times of ours are assigned the name "youth" and "the fulness of times," in which the signs are going to endure continuously until we shall have grown up to full and adult age and have fully attained to Christ. And so these, at any rate, are our remarks about analogy in general.

Now let us come to signs, some of which we have shown to be simple, others figurative. Simple signs--not only spoken but also written--are (as we have said before) either historical expressions or etiologies. Historical expressions are concerned with the question of what is true and what is false. However, although in history one usually asks first what is true and false with regard to nature and then with regard to the activities of such things as are in nature, sacred scripture has left natural history for the most part to the physicists and philosophers. But such history as is concerned with words and actions--as far as it is of import to the church--it has set forth in the truest and most faithful way. And history of this sort is twofold: One kind is δημοτική, containing a narrative of things previously done and said; the books of Genesis, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Matthew, Mark, Luke (both of them), and John consist of such contents. The other kind of history is προφητική, containing a nar-
rative of things to be done and said, proclaiming the promises and threats of God and, in short, future things and results; a great many of the books of the prophets are of this kind. The nature of aetiology, on the other hand, --that is, the question of what is right and what is wrong--demands that a simple method of expounding it always be consistent and remain one and the same. For that which is right at one time can never be wrong, or vice versa, since righteousness (as Augustine says very well) is everywhere and always the same, not different in another place nor otherwise at another time.\(^{21}\) Now this aetiology, to be sure, is occasionally set forth separately in simple and unadorned words, as in Exodus 20 and following and again in the whole book of Proverbs and the epistles of the holy apostles. But generally it opens the way for the preaching of the promises and threats of God, while it is intermixed with other historical matters as well; and so, for this reason, it is frequently joined together with the history of the prophets and evangelists.

As to the next point, figurative signs have been constructed from things or from words. Now all those which are concerned with things are "types," while all those concerned with spoken or written expressions are "allegories." For we call certain likenesses of things expressed by means of things "types," in the same way that we call likenesses of things expressed by means of words "allegories." Now types and allegories alike can occur in historical accounts and aetiologies. With respect to historical accounts, on the one hand, occasionally, to be sure, they occur in the διηγηματικαί,\(^{22}\) but especially in the προφητικαί.\(^{23}\)
The following, by way of example, are found in the narrative class of historical accounts: the passover was a type of that journey in which the angel passed by the homes of the Israelites which had been marked with blood; the bread which is broken, received, and eaten is a type of the body of Christ, which was broken for us and is taken by us and eaten for the sake of eternal life; the wine too is a type of the blood which was poured out; and many similar things. With regard, moreover, to the other class, most of the pages of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and each of the prophets are full of types and allegories. Likewise, types and allegories occur also in aetiologies; as, for example, the winged cherubim in the tabernacle represented the obedience to God of each of the members of the church; the participation in one and the same loaf of bread is a figure of the communion of saints with each other; and likewise the immersion in baptism is a figure of the death and burial of the old man and the raising up of the new. And, indeed, these types and allegories were formerly very frequent and close together, as if to serve as the first rudiments in the ancient custodianship of the law. The gospel, on the other hand, employs fewer types and allegories; because it generally sets forth and relates, not adumbrated matters, but the very substance and truth of the types and allegories, in a very simple way, so that we may embrace it with a simple faith. It is on this account that I can never marvel enough at the audacity of those who know nothing at all unless it is enveloped in the types and allegories of the law. The light
of the gospel is not only deflected by this way of thinking, but it is even obscured and impaired and, in a most shameful way, changed into darkness. Nor, indeed, can I approve of the method in interpreting [scripture] of those who, to reconcile with the Old Testament the passages adduced in the New Testament from the law and prophets, think that the Old Testament itself is not discussed, but that it is only alluded to, or that some things are changed allegorically—as if the evangelists and apostles, disregarding the intention of the law and prophets, had playfully dressed themselves in the meanders of types or immersed themselves in the unfathomable waters of allegories and had converted to tropes the words of their elder Θεόπνευστος, which had been expressed in simple fashion. For I am sure of this, that, while almost the whole of that old dispensation was constructed from types and allegories, this dispensation of ours consists, on the contrary, in a simple style of teaching and the unadorned truth itself of the matters which are taught. I am sure that those ancient patriarchs and prophets performed and proclaimed typically and allegorically—that is, dimly—the things which pertain to the kingdom of Christ and the teaching of the gospel, but that now these things are expressed and displayed to us apart from the shadows of types and allegories. To explain this matter more clearly, we shall bring forward certain axioms pertaining to this matter.

First, the types of the ancients consisted either of persons, for example, patriarchs, judges, kings, priests, and prophets; or of things,
such as the tabernacle, the temple, the ark, the altar, the ornaments, and the other things; or, finally, of actions, such as the oblations, sacrifices, first-fruits, the deluge, the crossing of the sea and of the River Jordan, etc.

Second, the types of the church are all from God, whether they were established by his word, as, for example, the shadows or ceremonies; or whether provided by his action, as, for example, the call and liberation from Egypt, the sending [of Israel] to take possession of the land [of Canaan], etc.

Third, the prophets, moreover, used the types given by God in setting forth the kingship of Christ for this reason, that all the things which they proclaimed concerning that kingship were either spiritual or going to come about only after a long interval. Accordingly, it was necessary that carnal people should be taught spiritual and future things analogically by means of carnal lessons, that is, things which were better known and nearer to them.

Fourth, yes, even the prophets themselves, although divinely inspired, proclaimed that mystery of Christ which had been hidden for all the ages from eternity in such a way that they themselves made inquiry concerning it (as Peter says). Thus, God dealt with all the prophets in types and figures.

And so, since God formerly performed all things in Christ but, through his servants, expressed most things in types or allegories, one
ought not to marvel if the prophets cherished that Sparta of theirs which they received—God being its author—and if they have used types of public events or commonly known matters to set forth the kingship of Christ. Moreover, some allegorical passages are the words of a type; accordingly, Moses was, to be sure, a type of Christ, but Moses spoke about Christ allegorically and was a figure of him typically. The apostles applied this fact to Christ, not allegorically, but anagogically in accordance with the truth. Likewise, David was a type of him, as everyone admits, but the same man spoke those things allegorically and did some things typically which his apostles, in as simple a fashion as possible, preached concerning the sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and glory of Christ. Solomon also, while he was a type of him, sang about him allegorically. Finally, all the prophets predicted many things concerning Christ allegorically of which we read in the gospel that they have at length been fulfilled καὶ ἤστοροι. Indeed, the laws themselves which were set forth by God—a great many foreshadowed many things concerning Christ allegorically, not a few typically—things which we shall point out (if God wills) in their proper place. For allegories and their kindred, the types, are properly elements of the Old Testament; anagógés and analyses of them both, on the other hand, are properly elements of the New Testament.

Admittedly, the pseudo-Jews grumble and carp at such things. They object that we drag the passages of the prophets too freely and boldly
into allegories, that we who assert that their writings were
\(\alpha \nu \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \omega \delta \eta\) do an injustice to them and to the whole church. Yet, although we recognize that the prophets occasionally used figurative representations\(^{30}\) and types and allegories, nevertheless we do not immediately conclude either that all prophecies are figurative or that their figurative representations are faulty. In the first place, we do not, in fact, say that they are all figurative, for most—whether they be examples of events or the most holy rules concerning what is right and wrong—are set forth in clear words. Almost the only figurative ones are those which are declared concerning matters which either are spiritual or which at one time were in the future. Moreover, we do not suppose that even all declarations about matters which were in the future or which are spiritual ought to be taken figuratively, but only those which disagree either with the true nature of the matter in a question of fact or with what is morally obligatory in a question of what is right and wrong. Statements ought to be taken figuratively when they disagree with the true nature of the things which occur in the natural order or of actions and events, such as when the prophet says, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the panther shall lie down with the kid; also, the calf and the young lion and the fatted animal shall be together and a little child shall lead them," etc.\(^{31}\) Likewise, "No lion shall be there, nor shall any violent beast climb up on it; it shall not be present there."\(^{32}\) Likewise, "From the root of a serpent shall come forth a viper, yes, his
fruit as a flying serpent," and whatever things there are of this kind. And certainly statements ought to be taken figuratively when they disagree with the obligations of the divine law and good morals, or with those of our holy faith—as when (in a question of law) the Lord commanded the prophet, "Go, and take to yourself an adulterous wife," etc.; and as when (in a question of faith) the prophet says, "There shall come forth a little twig from the stump of Jesse, and a shoot shall blossom forth from his roots, upon which the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest," etc. For he who denies that these things are said allegorically, denies Christ. Finally, so far from it being the case that these same types and allegories ought to be numbered among faulty statements, quite to the contrary, when they are applied soberly, they are pleasing to all pious men—for us, useful to know about; for the ancients, necessary for use as the rudiments of their times. To render further words unnecessary, the famous Abraham son of Ezra (whom the Jews unanimously call wisest) writes the following about allegorists in an eloquent fashion in the preface to his commentary on the Old Testament: "Their way is dark and misty—nay, rather, those are very much mistaken who, out of their own minds, devise mysteries in every single matter—who hold the belief, in short, that the laws themselves and the judgements are figurative representations. Nor shall I employ a lengthy discourse to respond to them, because their minds are deceived and their words have nothing in common with what is reasonable and good. Their opinion is good in only
one matter: that every statement or precept to anyone, however small or great, ought to be weighed on the scales and balance of the mind. For there is in our minds some power of discernment which has been implanted by the wisdom of the everlasting God. But if the power of discernment in man cannot tolerate the matter in question, or that matter would cancel out something which is confirmed in a very evident fashion in the natural order by our powers of perception, only then let one look to himself for mysteries," etc. 36 The noted Abraham son of Ezra writes these things in a pious and learned manner concerning both the light imparted by nature to everyone and the light implanted by faith in the minds of those who believe in the word of God.

On the basis of these things it is sufficiently well established (I think) that, in the first place, types and allegories are frequent in the Old Testament and also that, on the other hand, Christ and his disciples were not allegorists in this matter, but true ἀναγωγεῖς 37 or ἀναλύται 38 of allegories, and that this is why an injustice is done to them if they are said to cover over the types and allegories of the ancients with new allegories and to twist the words of the law and prophets to such a use, whereas they are most reasonable interpreters of them. "What then," someone will say, "do you actually contend that the New Testament is without types and allegories?" Plainly it is not, to be sure, but all in all it still contains rather few. For on the basis of those considerations which were previously mentioned, there is agreement
among good men, I think, that there were two very important subjects of types and allegories: one, the subject of spiritual matters; the other, of matters in the future. Types and allegories were aptly employed to enter into these matters in times past—in the case of the former, by reason of their sublimity; in the case of the latter, by reason of the length of the periods of time involved. Now the spiritual matters (to speak about them first) are the same for us [as they were for the Old Testament church]: one God, one mediator of the covenant, one covenant, one faith, one hope, one communion of saints, and whatever else of this sort there is. The future matters, on the other hand, were partly consummated when Christ was manifested and the gospel was promulgated; part of them remain to be consummated. Consequently, although a good part of them, which looked forward to the person of Christ, were already fulfilled and, therefore, did not need shadows in the same way as in earlier times, yet it is still necessary now that spiritual matters and all those concerning the future which were still to take place should have been expressed by means of some definite types (as happens in baptism and the sacred Lord's Supper) and adumbrated by allegories composed of words. Thus, that part of the rudiments have passed away which foreshadowed the Christ who was to come, and his offices must be publicly displayed in these last days of ours; part of the rudiments, however, have been exchanged for something better. For we have not yet reached full adulthood, we know in part and prophesy in part, and
we see (as the apostle says) as if by a mirror or by a figurative representation until the arrival of Christ, so deeply longed for, has dawned. 39

For example, the glory, power, and activity of Christ are spiritual; no good man does not long—in this poverty of our understanding—for these matters, although they are very much with us, to be set forth to him in [at least] a shadowy manner by means of some way of thinking congenial to human nature; and this has been done most brilliantly in the Apocalypse of John. Our communion with Christ is likewise spiritual, and spiritual is our renewal. We understand that communion rightly by means of the similitude of head and body, or the comparison of the vine and the branch; and similarly, our renewal by means of the application of the names "regeneration" and "new man." The communion between us who believe is also spiritual; this is assuredly set forth by means of the sharing of the one loaf and one cup and is made suitably clear to the understanding of men. And, moreover, the well-known words of Christ in John 3:12 point out that this method is very apt for teaching believers and for overcoming infidels: "If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?"

As to matters in the future innumerable examples stand out from which it definitely follows that you are ungrateful if you esteem types and allegories of matters in the future of little value, insane if you throw them away; as when the judgements of God about to come upon this rebellious world and upon the antichrist himself are proclaimed by the scrip-
tures, when the second coming of Christ and his glory is represented in figures, when his last judgement is foreshadowed, when the dignity of the catholic church and the majesty of the heavenly Jerusalem are exalted, and other things of this sort which cannot impress human minds in a way less than signal. Rather (to speak concisely) these same matters which have been handed down in this form and displayed to our minds and, as it were, to our eyes truly delight, teach, and deeply move men very greatly. "For if these figurative representations," says Augustine, "are drawn not only from heaven and from the stars but also from the lower creation for the impartation of mysteries, this certain form of eloquence is useful for teaching, adapted to moving the disposition of the minds of pupils from the visible to the invisible, from the bodily to the spiritual, from the temporal to the eternal. They excite and kindle love more than if they were set forth unadorned and without any comparisons of the mysteries [with humbler things]. It is difficult to state the reason for this circumstance; but it is still the case that something which has been intimated by means of an allegorical symbol is more moving, more attractive, is given more respect than if it is stated in the plainest way in literal language." "I believe," says Augustine later, "that the passion itself of the soul which hitherto is entangled for a long while in earthly matters, is set aflame with considerable reluctance; if, however, it is led to comparisons with bodily things and thence referred to the spiritual things which are figuratively represented by those comparisons,
it is roused to life by this transition, as it were, and when, in effect, it has been excited in a little torch of fire, it is kindled and is swept along to repose by a more ardent love. Accordingly, since these things have been established, let us come to the passage currently before us.

Some interpret the passage of Hosea the prophet historically and harmonize it analogically to the story which Matthew employs; others interpret it historically in a similar way, to be sure, but think that it pertains allegorically or typically to Matthew's design. For everything completely prevents an aetiological interpretation from being brought to bear upon either passage. Nevertheless, I propose (I should be very desirous that this be received by the good leave of all) that both passages ought to be understood historically and that they pertain, in fact, to one and the same historical episode apart from any type, allegory, or analogy. For there is one and only one goal and the same main point in both passages; but in order that everyone may see both of these things the more easily some brief delineation of the whole prophecy which Hosea announced must be made: In the first place, Hosea had laid down and expounded two types having almost the same theme, so that the Israelites might realize the gravity of their sins, the indignation of God, and the judgements about to come upon them and that, consequently, they might think seriously about repentance. The prophet describes these types and this twofold theme of his prophecy in detail in a most splendid fashion from chapter five to
the end-disclosing, on the one hand, the [Israelites'] sins and the very severe judgements of God as far as this passage where the words occur: "Out of Egypt have I called my son"; expounding, on the other hand, repentance (and the reasons for it, its effects, and the fruits resulting from it) from this passage to the end of the prophecy, that is, from chapter eleven, just where the prophet begins to turn his discourse in the direction of the true Israel. His purpose is that partly by the recollection of the kindnesses of God, partly by the asperity of the judgements, and partly by proofs of divine mercy, he may excite the pious to the expectation of the advent of the Christ in whom and through whom God was going to complete the truth of his prophecies. Accordingly, after he has expounded in the tenth chapter the teaching of repentance μεταβατικῶς to everyone in general, the just and the unjust, and has given out the verdict concerning the destruction of the Israelites who shrink from the prescribed repentance, at length God creates in the rest the hope of salvation in Christ Jesus; and at the beginning of the eleventh chapter, as if to modify himself, he resolves to snatch the chosen remnant out of the general conflagration for the sake of his son. The purpose of Hosea, therefore, has been shown to be the following: to confirm the remnant in the expectation of eternal salvation. The main point, on the other hand, is that the remnant will be saved altogether for the sake of Christ and in him; because, on the one hand, he is the head and first-born among many brethren, from whom eternal life and salvation is conveyed
to all his members, and because, on the other hand, he is the son of compassion, in whom the infinite love of God finds repose, so that we may all draw from his fulness and in him attain to grace and truth (with which he is completely filled). Now, the beginnings of this salvation will be pointed out in no dim way at the time when the Son of God, contemned by the people of the Jews and attacked by Herod, will be called back from Egypt that he may perform the promised work of salvation for the church in Judaea. Thus, in the first place, the prophet has, indeed, designated the fountainhead of salvation and the motives overflowing in it when he said, "Because he is a child of Israel and I love him." On the other hand, he has set forth the sign of the grace which is coming into view, arriving, and bursting forth, as it were, in the aforementioned words, "Out of Egypt have I called my son." For it is just as if God had said, "What, then, was I about to destroy all Israel? I shall not do so for the sake of my son. For "since he is the son of Israel," that is, the first-born, discharging an eternal priesthood (for the children of Israel are spoken of thus in Exodus 24:5); since, moreover, he is my only-begotten son in whom my soul finds repose—although the Israelites, in their perversity, will drive him from their midst and are clearly unworthy of the grace which is offered to them—yet for the sake of the elect and for their salvation, I shall call my son, the head of the elect, out of Egypt that he may bring salvation to the sheep of Israel who would have perished. Clearly, therefore, this is the same assertion which Christ
makes in John 3:16, when he says, "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten son," etc.; so that this assertion, "God so loved Israel that he called his son out of Egypt," etc., corresponds equally to the other one. The facts speak for themselves, moreover, that this goal was intended by Matthew as well, that he might point out that those things which God had predicted as coming in the future had taken place. All pious men who, without prejudice, consider both passages with an honest mind will judge (I hope), when they have pondered these things which we have just said, that the main point is completely the same. It remains for us, in the first place, to bring out such things as seem capable of being used to overturn this interpretation and, after that, to confute other interpretations.

Two things can be used against this interpretation in general: one is the consideration of novelty, in that, admittedly, no interpreter, old or new, would seem to have thought about this way of interpreting the passage; while the other thing is the consideration of the words connected with the passage, preceding and following it. With regard to novelty, we shall reply in a few words: first, that what the prophet said and Matthew interpreted is not new; secondly, that however new it may seem, yet everything which is old was new [at one time] but is not therefore faulty on account of novelty—unless perhaps you take "new" as meaning "revived" and "restored." In that sense we acknowledge that this interpretation is new, just as the religion is called "new" which, by the sin-
gular beneficence of God, has in these times been purged from the old leaven. We reply, finally, that new matters, when they are useful, actually impress our minds more by reason of their novelty and that, accordingly, nothing should be condemned on account of novelty per se. We are unable to see, furthermore, that the words connected with the passage oppose this interpretation; quite to the contrary, they are, in fact, in the closest conformity with our interpretation. The most just judgement of God concerning the destruction of the Israelites has preceded in the tenth chapter. A certain qualification, as it were, is subjoined to this judgement for the consolation of the holy remnant, of which the foundation is Christ, as we said previously. There is, therefore, the closest conformity with the matters preceding the passage. What arises, however, in the case of the matters which follow it? Those also agree very well with such an idea. For in the words which follow there is a plea for mercy in spite of guilt and a certain forensic disputation and judicial inquiry, by which God vehemently accentuates the perversity of the Israelites, so that he may then make his mercy the more manifest. "How could I do otherwise than call back my son out of Egypt?" says the Lord. "For otherwise it would have been all over for this whole people of the Israelites, who, in whatever ways she has been called back by the prophets, has gone over to idols; who has blinded herself of her own accord whenever I have pointed myself out by means of my works; who thus far, in short, could be tamed neither by my leading or healing,
nor by the most loving attentions, acts of deliverance, nutriments, assistance, and finally scourges; and who has not yet lifted up her eyes to God Most High. What else could I do at this point, therefore, than to bring back my son who was residing abroad? For how am I to give you up, O Ephraim? etc. In this way the decision concerning the salvation of the pious is at last handed down as if the Lord were suddenly emerging from the very severe vehemence of these disputations. "I will not execute," etc., he says, just as if he were saying, "And yet, you are my child, dear to me—damnable, to be sure, on account of your sins—but you must be saved on account of my nature, truthfulness, holiness, and mercy in the son of my compassion, whom I have called out of Egypt." That this is the natural understanding of the passage the very sequence of the discourse will point out to those who direct their attention to it. I say nothing about the words themselves of the prophet, of which both the arrangement and the metre demand that the passage be explained in such a way as we did at first; nor can they be rendered properly in any other way. For with regard to the fact that some Hebrews have attempted to expound those words, "I have called my son," in another sense, because they noticed that a particle had been prefixed to the word for "son," this is proof more of malice than of inexperience; since this construction of the aforementioned Hebrew word is the most frequent of all constructions and one, at that, with the most unvarying meaning. At this point, however, two other methods of harmonization are thrown up,
and especially with this idea, that it does not seem to hurt if you apply this same passage of the prophet in a literal sense to the deliverance performed through Moses in earlier times. The fountainhead of these methods is the interpretation which the Aramaic paraphrast offered that the prophet speaks of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. Two kinds of harmonization have, indeed, originated from this source: one typical or allegorical, the other analogical. We call the method typical or allegorical when the departure of the Israelites from Egypt is said to have been a figurative representation of this departure of Christ. We call the method analogical, on the other hand, when it is proposed that one ought to understand the leading forth of Christ—of the head, as it were—from the deliverance of the people—of the body, as it were.

That the former method of harmonization is feeble even its promoters themselves have sufficiently shown for the reason that each little while they lay hold of analogy in order to prop up their harmonization.

Although, therefore, when the second kind of harmonization has been overturned, this one also collapses by virtue of its feebleness, we are still going to offer a few words here which are necessary for explaining this passage and others, in order to establish that this idea cannot be obtained by any valid reasoning. For, in the first place, it is beyond controversy that types or allegories are sure instruction only when they are engaged in a question of what is morally obligatory, that is, if ever inquiry is made as to whether something should be called right or wrong.
But if they pertain to a question of fact, that is, if inquiry should be made as to whether or not something is going to come about, then one must distinguish between types; because some of the types have been given or commanded, while others are performed. Those which have been given or commanded by God—since they look forward in a literal sense to the matter foreshadowed and have a perpetual and necessary relation to it—conclusively demonstrate that the thing which they have been given to foreshadow is going to come about, because these types are nothing else than signs of divine truth, in which divine truth there is a certain inescapable and absolute necessity. All those types, on the other hand, which have been performed—and not assigned specifically and exclusively to any definite meaning—conform to the nature of object lessons. On this account the proofs offered by these types are not proofs of necessity but rather (as they say at school) of contingency. Accordingly, they can give pleasure and make things clear in teaching but can scarcely prove anything. Now this type (to grant that it can be called a type) is not one of moral obligation but of fact; has not been given or commanded, but provided by an action; is not specific, but general. All object-lessons are of such a kind. This type, therefore, if it is taken in this way, can prove nothing. Matthew, however, desired to prove almost every detail which happened in the story of Christ by undertaking a comparison of the predictions of the Old Testament with the events, in order that he might show from the fulfillment of all the details that Jesus was the Christ, even as he demonstrated, from the
words of the prophets, the family and conception and nativity [of Christ] in the first chapter [of the gospel] and the place of his origin in the second. Since this is the way things are, and this method of harmonization corresponds neither to the correct laws of types nor to Matthew's intention, let us now think over the other one mentioned above.

Almost everyone has thought that the way in which the passages fit together is analogical, taking the analogy of such an interpretation (so it seems) from the similitude of head and body. But--for myself, at any rate, --this idea, for many reasons, cannot be proven: in the first place, because Matthew refers in this passage, not to an analogy, but to a historical episode in a manner as historical as that in which he had referred to those which precede it; secondly, because that which we have previously pointed out is more probable, that Hosea prophesied both concerning this historical episode and in a historical manner. Thirdly, if it is an analogy, it is either an analogy of the whole to the part, or of the part to the whole, or of one part to the other; for there is no question here of an analogy of similar or equal things which are taken from outside. No sane person would say that an analogy of the whole to the part is employed here, for it would be necessary, with equal justice, that all the members of the church should have been called out of Egypt in a historical and not a figurative manner. Nor will it agree the more with reason if you would say that an analogy from the part to the whole is employed here, since it has been agreed by all who have propounded this
method of harmonization that an analogical comparison of the people and Christ has been undertaken. It remains, consequently, that we should conclude that an analogy of one part to another is being undertaken. When this is proposed, however, the whole method of harmonization falls apart. For, in the first place, one cannot argue from one part to the other, and an analogy cannot be established, except in the case of such parts as are declared similar. The head and the body, however, cannot be said to be similar to each other. Secondly, even though it seems that an analogical method of harmonization could be employed between parts of this kind, it still is not strictly an analogy of parts, in so far as they are parts, but one of relationships, in so far as some parts act in regard to others; and, consequently, the analogy is not with respect to parts, but with respect to the causes and effects proceeding from some and entering, as it were, into others.

Thirdly, not all the activities and relationships of some parts in regard to others should be said, in fact, to be in any way common to each other, but only those which—by virtue of necessary, unrestricted, and unimpeded connections—carry out a sharing with one another of offices both active and passive. There are activities and relationships of this kind in nature, to be sure, in consequence of the essential properties of each part. But in that most holy mystery of our spiritual communion with Christ, there are those functions which God has instituted for our salvation which are above nature; and, consequently, no analogy with
events which take place can be constructed, except in so far as they have been announced beforehand by the word of God through the prophets. These events, moreover, are not brought to realization on this account, that they were predicted; nor were they predicted on this account, that God had seen them coming in the future; but they were predicted and accomplished for the reason that God determined so to do. Finally, to grant even that which the truth of the matter demands, namely, that common activities and effects penetrate not only the whole body, but even to each member, it is still common knowledge that one cannot proceed from a particular to a particular in an argument. For the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt must be considered a particular in this sort of argument, even as we have pointed out above that it is necessary that an analogy of one part to another should be constructed in this passage. Accordingly, this comparison is constructed not of similar but of dissimilar parts, and not of natural effects and relationships but of contingent ones, and, at that, from a particular, an argument from which nothing can be proven.  

51 To be sure, we calmly allow it to be said that a certain similarity exists in both passages as to the fact that both Israel, in earlier times, and Christ, in the fulness of times, were called out of Egypt; but we are not about to arrive, therefore, at the opinion of those who accept this method of harmonization in an analogical way--because for one thing, we judge the mind of the prophet to have been different; because, for another thing, Matthew, a very scrupulous witness and very zealous to point
out those details by which Christ had been designated in earlier times, has opened up to us this mode of interpretation which, without ill will toward anyone, I courteously and lovingly ask that good men should calmly allow me to urge with a zeal for religion and not for contention.

PARALLEL VII

Jeremiah 31  
15. A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and much very bitter weeping. Rachel is weeping for her sons; she refused to be comforted for her sons, because none remain.¹

Matthew 2  
18. A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and weeping and much wailing, Rachel weeping for her sons; and she refused to be comforted, because they are not.

The goal in both passages is one and the same—namely, that it might be publicly declared and demonstrated by means of some definite mark and clear sign that the one had arrived in whom it was necessary that the kingdom of God should be disclosed and receive fulfilment, when the proclamation of the gospel had been undertaken. And, in fact, both passages describe this sign in agreement—Jeremiah, to be sure, showing it as coming in the future; Matthew, on the other hand, pointing it out as having taken place. The main point, consequently, is that the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ has been attacked by as many calamities as there are in this world and that the sons of the kingdom are going to enter into it through many afflictions; but that the aforementioned singular sign of that kingdom which was arriving and, for the first time, appearing in the person of Christ, the king and Saviour most high, was betokened by
God at an earlier time and was fulfilled in its proper time, of which sign there was going to be undoubted evidence. For although many and shameful massacres have been committed since the beginning of history, yet (unless my mind deceives me) one never reads of an example of a crime such as this, in which, contrary to what is morally right and divine law, only children—not excepting even the son of the king himself (if we believe Macrobius)\(^2\)--were slaughtered throughout a whole region without any inquiry, at the wish of one tyrant among the people of God—and, indeed, of one acting under another's authority. On this account the harmonization of these two passages with one another is easy. It is only in the words that there seems to be something of a difference, because Matthew does not translate the Hebrew prophet word for word; or else he followed that version which today is commonly called the Septuagint, but more likely (I think) Matthew followed that genuine version of those seventy translators\(^3\) which prevailed at that time. All these things, however, differ from one another only in wording; since it is for the sake of clarity alone that some change seems to have been made in the Greek translation. For, in the first place, that which the prophet calls, "Lamentation and weeping of bitternesses," is expressed more clearly in Matthew, and the Hebraism is explained in these words, "Lamentation and weeping and much wailing," by changing, it is plain to see, that hypallage of the rhetoricians (as they call it) which is very frequent among the Hebrews. As to the next case, the fact that those words, "for her sons,"
are omitted is so far from imparting a flaw to the words of the prophet that, contrariwise, this interpretation contributes a great deal to their dignity. For the prophet has, in fact, asserted in a way the consummate liberty of the Holy Spirit, who for the purpose of emphasis and vehemence inculcated these very words in the prophet, in order to impress the picture of future matters more firmly upon the minds of his countrymen. At this point in Matthew, on the other hand, he hasforgone the same words for the purpose of simplifying the exposition which had been undertaken, because it was sufficient that the matter should be stated by means of a simple narrative, but it was not necessary that it should be accentuated in a manner full of pathos (to which the words under discussion are appropriate). For the vehement nature of the matter demanded in the prophet those words which in Matthew would have been more detrimental than beneficial to clarity. Finally, that which the prophet states sylleptically, 4 "because none of them remains," is expressed by the gospel-writer in the plural number; because the form of speaking is ἀπαθήσετερα 5 and clearer, although with the same sense. But, in fact, all these things (as we have said previously in the fifth parallel) assert perspicuously the liberty of the Holy Spirit, who exercises, to be sure, the same truthfulness at all times, but not in the same words by virtue of some perpetual necessity. A great many, however, who have been beguiled by the interpretations of the Jews take this passage in some way other than in a manner consistent with the fact that Matthew is our
Some twist this passage to refer to the sending away of Jeremiah to Gedaliah, concerning which Jeremiah 40 speaks. This, however, the Jews themselves have confuted. Others twist it to refer to the disasters which the Assyrians inflicted (II Kings 16ff, and I Chron. 5); others, to the deportation of the Israelites into Assyria; others, to some signal episode of history, but of which there remains no mention in the Old Testament (no mention, at any rate, which could definitely be applied to this prophecy). For they have seen that, if the prophet had wished to discuss the aforementioned calamity of the whole kingdom of the Israelites, there would neither have been any need for so many individual details, nor would each of the details have corresponded, at a later time, to history itself and the truth of actual events. For, in the first place, Ramah belongs to Benjamin. For another thing, it belongs to the kingdom of Judah and not to that of Israel, contrary to what the Jews teach, who confuse Ramathajim (that is, the two Ramahs), which was situated in Ephraim, with Ramah of Benjamin. Moreover, lest they object perchance that there was another Raurah in the tribe of Naphtali, Rachel is deliberately mentioned, who was the mother of Joseph and Benjamin alone. In addition, only mothers are said to have mourned for their sons in this calamity; in the aforementioned [Assyrian deportation] every class of Israelite was in mourning for everyone. Also, these mothers are not asserted to have wailed for the reason that their sons were being deported, but for the reason that they were not alive.
Finally, the prophet is announcing matters in the future in the whole of
the chapter under discussion and does not relate things of the past. But
those things which the Jews say about their deportation had already
passed away at least ninety years previously.

Moreover, there is no reason why we should say much about the
interpretation of those who think that some particular episode of history
is noted at this point by Jeremiah but one of which no information is
available. For Matthew reports to us an episode of history which can be
fixed with certainty and of which information is available. It is better
for us to accept this episode and application with a sure faith than to
ramble among episodes which cannot be fixed with certainty; In the next
place, to what end would such an episode which could not be fixed with
certainty have been crammed in amongst the choicest predictions about
the kingdom of Christ? For, on account of this fact, one is dashed
against yet another rock, when one replies that the prophecies of Jere-
miah were collected indiscriminately and without order and judgement;
no one is going to approve this statement without some difficulty who will
remember that the book was first written by Jeremiah, and then, when
it had been consigned to the flames by the command of King Jehoiakim,
was written down in full afresh by Baruch (Jer. 36). 13 It remains, con-
sequently, but to state that this prophecy is suitable for designating the
beginnings of the kingdom of Christ and pointing them out with a finger,
as it were; all the words preceding and following the passage in Jeremiah
are, of course, suitable to this end. It is confirmed sufficiently well, moreover, by three arguments: first, the argument from the whole context, about which we were just speaking; secondly, the argument from the nature of the passage (for what sort of strange thing would the prophet have been going to say, and to what end would he have drawn such things in amongst gospel promises?); finally, the argument from all the details, which can be recognized nowhere else (as we have said previously) than in this same episode of Matthew, as Matthew most faithfully expounds it.

PARALLEL VIII

Isaiah 11
1. A shoot shall blossom forth from the roots of Jesse."

Matthew 2
23. He dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled: "He shall be called a Nazoraeus."

Isaiah 60
21. So that the shoot of my grafts may glory in the work of my hands. ²

Although the analysis of the goal and main point of these passages which we have decided ought to be matched to one another will be easy; yet interpretations and methods of harmonization (both of the names involved and of the words of Matthew) have been offered in various ways up to the present time. Therefore, one ought to make sure of this first, that we may determine something definite concerning these two matters, before we speak about the specific interpretation of this passage. We
are going to speak first, therefore, about the ambiguity of the terms, then about the manifold analysis of them. We are going to expound Matthew's words when we have set forth these things. The name Nazaraei is as ambiguous in the Latin authors as it could possibly be; in Greek authors, less so; in Hebrew and Syriac authors, least so. For we notice that there are four categories of Nazaraei in our books, since the Latin authors, at any rate, denote them by this general term. The first category is that of those who were bound by the well-known laws written down by Moses in Numbers 6; the second, those who were named from Nazareth, the town of Galilee; the third, those who tear asunder and abolish the Old Testament as an authority; the fourth, those who, confusing the first two categories with each other, taught that Christians were bound by the ceremonial laws of the Old Testament. Of these the first category belongs to the Old Testament; the second, to the New; the third and fourth, however, to ecclesiastical history.

As far as the first category is concerned, it is called, with regard to the Hebrew writers, Nāzīr in a great many passages of scripture. The Greek interpreters generally rendered this term with a common noun, but occasionally as a proper noun. Rendering it by a common noun, the seventy translators said ἁγιος, ἁγιάζων, ἡμιασμένος, ἡ δοξασθεις; that is, "holy one," "one who consecrates," "one who has been consecrated," or "one who has been glorified," according to the thought, it is plain to see, of those passages in which [Nāzīr] occurs.
Aquila rendered it ἀφωρισμένος, that is, "one who has been separated," while Symmachus rendered it ἀθυμός, that is, "one undefiled" or "in- violate." Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzenus, and Epiphanius provide evidence that, wherever the Greek interpreters translated it as a proper noun (but they did so, if we observe carefully, in just four passages of the Old Testament), it was written Ναζηραῖος, although three of these passages today have Ναζηρεύς and the final one Ναζαρεύς. On this account I should have very little doubt that these men were [originally] called Naziraei in Latin authors as well, but that an error passed into common use at a later stage by virtue of the affinity of the terms, and it came about that they were called Nazaraci instead of Naziraei. And yet one should observe this, that this term occurs nowhere in the New Testament, in whatever manner you read it, but it is only said periphrastically by Luke, "τοὺς εὐχῆν ἔχοντας ἐφ᾿ ἑαυτῶν," lest anyone might perhaps ignorantly confuse this kind of Nazaraci with the aforementioned second category of Nazaraci. Consequently, for the sake of differentiation in these Parallels we are going to restore this first category of Nazaraei to its original form and ancient spelling and call them Naziraei in conformity with the Hebrew term.

The second category of Nazaraei derives its name not from a religious usage (as the preceding one does), but from the proper name of a place which is in Galilee, as is confirmed both by the evangelist at this point and by several other passages in the New Testament. We do not recall, however, that this name is found anywhere in the Old Testa-
ment; because a definite mention of the little town itself from which the Nazaraci possessed the name does not even occur. But if the name of that little town is not explicitly found in the Hebrew text, yet one must not immediately reject the spelling and, indeed, the authority of the ancients—both Christian and Jewish. For all the most ancient Jewish authors termed the Nazaraci as Notzerim or Notzeriim, a term which they retain to our own times; while the Christians called them [by names derived] from the same source—the Syrians calling them Notzerai, the Arabians Notzaraiun—surely from the town which, in Syriac, is commonly called Notzerath, that is, Nazareth. The Greek evangelists, therefore, always wrote Ναζαραιος,13 or even Ναζαρηνους,14 and, according to the custom, expressed the letter ϸ, because it is stridulant (says Jerome), by means of the simple ζ;15 but Ναζαραιος or Ναζαρηνους are not found to have been written anywhere. The Latin authors, on the other hand, sometimes spoke of Nazarai without any differentiation, sometimes of Nazareni, making some distinction. All these, however, are from notzera or notzerath or even natzerath, a Syriac common noun; while the Syriac noun is derived from the Hebrew notzer,16 by which is meant, if it seems appropriate to render it with a common noun, a branch sprouting forth again from a dead stump—growing up, as it were, from the sap which has been preserved within the stump. If it seems appropriate to render it, on the other hand, with a proper noun, it is the name of the aforementioned little town, the location of which in
Galilee Luke describes in chapter four, and from this place, moreover, Christ was designated a Ναζωραῖος and Ναζωρινός, and likewise he is spoken of by a circumlocution as ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέως lest anyone should be able to explain the preceding terms in another way.

And Christians as well, by virtue of the profession of their faith in Jesus Christ of Nazareth, were once called Nazoraei. Therefore, Jerome, writing in Latin, although he did not distinguish Naziraci from Nazoraei by any differing letter, yet at the same time he declared in clear words in his comments on Isaiah that the experts of the Hebrews take the word in the way which we have just stated. And not only in writing to Marcella, but also here and there in other places, he interprets the Syriac name Νότζεραθ as "blossom of Galilee," so that he removes every occasion for uncertainty by means of this interpretation of his (in fact, he everywhere renders the Hebrew Νήτζερ in this way, taking "blossom" as a shoot blossoming forth and sprouting out).

The third category of Nazaraei differs from the preceding ones both in origin and in spelling. For while the first category ought to be written with a ζ and the second, on the other hand, with a ξ (since they lack this letter, the Greeks see to it, at least, that a distinction is made in the vowels), it is necessary that this third category should be written with a simple "s," even as Epiphanius wrote ναζωραῖοι with a σ (that is, as he himself interprets it, ἀφανισταῖ) from the Syriac word ܢسائر, which is "to rescind" and, indeed, "to abolish." For the name
was attached to these men for the reason that they asserted that the books of Moses and the rest of the scripture of the Old Testament had been annulled.

The final category is that of those whom Eusebius reckons amongst the Ebionaei or Ebionites. Others, however, count them among the number of the heretics, but separately from the Ebionites. Now these people believed in Jesus Christ in the sense that they preached that both the observance of the ceremonial laws and the gospel were obligatory for Christians. And pertinaciously defending that act and error of Peter, into which he fell at Antioch (although he was publicly rebuked by Paul), they attacked the liberty of the churches of Christ. This impious dogma, when it first asserted itself at Antioch, possibly provided the occasion for the Antiochene church that good men called themselves no longer Nazoraei or Nazareni, but rather Christians. And, at any rate, this last category of Nazaraei (who were the first promoters, whether from ignorance or from malice, of the idea that the name of the Nazaraei or Nazareni should be confused with the Naziraci, even as they confused their rites and offices) had Symmachus, that celebrated interpreter of the Old Testament, as the greatest champion and defender of its opinion. From this very passage of Matthew he harassed the fathers and confirmed his own people in this error to such an extent that the latter were afterwards called Symmachians, a fact to which Augustine is a witness. Eusebius himself also hinted at this fact in these
This is enough with regard to the aforementioned four categories of Nazaraei. Since the last two of these in no way pertain to this passage, but belong to ecclesiastical history (as we have said previously), it now seems good to discuss the former two described above and consider which suits this passage best. A threefold interpretation springs from the first form of Nazaraei, which we have taught should properly be called Naziraei. The first interpretation has its origin from the aforementioned Nazirites consecrated in fulfilment of a vow and regulated by the law, concerning which Numbers 5 speaks. The second has its origin from the Nazirites born or made by divine mandate; such were Samson and John the Baptist. The third has been sought from both categories in conjunction. The first interpretation is this sort of thing: those things which were said in the law about the Nazirites who were consecrated in fulfilment of a vow ought to be referred anagogically to Christ as well. If I thought that this interpretation was as sure and reliable as it is ready and facile, I should accept it with equanimity. But many things act as an impediment: the spelling, the form of this observance, the application, and other things of this sort. For in the case of the manner of writing the word, whether you examine the letters of the Hebrew and other Oriental authors or those of the evangelists and
all the Greek authors, the spelling [of the two kinds of Nazaraei] is everywhere quite different, as we pointed out previously. Whoever does not direct his attention to this matter is mistaken, and he who esteems it as of little importance does not, in my opinion, direct sufficient attention to the true character of the matter. As far as the form of the observance in question is concerned, although Christ was made under the law (as the apostle says), he surely could not have been lawfully released, if he was a Nazirite, from those religious usages of the Nazirite state which the law commanded, except after the act of redemption had been completed. And, consequently, Christ Jesus was not supposed to touch anything derived from the vine, shave his hair, go near to a dead man. Those last Nazaraei, about which we were speaking previously, or (if it seems desirable) the Symmachians, desired to prove each of these matters from this passage of Matthew. Now with regard to the hair, indeed, I certainly possess no effigy [of Christ] with reference to that matter; although, from the words of Paul and common practice of the Jews, it seems more probable that Christ did not let it grow long. With regard to the vine, however, he both drank wine himself and served it to others to drink and commanded Christians to drink it in the sacred meal, which without any doubt he would have done least of all if he had been a Nazirite of this kind. With regard to the approach to and contact with the dead, indeed, what need is there for further words? The sacred pages of the gospels are full of examples.
And, finally, if you look at the application, good God, how many things are wanting which would be needed in order that the aforementioned form of observance of the Nazirites could be applied to Christ the Nazarene and the aforementioned name to the proper name of a little town! Although all these should be explained in the most painstaking fashion, they will still neither teach the pious in a solid manner nor refute the impious. And, as a matter of fact, no sort of proof would be forthcoming at this point from matters which are disparate and cohere very little. Nor, indeed, can any similar example be brought forward from Matthew, even though he is the evangelist who, in particular, is most zealous in coupling together the Old Testament with the New. Accordingly, since that concept leads neither to proof nor to illustration, we conclude that these words were not brought forward by Matthew with this idea. Let us see now, therefore, whether the second interpretation can be more consistent.

The second interpretation is this sort of thing: those things which were already said in earlier times concerning Samson—as one who was appointed and born a Nazirite of God—prefigured, in the sight of the holy fathers, the truth fulfilled in Christ and anagogically pertain to Christ, a fact which Matthew is believed to have indicated in this passage. And, in fact, if it were necessary, by virtue of the interpretation of this passage, that any single variety of the religious usages in question should be applied to Christ, it would seem more probable to me, at least,
that this sort of Naziriteship which is appointed and possessed by birth should be assigned to Christ as a type rather than that sort which is regulated by the law and undertaken in fulfilment of a vow—and this for a great many reasons, but especially because this type is more distinct than the former one and is nearer to the true nature of Christ. But there are still many considerations which overturn this interpretation and completely deter me from this analysis as much as from the former one. For, in the first place, the spelling of the words involved is different. Then too, the religious usages were never observed by Christ. Next, the application is difficult. Furthermore, the type is complicated; yet unless a type is specific and specially designed for the matter about which it speaks, it neither proves anything as being necessarily true nor accomplishes even the least for the clarification of this passage, as we have just shown in the preceding parallel. Add to these a fifth reason as well, which Jerome wisely observed in regard to this very passage: "If Matthew," he says, "had set down a fixed example from the scriptures, he would never say, 'that which was written by the prophets,' but simply, 'that which was said by the prophet.' But by calling upon the prophets in the plural at this time, he shows that he has taken from the scriptures, not the words, but the sense." None of the prophets, moreover, make any mention of Samson except the author of the book of Judges.

It follows, therefore, that not even the type of Samson is applied by Matthew to Christ in these words (although we stated previously that
Samson had a type in common with John the Baptist).

And, therefore, someone will perhaps say, the third interpretation, it seems, must be employed, namely, that the ascription of this name to Christ is seen as constructed from both varieties of Nazirite. I am told this, to be sure, but yet (I hope that I speak by everyone's good leave) how it is to be referred successfully to both classes in conjunction, I have thus far been able neither to observe for myself nor to learn from the writings of those who think in this way. For there are, I admit, some things common to both sorts of Naziriteship, as are the hair, abstinence from the things of the vine (there is certainly no mention at all of the law pertaining to the dead in the account of Samson), and any other such things. But the former variety of the Nazirite state is undertaken in fulfilment of a vow; the latter, appointed or commanded. The former is temporary; the latter, perpetual. Finally, the former is common to all who are willing; but the latter, unique. On this account, although there is something in common between these two things, yet they differ from one another in their practices, nor are they joined together closely enough to be applied to the one Christ, our Saviour. For the next point, who does not see that each of the preceding reasons [advanced against the first two interpretations] pertains to this category of interpretation as well and refutes it at the same time? For once both of these species have been destroyed, the genus must fall to the ground also. Since this is the case, I unreservedly conclude that no conformity
between the Nazirites characterized by special religious usages and Jesus Christ, in so far as he is a Nazarene, is discussed in this passage, even though the aforementioned Nazaraci or Symmachians were, in times past, shamefully deceived by the appearance of such a conformity. Jerome saw long ago that these things were to be construed in such a way as he pointed out in those words which we previously adduced. 39 Chrysostom, too, saw these things; noticing that there was a difficulty in this interpretation, he preferred to rush imprudently into another, by saying: "Which of the prophets asserted this, then? Do not probe into such things at all, nor be curious about matters of this kind. For many things have been lost from the prophetic records," etc. 40 And Theophylact agrees with this same opinion that either books have been lost through the negligence of the Hebrews and the continuous succession of deportations, or else that it had been said orally by the Jews in earlier times without being written down. 41

From those things which have been said by us up to this point, it seems to be unquestionably certain that the evangelist did not look back to the ancient Nazirites of the law nor to the type of Samson nor to both at the same time, but that, rather, some alternate interpretation must be sought from somewhere else. which can be applied more aptly to Matthew's words. On this account the most illustrious men of times past and the most expert in the Hebrew language (Jerome is a witness to this fact), 42 applying themselves more closely to the words of St. Mat-
threw, discarded that interpretation concerned with Nazirites and embraced the other one. They decided that it was being asserted that Christ was called a Nazarene after the town of Nazareth—not only because of the event which Matthew narrates, but also because of the prophecies which had preceded it a long time beforehand. And, in fact, we are now about to raise this interpretation of that[name] from the dust, as it were; and, with God as our teacher, we shall expound it as simply as it can be done. Consequently, the goal of this passage is that—just as Christ has been pointed out in the church by means of his family, conception, birth, and the place of both his nativity and exile, and all the connected circumstances—in just the same way he might be pointed out with a finger, as it were, and be recognized in the church of God by means of the place of his upbringing, where he lived until he was dispatched by the Father to take up his calling.

The main point is that, even by means of the place of his upbringing, where Christ passed part of his life, it can be proven that Jesus is the Christ since he was brought up in the town of Nazareth, the place which the prophets had assigned to this same Christ a long time before. I am confident that every good man will readily grant all these things, if you make only one exception, namely, that we have said that this place was assigned to Christ by the prophets in respect to his upbringing. If we should prove this, all will be accomplished. But in order to be able to demonstrate this properly, we must take for granted the well-known fact which seems to be beyond controversy: that some things are ex-
pressed clearly by the prophets, some things intimated covertly or
enigmatically. For the fact that enigmas are set forth in the law or
prophets ought not to be marvelled at more than the fact that types and
allegories are employed, concerning which we were speaking above in the
seventh parallel, \(^4^3\) since an enigma is nothing other than an obscure
parable or allegory, which is understood with more difficulty (as Augus-
tine says). \(^4^4\) From this it comes about that not every parable or alle-
gory is considered an enigma, but every enigma is an allegory. More-
over, this kind of instruction is used in two ways. For either such ob-
scurity exists in matters which could be neither conveyed nor understood
without tropes; or else tropes and, indeed, enigmas are employed, in
accord with the design of those who are speaking, even in those matters
which, when they have later been made clear, have the greatest perspi-
cuity--just as we were saying about types and allegories before. And
so there were, in fact, prophecies about Christ and his kingdom which
were enigmatic, partly on account of the obscurity of the matters, partly
on account of the length of the periods of time [which were to precede
their fulfilment]. But as often as God, with a definite design, expounded
obscure matters enigmatically through his prophets, this truly possesses
both grace in speaking and teaching and the greatest worthiness. This
same thing, moreover, has been observed in almost every prophecy in
which the person of Christ was foreshadowed. For example, the following
are taken note of in regard to people: descent, birth, nationality, sex,
upbringing, character, disposition of the mind, station, good qualities, conversation, desires, accomplishments, name, death, and anything else of this kind.

Now the prophets announced each of these things in regard to Christ enigmatically, allegorically, or typically. Isaiah set forth his descent and also the time [of his appearance] for the fathers enigmatically ἄνθρωπον by saying, "There shall come forth a little twig from the stump of Jesse." These words, to be sure, do not seem enigmatic to us now, but they are and were in their own time. Likewise, how enigmatic the birth [of Christ] is in the words of that good patriarch Jacob: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the law-giver from between his feet, until his after-birth comes." The "his," of course, means "Judah's," as the masculine gender of the pronoun in the Hebrew language shows. Now, the after-birth derives from the constitution not of men, but of women. He, however, whom one after-birth has produced, and that without a man, that one is Christ, the promised seed of the woman. It was this enigma that Isaiah made clear in a later age by saying, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive," etc. Yes, even in our own day this same thing is truly an enigma, if someone calls Jesus Christ, our Saviour, the after-birth of a man. And, indeed, one ought not to think that, if we possess the interpretation of some obscure statement, there is, as a necessary consequence, no enigma in it. Similarly, moreover, there are many enigmas, throughout the whole of Isaiah's fifty-third
chapter and elsewhere, pertaining to the person of Christ in regard to these and other matters. We must refrain from mentioning these at this point for the sake of brevity. Consequently, we judge that, by the same rights and in the same way, the place of upbringing was touched upon by the prophet at this point in like manner, as we shall later demonstrate.

Now there are two classes of enigmas: One is larger [in scope], so to speak, because it embraces the whole sentence and obscures it with a great many words. The other is smaller or narrower [in scope] because it does, to be sure, obscure an entire sentence, but by means of the obscure rendition of only one or two terms. Some grammarians call the former simply enigma and the latter ὑπαίνιγμα or ὑπαίνιγμα. 50 Neither of these, however, can be considered allegory in the strict sense, because allegory possesses an obscurity either in a term alone or in the sense; enigma, on the other hand, in both at the same time. And, moreover, I recall that, among good authors, six modes are observed of the latter class, which in Hermogenes 51 lacks a name of its own (for we have to do chiefly with that class at this point), namely, κατὰ τὸ ὀμόνυμον, 52 κατὰ τὸ συνόνυμον, 53 κατὰ τὸ σύζυγον ἢ παρώνυμον, 54 κατὰ τὸ παρηχοῦν, 55 κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν, 56 and κατὰ τὴν γλῶσσαν. 57 Now, although there are examples of all these modes in the scriptures, yet this ought to be made use of especially in expounding the upbringing of Christ for that reason which we are going to state later. We are con-
vinced, therefore, that Isaiah refined διὰ τὴς ὑπαλλελευσις the other aforementioned enigma which he had previously set forth in the same verse. For he had said that Christ would come forth from the forsaken family of Jesse and David, just as a young twig from a stump which is almost dead. What is more, however, we are convinced that he embellishes this same enigma διὰ τὴς ὑπαλλελευσις when he says that this twig would be a Nētzer, that is, "a shoot"—or a Nazoraeus or Nazorenus, that is, "one like a shoot"—who should blossom forth from the roots of Jesse. Zechariah interpreted this enigmatic derivative ἐκ τοῦ ὄμωνύμου by saying that he would blossom forth in his own place—which place or abode of the shoot the Hebrew authors called Nētzer, the Syriac Natzerah or Notzerath.

Certainly, someone will say, but in which passages did the prophets use enigmas and dark intimations? I respond: they definitely used them in such subjects as are obscure either per se and by the nature of the matter—on account of its loftiness and the paucity of our understanding—or by virtue of the circumstances, as we have previously advised. For God does not πυθίζειν ἐν τοῖς φωτεινοῖς, but τυπίζει τὰ σκοτεινά. So what? I should truly prefer to expound this in the words of Hermogenes rather than in my own. For after he begins to discuss Περὶ ὁμούμηνος, he uses these words: "But you call, besides this, another thing acuteness or pungency of speech, a class of acuteness, concerning which it is difficult to determine whether it resides in the
mode of expression or in the thought; because one cannot establish concerning the whole that the ἐννοεῖα is or is not in it. For that acuteness or pungency, to be sure, is observed in the mode of expression, but that very mode of expression which possesses pungency possesses by itself nothing in the way of pungency if one removes it from that thought in which it is found or from such matters as were previously stated. This does not happen, however, to other forms of discourse. Rather, a plain mode of expression is everywhere plain, in whatever manner it may express a grave thought by means of itself, even if nothing precedes it. And a grave mode of expression as well is grave, even if someone has neither expressed a grave thought nor placed any word before it. And, in short, the nature of other forms of discourse is likewise invariable. But in truth this mode of expression, which expresses by itself nothing of the sort, still conveys some meaning which it cannot possess in the strict sense, except by consequence of the words connected with it. And, therefore, it is the same mode of expression with a certain pointed wit, as it were, and produces a pleasing acuteness," etc. The man then confirms these things with brilliant examples taken from Xenophon, Sophocles, Euripides, and Euphorio. And, indeed, the ancients themselves—at one moment, serious in respect to grave matters, at another, sportive by means of irony—made use of this variety of expression. For example, it is ironic when Homer calls an indigent person ἐξ ἀγαθωλίας (to which fact Eustathius is a witness) and when the comedian says τὸ μὲν
Plautus abounds in this variety of expression. However, the mode of expression in question is grave and has the appearance of reverence when, in the Odyssey, Pallas is called μεντης ταφίων ἡγήτωρ, that is, "powerful ruler of matters astonishing." The simplicity of the ancients was exceedingly delighted by this kind of speech.

But if this kind of expression can be employed at all, it is best suited, in my opinion, to predictions of things in the future. If, therefore, we seek for a ὑπαίνεις which is ironical from the scriptures, behold the most grave prophet Isaiah. He calls Edom, who is clamoring and jeering at the word and people of God, Dumah—the same as if you were to say "silent one"—by use of an artful ὑπαίνεις κατὰ τὸ παρηχοῦν and at the same time announces beforehand κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν that, by virtue of the judgement of God rushing upon Edom, there would be silence because she had been insolently clamorous. And Isaiah ἔρωνι-κῶς ὑπανίττει her sad state of affairs by means of one little word. Behold that most holy Jeremiah, who, although he nowhere hesitated to name Babylon explicitly, still pointedly uses a different word as a substitute in two places in order to make clear the precipitous state of Babylon at the time when she was bending her attention to celebrating feast days. "Finally," he says, "the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," and in another place, "How is Sheshach taken and the praise of the whole earth seized," etc. For the vocable "Sheshach" is
Babylonian in origin; by it Jeremiah intimated beforehand κατὰ τὴν γάλασσαν⁸⁵ that feast day of the Babylonians which was suddenly made by God a day of mourning for all the Babylonians, even as Daniel describes.⁸⁶ If, however, we want serious and grave examples of ὑπαίνεις, Jacob κατὰ τὸ όλομονυμον⁸⁷ assigns the territory of Shechem to Joseph.⁸⁸ Isaiah κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν⁸⁹ calls Babylonia a wilderness of the sea,⁹⁰ Judaea a valley of vision.⁹¹ Micah κατὰ τὸ παρθενῆν⁹² gives Egypt the name "Matzor."⁹³ But truly, to pass over other examples, there is nothing which the prophets more gravely, more pointedly, or more elegantly expressed by their mode of speech and embellished with figures of this kind than the kingdom of Christ and the teaching of the gospel. With regard to this subject, for instance, there are two passages in which Christ is specifically given the name ὅτζερ by a mode of naming things which is common to both the Hebrew authors and those of other tongues. The first passage has it thus, "There shall come forth a little twig from the stump of Jesse, and a ὅτζερ," that is, a shoot, "shall blossom forth from his roots."⁹⁴ Even the Aramaic paraphrast and all the Jews have seen that this passage ought to be taken of the Messiah.⁹⁵ Although, however, ὅτζερ denotes a shoot, yet since Isaiah would have wanted to say something more by this thing than what he said in the first part of the verse, we have no doubt that, by means of this word which he had taken up, he set forth ὅτζερ ὑπαίνεις⁹⁶ the name of that place
where Christ was brought up. Among the Hebrews, moreover, personal names used to be made into patronymics or gentilitial names, and those things which were simply first of their kind were interpreted as the things derived from them. In this way, consequently, both Jacob himself and the Israelis, his descendants, are designated by the name "Israel." In this way, "Heber" is spoken at one time with reference to Heber, at another with reference to the Hebrews, the descendants of Heber; also "Canaan," with reference to the notorious son of Ham and to his posterity; and "Sidon," with reference to the famous city of Phoenicia and to its inhabitants. Thus Netzer is at one time Nazareth, at another a Nazarene. It is in accordance with this line of reasoning that Isaiah says Netzer, that is, that he who had come forth from the stump of Jesse would be brought up as a Nazoraeus or Nazarenuš in the town of Nazareth. Thus, he taught the one thing in a clear way, the other in an obscure way—expressing the family and generation [of Christ], to be sure, in plain words, but his upbringing in hidden and more obscure words κατὰ τὸ ὀμόνυμον. The idea of the second passage is the same. For although on the surface it seems to be more obscure because of various and manifold interpretations, yet, in actuality, it is clear and plain if we shall take a look at the mind of the prophet. For after God has expressed the most glorious promises in a great many types and allegories, he at length concludes his discourse with these words: "As many of your countrymen as are righteous shall possess the land by
hereditary right forever, so that the *Nêtzer,* that is, the shoot, "of my grafts may glory in the work of my hands." This shoot is Christ the Nazarene, whose epithet, taken from his upbringing, Isaiah again ὑπαγείττετο. Into this shoot, however, have been ingrafted the souls of Christians, as if they were the grafts of God, which—by the hands of God, as it were, that is, by the omnipotent power of the Spirit—have been implanted, inoculated, ingrafted into Christ through faith. In this way they are perfected in him. For the success of these grafts is the glory of the shoot which bears them but is not borne by them. It is concerning this work of God's hands that Christ the Nazarene, the shoot of God's grafts, glories.

The third passage, which we have adduced from the prophet Zechariah, contains no difficulty at all. For every sprig which blossoms forth must blossom forth from its own shoot, and such is the dwelling-place of the sprig. Refining this similitude, the prophet announced beforehand that Christ would break forth from his own place, that is, from Nazareth, and he would thrust himself forward from the place of his upbringing in order to build the house of Jehovah. That this matter was attended to by Christ all the evangelists confirm, so that he at last went forth into public from Galilee and the town of Nazareth at that time when he was going to enter upon his calling. It is from this, therefore, that Christ and Christians were called *Nazoraei*—that Christ (from whom the Christians [received the name]) dwelt in the town of *Nêtzer*
or Nazareth, a fact which Isaiah ṣωνυνύμως and Zechariah συνωνυμως announced beforehand. The following objections, however, are raised against this interpretation: that this is a new interpretation; that the one discussed earlier has been accepted by everyone; finally, that it seems hardly likely that this was said by Isaiah. Two of these objections are questions of authority; the last has the appearance of reasonableness. All sane men will judge that one ought not to oppose the authority of any man to the authority of the Holy Spirit speaking through Matthew. But yet, to speak in good order, the idea that novelty serves as a reproach to this interpretation is refuted by the same arguments which we set forth in the seventh parallel, to which place we desire, for the sake of brevity, that the reader be referred. That the interpretation formerly discussed was not accepted by everyone we have already stated and proven by citations from the ancients. On the contrary, indeed, we have brought forward apt witnesses for this interpretation of ours.

It remains only that we should, in a few words, overthrow the capstone and foundation of the arguments [against our interpretation]. It does not seem, they say, that the one thing was said by Isaiah or Zechariah, nor the other by Matthew. I respond: We know well that Isaiah says nothing at all concerning the Nazirites regulated by the law in those passages which we have previously brought forward. Indeed, we completely deny, on the basis of his words and interpretation, that Matthew
deals with those people in this passage. Consequently, since neither of the two proposed to deal with the Nazirites in, at least, this passage, we esteem it completely just that some other interpretation should be investigated. Now Matthew says that Christ came to dwell in the city of Nazareth, that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled, "He shall be called a Nazoraeus." Therefore, this must have been spoken by the prophets. But if it was spoken, it must have been spoken either literally or figuratively, in plain words or obscure. I do not recall finding literal and plain words in the prophets concerning this name. Nor, indeed, do I think that they are found there, since no one up to now--either in orthodox antiquity or in our own time--has traced out and handed down anything of this sort. Therefore, it remains that we should judge that it was in a figurative and obscure manner that Christ was called a Nazoraeus by the prophets. But now, as to what in the prophets comes near to a use of the name of the place Nazareth and a Nazarene man, nothing has yet been uncovered other than the very thing which we have brought together from Isaiah and Zechariah. And, moreover, it especially seems to work in the direction of this opinion (to pass over all such things as have previously been said) that the aforementioned term Netzer is never found in the prophets when they are speaking in Hebrew, except in these two passages, and it is predicted, moreover, of no one who is discussed in Hebrew, except Christ, our Saviour. For even if, in addition, Isaiah once uses this term in discussing the king of Baby-
Ionia, in that case he is speaking μωνιτλας in a Syriac or Aramaic manner, even as he intersperses Aramaic terms with almost every verse in the same chapter. Nor does the fact stand in the way of our interpretation that people object that it was said by Matthew that Christ would be called a Nazoraeus but not a Netzer. For, in the first place, in accord with the usage of the Hebrew authors, the second term almost encompasses the connected one. Secondly, it is very common for personal names to be used by the Hebrews in place of patronymics and gentilitial names, as we were saying previously. Finally, the prophets gracefully ονανελαν the name of the place--the former, on the one hand, with a synonym and periphrasis, the latter, on the other, with a derivative, just as if they had said that the place of Christ was called Netzer, that is, "shoot," and that he was, on that account, a Notzri, that is, a Nazoracus or Nazarenus. Thus, Matthew does not, in any manner, but explains the ονανελαν of the holy prophets in clear words.

The Jews will retort perhaps that Netzer is a substantive and common noun and is not, therefore, stated concerning the place Nazareth. But, to grant them that this is a common noun, yet it is not unusual for proper nouns to be constructed from common ones, or adjectives and gentilitial names from substantives. Then too, it is shameful for them to snatch away from the prophets the figures and shadows of words by which the speech of the Holy Spirit was especially illuminated in former times. Lastly, since Netzer is a rare term in the Old Testament (it was
taken up more by Syriac and Aramaic than by Hebrew authors) and it
was predicated in the Hebrew only of the Messiah, it ought to occur to
the minds of these people that by this unique usage, something unique
is certainly signified—beyond what is common to the interpretation of
an appellative term. Now what is that unique something? That in the
church of the Jews in ancient times Christ was given the name Netzer,
that is, Nazarene—with the same faithfulness by which he was called
David or the Servant of Jehovah, or sprig, or salvation, or light. For
these names as well occur in the New Testament. Therefore, this
name Netzer was, by the providence of God, attributed to Christ not
only to point out the truthfulness of God in preserving the family of David,
but also to indicate the aforementioned place of his upbringing, which
Isaiah and Zechariah had prophesied in an obscure way would come about,
just as the holy Matthew most correctly interpreted them.

PARALLEL IX

Isaiah 40  Matthew 3
3. The voice of one crying, etc.  3. The voice of one crying, etc.

This whole passage is fuller at Luke 3:4. Therefore, we defer
a complete interpretation of this passage to that point.¹

PARALLEL X

Deuteronomy 8  Matthew 4
3. Man shall not live by bread  4. Man shall not live by bread
alone, but man shall live by everything which proceeds out of the mouth of Jehovah.

 alone, but by every word proceeding from the mouth of God,

The goal common to both passages is that a general plan for sustaining our life acceptable to the will of God should be brought forward. The main point, on the other hand, is that the means suited to the maintenance of life and the efficient cause—that is, his word and blessing—are both from God. Everything in either place agrees as closely as it possibly could. Jerome, indeed, stated eloquently about this passage: "Christ conquered his adversary by the testimonies of the law, not by the power of strength, so that, in this way, he might both honor man the more and punish the adversary the more, since the enemy of the human race was conquered, not as if by God, but as if by man."  

PARALLEL XI

Psalm 91
12. He will give his angels charge of you, to guard you in all your ways.
13. On their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone.  

Matthew 4
6. He will give his angels charge of you, and on their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot at any time against a stone.

The goal in the words of the prophet is that the pious who cling to God in holy faith and obedience should be strengthened against everything evil. The main point is that no evil befalls the pious which is so severe that by it they can be overthrown and destroyed. For everything
not only on earth but also in heaven—ministers to their welfare by reason of a fixed management and superintendence by the providence of God. The devil twists this passage against Christ by using the fallacy of division\(^2\) (as they call it). For the prophet had very carefully pointed out the ways of the saints at the beginning of the aforementioned psalm by saying, "He who will confide in the refuge of the Most High, who continually spends the night in the shadow of the Almighty," etc.\(^3\) And the prophet, by definite design, had connected the ways of the saints with the promises of God in this very verse by saying, "to guard you in all your ways." After he has torn all these things apart, Satan throws the promise in front of Christ, but throws away its condition. On account of this, the application of this passage was wicked and so was the alteration connected with this application. The devil was the author of this alteration. But Matthew reports this alteration in good faith, in order to show more fully the impiety and audacity of Satan as he attacks both the person of the Son of God and the truth of the word at one blow. But we talked enough for our purpose about this sort of alteration above in the fifth parallel.

**PARALLEL XII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deuteronomy 6</th>
<th>Matthew 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Do not tempt Jehovah your(^1) God.</td>
<td>7. You shall not tempt the Lord your(^2) God.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common goal is that the pious, even though pressed down by the heaviest ordeals and difficulties, should, with an unwavering faith,
avoid all courses of action which are contrary to God's will and persist in obedience to him. The main point is that the pious ought to cling to the Lord and not place their own selves before him and so embrace such means as God has not approved. Everything is the same in either passage, if you make this exception, that Christ states in the singular a prohibition which was expressed in the plural number; that is, he applies the general statement in the law to the special case before him by a mode of application and, indeed, necessary for every believer.

PARALLEL XIII

Deuteronomy 6  Matthew 4

The goal is that God should be ascribed the glory which is his. The main point is that the pious ought to take care that they most constantly tender these two duties—reverence and worship—whole and undefiled to the Lord. Everything in the words of Moses and Christ agrees if you except two changes which were made by Christ with a most holy design. The first change is in the first part, when Christ substituted, "You shall worship your God," for that which Moses had said, "You shall fear your God," or "revere" him. The second change is in the second part, to which Christ added the part "only." The former change was
made by Christ with respect to the ὑπόθεσις, or the case at hand. For he restricted the word for a genus to that species which Satan had wanted to obtain from Christ. The genus is fearing or revering God. Within this genus are contained all the duties of the pious, internal and external, which are owed to the majesty of God. Now when Satan demanded that one of the number of these duties—even though the least consequential in appearance—should be rendered to himself by Christ, in a most holy fashion Christ referred the adversary to the general law which occurs in Moses. And because Satan was demanding that one species of worship should be ascribed to himself, Christ restricted the more general word to this very species in order to confute the other's sophism with an argument drawn from the genus. Moreover, it is for the purposes of explanation that the term "only" is added. For Satan displays all the kingdoms of the world and promises their glory to Christ, if he will fall prostrate on the ground and worship him. Christ shows that this cannot for any reason be granted or rendered to Satan in even the least degree without depriving God of that highest power of God's over the world and its kingdoms. And, consequently, it would be a twofold and, indeed, a most grievous impiety, if anyone paid respects to Satan with this title or worshipped him with the least indication of worship. For, in the first place, that act is impious because God is deprived of his power. And, secondly, that act is no less void of piety, if one for such a reason shows to the devil even so small an amount of the honor which is owed wholly
to God, according as he is the only ruler and, indeed, grantor of kingdoms.

PARALLEL XIV

Isaiah 9

1. But she will not be covered with darkness who will have been afflicted with an ordeal, when the first time has afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali more lightly and the second time has afflicted them more severely. Populous Galilee, by the way of the sea, next to the Jordan,

2. her people, who walk in darkness, will see a great light; the light will shine brightly on those who sit in a land of deadly shadow.

Matthew 4

15. The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the way of the sea, next to the Jordan, Galilee of the nations--

16. the people which sat in darkness has seen a great light, and the light has arisen upon those who sat in the region and shadow of death.

The interpretation which the Jews have brought to bear on this passage has evinced best of all the thoroughly shameless audacity of the Jews in distorting the testimonies of sacred scripture, having twisted the terms, the accentuation, the construction, the thought--in short, everything--in a most wanton fashion. ¹ That Jonathan the Aramaic paraphrast connects reasonable statements with the first verse (so that, in one way or another, he tears some meaning out of it) would, to be sure, be marvellous to us, if we did not consider him to have been a man both excessively devoted to allegories and ignorant of Christ. ² But what am I to say about the interpretation of the Greek translators? ³ Although it
is adduced to a considerable extent by Jerome, Cyril, and other fathers; surely either this interpretation has in no way sprung from the famous seventy translators (which is what I, at least, think) or else they all fell asleep at the same time as they were writing such things.

Therefore, lest we be too tedious, let us come to the matter itself.

Isaiah speaks word for word as follows: "It will not have been darkened for that land of Zebulun and Naphtali for whom there will have been an ordeal" (for the Hebrew authors usually so employ passive verbs ἀποστολέως, or in the manner of impersonals, for what is, in effect, "She will not be covered with darkness who will have been afflicted with an ordeal") "when this former time will have afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali more lightly," etc., as we have laid it out in the summary or diagrammatic arrangement of our parallel. However, in omitting at this point matters which pertained to the history of former times, Matthew plucked off only such things as serve the narrative which he had undertaken, just as above in the fifth parallel we said was done with regard to this kind of alteration. Now the goal or target of Isaiah was that the pious should not be cast down by the severity of the judgments which he had announced would come upon the rebellious nation of the Jews by Immanuel's command, but that rather they should take comfort from the gospel promises concerning the nature, strength, function, and benefits of Christ. The main point is that, although the impending evils and the calamities shortly to follow were very severe (so that
even the most steadfast of men's minds could be discouraged by them), yet those same calamities shortly to come would be a sign for posterity and an argument for proving the salvation of the pious and the glory which one day would come through Christ to the same place which calamities so severe had darkened. For the inhabitants of that same place would have this honor above all, that that sun of righteousness would, as it were, arise among them. "In our time, to be sure," he says, "Galilee of the nations (that is, crowded with nations and populous) will be a partner of Zebulun and Naphtali, and the whole district of the Israelites lying next to the Jordan will be oppressed with two very severe devastations by Assyria—first, on the one hand, by Tiglath-pileser, 2 Kings 15:29; then, on the other, by Shalmaneser, 2 Kings 17.8 But just as the darkness of ordeal will severely oppress this people more than others, so also in the fullness of time that greatest light of our salvation will beam among them more than others." But what light is that? The "child" who "is born to us," etc.9 The Jews, to be sure, have referred these words, "the way of the sea," to the Syrian Sea, that is, the Mediterranean. But they have acted from ignorance, if not, perhaps, from malice. Since the following part contains a very clear delimitation; it is "the way of the sea which is next to the Jordan" which is being discussed. They have violently torn this part away from the preceding one, even though they are connected by the subject-matter, the sequence, and the position of the accents.
Therefore, that the agreement of these passages with one another may be better seen, let the following serve as an analysis of Isaiah's words. "Two periods of tribulation," he says, "are going to afflict the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali severely in this age of ours. Now the first, to be sure, will afflict Galilee with a lighter ordeal when Tiglath-pileser, summoned by King Ahaz, will lay her waste and plunder her riches. But the later period will experience a far more severe ordeal, when Shalmaneser will devastate everything and carry vanquished Israel to Assyria"--thus far the paraphrase\(^{10}\) of that παραγόμενος ἔξωθενος\(^{11}\) which Isaiah in the first verse stated concerning his own times and which Matthew, for that reason, deliberately omitted. The other part follows. This land, after it has been afflicted with two such severe ordeals, will lie neglected and frightful in appearance up to the coming of Christ--"the land," I say, "of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali . . . Galilee of the nations," or crowded with nations, "by the way of the sea," that is, lying on the sea, bordering on the Sea or Lake of Gennesaret, and lying "next to the Jordan." Nevertheless, this same land will not remain covered with darkness, but rather that "people which walks in darkness will see a great light," etc. All these plain and clear things were quite obviously uttered concerning the kingdom of Christ and, consequently, are applied quite suitably by Matthew to the aforementioned sojourn of Christ, who adorned Galilee above all with his presence, words, and deeds while he was here in the form of a servant.
It remains that, passing over the dreams of the Jews, we should take up such impediments as are able to produce uncertainty. Now, the manifold alteration which seems to have been made in the words of Matthew raises such uncertainty. The first subject of doubt is that a great many people have taken "the way of the sea" of the Syrian Sea (as we said previously). But they ineptly mutilate both history and the prophet's words. They mutilate history, because one nowhere reads that these kings of the Assyrians reached as far as the Syrian Sea, even though the Israelites, when they had been crushed, surrendered themselves to their sovereignty. They mutilate the prophet's words, on the other hand, because the delimitation (as it is called) or explanatory phrase of the preceding expression, "next to the Jordan," is appended. This phrase shows that these words pertain to the Sea of Chinnereth, as it is called in scripture from the town of that name which they later called Gennesaret. Matthew, indeed, calls it the Sea of Galilee. Nor does the fact that we have translated πέραν as "next to" stand against us. For, in the first place, let us explain that whether it be across [the Jordan] or on this side, neither of the two supports the thinking of the Jews. Next, there are no grounds for doubting that the term πέραν corresponds to the Hebrew ĉēber. But this term signifies in the Hebrew authors every region near which a river flows or which is divided by a water-course flowing through the middle, whether the region be that on the nearer side or that on the farther. And so the Greek term πέραν pos-
sesses a broad range of meaning, denoting now the region on the nearer side, now that on the farther, now both banks with the bordering district. On account of this, indeed, Luke used the compound ἄντιπέραν, lest the ambiguity of the uncompounded term deceive someone. I say nothing about the etymology, in the strict sense, of the Hebrew and Greek terms; this I leave to the grammarians to expound. At any rate, examples in a great many passages of the New Testament show that πέραν denotes the region on the same side and not the one across the river, especially where the banks are full of curves, as in Matthew 14:22 and 16:5, Mark 6:45 and 8:13, John 1:28 and 10:40. Everyone, moreover, testifies that the Jordan is that sort of river; Pliny, indeed, specifically calling it a pleasant river and, as far as the lie of the region allows, full of windings. The second subject of doubt occurs in the second verse. There, due to regard for the times [in which he wrote], Matthew has somewhat changed Isaiah's words, doubtless for that reason which we pointed out above in the fifth parallel. For the prophet declared in his own time that the Israelites "walk in darkness." In place of this, Matthew writes that they "sat in darkness," namely, on account of its long duration. It is ἐμφατικῶτερον. Next, that which the one calls the "land of the shadow of death," or "deadly shadow," the other calls the "region of death and shadow of death," likewise for emphasis, εὖ διὰ δύο. Finally, Isaiah was looking to the magnificence and most majestic illuminating power of the gospel of the glory of Christ. And
so, while the one predicted ἡαὐτοῦ that the light would "shine brightly," the other says that it "has arisen." Matthew says: ἀνέτειλεν, not ἀνέλαμψεν, surely because he takes into consideration his own times, in which the splendour of the gospel was, for the first time, breaking forth, in a way, and arising through the coming of Christ. Therefore, we do not see that this passage can be expounded well in any other way than just as we have been instructed by virtue of its fulfilment by Christ and on Matthew's authority, have explained it at length.

PARALLEL XV

Exodus 20
14. You shall not commit adultery.

Matthew 5
21. You shall not kill, and whoever kills shall be liable to judgement.
27. You shall not commit adultery.

Deuteronomy 24
1. When someone takes a wife and becomes her husband, and if she finds no favor in his eyes (because he has found some base matter in her) and so, writing her a certificate of divorce and putting it in her hand, he sends her away from his house, etc.

31. Whoever sends his wife away, let him give her a certificate of divorce.

Exodus 20
7. You shall not take the name of Jehovah your God in vain.

33. You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform to the Lord what you swear.

Exodus 21
24. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth.

38. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.
Leviticus 19

18. You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

43. You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.

Although all these passages differ from one another, yet because they possess the closest agreement in both goal and character and, consequently, can be circumscribed by certain common rules, we have decided that they ought to be grouped together. The goal is that the laws of nature pertaining to piety toward God and to love and humane conduct should, by the authority of God, be decreed among his people in a more unalterable form and that, having been corrupted, they should be restored to a pure form by the testimony of Christ Jesus. The unalterable decree God published through Moses; the restoration to purity Christ declared and effected personally. Accordingly, the main point is that all those things which were impressed by nature upon our minds concerning our duty toward God and men, even though the sin of man has weakened them in a most shameful manner—nevertheless, all these same things are, in these last times, repeated, vindicated, and receive perpetual authority by the testimony of the law and gospel. And, consequently, all those who either interpret them differently than natural law has taught from the beginning or comply with them as little as possible—they resist not only nature, but also the law and gospel. Our Lord and Saviour Christ pointed these things out in the four preceding verses, in which he set forth this goal and main point very carefully.¹ For Christ argued as follows: "Whatever sovereigns are like, so are the subjects. Or what-
ever the king is like, so are the sons of the kingdom. Now I, who am
Lord of the kingdom of heaven, have not come to abolish the law or the
prophets, but to fulfill them," verse 17. "Therefore, the sons of the
kingdom must be like this in words and deeds," or (if it seems preferable to anyone) in teaching and works, verse 19. The proofs and explanations belonging to both propositions, in accordance with the customary manner of speaking, are set down in order. For the proof for the minor proposition that Christ came to fulfill the law is added immediately after it by means of a very weighty vehement assertion, or (as others interpret it) oath, in these words: "For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a single point of a letter,\(^1\) will by any means pass from the law until all is accomplished."\(^2\) Moreover, the exposition of the conclusion is appended to it in verse 20, by means of a comparison, in these words, "For I tell you that unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven." Now the \(\text{ἀπὸδεξίως}\)\(^3\) of this comparison follows throughout the whole remainder of the chapter, from verse 21 on, by means of an enumeration of examples pertaining to this comparison. In this presentation, to be sure, Christ could have run through every precept of the law with very little difficulty. He considered it sufficient, however, to protect the righteousness of the law—that is, the righteousness which the natural law commands man to show—from the righteousness of the scribes and
Pharisees by means of six clear examples.

Having said this, we must now lay down certain laws or rules common to the passages, before we undertake an individual exposition of them. Let the first rule be as follows: each of these passages contains a comparison of that righteousness which has been commanded by the law with such Jewish or Pharisaic righteousness as obtained during that period in teaching and practices and, indeed, modes of life. It is for this reason that, in each passage, Christ distinguishes the parts of the comparison. When he is attacking that Pharisaic righteousness, he uses these words, "You have heard that it was said by men of old," etc. But when he is dealing with that true righteousness which God and nature demand, he uses these words, "But I say to you." And it was also for this reason that Christ very carefully guarded against conceding in the first part that something had been written; and everywhere he said, "You have heard that it was said by men of old." And this, in truth, seems to me to be as far removed as could be from what many have thought for a long time now, that the law of God is amended in this chapter. If Christ had intended that undertaking, he would not have been likely to say, "You have heard that it was said by men of old," or (if anyone prefers) "to men of old." But rather he would have used these words, "You have read what was written in the law of God." The second rule is that, consequently, alterations, additions, and deletions which have been made beyond the law and contrary to the law in these words
were produced, not by Christ, but by the Pharisees and scribes, who were quite shamelessly trying to commend themselves in ways other than those which accord with the fixed and uncorrupted interpretations of the law. Accordingly, these evils broke into the law of God in the same ways which we already described above in the fifth parallel. Third, it is not simply distortions of words which are rebuked by Christ, but pernicious dogmas; impious opinions of the Pharisees, and unclean and corrupt interpretations; and the true understanding of the law is restored even as these words in every place show: "You have heard that it was said by men of old" and "But I say to you." Christ by no means desired by these words to oppose his own authority to the authority of the law—that is, of God, his Father—but only to the empty mask of the Pharisees, who were misusing the most holy law of God for the purposes of their buying and selling. However, that these things may be better understood, what we have said will have to be demonstrated in each of these cases.

1. "You shall not kill." This first point of comparison vindicates the truth of the law against the leaven of the Pharisees in two ways: in the first place, by refuting the false understanding of the precept; but, secondly, by tearing away their additions. The false interpretation was that they took the word for killing only of active murder; and, accordingly, they imagined that no one trespassed against this commandment, unless he had killed another by an act. Therefore, Christ declares that anger,
abusive outcries, and insults against another are also embraced by the word for killing. Accordingly, all who have erred even this far, are guilty of violating this precept, verse 22. For God is a spiritual law-giver, as James says, 7 The addition occurred when they said, "whoever kills shall be liable to judgement." That is, no one can lawfully be brought to justice on account of wrongdoing concerning an act committed against another, unless he kills someone. But, as to something done in the private sphere, whoever does a wrong can make satisfaction to God through the priests, and he who suffers the wrong can avenge it without any examination by the judges. Moreover, it is not the case, they said, that murder is a capital offence, as is commonly believed; but rather one can make restitution in some way and compensate for the injury by means of the judge's inquiry. Thus, the Pharisees erred from the truth both in regard to the crime and in regard to the punishment for the crime. Christ points out both in verse 22: in the first place, that to have recourse to anger, to insult, to hurl abuse are species of homicide; next, that there is no species of homicide so trifling that one is not liable to come under judicial examination and punishment on the basis of the law. For thoughtless anger ought to be punished by the examination of the judge and, indeed, the praetor, as it were; abusive outcries by a sentence of stronger condemnation; insults, by a sentence of the most extreme and deadly condemnation. Moreover, as to the fact that men bestowed greater care on reconciling God by means of sacri-
fices and votive offerings, Christ asserts that this is pure, unmitigated hypocrisy and αἰσχροκόσμενα; when love commands that one should be reconciled to the brother offended against and that restitution should be made to him for the injury before pardon is sought from God by means of an offering.

2. "You shall not commit adultery." This second point of comparison defends the truth of the law from the false interpretation which the Pharisees employed. For these people concluded that this prohibition guarded against only actual fornication (as they call it). Christ asserted that God, the author of the law, had intended something far different. For he who even looks [at a woman in such a way] as to lust, but much more he who lusts, is guilty of violating the law. For not only the evil deed, the evil desire, intention, or thought is at fault; but also the very opportunities and instruments which are in us are evil. Now since the instrument and opportunity of that way of looking is the eye, one must let the same instrument and opportunity go (as if it had been condemned by this deed of its) rather than act in such a way that, through its fault, the whole man goes away to condemnation.

3. "Whoever repudiates his wife," etc. This third point of comparison is an appendix to the previous one. Now Christ protects the truth of the law from the false interpretation of the Jews in this way: The Jews held that a man was entitled to repudiate his wife on this one condition, that he give her a certificate of divorce. They ignorantly
twisted the words of Moses towards this end, Deuteronomy 24:1. Moses had entered these words in the law of God, καθ' ὑπόθεσιν καὶ κατὰ συγχώρησιν, doubtless due to the hardness of heart of that people, as Christ declares in Matthew 19:8. Consequently, Christ responds that this interpretation is false. For so far from a man being entitled, on the basis of the law, to repudiate his wife, the law, on the contrary, declares in this very place that whoever repudiates his wife, not only sins himself, but is also the author and instrument of a twofold sin besides.

The aforementioned act is one sin because such a man causes his wife to commit adultery, since she is not free from the law concerning her husband while he lives, even by the will of the husband himself. This is because the law of marriage possesses not only the force of some civil contract, but also a heavenly obligation and authority by virtue of its institution by God. The second sin is that he likewise commits adultery who takes the wife of another man, even though she has been repudiated by the latter. Moses expressed this point in clear words in this very place in verse 4.

4. "You shall not swear falsely," etc. This fourth point of comparison defends the truth of the law from the false interpretation and additions which the Pharisees employed to deceive the common people. The false interpretation is as follows and is one which restricts the precept of God within very narrow limits: What God said was, "You shall not take," or mention, "the name of Jehovah your God in vain." This the
Pharisees interpreted as, "You shall not swear falsely." It was just as if they had said, "You may utter the name of Jehovah your God in whatever way you wish as long as you do not swear falsely." The addition was, "but you shall render to the Lord what you swear," that is, "But if perhaps you cannot perform those things which you swear, make good this imprudent act of yours and wash it away by means of gifts offered to the Lord." Christ censures both; but the former, on the one hand, in explicit language, and the latter, on the other hand, tacitly (as they say), by consequence. As far as the interpretation is concerned, the following things are censured by Christ: In the first place, the Pharisees and scribes, by this teaching of theirs, not only allowed, but also impiously sanctioned, abuse of the divine name. Secondly, they excused the indirect abuse of God's name by those who held that they could swear by the name of God if they disguised it under the form of things which he had created. Thirdly, they allowed both these abuses to be practised in familiar speech in addition to [their practice when demanded by] necessity and a good and lawful reason for an oath. For it is this practice in particular that is signified by the term λόγος, which Matthew uses in verse 37. And, indeed, Christ stated the first and second points of his censure in these words, "Do not swear at all," that is, either directly, by taking up God's name, or indirectly, by using the name of things which he has created in place of God's name. Since the latter act is more fully and easily excused by people, Christ wisely brought
forward several examples of it—in order to show that all things of this sort were forbidden as well, even if they were not mentioned by him in this passage. Next, indeed, he came to the third point of his censure in these words, "But let what you say be, 'Yes, yes,' 'No, no' in order to protect the most holy name of God from every inconsequential, unconsidered, and idle statement, so that it could not be used by anyone without a proper summons or need. The addition, on the other hand, falls to the ground through its own weakness, once these matters have been settled. For its unreasonableness and falsity clearly proven as a necessary consequence of that rule which Christ conveys in the final words here, "but anything which is more than this, is from evil." For from this the following line of argument arises: What is from evil, cannot be acceptable to God. But swearing falsely is from evil. Therefore, it cannot be acceptable. To this a second line of argument with Christ as its author must be added: The wages of a harlot, the price of a dog, the sacrifice of a wicked man, and other things of this sort are an abomination to Jehovah. But the price or gift of one who swears falsely is the gift of a wicked man. Therefore, it is an abomination to the Lord—contrary to what seemed proper to the Pharisees, who allowed the greatest licence to everybody to swear falsely to the benefit of his κατήλθει δια επιλογῆς. 21

5. "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," 22 The fifth point of comparison defends the truth of the law from the false interpretation of the scribes and Pharisees. The words are in agreement. The purpose of the law
was this, that whatever kind of injury one person had inflicted on another, he who had inflicted the injury should suffer the same sort—but yet on the basis of a legal examination and trial. For this law was one of judicial and not of private administration. The Pharisees, however, abused this law in two ways: For, in the first place, they completely destroyed every just form of trial which answered to the will of God and the laws of nature. And they destroyed the authority of the judges, since they dispersed it to private citizens. Secondly, moreover, they opened a very wide door to private revenge and evil deeds, into which people eager for private vengeance easily proceed. And so Christ, in restoring the correct understanding of the law, first restrains all private citizens to such a degree that they may not resist evil—that is, an unjust and evil-doing person—by means of evil. Secondly, he asserts that we must make sure to submit to every evil, to offer the jaw, the cloak, etc., rather than avenge evil with evil. Finally, he asserts what the apostle says to the Romans, that evil must be conquered with good\textsuperscript{23} God had commanded. Each of these matters long before in the law.

6. "You shall love your neighbor," etc.\textsuperscript{24} The sixth point of comparison defends the law of God from both the false interpretations and the impious additions of the Jews. The false interpretation was that, by the term "neighbor" in these words, "You shall love your neighbor," either they understood "friend," or, at least (if they appeared to have somewhat more sense), they understood "him who is not an enemy." The addition occurred when they said, contrary to the authority of the law,
"you shall hate your enemy." Christ overturns both πρότερον with a most proper interpretation of the law. For first he affirms that the latter (that it is said, "You shall hate your enemy") is opposed to the law, because it is opposed both to the righteousness of the law and natural law, verse 44; and to the nature and example of God himself, verse 45. Next, moreover, he explicitly teaches ἡμιν that, by the term 'neighbor,' all people are to be understood and that, accordingly, all ought to be loved. God has pointed this out by means of his example in every period of time, and Christ taught it by means of a very clear story in Luke 10. Therefore, by means of all these examples, Christ protected the purity of the divine law from the impure leaven of the scribes and Pharisees.

PARALLEL XVI

I Kings 3 13. I give to you what you have not asked, riches and glory, to such an extent that no other king may be equal to you throughout all your days.

Matthew 6 29. But I tell you that not even Solomon in all his glory was so clothed as one of these lilies.

It does not seem reasonable, to be sure, to undertake to match these passages together in the strict sense. Yet, since there is something in common to both passages and there appears to be some discrepancy, it seemed good to enter them among the number of the Parallels. The common element is that the glory of Solomon is praised in both
places; but what is stated in a general way in the first book of Kings is applied to a special case concerning clothing in the discourse of Christ. Now to pause at this same special case which Christ has undertaken, the following seem to be in disagreement: that Christ denies that Solomon in all his glory was so clothed as the lily is, and that it is asserted in the Old Testament that there was no king equal to Solomon in glory. These things are brought into agreement by the words of Chrysostom who says, "There is as much difference between clothing and flowers as between truth and falsehood," etc. Therefore, (to finish up in a few words) Solomon surpassed all kings in glory according to the same thing, while the lilies surpass the sartorial glory of Solomon in diverse ways—in the first place, according to the quality. For (as Chrysostom likewise says), "When can you excel the beauty of flowers with clothing?" Or as Jerome says, "What silk, what purple of kings, what embroidered cloth can be compared with the flowers? What is so red as the rose? What is so white as the lily? Indeed, that the purple of the violet is surpassed by no purple dye is information provided more by the eyes than by anything said. " Secondly, the one surpasses the other κατὰ τὸ ἔχειν. For the sartorial glory of Solomon is lent to him and adventitious, while the glory of the lilies is inherent and intrinsic. As a third point, finally, the one surpasses the other by reason of duration and term of life. For Solomon (as Chrysostom likewise says) was "surpassed by the beauty of the flowers, not only once, nor twice, but throughout the whole period of
his reign—nor in one case only, but in all those pertaining to clothing and the necessaries of life. Consequently, there is no discrepancy between these passages.

### PARALLEL XVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leviticus 19</th>
<th>Matthew 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. You shall love your neighbor as yourself.</td>
<td>12. Whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is stated that the main point of the law and prophets is contained in the above words of Jesus Christ, but they do not occur in the Old Testament (if we scrutinize it closely) in an explicit fashion. It seemed good to join these two passages together as agreeing in theme. For the authority and force of divine mandates such that, if they command causes, they embrace the effects proceeding from those causes, by means of that synecdoche which Donatus calls "meta-lepsis." And, conversely, the causes are comprehended in the effects. Therefore, when the law decrees in this way, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," it commands by synecdoche that the services entailed by love be tendered to the neighbor with the same faithfulness with which we should wish them to be bestowed upon us, if we were in the same situation. It is in this way that the passages Matthew 19:18 and Romans 13:10 are to be taken. Now, conversely, the assertion of Christ quoted above, "Whatever you wish that men would do to you," etc., is to the other. For the earlier passage in Leviticus, when
it commands love, contains, by metalepsis, the services entailed by love, just as if they were streams flowing forth from love. In just the same way, the later passage tacitly summons us back to the fountainhead of love by way of the streams flowing from it, because it is from this fountainhead that the services must pour forth. Now, add to this the famous sentence stated in an antithetical fashion, "What you do not wish for yourself, do not do to another." Lampridius is a witness that this sentence was held in very high esteem by Alexander Severus.

PARALLEL XVIII

Matthew 8:4
Go, show yourself to the priest, etc.

This passage is clearer in the first chapter of Mark. On account of this, we are going to defer its exposition to the fifty-first parallel.

PARALLEL XIX

Isaiah 53
4. He bore our sicknesses himself and carried our pains.

Matthew 8. 17. He took our infirmities himself and bore our sicknesses.

The goal common to both passages is that Christ—even though he should seem, in appearance, to be very lowly and contemptible—should still be shown to be, in actuality, very powerful in both words and deeds. The main point is that the Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man in the unity of a person, exercised divine power for the sake of our salvation.
while he was walking about in the form of a servant, by graciously remov- 
ing from men the diseases and infirmities of mankind as well as 
their causes, and by taking these upon himself and making them his own 
in order to show that the fulfilment of the law and the prophets had been 
displayed in him. There are no other alterations than those made \textit{\textit{ἐκ}} 
\textit{συνωνύμου}.\textsuperscript{1} For Matthew expresses "sickness" by the term 
\textit{δασθένεια},\textsuperscript{2} "pains" by the term \textit{νόσοι};\textsuperscript{3} these all pertain to the same 
thing. Now the fact that the Jews hold that the prophet had someone else 
in mind, is impious and inept at the same time. Both the Aramaic paraphrast Jonathan and all the most learned men of the Jewish race have 
perceived this.\textsuperscript{4} They cannot produce any episode of history in which 
there exists even the least appearance of a fulfilment of those things 
which the prophet had predicted. Nor can they adduce any authority or, 
indeed, any rationale which is probable, on account of which they should 
transfer the words of Isaiah to someone else. Therefore, we shall pass 
over their nonsense and go on to other things.

\textbf{PARALLEL XX}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Hosea 6 & Matthew 9 \hline
6. I delight in kindness and \textit{not sacrifice}. & 13. I desire mercy and \textit{not sacrifice}. \\
\end{tabular}

The goal of this passage is that God should make clear his glory 
by an exposition of his mercy. The main point is that God is the Father 
of mercies and, accordingly, visits the wretched, on whom he has mercy,
rather than those who, ignorant of their wretchedness, imagine that they will perform enough of the righteousness discussed earlier. Christ takes this theme which was stated long before by the prophet and applies it to a special case, since the Pharisees were objecting to his familiar association with sinners. Therefore, Christ responds very appropriately, by means of αιτιολογία, with an argument drawn from the genus to the species, or the individual case and situation at hand, as was done in Matthew 12:7 as well.

**PARALLEL XXI**

Isaiah 35
5. Then the eyes of the blind shall open.

Malachi 3
23. Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, etc.

Matthew 11
5. The blind receive sight, etc.

Matthew 11
14. John is that Elijah who was to come.

As far as these passages are concerned, because they are explained more fully and more clearly elsewhere—the former, on the one hand, at Matthew 15:30, and the latter, on the other, at Matthew 17:10-11,—we are going to speak about their interpretation later at those places.

**PARALLEL XXII**

1 Samuel 21
6. Then David, answering the priest, said to him, etc.

Matthew 12
3. Have you not read what David did, when he was hungry, and those who were with him:
7. And so the priest gave him the holy bread, because there was no bread there but the bread of the presence, which was removed from before Jehovah in order to serve up hot bread on the day that it was taken away.  

Numbers 28
9. But on the day of the sabbath two unblemished lambs a year old, and two tenths of the finest wheat flour as an offering mixed with oil, with its drink-offering: 
10. Let this be the whole burnt-offering of the sabbath on its individual sabbath, besides the continual burnt-offering itself, etc.

Hosea 6
7. I delight in kindness and not sacrifice.  

The goal of these passages is that the mercy of God should be made clear and set up as an example for men, that they might learn to imitate it and to make judgements in accord with it. The main point is that the authority of the sacred usages which God instituted in his church is, to be sure, very great, and one ought not act rashly and forsake them for the will of men; but, nevertheless, these sacred usages were laid down and commanded by God in such a way as not to conflict with love for one's neighbor. For the external sacred usages ought to be observed by the faithful for the sake of the other thing, but love for one's neighbor for its own sake. That reason for which Christ was drawn into
this discussion proves this interpretation—namely, that the disciples of Christ began to pluck ears of grain on the day of the sabbath and, for this reason, incurred censure among the Pharisees as violators of the sabbath. Christ puts this censure to silence in two ways—by cases of precedent and by authority. Let this, then, be the argument of the Pharisees:

"The seventh day is a holy day, a sabbath of rest to Jehovah, Exodus 35:2. These men of yours do not observe a state of rest; and, therefore, they do not treat the seventh day as holy." Christ responds: "In the first place, as to the matters which God has sanctified by his institution—if either another institution of God or love for the neighbor demands that they be turned to other uses, they can be turned to such uses without offense. For God did not wish to restrict either love or his other ordinances and to stand in the way of human need with any ceremonial institution. But this is a matter of love, lest the opportunity for obtaining food and relieving their hunger be snatched away from the hungry. Therefore, these men are innocent of that accusation of yours."

He proves the two parts of the major proposition by means of individual cases of precedent, namely, that either by reason of an institution or by reason of need and the law of love, it is lawful to do what, aside from this cause, would not be lawful. The first precedent is one of need: "David, who was a man after the mind of God," says Christ, "did not hesitate, when he was hungry, to turn to his own use holy things which were supposed to be eaten by the priests alone and in the holy
place. Or if anyone pleads as an excuse (which is quite commonly said) that a sturdy weapon was the need by reason of which David came to that place, the priest Ahimelech, having consulted the Lord, did not hesitate to give him the holy loaves of bread which were supposed to be eaten in the holy place by the priests. Therefore, in accord with the authority of God and the precedent of the priest and David, even holy usages must yield to the need of one's neighbor. " That usage of the bread of the presence was this sort of thing, Leviticus 24:9. The second precedent was offered for the reason that the Pharisees could immediately have loudly protested that the case was one of a kind and atypical and, consequently, achieved nothing in the current argumentation. Furthermore, one must live in accord with laws, not cases. Christ attends to both objections with the clearest foresight, citing a precedent of legal right and not one of fact (as the former one was). And he argues in this way: One ceremonial institution yields to another according to a precept of the law. But mercy, love, and the need of one's neighbor are more important in the sight of God than sacrifice or sacred usage. Therefore, much more ought sacrifice and every ceremonial institution yield to mercy, need, and love toward one's neighbor. That one institution yields to another according to the law, he proves with these words, "Have you not read in the law that on the sabbath the priests in the temple profane the sabbath?" etc. It is just as if he were saying, "The rest on the sabbath was, to be sure, commanded by the law, but work was prescribed for the priests
on the sabbath. Therefore, rest was not commanded without any qualification, but in a certain definite manner. But if one gives up that rest for the sake of some other prescribed sacred usage, how much more proper is it to give it up for the sake of love and mercy? Thus, Christ likewise adduces in another place the law concerning circumcision, which must be performed on the day of the sabbath. And in this very chapter, in the immediately ensuing account, he resolves this whole question and checks the shameless mouths of the Pharisees by means of a comparison with something of less importance. For they permitted one to lay hold of and lift up a sheep which had fallen into a pit, to water an ass on the day of the sabbath, but they took it exceeding ill that a man was healed. The second method of confutation [which Christ uses here] is an argument from authority. This authority is twofold: the first deriving from the person of Christ, the second from the testimony of the prophet Hosea. Christ sets up a comparison from his own person in this way: The fact that on the sabbath the priests profane the sabbath is sanctified by the temple. But someone greater than the temple is here. Therefore, this one more than the temple will sanctify the deed of his disciples. We have already spoken about the passage from Hosea in the immediately preceding parallel.
Parallels XXIII

Isaiah 42
1. Behold my servant whom I hold up, my chosen, whom my soul accepts with favor; I shall put my Spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice to the nations.
2. He will not cry out or lift up a voice or make his voice heard out of doors.
3. A shaken reed he will not break, and even the smoldering wick he will not quench; he will bring justice to reality.
4. He will not cause it to smolder or shake, until he dispenses justice in the earth; and the lands will long for his teaching.

Matthew 12
18. Behold my servant whom I have taken up, my beloved in whom my soul finds pleasure; I shall put my Spirit upon him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations.
19. He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets.
20. A shaken reed he will not break, and the smoldering wick he will not quench, until he brings justice to victory.
21. And in his name will the nations hope.

These two passages (as they say) are from one diagram, or rather are completely one in goal and also in theme. The goal is that Christ--the chosen servant of God, the son of his compassion, in whom the soul of the Father finds pleasure--may be able to be definitely recognized in the church, not only from the substance of his gifts and ministry, but also from the latter's form and mode. The main point is that Jesus Christ our Lord so displayed before the eyes of the whole world that ministry of his and fulness of the Spirit which he had received from the Father, that he exhibited the utmost public humility in the utmost majesty. And he was concerned about all men, even the weakest, so that, having de-spoiled the powers, he might exult concerning the restored salvation of his people, whom he has gathered from the Jews and Gentiles. There-
fore, this whole passage can be comprised under three main points, the
first of which concerns the person, calling, gifts, and ministry of Christ,
verse 1; the second, the mode of the ministry, verses 2-3; the last,
finally, the goal or result of that ministry, verse 4. Moreover, this
passage is applied quite appropriately by Matthew to that prohibition of
Christ which it is said in verse 16 that he employed. Says Matthew, "He
healed them all and forbade them to make him known." But why? "So
that what had been spoken by Isaiah might be fulfilled," etc. The sense
is that what Isaiah predicted concerning the mode of Christ's ministry
as a sign, Christ actually did. Now Isaiah had predicted that this would
be the mode of his ministry: He would not act in a contentious manner
with anyone, but with the greatest humility, verse 2. Nor would he give
reason for offense to the weak who were about to come to the kingdom of
God. But rather he would remedy the present weakness of his people and
guard against future weakness with the greatest gentleness and sagacity,
verse 3. Christ, then, actually did this and did it, indeed, so conscien-
tiously that he preferred to instil gently into the minds of weak men the
dignity of his person, the majesty of his calling, the wide extent of his
kindnesses, and the truth of the salvation which he tenders to all. He
preferred to do this rather than let an occasion be given to the weak for
drawing back from his following—or to the adversaries for making an
attack on him—by virtue of untimely clamoring and praising of his name.
Or (to speak more concisely), having felt pity for human weakness, he
preferred to teach men gently from effects—that is, from his works—and to draw them to himself by the boundlessness of his kindesses, rather than let those who were about to arrive at his kingdom be offended and upset by the persecution of some and the praise of others in an untimely manner. And, indeed, this passage of Isaiah seems to me to pertain to a great many other passages which are found in the evangelists where Christ forbade either the devil or men to proclaim his name, speech, or act of kindness. But Matthew thought that it would be sufficient if he adduced the words of Isaiah at this passage alone, so that they might be applied by pious people to similar accounts.

At this point, however, two questions can be advanced—one concerning the alterations which are numerous here, the other concerning the interpretation of the matter itself. First, therefore, to speak about the alterations in order, no alteration is present in the first verse. For Matthew acts most suitably in translating the word for "holding up" with αἰσθανέω. For this word does not signify "choose" (as almost everyone has interpreted it), but rather (as Varinus explains) προσλαμβάνειν καὶ εἰς Εαυτὸν αἰσθάνειν, that is, to take and, indeed, to take up to one's self. The Hebrew authors called this same thing "to hold up" in countless passages, as, for example, Genesis 48:17, Exodus 17:12, Psalm 41:13 and 63:9 and elsewhere passim. In the second verse those words of the prophet, "He will not cry out," have been rendered by Matthew by use of metalepsis, "He will not wrangle," namely, by crying out, where-
as quarrelsome and importunate men are accustomed to strain the voice in the midst of wrangling. In the same way the effect is understood and expressed by the efficient cause when Matthew substituted, "no one will hear his voice," for that which the prophet had said, "He will not make his voice heard." Similarly, there is nothing in the way of an alteration in the third verse, if you make this exception, that Matthew joins together and shortens to fewer words the result or goal of the ministry of Christ, which the prophet took up at the end of this verse and explained in the following one. In at least this passage, a detailed exposition of the result was not very relevant, of course, to Matthew's intention and to the case which is being discussed. Since this is the way things are, no alteration occurs here which could justly, or with any appearance of justice, be censured. Moreover, as for having to confirm the interpretation, there is no reason why we should be anxious over this passage, since all the ancient interpreters among the Hebrews and other peoples saw that all these things had to be taken of Christ. For some vile men, to be sure, have interpreted it as concerning Jacob and others as concerning the church of the Jews. Nevertheless, the words of the prophet cry out, the ancient histories teach, and the result confirms quite obviously that no man has ever existed to whom these things could correctly be attributed other than Christ. But if they cannot be predicated of any other man, much less ought they be stated concerning the whole body of the church (the head of which is Christ). For these are acts, efficient causes,
and attributes characteristic of the head, but not of the body or of any particular member of the whole body.

PARALLEL XXIV

Jonah 1
17. But Jehovah had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah; and Jonah was in the belly of that fish three days and three nights.

Matthew 12
39. An evil and adulterous nation seeks for a sign; but no sign shall be given to it except the very sign of the prophet Jonah.
40. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so will the Son of Man be, etc.

Before we bring forwards our opinion concerning the right way of coupling these two passages together, we consider it necessary that certain definite points concerning types be dispatched in advance. When these things have been settled, we shall pass on to the individual exposition of this passage. No sane man is likely to doubt that there are types in the church of God and in sacred scripture. Now what types are, we have already described in the sixth parallel. For types are representations of things expressed in things, as allegories are representations expressed, as it were, in words. Now, there are two species of types—the general and the specific or exclusive. A general type is one which pertains to various things in common and can be applied to them. The Greeks called this, not only τύπος, but also ἔνδειγμα, παράδειγμα, ὑπόδειγμα, and ὑπογραμμός. Thus, Paul says, for instance, "Now these things were types for us, that we might not desire evil things,"
etc. Again, "Now all these things happened to them as types--as types, I say--but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages has come." And he likewise commands Timothy to "be a type for the believers in speech, in conduct, in love, in spirit," etc. And he orders Titus to show himself "in all respects a type of good deeds." In this sense Christ said that he had given us "a ὕπόδειγμα." And Peter said that Christ had "left us a ὑπογεγραμμένος." A specific or exclusive type, on the other hand, is one which has been constructed and designed to designate and express specifically and exclusively one definite person or action or something. For instance, the paschal lamb is a specific type of Christ and was designed as such. The bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a specific type of his body and blood broken and shed for us and, indeed, truly shared with us unto eternal life. And there are similar things. But, at any rate, the aforementioned attribute is common to all types--that they are πρὸς τί, and have to do with something else. For all types are composed of persons, things, or actions which are portraying something. But they have to do with the persons, things, or actions which are τυπωθέντα, that is, portrayed by the types.

It is characteristic, however, of the general type, which we described first, that it clearly shows that a line of argument is logically binding in a question of right and wrong. But in a question of an individual action, it does not prove an argument binding, but only contingent. For
in this sort of question, nothing is proven from a particular, but a principle of moral obligation is always and everywhere universally applicable to every special case. For example, this statement, "Be a type of good deeds," establishes a logical conclusion which is equally binding on all mortals, because the type is aetiological, that is, one dealing with right and wrong. But from the proposition, "The fathers lusted, were idolaters, committed fornication, tempted Christ," etc., this does not necessarily follow: Therefore, our people will lust, will be idolaters, etc. This conclusion, to the contrary, is only contingent. For if that were to be concluded, not according to contingency, but according to logical necessity, the apostle would not likely have said, "these things are types that we might not desire evil things," etc. Therefore, in the case of this class of type, what is aetiological proves something in a binding way; what is historical, only in a contingent way. It is characteristic of a specific and exclusive type, however, that it establishes a logically binding conclusion concerning the thing which it adumbrates in respect to history and aetiology alike--that is, just as much in a question of an action as in a question of moral obligation. For example, the statement, "not a bone of him shall be broken," which is adduced by John in the history of the sufferings of Christ, was, to be sure, stated by Moses and ordained by God concerning the type, which was, of course, the paschal lamb. But the latter is a specific and exclusive type of Christ; and this ordinance of God, among other things which were signi-
fied, indicated beforehand the history of Christ's sufferings. Consequently, this type in the law demonstrated conclusively and by logical necessity that the same thing that was done [to the lamb] was going to happen to Christ as well. And, accordingly, John does not interpret the law allegorically, but unfolds a type in the law and teaches that it was accomplished in Christ, who is its fulfilment. Similarly, what is predicated of Christ in Matthew 27:9, that his price was set at thirty pieces of money\(^\text{16}\) and these pieces were laid out to purchase the potter's field—Zechariah, to be sure, had done this typically by the command of God, but, by logical necessity, it had to be fulfilled in Christ. For it was a specific type of Christ and, accordingly, that which the Lord had adumbrated through Zechariah with a type was specifically brought to pass in Christ. Nor does it matter whether this type (whether you call it specific or specially designed) was commanded or given, had to be done, or was done. For, in either case, it is enough if the Lord used the thing which we say was commanded or done to prefigure some definite thing.\(^\text{17}\)

Now in the case of all types one must consider sagaciously and conscientiously what is characteristic of the type which is portraying something, what characteristic of the thing which is being portrayed. For any and every similitude agrees only in part, and not \(\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\),\(^\text{18}\) with that thing with which agreement exists. If this is so, it surely is not necessary that types correspond \(\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\) to the things portrayed by them, but only in part. For types are a class of similitude. There-
fore, whatever is characteristic of the thing which is portraying something else, must be set apart, in a way, so that only that respect in which it agrees with the thing portrayed may be connected, when good judgement has been exercised, with that thing. And similarly with whatever is characteristic of the thing portrayed—this must be removed in such a way that it may not be confused in the least with the type. In this way, that paschal lamb of the ancients was a lamb; ours is Christ, true God, true man—the former a type but the latter reality. And the fathers ate the former paschal lamb with the mouth (for it was the type) as we eat bread with the mouth, but both they and we have eaten Christ (for he is the Αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ) by means of faith. The same good judgement must be exercised in the remaining cases. That exalted comparison of Melchizedek with Christ, which the apostle constructs in the Letter to the Hebrews, very clearly proves what we have just said. In that comparison, unless you nicely distinguish what is characteristic of Melchizedek from that which is characteristic of Christ, you will fall into the most grave and dangerous errors. For if the properties of a figurative representation are confused with the properties of reality, what else is it than to make reality out of a figure and exchange reality for a figure in an ignorant manner—in short, to do away with both at the same time through their confusion?

Having put these things in this way, now let us see about this passage before us. The goal common to both passages, then, is that the
unbelief of faithless men should be cast in their teeth and scaled to them; and, because such men wantonly endeavor zealously to extinguish the shining light of the divine word, that their condemnation should be set before their eyes by means of a signal miracle of God. For it seemed good to God to do this, when God resolved to keep Jonah in the belly of a sea-monster for three days when he was fleeing in secret from the duty which had been commanded him. And it likewise seemed good to Christ to do this when he threw down to the scribes and Pharisees the future miracle of the resurrection. There was, to be sure, another goal relating to good men in the deliverance of Jonah and the resurrection of Christ, namely, that they might be for the good of believers. But this other goal in opposition to unbelievers was no less determined by the judgement of God, according as the wisdom of God knows how best to join together the several goals of the same matter. The main point, on the other hand, is that those for whom neither the word of God nor the signs added to the word can be useful for salvation due to their unbelief, but who, on the contrary, are further provoked by their own corruption to put God to the test and make sport of his ministry—such men will not, on account of this, be deprived of every sign. For it will come to pass that God will reproach them with signs of this kind, by which their obstinacy will be provoked further, convicted, and most justly condemned. It happened thus to the Israelites long ago, when Jonah was taken below out of their sight and buried, as it were, in the belly of the sea-monster for
three days and afterwards at last restored. Thus will Christ likewise deal with the Jews, when Christ will vex them with his resurrection and be a stone of offense.

At this point, however, the question is asked, to which class of type does the way in which these passages fit together pertain—the general type or the specific and specially designed type? If you propose that it pertains to the general type, the interpretation of Christ’s words is going to be as follows: "No sign shall be given to it, except that sign of the prophet Jonah," that is, a sign will be given similar to that which was put forth in the prophet Jonah. And, indeed, the sacred scriptures, secular authors, and the speech of the people have always made frequent use of this mode of expression. For thus we read that King Jehoiakim was destroyed by God on account of the sins of Manasseh—for what is, in effect, on account of such sins as Manasseh had done. Thus, the Jews are said to be the people of Sodom and their rulers the rulers of Gomorrah, and many similar things. Thus (to come to common and popular matters), we likewise use Tolosan gold or Dodonaean bronze for things which are similar in result to the Tolosan gold and Dodonaean bronze. Again, the power of Syloson, laws of Draco, a Thessalian meadow or coin, a Tuscan dispute—we use them all for things which are similar. The following verse, indeed, seems to confirm this interpretation, when it is said there,"For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so will the Son of Man be," etc. The
second interpretation is that here there is no simple comparison with a similar case or connection with a general type, but that a specific (as we have termed it) and exclusive type connected with the fate of Christ is being cited. I should not wish, to be sure, to repudiate as clearly foreign to this statement of Christ this interpretation which has been esteemed by most of the ancients and our people. But, in my opinion, the other is still to be preferred--first, because it is simpler and requires less labor to develop; secondly, because it seems to agree better with the words of Christ which occur in Matthew and Luke; lastly, because it seems to correspond more closely to his whole line of argument and goal. For Christ does not argue that he will rise again because Jonah, after a certain manner, rose again. Nor did he have as his purpose this goal, that he might demonstrate that he would rise again in order to fulfill the type which had preceded in Jonah. But rather the line of argument is as follows: God long ago cast the unbelief of the Israelites in their teeth and sealed it to them by means of the very important sign of Jonah. Now, indeed, God declares the same thing to the Jews in person as well—the message, of course, that those who put him to the test will, due to their faithlessness, be vanquished by a supernatural miracle and the severity of the judgement about to come from God and that they will all be condemned publicly unless they shortly come back to their senses. It was for this reason also that Christ followed up this whole statement by adducing thereafter, not exclusive types, but general examples of conduct,
namely, those of the Ninevites and the queen of Sheba. 31 This type, therefore, is not specific, in my opinion, but serves purely as an example, as Ambrose perceived before us. 32 Everything which Christ declared in the connected discourse to the Pharisees who are testing him, seems to show this. It would be superfluous, however, to undertake bringing together here in a parallel arrangement the ensuing passages about the Ninevites 33 and queen of Sheba, 34 since the passages are clear in words and thought, and plainly accord with the Old Testament history.

PARALLEL XXV

Isaiah 6
9. Hear by hearing, but do not understand; and see by seeing, and do not perceive.

Matthew 13
14. You shall hear with the sense of hearing and not understand; and seeing, you shall see and not perceive.

The goal common to both passages is that the righteousness of God in hardening and punishing those who have wantonly cast off all piety should be clearly disclosed. The main point, on the other hand, is that it has not been given to the faithless to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but that very remnant of light which they possess is so unsuitable for perceiving those mysteries that they cannot understand the things even when heard or perceive them even when laid open before their eyes, because of their dulness and blindness. The way, then, in which these passages fit together has been regarded as aetiological, or centering in a question of right and wrong, to this effect: It is within the realm of
God's righteousness to afflict the hearts, ears, and eyes so as to seal up, not to correct, the corruption of those whose hearts are fatten
ed, whose ears are heavy, and whose eyes are shrouded in darkness. "But," says Christ, "those with whom we are speaking at present are this sort of people. Therefore, it is necessary for them to be afflicted in this way." Christ confirms the first proposition in verse 14 on the basis of divine authorization in a similar case. "For God," he says, "dealt thus with the Jews through Isaiah long ago, and it is certainly altogether proper for us to imitate his righteousness in our own time also." The second proposition, or minor premise, on the other hand, Christ confirms in the fifteenth verse when he says, "For this people's heart has grown fat," etc. Thus, everything in this passage is quite obvious, if you make this exception, that Christ seems to have made some alterations and to have departed from Isaiah's words.

Nevertheless, there is only one kind of alteration, namely, that Isaiah stated these things in the imperative mood, because he was reproachfully addressing the people themselves with the words of the Lord God. Christ, on the other hand, is stating the same thought in the simple indicative mood, because he was speaking, not with the people, but with his apostles who were questioning him about this matter. And so, there is no alteration of the subject-matter but only of the mood, due to a regard for those persons with whom the conversation was being conducted. This alteration does not detract from the truthfulness of the word, but
exhibits the mode of application, as we explained in the fifth parallel.

And the concern of the ensuing verse seems to be the same as well, where the Lord, in fact, appropriates 1 Isaiah's words 2 and uses them when he is conversing with his apostles about the condition of the people of the Jews who were around at that time. But no one ought to imagine, for this reason, that the passage from Isaiah is expressly adduced in this verse, because Christ is speaking about the people who were in existence at that time and not about the people who had been in existence in the times of Isaiah long before. And so, verse 15 is not (so to speak) the adducing of an authority leading by logical necessity to a conclusion concerning an action or event. It is, contrariwise, only the skilful structuring of speech which had to be employed for this reason—that the truth of this whole line of argument might be more manifest. We deduce that this truth has been unfolded enough for our purposes in the above words.

PARALLEL XXVI

Psalm 78

2. I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter things which have been hidden from ancient times.

Matthew 13

35. I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been hidden since the foundations of the world were laid.

The goal is that the awesome wisdom of God should be exposed to the church in a style of teaching by which it instructs the good and forsakes more and more the evil and impious. The main point is that God not only uses literal and simple speech, but also most wisely employs
figurative and parabolic speech in his church, by which he fitly affects some in one way and others in another according to the purpose of his will—ffecting those who are good and tremble at his word, on the one hand, by informing them concerning their salvation; affecting the evil, on the other hand, by evincing from their blindness proof concerning their future destruction. The way in which the two occurrences of this sentence fit together does not seem the same to everyone. For, because there are two classes of types (as we said previously in the twenty-fourth parallel), a twofold interpretation of this passage has likewise sprung up. The first is that which sets up the author of Psalm 78 as a specific and exclusive type of Christ in singing this psalm. And, accordingly, it takes this passage historically, just as if you had said that the author of that psalm had uttered these words typically in so far as they concern himself, while Matthew now pointed out anagogically the historical reality of that type. The second way of fitting these passages together is not historical, but aetiological. It sets up a type, not in the person, but in the style of teaching; that is, it proposes that there is a similar and common comparison in the earlier utterance of the prophet and also in the later one of Christ, and that there is one and the same analogy of both teaching and mode of teaching in both places. The latter interpretation convinces us more—to this effect: "It is necessary," says Christ, "that I, who am the Word of God, should use the same method by which God the Father through his prophets has declared to the people in every age the mysteries of the
kingdom of heaven. But he used the parabolic method," etc. Now this
latter proposition is corroborated by the authority of scripture. So then,
we conclude that the figure of speech ought to be fixed not in the term
πληρωθή, but in the other term there, τὸ ἀνθήν, just as if you were
to say that something was being fulfilled by Christ which the prophet had
long before fulfilled in a similar case. That this figure or mode of speech
is very frequent we have previously shown in the twenty-fourth parallel.
There is only one alteration—that Christ has substituted "since the foun-
dations of the world were laid" for the earlier words, "from ancient times."
But no difficulty arises from this, since the one is an explanation of the
other.

More serious is the fact that someone could levy the objection
against this passage, "But the nature of the parables is not the same in
both passages. For the prophet relates actual events in this psalm and
Christ, fictional events, which are commonly termed μυθωδεῖς καὶ
ἀλληγορικαί." I respond: But, on the contrary, they do, in the first
place, have a common generic nature, or a common nature in so far as
they are subordinate to the same genus. For both true and fictional ex-
amples, that is, historical and fictional narratives are comprehended by
the genus of parables; just as theses, or general propositions, and contingent matters can also be referred to the same genus. Secondly, even its
goal shows quite clearly that the seventy-eighth psalm was not devoid of
even this class of parable, which has been stated in theses. Finally,
no one denies (if the man is at all sane) that even these very things which Christ here relates occur among mortals; since all these parabolic narratives—whether you call them historical accounts or fictional ones—have been drawn, not from concealed and unknown matters, but from especially public, well-known, and popular matters.

**PARALLEL XXVII**

**Exodus 20**

12. Honor your father and your mother.

**Exodus 21**

17. Whoever speaks evil of his father or mother, shall be punished by death.

**Matthew 15**

4. God commanded, saying, "Honor your father and mother."

Also, "Whoever speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die."

These two passages agree completely in words and thought with the precept of the law. But Christ is setting up a comparison of the teaching of the law with that of the Pharisees, as we stated above at the fifth chapter. Accordingly, we shall bring forward only that which seems to be necessary to the proof of this line of argument. The goal of this argument is that the consciences of the Pharisees should be evinced as perverted, in that they were solicitous for their own traditions and neglected the precepts of God, verse 3. The main point, on the other hand, is that Christ, by setting up a comparison, establishes both these parts of the one argument; he wanted other things to be understood from his example as well. It is a comparison of that divine precept concerning the showing of honor to parents (verse 4) with the Pharisaic dispensation (as they
commonly call it), that is, deliverance from the lawful duty of children toward their parents (verse 5). The commandment of God is adduced by Christ in two steps\(^2\)--one by which the duty toward parents is enjoined; a second by which the punishment for those who contravene this commandment is established. Christ declares that both these commandments are being overthrown by a single dogma of the Pharisees--first, because they taught that children had enough honor for their parents if they presented some gift to God in the church for the sake of their parents; secondly, because they said that the aforementioned gift was so meritorious that the parents received the benefit of it and the children, at the same time, were exempt and completely free in the future from bestowing further aid or honor on their parents.

To show more clearly that these things are so, we shall produce a grammatical exposition of the words.\(^3\) And so, in the first place, those words, δώρον ὅ εὖν ἡμοῦ, are, in fact, a very frequent tractatio\(^4\) (as Varro calls it),\(^5\) or substitution, in the sacred scriptures for what, in effect, is, "whatever gift there would have been from me." Next, in the term ἡμελεχθής, there is an ellipsis of the [preposition and] pronoun ἐν τούτῳ.\(^6\) It is as if you were to say, "You will be benefited by this gift," or "This gift will be beneficial to you." Finally, however, those words, καὶ οὖ μὴ τιμήσῃ,\(^7\) seem to have been spoken by use of a change in form\(^8\) to this effect: He who offers his gift to God and says that the reward for it is being turned over by him to his parents--
there is no reason why he should trouble himself any longer about showing other honor beyond this to his parents. And, accordingly, even if he honors them no longer, he is free both from the aforementioned precept of the law about honoring parents and also from the punishment which the law establishes for those who contravene this commandment. Mark confirms this interpretation in a very clear way when he relates that Christ used these words, "and then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother." The rest seems to be so clear that it has no need for any exposition by us.

PARALLEL XXVIII

Isaiah 29  
13. This people draw near with their mouths and honor me with their lips; but they remove their hearts far from me, and their reverence toward me has been taught by the precept of men.

Matthew 15  
8. When this people draw near to me, they honor me with their mouths and lips; but they remove their hearts far from me.

9. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.

The goal of both passages is that the impiety and faithlessness of the Jews should be convicted. The main point is that they have, indeed, the appearance of piety but altogether deny the reality of it, both internally in their minds and also externally in their teaching and practices, since they substitute the commandments of men for divine teaching. The way in which the two passages fit together is (as it seems to me, at least) historical, because Christ confirms his preceding statement, not only by
one example of teaching (about which we spoke in the preceding parallel), but also by the authority of the prophet—to this effect: "God, through his prophet, foretold this impiety and faithlessness concerning the whole people of the Jews. But you, hypocrites, are of the number of this people. Therefore, this prophecy was delivered concerning you." Thus, the line of argument is quite cogent, drawn from the whole with respect to the proper time (as they call it) to a part of it. But if any prefer that it be an argument from example, they are at liberty to do so as far as I am concerned. Nevertheless, the former interpretation seems to carry more weight and to suit Christ's intention better. There appear, to be sure, to be some alterations—as there will be, for example, in the first verse in Matthew if you take the verb ἀπέχειν in an intransitive sense. It seems that this verb can also be interpreted no less properly in a transitive sense, so as to correspond to the words of the prophet in the way that we have rendered them in the parallel diagrammatic arrangement. Furthermore, any words which appear to differ in the second verse are all synonyms, or διόσθενα, and Isaiah's words have been expressed more clearly in Matthew. On account of this, no one can justifiably be detained by these alterations, since some terms are explained by others which signify the same thing. The one addition is that of the little note, "in vain," which is not unreasonable or redundant, but an exegetical and exceedingly appropriate addition provided as an explanation of the matter which is being discussed. This is true whether you say that Christ added
it on his own authority because it is a reasonable addition and pertinent to the matter concerned, or whether you say that he summoned it from the similitude which precedes this passage in Isaiah. 5

**PARALLEL XXIX.**

_Isaiah 35_  
5. Then the eyes of the blind shall open, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.  
6. Then shall the lame man leap like a deer, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing.

_Matthew 15_  
30. Then a great crowd came to him, having with them the lame, the blind, the dumb, the maimed, and many others; they put them at the feet of Jesus and he healed them,  
31. so much so that the crowd wondered, etc.

The goal of both passages is that the kingdom of God should be recognized in Christ and extolled. The main point is that the said kingdom was recognized and richly extolled by all men, even the most unlearned, on the basis of its very obvious results and effects (these divine works foretold by Isaiah and fulfilled by Christ were of this nature). Therefore, this and other passages of Isaiah fit together very well with this account and similar ones. Only one thing could perhaps detain the pious. This is the fact that in such passages Isaiah seems to have spoken typically rather than historically; and, accordingly, these passages could not be coupled together in the strict sense if Isaiah intended something else. I respond that this consequent would, to be sure, be true if the antecedent were assumed as true and regarded as manifest and certain. However, passages of this kind ought not be taken typically rather than historically.
where their historical fulfilment is pointed out. But now, this is pointed out here and in a great many other passages. Therefore, they must be taken in this sense. Indeed, a reasonable mode of interpretation demonstrates that a historical rather than a typical interpretation must be employed wherever the reasonableness of either has been set forth. For a literal and simple interpretation is always preferable; nor ought one thoughtlessly fly over to a figurative interpretation, where there is room for the literal. Secondly, the design of the prophets in passages of this kind confirms the same thing. For although they use hyperboles, types, and allegories without distinction, yet they interpose simple historical accounts between them with a definite design—that the latter may serve as proofs of the former, because all the prophecies would be dubious, if they contained nothing except hyperboles, types, and allegories. Thirdly, the very manner in which typical prophecies operate evinces the fact that the prophecies in question are not typical. For those are, in fact, typical which are predicated either of God after the manner of men or of created things in some way other than in accord with their nature or the dispensation of grace or a rule of right and wrong. But those things which are predicated of the activity of God and Christ in created things according to this dispensation of grace—namely, those things which either have been fulfilled already or must be fulfilled continuously in Christ and through Christ—these things surely ought not to be taken typically. This is because they cannot be taken at all in this sense with-
out the most horrible insult to God and his Christ. But the present passage is one of this kind. Therefore, this and similar ones must be taken literally.

PARALLEL XXX

Matthew 16

4. An evil and adulterous nation seeks for a sign; but no sign shall be given to it except that sign of the prophet Jonah.

This passage has already been treated in the twenty-fourth parallel.

PARALLEL XXXI

Malachi 3

23. Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, etc. ¹

Matthew 17

11. Elijah surely will come first and restore all things;

12. But I tell you that Elijah has already come, etc.

Both passages have one goal, that the kingdom of Christ should be recognized from its forerunner ² or harbinger ³. The main point is that John the Baptist is the forerunner of Christ; by his ministry the pious among the people of God were prepared to perceive the renewal which was accomplished through Christ. There is a divergence only in that what Malachi was pointing out beforehand, Christ points out as having arrived. Nor does the fact that Elijah is mentioned in both passages stand against our analysis. For, to be sure, the name Elijah is not ascribed [to John] in these passages on account of an identity of person (as they say at school), that is, for the reason either that Elijah was living again
during that period or that the spirit of Elijah, in accord with the well-known Pythagorean μετεμψυχωσίς (which most of the Jews believe), passed into another human body, namely, that of John the Baptist. The name is ascribed, on the contrary, on account of the identity of spirit and strength of which the angel spoke in Luke 1:17. That is to say, John is called Elijah for the reason that he was equipped with equal gifts, calling, ministry, and labors, in order to recall to virtue times in an equal condition with equal power. It is on account of this that Christ uses these words in this passage, "Elijah surely was going to come first and restore all things; but I say to you," etc. And so, in this way, Christ shows that it was not [John's] fault that he had not performed those things which he had received in the way of commissions. It was, on the contrary, the unbelief of the Jews which stood in the way of his ministry, verse 12, just as long before the obstinacy of the Israelites hindered the ministry of Elijah from being as fruitful among them as it ought to have been.

PARALLEL XXXII

Deuteronomy 19
15. From the word of two witnesses or from the word of three witnesses the matter shall be sustained.

Matthew 18
16. Let every word stand sure in the mouth of two or three witnesses.

The passage is aetiological and, accordingly, describes a rule of moral obligation which is quite unchanging and always binding, a rule which ought always to occupy a place in private, public, civil, ecclesiastic-
tical—in short, all matters. For the nature of aetiology is always the same and consistent, as we stated in the sixth parallel.

PARALLEL XXXIII

Genesis 2
22. That rib which Jehovah God had taken from Adam he made into a woman and brought her to Adam.
24. Therefore a man will leave his father and his mother and cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.

Matthew 19
4. Have you not read that in the beginning the Maker made male and female,
5. and said, "Therefore a man shall leave father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they who had been two will become one flesh."

The goal of both passages is that the natural order of holy matrimony should be preserved uncorrupted and inviolate in the human race. The main point is that the law of human matrimony must not be sought from the decision of one spouse or of both; but that it is indisputable that the one and universal law of matrimony derives from the act of creation itself, from the precedent of our first parents, and, finally, from the holy institution of God. The result is that as long as they live, the one is and remains to the end flesh of the other. Consequently, fitting the two occurrences of this passage together is easy. For, in the first place, Christ adduces the act of creation in these words, "He who made from the beginning male and female," not, "He made males and females," that is, he made one man to be married to one woman. Next, indeed, he hints at the precedent of our first parents with this term, "therefore," just as if the author [of Genesis] had said, "because the woman came
into the hands of the man by virtue of God's institution and act, and was brought to the man by God himself." It is reasonable for this deed of God to possess the force of law among men, because its reasonableness did not stop with Adam and his wife, but laid their whole posterity and species under an equal obligation. As the last and, indeed, most powerful point, there is the institution of God, who not only established this law by means of the act of creation or of that singular marriage between Adam and his wife, but who also announced his universal institution for all posterity. He did this, of course, both so that marriages might be entered upon and so that the force of marriages might be preserved and respected even as the force of consanguinity and the binding power of things above [human control]. Nor does that question which is commonly urged stand in the way of this analysis: "Are these the words of God, or, rather, of Adam or, indeed, of Moses, who is writing down the account?" For whether you decide that they are from Adam or from Moses, they still are altogether from God, whose Spirit uttered these and other things through Adam and Moses. Or if you think that these are the words of God in an immediate sense (which cannot be deduced from the account of Moses), it is still certain that it was through Moses, with the Spirit of God as his guide, that these same words were recorded in the annals of history. On account of this, in this passage Christ relates simply that God the Maker said these words, in order to show the more fully their authority, regardless of the means which he was pleased, in the end, to use in
producing them.

PARALLEL XXXIV

Matthew 19
7. Why, then, did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce and to send her away? etc.

This passage has already been expounded at the fifteenth parallel, in the third section.

PARALLEL XXXV

Matthew 19
18. You shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness,
19. honor your father and mother, and you shall love your neighbor as yourself.

All these things were spoken by Christ by use of συναθροισμος, or the accumulation of diverse points, as if speaking in the presence of a man who was not uneducated. And if you pay attention to the substance of the matter, not to the mixed order of the accumulated points, they are in the closest agreement with the law. On account of this, we are going to pass over these things and go on to others.

PARALLEL XXXVI

Zechariah 9
9. Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! Shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem! Behold, your king comes to you, just and endowed with salvation, poor, and sitting

Matthew 21
8. Tell the daughter of Zion, Behold, your king comes to you, gentle, and sitting upon an ass and a colt, the offspring of an ass accustomed to the yoke. 2
upon an ass and a colt, the offspring of asses. 1

The goal in both places is to point out definite indications and distinguishing marks of Christ which were manifest in him close to that time when he was girding himself up to accomplish the redemption of mankind in the very near future. Now the main point is that at this time when Christ, our Saviour, was going to enter Jerusalem (to bring to completion the awesome task of our deliverance and to enter upon his kingdom when he had accomplished this deliverance), he was not going to come to his own with the greatest pomp and with the splendour displayed by men, but was going to offer himself with all his accoutrements as an example of gentleness before the eyes of all. That Zechariah predicted these things when they were in the future, Matthew relates and shows that they came about when the time was right for them. And, indeed, the words themselves which occur in this verse and also the whole context, preceding and ensuing, as well as the theme of that prophetic discourse [in which this verse appears] demonstrate very clearly that this was the intention of Zechariah and the design of God. For (to say a few words about the context) everything which occurs in that prophetic discourse in the ninth chapter and the two following, defines the coming of Christ to that most glorious kingdom which the Father gave to him. And it does this in such a way that it could not have been pictured more clearly at that time. Whether it was on account of the effects upon the adversaries in the first six verses of the ninth chapter, or whether it was on account of the de-
fence of the pious in verses 7 and 8 (no one may imagine that these two ought to be taken in a human fashion and fleshly manner), the prophet used the same literary device on which we commented in the seventh parallel on the passage from Jeremiah. 3 For suddenly, by means of an apostrophe to the church of God, Zechariah explains to the pious that there is no reason to think that those most powerful effects of Christ will be splendid in the eyes of the world and magnificent after the manner of the flesh, when Christ is about to come to his own and to exhibit the light of the gospel and the fulfilment of the gospel promises in himself. But, rather, they must form their judgement concerning the nature of the kingdom as a whole in this world and concerning its effects from the nature of the king when he is taking possession of the kingdom. Surely, the nature of a king cannot be learned better from any other time than from that time when he is about to go to battle for the first time and to set his kingdom in order by means of a distinguished victory (which he accomplished for us through his own blood by means of the cross). But Zechariah says that Christ will do this in such a way that at this inauguration of his reign, although it is very powerful, he will exhibit the most lowly and abject humility. For, in fact, the proof of his kingship and dominion would be in the fact that he would be riding upon an ass when entering the city of the great king, as Jerusalem is called in the scriptures. 4 This was a practice which those judges of ancient times observed in those holy and unspoilt times. But this proof from humility would be present in every respect,
because neither in himself, nor in his retinue, nor in his actions or
words would he display any of the pride of kingly majesty and the glory
of this world. Contrariwise, he would perform everything in as humble
a way as possible. When the prophet has said these things by way of anti-
cipation, there follows an ἀνάβασις, or return to the discourse which
was undertaken concerning the effects of Christ on his church, verse 10
and following. In this ἀνάβασις the prophet, by means of exceedingly
graceful types, proclaims this one thing, that the church, when her ene-
mies have been vanquished and her defence assured by Christ, will, by
the kindness of Christ, possess and abide in perfect peace. But what
need is there to speak about the theme? After all, ever since the time
that they were uttered, those three chapters always tendered the most
excellent consolation and the hope of the kingdom of Christ to the ancient
church of the Jews and, on the other hand, have always tendered to our
church the most definite and manifold proof concerning the fulfilment of
the promises of God in Christ.

Since this is the way things are, it only remains that we should
conclude with Matthew what the authority of the Holy Spirit decrees and
the truth of the matter teaches, that these words have been adduced quite
appropriately by Matthew and could not be referred to anyone else with-
out the gravest blasphemy against God and his Christ. Moreover, the
fact that certain alterations occur can detain no one with good intentions,
because it was not Matthew's design to set forth the individual words of
Zechariah as if they were of equal weight. On the contrary, it was only to point out the matter with his finger and to lead the pious from these streams, as it were, to the fountainhead of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, let us see what, pray, these alterations may be. In the first place, those words of Zechariah, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion," are omitted, because these were particularly relevant to the consolation of the ancient church, but not to Matthew's present purpose. It was, however, by use of synecdoche that, in place of those words, "Shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem," Matthew substitutes, "Tell the daughter of Zion," that is, the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Both modes of expression lead to the same thing. For when people shout or cry out in speaking, some tell others and noise their words abroad—which is just what Matthew understood by those words of his. For it is the daughter of Zion that he orders to tell the daughter of Zion, that is, some to cry out the news to others. As to the fact that Matthew does not mention the adjectival phrase, "just and endowed with salvation," it is not done for the reason that that phrase ought to be expunged from the words of Zechariah, but because it does not pertain to the present theme. Here it was enough to describe the signs of the coming king and (as we said previously) point with a finger, as it were, to the more complete place. It is not unusual that the substantive "poor man" is translated by the noun παϊδες and the same man said to be "gentle," because "gentle" and "poor" in the Hebrew authors are derivatives which are branches from the same trunk, or cognate
terms. Then too, it is nothing unusual because that poverty of our king is nothing other than the voluntary gentleness and humility of him who made himself poor to make us rich. Finally, as to the fact that Matthew translates those words of the prophet, "sitting upon an ass and a colt, the offspring of asses" (in which the latter phrase is explanatory of the former), with "upon an ass and a colt, the offspring of an ass accustomed to the yoke"--this explanation of this Hebraism is the most appropriate one possible. For the Hebrew writers call a suckling young bullock or bull-calf the offspring of a herd; a little kid, the offspring of goats; a lamb, the offspring of a flock. The reason is that, even though a calf, kid, lamb are the issue of only one cow, goat, or sheep, they live in the herd or flock although they suck milk from one only. Now this ass which is clinging to its mother's side and sucking milk from her is called the offspring of asses because two yoked asses were used in the field and the ass-colt was following one of these two, namely, the one giving milk.

Therefore, the gospel-writer expressed that phrase, "the offspring of asses," very well, since he was saying that it was the offspring of an ass accustomed to the yoke, that is, joined together with another by a yoke.

PARALLEL XXXVII

Psalm 118
25. I beseech you, O Jehovah, save now; I beseech you, O Jehovah, be propitious now.
26. Blessed is he who comes

Matthew 21
9. And the crowd shouted, saying, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna to you who are in the
in the name of Jehovah. highest,"

In view of the shadows which were so numerous in the ancient church and in view of the blindness which was so great in those times in which Christ came, it is credible, to be sure, that there were not very many about who properly understood that most exquisite psalm from which these words have been taken. Nevertheless, we have very little doubt that the Spirit of God directed this remarkable action very wisely. He incited the minds of the more learned of the pious to lead the less educated in repeating the words of this auspicious acclamation. He also inflamed the ardent zeal of the uneducated to follow those who were leading the way in this holy acclamation, even though they plainly did not understand the mystery of it. So then, the one and the same Spirit was the author of that ancient song and of this acclamation. Therefore, we conclude as certain that what had been uttered long before—the same thing was fulfilled on this very occasion when Christ was entering Jerusalem and was recognized, received, and extolled by the minds, hearts, and speech of that pious crowd. And, for this reason, we conclude that there is a goal common to both passages and that there is a common theme; if you make this exception, that the former prophecy spoke about an event which was to come, the latter pointed out one which was contemporaneous. Consequently, the goal is that the rightful king of the church should be received and extolled with pious acclamations and expressions of joy when he was coming to his own and about to enter upon
the administration of his kingdom through death on the cross. The main point is that Jesus Christ, the Son of David and the rightful king among the people of God, comes to his church according to his promise and in the name of Jehovah, or (to explain the matter more clearly) furnished with his authority, commission, and power. And, for this reason, all the pious members of the church stand in the presence of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is in heaven, with prayers that he may accomplish the salvation of his church and deliver it, according to the promise, into the hands of Jesus Christ, so that he may share it with each of the chosen members of the church in accord with the eternal good pleasure of his will.

Let us demonstrate in a few words that all these things are embraced in this way by the statement in question: The person of Christ is designated by these words, "the Son of David"; his coming in accord with the design of God the Father, by these, "who comes in the name of the Lord"; the goal of this coming, by that refrain, "Hosanna," that is, "Save now"; the author of this salvation, God, by this addition, "O, you who are in the highest heavens"; the acclamation of the whole church, finally, when it is said, "Blessed," etc. And, indeed, all these things are also clearly expressed in the psalm from which these things were taken; and, for this reason, they cannot be rightly applied to any other event. But, nevertheless, because the interpretation of that passage varies, we shall declare our view after we have first compared others which admittedly seem to be
more probable. There are, then, three interpretations of this passage which appears in the one hundred and eighteenth psalm. The first is that of the Jews, who contend without qualification that these words of the prophet ought to be taken of David. But the very nature of the passage, which we shall develop by means of a paraphrase a little later, overturns this interpretation. The second is that of our own people, who think that this whole passage ought to be interpreted according to the relation of a type and the real object adumbrated by the type. Far be it from us to condemn or repudiate this interpretation, pious, as it is, and unanimously accepted by pious people. For it can, indeed, abide in its place and be employed for the edification of the church, but always providing that the peculiar qualities of the type and its object are preserved in both parts of the relation. But yet I am inclined to think that the third interpretation ought to be recommended even more and held up against the adversaries of the truth of the gospel, so that their obstinacy might be convicted. Now this is the third interpretation: Those words of David are not predicated anagogically of Christ in this passage, but are merely ascribed to him historically and directly, according as they were predicted about Christ by David directly and without any manner of type. That is (to state it in few words), in the psalm a prophetic account was set down by David (for I esteem him the author), but here in Matthew a δεινηματική, or narrative, account of the fulfilment of those events which David had predicted.
However, to come to understand this better, it must be borne in mind that there are four parts to the psalm in question. The first is a proposition which takes the form of praise in the first four verses. The second is the narration of a particular argument leading to the proposed praise from the prophet's continual experience (up to the fourteenth verse), and not from his only, but also from that of the whole church and company of the pious (thereafter up to the nineteenth verse). The third part is a description, thereafter up to the twenty-eighth verse, of the cause due to which that most praiseworthy salvation reaches the individual members and whole body of the church. The fourth part, finally, is a conclusion in the last two verses which takes the form of praise, corresponding to the beginning. Now when the prophet hastens from the second part to the third, he very eloquently combines the prayer of the members of the church and of the church as a whole, so as to come to a discussion of causes. Says the pious man, "Open to me the gates of righteousness; I shall enter through them and praise Jah." To this petition is appended the response to it, just as if the church as a mother were instructing each of her sons about the causes of his salvation. Do you ask, says the church, about gates? "This is that gate of Jehovah through which the righteous shall enter"—Christ, of course, who is the way, the truth, and the life. When this entrance-way has been exposed, the pious give thanks by saying, "I praise you," etc. It is just as if they were saying, "When we behold this entrance-way which God has laid
open to us, by which he testifies to us that he will henceforth hearken
to us and present us with salvation; we cannot but extoll his marvellous
beneficence." This is especially true since we observe that everything
has been given and offered by God to mankind, even though none of that
race was thinking even in his sleep. For what sort of gate is this, I be-
seech you? "It is the stone which the builders rejected; it has become
the ἄξονα, forming the door-post of the building and the door-
way as well. 7 It is, in short, the stone and support of the building and,
at the same time, the entrance into the building. It is altogether neces-
sary that we should confess that this was something done by Jehovah and
not something which proceeds from any mere man, since it surpasses the
power of the mind's comprehension--how much more the skill of man?
How long, then, did he take to do this? Jehovah did this in a day, not
by prolonged labor and skill. 9 Therefore, it is reasonable for us to set
forth our joy and gladness in him alone and, glorying with an unwaver-
ing faith in our deliverance, to cry out at this entrance, "I beseech you,
O Jehovah, save now," etc., 10 that is, give full salvation to the members
of your church and prosper the way of your Christ. Him we all receive
with this auspicious acclamation, "Blessed is he who comes in the name
of the Lord," 11 and not blessed only in himself or (as they say) in his
person, but pouring out divine blessing through the voice of the gospel
into those who believe his word. It is he who says, "We bless you from
the house of Jehovah," 12 that is, from heaven or from the highest places,
So then, David rises from the individual and collective effects on the church to praise of their efficient cause in this third part of this psalm and describes it in all aspects and with such precision that not only the apostles, but others as well discerned this description, due to its reliable fidelity, in the contemporaneous coming of Christ and, by virtue of a holy obligation, proclaimed it. Therefore, we conclude without reservation that this interpretation ought to be upheld by us. This is true whether we turn our attention to the psalm itself in which everything flows very easily if this interpretation is maintained; or whether we turn our attention to this application of the apostles and disciples of Christ and also of the Jews themselves, which the Spirit of God prescribed to the faithful when Christ was entering Jerusalem. We realize, to be sure, as we said previously, that the Jews take the psalm as treating of David, but there is scarcely any verse in the whole of that third part to which they do not do violence, mutilating the words and twisting the thought in a most shameful fashion. We likewise realize that a typical interpretation is brought forwards. But, having carefully weighed such things as we have previously stated, we conclude, with everyone's good leave, that a historical narrative which is simpler and seems to savor more of something prophetic must be preferred to a typical and obscure narrative. Yet I should certainly by no means deny that, when the ark of God was being carried into Jerusalem, an opportunity presented itself to David to trans-
cend in faith, by the power of the Spirit of God, from the type to a de-
scription of the real object itself—and this psalm was given to the church
in this manner already at that time, so that each man might be recalled
to the contemplation of the real object. But as to that which was happen-
ing in the form of a shadow, I think that David publicly spoke concerning
its real object and directed his attention in a literal sense to this day of
our Lord and Saviour, and so he makes known this prophetic account con-
cerning it in the church of God. We have a reliable exposition of this ac-
count in the gospel. There is, strictly speaking, no change, if you make
this exception, that the Hebrew and original form of the word ["Hosan-
na"] was recited by the people in a corrupted form. 13 Nor are all the
words of the psalm set out in the auspicious acclamation, but only those
which were in use with the people, and those of which the pious had al-
ready made frequent mention for a long time, so that they imbued even
their children with set formulas from the prophets which were understood
of the Messiah's coming by the common agreement of all.

PARALLEL XXXVIII.

Isaiah 56
7. My house shall be called
a house of prayer for all peo-
ples.

Jeremiah 7
11. Or does this house appear
to be a den of house-breakers,
etc.?

Matthew 21
13. It is written, "My house shall
be called a house of prayer," but you
have made it a den of robbers.
The goal of these passages is that the sanctity of the Lord's house should be protected and defended from every human stain. The main point is that God, as far back as human memory extends, has declared his church to be holy and has desired that all those who have a hand in it should devote themselves to its sanctification with word and prayers; and, consequently, all those who misuse the house of God for other purposes are robbers, house-breakers, and perpetrators of sacrilege, despisers of divine law. Now there are two passages which Christ combines. The former is aetiological; the latter historical, but still having aetiology or a question of moral obligation interwoven with it. Now the norm of aetiology is unchanging and universal, as we said previously in the sixth parallel. Accordingly, the application of the former passage is correct and effects a conclusion which is logically binding. The latter passage is, as it were, the assumptio, or minor premise, in this manner: "He who does not use the house of God for a house of prayer comes to this, that he makes it a den of robbers. Now you are not using it in this way, but are indiscriminately allowing and employing in it venders, purchasers, money-changers—pedlars, in short, of every variety. Therefore, you make it a den of robbers and overthrow the commandment of God with your tradition." So then, this passage contains a part which is of the nature of aetiology and a part of the nature of history. That minor premise is of the nature of a question of history, or concerning an action; the Jews are not using the house of God as God has commanded: And so Christ reproached and set this part right through
an action, when he threw those pedlars out of the temple, in the immediately preceding verse in Matthew. For in this way he brought his proof forward from the matter at hand. But the proof for the other part of the question was summoned from the authority of Jeremiah and the case of the Jews who had lived in his era. For Christ speaks in this way: "Jeremiah reproached the Jews thus when they were misusing thus the house of God. Therefore, you incur the same reproach. For it is just as proper for these times to be reproached by me now for their abuse as for those times long ago to be reproached by the aforesaid prophet."

PARALLEL XXXIX

Psalm 8
3. Out of the mouths of infants and sucklings, you have set down well-founded praise.¹

Matthew 21
16. Out of the mouths of infants and sucklings, you have perfected praise.

The goal of both passages is that we should be taught by what instruments it is that God makes his glory manifest. The main point is that the name of God is so wonderful that even by means of the mouths of infants and sucklings— that is, through the least important things and those which seem least fitted to this purpose— he displays proofs of his glory from the time of their birth. Or, indeed, there is nothing so small and humble among things created that it does not relate the glory of God and serve as an instrument of that declaration of praise. So then, there is a two-fold line of argument present here. The first is one from the
universal whole (as the logicians say): "All things, even the most insignificant, declare the praise of God and, therefore, these people must be instruments of this declaration of praise." The second line of argument is one from a comparison with something less important: "If infants and sucklings praise, what is the right thing for these to do?" There do seem to be some changes in the words in two ways. For, first, that Hebrew word which signifies "to found" is expounded as καταρτίζειν. Then, too, the noun for "strength," as it is commonly rendered by interpreters, is said in this passage to be ἀρετής. The former alteration is exegetical. For the word, "to found," is explained by metalepsis as that which is, in effect, to establish very firmly something very well-grounded and well-constituted (just as foundations are made). And, in fact, this is what is denoted by the Greek term καταρτίζειν in the strict sense. For everything which has a perfect and complete nature, without any defect, was called ἀρετής, in the strict sense, by the Greek authors. From this practice Herodotus, in regard to speech, likewise uses the term ἀπαρτιλογία for ὁ ἐπαριθμητικός ἢ ἴμμοιμένος λόγος. Now as to the fact that the other term is rendered in a different way than commonly, it was done with the best justification. For although the Hebrew noun which the psalmist uses literally signifies "strength," there is still no doubt that, according to the nature of the passages (a fact which the multitude of grammarians seek to avoid in some other way), the same term signifies, by metonymy, "strong, that
is, very forceful, praise." That this exegesis ought to be assigned to this passage, not only does Christ show, but also other additional passages altogether demand it in which a noun for "glory" or "praise" is connected—for example, in Exodus 15:2, "Jah is my strength and my song"; also in Psalm 29:1, "Ascribe to Jehovah glory and strength"; and also in Psalms 96:7 and 118:14 and other places. Since this is the way things are, these alterations ought not to be troublesome to anyone with good intentions, since they lead more to a right understanding of this and other similar passages.

PARALLEL XL

Psalm 118
22. The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner,
23. This was made by Jehovah; it is marvellous in our eyes.

Matthew 21
42. That stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. This was made by Jehovah, and it is marvellous in our eyes.

The goal of both passages is that the pious should learn to take counsel from God about the building of the church and not depend upon the authority of men; but that, since the building up of the church is marvellous, and, indeed, marvellous in the highest degree, they should esteem and revere in this subject the authority, work, and effects of God alone. The main point is that Jesus Christ, who was made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption for us by God the Father, is the foundation of his church. And, indeed, this foundation was rejected by
those to whom the building up of his church had been committed by God. But, for that reason, God's work is more marvellous, since, with saving grace, he applied his healing hand, as it were, to everyone—even the overseers of the building, who were either resisting or sleeping—that this foundation might be laid. The church built upon this foundation has been so firmly founded that not even the gates of hell can prevail against her. It is, consequently, a very good and correct application of this passage when Christ teaches that this stone, this corner, this marvellous object of divine work pertains to himself alone, as the Son of God and the heir of everything. We showed above in the thirty-seventh parallel that the relevant part of Psalm 118 must be taken in this sense. And the ancient church of the Jews as well recognized this so definitely and commonly that even the chiefs of the priests and the elders did not dare to mutter against the production of this evidence in order to overthrow this interpretation and application. Now this passage (to speak cursorily) is an argument from authority, which Christ adduced for this reason, that the _assumptio_, or minor premise (as they call it), of this whole argument had to be corroborated, so as to scourge severely the stiff-necked Jews. For the major premise to this argument was laid down in the preceding parable: "The laborers who afflict the servants and the son and heir of everything himself with every injury and even with death will, by your own admission, O priests, perish miserably, and God will let out his vineyard to others." On this proposition, which is freely admitted,
the second follows in this way: "But you are those labourers, murderers, and traitors." The previously stated pronouncement of the Holy Spirit corroborates this proposition. And so at this point the conclusion arises in the following verse: "Therefore, I tell you, the kingdom of God will be taken away from you," etc. There plainly is no alteration if one considers the matter more closely.

There is one thing which could perhaps detain the reader, namely, that those words of the prophet which are contained in verse 23 are commonly set forth in the neuter gender. This, however (may I be permitted to say this by everyone's good leave), does not sufficiently agree with the words of the prophet and of Christ. For in both places the demonstrative pronoun is of the feminine gender. Now since the noun for "stone" is feminine in the Hebrew writers, the demonstrative could, to be sure, be applied to that, if the most holy interpretation of Christ or, certainly, of Matthew did not stand in the way when he utters άδος, in the masculine gender. Next, since κεφαλή is feminine in the Greek authors, the demonstrative would also appear to refer to this, if it had not been stated in the masculine gender in the Hebrew authors. It only remains for us to conclude, therefore, that this demonstrative has reference to the most closely preceding noun, "corner" (which is feminine in Hebrew and Greek). For I do not recall observing that the demonstrative ἢτθα has been described in the Greek writers in the neuter gender. It is surely the most proper thing of all and the most consistent with this allegory to refer the pronoun to "corner." For God the Father is compared with a
builder; the priests of the Jews with the labourers who are building; Christ with the ἄκρογωνιστός¹² rock; the beginning of the church with the corner (for its beginning was already being built in Christ at that time). And Christ is said to unite two peoples in this corner, as the apostle very correctly interprets it in Ephesians 2:20 and following. ¹³

PARALLEL XLI

Deuteronomy 25

5. If brothers dwell together and one of them dies who has no son, the wife of the dead shall not be married outside the family to a stranger. Her husband's brother shall come together with her and, taking her as his wife, perform the duty of a husband's brother to her.

6. Now the first son whom she bears shall succeed to the name of the dead man, etc.

Matthew 22

24. Moses said, "If a man dies, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife according to the law of relationship by marriage, and he shall raise up children for his brother."

The Sadducees did not excite any controversy concerning the understanding of this law, nor does Christ retort in any way to this part of their special case. ¹ Now Christ, without doubt, would not have kept it a secret if they had been assailing the theme and truth of the law. Consequently, we do not think that we need to exert ourselves in this passage to demonstrate the agreement of parts which agree in contents. The Sadducees, to be sure, had a different goal. They wove from this special case a new question which they might thrust upon Christ, but a convenient
point for speaking about this question will come in the following parallel.

One thing must be said in passing, that even this single passage itself suffices to confirm, among all men with good intentions, those things which we taught above in the fifth parallel about the laws of alterations. For here the content is the same, but is recounted in different and abridged language. We are given full assurance by the silence of Christ that there is no offence in this alteration of language when it is not separated in the least way from the design of the Holy Spirit.

PARALLEL XLII

Exodus 3
6. I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

Matthew 22
32. I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.

The goal of both passages is that we should be taught the faithfulness of God, that is, his constancy and perpetual truthfulness in regard to his covenant and the promises of his covenant. The main point is that God, in accord with the covenant by which he has bound the church and each of her members to himself, never acts in such a way that that most holy covenant falls into disuse in respect to the church or any of her members. On the contrary, by his almighty power, he preserves the covenant in respect to those to whom he is bound by it; and those to whom he is bound by it he preserves because of his covenant. At this point, however, (to say something about the argument itself) one must first consider what
the Sadducees were teaching and what they were seeking to obtain. ¹

Next, one must consider what was Christ's line of argument in confuting them. There were three errors which the Sadducees were teaching in this matter. The first was that there are no spirits, that is, no spiritual substances. And, consequently, they concluded that human souls are (to speak in company with the scholastics) descriptive,² or just powers and faculties inhering in the body as something subject to them. The second error was that a dead man no longer exists, because they thought that, since his body has been destroyed, his substance is reduced to the elements which compose it and comes together no more. The third error, as Luke testifies in Acts 23:8, was that it definitely follows from these facts that there is going to be no resurrection. And so it is in this sense that the word for dying which they used in their statement must be understood—as what is, in effect, "to cease being at all."³ From these principles these men were seeking to ridicule publicly the doctrine of the resurrection by means of the ridiculous special case⁴ which they threw up against Christ by saying, "In the resurrection to which of the seven will she be wife?" etc.⁵ But Christ confutes their ridiculous special case very wisely when he says, "You are wrong," etc.⁶ And he shows that their special case sins in two ways—first, on the one hand, against the authority of scripture; next, on the other, against the omnipotence of God. These two things are demonstrated ὡς τερενον πρότερον⁷ by Christ in the following verses. For he demonstrates in the thirtieth...
verse that the omnipotence of God is assailed by their dogma, and in
the following ones that the authority of scripture is likewise assailed. 8

Now Christ overturns those three errors which we previously
enumerated with this single passage of scripture. 9 And he proves that
spirits exist; that men, even though they are dead, still exist; and that
they will rise again. He does this with an argument drawn from the ef-
cient cause, on the authority of scripture—and, indeed, of that very
scripture, the authority of which not even the Sadducees called into doubt.
For they approved the books of Moses; the others they impiously struck
out of the Old Testament. This is the true and only reason why Christ
summoned his authority for confuting these men from Moses rather than
from other prophets. The line of argument, therefore, is as follows:
God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. But he is the God of Abra-
ham, Isaac, and Jacob. Therefore, they exist. But the resurrection does
not appear to have been proved as yet by these words. However, the re-
futation of the two errors which we enumerated first is proved. Yet it
definitely follows, after those two errors have been refuted, that there
will be a resurrection, namely, by an argument drawn from the whole to
its principal parts. For (to please the multitude of dialecticians) when the
whole has been laid down as true, its principal parts must also be laid
down as true. Therefore, when this has been laid down as true, that God
is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, it necessarily follows that God
is their God according to the soul and according to the body, since these
are the two principal parts of these, as of all other, men. But if a Sadducee should object, "Yet the body has already ceased to exist,"

Christ furnishes a rebuttal when he says, "You do not know the power of God." That is, the body of the pious man exists by the power of God by virtue of his covenant, promise, and truthfulness, even if it does not exist in human appearance. To prove this fact, proof need be drawn from no other source than from that same line of argument from the whole to the principal parts which we were just stating in regard to the man as a whole. For not only the principal parts, but, indeed, each and every part, even the most minute, is so exposed to the Lord's view that he unites them with one another and unites them all to the living spirit, so that the whole man, restored in accord with God's covenant, may live forever in Christ.

PARALLEL XIII

Deuteronomy 6
5. You shall love Jehovah your God with all your heart, and with all your mind, and with all your might.

Matthew 22
37. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your thinking.

Leviticus 19
18. You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

38. You shall love your neighbor as yourself. 

Everything agrees if you make one exception, that Matthew has substituted these words, "with all your thinking," for the earlier ones, "with all your might." But here I take "thinking" in the general sense
as all internal action taking place in either of those subjects of such action, that is, in our hearts and in our souls. The source of this action or energy is that δύναμις² or ἕχωνς³ which is added in the other evangelists.⁴ Thus the antecedent is understood from its consequent, and, indeed, the same service to be rendered is stated more fully by means of the nature of that might which God has commanded to be employed in both kinds of love.

PARALLEL XLIV

Psalm 110
1. Jehovah said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies a footstool for your feet."

Matthew 22
44. The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies a footstool for your feet."

David's goal was the design to foretell the kingdom of Christ and to describe his person and functions. Not only does the authority of Christ prove this, but also the [conduct] --partly an acknowledgement and partly silence--to which the Pharisees resorted in response to this question which Christ had brought up.¹ Everyone is agreed about the agreement of these passages, and there is no dispute about the interpretation. We shall, therefore, hasten on to other passages.

PARALLEL XLV

Daniel 9
27. Through a desolating wing

Matthew 24
15. So when you see that devasta-
of abominations, and one which desolates, indeed, all the way to the finish—and that, an abrupt finish—it will be poured out to desolation.

The goal intended by the prophet Daniel in that remarkable narrative was this, that the church might be informed concerning the severity of the judgements of God which, because of the utmost impiety of the Jews, after Christ's death, were going to come upon them and their chief city particularly. And the goal was further that, with confidence in them, they should patiently endure the calamities and recognize in their occurrence the truth of God. The main point, on the other hand, was that not so long after the Jews crucified Christ, God would inflict the severest punishments upon them. And, for this reason, he would cause a powerful army (which he calls a wing, in accord with the usage of the Hebrew writers and the military term)\(^1\) to invade Judaea. The nature of this army would be such that it would be abominable and would be enslaved to abomination and idolatry, also that it would truly desolate and destroy those regions on which it would rush. Finally, he would engender in this army such resolution of mind and such determination that it would by no means take a step from its place until, as if by a torrential inundation and flood, it turned everything upside down and brought about an abrupt finish. Now from all these things Christ singles out only that little part which pertains to the description of the judgements, according as it is set forth in the six following verses.\(^2\) But he concisely applies to these judgements that sign
which the prophet Daniel had long before expressed in those words which
we laid out in the diagram for the present parallel. Christ does this in
order to announce to all the Jews that they would possess the sign of the
overthrow and downfall of Jerusalem when a complete army first pre-
pared itself for the siege of the city. For the whole army of faithless
men which was prepared for the destruction and desolation of the people
of God is called by that name which our supreme prophet Christ has here
retained, τὸ βῆλενυμα τῆς ἔρημωσεως, that is, literally, "the abomination
of desolation." It is called, on the one hand, an abomination on account
of its nature and constitution, because the whole army was raised from
abominable and faithless men. It is called a thing, on the other hand, of
desolation from its effect, because it was going to bring terrible desola-
tion to the place into which it forced its way. For the prophet explains
the same thing in this way in regard to a different episode of history too,
namely, concerning the kings of Syria, chapter 11:31 and 12:11. And
Luke expressly interprets it thus in these words, "But when you see Jeru-
salem surrounded by armies," etc. Christ definitely sets it forth in this
way: The first army which will "stand" (that is, come to a halt for the
sake of a siege) in the holy place, that is, in a circle around Jerusalem,
or at Jerusalem (for God had long before chosen and sanctified this place
by his promise, ordinance, and presence)—that army will be a sure sign
concerning the overthrow of Jerusalem, the demolition of the temple (of
which Christ had spoken previously in the second verse of this chapter),
and the crushing of the Jewish people. So then, fitting the one passage together with the other is very easy. For Christ prophesied shortly beforehand the fulfilment of the same event of which Daniel had set forth a prophetic narrative. And Christ pointed out its appointed time with his finger, as it were, so that the good might be previously warned and the evil vanquished.

We are not unaware that this passage is commonly explained differently. Some want it to be referred to certain images which were erected in the temple in the times of Nero and Caligula; others, to the perversion of sacred doctrine in the church of the Jews. But those who prefer the former interpretation are prompted especially by the fact that Christ announces that this abomination would be in the holy place. But these people are deceived in no small measure who imagine that "the holy place" must be taken in this sense. For, truly, whenever a place is called holy in scripture, it is called so by way of reference to, or in comparison with, a second place. And so the sanctuary, or innermost part, of the tabernacle, where the ark of the covenant was, is called the holy place, in comparison with all the remaining parts. And similarly the foremost part of the tabernacle—compared with the entrance-rooms, porches, and vestibules of the structure—was the holy place, that is, holier than all those mentioned. On the other hand, the whole enclosure and periphery of the temple was the holy place in comparison with the city; and the city was holy in comparison with the whole of Judaea; and, finally, Judaea
itself was holy if it was being compared with the other regions. Now here it is understood as the surrounding region, which, because it was mountainous, is called by the name "mountains of holiness," Psalm 87 and elsewhere. Finally, for us Luke's authority takes the place of all interpreters. For another thing, what, I pray, would that sign be which Christ is announcing [with the words], "When you see that abomination," etc., and "Then let those who are in Judaea flee to the mountains," etc.? For the time of Caligula followed very closely after the death of Christ, and Nero held sway not very long afterwards; and some years intervened between the erection of the eagle and other standards in the temple and the siege of the city. Yet Christ commands the Jews to look to themselves by fleeing when this abomination is first seen. This sign, consequently, cannot be taken of those statues and images, since this is far from the intent of Daniel, from the express words of Christ, from the use of signs, and from historical reality. Now those who think that the sign ought to be taken of the impious perversion of doctrine have, in my opinion, attained to at least this much of something worthwhile, that they have realized that that other interpretation concerning images brought into the temple cannot stand. But yet these men have (unless my mind deceives me) produced a much more dubious interpretation. For who would deny that the doctrine was already very perverted a long time before? Or who does not see that the discussion--by Christ at the one place and by Daniel at the other--is about some sign which is visible and meets
everyone's sight? Since this is the way things are, or to put it better, following in the footsteps of Christ and the words of Luke, we esteem it simplest and fittest that this whole passage be understood in reference to the troops of Vespasian which were to invade Judaea and throw down Jerusalem, according as it was accomplished through Titus, Vespasian's son.

PARALLEL XLVI

Matthew 26
24. The Son of Man, indeed, goes as it is written of him.
54. How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, which teach that it must be done thus.
56. But all this has taken place, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.

These three passages appeal to the authority of the prophets in common. But they are adduced in a more distinct way in this whole argument (which is concerned with the death of Christ) in the Gospel of John. And they have all been taken principally from Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah. Therefore, we are going to speak about these in the Gospel of John.

PARALLEL XLVII

Zechariah 13
7. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man next to me"—a statement of Jehovah of hosts. "Strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered."

Matthew 26
31. For it is written; "I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered."
The goal of this passage in the prophet was clearly the same one which we showed was likewise intended by Jeremiah in the seventh parallel, namely, that it might be demonstrated publicly by means of some definite mark and clear sign that Jesus Christ is that shepherd who in the very strife of his sufferings tended his scattered sheep, whom he was later to lead back with his hand into one fold. Jesus Christ shows that this goal relates to himself. Accordingly, the main point is that, when the time was near for Christ to suffer, he was struck by God the Father and given into the hands of his enemies. Furthermore, his disciples and companions, tripped up by the severity of this rod, turned aside hither and thither, each of them, just as straying little sheep. But they were not only preserved by Christ our Saviour at the time of his suffering, but were also, after he rose again, tended and led back by his hand, just as the prophet had predicted. Consequently, the application of this passage is quite without difficulty. For the prophet laid out in this chapter a most exquisite type and manifest lessons concerning the wonderful services of Christ to the church. Therefore, his incredible sufferings would have seemed to oppose this wonderful beneficence, if the all-wise God had not, by way of anticipation, \(^1\) added a passage concerning the cross and the scandal of the cross. \(^2\) The purpose was that, warned beforehand and armed against this stumbling-block, the minds of the pious might recognize Christ from the very thing from which the flesh is wont to seize an argument for stumbling. We have set forth this whole matter more fully
at the aforementioned passage from the prophet Jeremiah. There seems to be some alteration in the words, yet the content is one and the same.

For Zechariah, in words ascribed to God, addresses a sword when he says, "Awake, O sword, . . . strike," etc. In place of this, Christ omits that figurative mode of speech and states the matter in literal and straightforward language, "I will strike the shepherd," etc., doubtless with the sword which had this function in relation to commands by God, as it is represented figuratively by Zechariah. Since this is the way things are, it is altogether necessary that the former passage be taken of Christ, just as Christ in a most holy fashion interpreted it as referring to himself, not by means of an analogical application, but by means of a historical and logically necessary interpretation.

PARALLEL XLVIII

Zechariah 11
12. And they weighed out as my wages thirty shekels of silver.
13. And Jehovah said to me, "Cast it out to the potter:"--the magnificent price at which my worth was reckoned by them. So I took those thirty pieces of silver and cast this money out of the house of Jehovah to the potter.

Matthew 27
9. Then was fulfilled what had been spoken by the prophet Jeremiah, "And they took the thirty shekels of silver, the price of him whose worth was reckoned, whose worth was reckoned by the sons of Israel,
10. and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed to me."

One of these passages relates an act which had to be performed long beforehand, the other an act which was performed; the reference of both passages is clearly the same. The goal is that, through this pro-
phetic narrative, a very definite sign might be predicted and that, through this gospel narrative of Matthew's, it might also be demonstrated as having been exhibited—a sign by which it might become completely clear to everyone that Jesus Christ was precisely that individual who, although he had been given by God to his people as a shepherd, was reckoned as of very little worth. God willed that a perpetual sign and proof of this fact should stand forth, when he willed that the money from that estimation of worth should be laid out for a potter's little field. Accordingly, the main point is that in the time before us everything was done in order in just the way that God had long before predicted through the prophet that the Jews would, in place of wages, pay a niggardly price for treachery and that, casting that price out of Jehovah's house under pretence of virtuousness, they would convey it to a potter. For in place of wages they weighed out a price for treachery to Judas, namely, thirty shekels of silver, Matthew 26:15. But even on the testimony of the priests themselves, God did not wish this money to be put in his house, Matthew 27:6. On account of this, on his authority, although unconsciously so, they purchased a little field from a potter for the burial of foreigners. A sign of this fact was the continuing custom that ever since that time that field was called the Field of Blood, verses 7 and 8. In this way, therefore, each of these things are in the closest agreement with one another.

At this point, however, two questions suggest themselves. The first is this: What passage from a prophet ought to be coupled with this
one from Matthew? The second is this: If it is a passage from Zechariah, how is it that the name "Jeremiah" is found in the context? With regard to the former, we see it, in a few words, in this way. Three responses have been brought forward by our people. The first is that the passages, not of one prophet only, but rather of two, have been combined here by Matthew, namely, Jeremiah 18 and Zechariah 11. But it does not follow, if the noun "potter" is found in Jeremiah in this passage, that, for this reason, that noun refers to the passage before us. Nor does it appear that the theme of the former passage has been combined with the latter. The second response is that it is, in fact, a passage from Jeremiah, but that this one does not occur in the authentic books, but in those apocryphal ones which the Nazoraei possessed long ago. Chrysostom reports that he had seen a Hebrew copy of these books in which these words were found in an explicit form. But it is no more acceptable in this argument than in any others to place one's confidence in the books of the Nazoraei. For it would be shameful for Matthew to derive confirmation for his gospel narrative from these books or for us to rest our confidence on the authority of such books. The third response, finally, is the one which we follow completely, that the passage is not from Jeremiah, but from the prophet Zechariah, just as we have laid it out in our parallel diagrammatic arrangement and as we have just explained.

From this the second question proceeds: How, then, did it happen that Jeremiah was designated instead of Zechariah? We have noticed
that, up to this time, seven varieties of response have been brought forwards to resolve this question. Two of these have been taken from the preceding remarks: the first, that one passage from Jeremiah and another from Zechariah are combined; the second, that it is a passage of Jeremiah's from apocryphal books. But we have found neither of these satisfactory; nor, indeed, can either be proved from the testimony of any authentic part of scripture. The third response is that it is a μνημονικὸν ἀμάρτημα of the author (as they call it), that our good Matthew inadvertently wrote "Jeremiah" instead of "Zechariah."

Augustine excuses this error (as it appears to be) with many words in the third book of De Consensus Evangelistarum, chapter 7. But I, at least, have scruples about ascribing this error or any other like it in this sort of writing to any evangelist, that is, to the public amanuensis of Christ and his church. The fourth response is that it is a γραφικὸν ἀμάρτημα, that is, an error of the pen and of copyists as they were either reading or writing out the manuscripts laid out before them in a careless or negligent fashion. It occurred as they were reading if, for example, someone read 'Ἰω' here for Ζω, that is, Ἰσραήλου for Ζαχαρίου. It occurred while they were writing out, if, for example, someone carelessly let the former name slip out in place of the latter (which happens not infrequently) or, through an error, added a name when none was present in Matthew's autograph. The Syriac and Arabic versions seem to confirm this last view. But the very antiquity and
consensus of all the manuscripts which long ago were already in the hands of the orthodox fathers justly seem to wrest this variety of defence away from us. Jerome recognized this in his time too. The fifth response is that the name of Jeremiah was set down in place of Zechariah's συγχωρητικῶς, or κατὰ τὸ δοξαστικὸν, namely, because one of the following beliefs had already taken hold and possession of the minds of the Jews a long time before: The prophet Jeremiah was himself Zechariah, who, returning from Egypt, showed to the people that he was restored anew by assuming the name "Zechariah." (People wish to confirm this idea by the case of Daniel, on the grounds that one and the same man saw both the beginning and the termination of the deportation, as did many others.) Or, at least, those prophets who prophesied after the return—Zechariah especially, indeed—had been taught by Jeremiah. Or, finally, Jeremiah was living again by means of that crazy Pythagorean μετεμψύχωσις. For this reason we see that a remarkable mention of Jeremiah the prophet is made in II Maccabees and Matthew 16 the disciples were asked with respect to Christ, "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" They replied, "Some say John the Baptist, others Elijah, and others Jeremiah or some certain prophet." For those people imagined that these prophets would regain life and return in their time to provide for the instruction of the people of God. The sixth and last response is that the prophet Zechariah had two names. Many examples of this phenomenon occur in the scriptures, as, for ex-
ample, Ahimelech and Abiathar, 18 Johanan and Joahaz, 19 Penuel and Hareph, 20 Johanan and Joiada, 21 Joah and Ethan, 22 and innumerable others.

Of all these responses, two commend themselves to me in preference to the others. One is for us to say that Zechariah passed his life in the midst of Jeremiah's teaching, which has been transmitted through his hands, as it were, from the forefathers; and, consequently, this prophetic discourse has come to us from Jeremiah through his disciple Zechariah. The prophetic discourse to which we refer, one truly gospel-oriented in theme, is the one which we already said in the thirty-sixth parallel is contained in the three chapters 9, 10, and 11. The second response is for us to decide that there were two names for this prophet. This phenomenon was not unusual among the Hebrews, especially when the two names were in agreement with each other in respect to either the etymology of the terms or the meaning of the things. There are, for example, Jonathan, 23 Elnathan, 24 and Nathanael, 25 Uzziah 26 and Azariah; 27 and a great many similar things. But now both of the names Yirmeyah 28 and Zekeareyah 29 have a single significance. It is just as if you said, "the man who exalts God or recalls him to mind and praises him by his declaration." For a consideration of the periods of time involved prevents us from thinking that Jeremiah was still surviving after the return of the people, since he began to prophesy in the thirteenth year of Josiah. 30 Granting that he was twenty-five years of age at that
time, he would have had to go twenty-five years beyond his hundredth birthday. How much less likely, therefore, was he to live to the times of Darius? So then, this, with everyone's good leave, is our opinion concerning the application of this passage.

PARALLEL XLIX

Psalm 22
19. They divide my garments among them, and for my raiment they throw lots. 1

Matthew 27
35. Now after they had crucified him, they divided his garments by casting lots, that it might be fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet. "They divided my garments among them and over my vesture they cast lots."

The goal of this passage—as likewise of the psalm as a whole—was this, that the church of God might possess long beforehand a prophetic narrative and contemplate every day the clear pattern of all those events which befell Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, while he lived in the form of a servant and suffered for us on the cross. Even for the latter time a remarkable pattern is contained in this verse. Matthew states its main point in words so perspicuous that, if we were to add anything besides, we should be seen as lending light to the sun. The application is obvious and logically necessary. There is no alteration. There is only one question here—whether the theme of that psalm is simple, that is, it contains a simple and prophetic narrative and story of Christ; or whether, on the other hand, it is composite, from the type David and the
foreshadowed story of Christ. Now we realize that most, to be sure, have been of the opinion that it appears with a composite theme. We hold that this interpretation is, of course, tolerable. But a great many things occur in this psalm which cannot rightly be attributed to David. Moreover, many things besides have been predicated of Christ, not figuratively or typically, but so literally that only by some violence can they be applied to David and entangle with complications a simple interpretation concerning Christ. Above all, the special title of the psalm itself shows that the psalm was given to the church so that it might also be sung once a day when the continual morning sacrifice was set in the presence of the Lord, according as we are going to develop the same thing more fully in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. From all these considerations we completely conclude that this psalm and each of its statements are talking about Christ and that this psalm was understood as gospel-oriented in the ancient church of the Jews. It is for this reason that Christ sanctified, as it were, its first words and applied them to himself in the moment of his suffering, below in verse 46. And it is for this reason that the evangelists have taught that not a few of the verses of this psalm refer to Christ. All the apostles, finally, have very frequently selected statements from this psalm, from which they have taught that, in accord with the predictions of the Old Testament, the fullness of grace was exhibited in Christ.
Malachi 3
1. Behold, I am going to send my messenger to make ready the way before me.

Isaiah 40
3. The voice of one crying: In the wilderness prepare the way of Jehovah, level off a path in the desert for our God.

Mark 1
2. As it is written in the prophets, "Behold, I send my courier before your face, who shall prepare your way in front of you.
3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths level."

The goal due to which these two passages have been adduced by Mark is set forth very clearly in verse 1, when he says, "The beginning of the gospel proclamation concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God"—plainly, that it was of such a nature that it had been announced beforehand through the prophets in these passages. Therefore, the Holy Spirit wished to teach, as much in this argument as in others, that (as Augustine says) the Old Testament was the foretelling of the New and the New the fulfilment of the Old. ¹ The main point is that God had already indicated long before through the prophets that, in the most corrupt times of the church of the Jews and times of which anyone would despair, he would cause his messenger or courier to appear, who, in such a great desert, would prepare the ways of the Lord Jesus Christ with a very loud voice and a clear proclamation (so to speak) of the gospel. The point is further that it happened in exactly this way through John the Baptist, the messenger of God and forerunner ² of Christ, a fact which is set forth
more fully in the following five verses. Consequently, fitting these two passages together is easy. Nevertheless, as far as the latter passage is concerned, because it appears in more extended form in Luke 3, we are going to postpone it to that point. Let us see about the former passage. Two interpretations of that one can, to be sure, be brought forwards. One is that which takes the title "messenger," or "courier," as a syllepsis for all the couriers or prophets whom God has raised up in his church since that time. The other interpretation is that which explains it as literally and exclusively referring to one certain prophet. Certain Jews have brought the former forward (although others, seeing that it is rather weak, have been forced to refer the title to one certain prophet, namely, to him who is afterwards honored with the name Elijah at the conclusion of this same prophetic discourse). But it does not require many words at all to shatter this interpretation. For although the title "messenger," or "courier," is, in itself, general, this interpretation is still the fallacy of division (as they call it) and such a shameful one that it has no need of a refutation. For, in the first place, a certain single period of time is designated when God says, "Behold, I," etc. Secondly, a single action and not one common to all the prophets is designated when he says, "he will make ready the way before me." Thirdly, a description of the person of Christ coming to his church is designated when God says, "The Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple." Nor is this said with respect to the person of the Father
or of the Holy Spirit, but with respect to the person of the Son, of whom the words which follow this contain a depiction: "the messenger of the covenant in whom you delight," etc. Lastly, the goal of the chapter plainly demands this, a fact which the Jews themselves, even though quite averse to Christ, have realized. It only remains, therefore, that we should explain those words of the prophet as referring to some one person. Now no one emerged as a prophet from the times of the afore-said Malachi well-nigh until the coming of Christ. And no one except Christ, who is God made visible in the flesh, can be called that Lord before whose face the prophet walked who was to prepare his ways. Finally, none of these things can be shown concerning other people or times. For these reasons, we judge as most reasonable the application by this gospel-writer and others through which Christ is established as that Lord and John the Baptist as that harbinger of whom the prophets had prophesied with one voice long before.

PARALLEL II

Mark 1

44. Go, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, that this may serve as a proof to them.

The institution of this ceremonial observance has this ultimate goal, that after a legitimate examination had been conducted by the priests and the church of God, a solemn declaration might be publicly promulgated concerning a healing wrought by God and thanks might be given to God.
Christ wished this institution to be observed so that, by this procedure, he might make manifest to the priests the healing wrought by him, even as by God made visible in the flesh, and so that he might tender to the whole church an opportunity for giving thanks concerning this remarkable blessing which had been received. So then, the law enjoined in a mystical and sacramental way that this should be done in order to proclaim the reality of divine grace. Christ commanded, on the basis of the law, that this same thing should be done in order to demonstrate the reality of his grace and to convict the priests more fully as enemies of this grace.

And, accordingly, what is commanded in a historical sense in the law to serve as a typical, or sacramental, sign—it is related in the present verse that the same thing was performed in a historical sense in order to make manifest the true nature of Christ.

Mark 2:24. The line of argument, drawn from the story of David, was discussed in Matthew 12.

Mark 4:12. The passage from Isaiah was discussed in Matthew 13.

Mark 7:10. The passages from Moses were discussed in Matthew 15.

Mark 9:12. The passage from Malachi was discussed in Matthew 17.

PARALLEL LII

Leviticus 2
13. You shall salt every offering of your service with salt; and you shall not let the salt of

Mark 9
49. Every offering will be salted with salt.
the covenant of your God be missing from your service; with your every offering you shall offer salt.

Christ, to be sure, does not here adduce in explicit language that passage of the law from which these words have been selected. Nevertheless, since they were fetched from an ordinance of the law written down by Moses, it seemed necessary for us to undertake this matching up of the passages ἐκ παραλλήλου. Now Moses points out the goal of this institution so perspicuously that no one can be doubtful about it, namely, that men should show that they continue steadfast in God's covenant. That this same goal has been preserved in the later passage by Christ, we shall shortly demonstrate in relation to its application. The main point, on the other hand, is that after men have been graciously received into God's covenant, they are obligated to continue in that same covenant in a steadfast and untainted fashion. They are obligated to cherish the same within themselves in a most holy way and preserve themselves pure from every wickedness (which conflicts with the covenant) with as much scrupulousness as men are used to employing who season meat or anything else in danger of rottenness and protect things from such rottenness by throwing salt on it. For in Christ the pious man is a holy sacrifice, or offering, while the covenant of Christ is the salt by which every man who continues steadfastly pious has been protected from corruption and destruction. But to demonstrate perspicuously that Christ has this in mind, the application of the expression before us must be considered. This was
the special case which the disciples set before Christ: someone had been driving out demons by the name of Christ who was not following him, and so the disciples had thought it best to forbid the man. Christ responded that he ought not to be forbidden. The reason: "For he that is not against us is for us." That is, if one does not oppose God's covenant, of which the mediator is Christ, he ought to be considered inimical neither to Christ nor to the covenant, but rather, in accord with the covenant, ought to be strengthened in the covenant through all the services of godliness and humaneness. Christ explains this theme in detail from verse 41 on by means of the opposition, as fitting as could be, between services rendered and denied and between the consequences which have generally followed from rendering or denying those services. And, indeed, of the services rendered and of even the least service whatsoever (as, for example, if someone gives another a cup of water in the name of Christ), Christ makes the consequence plain in verse 41 in these words, "Truly, I say to you, he by no means loses his reward." But what will be the consequence of services not rendered, Christ sets forth first in a general way, on the one hand, in verse 42--then in particular, on the other hand, in verse 43 and following, by offering an enumeration of several parts of the body, each of which is supposed to provide specific services, namely, the hands, feet, eyes. Now two kinds of consequences are described in this latter category: one of them is commanded; the other, announced as occurring if the command is not executed. For it is command-
ed that whatever causes stumbling should be cut off. That is, the pious should keep away from every stumbling-block with so much scrupulosity that they would, of their own accord, suffer any injury, whether of the body or of a member of it, rather than to act as a stumbling-block for any little one. And if ever desire for or thinking about any thing which can cause stumbling titillates them, they are, in like manner, commanded to cast it away from them, just as if that thing were being consigned to the fire. It is announced, on the other hand, that if the pious do not do this, all those who would not consign those things to the fire are thrust down to eternal fire together with those stumbling-blocks of theirs and those means by which they caused stumbling. The aetiological basis for both parts of this matter is brought forward in verse 49—and that by employing an exceedingly exquisite metaphor in the form of the word for salting. For when it is stated that "every man will be salted with fire" (or, as the Syriac and Arabic versions translate it, "everything will be salted with fire"), the sense of these words, in my opinion, is that a man can be protected from the rottenness of stumbling-blocks in no other way than if he himself has cut off and cast away whatever constitutes wickedness for himself and a stumbling-block for others. And, indeed, he must cast it away in such a manner as if to consume anything wicked which he sees to be near by the sudden application of glowing iron or fire. If this has been done, it is just as if the rottenness has been cut off and the man salted in such a way that he is no longer being eaten away
by some such gangrene, as it were. Now when it is stated that "every offering will be salted with salt," this meaning which we previously asserted now seems to be plain. It is, namely, that any pious man is a sacrifice pleasing to God and is preserved by the salt in God's covenant. But he must see to this above all, that if he is conscious in his mind of wickedness, he should remove it from himself as if by fire, so that, purged from it, he can be a sacrifice holy, acceptable, and pleasing to God. And the line of argument previously developed and the point of exhortation which Christ employs in the ensuing verse agree very well with this interpretation.

Mark 10:4 and following. The passages of Moses were discussed in Matthew 5.6

Mark 10:19. We spoke about this in Matthew 19.7

Mark 11:9. We spoke about these words of the prophet in Matthew 21.9

Mark 11:17. We spoke about these in Matthew 21.10

Mark 12:10. We spoke about these in Matthew 21.12

Mark 12:19. We spoke about this passage from Moses in Matthew 22.13

Mark 12:26 and 29 and 36. We spoke about these in Matthew 22.15

Mark 13:14. We spoke about this in Matthew 24.16

Mark 14:21 and 49. We are going to speak about these in the Gospel of John.17

Mark 14:27. We spoke about this passage from Zechariah in Matthew 26.18
Isaiah 53
12. And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Mark 15
28. And the scripture was fulfilled which says, "And he was numbered with the transgressors."

The goal which was intended by the prophet Isaiah as he was writing these words according to the testimony of the divine Spirit was this, that he might relate the sufferings of Christ and the benefits which would come to his body from them. To these things certain signs of his were also quite appropriately added through the prophet. In just the same way, we have no doubt that Mark in the later passage teaches in a historical way that this fulfillment of the prophecy which Isaiah foretold in the same words is most certain. Now the main point of that passage in Isaiah is that Jesus Christ is going to join many co-heirs to himself by accomplishing our redemption through death on the cross and blotting out our sins through his intervention. The aforesaid sign of this fact would be that the same man who is righteous and was pronounced righteous by the verdict of his judge, was to suffer among the number of the guilty, just as the gospel account very clearly relates that it took place. So then, the application of this passage is not complex. But because the understanding and goal of that whole chapter is discussed with a definite design at Acts 8:32 and following, it is better to defer a more extended interpretation of that chapter to that point. 1

Mark 15:34. We spoke about that passage from David in Matthew 27. 2
Psalm 132
17. There I will make a horn of David flourish, preparing a lamp in my Christ.
18. His enemies I will clothe with shame, but upon himself his crown will flourish.

Luke 1
69. He has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David,
70. as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets who have been from of old--
71. salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us.

This whole song of Zechariah has, to be sure, been copied almost word for word from various passages of the prophets. Nevertheless, they are either clear in themselves or are adduced without the least acknowledgement. Therefore, it does not seem necessary besides to match each passage from the prophets with each expression of this song. This passage, however (to which there can be connected others too with almost the same words and with the same sense), had to be adduced among others, because I, at least, have no doubt that Zechariah had the same passage in mind. Now the goal in both places is that the church should be taught about the saving power which she possesses in Christ and that, relying on the hope of that power, she should be at rest in God. The main point is that God the Father, at the time which he appointed to visit and redeem his people from their sins, raised up Jesus Christ from the seed of David, so that through a saving horn, as it were--that is, through his divine power--he might provide eternal salvation to his own and, against
all obstacles, set them free and that they, therefore, might enjoy his eternal mercy and declare it openly to his glory. So then, the first point, on the one hand, is that it is stated that God raised up a horn of salvation and glory in Jesus Christ. The prophet intimates this in verse 17 with a twofold metaphor, calling the saving power a horn, while calling the glory by the name "lamp," a lamp which God prepared in the son of his compassion. The second point, on the other hand, is that from that power and glory of Christ there arises the deliverance and salvation of his members, united with the shame and stunned confusion of his enemies. The prophet intimates this part in these words, "His enemies I will clothe with shame," etc. Both points, however, are clearly interwoven here in the same order by Zechariah. For, in the first place, he praises the glorious power of God in Christ with these words, "He has raised up a horn of salvation for us," etc. Next, moreover, he reports the effect of that power, as though inseparable from the power of Christ, by means of apposition (as the grammarians say) in those words, "He has raised up salvation from our enemies," etc. He is, of course, deducing the effect of that power, by a most certain and indubitable line of argument, from an efficient cause which is in no way obstructed and never rests. 2 The prophet Micah, conversely, at the end of chapter 4 and the beginning of 5, rises from the effect which God revealed in his church to the efficient cause and establishes, by consideration of the efficient cause, that this effect on the church would be quite unchanging. 3
Malachi 3
20. For you, O you who fear my name, the sun of righteousness shall rise with healing in his wings. And you shall go forth and grow like calves in a feeding-stall. 1

Isaiah 9
2. The people who sit in darkness, etc. 2

Luke 1
78. On account of the bowels of mercy of our God, whereby the sun from on high has visited us
79. to appear to those who are lying in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Before we state our opinion about the nature of these passages, a few words must be brought forward concerning a correct interpretation of the term ἀνατολή. 3 There are, then, two interpretations of this word, both pertaining metaphorically to Christ. The first is taken from a comparison with stalks, twigs, or sprigs which are sprouting forth. For all these things are said to ἀνατέλλαι 4 for what is the same as "to spring up" or "blossom forth." Hesychius esteems this latter idea more satisfactory. 5 A great many think that the noun ἀνατολή, derived from this source, designates a sprig bursting forth for the first time and rising from its root. The second interpretation, on the other hand, is taken from a likening to the rising sun, to which the grammarians contend that the word ἀνατέλλειν 6 is proper, as is ἐπιτέλλειν 7 to the other stars and constellations. The noun ἀνατολή, consequently, has been derived from this source—literally, to be sure, signifying the sunrise, that is, the action of the rising sun, or the region as well;
but metonymically signifying the rising sun itself. The interpretation of this passage, however, is perhaps no less appropriate and suitable if you say that those added terms, ἐξ ὑψοῦς, must be connected with the term ἀνατολή for the sake of delimitation (as they say) and must not be construed with the preceding word ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. For ἀνατέλλειν is not only "to spring up" in the Greek authors, but also τὸ ἀναλάμπειν, or τὸ μεσημβριάζειν καὶ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἐστάναι, which the Egyptians called μεσουρανέιν. Thus, the sun is said to ἀνατέλλειν in two ways, both at sun-rise itself when appearing with its first light and also at mid-day when illuminating everything from the height of heaven in its full strength, as sacred scripture says. Perhaps, therefore, what is conjointly termed ἀνατολή ἐξ ὑψοῦς (as it seems to me, at least) is that mid-day and most powerful illumination with which the sun surveys all the world, so that the rising sun of the verse is neatly distinguished ἀπὸ τῆς ἑώς ἀνατολῆς, that is, from its first rising.

Now, however, let us show in a few words which of the two interpretations appears more suitable to the present passage. The following things make it appear that the metaphor has been taken from twigs: first, the usage of the word ἀνατέλλειν; secondly, a comparison with passages in which Christ is called a sprig; thirdly, the interpretation of the seventy Greek translators (as they are reckoned). But (to state what I think in a few words, by everyone's good leave) this conclusion, which from the accepted usage of one verb ascribes the same meaning to a re-
lated noun, does not seem to be logically binding, especially since the fact is well-known among Greek grammarians that the noun ἄνατολη does not occur with this meaning in the good authors. Nor, for the next point, is it logically binding that a sprig is introduced in this passage because Christ is called a sprig by Jeremiah and Zechariah. For the same person is also termed "sun" and "light," etc., in the scripture. Nor, lastly, does it possess binding force that, if those seventy Greek translators rendered these passages in this way, the interpretation of the present passage too ought to be fetched from them and, indeed, from the same passages. For, in the first place, it is not even certain whether that translation which we possess arose from those seventy men; this idea can, in fact, be shattered by not a few clear instances from the New Testament. Next, however, supposing that this idea were certain, it will not be proven thereby that an exposition ought to be conveyed to this place from those passages. Therefore, passing over the comparisons of passages which can be collected from elsewhere, we conclude that we ought to give more attention to deciding the interpretation of this ambiguous noun from the present passage itself and its context. Now, not only this very class of allegory which is employed by Zechariah in this verse, but also the preceding and ensuing lines which relate to this theme, seem wholly to demand that the interpretation be drawn from the second metaphor. For whether we embrace the meaning "rising sun" or the meaning "mid-day sun," about which we were just speaking, it is certainly de-
scribed as looking upon and surveying earthly affairs from above. This kind of expression cannot be thrust out of this passage without spoiling the value of this allegory. Next, indeed, if we look to the preceding lines, there is no doubt that John the Baptist is compared with Lucifer,²⁰ or the morning star, when Zechariah said in discourse directed to his son the Baptist, "You will go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of the salvation coming to his people through the forgiveness of sins," etc.²¹ It is just as if he were saying, "As, by its nature, the morning star goes before the sun, even so will John the Baptist go before Christ, the sun of righteousness, so that, from his witness and advance indication, the people of God should be taught and come to know Christ. Lastly, the agreement of the following verse with this interpretation is so evident that we do not hesitate to prefer it to the other one as correct and logically necessary. For, in deliberately uniting the other passage which we have laid out in our diagram, one from Isaiah, with that from the prophet [Malachi], Zechariah uses these words, "to shine from above on those who are lying in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." These are the words which Matthew had deliberately adduced in his fourth chapter, using the word ἀνέτειλεν,²² in order to demonstrate that the fulfilment of God's promises was this very thing which Zechariah, the father of the Baptist, wanted to point out here with various passages accumulated from the prophets.²³
It only remains that we should see about the way in which our diagram fits together. First, then, the thing speaks for itself that various passages of scripture are drawn together into one; and it is quite obvious from the diagram. For the latter phrases are from Isaiah, the former from Malachi. But it must be maintained further that the words of Malachi are adduced by Zechariah in such a way that the greatest part of the former's third chapter is drawn together into a certain summary in this apostrophe to John the Baptist. For those words, "And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before," etc., look back to the beginning of the third chapter, where Malachi was saying, "Behold, I will send my messenger," etc. Also, those words, "to give knowledge of salvation," etc., look back to the end of the same chapter: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the exceedingly great and awesome day of Jehovah comes, in order to turn the hearts of the fathers to their children," etc. Similarly, those words, "on account of the bowels of mercy of our God," have been drawn from verse 16 and following of the same chapter: "Then those who fear Jehovah, who often speak with one another," etc. Those words, finally, "whereby the dayspring from on high has visited us," have, without doubt, been copied from verse 20 of the same chapter, although the words have been changed as we have laid them out in the diagram. And the final words of the following verse, "to guide our feet into the way of peace," express briefly what Malachi set forth in more words: that only in the wings of Christ,
the sun of righteousness, would there be healing, that those who fear God would go forth and grow like calves in a feeding-stall, finally that they would so tread down the wicked that the latter would be made like ashes under the soles of the God-fearers' feet. In my opinion, therefore, bringing these passages together with each other in this way is as correct as it is logically necessary.

PARALLEL LVI

Exodus 13
2. Consecrate to me all the firstborn; whatever first opens the womb among the people of Israel, etc.

Leviticus 12
8. But if as much as her hands may obtain is not enough for a small sheep, she shall take two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, etc.

Luke 2
22. And when the days of Mary's purification were completed according to the law of Moses, they brought Christ up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord
23. (as it is written in the law of the Lord, "Every male who is born first shall be called holy to the Lord")
24. and to offer a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord, "a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons."

The goal of both passages is that we may understand that both Mary the virgin ἡ Σεοτόκος and Christ as man were subject to the law and, consequently, religiously performed what the law commands. Now, the law of God had already commanded long before that, at a fixed and appointed time, women who had given birth should be purified from their flow of blood by some prescribed ceremony and should present and sanctify their first-born to the Lord, as if given up by them to him. The main point is that since these were the requirements, both were solemnly observed by
Mary, the mother of Christ. And, indeed, with regard to the idea that
the observance of the ceremonial commandment was encouraged by the
explicit words of the divine law, we have Luke as a very reliable witness
when he says that Christ's parents "brought Christ up to Jerusalem to
present him to the Lord, as it is written in the law of the Lord," etc.,
and "to offer a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord,"
etc. So then, the way in which the passages fit together in both cases is
quite correct, just as the obedience in relation to the present ceremonial
observance was correct and holy. In the first passage, nevertheless, there
seem to be two changes. One is that the noun "male," or "man," is added.
The other is that the noun "first-born" is omitted by Luke. The
reason for these things is uncomplicated. For Luke takes the noun "male"
from the interpretation of Moses. In place of what God had enjoined ("Con-
secrate to me all the first-born," etc.), Moses, commanding the same
thing in words from God, spoke to the people as follows: "You shall set
apart to Jehovah all that first opens the womb; indeed, of the offspring
of such cattle as shall belong to you, all the males that first open the
womb shall be Jehovah's." As to the fact, on the other hand, that the
noun "first-born" has been omitted by Luke, no one will wonder at this
who observes that the sort of expression found there, διανογίγον υμντραν, pertains to the delimitation of "first-born." For the noun "first-born"
in the Hebrew authors was customarily predicated, without distinction,
not only of man or animate beings, but also of inanimate things; and not
infrequently it was employed metaphorically as well. Appropriately, therefore, it seemed good to the Holy Spirit at this passage to retain this expression which not only denotes something first-born, but also restricts and circumscribes its signification to its proper sense, just as the law itself had explicitly stipulated.

At this point, however, two questions arise. One is: what did it avail for Christ to be presented to the Lord? The other is: what did it avail for Mary to offer a sacrifice for the sake of her purification according to the law of Moses? We respond in this way with a few words to the former: Christ the eternal Son of God, only-begotten by nature and yet first-born for the sharing of grace and our redemption, was holy to the Lord all the time—from eternity, on the one hand, in so far as he is God; from the moment of conception, on the other hand, in so far as he was made flesh. Therefore, it was of no avail at all for him to be presented to the Lord for his own sake—him who, according to essence, is one and the same God with the Father and the Holy Spirit and, according to person, the eternal Son of the eternal Father. It must be, therefore, that it was for our sakes that he was consecrated to his God and Father according to the ceremonial usage of the law, just as he was likewise given as a child for us and made a man for the sake of us men. Now, in the scriptures, everything which is said to be consecrated, or sanctified, is consecrated by nature or by an institution or, finally, by a sacrament. As far as sanctification by nature is concerned, some things are conse-
crated κατὰ γένησιν, when they are actually made holy by the grace of God; others, κατὰ φανέρωσιν, when those things which are actually holy show themselves to be such as they are. As far as sanctification by an institution is concerned, some things are consecrated κατ' ἐπιταγὴν καὶ ἐπαγγελίαν, by the command and promise, or blessing, of God, as, for example, the day of the sabbath and similar things. Others are consecrated κατὰ παραγγελίαν, as when men are ordered to sanctify, or consecrate, themselves. It is in this sense that that passage of Moses must be taken which we have quoted in the diagram from chapter 13 of Exodus. As far as sanctification by a sacrament is concerned, finally, some things are consecrated by a sacrament specifically in so far as it is a sacrament, as the ancients expressed it; others, by transfer, that is, not only by the sign but also by the reality of the things signified.

Now let us see in which ways it was that Christ, as the first-born, was sanctified to God. As to consecration by nature, it cannot properly be said that he who is holy and holiness itself was sanctified except κατὰ φανέρωσιν. In that sense, indeed, it is rightly said that Christ, who was made under the law, is holy to God and was sanctified according to the commandment of the law. On the other hand, he who κατὰ γένησιν is holiness itself, could not be made κατὰ γένησιν more holy. As to consecration by an institution, it was not for his own sake, but for ours, that Christ had to be sanctified according to the command and promise
of God, to serve as the first-born among us and, likewise, as our priest, having abolished the priesthood of the Levites. As to sanctification by a sacrament, finally, even though he himself is the reality of the sacraments, Christ had to be consecrated by a sacrament for these reasons: first, to obey the law as a man made under the law; secondly, to sanctify the sacrament of the law in his own person as the one who is the goal and fulfilment of the law; lastly, to act as a servant of the same sacrament which had been observed among the ancients, that is, to sanctify that sacrament of the law in relation to the fathers who had lived under the law, corresponding to the way in which the apostle spoke in Romans 15 about the circumcision of the fathers. It follows, therefore, that the aforementioned sanctification was performed more for our sakes than for his.

The other question was this: why was it necessary for the virgin Θεοτόκος to undergo purification and to offer a sacrifice according to the law of the Lord? The explanation is easy. For it is nowhere said in the law of Moses that it is on account of sin that a woman is obligated in regard to this sacrifice which the law commanded—whether original sin, whether actual sin (as they call it), or whether, finally, the copulation with a man itself. But rather it is on account of the flow of her separation, as scripture expresses it; that is, on account of a ceremonial impurity which the woman contracted from the flow of blood, even though natural, whether it was that common flow which they call the menses or
whether the less common flow resulting from childbirth. So then, this impurity was imposed by the law through a ceremonial usage for the sake of designating, not a sin, but a physical weakness and natural uncleanness (physical weakness, but not sin, is a class of this natural uncleanness). Therefore, it definitely follows that this sacrifice was commanded for the sake of purifying not a sin, but a physical weakness, as a result of which, according to the ceremonial law, women were held liable, not indeed for sin, but for a state of obligation proceeding from impurity, without there being any question of sin. Consequently, pubescent virgins shared in this impurity due to the weakness of nature without any idea of either sin or even copulation. And, on account of this, they were obligated by the law to observe a separation (as Moses calls it). In just the same way, we have no doubt that the most holy virgin, the mother of Jesus Christ, likewise suffered, in accord with the law of nature, this weakness and blood-flow, both the monthly one and also the less common one after the birth of Christ. And, for that reason, she abode in separation in the prescribed manner and religiously observed this separation, so as to obey the law. Therefore, this purification was an expiation not of sin, but of ceremonial impurity. The virgin was so conscious of this impurity within her that she was obliged by an inimitable faithfulness to purify herself from it through this ceremonial observance. Nor could she, except in an impudent manner, exempt herself from this law—this law which the Lord had decreed on account of impurity, not on
account of sin. For everywhere in the institution of this purification, the impurity of women who have given birth is compared with the week-long monthly impurity and is considered by the law in the same terms. For so says Moses: "As she is wont to be unclean for seven days, according to the days in which she is separated on account of her weakness, she shall be unclean," and so forth. 12

PARALLEL LVII

Luke 2

30. Your salvation
31. which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples,
32. a light to offer revelation to the Gentiles and the glory of your people Israel.

Although all these things occur in a great many passages of scripture—one here, another there—it is still quite certain that they are drawn from chapter 49 of Isaiah, where these same things are predicated of Christ in literal and explicit language. 1 Nor do they have any need of explanation.

PARALLEL LVIII

Isaiah 8

14. And he will be for your sanctification but will become a stone of collision and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitant of Jerusalem.

Luke 2

34. Behold, this one is set for the fall and resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign that is spoken against.
15. And many of them shall stumble, who shall be broken when they fall and taken when they have been snared.

The goal common to both passages is that the results which would follow from the former coming of Christ and the preaching of the gospel should be set forth in the church of God and be established among all good men for the strengthening of the pious. The main point is that there would be two results of the presence of Christ and preaching of the gospel (according, that is, to the nature of those opposite groups to whom Christ would be revealed through the gospel), namely, the fall of the impious and the resurrection of the elect. The application is surely quite reliable, since the same thing is clearly proclaimed by Isaiah and Simeon. To be sure, there is, in outward appearance, a certain alteration here. For, in the first place, the order of the assertion has been inverted, since here the fall, or destruction, of the impious is mentioned before the resurrection to salvation of the elect. Secondly, in place of that which Isaiah states as "he will be for sanctification," Simeon has stated it differently by use of metalepsis,¹ saying that Christ would be "for the resurrection of many." For sanctification is the fruit which follows from the resurrection, that is, our restoration in Christ and regeneration. Or if you take "resurrection" as the whole formation of the pious in Christ, sanctification will be a part of it. Thirdly, as to the fact that Simeon says that Christ would be for the fall [of some], he thereby embraces for the sake of brevity all the effects which have been cited from Isaiah in our diagram.
This alteration, so far from detracting from the truth, is, on the contrary, the most suitable interpretation of them all. In the same manner also that last phrase, "for a sign that is spoken against," is taken from the same place in the third verse thereafter, when Christ speaks as follows: "Behold me and the children whom Jehovah has given me for signs and for portents," etc. Thus everything agrees with everything else in a manner quite suitable.

But the application of this passage seems to be difficult, someone says. Nay rather, says the Jew, it is false and unsuitable. I respond; it is neither false nor unsuitable nor a difficult application, if one turns his attention to the passage from Isaiah. For everything which is contained in this chapter, from the promise in the tenth verse on, must all be taken as referring to Christ, just as Isaiah himself very clearly shows. For after the prophet has described the calamities that will pervade Judaea, which is called the land of Immanuel, the prophet recalls the people to the gracious promise of God's salvation with a glorious proclamation to their enemies by saying, "Join together, O peoples," etc., verse 9, then in verse 10, "Take counsel together and it will come to nought; speak a word and it will not come forth; but that of Immanuel will." Later on, indeed, God the Father, transmitting the word of Immanuel to his prophet and strengthening him against the common perversity of his people, warns him in these words, "Do not say, 'Conspiracy'; and do not fear with the fear of this people," verse 12. But, rather,
the prophet is warned to fear, on the contrary, "Jehovah of hosts," that is, Jesus Christ, the messenger of the covenant and commander of hosts (as he is called in the book of Joshua), fearing him and having dread of him. Then, at last, to this command is appended the aforementioned promise, "And he will be for your sanctification," etc., as we laid it out in the diagram. Since these things are declared by Jehovah and, indeed, concerning him who is called Immanuel and Jehovah, they surely cannot, by any line of reasoning or even appearance of reasoning, be confiscated from Christ and dragged away to some other and forced interpretation. We shall, if the Lord wills, speak about such remaining things as pertain to the last words of Simeon in their proper place, that is, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.5

PARALLEL LIX

Isaiah 40
3. The voice of one crying, 'In the wilderness prepare the way of Jehovah; make level in the desert a highway for our God.
4. Every valley shall be lifted up and every mountain and hill be made low; and that which is crooked shall be straight, and the rough places shall be changed into a level way.
5. And the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see the same together. For the mouth of Jehovah has spoken.'

Luke 3
4. The voice of one crying, 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord; make his paths straight.
5. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill be made low, and things that are crooked shall be made a straight way, and the rough ways shall be made level.
6. And all flesh shall see the saving glory of God.'
The goal common to these passages is that there might be definite agreement in the church about the coming of Christ on the basis of the legate or herald preceding him and the legation's theme. There is only this difference, that what Isaiah announced beforehand as going to come about, the evangelists announce as having been accomplished. The main point is that John the Baptist, the son of Zechariah and Elizabeth, preached, according to his calling, the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins through faith in Christ who was following after him, just as it had been very carefully announced beforehand through Isaiah. For John the Baptist is the very one who, by reason of his office, is called "the voice of one crying." Those words, "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord," etc., signified the baptism of repentance in Christ. As for the remission of sins through faith in him, the whole fourth and fifth verses of Isaiah in the same passage point this out allegorically. All these things have been compressed together into fewer words by the evangelist. And so the reason for the alterations is simple. For, in the first place, as to the fact that in all the passages of the New Testament the punctuation mark is placed after the noun "wilderness," we have long advised in comments on Isaiah from the testimony of the Hebrew context and from the connection with the following phrase, that it must be changed [in Luke] and that a punctuation mark ought to be restored after the participle "crying." Next, it is an ἐξηγητικόν2 phenomenon that in the following verse Luke, in place of these words, "Every valley shall be
lifted up," explains it as "shall be filled." Finally, the theme of the fifth verse is compressed by Luke into fewer words when Luke substitutes merely these words, "And all flesh shall see the σωτηρίον of God," for [the statement] that the glory of Jehovah will reveal itself so that it may be seen by all flesh. On account of this, we have translated this term σωτηρίον as "saving glory," so as to explain it more clearly and without use of a homonym. Everything, consequently, leads to the same thing.

But the Jews and other enemies of the truth may growl that the passage concerned from Isaiah cannot be taken as dealing with this argument. But for witnesses that what they say is false and opposes the truth of the divine word, we appeal not only to the evangelists and the Baptist himself (John 1:23), but to the self-same Isaiah in the whole argument in question. For, in the first place, Isaiah declares in the second verse that this prophecy which he will speak is proper to the consolation of the holy people, that is, the church, of that time when the time assigned to the people of God has been completed and her iniquity pardoned, when she has received from Jehovah's hand double for all her sins. But Daniel relates in a great many places that this predetermined time was not completed when the Jews returned from Babylonia; the darkness of the Jews is not able to dispel his light. Secondly, to that time is referred the coming of Jehovah and our God when he would reveal his glory and disclose himself in the flesh so that he could be beheld by flesh. Thirdly, the theme and whole ministry of the gospel is foretold, namely,
concerning the manifesting of Christ and concerning his office, on the one hand, against the wicked and impious who oppose the gospel and, on the other hand, toward all the pious who have entrusted themselves to the leading of their Saviour, verses 9, 10, 11. Lastly, not even the more clever and experienced Jews have been able to overthrow this interpretation altogether, but, shattered by the force and strength of the truth, have acknowledged that there are things in this passage which they were compelled to refer to the Messiah. In other respects, however, they have, in an extraordinary way, bent their energies to this end: that each word, even though quite clear, might be twisted from the person of Christ and the times of the gospel to the people of the Jews and the return from Babylonia.

PARALLEL LX

I Chronicles 3
17. And the sons of Jechoniah, the captive: Salathiel his son, etc.

Genesis 10

Luke 3
27. Who was the son of Joanan, who was that of Rhesa, who was that of Zerubbabel, who was that of Salathiel, who was that of Neri...
35. who was the son of Eber, who was that of Shelah, 36. who was that of Cainan, who was that of Arphaxad, etc.

We have already expounded the first passage concerning the genealogy of Salathiel in the third parallel. 1 Let us see, therefore, about the second passage. The goal in both places is that, by an enumeration of the holy line of descent, the faithfulness and truthfulness of God might be
shown in the keeping of his promises, of which Christ was the fulfillment as the blessed seed promised to this line. The main point is that Christ is the seed sprung from this line to which the promises had been made by God and that, accordingly, it is proven by this enumeration of his line of descent that no one ought to be considered or called Messiah other than he whose story the evangelists have transmitted to us. But in the comparison of these passages it is commonly thought that there is an ἄνωτερον 2 not indistinct. For Moses taught that Shelah was begotten by Arphaxad; but Luke, that Cainan was sprung from the latter and Shelah was begotten by Cainan as though he were the grandson of his father Arphaxad. There are three solutions (if I remember correctly) which have so far been applied to the interpretation of this passage. The first is that the name "Cainan" was not added by Luke at this place, but was interpolated by either the presumption or the inexperience of copyists. The second solution is that these things scarcely contradict each other, because in scripture a grandson is called the son of his grandfather and is said to have been begotten by his grandfather—by means, of course, of the father who (as they say) comes between them. 3 And, accordingly, the father whom Moses omitted in his account for the sake of brevity was rightly inserted by Luke. The third solution is that the word "Cainan" was, to be sure, added by Luke, but on the testimony of the Greek translators, whose translation Luke preferred to follow rather than, through an untimely alteration, press the makings of a
dispute upon the infant church and just as the truth of the gospel was
first dawning.

As far as the first solution is concerned, it is confirmed by the
testimony of a few ancient manuscript books (which testimony few learned
men in our day assert that they have corroborated), and also by a single
passage of Epiphanius (unless my mind deceives me) in Κατὰ
Μελχισεκανών. There in making a computation of periods of time
with the specific intention to refute the dogma of the Melchizedekians,
Epiphanius clearly omitted Cainan, and, by so omitting him, the total
sum of years is very prettily established which he wanted to procure
from bringing together the years of all the individual patriarchs. Never-
theless, however this matter may stand, to me, at least, this solution
cannot be adequately corroborated. For although some books (so they
contend) exist which lack the name of Cainan in Luke's account, it still
scarcely follows from this that the word "Cainan" was crammed in by
others; because it is the unvarying consensus of all the fathers--however
many they are--and all the translators--Syriac, Arabic, and others--that
the name "Cainan" occurred in Luke and, in fact, in this place. It was
for this reason as well that the fathers themselves also mightily exerted
themselves concerning this question long ago--Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine
and others, who unanimously agree that seventy-seven names
are found in this enumeration of the line of descent. And it was also for
this reason that already long ago, for convenience in counting, five names
were assigned by the fathers to each verse, if you except the first and
last of them, of which the latter contained four names and the former
three. What about the fact that, if it is otherwise, the metre of Nazian-
zenus cannot cohere? 8

Τοῦ δὲ Μαθουσάλα ἐσκεν ὡς υἱέα γείνατο Λάμεξ.
Λύταν ὁ γιός πατήρ. Σημί χώσος υἱὸς ἐκείνου,
Ἐκ τοῦ θ' Ἀρφαξάδ καὶ νάν. Σαλά, τοῦ δ' ἐνέπουσιν
hydrate Ἑβερ . . .

It was altogether reasonable, however, for Epiphanius, in opposing
the Melchizedekians, to pass over the name of this man if he was going
to prove the cause which he was pleading with the Melchizedekians—for
one thing, because those men did not esteem the authority of the New
Testament as highly as he; for another thing, because he was drawing
this enumeration of the line of descent from Moses. The orthodox fathers
taught that among the Greek writers copies of this enumeration had al-
ready differed in a great many places for a long time. It is also for this
reason that the same Epiphanius in Λόγος Ἀγιωστός did not wish to
pass over the name "Cainan" when he was constructing a genealogy of
Christ from the words of Luke. 9

The second solution too, for many reasons, is unable to be proven
to me. For it is, to be sure, true that in the Hebrew authors grandsons
are given the title "son." 10 And, accordingly, Shelah, if he had been
the grandson of Arphaxad, could have been called not improperly the son
of Arphaxad, if only the matter could be shown in at least a single passage
of the Old Testament. However (we should like this said by everyone's
good leave), this interpretation can fit neither a consideration of the 
periods of time involved nor the argument of Moses or Luke. It cannot 
square with a consideration of the periods of time, because Moses fur-
nishes the age of each man at which he begot his sons. 11 But if it will 
be acceptable to make interpolations in this account of his, the whole 
chronology will directly be unstable and fall down of itself. A compari-
son of both passages, however, demonstrates that least of all can the 
interpretation accord with the argument, as if Moses had passed over the 
name of Cainan for the sake of brevity. For Luke aimed at brevity in this 
enumeration more than Moses; while Moses desired to transmit not brev-
ity, but a careful delineation of persons, periods of time, and the whole 
line of descent (as he very aptly did).

There remains, therefore, only the third solution, that the word 
"Cainan" was added by Luke, but on the testimony of the Greek transla-
tors. Bede expounds this solution in these words: "The name and pro-
creation of Cainan is found, according to the Hebrew original, neither 
in Genesis nor in Chronicles; but it is asserted that Arphaxad begot 
Shelah 12 his son, with no one interposed. Be assured, therefore, that 
Luke has taken this procreation from the edition of the seventy translators, 
where it is written that Arphaxad at one hundred and thirty-five years be-
got Cainan," etc. 13 It is just as if he were saying that Luke conceded 
this point of courtesy not only to the version of the Greek translators, but 
also to the generally accepted belief, just as many things in the scriptures
were stated δοξαστικός and accommodated to the belief of the common mind. Nor did he wish, by an untimely battle for the cause of some name, to act in such a way that the peace of the church or the repose of pious minds would be incited to division, their faith shaken, or the authority of scripture imperilled. So, then, I approve of the reverence of this response and the integrity of the first solution. But the name "Cainan" is present according to the most complete consensus of the fathers, the Arabic and Syriac interpreters, and almost all of the copies. Therefore, we acquiesce without difficulty in the last solution, especially since Luke, in the very introduction of this genealogy adopted a προσερευόµενα pertaining to this passage when he said ὡς ἐνοµιζέτο. By these words he intimates not obscurely that he has undertaken at this place, not some exact enumeration of the line of Christ's descent, but a less elaborate one and one adapted to the notion and belief of the common mind.

At this point, however, we are not unaware that some enemies of the truth clamor and, relying on this argument, detract from the authority of Luke himself and the gospel written down by him. This thing is false, they say, and the name "Cainan" is falsely added. We respond: although we grant that it was false in reality, it was still believed, nay rather it was the belief of the common mind. It is to this quite generally accepted belief that Luke turned his attention, as we just showed from his own words. Now, those seventy translators had been the authors of
this false belief long before, while Luke, in good faith and with a definite purpose, followed their example and the belief of the common mind. It is in them, therefore, and not in Luke that reliability is lacking. But Luke, they say, knew that it was false. He did, to be sure, know that, but he knew that this was of such a nature as to offend against the truth merely of a single historical matter, but not against the truth of the catholic faith. For something is, to be sure, added to the truth of history by interposing Cainan, but nothing is taken away from the faith. The sureness of this faith is scarcely overthrown by the error of one or two accounts, statements, or words, unless it attacks the foundation of the Christian faith or its fundamental articles (as they call them). So, then, this is not a μνημονευόμενον ἀμάρτημα, but a συγχώρησις ἀναμάρτητος, that is, a patient concession free from sin, a class of speech which the scripture employs not infrequently. What is this, then? Luke, by this procedure, strengthens an error, something false, does he not? Not in the least. For a public error differs from a private one, and an error of long standing from a recent and new one. Now, Luke neither made a public error out of a private one nor nourished an infant error, but tolerated a public error already of long standing, because, with the Spirit of God as author, he saw that, as it is commonly phrased, the lesser of two evils had to be chosen. That the seventy translators dared to depart from the truth of history was, to be sure, an evil—whatever the intention and purpose was for which, in the end,
they did it. And it was, consequently, through their deed that something false came into use in the sacred history. But since that historical error does not in itself impart an injury to the faith, Luke saw that a more grievous evil would result if he attempted to remove, in an untimely manner, the aforesaid point which was of long standing and accepted by all. What evil? A grievous one, in my opinion: truly, that in such a way, for a cause which does not, strictly speaking and in itself, touch any foundation of the faith, the authority of scripture would have been imperilled, the faith of the pious would have faltered at the time when the gospel was making its beginning, and the building of the church would have been thrown into confusion. For who would doubt that all these dangers would have come about if stubbornly Luke had at that time introduced into the church of God such a question not yet necessary, and had he not, rather, patiently and sagaciously deferred it to more opportune hours?

But this appears to be the wisdom of the flesh. On the contrary, however, this is the wisdom, not of the flesh, but of the spirit, if you bear with a diminution of the truth that is not inimical to salvation, when it cannot be corrected without causing the stumbling and fall of the church, which is the pillar and support of the truth. Errors which are reproved in stronger men are allowed to the weak and covered in their presence. Nor is this only for the weak or in the case of doctrine, but even for those whom obstinate σκληροκαρδία possesses, even in the very case of lawfulness and justice, something is tolerated lest the church be burst
asunder or the course of its building blocked up, even as Christ taught in Matthew 19 and as a great many instances show. Finally, if something is diverted from the truth of history or lawfulness or from uprightness of life, it would be κατὰ θείαν τινα συγχώρησεν in order to preserve truth and righteousness among men—that is, in the remaining matters, of which the expounding is more important for the church of God. For the lesser is conceded or granted that the greater may be preserved. In other respects, like righteousness in itself, even so truth must be cherished in all matters, but in such a way that it be tempered, as far as possible, with peace and charity. The main point is that when the seventy translators altered Moses long before, this was done in shameless fashion; when the evangelists and apostles accepted and employed the alteration, this was done by the Spirit of God and in a fashion wise and suitable to their times. But now the truth is shown to the church by our men without danger and the difference reconciled; it is a timely service and worthy of praise. So, then, may the Lord deign to grant to our age this patience of the men of God in bearing with the errors of others that can be tolerated without offense to conscience for public peace and edification. And may he deign to quench that raging spirit of contention which is able to give up nothing for one's brothers; able to grant nothing, by virtue of perfection's fetters, to public peace, edification, and charity; able to cover over and hide away nothing in him who covers over our sins and has tolerated with the vastest mercy the times of our ignorance.
Luke 4, verse 4. We spoke about the passage from Moses in our comments on Matthew at the tenth parallel.

Luke 4, verse 8. We spoke about the passage in our comments on Matthew at parallel 12.22

Luke 4, verses 10 and 12.23 Concerning these look at Matthew in parallels 11 and 13.24

PARALLEL LXI

Isaiah 61
1. The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me. Therefore, Jehovah has anointed me to preach good news to the poor; he has sent me to bind up those who are broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound,
2. to proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah.

Luke 4
18. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; therefore, he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor; he has sent me to heal those who are bruised in heart, to announce release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set the broken free with a complete release,
19. to announce the acceptable year of the Lord.

The goal of these passages is that the church should recognize the gifts and calling of Christ and learn of his offices for her salvation. The main point is that Christ was provided with the Holy Spirit, that is, the fulness of God's gifts in the Spirit, and for this reason: that when he had been called and sent forth by God the Father, he might lay hold of the gifts which he had received so that he might discharge his saving offices towards the church of prophet, priest, and king. Now, that remarkable and divine providence by which Christ, as he was expounding from the Old Testament, came, through the Spirit's agency, upon this very pas-
sage which he was interpreting from the book of Isaiah—this providence shows that the application of this matter relates to Christ. So too does the authority of Christ himself as he interprets the matter in verse 21 by stating, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled for you who are listening." So too, finally, does the argument of the whole prophetic discourse in Isaiah. For although the Jews all strive most ardently in this matter to establish that this prophetic discourse is proclaimed concerning Isaiah himself, yet neither the subject-matter of the prophetic discourse, nor its effects, nor the whole context can be made to fit the aforesaid prophet. On the contrary, divine acts are announced and, indeed, a time for the preaching of the gospel in the future. This passage cannot be applied suitably except to Christ. For God, to be sure, used the ministry of this prophet, as he did that of others, to declare his promises amidst his ancient people. But it must be considered as absolutely certain that, from chapter 53 of Isaiah on (where the goal of Christ's sufferings is explained very eloquently), gospel promises of Christ are transmitted to the church in his own words. For God had stated at the end of chapter 53, "He shall see his soul delivered from travail and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous," etc. Now, what God had expressed in few words in that passage, Christ, as though rising through the resurrection from the dead after overcoming his sufferings, explains in a most splendid way in the chapters following thereafter. For this reason he begins his
gospel discourse from these words, "Sing, O barren one, who does not bear," etc. ³ And from then on, after he has excited his church to a more excellent hope, he sets forth the doctrine of the gospel, as those very words of the prophet in verse 5 of chapter 54 demonstrate—the words which pertain to the distinction of the persons in the unity of God's essence: "Your husbands are your makers; Jehovah of hosts is his name," etc. ⁴

Christ, then, proclaimed in these words in Isaiah and explained more fully in the synagogue among his own people the awesome distinction of these husbands or makers (that is, of the persons who are one in unity of essence) and the delimitation⁵ of the blessings which are bestowed by each of the persons in the mystery of redemption, namely, as follows: The Lord Jehovah, that is, God the Father, is the author of his gifts, calling, and offices relating to the salvation of the church. The Son is he who to this end was provided with these same items by the Father. The Holy Spirit, finally, Jehovah, proceeding from the Father and the Son from eternity, is he who, according to the Father's plan, rests upon the Son and, in the same and through the same, is poured out upon the church catholic and each of her members for her prophetic instruction, priestly sanctification, and kingly liberation and salvation. Those who imagine that these things can be taken as referring to Isaiah appear to be wantonly fleeing from the radiant truth.

It only remains for us to say a few words about the alteration of Isaiah's words in Luke. Whatever there is in this passage in the way of
an alteration tends either to brevity and convenience or to the exposition and adaptation of those things which were regarded as having been stated more obscurely by the prophet on account of his times. It is a case of brevity, for one thing, that only "the Lord" is mentioned instead of "the Lord Jehovah"; for another thing, that shortly thereafter the name "Jehovah," or "the Lord," is omitted. It is a case of exposition that for those words which the prophet had stated, "to bind up those who are broken in heart," 6 Christ substituted "to heal those who are bruised in heart," by use of a very apt metathesis. 7 There is, for another thing, the fact that Christ added from chapter 42:7 and other passages of this same prophet, "to announce recovering of sight to the blind." Lastly, there is the fact that, in place of those words which Christ had stated through the prophet, "to proclaim the opening of the prison to those who are bound," the same person now at last calls his church to the matter at hand, as it were, by saying, "to set the broken free with a complete," or "full," "release," that is, to declare a complete and sure liberty. In this alteration of the passage from Isaiah, therefore, nothing is different except the words, while the sense was made more evident.

PARALLEL LXII

Luke 4

25. But, in truth, I tell you, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, so much so that there was a great famine in all that land:
26. and Elijah was sent to none of them, but only to Zarephath in the land of Sidon, to a woman who was a widow.

27. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian.

Although these words contain a complete argument consisting of two points, it did not seem necessary for the words of the Hebrew text to be coupled together with the words of Luke. The goal is that the proposition of Christ set down by Luke in the preceding verse should be confirmed. The main point is that the proposition, "no prophet is acceptable in his own country," is confirmed, not only by a great many other instances, but also by these two instances which Christ employed. Now, it is confirmed from the antithesis in this manner: God, in his providence, sends his prophets to that land and those people to whom they are acceptable. But he sent these men, not to their own land or people, but to foreign countries and people. Therefore, prophets are acceptable, not in their own, but in foreign lands. Christ, moreover, applied both parts of the antithesis to himself in verse 23 in these words, "Doubtless you will quote to me this proverb, 'Physician, heal yourself: what we have heard was done at Capernaum, do here also in your own country.'" And, consequently, by means of a single line of argument drawn from previous instances, he removes both grounds for reproach.

Luke 5:14. We treated above in our comments on Mark at parallel 51 of the things which are stated about cleansing according to the precept of Moses.

Luke 6:3. We spoke about the case of David above in our comments on Matthew at parallel 22.

PARALLEL LXIII

Luke 9
54. And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, "Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them, as also Elijah did?"

It was not at all necessary to write down in addition to this passage the story about Elijah contained in II Kings 1—for one thing, because it is adduced in brief compass as a precedent, while a transcription of it would be lengthy; for another thing, because the application of it as a precedent for the matter at hand was inept, as Luke demonstrates quite well in the following verse by saying that Jesus "turned and rebuked them and said, 'You do not know what manner of spirit you are of,'" and such things as follow. So, then, Christ reproved this statement by the apostles as severely as if it were opposed to righteousness, and he showed its unrighteousness by means of two arguments. One of these was drawn from the person of the apostles, who were conforming their spirit to the spirit of Elijah in neither knowledge nor inclination. The other was drawn, in the following verse, from the person of Christ and his calling and office. Therefore, it is sufficient for us to acquiesce in the response of Christ and to exert ourselves no further concerning the application of this passage by the apostles.
Luke 10:27. We spoke about the words of Moses in our comments on Matthew at parallel 43.

Luke 11:29. Concerning the sign of Jonah look at Matthew in parallel 24, and likewise concerning the ensuing cases of the queen of the South and the Ninevites.

PARALLEL LXIV

Luke 17

26. And as it happened in the days of Noah, so will it be also in the days of the Son of Man.
27. They ate, they drank, they married wives, and they were given in marriage, until the day when Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all.
28. Likewise, even as it took place in the days of Lot— they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they built,
29. but on the day that Lot went out from Sodom fire and brimstone rained from heaven and destroyed them all—
30. of the same nature as these things will be the day when the Son of Man is revealed ... 32. Remember Lot's wife.

It would likewise be too lengthy if it had been necessary to write out the whole account from Moses in addition to this excellent recital of the instances. The goal is that men should be provided with a fear of God's judgements leading to an awesome regard toward that much longed-for day when Christ will come a second time. The main point is that there will be the utmost over-confidence and sense of security at the time when Christ will come, just as is also intimated at the end of the parable which ensues, at the beginning of chapter 18. But, nevertheless, the pious must take care lest they rush into the same destruction or lest their minds give themselves up to passions, because the Lord on that day will
crush (as he had done long before Christ's assertion) those who in that time are shameless and follow the other course of action. And, moreover, it is to this point that the three instances pertain which are adduced by Christ in this passage. Now, we have warned previously, in our comments on Matthew at parallel 24, that by themselves individual types or instances scarcely produce a logical conclusion and that nothing can be obtained from particular and contingent things. But where the word and authority of God has been added, those things which otherwise furnish nothing by themselves, produce a necessary consequence—for one thing, by virtue of the institution or prediction of God; for another, by virtue of the analogy of his divine nature, righteousness, and judgements. Since this is the way things are, that Christ's prediction is logically binding we deduce not from the contingent instances which are adduced, but from the authority of the one who is speaking and the truth of his statements. By these statements he represented figuratively, through the history of preceding times, the sense of security of the last times and the punishment at his second coming, and he excited the pious to a constant expectation of that day.


Luke 20:17. We treated of this passage from David in our comments on Matthew at parallel 40.

Ibidem, verses 37 and 42. We spoke about these passages in our comments on Matthew at parallels 42 and 46.
Luke 22:37. We spoke about this passage from the prophet above in parallel 4, 6

Luke 24. Those things which are said in a general way about the testimonies of sacred scripture in verses 25, 27, and 44 and the two following verses 7 must be sought from a comparison with the other evangelists and from the writings of the apostles where testimonies concerning the priesthood and kingship of Christ are cited.
THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

John 1:23. Look above in parallel 10. What is said, moreover, with reference to Moses and the prophets in verse 46 of the same chapter has a concern in common with the immediately preceding observation.  

PARALLEL LXV

Psalm 69

10. Zeal for thy house has consumed me.  

John 2

17. Zeal for thy house has consumed me.

The goal of both passages is that the infinite zeal of the Lord and Saviour Christ towards the church should be exhibited to everyone. The main point is that this piety and zeal of Christ towards God the Father and the church, as if towards his house and sanctuary, was such that he esteemed other things as of no consequence, and so much so that he emptied himself, cast aside every regard for himself, and laid out his life for the salvation of the elect. But as to the application of this passage to Christ, judgements vary. For some think that these words of John, "Zeal for thy house," etc., were spoken by David in a literal and simple sense and that they were applied by John to Christ as an instance relating analogically to all the pious in common. Others judge that these words were, to be sure, spoken by David, but in a typical sense, and that they fit Christ in a literal sense. Others suppose that they pertain to every member of the church. Others, finally, hold that they were stated with reference to the person of Christ himself in a literal sense.
and that, for that reason, they were applied by John in a literal and exclusive sense to Christ. And, indeed, this diversity of interpretations of John's words has flowed from the diverse understanding of Psalm 69, which some have concluded is proper to David; others, typical of him; others, common to the church; others, proper and exclusive to Christ. The Jews think and most vehemently contend that it was proper to David, because they seem to themselves to elude, by this approach, shining testimonies concerning Christ our Saviour; with which testimonies this psalm overflows as much as it possibly could. But we shall directly show that these testimonies relate in a logically necessary way to Christ, while not even in a contingent way to David, when we bring forward the true interpretation of the psalm. However, just as the psalm cannot be said to be stated as proper and exclusive to David, so would it also be absurd if one were to assert that it is proper to Christ and must be understood as referring purely to him in every part. For in the way of this interpretation stand not a few verses which altogether demand that they be understood as referring to David, the author of this psalm.

Since, then, the psalm is proper and exclusive neither purely to the one nor purely to the other, it only remains that we should say that it is common to both and has need of a common interpretation. But if it is common to both (as it is), it must be said either to be common κατὰ τύπον² to David and κατ’ ἄληθειαν³ to Christ, or else to be common to the whole church κατὰ προφητείαν⁴ (which is a general and univer-
sal type). And, to be sure, we are ready without difficulty to grant that it is common to the whole church in the manner of an example and its application, or attachment, which the Greeks call ὀλίγεωσις following the method of interpretation which we taught in our comments on Matthew at parallel 24. But no pious man who has even once run through this psalm's line of thought with sound judgement and sincerity will ever (I believe) contend that the psalm under discussion was written by David with the specific purpose that it should be understood as referring by special design to the whole body of the church and to each of its members. In my opinion, therefore, the psalm is held in common after the manner of a specific and specially designed type, about which we spoke in the aforementioned passage of Matthew. And, accordingly, the acts of David are set forth in this psalm in such a way that the acts of Christ are represented figuratively; and, conversely, the acts of Christ are set forth in such a way that they cannot fit David except figuratively. For example (we need not go farther), when the prophet says in verse 21, "Insults break my heart," etc., this is stated as literally as could be about David, since his heart was not infrequently disabled and weakened by the weakness of the flesh. But it is stated figuratively about Christ, whose sufferings David foreshadowed with this qualification, that he intimated that Christ was only tempted, but not broken by temptations. Conversely, however, when in the following verse he uses these words, "They give me bitterness for food, and for my thirst they give me vinegar to drink," this was said figuratively concerning David, but it was predicted
concerning Christ literally and by special design (so to speak). And, moreover, a third class of expression arises from this passage which is very common in writings with this theme, namely, that certain expressions are taken as referring in a literal and simple sense to both objects, even as they were also stated in a literal way; as, for example, when in the same chapter, from the fifth verse on, David sets forth his cause and Christ his in David’s words. It is in this class of expression that this cause must be reckoned which David had and which the apostles recognized as pertaining to Christ, "For zeal for thy house has consumed me," etc. The prophet David wanted these words to be uttered and understood in a literal and simple sense as referring both to himself and to Christ whom he was foreshadowing. The application of this passage, therefore, is quite reasonable and quite correct.

PARALLEL LXVI

John 3
14. As Moses lifted up that serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up,
15. that whoever believes in him may not perish but have eternal life.

It is not at all necessary for the whole account from Numbers 21 to be set down beside this passage, because writing down in addition a good part of that chapter would have been too lengthy and the whole truth of the matter can conveniently be learned from Moses. As for the rest, that material serpent was a specific and exclusive, or specially designed,
type of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Its lifting up was a type of
the lifting up of Christ. And the way in which those people looked to it
in a bodily way was a type of that way in which we look to Christ spirit-
ually—or, in other words, of our faith, by which, as they were delivered
from bodily death, we are delivered from spiritual death through Christ
and possess eternal life. However, our comments at parallel 24 on Mat-
thew must be consulted concerning this specific and exclusive class of type.

PARALLEL LXVII

Genesis 48
22. I give to you one part be-
yond your brothers, which I took
from the hand of the Amorites
with my sword and with my bow.

John 4
5. Jesus came to a city of Samar-
ia which is called Sychar, near the
estate that Jacob gave to his son
Joseph.

Both passages are purely historical. Now Jacob, on the one hand,
asserted in those words in Moses that he had granted an estate or double
portion to his son Joseph, which two portions were named from the names
of Ephraim and Manasseh. But these words were deliberately set down
by the evangelist in the latter passage so as to fix the part at which Jesus
had arrived when the episode which is set forth thereafter was enacted by
him. ¹ He shows, therefore, that, because the name "Samaria" is a word
with another sense, the place where these events were enacted had to be
circumscribed more precisely, namely, that it was a place in Galilee,
but on the boundary of Samaria, so that he might influence his own
Galileans the more fully through the testimony and example of their
neighbors. On account of this, after John said, "He came to a city of Samaria which is called Sychar," he added this explanatory phrase, "near the estate," etc. It is just as if he were saying, "The whole upper district, to be sure, which once belonged to the kingdom of the Israelites is by custom sometimes embraced by the name 'Samaria,' from the name of its chief center and royal city. But since the two parts of that district as a whole were created a long time ago now"—one of these parts was called Samaria, but the other Galilee—"one must understand the narrower signification in this passage." For Sychar was a border town of Samaria. Christ, after he had passed by the Samaritans, stayed at this time in the vicinity of this town and on the boundary of Galilee. The purpose in so doing was that, having concealed his design, he might more opportunely draw the Samaritans, who were abhorred by the Jews, to faith in him and instruct his own Galileans concerning their own duty by means of this very example. For that phrase, "near the estate," etc., must not be rendered in conjunction with the city of Sychar (for this was a city of Samaria), but must be construed with the word "came." When this has been done, the passage is free from the obscure. Now, if there is room for any conjecture [about the location of this town], we should have reckoned that this place was not far away from Succoth, of which Genesis 33:17 speaks.
John 5
39. The scriptures are they that bear witness to me.
46. If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me.

No one certain passage of scripture is expressly adduced in these words, but Christ only confirms in a general way that there are passages which bear witness to his person, offices, and blessings. Now, since these passages are for the most part pointed out specifically in other places (and also through the apostles and evangelists), there is no need at all for them to be heaped together at this point. Therefore, we shall hasten on to other statements of Christ.

Psalm 78
24. He gave them the grain of heaven.

John 6
31. He gave them bread from heaven to eat.
49. Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness and they died.

Both passages are historical and agree in theme. Whatever there is in the way of an alteration by Christ, is for the purposes of explanation. It must only be observed that in the latter passage from John, where the words of Christ are quoted, two passages from the historical books are drawn together: one from chapter 16 of Exodus, when the fathers are said to have eaten manna in the wilderness; the other, from Numbers 14 and Psalm 95, when these very Israelites who ate the manna in the
wilderness are said to have died.¹ This happened, of course, because most of them ate the sacrament, but not the real object of the sacrament, as Christ explains in the following words;² but, above all, because the manna in itself was nourishment for that temporary life, as Christ is for eternal life. For it is to this end that this comparison set up by Christ looks.

PARALLEL LXX

John 7

22. Moses gave you circumcision (not that it is from Moses, but from the fathers) and you circumcise a man on the sabbath.

The argument of Christ is, to be sure, plain; we treated of one very like it previously in our comments at parallel 22 on Matthew.¹ Yet because two distinct points are brought forward here by Christ, it seemed good to set this passage before the eyes in a few words--but yet without any preparation of the sort of diagram which we usually employ in this book, lest we be too long. The first point occurs when it is said that Moses gave circumcision and that a man is circumcised on the sabbath. Now, this point looks back to the words of Moses in Leviticus 12.² In these words, although Moses scarcely gives or institutes circumcision for the Israelites as if he were its first author, he still confirms that circumcision which had previously been given and establishes it more unalterably by the authority of the law. The second point occurs ἐπεὶ ἐπανόρθωσεν³ when Christ says that circumcision was received not
from Moses, but from the fathers. The account of Moses confirms this point very clearly, Genesis 17.⁴ Christ uses the former point to prove, by means of the authority of the law, the line of argument which he has undertaken. He uses the latter, on the other hand, as satisfaction of an anticipated objection,⁵ lest perhaps spiteful men should gnaw away at his preceding words and calumniate him as if he were ignorant of sacred history or a corrupter of it. This art of calumniating is commonly used in disputes by those who, despairing of either themselves or their cause, lie in wait for another's words that they may escape from the point of debate itself and so conceal the truth.

PARALLEL LXXI

Isaiah 55
1. Ho, everyone who thirsts, come to the waters.  

Isaiah 58
11. You shall be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not.

John 7
37. If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink.

38. He who believes in me, as scripture has said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

The matter speaks for itself that it must be acknowledged that, in every respect, both passages laid out in this diagram of ours have the same goal and the same main point. For it is as sure as sure can be that Isaiah, in that whole series of several chapters, spoke concerning the kingship and prophetic office and priesthood of Christ, even as we fully demonstrated above in parallel 61. On the other hand, no one who scrup-
ulously and dispassionately has compared the words of Christ (who spoke long before through the prophets) with the words of Isaiah, who had foretold these things of Christ—no one who has done this is likely to doubt that Christ, in whom the most certain reality of that splendid prophecy is found, looked back to this passage and distinctly pointed it out to the Jews with, as it were, his finger. Now, to say frankly what I think about the latter part of the diagram, if any passage in the Old Testament ought to be matched up with those words of Jesus Christ, it seems to me, at least, that it is that one which we have laid out in our diagram. For although the words are thoroughly divergent, the contents themselves and the theme still agree in every way; and there is a common goal and main point in this promise, as we were saying about the former part of the diagram. But, by everyone's good leave, I consider that one troubles one's self in vain about fitting some passage of the Old Testament together with those magnificent words of our Lord Jesus Christ. And, accordingly, nothing was needed in the diagram, although it seemed right that this should be added in order to satisfy in some measure those who think something else.

We are of the opinion, then, that in those words, "He who believes in me as scripture says," etc., it is not the case that some new passage of scripture is cited by Christ, but only that the words of that promise which he had publicly proclaimed in the church of the Jews on that great day of the feast are developed and delimited and look back to the same
passage from Isaiah. The sense, then (to express it paraphrastically), is just as if he were saying, "Perhaps someone is about to inquire what these words mean, 'If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink.'

But I shall expound this whole statement in a few words. In short, it is he who believes in me that comes to me and drinks. For it is by faith that one comes to me, and it is by faith too that one drinks and lives in me. But this faith which I desire is not a casual faith or one that rests on opinion, but rather the true law of faith is that he who believes in me, believes in the same way as the aforementioned scripture-passage said, that is, as Isaiah mentioned in that very passage" (we have no need to go farther). He who believes in Christ, namely, is possessed of that true thirst which Isaiah mentions in that same place and which Christ indicates in Matthew when he says, "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness." Moreover," says Christ, "I promise this in the way of a boon to the man who, truly thirsting, believes in me: that he will possess not only that whence he may drink, but also that whence he may copiously flow forth to others for eternal life." If, therefore, this opinion is held, the passage will be clear. If, however, anyone will prefer that this promise of Christ be referred to the pattern of the Old Testament, there will be two methods of interpretation. The first will be to match up with this passage some certain passage of scripture which will satisfy the wish of those who desired it, just as we have done in the diagram.

The second method will be to decide that no one certain passage was cited
by Christ, but that the collective substance (so to speak) of the gospel promises from the collective corpus of the Old Testament were joined fitly together, as it were, and embraced by this one mode of expression. Everyone is free to have his own opinion as far as I am concerned.

John 7:42. What is said concerning the ancestry and place of birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, was discussed in our comments on the second chapter of Matthew. ²

PARALLEL LXXII

Deuteronomy 19
18. The judges shall inquire diligently; but if, lo, the afore-said witness is a false witness, and has spoken something false against his brother, etc.

John 7
51. Does our law condemn a man unless a judge first hears from him and learns what he does?

An analogy involving what is right and wrong is quite unchanging, as we have often pointed out previously. It was stipulated by this law both of nature and of God that no one should be condemned in a judicial inquiry unless two things preceded this condemnation: first, a hearing of him who is accused for his defence, examination, or excuse; next, a reliable and lawful inquiry, which is enjoined in explicit language in Deuteronomy 13¹ and 17 and in other passages of sacred scripture.² But these things are so perspicuous as to have no need of our exposition.
Leviticus 20  
10. If a man commits adultery with another's wife, he commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor; the adulterer and the adulteress shall by all means be put to death.

John 8  
5. In the law Moses commanded us to stone such.

We have often taught that aetiology, that is, the law of what is right and wrong, is universal and quite unchanging. Since the Jews followed this aetiology in adducing this passage and proposed a judgement on the authority of their law, there is no reason at all why one should trouble one's self about the interpretation of this passage. Only this point may perhaps have disturbed the less erudite, that they say that according to the law an adulteress must be stoned. And if, now, this word is not explicitly used in this passage of Leviticus which we have added to this diagram, the Jews have still not interpreted this passage improperly in this way. This follows from the comparison and analogy of other passages, since this kind of death is indicated for the female adulterer and the betrothed woman who has been defiled, Deuteronomy 22. ¹ Their interpretation, therefore, is in accordance with the sense of the law; but they had an aim altogether opposed to the law, since they were putting Christ to the test by means of this question. To say more about the matter would be relevant neither to this passage, nor to our purpose.
This passage too is aetiological, nor does it have any need for exposition. The application, however, which Christ has made, is effected by means of a comparison with the lesser and with the equivalent. There is a comparison with the lesser when the testimony of men is compared with the testimony of God the Father and Son. For if confidence is placed in the testimony of men, how much more in divine testimony? The weight of this comparison is ἄναντιροπτος. There is a comparison with the equivalent, on the other hand, when equal number is compared with equal number, namely, the number of two human witnesses is compared with two persons of the most holy Trinity, the Father and the Son, just as Christ explains in a most splendid fashion in the ensuing verse.

John 8
56. Your father Abraham longed to see this day of mine, and he saw it, and he was glad.

These words, to be sure, neither need to be referred, strictly speaking, to some one single passage, nor can they be; but, rather, they embrace the whole corpus (so to speak), or sum, of the account of Abra-
ham. Yet there is no doubt that Christ drew together in these few words the order of the whole account which Moses wrote at length concerning Abraham and that Christ cast the growth of Abraham's faith in the teeth of an unbelieving and disobedient people. For there are three things which are here touched upon by Christ in order. The first is that Abraham exulted and longed with an ardent desire to see this day; the second, that he saw it; the third, that having seen it, he was glad. Now, to be sure, the promise first had to be given by God to Abraham before these things were done by him. The words of this promise are contained—rather obscurely, to be sure—in the beginning of chapter 12 and then explained more clearly in the following chapter. But how he longed to see this day when he had heard this promise, Moses explains in chapter 15 of Genesis. That most holy obedience of his in observing the rite of circumcision, but, above all, in sacrificing his son, demonstrates how with steadfast faith Abraham saw this day, Genesis 17 and 22. At that time he saw the day of Christ so clearly that, although he was about to sacrifice his son, he was nevertheless certain concerning his seed, and said, "Jehovah will provide for himself, my son." Finally, Moses demonstrates that Abraham was glad—for one thing, in the same chapter, when he is said to have been the author of that proverb, "On the mount of Jehovah it shall be provided," and when he returned home with tranquil mind after the promise had been further strengthened to the effect that in his seed all the nations of the earth would be blessed. Abraham is
surely shown as glad, for another thing, in the following chapters as well, when he wanted everything in his family conducted according to the guidance and authority of God, relying upon the assistance of God the Father and the angel of his covenant, Genesis 24:7 and so forth. 7

PARALLEL LXXVI

Psalm 118
20. This is that gate to Jehovah through which the righteous enter.

John 10
7. Truly, I say to you, I am the door of the sheep.

The goal of this statement which Christ provides in the gospel is that, on the one hand, that blind man who had been rendered ἀποσυναγωγὸς (because of his holy public profession of Christ) and all the pious should be strengthened in the face of that raging tyranny in the church. The goal is also that, on the other hand, the Jews, who were obstinately opposing Christ’s grace, should be taught that Christ was not heedless or ignorant and unaware of this stubbornness of theirs, but that, on the contrary, it is his special task that he sets his own apart and, by means of his voice, leads them to eternal salvation. The main point, however, is (as Christ later says by way of explanation in verse 9) that Christ is the door, as it were; that is, if anyone enters through him, he will be saved. We have already demonstrated in our comments on Matthew at parallel 37 that this was, in fact, the intention of David in that passage of Psalm 118 which has been written out in this diagram. 2 The correct
interpretation of that psalm must be sought from that source. For the
church of God responds very simply, as a mother responding to her
children, to the pious who are asking about the gates through which there
is entrance into the kingdom of heaven and who are promising sacrifices
of praise to the Lord. The church responds that there is no reason for
the pious to trouble themselves about gates or to think that there is a
need for more gates for this Christian journey. For, she responds,
there is only one gate, or entrance, to Jehovah, or God the Father, name-
ly, Jesus Christ our Saviour, through whom the righteous will enter and
come to the Father. This same gate is the lowermost corner-stone, in
which the whole building is joined together so as to be a temple holy to
the Lord. This, therefore, is our interpretation, which we bring forward
without following anyone’s example and which we commit to the judgement
of the church and all the pious.

PARALLEL LXXVII

Psalm 82
6. I said, "You are gods."

John 10
34. Is it not written in your law,
'I said, 'You are gods'"?

The prophet uses these words in the psalm, not εἰρωνεύως or
merely συγχωρητικῶς (as most people think), but, rather, ἐπι-
τιμητικῶς, that he may show and evince more fully in the words of
God himself the iniquity of mighty men who misuse their authority. The
main point is that it is the most wicked thing of all that men who have
been provided and endowed with a certain divine glory and majesty by God's will and blessing should employ the same in oppressing their poorer brothers. Christ quotes these same words in this passage in order to assert the truth of his statement which he had predicated of himself, namely, that he is the Son of God. The way in which they excuse themselves in verse 33 shows that even the Jews understood the statement in this way: Christ argues, therefore, by means of a comparison with the lesser, to convince the Jews that his words which he had uttered concerning himself could not be rebuked in even a civic sense. The explication of this comparison is transmitted in the ensuing verses, and it is distinctly elucidated by means of two antithetical members in the words of Christ himself. For the purposes of instruction, these things can be reduced to the following syllogism: If it is holy and not blasphemous for those to be called gods to whom the word of God was spoken, it will be altogether holier if he is called the Son of God to whom the word of God was spoken and who was sanctified by the Father and sent from heaven into the world. But the antecedent is true on the basis of the authority of scripture. Therefore, the consequent is also true. This was an incontestable line of argument which no obstinacy of the Jews could oppose.

John 12:15. We treated of the passage from Zechariah above in our comments on Matthew at parallel 36.
PARALLEL LXXVIII

Psalm 110
4. You are a priest for ever.

John 12
34. We have heard from the law that the Christ remains for ever.

Both passages are historical prophecy, agreeing in the point of the contents in every respect; and, for this reason, it is not at all necessary for us to tarry in the exposition of these things. However, it must be noted that the goals of the two passages are very divergent. For the prophet taught that the saving office of Christ towards the church would endure forever; while the crowd of Jews, when they adduced this, wished to refute the statement of Christ, in that he had said earlier, "I, if I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself."¹ Christ responded to this objection, however, with a very suitable similitude. "Both are true," he says, "both that I, the Son of Man, must be lifted up and that the Christ remains forever. For the Christ is the light of men, which light abides forever, even though after a short time he will be lifted up from the earth. But if, according to the body, he is lifted up from the earth and will die by death on the cross, the light will not, for that reason, die but will abide forever, although in this world it will vanish from the eyes of men and from public view."² And so it is from this source that there arises that occasion for exhortation of which Christ next takes advantage, "Walk, while you have the light," etc.³ By these words he intimates that, according to his deity, he is, indeed, the light; but that, according to his humanity in which the fulness of deity dwells bodily,⁴ he is the lamp, as it were, offered to men for the sake
of its light. But when the lamp was lifted up out of public view, darkness would overtake the people of the Jews, etc. 5

PARALLEL LXXIX

Isaiah 53  
1. Who believes our preaching? And the arm of Jehovah has been revealed to that! 1

John 12  
38. Lord, who has believed our report? And the arm of the Lord has been revealed to that!

The goal of this passage in both places is that the pious members of the church should be strengthened against the scandal of this world, which, by reason of its unbelief, is rejecting the grace and teaching of the gospel. The main point, on the other hand, is that many, to be sure, have been called, but few have been chosen to heed the saving teaching and power of God and to grasp it by faith. Now, the prophet Isaiah, to be sure, prophesied this concerning his own time and his own nation, with respect to the teaching of the gospel, as much as he had spoken very severely to his people in the preceding chapters. But it is not without justification that John testifies that this same passage relates to the very times of Christ, when he uses these words, "that the word spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled: 'Lord,'" etc. 2 For there are, in my opinion, two reasons for this application which are entirely possible. 3 One is that Isaiah looked at the condition of his own times in such a way as to turn his attention from the matter at hand--as if from an opportunity which presented itself for speaking thus--to the nature of
the whole human race in general. For that men should not have faith in
the preaching of heavenly and saving teaching is certainly not peculiar
and exclusive only to that period of time in which Isaiah prophesied or to
that in which Christ lived here on earth. On the contrary, it is a defect
common by nature to all men, places, and times, until they are trans-
formed by the remarkable grace of God in Christ. The other reason for
John's application of Isaiah's words is that those very words pertain in
a literal and exclusive sense to the times of Christ, which Isaiah had an-
nounced from chapter 49 on and which he expressly discusses in the
whole of that fifty-third chapter and the following ones. Since this is
the way things are, those things which were announced in this manner
long beforehand about Christ's teaching by Isaiah, are quite aptly said
by the apostle to be fulfilled.

John 12:40. We interpreted this passage of Isaiah in our comments
on Matthew at parallel 25.

PARALLEL LXXX

Psalm 41
10. He who ate my bread has
lifted up his heel against me.

John 13
18. He who ate my bread has lifted
up his heel against me.

All agree that the narrative in the words of David is historical.
And no one will fail to see that the other one too is described as history
by Christ, if he pays attention to those words: 'I am not speaking of you
all; I know whom I have chosen; but that this scripture-passage may be
fulfilled, 'He who ate with me!" etc. For in the former account Ahithophel, who was rising up against King David, is designated, while in the latter it is Judas, who betrayed his Lord. Now it is certain that some one account exclusively concerned with a certain act cannot literally be uttered concerning the account of another act, but only figuratively, as we demonstrated in our comments on Matthew at parallels 6 and 24. The application of this passage by Christ, therefore, is figurative. But there are two sorts of figurative application in this category. For one is of human, the other of divine institution. It is one of human institution when some type or general metaphor is taken up to signify some certain matter, as, for example, if one utters "Dodonaean bronze" instead of "ringing," "Tolosan" instead of "deadly," and other such things. An application is one of divine institution, on the other hand, when one and the same matter both supplies the material for a general type and has been granted by God as a type exclusive to something else by virtue of some institution exclusive to it. This passage is of this kind. For the case of David and Ahithophel is a general type—in respect to the one, of uprightness and goodness; in respect to the other, of treachery. However, when it is applied to the history of Christ, the person and act of David is, according to the institution of God, a specific type of Christ and his acts. And the treachery of Ahithophel figuratively represented the treachery of Judas, who conducted himself more treacherously by far against the spiritual kingship of Christ than did Ahithophel against the temporal and symbolic kingship of the other. But if it was
according to divine institution that this type was constructed, it is assuredly in a very apt manner and one appropriate to the same institution that Christ applies this type to his own history and prophesies about it.

**PARALLEL LXXXI**

Psalm 35  
19. They hate me without cause.

John 15  
25. They hate me without cause.

Sacred scripture teaches and our natural corruption proves that, as the hatred of many toward David was undeserved, so the hatred of the whole world toward Christ and toward those who cling to Christ is always undeserved. This hatred was, moreover, foretold concerning Christ our Saviour by David, acting as the type of Christ and one, in a certain sense, exclusive to him. Now the Lord Christ applies these words to himself in accordance with both the common nature and the unique law of types. Therefore, no other interpretation of this statement need be added to this, nor need any other reason be brought forward than those which were explained by us in the two immediately preceding parallels.

**PARALLEL LXXXII**

John 17  
12. I kept them whom you have given me, and none of them is lost but him who is the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled.
It is the opinion of many, to be sure, that some definite passage of scripture is designated by these words of Christ. Yet, everything considered, it seems to me, at least, that rather it is not one certain passage which is expressly touched upon, but all those passages of the law and prophets in which the promises and threats of the gospel had already been discussed long before. Now, there is no one who does not realize that this is a correct summary of the promises of the gospel: that Christ will save those whom the Father has given him and save them, indeed, in such a way that none of them is lost. Conversely, there is no one who does not realize that this is the theme of the threats of the gospel: that those who are sons of perdition, that is, whom God the Father has not given to his son to save, will be lost through their own unbelief and fault. Almost all the pages of the law and prophets are filled with these two points of the lessons [of the gospel]. Surely, Christ, in balancing accounts, as it were, with his God and Father, carefully enumerates both points here and proves the faithfulness of his management from the authority, or testimony, of sacred scripture. Now, he is talking about the body (so to speak) of his apostles; he commends the members of this body to God, since he is about to depart from them. Therefore, Christ very aptly reports concerning each of those members that which had already been promised concerning the whole body of the church long before through the law and prophets. And, conversely, the aforementioned Judas Iscariot is scrupulously excluded from their number, even
as scripture already taught long before that those are excluded who are sons of perdition and who scarcely belong to the Son of compassion\(^1\) who is, as it were, our \(\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu\).\(^2\)

**PARALLEL LXXXIII**

**John 19**

7. By our law he ought to die, because he has made himself the Son of God.

These hypocrites did not hesitate to adduce the law of God against Christ (who is the fulfilment of the law and the prophets). They did this, to be sure, with the utmost treachery, but the thesis, or (as the dialecticians call it) the major premise,\(^1\) which they employed is still true. For they argued as follows: "Whoever makes himself the Son of God (that is, whoever pretends and feigns and falsely declares that he is such), is a blasphemer against God and is condemned to death according to the law, Deuteronomy 13 and 18.\(^2\) But this man pretends that he is the Son of God. Therefore, he is condemned." After the aforementioned major premise, which in itself is quite true and in agreement with the law, they add a false minor premise and assail Christ with a charge of blasphemy and, for this reason, propose the punishment of death against him. But because this passage has clarity enough, we shall hasten on to others.

John 19:24. We previously treated of the passage of David from Psalm 22 in our comments on Matthew at parallel 49.
Psalm 69
22. They gave me bitterness for food and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.

John 19
28. That the scripture might be fulfilled, he said, "I thirst."
29. There was, then, a bowl there full of the vinegar which had been put in it. And they filled a sponge with vinegar and, putting it on hyssop, they brought it to his mouth.

This passage was stated figuratively by David while acting as the type of Christ—in a typical sense with regard to David himself, but in a literal sense with regard to Christ, and it ought to be taken in this way. The truth of history, the concurrent authority of the evangelists, and the very nature of types (of which we treated a short while ago in parallel 65) demonstrate this fact.

Exodus 12
46. You shall not break a bone in it.

Zechariah 12
10. They will look on me whom they have pierced.

John 19
36. For these things took place that the scripture might be fulfilled, "Not one bone of him shall be broken."
37. And again another scripture says, "They shall look on him whom they have pierced."

These two passages have been aptly joined together to testify to the truth of the account which is being written down by the evangelists. For among the ancients it was regarded as customary for the legs of those who were crucified (if, by chance, they survived very long) to be broken by the soldiers. By this procedure blood flowed forth and the
power of life was cut short. Nevertheless, the evangelists show that it was not without purpose that it happened that the legs of our Lord Jesus Christ were not broken, but that the providence of God so ordained that he should expire before the soldiers prepared themselves to break the legs of the condemned men who had been crucified. For this reason, they acted according to the custom, to be sure, with the legs of the two robbers, but the legs of Christ remained whole and uninjured. The soldier merely took the trouble to make a test by tearing open Christ's side, to see whether or not he had truly given up his life. The sign of blood and water which came out, however, demonstrated that he had given it up, for the reason, of course, that when the pericardium and receptacle of water is pierced so that its contents pour out, any creature at all must immediately die. Now the gospel-writer demonstrates with two testimonies that these things took place by the same providence of God by which they had been predicted by the prophets—the one a typical testimony, the other spoken in a literal and simple sense. And, indeed, even from the thing itself anyone at all can recognize that it is clearly the necessary consequence of that typical passage that the type concerned was a specific one and specially designed to signify this very part of history which was related by John with singular assiduity in order to show that this was, at last, the truest fulfilment of that shadow. For we showed previously in our comments on Matthew at parallel 24 that specific, or specially designed, types are so constituted.
The other passage, on the other hand, which is adduced from Zechariah, is similarly a prophetic account, but without type, of that piercing which Christ suffered in his side. Not only is John our author in this assertion, but also the line of argument of the prophet Zechariah itself demands that his words be taken in this sense. For not even the Jews themselves have ever dared to deny that the reign of the Christ is being discussed in this passage. Now, the two effects of that reign are explained in order: on the one hand, that our supreme king will seek, that is, will prepare and arrange everything that will be necessary to destroy his enemies; on the other hand, that he will most copiously provide and fill his elect with all spiritual gifts in the gospel of repentance and faith. These two points are described by the prophet Zechariah in the ensuing words. Now the words before us were placed in the exposition of that former point, concerning Christian penitence, or repentance. They definitely show, therefore, that the people of the Jews --or, at least, those of the nation of the Jews who will come to repentance--will turn the gaze of their eyes and turn their attention to Christ, as to the author of repentance and the sole and certain aim of faith. And, indeed, they will turn their attention to him for this reason, that they will be conscious in their minds of their impiety and unrighteousness against Christ, who was previously pierced by them. And, consequently, that very piercing, which was going to occur without the breaking of any bone, would be, among the other sufferings of Christ, a very evident
sign from which the repentant Jews would see that Jesus is the Christ and possess a very just reason for lamentation concerning their impiety and unrighteousness, by which Christ was pierced. Therefore, since the prophet Zechariah foretold each of these things to this end with such clarity, it ought not to seem surprising if this evangelist of ours has applied to the full account of its fulfilment the matter which had been spoken clearly long before, but which had been dimly understood by the fathers before its fulfilment. This way of interpreting the matter is surely the most holy and correct way of all.

Now, if someone says, "But in this account of our evangelist this lamentation and repentance which Zechariah describes is not discussed," the response is easy: Zechariah described both the lamentation of the pious and the reasons for the lamentation. Now, here [in John] there is, to be sure, no passage devoted to discussing the lamentation of the pious. But, nevertheless, not least among the other reasons for the holy lamentation of the pious was the aforesaid fact that both the Jews themselves and impious hands from the Gentiles pierced their king, our Saviour. Consequently, this is that part which John had particularly in mind in these words; and the prophecy of it had to be pointed out distinctly, as it were, in these very few words, in order that the agreement of prophecy with gospel history and of gospel fulfilment with the prophecy which precedes it might become evident.
John 20:9. As to the fact that scripture is adduced in regard to the resurrection of Christ, it is stated only generally and without specification. And since elsewhere, but especially in the Acts of the Apostles, passages of scripture are adduced as confirmation of this doctrine, we shall defer the matter to the parallels belonging to that book.
Psalm 69

26. Let their habitations be forsaken; let there be no one to live in their tents. ¹

Psalm 109

8. Let another take his office, "His episcopate let another take."²

The goal for which these two passages are adduced by Peter in the assembly of the church can easily be learned from the character of the discourse as a whole which he delivered. For the discourse is deliberative in nature, pertaining to a matter at issue.³ By it Peter teaches the church, which was present at that time, that it must make provision, since the Lord Jesus Christ desired that there be apostles who should be twelve in number for the foundation of his church and apportioned the apostolic superintendence, or office, to twelve men—that the church must make provision, therefore, that so important and honourable a ministry not be narrowed to fewer men. And, accordingly, Peter teaches that one must be chosen in place of that dead betrayer. But it was to be feared that some uneasiness might stick in the minds of the weak and that they might, perhaps, be hindered by this uneasiness from zealously continuing in the work of God. For this reason, it seemed good to Peter to state in advance, in the four verses before the point of exhortation, a certain προθεσμεία,³ by which he teaches the church that it is not the part of any pious man to allow himself to be alienated from the office.
by reason of this scandal. 4 For these things were already foretold by sacred scripture and divine authority long ago, so that no one could be offended for this reason. The main point, therefore, of both passages is that the aforesaid scandal was predicted so that no one should think that it happened without cause or be offended at it without cause. Next, on the other hand, the point is also that the will and command of God is this, that this charge should be committed to another. And, indeed, the application of the former passage by Peter cannot be obscure to pious minds, if they attended well to that which we taught above in our comments on John at parallel 65, 5 namely, that Psalm 69 is common to David, as the type, and to Christ, as the real object of the type; but is not peculiar to the one or the other, or common to the church of God. For since the theme of that psalm is well established, it will be established by the same token that this passage was adduced quite aptly by Peter and uttered with regard to the betrayer Judas.

The Jews, to be sure, appear to themselves to have sufficient grounds from which to undermine this interpretation of Peter's. And the less learned will, perhaps, be shaken by this pretext, that the numbers have been altered in this discourse, because David made mention of many, while Peter talks about only one. But this line of argument cannot overthrow Peter's interpretation or the application of it to the story of the betrayer Judas. For, if you were to argue in this way, from "David spoke about many," it does not follow, "Therefore, he in no way
spoke about Judas. " It would, to be sure, follow that he in no way spoke about Judas alone. However, what has been stated concerning many is quite correctly stated concerning this or that individual (as they call it) included within the number of those several men. Both these things, indeed, are true: it was stated prophetically, on the one hand, concerning many by David; it was explained anagogically, on the other hand, concerning Judas the betrayer by Peter. For in both ways the account is, in fact, quite true. And, in the first place, indeed, the history of Josephus, but above all, his De Bello Judaico, demonstrates that this was stated quite correctly about all the Jews who stubbornly opposed Christ and his gospel. And the histories of Hegesippus and others likewise demonstrate this, even as Christ had related in clear words in Matthew 23 and 24. It was quite reasonable, however, for this statement to be explained in the present passage as referring to Judas separately, because God wanted to effect in him—-as in the leader of the conspiracy against Christ which had to be avenged—the first example of his very severe justice, which he had made known in this psalm. Peter adduces this example and beginning, as it were, of divine vengeance most suitably, as if it were some pledge and token rightly deposited in the church of God to set the seal on the fact that the same judgement was about to come upon the remainder of the nation. It is true, to be sure, that it cannot be proved from scripture that Judas had any habitation, or dwelling for his habitation. But Peter very aptly removes this objection, when he relates that the habitation of Judas, or place for his habitation, which the Apostle Peter had in mind
in this passage was not, in reality, possessed by Judas himself; but it is even still justly called his habitation, since it was purchased from his money. For the preceding part of the discourse demonstrates that these words must be taken in this sense, when it says, "This man, then, bought a field with the reward of his wickedness," and a little later, "And it became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so much so that that field was called in their own language Akeldama, that is, Field of Blood." It is to this statement that the confirmation from the authority of scripture is appended, "For it is written in the book of Psalms," etc. Peter had had this passage in mind at the beginning of his discourse in saying, "The scripture had to be fulfilled," etc. For the things which come thereafter up to the verse before us intervene by hyperbaton for the sake of a fuller clarification of the matter.

We pass from the application of this passage to the other passage, which is the chief passage of the whole discourse, namely, to the effect that another good man and disciple of Christ ought to be provided who should be put in the place of Judas to assume his charge. Peter immediately adds this passage to the preceding one for the sake of convenience, beginning from his authority in this verse and bringing forward an exposition of this authority in the following verses. It seems, to be sure, that his application of this passage is insensitive and that David scarcely had Judas in mind in Psalm 109. But it is not, for this reason, fitting that we should repudiate whatever seems to be insensitive and esteem
lightly the authority of the Spirit of God. I acknowledge the aforesaid point, to be sure, that the story of Judas is not discussed in this passage, but it is not necessary for us to interpret that psalm as referring to Judas in order to confirm this application of Peter's. On the contrary, it does not necessarily follow that the application is insensitive because that passage was not prophesied with reference to Judas. For this class of application is aetiological and not historical, just as we demonstrated at parallel 6 in our comments on Matthew that applications must be distinguished from one another. Now, (to express the matter more clearly) that which we propose is, in a few words, this: the discussion there is not about an act of Judas, but about moral obligation and just conduct. For this was David's intention, agreeing with moral obligation and just conduct: It is very necessary that there be offices of superintendence, ministries or charges, but in such a way that they are not committed to the wicked. For they ought to be committed to the upright rather than to the wicked, or if they have, by chance, been committed to the wicked, they ought to be taken away from them. But it is altogether necessary that there be offices of superintendence, and it is quite just that good men be set over them. From this general proposition which David asserted, Peter constructs a special case by a line of argument drawn from the whole (as they call it) in extent. The superintendence, or charge, he says, which Christ had entrusted to Judas is holy and necessary for the church of God. Therefore, even as it was justly taken away
from him, so it must be assumed by another, whose qualifications he describes in the following verses. That this must be done he teaches from the authority cited, and, indeed, the thoroughly unassuming conduct of the apostles establishes that the importance of the office and the benefit to the church demand this. Although the apostles were eleven in number, they were still aware in their minds how important the office of the apostolate was, and, accordingly, they judged it necessary for one to be added to discharge their duties with them. So far was Peter from that domineering and sacrilegious presumption of imagining that the apostolic office and authority ought to or could be drawn together into his own hand or that of any other one man. "For who," says Paul, "is sufficient for these things?" 15

PARALLEL LXXXVII

Joel 2

28. And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions.

29. Nay, even upon the menservants and upon the maidservants in those days, I will pour out my Spirit.

30. And I will show portents in the heaven and on the earth,

Acts 2

16. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel:

17. And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour forth from my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.

18. Yea, and upon my menservants and upon my maidservants in those days, I will pour forth from my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.

19. And I shall show wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth
blood and fire and billowing clouds of smoke.  
31. The sun itself shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that very great and terrible day of Jehovah comes.  
32. And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of Jehovah shall be delivered.

The goal of both passages is that the truth of the promises of the gospel should be shown, and be confirmed by divine signs. Joel had foretold long beforehand that this matter would come about, while Peter showed that it had come to pass. The main point, consequently, is that all the promises of the gospel have their beginning from the impartation of the Spirit of God in Christ Jesus. Two things would result from the remarkable power of this impartation: on the one hand, the members of Christ, imbued with it, would overflow with his spiritual gifts to his church; on the other hand, the greatest signs would appear in heaven and earth to afflict the consciences of men, so that by those stings, as it were, the pious should be excited to earnest invoking of the divine majesty and should obtain salvation from God. So, then, the application of this passage by Peter is not troublesome since not even the Jews themselves deny that the aforesaid prophecy pertains to the reign of the Messiah, that is, to the times of the gospel. And Peter himself establishes this application in a fashion quite splendid by teaching that these are, at last, those times in which the Christ has begun to display his heavenly
gifts, by his divine power, in his church, which the same Christ would continue from then on to display among his elect. But if there are alterations which appear in this interpretation, these are certainly not of such a kind that they could occasion a scruple of doubt to a moderately educated man. For most of the things which Peter substitutes in place of the prophet's wording are exegetical. Therefore, we shall pass over this point and come to the following passage.

PARALLEL LXXXVIII

Psalm 116

8. I set Jehovah continually before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.

9. Therefore my heart is glad, and my tongue rejoices; my flesh also dwells securely.

10. For you will not give my soul up to the grave, nor hand over him whom you attend with kindness to see corruption.

11. You have made known to me the way of life, the fullness of the most pleasant joys in your presence, at your right hand for evermore.

For the strengthening of his faith the prophet David, in Psalm 16, adduced long beforehand from the forthcoming history of Christ the point which the Apostle Peter similarly adduces in the passage before us to serve as a support for public faith in the church and to vanquish the Jews.

Acts 2

25. For David says concerning him, "I saw the Lord always before me, because he is at my right hand that I may not be shaken.

26. Therefore my heart was delighted, and my tongue rejoiced; and, moreover, my flesh will rest in hope.

27. For you will not abandon my soul as vanishing to the grave, nor let your holy one see corruption.

28. You have made known to me the ways of life; you will make me full of gladness in your presence."

The goal in both places, consequently, is that the faith of the pious should be strengthened by the history of Christ and the treachery of the idol-worshippers overthrown. The main point is that the pious perceive that nothing can more fitly obtain either of these goals than if, with an un-wavering faith, they not only discern the Lord Jesus Christ as incessantly present with them, even in death itself, but also take assurance in their minds from his resurrection concerning the resurrection of their own flesh and concerning eternal life. And so these two points are those which are set forth, in order, by the prophet. For he confessed the presence of Christ and his continual activity in these words, "I set the Lord continually before me," etc. The ensuing verses expound, on the other hand, the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life very suitably. The prophet passed to this part of the discourse in verse 9 from its result, our spiritual gladness—rising most appropriately to its cause. The application of this passage, then, which the apostles have made in the place before us and in no few others is most holy and most correct. There are surely few alterations which could actually disturb the reader; if you except the last verse, in which, for the sake of brevity, one word has been altered, some have been omitted.

But because the application purposed by Peter may not, perhaps, be sufficiently clear unless it is pointed out through our agency and elucidated by some exposition, each part of the prophet's discourse must be compared in a few words with Peter's discourse. Before, then, Peter
shows fully the fulfilment of this discourse in Christ Jesus, he very aptly stated in advance, in verse 29, the ἀναίρεσις, or negation (as they call it), that these words cannot be taken as referring to David. For an event of which Peter calls the Jews themselves witnesses would plainly contradict this discourse if it were taken as referring to David. With this foundation laid, the affirmation follows that David uttered all these things in reference to Christ.³ And, in the first place, indeed, as far as the person of Christ is concerned, Peter shows that David understood those things which must be understood in order to constitute a true faith. For the person of Christ and his office and his kindness toward us was set forth in those words. When he said, "I saw the Lord, or Jehovah, always before me," David testified that the person of Christ already existed at that time, as he who is the eternal Son of God and is likewise Jehovah in the unity of essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit. David set forth the office of Christ in the ensuing words by saying, "because he is at my right hand that I may not be shaken." He described, finally, the kindnesses of Christ very carefully in the remainder of the prophetic narrative by rising from the effects to the causes and, conversely, returning from the causes to the effects (which are very sure indications). The prophet goes from the effects to the causes when he testifies that he receives peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, but that the cause of this spiritual gladness is Christ.⁵ For Christ, by coming forth from sufferings and death, which he underwent for our sakes,
and, indeed, from the grave, will triumph over death and him who maintains the sway of death, and he will deliver David himself and all the elect from death by the price of his blood, verses 9 and 10. Next, however, in the last verse, David goes from the causes to the effects. For he states that the cause of that life which the pious receive is the teaching of the faith, which is the way to life, or the teaching of the gospel, which the apostle defines as "the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes." The effect, on the other hand, is the eternal life which enjoys most fully the most pleasant presence of God. Peter, therefore, runs through each of these things in a few words—in regard to the person of Christ and his station, in verse 30; in regard to his office and kindnesses, in the following verse—drawing together each of those things which seemed to pertain to the argument which he had purposed. Since this is the way things are, who would desire a more reliable and more faithful interpreter of the Holy Spirit than the Holy Spirit himself, who uttered these things through Peter's mouth?

Some, whether because they are clinging more than is proper to the treatises of the Jews, or because they have been carried away by the judgements of others before them—some will object, perhaps, that this interpretation seems alien to David's intention. But, by their good leave, no better exposition of that golden psalm can be brought forward than that which is asserted by Peter in this passage. For the prophet had declared in the first four verses of Psalm 16 that his only refuge was in
God (as in him who in every age is most beneficent to his elect) and that he would never renounce God though tossed about by the storms of afflictions and persecutions. He expounds this confidence in the remainder of the psalm: for one thing, because God is his portion and heritage; for another, because he is the leader and master who teaches us the way which leads to that heritage, verses 5, 6, and 7. He thereafter confirms this etiology of his confidence and constancy from his matchless understanding of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. And he does this in that order which we previously set forth, treating of his person, office, and kindnesses in that manner of piety which we are taught in the gospel.

So, then, having considered all these matters, we prefer to understand David's words in line with Peter rather than stray with the words of others from the intention of David and Peter and from the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Acts 2:34. This passage from David is perspicuous and has already been discussed in our comments on parallel 44 of Matthew.

PARALLEL LXXXIX

Deuteronomy 18
15. Jehovah your God will raise up for you a prophet from among you, from your brethren, as he raised me up. You shall listen to him. 18. And I will put my words in his mouth and so he shall

Acts 3
22. The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up. You shall listen to him in all things that he tells you.
speak to them all that I command him.

19. And it shall come to pass that whoever does not listen to my words which he speaks in my name, I myself will require it of him.

20. And it shall be that every soul that does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed from the people.

The goal is one and the same in both places: that Christ should be pointed out to the church as the mediator between God and men—long ahead of time, on the one hand, as the mediator to be expected, as was foretold by Moses; at the latter time, on the other hand, as the mediator who had been exhibited and made manifest in the flesh, as is asserted by Peter. Now, God was dealing with a people which was suffering from weakness and hardly bore his voice and the sight of his majesty, and which, for this reason, requested a mediator, or intervener, as the lawyers call it. At that time, to be sure, he appointed Moses to perform the functions of an intervener, but the same weakness always possesses his church in this world and each of its members. The main point, therefore, is that God had not provided at this time alone for a useful and suitable mediator for his church, but that he had made provision for a true and eternal mediator, or intervener, for all time, who would be similar to Moses and who would discharge those functions of mediator perfectly and eternally. Now, it is said that Christ would, indeed, be similar to Moses, because the mediation of Moses was a certain shadow of Christ's mediation, and it acquires its substance in Christ. And, accordingly, Moses, as a type, is similar to Christ and, conversely, Christ as the real ob-
ject of the type, to Moses. The functions of mediation, however, which are predicated of Christ in the same passage all belong to this one office of his, that is, in so far as he is the prophet or teacher of his church. On account of this, the Lord pointed out through Moses the nature of that office by degrees: first, the divine calling of that person in whom the substance and real object of Moses would appear; secondly, his faithfulness in performing and executing the office; thirdly, the authority with which it was constituted, so that God himself teaches us and we hear God himself teaching; but lastly, the very grievous consequence which those who do not listen to his word receive. And the application before us of the words of Moses is, indeed, a correct one. Peter made it so impressively and suitably that none dared at that time to gainsay his interpretation, although, for the sake of brevity, some things are cut off and others drawn together from two verses of Deuteronomy which have very little divergence from one another in the mode of speech. For this reason, there is no need at all for us to tarry in discussing a matter so perspicuous, namely, the reason for this alteration.

It is, however, very serious that almost all have thought that Moses was talking literally about the whole ministry, or body of the ministers of the church, but that in the passage before us the same words of Moses were applied by Peter analogically to Christ, as if to the head of this body. With everyone's kind indulgence, I judge Peter's application to be a literal one. Not only does the line of argument of Moses himself
altogether compel me to this opinion, but also Peter's authority and Stephen's agreement, Acts 7:37. As to the application by Peter and Stephen, there is no reason why we should trouble ourselves about pointing it out. For the passages stand before everyone's eyes. But as to the fact that the line of argument of Moses demands that this interpretation be maintained, it can, to be sure, be confirmed from that common silence which all the Jews, the evil ones as much as the good, observed when these things were spoken by Peter and Stephen. Nevertheless, we shall demonstrate the fact from Moses himself in this way. The main proposition of Moses was this: "You shall be blameless in company with Jehovah your God." A comparison from the antithesis elucidates, in the following verse, this blamelessness and συνακολουθένσιν of God commanded by Moses. "For these nations," Moses says, "whose heirs you are about to be listen to astrologers and diviners; but as for you, Jehovah your God has not allowed you to do so." It is just as if he were saying, "These people are neither blameless nor follow God blamelessly; but a different blamelessness and obedience benefits you." The Jews would immediately have been ready to object to this commandment, "And how, pray, can we walk with God and be blameless in company with him, when we can neither hear his voice nor see the exceedingly great fire in which he dwells without abruptly dying? For you will not always be with us, but will shortly die, as God has threatened and as you yourself have disclosed to us," above at Deuteronomy
So, then, anticipating this objection, Moses tells the Jews that this is, to be sure, true, namely, that God dwells in unapproachable light and that the people have need of a mediator by whose intervention they may be able to walk blamelessly before God. But because the people, or church, of God will have that need for as long as we live on earth, God the Father would, for this reason, bring it about that the church should have one mediator and intercessor to succeed Moses and to discharge perfectly the office of mediator between God and men forever, with the highest authority and power. And, accordingly, the Jews, who had previously besought Moses to perform the functions of a mediator, had no need to trouble themselves concerning another mediator. For God, having recalled that request which the Jews had made to Jehovah on the day of the assembly at Horeb, had already made provision for a mediator. Not only would this mediator act for the people in the presence of God the Father, but also he himself would talk in the words of God the Father with the people and with all the prophets whom he would dispatch to the church of God. The very sequence of the line of argument shows distinctly that this is the way these things stand. For first Moses states this promise, verse 15; and the motive behind it, verse 16. Next, he confirms the same promise by means of the authority of God, verses 17 and following. And, lastly, he unfolds the same promise by means of its outcome and use in the remainder of the chapter. It definitely follows, therefore, from these things that this pro-
mise treats, not of the whole body of prophets, but of their head alone, and not of any prophet other than Jesus Christ, the prophet and apostle of our confession and our eternal mediator.

PARALLEL XC

Genesis 22 18. And in your seed shall all the nations of the earth confess that a blessing has been bestowed upon them.

Acts 3 25. And in your seed shall all the families of the earth obtain a blessing.

Peter explicitly states the goal of these statements in the preceding words when he says, "You are the sons of the prophets and of the testament," or "that dispensation," "which God dispensed," etc. The goal is, namely, that the nation of the Jews should recognize that that covenant and testament of God belongs to them. The main point, consequently, is that God exhibited, to be sure, his covenant and dispensation of grace in regard to his church to the [whole] human race already long ago through his prophets; but that he especially entered into a covenant with the fathers of the aforementioned nation and contracted with Abraham, the father of believers, that his blessing should extend to himself and his nation first, inasmuch as he would beget, according to the flesh, that seed of blessing from whom blessing would spread first to the Jews, but then to the other families of the earth. Now, not only do the words of Peter which are directly appended (when he says, "God, raising up his son Jesus, sent him to you first, to bless you," etc.)
show that this is the correct understanding of this passage, but also the very nature of the passage requires it. For when God promises that in his seed a blessing is going to be dispersed to others, one of two alternatives is altogether necessary, either that the word for "seed" be taken as a syllepsis or that it be taken as singular. And the very sequence of the divine promises teaches in a fashion quite manifest that the word must, in fact, necessarily be taken as referring to one and to some single individual. For God had previously treated by syllepsis of the whole progeny of Abraham and Isaac in saying, "I will bless and multiply your seed so that they will be in number as the stars of heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore. And your seed shall possess the gates of their enemies." Now, the later part of the promise cannot, by any line of reasoning, agree with this other part which it immediately follows unless the clause, "And in your seed shall all nations obtain a blessing," is taken as referring to a specific and single person. For that seed cannot be said at the same time both to possess the gate of his enemies and to pour forth blessing upon all, since the former is an act of punishment, the latter one of benefit. The former, moreover, can be shared with others, so that they may afflict the adversaries with punishments. The latter is a beneficial act exclusive and peculiar to Christ, as he pours out blessing, in accord with the promises of God the Father, upon all, both the Jews and also the Gentiles. Much less, however, can these things be said about Isaac than about the whole nation of the Jews. It
remains, therefore, only that the statement should be understood, in a manner consistent with faith, as referring to Christ, since this promise and beneficial act can be predicated suitably of neither that seed taken in a wider sense nor of Isaac.

Acts 4:11. The passage from David was discussed in our comments on Matthew at parallel 40.

PARALLEL XCI

Psalm 2
1. Why have the nations raised a tumult and the peoples contrived a vain thing?
2. The kings of the earth have stood beside one another, and the chiefs have taken counsel together against Jehovah and against his Christ.

Acts 4
25. Why have the nations raged and the peoples contrived vain things?
26. The kings of the earth have stood beside one another, and the princes were gathered together for the same purpose, against the Lord and against his Christ.

The common goal in both passages is that the opposition of sinners to the kingship of Christ—and especially, indeed, from the time of his coming—should be set forth and that his church should be strengthened over against the scandal of the cross. The difference in this case is that David prophesied that it would come about; Peter pointed out that it had come to pass. Now, some, to be sure, affirm that the passage from David ought to be taken as referring purely to David; others, as referring purely to Christ; others, finally, as referring to David and Christ, the former of whom was the type, the latter the real object of the type. The first opinion
is that of the Jews who, so far as in them lies, subvert teaching concerning Christ. The second is that of the orthodox fathers in particular. The third is current among men of our times. Now, the first opinion is surely overthrown, not only by the theme of the psalm itself, but also by the sequence and the very order of thought. For the theme pertains so manifestly to the kingship of the Messiah that not even the most obstinate of the Jews can deny it. Jehovah addresses his Son; appoints him as prophet, priest, and king; gives him the inheritance of the whole world; assigns omnipotence to him; and commands worship, reverence, and fear of him by all nations—and, finally, faith in him. No one, except a blasphemer, can predicate all these things of a human being pure and simple. The same interpretation is surely overthrown by the sequence of thought, because it seemed good to the Holy Spirit through David to embrace within the very entrance-way to the Psalms an epitome of heavenly doctrine: of the law, on the one hand, in Psalm 1 and of the gospel and faith in Christ, on the other hand, in Psalm 2.

The other opinion, which we said was that of the fathers, is far more supportable. For although there are some things which are suitably taken as referring to David, there is still no doubt that the principal aim of the psalm in question relates to this point, that the kingship of Christ should be glorified by means of the exertion of its adversaries, a reproof and warning to them, and the destruction which would in the end come upon them. These matters were occasionally perceived by David, as by
a type; but the real object of the type was brought to consummation in Christ. On account of this, whether one purposes to interpret the psalm by means of the second mode of interpretation or by means of the third, there is no pious man who will not see that David's words are brought forward very aptly by the apostles to the passage before us. The second interpretation convinces me most of all (something which has been said by everyone's good leave), although I do not deny that it was on account of his own affairs that David came to the point that, by faith, lie looked upon the kingship of Christ. The main point, consequently, is that, even as David had predicted long before, so it happened in the latter time to the person of Christ, verses 27 and 28. And, accordingly, the apostles, when they have been severely chided by the council of the Jews, 6 justly explain their confidence with this passage and through it beseech the Lord that he who sits in the heavens may laugh, that the Lord may have them in derision, speak to them in his wrath, and confound them, granting to his "servants to speak" his "word with all boldness," etc., verses 29 and 30. There is no alteration in the words which could detain a pious and moderately educated man. For the word for raging 7 denotes by synecdoche the raising of a tumult. 8 The fact, moreover, that the Psalmist says that the kings have stood beside one another is suitably translated by the word παριστάναι. 9 This word would signify the same as if you had said that some stand beside others. Lastly, moreover, those words συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, "they have come together for the same thing," 10 corre-
spond to the word for taking counsel. I, at least, think that this idea of
coming together ought to be taken as referring, not to the presence of
bodies (which the prophet had previously set forth), but to the agreement
of minds, as is confirmed in no dim way by the ensuing words of Peter.\textsuperscript{11}

PARALLEL XCII

Acts 7

2. "The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham when he was
in Mesopotamia, before he lived in Haran," and those words which follow.\textsuperscript{1}

The goal of this whole discourse must be sought from nowhere else
than the reason for which it was delivered. Now, Luke related the reason
in the preceding chapter, namely, that adversaries, who were disputing
with Stephen and could not withstand the wisdom and the spirit with which
he spoke,\textsuperscript{2} suborned men to say that Stephen had spoken "blasphemous
words against Moses and God,"\textsuperscript{3} or (thereafter to clarify the same point)
"blasphemous words against the holy place," or the temple of God, "and
the law" transmitted by Moses.\textsuperscript{4} This was an opportunity for Stephen
to respond with this most holy discourse to their heinous accusations.
The goal, therefore, was this: not only to disparage the trustworthiness
of the witnesses (although he could still refute them, trusting to the testi-
mony of God and his conscience, with a denial pure and simple if he had
not considered that he was prevented by the number of witnesses being in
accord with the semblance of the law), but also, by setting forth his piety
and faith with great dignity, to convince the council before which he was
standing that it could not have happened that a man endowed with such learning, piety, and sanctity would pour forth blasphemous statements of a kind such as were urged against him by the witnesses. So, then, that goal to refute the witnesses, was, to be sure, proper and very necessary. But owing to the wrong-doing of the witnesses, owing to the displeasure of the judges, and owing to friendly regard for the pious (in another situation--before equitable judges--it would have been useful for them to be produced as witnesses), he could not attend to shattering the testimonies of those witnesses. For this reason, the Holy Spirit led Stephen to decide, by some very unassuming recommendation of himself, that his trustworthiness would have to be proven before the judges rather than the trustworthiness of others' overthrown. If he could have demonstrated the former of these things in the assembly, he would have shown the latter conclusively and very suitably diverted from himself the wrong-doing of the false witnesses.

In order, however, to achieve this end, Stephen drew up for himself this epitome of a discourse: First, he would testify that he belonged to the covenant of God into which God had entered with Abraham already long ago--also that he asserted the authority and truth of the law of Moses as much as anyone at all did. Furthermore, he would testify that he confessed the very lofty dignity which God imparted to the temple by means of his presence and his sanctification. Lastly, he would testify that all these things were confessed not in mere words, or in vain and empty boast-
ing, but in faith and obedience by the faithful servants of God. Not only had a great many of the ancestors of that nation already forsaken all those things long before, according to the testimony of the holy prophets, but also those who were present and who were speaking with him with such indignation were swerving from them with utmost faithlessness. Thus, the whole discourse is first of all, to be sure, in the nature of a defence, but it is also in the nature of a counter-charge, because Stephen not only diverts the accusation which has been hurled against him, but he turns it back against those with whom he was pleading his own case. As for the rest, this whole discourse has been brought from the Old Testament if you except the last part of the ἀντέγκλημα, and most parts of the narrative agree quite evidently with passages from the Old Testament beyond any doubt. Consequently, it does not seem necessary for us to consume time in comparing each of them, but we shall leave it to the good sense and faith of the reader to explore for himself such a comparison of passages. Therefore, in the case of those things which are perspicuous, we shall merely note down the unembellished passages. The theme of four verses, namely, the second and the three following, are contained in chapters 11 and 12 of Genesis. The sixth and seventh verses are brought from Genesis 15; the eighth from Genesis 17, 21, 25, 29, 30, and 35; the ninth from Genesis 37; the tenth from Genesis 41; the eleventh and the four following from the remainder of the book of Genesis.

But in verse 14 Stephen appears on first sight to have swerved from the truth of history when he relates that the whole kindred of Jacob or
Joseph consisted of seventy-five people. For Moses, on the contrary, relates in Genesis 46 (which is, beyond dispute, the passage which Stephen had in mind here) that sixty-six souls had sprung from the loins of Jacob, or that, including Jacob and Joseph and the latter's two sons, there were seventy. And various methods, indeed, for reconciling these passages with each other were already investigated long ago by the holy fathers. Their testimony and authority do not make it possible for me (with their kind indulgence) to descend to their opinion, in the case of those who judge that Stephen's words in Luke have been corrupted, whether they conclude that the word πέντε ought to be deleted altogether or that πάντας ought to be substituted for πέντε. Passing over, however, all the other conjectures, without regard to whose-ever judgement has gone before us, that course of harmonization pleases me very much which Epiphanius adopted in book 1, chapter 1, in these words, κατεστάλη τού πολεμίου, ως προείπον, ὁ Ἰακώβ, καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ γενεία, καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἐγγονοί ἐν ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε ψυχαῖς ἀριθμηθέντες εἰς Ἰγυπτίον, ως περιέχει ἡ πρώτη βίβλος τῆς κατὰ Μωυσέα πεντατέχους. So that this course of harmonization can be maintained better by the reader, it ought to be established in the following manner that three ways of numbering Jacob's family have been preserved by Moses in this passage. The first is that in which Moses numbers only those souls who came forth with Jacob into Egypt but who also came forth from his loins--therefore, not including the wives of his sons. Now these are said in verse 26 to have been sixty-
six in number. The second way is that in which the number of the whole race, including Jacob, Joseph, and the latter's two sons, are set forth. Now, if you add those four, Jacob, his son, and his two grandsons, to the previous number, the number of people rises to seventy, as Moses himself sets it down in verse 27. The third way, finally, is that in which the number of all the people belonging to the family of Jacob and encompassed therein by the mention of their names (as they occur in the enumeration of Moses) is drawn together into one total; in other words, including the four wives of Jacob and the two sons of Judah whom God had killed in Canaan. Now, Moses relates that, including Jacob, Joseph, and the latter's sons who dwelt in Egypt, there were seventy souls in all. Therefore, including the names of four wives and of the two sons of Judah who had previously died, there will be altogether seventy-six. But Jacob is specifically struck out of this number when Stephen says, "he called to him Jacob his father and all his kindred of seventy-five people." And that this may be done more suitably, the matter will be quite evident if you infer an ellipse of the Greek article, or likewise apply to the later part that very article which previously preceded it, just as if it read, καὶ πᾶσας συγγένειας αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε. This method seems to me, at least, to be the most suitable of all and one which accords with the authority and truth of scripture.

Nor, in truth, do those two objections which can be raised against this passage move me from this interpretation. One is that more people
are enumerated by Moses. The other is that this interpretation does not seem to relate to Stephen's design and argument. For, to respond to both in a few words, we establish in the following manner that both these objections are alien to the truth: The demonstration of this is easy in regard to the former one. Stephen's words are that Joseph "called to him Jacob his father and all his kindred of seventy-five people." Yet Moses shows that his kindred was more extensive even than this, in that he explicitly uses these words, "not including the wives of Jacob's sons." For these too by all rights belonged to the kindred and, without doubt, travelled into Egypt with their husbands. But if Joseph called to him the whole kindred, it is still said that it consisted of only seventy-five people. Since just as many people are numbered by Moses, one of two alternatives must necessarily follow from these matters: either part of those whom Moses numbers travelled to Egypt with their wives and part remained in Canaan, or only those people travelled there who are numbered by Stephen and whom Moses designated by name and so not including the wives even though they belong to the kindred. Yet if Joseph had not called to him the whole kindred including the wives, it would have been an inhuman act. If, however, he called to him the whole kindred, it would surely have greatly surpassed this number. Only this course of harmonization, therefore, remains, that we should conclude that in the passage before us Stephen in his defence does not, to be sure, number all those people whom Joseph called to him (for there would have been
many more people in the families), nor the fathers of families alone
(for these will be too few and will not be even seventy, however they be
numbered). On the contrary, Stephen numbers those people whom Moses
enumerates by name in his delineation in Genesis 46.

At this point, however, the other objection comes up. It did not
at all relate, they say, to Stephen's design to keep in this narrative to
the number of personal names which Moses set down at this place. I re-
spond: Quite to the contrary, if he had followed some other method of
numbering, he would not have attained his design. But he did attain it,
because this enumeration agrees completely with his purpose. If he had
employed another, it would surely have been either unclear or even un-
certain. It would have been unclear if he had enveloped his narrative,
which simplicity befits, in exceptions and inclusions by speaking while
omitting some things or other things, or adding some things or other
things, and whatever else is of this nature. The numbering would have
been uncertain if he had decided to include wives or whole families. Fi-
nally, by whichever of the two methods he would have reproduced the num-
ber of kindred, adversaries would not have lacked an argument which they
might censure and rebuke by passing over its primary cause. On account
of this, this method of numbering agrees most aptly with his purpose. It
agrees, for one thing, because in these words he copied precisely the num-
ber of souls whom Moses enumerated with specific names and he snatched
away an argument for his wickedness from those who would make false
accusations. For another thing, by this method he demonstrated in a fashion quite splendid that, so far from uttering blasphemies against Moses, he, on the contrary, followed Moses very scrupulously even in matters of lesser importance and had, as it were, each of his syllables in readiness. For it is beyond all dispute that, excepting Jacob (whose name Stephen places separately before the others), no more than seventy-five personal names belonging to that whole kindred occur in this passage of Genesis, just as Stephen teaches here that they are enumerated by Moses. Now, Epiphanius had propounded this interpretation long ago, as we stated previously; and the Syriac translator too seems to have intimated it although in a less clear way.

Verse 16 was brought from the final chapters of Genesis and Joshua, and there seems to be no less amount of toil involved in searching out its correct interpretation than there was in expounding the immediately preceding passage. For this reason some have imagined that it ought to be abbreviated; others, that it ought to be altered somewhat; others, that it ought to be transposed. Others, finally, have produced stranger interpretations in order to preserve, patched and sheltered, the authority of this sacred text. And so this was the goal to which we looked several years ago when we brought to light that Arabic translation. There we translated the last part of the verse in question by a certain metalepsis in such a way as if it read, "They were placed in the tomb which Abraham purchased for a sum of money, to which they had been carried from
Shechem—away from the sons of Hamor—so that they might be buried with Abraham and with the rest of their ancestors. But it is neither enjoined by duty nor necessary to tarry long in overthrowing the interpretations of others, which, without regard to anyone's judgement which has gone before us, we leave in their own place. Consequently, I shall bring forward the arguments by which I am now at length compelled to forsake that formerly-held interpretation of mine. Nor am I ever ashamed to submit my judgement to the truth ascertained or set forth by others, since I admire and honor the faith, diligence, and sound judgement of good men in searching out these matters with the utmost conscientiousness. There are, then, principally two arguments which have drawn me away from that interpretation. One is that at the beginning of the verse these words are stated, "they were carried to Shechem." These words, however, as likewise those which are stated at the end of the verse, would be completely if all the patriarchs were carried to the field and the cave which had been purchased by Abraham. For why should Stephen make mention here of Shechem rather than of the Jordan or a different place, especially since no mention of this Shechem occurs where it is related that the body of Jacob was carried from it, while there is mention of the Jordan particularly? The other argument is that the Greek preposition (if I remember correctly) does not allow, in this sort of connection, the signification of movement from a place. It is certainly not credible to me that a new signification must be given
to this much-used connection—and least of all, indeed, that this must be done if some other suitable method of interpreting the matter can be devised and brought forward. I pass over the fact that Jerome relates in Paulae Epitaphium that the twelve patriarchs were buried at Shechem; but Josephus that they were buried at Hebron. For some of them were buried in the one place, some in the other, according as it seemed more suitable to their descendants. Stephen intimates this fact in no dim way in this verse when he says, "Jacob and our fathers" (and not the twelve patriarchs only) "were carried back" and some "were laid... in Shechem," but some were laid "in the tomb that Abraham had bought for a sum of silver," etc. We interpret the ensuing words, consequently, just as if the article were expressed and it read, παρὰ τὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμων τοῦ Σιχεμ, as if you were to say, by that tomb which it is read (at the end of chapter 33 of Genesis) that Jacob purchased from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem. When they came back from Egypt, the Israelites regarded both these places with the utmost reverence, just as Jacob himself had stipulated concerning the tomb of Abraham in Genesis 40. But as far as Jacob's property is concerned, that Samaritan woman in John 4 serves as a witness and other passages of scripture confirm that it was so regarded. No one, however, who has engaged even moderately in the reading of the Old and New Testaments is unaware that the ellipse of an article, which we have established in this passage, is not unusual. It is just as we have likewise remarked,
not only on the first chapter of Matthew in parallel 2, but also frequently elsewhere.

The seventeenth verse and the following two have been drawn from the first chapter of Exodus, the two following verses from the second chapter of the same book. Those which immediately follow these, six in number, correspond to the third chapter of Exodus. The thirty-sixth verse embraces a summary of the account concerning the departure of the Israelites which Moses described in the remainder of the book of Genesis. We treated of verse 37 a short while ago in parallel. The theme of the thirty-eighth verse agrees partly with chapter 19 of Exodus, partly with those which follow. Verse 39 and the two following relate to that account which Moses narrated in Exodus 32. The forty-second verse relates to the account of the deeds done by the Israelites from the time that the spies had returned to their camp, Numbers 13; and to the complete account of succeeding times written, not only by Moses, but also by other prophets whom God raised up after the time of Moses. Confirmation, however, [for the thesis of this verse] was brought from the very vehement reproach made by the prophet Amos, whose words must, for the sake of clarity, be compared with Stephen's exposition.

Amos 5
25. "Did you offer to me sacrifices and a gift the forty years in the very wilderness, O house of Israel?"

Acts 7
42. Did you offer to me sacrifices and gifts the forty years in the very wilderness, O house of Israel?
26. Nay, rather, you carried the tent of your Melech
and the pedestal of your images
--the stipulation of your god--
which you made for yourselves.
27. So, then, I will carry you
away farther than Damascus,"
says Jehovah, whose name is
the God of hosts.

43. And, rather, you took up and
bore the tent of Moloch and the stipula-
tion of your god Remphan, the images
which you made to worship them. So,
then, I will remove you beyond Baby-
lonia.

This παραλληλόγραμμος comparison of ours does, to be sure,
demonstrate in no dim way how well these two passages agree with one
another. Nevertheless, because there is some variation in the words
which could, perhaps, drag the less experienced into uncertainty, we
shall treat in a few words of whatever there is in this passage in the way
of variation. In the former verse nothing was changed by Stephen. For
the noun θυσία is, admittedly, commonly translated as "sacrifice,"
that is, as σφαγίων, which Stephen mentioned earlier. Yet it is cer-
tain both from the Septuagint translation and from a comparison of in-
stances in the New Testament, that the Greek word is understood as
"gift" and "offering" just as much as it is understood as "sacrifice."
In the same manner, the etymologically related verb θύω signifies
in the Greek authors of proven merit, not only "to immolate" and "to
sacrifice," but also "to burn incense" and "to burn," or "offer," a gift,
which is called in the Hebrew authors a minhāh. Nor did Irenaeus
translate it differently in his book 4 when he was adducing a passage from
the prophet Malachi. There is only this difference, that Stephen trans-
lated with the plural number a word of the prophet's which was in the sin-
icular, in order to teach that the singular noun had to be interpreted
"Moloch," who was also called Milcom in I Kings 11:5 and whose name signifies
"king." There is also this other thing in the way of alteration, that, by
transposing the phrases which occur in a different order in the prophet,
Stephen mentions the stipulation of those people's god in the prior position
and the images in the latter. But this seems to be more suited to aptness
of rhetorical sequence and to clarity. Lastly, there is also this in the
way of an alteration, that in place of those words, "I will carry you away
farther than Damascus," Stephen, for the purposes of an explanation, ren-
dered it in this way: "I will carry you away beyond Babylonia," having in
mind, of course, the trustworthiness of the sacred history and the true
nature of the event. There are two additions: One is that the name of
the god of the Ammonites, Remphan, is set down. The other is that the
goal of that bearing about of images is adjoined, "to worship them." And
as far, indeed, as this goal is concerned, there is no doubt that it signi-
fied the περιφορητός process of idol-worshippers about, which
there is much in the book of Baruch.

As far as the word "Remphan" is concerned, judgements vary,
especially because there are various ways of writing it. So, then, some
hold that he was so named from the Hebrew word רמא and that his
name signifies Hercules—a giant, as it were, who was represented a-
mong the heathens in the form of a giant. Others take "Remphan" as
Rimmon, the god of the Syrians, and think that it ought to be restored
in this way in the passage before us. Others affirm that it is a compo-
site word of Hebrew origin in that the statue was in the form of a giant
and in that its size seemed to be lofty beyond all human beings. I, with-
out regard to whose-ever judgement has gone before (as I advised pre-
viously), believe that the name was drawn from the name of a place, or
perhaps that the name of the idol was transferred to the place. There
was, in any case, a town of Rephan (I Maccabees 5, verse 37), or
Raphan (in Josephus, book 12 of the Antiquities, chapter 12), or Rophon
(in Rufinus, the translator of Josephus), or Rephon (in the Aramaic
paraphrast) situated in the territory of the Ammonites, over which
the god Rephah or Remphan seemed to preside as a guardian deity. It
is on this account also that the thing is thrown up to the Jews by Stephen
at this point, as if they had taken the abominable worship of that deity
from the Ammonites.

There remain the deletions from the prophet's words; we touched
just now upon the reason for these. Amos spoke as follows: "the tent of your Melech," but Stephen omitted this pronoun because it is understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ from the ensuing phrase. Then too, that which Amos had called "the pedestal of images," or "the shrine," Stephen instead called simply τύπος, that is, "figures," or "images." Furthermore, in place of that which Amos stated, "which you made for yourselves," Stephen set down the εἴγνησις, "which you made to worship them." Stephen omitted the remaining words as achieving nothing to the purpose in this passage. One thing must be noted: an occasion for doubt in interpreting this passage of the prophet's has been seized from this, that the prophet Amos, in speaking about foreign gods and the foreign worship and appointments of these gods (namely, a tent and a shrine, or pedestal, and images) employed foreign words μιμητικώς so as to show the more fully the vileness and hideousness of their act to the impious Israelites. Almost all interpreters have easily strayed from the correct understanding of his words since they had not paid sufficient attention to this mode of speech.

The theme of the forty-fourth verse was transmitted by Moses in the twenty-fifth and the last chapters of Exodus, just as that also of the following verse is set forth in Joshua 3 and the following books. The passage pertaining to the forty-sixth verse is II Samuel 6 and 7. The narrative, however, pertaining to the forty-seventh verse is contained in I Kings 5 and 6. Solomon had verse 48 in mind in I Kings 8. The
passage of Isaiah which is adduced directly thereafter is without difficulty.

Isaiah 66
1. Thus says the Lord, "Heaven itself is my throne, and the earth is a stool for my feet. What sort of house is it that you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest?
2. But, now, my hand made all these things."

Acts 7
49. "Heaven itself is my throne, while the earth is a stool for my feet. What sort of building will you build for me," says the Lord, "or what is the place of my rest?
50. Did not my hand make all these things?"

These passages agree with each other exactly if you make this one exception that Stephen, with more force, expressed ἐρωτητικά the second verse; which Isaiah had uttered declaratively. Stephen did this to afflict those σκληροτραχῆλοι Jews more forcefully. The matter speaks for itself that verses 51 and 52 agree exactly with the last chapter of Second Chronicles. Moses in Exodus 19 and Deuteronomy 33 provided verse 53, which Stephen employed to strengthen the authority of the law and to heighten the impiety of the Jews and on account of which the Jews began to rage and to cease listening to him. In the same way also the words of the prophet David in Psalm 68, of Habakkuk in chapter 3, and of Paul in chapter 3 of his Letter to the Galatians were brought from the same author. To be sure, as the exposition of this fifty-third verse is commonly asserted (I have stated this by everyone's good leave), it plainly does not seem to accord with the words of Moses or Stephen himself. For Moses did, indeed, declare and the prophets remarked long before Stephen that the law was given with my-
riads of holy angels in attendance, but scarcely that it was given through angels or through their disposition. But the words of Stephen do not, however, signify this latter thing. Contrariwise, the correct interpretation of them (as it seems to me, at least) is as follows: "You received the law in dispositions—that is, in the midst of multitudes, or in the midst of armies of angels attending their commander on account of his honour and office—and yet you still are now moved to observe this law neither by the majesty of God nor by the reverence and respect of holy angels and of most holy and innumerable retinues of the majesty of God." For Stephen thought in this way: God, who attended by angels transmitted the law to his church, confirms in this time too by the same means the authority of the law and of all his teaching and now makes known that manifold wisdom of his through the church to the principalities and powers which are in places above the heavens, as Paul says elsewhere. 78

And Paul too, in writing to the Galatians to this effect, says that "the law... was ordained δι' ἀγγέλων," that is, among angels, and that it was so ordained "by the hand of a mediator," 79 that is, through the agency of that angel who had appeared in the bramble-bush and whom Moses had declared would be a mediator, as Stephen previously pointed out in verse 35 and following. 80 It surely achieves nothing to the purpose, moreover, that the passage of the apostle in the Letter to the Hebrews, 2:2, is adduced to confirm the other interpretation mentioned previously. For in that passage it is not a comparison of Christ with
Christ which is set up, that is, of Christ, in so far as he showed himself in a less clear way in delivering the law to the Israelites long beforehand, with Christ, in so far as God was made manifest in the flesh in the times of the gospel. On the contrary, the comparison is that of Christ with the angels which the apostle had undertaken in chapter 1 and in which he continues in the second chapter. Nor, in truth, is it that single moment of time at which the law was delivered which is held in view there. Contrariwise, the apostle looked back in general to the time of the Old Testament, during which God took care that his word was proclaimed through the ministry of angels; as those words of the apostle show, "If the word declared through angels was valid," etc. 81 For it is one thing that his word was uttered, another that the law was commanded. If one attends more strictly to the argument of the first chapter of the epistle in question, one will quite easily observe that the argument at the beginning of the second chapter is made by means of a comparison with the lesser. This comparison must be sought from chapter 1. And, consequently, that point of doctrine which the apostle makes arises from the previously constructed comparison of the angels with Christ by means of a comparison of their word with the word which Christ the Lord related.
Isaiah 53
7. As a small animal is led to the slaughter and as a sheep before its shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.
8. By oppression and by judgement he was taken away; and yet who would expound his generation? For he is destroyed from the land of the living.

Acts 8
32. As a sheep was led to the slaughter or as a lamb before its shearer is dumb, so he opens not his mouth.
33. In his humiliation there was judgement upon him by which he was taken away; but yet who would expound his generation? For his life is taken up from the earth.

That the whole of that chapter of Isaiah is talking about Christ is so manifest that not even the Jews themselves would dare to deny it, as we showed at parallel 19 in our comments on Matthew. Nor, in truth, have we a doubt that Philip interpreted it to the same effect and that from this passage, which he perceived had been divinely offered to him, he laid hold of an argument for instructing the eunuch in a more indubitable way concerning the person, offices, and beneficial act of Christ, as the narrative of Luke shows in the following words and as the result itself proves. There is a slight difference in the words if you take notice of it. First, there is the fact that events which are mentioned by the prophet as in a future time Luke reported as having occurred, so as to make Philip's interpretation evident and, at the same time, to point out that the fulfilment had taken place in Christ at that time. Next, there is the fact that Luke mentions a sheep instead of a small animal, that is, the species instead of the genus, for the sake of a clearer delimitation of
this simile. Then too, there is the fact that in the second verse those things are appropriately divided by Luke which the prophet joined together when he said, "By oppression and by judgement he was taken away."

For Luke, bearing Philip's interpretation in mind, enunciated that very statement of the prophet's more distinctly in this way: "In his humiliation there was judgement upon him, by which judgement he was taken away." It is just as if he were saying, "It took place in two ways that Christ was taken away from this life, namely, through oppression by men and through the judgement of God. For when he was oppressed so severely and violently, then the Lord executed his judgement. And, consequently, it did not take place by human agency alone that he was taken away from this life by the hands of the impious (as Peter says), but by the judgement of God, just as his hand and plan had arranged and accomplished for our salvation." On account of this, I should, at my risk, like the words of the Greek text to be divided in this way: Ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀποκρίσεις, etc.; in other words, "In his humiliation there was judgement upon him," that is, it came forth or was executed, "and by this judgement he was taken away." But did it have to be said, for this reason, that he had vanished forever? By no means, in truth. For "who would expound his generation?"

Lastly, add to these that alteration too, that for those words, "he is destroyed from the land of the living," Luke substituted the ἵστος ἡμῶν expression, "his life is taken up from the earth." But since these things
actually are in the closest agreement with each other, I do not know how greatly they could hinder even the most inexperienced from recognizing that both Isaiah's words and Luke's account proceed from the same Spirit.

PARALLEL XCIV

Acts 10
34. In truth, I perceive that God is not one who has regard for one's person,
35. but in any nation anyone who fears him and gives attention to righteousness is acceptable to him.
36. And so he proclaims that word of good news which he had proclaimed to the sons of Israel by sending his prophets, namely, peace through Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all,
43. To him all the prophets bear witness that anyone who believes in him will receive forgiveness of sins through his name.

Although these two passages do not relate, strictly speaking, to some one single passage of the Old Testament; they still embrace the theme in general of the law and prophets in regard to the fulfilment of the gospel promises, and these promises are crammed into almost every page. Consequently, we could do nothing but refer those passages too to a number of parallels. However, both passages (if we look at the words of the apostle) seem to pertain especially to the prophecy of Isaiah, who prophesied in a fashion quite splendid in chapters 48 and 49 both concerning the peace established through Christ for Jews and Gentiles and concerning the forgiveness of sins which would fall to those who believe in him. But because the prior passage is variously expounded due to the varying judgement of interpreters, it also seemed proper to us, by every-
one's good leave, to bring forth our opinion concerning its correct interpretation. For in verse 36 Peter confirms that proposition from which he commenced his discourse (namely, that God is not a προσωπολήπτης) from the authority of the utterances of the prophets, which all agree to this theme: whoever believes, from whatever nation he has sprung, will be acceptable to God the Father in Christ—and Christ is called Lord of all. So, then, there are two figures of speech which must, in my opinion, be observed in this verse. One figure, which we designate a meta-
lepsis, is the Hebrew ellipse in these words, "the word which he sent to the sons of Israel," for what is, in effect, "the word which he published beforehand through the ambassadors which he had sent, or his prophets."
The other figure, which the grammarians call apposition, is in these words, "And so he proclaims that word of good news, peace," that is, which is the word of peace, or about the peace established through Jesus Christ. When these things are assumed, everything seems free from the obscure.

PARALLEL XCV

Acts 13
17. The God of this people Israel chose our fathers, etc.

This whole oration was undertaken by Paul in order to assure the Jews who were at Antioch concerning the fulfilment of the gospel promises in Christ from the lessons of the law and prophets and to announce that
through him the forgiveness of sins would fall to all who believe. Consequently, (as Stephen had previously done) he very wisely prepared this oration of his in such a way as to draw the whole of it from the inner recesses of the Old Testament. For in this oration he first of all treats in a few words of the election of the people and the way in which they were led about and of the promises made to David. Next, he demonstrates the fulfilment of these promises in Christ. Then he confirms with attestations those points concerning Christ which were especially capable of being disputed by the nation of the Jews. Lastly, moreover, he concludes his discourse with an exhortation to faith. On account of this, as we did above in our comments on chapter 7, we shall note down the passages of the Old Testament from which the parts of this narrative are brought, and we shall tarry only in expounding those in which something of doubt could perhaps arise for the less experienced. The seventeenth verse, then, was brought partly from Genesis 11 and 12 and partly from the first chapter of Exodus and following. Verse 18 draws together a summary of the account of those times which were described in detail by Moses in the remaining part of Exodus and the following books. Verse 19 embraces the chief part of the account which was written out in full in the book of Joshua, just as the following verse also embraces a summary of the account of Judges. And likewise the twenty-first and twenty-second verses embrace the account of the First Book of Samuel. Lastly, moreover, the twenty-third relates to the promise which, it is read in II Sam-
But a very serious question occurs in verse 20 concerning the computation of the times under consideration when Paul says, "And after that God gave them judges in the course of about four hundred and fifty years," etc. For some think that this delimitation of times ought to be commenced from some other point. Others do not hesitate to assert that this delimitation has been corrupted; others, finally, that it was not corrupted by Paul or a copyist, but was conformed to the version of the seventy Greek translators. And yet (to speak ὑστερον πρότερον about the last thing) for two reasons it does not seem very likely to me that in this passage Paul is discussing this theme on the basis of the authority of the seventy translators. One is that it would likely have been inept if Paul, having entered a synagogue of Jews on the day of the sabbath, had desired, after the reading of the law and prophets, to speak among Hebrews concerning matters pertaining to faith according to the version of the seventy translators and not according to the trustworthiness of the Hebrew text. By this procedure, indeed, he would have been more likely to detract from the trustworthiness of Christ and the authority of the gospel than to win favor. The other reason is that, besides, however times are calculated from the version of the seventy translators, there plainly will still exist no suitable way by which this difficulty in harmonization is escaped. Nor, in truth, is the other interpretation of those who hold that the reading of this passage was corrupted able to convince me more fully. For,
if I remember correctly, no other reading has been attested to so far by the authority of any ancient codex or translator. Nor does it belong to the authority of any man, by virtue of his own opinion or judgement, to pour out things in this way which are found uniformly and with complete consensus in the sacred books and in every mention made in our forefathers. For it is better (in my opinion), it is better that we should confess our imperfection and inability and ignorance rather than forcing imperfection or blemish on these sacred books.

It remains for us, therefore, only to enter upon the first course in the exposition of this passage and to see which times in preference to others ought to be referred to this computation. Only two courses present themselves to us for the interpretation of this passage. One is that the four hundred and fifty years in question relate to that period of time in which the preceding things took place which Paul mentioned in the preceding words in his narrative. The other course is that they are said to pertain to the following words. For that delimitation of the times of the judges which appears both in the account of Judges and also at the beginning of the sixth chapter of I Kings prevents us from referring that space of four hundred and fifty years to the period of the judges which alone is discussed in this verse. And, indeed, some very learned men in our age have thought that the delimitation of times in question pertains to the preceding words, just as if it read as follows in the Greek text of Luke: καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ὡς ἔτεσι τεταρκοσίως καὶ πεντήκοντα γινόμενα.
almost think, however, that Jerome, or whoever is the ancient Latin translator, employed long ago a more suitable form of the Greek text. 10 For he seems to have read these words as connected with the preceding verse in this manner: κατεκλημένους αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐδώκε κρυτός . . . 11 The Arabic translator, on the other hand, or whoever added the Arabic punctuation marks in his translation, has brought forward the other interpretation by which this delimitation of times is ascribed to the ensuing account. I, however, (to state openly what I feel) cannot be sufficiently satisfied with the latter interpretation, which in good faith I translated in my Arabic edition several years ago. 12 After all, although the calculation of times can agree together in a way, it still cannot be applied suitably enough to this passage. For part of the account which preceded must be cut off so that, united with the years which ensued, it could rise to that sum of years which Paul asserts in this passage. Therefore, passing over that Arabic interpretation, I am altogether convinced that the prior interpretation must be embraced, namely, that in these words the apostle has included that whole period in which those events took place and were accomplished which he set forth in the three immediately preceding verses— from the beginning of the narrative.

That beginning, however, must be taken from that time at which God expressly responded to Abraham, "in Isaac shall your seed be named." 13 For at that time, by excluding Ishmael, God first exhibited
the force and authority of his election. It is from this point that Paul begins by saying, "The God of this people Israel chose our fathers," etc. 14. After those things, therefore (of which the beginning must be taken from when Isaac's election was announced in Genesis 17), 15 almost four hundred and fifty years elapsed until that time when, by the casting of lots, the land of Canaan was apportioned to the Israelites through Joshua's agency. The calculation of these years in this way, moreover, will (unless my mind deceives me) be quite unencumbered. The election of Isaac and of the fathers in Isaac was announced when Abraham was ninety-nine years old. 16 In the following year, when Abraham was a hundred years old, Isaac was born. 17 Precisely four hundred years intervene between his birth and the giving of the law. 18 If the forty years in which the Israelites dwelt in the wilderness are added to these, and then the seven from the time that the Israelites undertook the conquest of the land of Canaan, four hundred and forty-eight years are yielded. For exactly the seventh year after Joshua had brought the people into the land of Canaan the sabbatical occurred, and at that time the apportionment was first made, as the account of the book of Joshua teaches. 19 So, then, if you pass through the latter year and come to the ensuing one, in which the people renewed the γεωργία, or cultivation of the land, according to the law, you will learn that precisely four hundred and forty-nine years must be computed up to when the apportionment of the land and its proper use was accomplished—namely, the conception of Isaac, one year; from when
Isaac was born to the year when the law was given, four hundred; from when the law was given to the entrance into the land, forty; and from the entrance into the land to when its apportionment and occupation was completed, eight. From all these things there arises, less one, the number of years, four hundred and fifty, which is fixed upon by Paul in this verse. On account of this it seemed right to employ the particle ὅτι that it might be shown that this delimitation of time was being stated in accordance with the familiar practice of the rounding off (as it is generally called) of a number. As to the fact, moreover, that Paul adduces words from God in verse 22, they have not been drawn from some one specific passage of scripture. (For Paul deliberately runs through in few words part of his narrative as established and undoubted among Jews.) On the contrary, he brought words together into one passage from the various passages of scripture pertaining to the same theme. 21

The whole second part of the narrative consists of gospel history. 22 Now, it is comprised of two principal parts. One concerns how Christ was exhibited; 23 the other, how he was raised from the dead. 24 It is, above all, the history of our salvation that is considered in these two parts. For this reason Paul summons confirmation for both parts, as he has distinguished them in a very evident way in verses 32 and 34. 25 For in verse 32, 26 on the one hand, Paul uses these words purely about the fact that God was made manifest in the flesh, "We also bring you the good news that the promise which was made to the fathers, this God
has fulfilled to their children, when he raised up Jesus for us," etc.

In verse 34, on the other hand, to prove the other point of the narrative which he had undertaken, he set the matter forth διακρίνως 27 in clear words, "And as for the fact that he raised him from the dead, no more to return," etc. This antithesis shows in a very evident way that the first point of confirmation pertains, on the one hand, to the raising up, that is, the exhibiting of Christ; the latter, on the other hand, to the ἐγέρσις and raising from the dead, which we call the resurrection. And, in fact, both the etymon of the very word and also a comparison with very similar passages (as Acts 2:30, 3:26, and elsewhere) proves that the word ἀνιστάμενος 28 is understood not infrequently to this effect. Therefore, (to speak about each part of the confirmation in order) the prior part, which is about the exhibiting of Christ, is confirmed by one passage from David; the latter, about the resurrection, by two—namely, from Isaiah and also from David.

The passage which is laid down as confirmation for the exhibiting of Christ was taken from Psalm 2, 29 as Paul himself expressly states when he says, "as also it is written in the second psalm, 'Thou art my son, today I have begotten thee." 30 Although others interpret these words differently, yet we believe with unwavering confidence and we shall prove with arguments that they are understood here by Paul in their literal and native sense. For, in the first place, who is likely to believe easily that Paul, speaking in a synagogue among Jews, cited as confir-
mation passages which were not only subject to dispute, but also difficult to apply? The latter method of confirmation would surely have been likely to confirm the Jews in their error rather than weakening their faithlessness and bringing their minds to faith, unless at that time everyone, even the Jews, already agreed that this psalm pertained literally to the Messiah. Furthermore, the argument of the psalm itself (just as we showed above in parallel 91)\textsuperscript{31} cries out that it cannot be twisted to a different object, but that the whole of that prophetic narrative plainly pertains to the Christ. Not even the Jews themselves, overwhelmed by the force of the truth, have dared to deny this flatly. For how many of its parts, pray, can fit David? On the contrary, however, is there even a single word of it that can be cited as not having its fulfilment in Christ? Lastly, (to come to the words before us themselves) what pious man, if he examines the matter more thoroughly, would conclude that these words are stated about David, "Thou art my son"? The apostle, in writing to the Hebrews, teaches that not even to any of the angels were these words ever spoken.\textsuperscript{32} His argument, indeed, must plainly fall to the ground if this interpretation does not prevail and win the day.

Let us see, therefore, what, pray, this interpretation would be. After the prophet has related the insane design of Christ's enemies and God's very powerful decree, he at length introduces Christ, who, as the eternal word of the Father and ὃς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ \textsuperscript{33} with him, relates that decree of God his Father. By this decree the person of Christ is estab-
lished, and he exhibits himself performing the office of prophet, verse 7. Then too, the offices of priest and king are set forth in verses 8 and 9, even as (if God grants) we shall demonstrate very clearly in our comments on chapter 5 of the Letter to the Hebrews. Now, Christ stated two things, in order, as having been proclaimed by the Father with respect to himself, or (as they say) to his person. One point is concerned with his eternal generation, by virtue of which he is the Son of God, eternally begotten by the Father and ὃμοουσιος, or co-substantial, with the Father. The other point is concerned with his manifestation, or exhibition, accomplished in time and the dispatching of him whom the Father begets before all ages of time. The former point, concerned with his eternal generation, is stated in these words, "Thou art my son." The latter, concerned with his dispatch into this world, is stated in these words, "today I have begotten thee." And, indeed, David himself shows distinctly in the ensuing words that the former must be taken as referring to eternal generation, when he commands the kings and rulers to worship Jehovah with reverence as he is exhibited to them and to jump with fear, to kiss the Son, etc. Above all, however, David shows this when he concludes his discourse with that most holy exclamation, "Blessed are all who betake themselves to him." For if he is Jehovah, if he must be worshipped with reverence, if he must be kissed, if his wrath must be feared greatly (since it is first kindled in even a moment and very easily as if by him who is a consuming fire), if, finally, we
must betake ourselves to him in faith in order to be blessed, Christ
definitely must be God and co-substantial with the Father, begotten as
the Son of the eternal Father not in time but before all ages of time, one
with the Father in essence, one in power, and one in activity. For (as
the orthodox fathers argued quite correctly from such passages) those
who have effects which are completely the same, must have the same
nature. Who, however, would not see that here the same effects are
attributed to this Son as are also attributed to the Father by the invariable acknowledgement of all, even the Jews? On account of this, the
apostle, in making a comparison of the Son with the angels, quite correctly asserts that his superiority and majesty above all things in every way proceeds from this passage. The apostle asserts this when he says,
"having become as much superior to angels as the name he has obtained
is more excellent than theirs. For to which of the angels did God ever
say, 'Thou art my son,'" etc. 38

The second point that we said must be taken as referring to Christ arises, on the other hand, through a certain analogy from the preceding proposition. For God—he who is supremely good, great, and wise—has so arranged the order of his οἰκονομία in relation to his creatures and of his activities in actual reality and has so disclosed it to us in his word that his arrangement of things in external actions is conformed to the relationship which the persons of the Godhead have with each other from eternity. For even as the Father begets the Son from
eternity, so also, as Father, he sends the same. And even as the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, so also, in time, he is sent by the Father and the Son, and by command of the Father himself and the Son he inspires and sanctifies his body and each of its members, that is, his church. Consequently, when that eternal and ineffable generation of the Son has been asserted, the prophet appends to the words of Christ himself these others which were spoken in time, namely, that God the Father in time dispatches his first-born son for the deliverance and salvation of his church. And it is, in fact, true that God the Father, who is the sole author of the dispatching and exhibiting of the Son, was also the author of this second and temporal begetting. He cannot, however, be called the Father of Jesus Christ in relation to his incarnation in a way which is satisfactorily suitable, since the Holy Spirit, by whose power Christ was conceived, must be called in the same respect the Father of Jesus Christ according to the flesh. But if at any time paternity (as we call it) in respect to the Son is predicated of the Father on account of the incarnation, and if sonship, in turn, is predicated of the Son with reference made to the Father, it is altogether safer for these titles to be referred to the whole exhibiting and manifesting of the Son of God in flesh which was accomplished with the Father as its author. These titles are understood, that is, according to that rule which the orthodox fathers commonly employed in this matter; sometimes things are said to come about only at that time when they begin to be manifested.
That this was, in truth, the Apostle Paul's intention in this passage is shown, for one thing, by the argument of the narrative and, for another, by the repetition which he used for confirmation. For in the narrative he employed these words in verse 23, "From this man's seed, God, according to his promise, has raised up a Saviour for Israel, Jesus." In the confirmation, however, he repeated in this way that part of this narrative which he has undertaken, "And we bring you the good news that the promise which was made to the fathers, this God has fulfilled to their children, when he raised up Jesus for us; as also it is written in the second psalm," etc. 40 So, then, it is stated that the Father begets the Son from eternity κατὰ φύσιν 41 (if φύσις, that is, "nature," can be mentioned in this mystery), or rather κατ' ἀληθείαν; 42 while it is stated κατὰ φανέρωσιν 43 that the Father begot the Son in time. I believe that this φανέρωσις was, indeed, clearly pointed out in the prophet by the Holy Spirit with that Hebrew word for begetting, which is ascribed to the female who brings a person into the world rather than to the man who begets him. 44 I am not unaware that this passage of the prophet is expounded differently by some because they think that only that divine mode of eternal generation is recounted, as did a great many of the fathers. Others think that only the mode of temporal generation is recounted; others, that both are recounted in these two clauses which the prophet employs. But if you discern a single mode of generation only, it is not adequate to the proper analogy of faith. If, however, you discern both
modes, the interpretation will contain more in the way of controversy and obscurity, and the words will not be free from a certain ταυτολογία.\footnote{45} For this reason I prefer to take the prior clause as referring, in a manner consistent with scripture, to the aforesaid eternal generation, relying upon the authority of the apostle in chapter 1 of his Letter to the Hebrews.\footnote{46} I prefer to take the latter clause as referring to the aforesaid temporal generation, by which he was made from a woman, made under the law in the fulness of time,\footnote{47} when God fulfilled the promise which he had made long before to the fathers, as Paul interpreted it in this passage.

At this point, however, one question comes up: How did it come about that the psalm under discussion, which is the second in order, should be called the first in a great many of the fathers, even as Erasmus has adduced attestations from Jerome, Hilary, and Augustine,\footnote{48} and as it is expressly read in Oecumenius.\footnote{49} Two solutions are offered at this point. One is that the psalm which we call the first was regarded not as a psalm, but as some preface to the book in general. The other solution is that the first psalm was united by a great many people with the second and the two regarded jointly as one. We have learned from the books of the Jews that this was a very old idea of the Jews on account of some superstitious caution.\footnote{50} For whenever these men noticed at the conclusion of books or psalms some ending which was δύσωφιμος\footnote{51} and inauspicious (as they call it), they were wont to join those books and also psalms together with
the ensuing ones--or if the union did not appear in any way suitable, to repeat something from the same book so that the last clause would be more agreeable. They added, furthermore, the other argument that the psalm which we call second is almost concluded by that word from which the first takes its beginning. It was already current, then, by virtue of the judgement of the Jews themselves that the two psalms in question should merge into one and that they should embrace, in fact, a summary of divine doctrine, the law and the gospel. (For the precepts and promises of the law are discussed in the first; but the truth of the gospel and its promises made to believers, in the second.) For this reason, it does not seem strange to me if Paul, speaking among Jews, called it the first rather than the second psalm--for one thing, because such a usage was already current; for another thing, because it was not opposed to faith. He would have hindered and not aided this faith if he had at that time stirred up a subject for debate among the Jews which would have been untimely and unnecessary. See the things which were noted on parallel 60.

Now follows the confirmation of the other part of Paul's oration by citing the authority of two passages of the Old Testament. The prior passage was brought from Isaiah 55, where Luke plainly followed the version of the seventy translators, just as it is found also in our times in Greek Bibles. Now, the words of Isaiah seem, to be sure, to sound differently than those men rendered them, but the harmonization of his
words with this translation is quite easy. Those who have engaged moderately in the reading of the Old Testament are not unaware that the adjective יָשָׁד⁵⁶ is understood in the Hebrew authors sometimes with an active signification, sometimes with a passive. For in one place it signifies "kind," in another place "accepted in a kind and gracious way," according to the nature of the passages in which it is found and the analogy of faith. Since the Greek interpreters wished to express this matter in one way or another with a single and unvarying word, they rendered it ὅσιος⁵⁷ in order, by metalepsis,⁵⁸ to signify both that a man has been accepted in a kind way by the Lord and so is one who has been sanctified and also that a man acts in a kind way and so is one who advances in sanctification. The same line of reasoning plainly must be maintained in the exposition of the etymologically related word יְסָד.⁵⁹ For according as the passages in which it is found demand, it denotes sometimes—in an active sense—the kindness and beneficence by which a man imparts benefits; sometimes—in a passive sense—the beneficial act by which benefit is imparted to a man by God. Now, in this passage, to be sure, the noun "kindness" must be taken in a passive sense as that divine beneficence with which men who believe in Christ are graced. In my opinion, nevertheless, the Greek translators, by means of this expression (when in this way they stated, δὸςῷ ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαβίδ τὰ πιστά),⁶⁰ explained quite correctly, although by metalepsis, God's intention when he said through the prophet, 'I will give you the quite unchangeable kind-
nesses of David." For the sense is that whatever in the way of a beneficent act God already long before promised to David and foreshowed that he would pour out upon the church for its sanctification, all this was going to be brought about at the right time.

At this point, however, the question comes up as to the way in which this passage could be suitable to confirm the resurrection of Christ, and such a resurrection, indeed; that, having once attained it, Christ would never die nor would death have dominion over him. The response is: there are two points which are predicated of Christ's resurrection by Paul. One is that God the Father would raise his son from the dead. The other is that, when he rose again, he would deliver him from corruption forever, that is, bring it about that his resurrection would be quite unchangeable and invincible. Now, both points are clearly proven by these two passages, although the prior passage, which is from Isaiah, is expounded by means of the latter because mention was made in the prior one of the kindnesses of David, which God had stated beforehand to David through the Spirit—and through David to the church. From chapter 49 on, all the preceding words of the prophetic discourse concerned demonstrate in a very evident way that such is the case in this passage of Isaiah. For he sets forth in that chapter his fatherly affection and infinite love towards the church; and when he has demonstrated her unworthiness, he enlarges upon his mercy in Christ in the following chapter. After he has done these things, he at last passes at the end of chapter 52 to a pro-
thetic narrative of the history of Christ with respect to his sufferings, death, and resurrection, chapter 53. Next, however, having raised Christ from the dead, he raises up the church with the promises and word of the gospel, chapter 54. And, lastly, as though his wrath has been appeased, he sends Christ whom he has raised from the dead to take possession of his church, adding this magnificent promise, "I will give you the benefits which already long ago I declared to David and through David, and I shall so make them a part of your rights that they could never be torn away from you nor could any of you ever be lost from the hand of your Redeemer."61 If Paul had wished to indicate only that the resurrection of Christ had been accomplished once and for all, he would, beyond doubt, have produced a passage from chapter 53 of Isaiah. 62 But it seemed proper to prove in a few words all its connected circumstances and effects which the prophet related in so many words, especially since Paul was speaking among Jews who were not ignorant of the prophetic discourses. Consequently, a passage more suitable than this one is could not be cited in support of the resurrection and the unchangeable nature of the resurrection; since it recalls the minds of the pious to all the things which precede, and it embraces all the things which could be said on this question within two little words, "kindness" and "fidelity," or "unchangeableness." This point of the confirmation states these two matters in a very powerful way. To this proof the other one from David is, in truth, suitably united, that the agreement of Isaiah
with those ancient promises might be shown more fully for the strengthen-
ing of the pious who believe in Christ. 63 But we have said what seemed suf-
ficient concerning the whole composition and application of that pas-
sage in our comments above on chapter 2 in parallel 87. 64 And the a-
postle himself corroborates his judgement in the two ensuing verses and
summons the Jews themselves as witnesses for his corroboration. 65

We shall, therefore, hasten on to other things.

The conclusion of the totality of this most holy oration calls the
Jews to faith and repentance—in the first place, on the basis of the bene-
fit of the blessings which faith in Christ will obtain; 66 next, however, on
the basis of the necessity of fleeing those very severe and very perilous
threats which God had already foreshown through the ministry of his proph-
ets, but which he had especially pronounced upon the obstinate nation of
the Jews. 67 Now, from among the many, one passage comprised of
threats is brought forward, one from the first chapter of Habakkuk. 68

The prophet, to be sure, scarcely designated the later time in this pas-
sage, but thundered very severely against the obstinacy of the Jews who
were then living by declaring the harshest threats of God. Nevertheless,
the pattern of divine justice is sure and quite invariable, as we showed
at length in our comments on Matthew in parallel 6. Therefore, the ap-
plication of this passage is indubitable and quite sure, especially since
this passage (although it alone is expressed here) is adduced not alone,
but with others pertaining to the same point. These passages are tacitly
intimated by Paul when he says, "Beware lest there come upon you what is said in the prophets," but then, for the sake of explaining that statement, brings this one passage forward as if as an example. But what if we were to show that two or even more passages of scripture are united? Almost everything, to be sure, has undoubtedly been brought from Habakkuk. Nevertheless, the fact that the passage expressly addresses "despisers" is not from him, but seems to relate more to a prophetic discourse of Isaiah, who, with plainly the same theme, accosts "despisers," or "scoffers," in chapter 28:14. This theme, therefore, does not derive from one instance only; rather from the bringing of a great many instances derives a very vehement one. But do I say that it derives from the bringing in of passages? Nay, rather, it derives from the most just and unchangeable nature of God, which has never permitted nor ever will permit despisers of his word to go unpunished. Between this passage and that from the Old Testament there is the closest agreement in the words (and the agreement is certain), if you make the aforementioned exception that Paul addresses "despisers."

PARALLEL XCVI

Isaiah 49  
6. I have established you as a light for the Gentiles, that you may be my salvation to the end of the earth.

Acts 13  
47. I have established you as a light for the Gentiles, that you may be for salvation to the end of the earth.
The goal common to these passages is that the obstinacy of the Jews against the teaching of the gospel should be cast in their teeth and that, through the invitation of the Gentiles, those who were marked out for eternal life should be provoked to holy jealousy. The main point is that, although the Lord had previously enclosed salvation and the light of the teaching of the gospel within certain boundaries, as it were, yet the grace of God shines brighter from the time that God was made manifest in the flesh as Christ, who both shed light on all Gentiles without distinction through the torch of the gospel and called all believers from whatever nation to the sharing of salvation. Nevertheless, the less experienced may have thought perhaps that Paul spoke too arrogantly something which God seems to have uttered in Isaiah as referring specifically to Jesus Christ. But that very passage of Isaiah, whence these words have been drawn, removes all this doubt. For although they were spoken with reference to the person of Christ, yet they must be interpreted as referring to him, not in an unqualified sense, in so far as he is a person, but in so far as he is the prophet and apostle of our confession. The sequence of thought which the prophet employs in that narrative as a whole demonstrates that this is the case. For at the beginning of the chapter Christ, both through his own agency and also through that of his ministers, calls all nations without discrimination to take hold of the gospel. He speaks expressly about these things in the first verse in this way, "Jehovah has established the remembrance of my name from my mother's
womb.\(^1\)

But when he made his invitation to the Jews public, the Jews raged and opposed his office very obstinately. On account of this, the Son complains not only in his own name, but in that of his assistants as well, verse 4; the Father responds to him in verses 5 and 6 and uses those words which Paul adduced, as we laid them out in the parallel diagrammatic arrangement. The agreement, therefore, of the instances of this passage is evident, and its application to the holy ministry of the gospel is logically quite inescapable. And so, this is Paul's line of argument: "God the Father entrusted the ministry of the word and salvation to Christ. But Christ entrusted it to us from the Father. It is reasonable, consequently, that we should observe the laws of that ministry which the Father entrusted to him and he to us. But this is the law of that ministry of the gospel which was transmitted in Isaiah. Therefore, O Jews, since you thrust it from you," says Paul, "and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, in accordance with that command which we have received, we turn to the Gentiles."\(^2\) So, then, Paul assumes to himself, or arrogates to his colleagues together with himself, nothing which belongs more exclusively to the person of Christ and cannot be shared. But only in this thing which Christ wished to be shared with his servants, apostles, and ministers does Paul show that he wishes to cherish the sharing of this thing very scrupulously and to occupy himself in it, relying upon the promise of Christ, "He who receives you receives me";\(^3\) "but he who rejects
you rejects, not me, but the Father who sent me." For this reason, elsewhere as well Paul declares that the obligation of preaching the gospel has been laid upon him and pronounces this grave sentence upon himself, "Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!"

PARALLEL XCVII

Amos 9
11. "At that time I will raise up the tent of David that is failing and close up their breaches and repair its ruins and rebuild it as in the days of old," etc.

Acts 15
16. "After these things I will return and repair the tent of David which has fallen and repair its demolished parts and raise it up again, 17. that the rest of men may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is invoked," says the Lord who does all these things.

That most holy oration of Paul's which he delivered at Lystra in Lycaonia, is, to be sure, in the closest agreement with many passages of scripture. Nevertheless, Paul gave that speech in the company of Gentiles and not of Jews, and, consequently, he recalled the Gentiles to the knowledge of the true God through unchanging principles of nature and apodictic arguments rather than through the authority of scripture. Consequently, we do not think that he adduced any one passage of scripture in that whole address; and, for this reason, we do not think that any parallel comparison need be undertaken. To come, then, to the words of James in chapter 15, the intention of the apostle, on the basis of the preceding verse, is not obscure. For he shows that it is not a single passage of sacred scripture from the prophets which he has in mind.
the contrary, he shows that, from all the passages pertaining to renewal of the church through Christ and the revelation of the gospel, he has brought forth in this passage a certain summary, in order to show that this, at last, is that time in which God has chosen a people holy to his name from the Gentiles. Now, it is, to be sure, true that the passage from the prophet which is generally compared with this one from James must be reckoned among this number. 4 Yet since no few other sentences have been heaped upon this passage by James, and since he himself says that these expressions of the prophets are present, I judge that in these words is contained a general rather than a particular delineation of the gospel promises which the prophets predicted. Because, however, it would be a task of infinite labour to adduce the passages spoken on this theme by the prophets or drawn together by James, we shall refrain from this. Otherwise, the theme of this application is quite certain and quite clear.

Shortly thereafter follows a passage which is to no small extent a subject of dispute by interpreters. 5 The authority of the Old Testament, to be sure, is not adduced in it, but there is still no doubt that the sources of the evidence presented here come from the Old Testament, as James himself shows clearly in verse 21 by saying, "For from ancient times Moses has had in every city those who preach him, for he is read every sabbath in the synagogues." The question, then, is of this nature: The ceremonial usages of Moses were (as Peter says) just like a yoke imposed
upon the neck of the disciples which neither their fathers nor they them-
selves were able to bear, verse 10. For this reason, the apostles judged
that those from the Gentiles who turn to God ought not to be troubled with
those usages, verse 19. The ensuing prohibitions, however—especially,
indeed, those concerning what is strangled and blood—have come from
the law of Moses. How is it, then, that these ceremonial usages were
established anew by the apostles? The solution is as follows: There are
three points in which James judges here that a prohibition ought to be
made: the pollutions of idols, unchastity, and blood. Two of these are
necessary by virtue of the law both of nature and of God himself. Namely,
one must abstain from idols, idolatry, and all matters pertaining to it ac-
cording to the first table of the law; and one must avoid unchastity ac-
cording to the second table of the law. In these words, indeed, the ob-
servation of both tables and of the whole law is commanded by synecdoche;
buts yet these two examples, or classes, of 
were brought up
by James for the reason that they were commonly in use among Gentiles
and were considered of little importance. The third point, however,—
that they wished one to abstain at that time from what was strangled and
from blood—was not commanded for the reason that it seemed to be neces-
sary according to the law. (For this would certainly have been a yoke
and would have troubled the faithful from the Gentiles.) On the contrary,
it was commanded because of the consciences of others which would have
been very easily offended by this act at that time when they had not yet
been completely established and confirmed in faith in Christ. For in
this matter all things are, to be sure, lawful, but not all things are helpful or build up. And that this was, in fact, the design of James the ensuing etiology shows, "For from ancient times Moses," etc. It is as if he were saying, 'In a matter in the middle, or adiaphorous, consideration must be shown to those who up to now adhered to Moses. Nor ought one act in such a way that, on account of food, even the least of those for whom Christ died is ruined." And so this was surely the most holy judgement of James, who wished that the whole rationale of the external life of Christians should be sketched in a very few words.

But, when everyone had compared judgements with each other, the apostles, in that letter of theirs which is appended from verse 23 on, seem to have deliberately removed something from those matters which James had brought up. They did so not for the reason that not all his statements were holy and necessary in themselves to rightly establishing our life, but because they decided that it was better to keep within the question which had been laid before them and not to wander farther afield. So, then, they did not deny, to be sure, that one ought to beware of every against the first and second table of the law, but they thought that in this case it would certainly be sufficient if they reminded the Gentiles to beware very scrupulously both of occasioning offence in matters indifferent and of unchastity, which prevailed overmuch at that time.

And it was for that reason that they wrote in this manner at the end of
their letter, "that you abstain from what is sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity."\(^{12}\) By this course of action, they very correctly averted the scandal which could have been rendered to the Jews and they reminded believers from the Gentiles of their duty as gently as possible, just as it was repeated by them afterwards in Acts 21:25.

As to that most holy oration delivered to the Athenians of which Luke recorded a summary in Acts 17,\(^{13}\) we make the same judgment as we made at the beginning of this parallel concerning the other oration delivered at Lystra.

**PARALLEL XCVIII**

Exodus 22

28. You shall not speak evil of a ruler among your people.

Acts 23

5. You shall not speak evil of a ruler of your people.

Because everyone is in agreement about the goal and main point of the law quoted, we shall not be laborious at this passage in imparting a detailed exposition of it. It is undisputed that the goal is the preservation of obligatory conduct, justice, virtue, and order. The main point, on the other hand, is that no one appointed by God as a protector and defender of such things ought to be afflicted by the unmannerly impudence of men or by a single voice. One question is asked at this point, about which there was already controversy long ago among the orthodox fathers. For some think that these words were uttered ironically by Paul, but
others that this defence was submitted by him in earnest. I am not unaware of the arguments which influence those who think that this defence was uttered ironically. That judgement of Cyprian's pleases me, however, very much—that Paul employed this defence in earnest and utmost seriousness to condemn the ἀταγεία of the whole assembly and the injury received by him. For in the opinion of many, to be sure, it does not seem very likely that Paul would not have been able to distinguish the high priest from others by virtue of the arrangement of the assembly, the honour given him, his clothing, and whatever things are of this nature. This line of reasoning, however, is not of such weight with me that I should opine that Paul spoke ironically. As for some orderly arrangement in this assembly, I do not think that one existed, because the tribune was present, to whose authority everything was submitted. The assembly had been called together to his residence and by his command, Acts 22:30. It was, indeed, called together hastily and was conducting everything hastily, as is confirmed in a very evident way by this act of Ananias and the dissension excited shortly thereafter. As for the honour, although we readily believe that it was rendered to the high priest by the rest of the assembly, or rather the surrounding crowd, yet we judge that this was done (as is the custom) before Paul was sent into the place. Next, they seem to have held the council standing and on an equal footing (as they say) rather than sitting in an orderly arrangement. As to clothing, certainly, the high priest was, to be sure, commanded to wear clothing different from the
others at the time when he was going to enter the house of God. Outwith that time I do not recall that anything was noted. And, in truth, in times so disordered, when the priests themselves had been inflamed with such vehemence against Paul and were suddenly summoned for that reason by the military tribune, it is not credible that they troubled themselves particularly about such matters, if only they could satisfy their blood-thirsty minds, as is confirmed by the whole ensuing account. Since this is the way things are, I definitely judge that these things were stated in earnest and seriously by Paul. For he had not known that Ananias was the supreme pontiff; he had recently arrived at Jerusalem after a long interval; and since the time of his arrival he had not been very concerned about who was the high priest at Jerusalem. And, consequently, his defence is very reasonable. Since not even the Jews themselves in that assembly of theirs arranged their affairs in such a way that a new arrival could distinguish the high priest, it was a point of obligatory conduct and justice that he should be excused in consideration of this defence of his, which was ever so serious and ardent. For the thing had been done by him unwittingly.

The passage of Isaiah 6:5 which Paul adduced in Acts 28:26 was previously discussed in our comments on Matthew at parallel 25.
ABBREVIATIONS

EV = English Version


CSEL = Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna, 1866 ff.


M = The margin of the original edition of the Sacrorum Parallelorum Liber Primus


MT = Masoretic Text
ANNOTATIONS

PARALLELI

1. Actually verse 9.
2. 1 Chron. 1:34; 2:1.
3. 1 Chron. 2:9, 10.

PARALLELII

3. 1 Chron. 3:11, 12.
5. 1 Chron. 3:12.
6. 1 Chron. 3:16.
9. The words "who comes between them" translate the term "mediante," which is likewise used in the *De Concordia Matthaei et Lucae in* 331
10. This passage actually describes Sarah as the "sister" (that is, the half-sister) of Abraham.

11. I. e., "ellipse." The word was used already by Athenaeus as a technical grammatical term for an omission. Liddell-Scott, p. 536.

PARALLEL III

1. Literally, "in the second degree."

2. E. g., Ezra 5:2.

3. E. g., Haggai 1:1.


PARALLEL IV

1. In his Bibelwerk Junius translates qārāt, as here, as "vocabis," but he notes that he is tempted to understand it as a third person rather than a second person verb. Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra, sive Libri Canonici Priscæ Judæorum Ecclesiæ a Deo Traditi, Latine Recens ex Hebraeo Facti, Brevibusque Scholiis Illustrati ab Im. Tremellio et Fr. Junio. Accesserunt libri qui vulgo dicuntur Apocryphi, Latine redditi, et notis quibusdam aucti a Fr. Junio. Multo omnes quam ante emendatius editi et aucti locis innumeris: quibus etiam adjunximus Novi Testamenti libros ex sermone Syro ab eodem Tremellio, et ex Graeco a Theodoro Beza in Latinum versos, notisque itidem illustratos, Secunda cura Francisci Junii (London, 1593), ad locum.


4. J. -P. Migne, ed., S. P. N. Joannis Chrysostomi, Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, Opera Omnia Quae Exstant, vel Quae Elius Nomine Circumferuntur, VIII (MPG, LXIX), col. 87. (Commentarius in Sanctum Joannem Apostolum et Evangelistam, XIII:1, according to the usual enumeration; XII:1, if one takes Homily I as a preface, as Junius evidently does.) Chrysostom, however, does not actually quote in this homily the relevant part of the verse in question, but he uses the form καλέσουσι in quoting the whole verse in his Interpretatio in Isaiah Prophetam, ad locum. J. -P. Migne, ed., Ibid., VI (MPG, LVII), col. 82.


7. The Hebrew form to which Junius is referring is qārāṯ. Cf. note 1.


9. I. e., "you shall call." This reading occurs at Matthew 1:23 in the Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis and a few other manuscripts (and at Isaiah 7:14 in Vaticanus).

10. I. e., "they shall call." This reading is supported by almost all the
manuscripts of Matthew.

11. I. e., "she shall call." This reading occurs at Matthew 1:23 in the original form of a couple of Old Latin witnesses (and at Isaiah 7:14 in Sinaiticus).

12. The meaning of the phrase is explained in the text. Liddell-Scott, pp. 325, 444.


14. See Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 761a. The modern lexicon, however, derives the noun in question not from this root but from a second root with the same consonants. This root does not occur in the Old Testament, but the lexicon suggests that it originally meant "be mature (sexually)" on the basis of Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic cognates meaning "be strong," "rejuvenate," and "be lustful" respectively. Ibid., p. 761b.

15. I. e., "festival of unveiling, when the bride first took off her maiden veil, and received presents from the bridegroom." The word derives, as Junius here implies, from ἀνακαλύπτω, "uncover, unveil." Liddell-Scott, p. 107.

16. I. e., "the day after the wedding." The word evidently derives from ἐπαυλάζωμαι, "encamp, pass the night," and so the association with unveiling which Junius here implies is not forthcoming. Liddell-Scott, p. 611. The additional α which is printed in the Latin text has been removed in the translation.

17. I. e., "maiden, virgin." This is, of course, the word used at Isaiah 7:14 in the Septuagint (as well as at Matthew 1:23).

19. Actually verse 19.


21. I. e., "in truth or according to the true nature of the substance." In philosophical writings ωσια is used to denote the substance or essence as opposed to the modes or accidents. Liddell-Scott, p. 1274.

22. I. e., "according to general repute." Aristotle uses this adverb in opposition to ἀληθῶς in his Sophistici Elenchi. Liddell-Scott, p. 561.

23. I. e., "according to opinion." Aristotle uses this adverb in opposition to κατ' ἀληθεῖαν in his Analytica Priora. Liddell-Scott, p. 444.

24. Presumably, "by way of concession." One of the meanings of συχωρέω is to concede or grant something in an argument. Liddell-Scott, p. 1669.


27. Is. 7:3.

28. Is. 8:3.

29. MT; EV, 7:2.

30. Especially verses 9 and 16.

31. Is. 7:3.

32. Junius is referring especially to Genesis 3:15.

PARALLEL V

1. MT; EV, 5:2.

2. Cf. parallels 11 and 15.


5. In the Latin text this "ennoble" ("nobilitaturus") contrasts in an elegant manner with the "obscurity" ("ignobilitatem") mentioned in
the previous clause.

6. Presumably, "by way of differentiation." The basic denotation of ἐξαιρέω is to separate one thing from another. Liddell-Scott, p. 399.


8. E.g., Micah 5:5 (MT 5:4); Ezek. 34:1-10.

9. I.e., "shepherds of men." In the Iliad the phrase is frequently applied to Agamemnon. Liddell-Scott, p. 1430.


PARALLEL VI

1. In the first edition of his Old Testament Junius had translated this verse, "Quia puer Jisraēl est quem diligo; ideo ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum," Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra, sive Libri Canonici, Priscæ Judæorum Ecclesiae a Deo Traditi, Latine Recens ex Hebraeo Facti, Brevibusque Scholiis Illustrati ab Immanuele Tremellio et Fr. Junio. Accesserunt libri, qui vulgo dicuntur Apocrypi, Latine redditi et notis quibusdam aucti a F. Junio (London, 1581), ad locum. In his second edition, however, Junius translated the verse so as to coincide more closely with the translation here in the Sacri Paralleli and to bring out more clearly the genitive construction, as he understood it, of "Jisraēl": "Quia puer Jisraēlis est, et diligo eum; ideo ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum." Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1593), ad locum.

2. The Greek etymon of "anagoge" and "anagogicus" was used by Aristotle of the resolution of definitions into syllogisms and by Porphyry of the lifting up of the soul to God. Liddell-Scott, p. 102. Both the ideas of resolution and elevation from earthly thoughts to heavenly ones are present in the use which Junius makes of these words.

3. M: "August. li. de Genesi ad liter. imperfect. cap. 2. & li. de utilitate cred. ad Honorat. cap. 3." The latter reference is to De Utilitate Credendi, 5 (at least, as the chapters are divided in modern

4. The word is used in classical Greek to mean the "giving of the cause of a thing." Liddell-Scott, p. 44. In Augustine and Junius it refers to the utterance and exposition of the principles of morality.

5. The word is used in classical Greek to refer to proportion, correspondence, or analogy. It has the latter meaning in Aristotle's Historia Animalium. Liddell-Scott, p. 111.

6. Cicero and Quintillian use the word, as Junius does, of figurative language in general. Liddell-Scott, p. 69.


13. E. g., John 8:44.
14. E. g., Eph. 2:11.
15. E. g., I Pet. 1:19.
16. E. g., Gal. 4:1.
17. E. g., Gal. 4:4; Eph. 1:10.
20. I. e., "oracular, prophetic." Liddell-Scott, p. 1540. The word is used in II Peter 1:19 of inspired utterance in general, but Junius is restricting its scope to utterance concerning the future.
22. See note 19.
25. I. e., "God-breathed, inspired by God." The adjective is used of the sacred writings, rather than of the men who produced them, in II Timothy 3:16. Junius, however, generally applies the word to the authors of scripture.
27. Cicero, alluding to Euripides, uses this proverb on at least two occasions: "Sparta is your country, make the most of it." Lewis-Short, p. 1734.
28. I. e., "in a historical manner."
30. Junius seems to be using "aenigma" and its derivatives more loosely here than he does in parallel 8 (where it becomes a technical term for one particular category of figurative language).


33. The margin has "Jesa. 15:2" but the reference is actually to Isaiah 14:29.

34. M: Hos. 1:2.


36. These remarks are made with reference to the Cabalists (in the course of a brief review of the various schools of Jewish exegesis) in Abraham ibn Ezra's preface to his comments on the Pentateuch, which is printed (on unnumbered pages) immediately preceding Genesis in Jacob ben Chayyim ibn Adoniyah, ed., הָלָּא חַדֶּשׁ הַרְתּוֹן (Venice, 1524). (This book is the first of the four volumes which comprise the so-called Second Rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg.)


39. The margin mentions "1. Cor. 13.9." but verses 10-12 should also be included.

40. M: "Epist. 119. ad Ianuar. cap. 7. & 11." The reference is to Ad Inquisitiones Januarii Liber Secundus, seu Epistula LV, using the modern (Benedictine) enumeration of Augustine's letters. Junius seems to have confused the locations within this letter of the words which he quotes. The portion quoted in the Sacri Paralleli from "Si quae enim" ("For if these") to "ad aeterna" ("to the eternal") does, indeed, emanate from chapter 7. However, the part from "Plus movent & accendunt amorem" ("They excite and kindle love more") to "verbis propriis diceretur apertissime" ("it is stated in the plainest way in literal language") comes not from chapter 7, but from chapter 13. The remainder of the quotation, which Junius separates from the preceding words with the phrase "inquit postea" ("says Augustine later"), actually follows immediately and so likewise emanates from chapter 13 (not 11). Al. Goldbacher, ed., Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera, Sect. II. Pars II. Sancti Aureli Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Epistulae. Epistulae XXXI-CXXIII (CSEL, XXXIV; Vienna, 1898), pp. 184-185, 192.
41. The reference is evidently to Hosea's two marriages to a harlot in chapters 1-4.

42. I.e., "by a process of discursive reasoning." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1110.

43. M: Col. 1:18; Rom. 8:29.


45. More explicit identification of Israel as a priesthood occurs in Exodus 19:5-6.

46. Hos. 11:2-8.

47. Hos. 11:9.

48. The reference is to the lamed of הָכִּי, indicating the object of the verb qāra. See Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 895.


50. See note 12.

51. The preceding sentence seems to be incomplete. The "cum" with which it commences has, consequently, been ignored in the translation.

**PARALLEL VII**

1. In his *Bibelwerk* Junius describes the reference to Rachel in this verse as an elegant prosopopoeia and connects it directly with Herod's massacre. *Testamenti Veteris Bibli* (1593), ad locum.


3. The translation generally renders "Septuaginta" as "the seventy trans-
lators" (the first occurrence of the word in this sentence being an exception), since Junius distinguishes between the version supposedly executed by the legendary seventy translators of the Old Testament and the Septuagint as it existed in his own day (which sometimes, he felt, represented the work of the original translators and sometimes did not). On the discussions concerning the origin of the Septuagint in earlier times, see W. Schwarz, Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 17-44. Strictly speaking, according to the Letter of Aristeas, there were seventy-two translators involved. Ibid., p. 21.

4. I.e., "in a collective or comprehensive manner." Liddell-Scott, pp. 1672-1673. Thus, the meaning is rather different than that usually associated with the word "syllepsis" in English. This is one of those occasions on which Junius identifies a word as a Greek loan by leaving the omega in it, while printing the remainder in Roman letters.

5. I.e., "less emotional." Liddell-Scott, pp. 174-175.


10. The margin has "Isa. 10, 21" but the reference is actually to verse 29.


13. Baruch wrote both scrolls at the dictation of Jeremiah, 36:4, 5, 17, 18, 27, 32.

PARALLEL VIII

1. In the original edition of the Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres (and, strangely enough, in most succeeding editions) the "Index Locorum" concludes with a note that a third passage should be added to the Old Testament passages quoted at the beginning of this parallel, namely, Zechariah 6:12. Junius translates this verse as follows: "Sic edixit Jehova exercituum dicere me, Ecce virum, cui nomen est
GERMEN, qui e loco suo progerminet,aedifictq. templum Jehovae."

2. In his Old Testament Junius notes at Isaiah 60:21 that the "shoot" mentioned in that verse is "Christus, cui tamquam surcule et stirpe Davidis, supra 11.1., insita sunt Ecclesiae membra a Domino." Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1593), ad locum.

3. Brown-Driver-Briggs derives this noun, meaning "one consecrated, devoted," from nāzār, "dedicate, consecrate" (p. 634). The religious use of the noun occurs in Numbers 6:2, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21; Jud. 13:5, 7; 16:17; Amos 2:11, 12.


6. According to Field, Symmachus had Ναζαραῖος and its genitive in Numbers 6:18-19 (although there are other readings in the various manuscripts); ἀφορισμένου in Judges 13:5; and ἀφορισμένου in Lamentations 4:7. Ibid., I, pp. 233, 444; II, p. 758.


Oratio in Patrem, Praesente Basilio, 35; Oratio XLIII. Funebris Oratio in Laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia Episcopi, 28; Oratio VI: Prima de Pace, ob Monachorum Reconciliationem, post Silentium, Praesente Patre, 18.) In the edition cited the first of these passages has the form Ναζαρέιος; the second, Ναζαραίος; the third, Ναζαραῖοι.


10. M: "Iud. 13. 5. & 7. & 16. 17. Lament. 4. 7." This note occurs opposite the second sentence prior to this one (and so was incorporated at the wrong point in the text in the folio editions of the works of Junius), but it actually belongs here. The Septuagint has the form which Junius indicates at Lamentations 4:7. At Judges 13:5 it has ναζετείορ, while at Judges 13:7 and 16:17 Codex Alexandrinus and other manuscripts have ναζετεραῖον (Vaticanus reading as indicated in note 4). Joseph Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctortate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis Editum. XV. Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae (Göttingen, 1976), p. 488. Brooke and McLean, I, pp. 847, 860.

11. i.e.; "men who are under a vow."


16. Brown-Driver-Briggs defines nēser as "sprout, shoot," locating it in Isaiah 11:1; 14:19; 60:21; and Daniel 11:7 (p. 666a). The English translation of Junius preserves his method of transliterating Σ as "tz" in order to maintain his connection of the word nētzer with Nazoraeus and Nazorenus. These annotations, however, consistently use the modern method of transliterating the letter as "ṣ."


18. See notes 13 and 14.

20. M: Acts 24:5. This note stands in the margin beside the prior sentence (and so has been incorporated into the text at the wrong point in the folio editions of the works of Junius), but it actually belongs here.


27. I.e., the ceremonial laws (literally, "the legal ceremonies") which God commanded his people to observe in Old Testament times. On the distinction which Junius makes between the moral and ceremonial laws of the Old Testament, see parallel 97.


30. "Hyperaspistes" is a Greek loan-word which literally means "one who holds a shield over" someone. Liddell-Scott, p. 1859.
   The omission of the "c" in "Manihaeum" is, of course, a misprint,
   but the latter chapter reference is also in error; it should be 17,
   rather than 18. Iosephus Zycha, ed., Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera
   Sect. VI. Pars I (see note VI:3), p. 500, 514-516.

   (Historia Ecclesiastica, VI: 17.) Williamson's translation of this
   sentence is as follows: "Pamphlets also by Symmachus are still
   extant, in which he inveighs against the Gospel according to Matthew,
   apparently in order to bolster up his heresy." Eusebius, The History
   of the Church from Christ to Constantine, tr. G. A. Williamson (Bal-
   timore, 1965), pp. 256-257.

33. Actually Num. 6.


35. M: I Cor. 11 (the reference being to verse 14).

36. E. g., Luke 8:54.


38. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, eds., Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera
   Pars I, 7. Commentariorum in Matheum Libri VI (CCL, LXXVIII;

39. Ibid.

   Chrysostomi, Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitanis, Opera Omnia Quae
   Exstant, vel Quae Eius Nomine Circumferuntur, VII, 1 (MPG, LVII),
   coll. 180-181. (Homiliae in Matthaeum, IX: 4.)

41. Theophylacti Bulgariae Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia sive Quae Hactenus
   Edita Sunt, sive Quae Nondum Lucem Viderunt: cum Praevia Discer-
   tatione de Ipsius Theophylacti Gestis, & Scriptis, ac Doctrina, I
   (Venice, 1754), pp. 15-16. (Enarratio in Evangelium Matthaei, 2.)

42. Jerome considers the interpretation espoused by Junius a viable op-
   tion, but also notes that Nazaraeus means holy and that all of scripture
   declared that the Lord would be holy. Hurst and Adriaen (see note 38),
   p. 16.

note VI:30.


45. I. e., "in a similar manner," or "in the manner of something similar."


47. M: Gen. 49:10. In his Old Testament Junius translates Genesis 49:10 as follows: "Non desistet tribus a Jehuda, neque Legislator e medio pedum eius; usquedum venturus erit filius eius, & eris e obedientia populorum." He notes that the Hebrew word which he has translated "filius" actually means "secundae" and that it refers to "Christus, semen mulieris, ex secundis editus sine virili operatione." Testamenti Veteris Bibli Sacra (1593), ad locum.

48. Tossanus defines "secundae" as "membrana qua partus involutus ex utero prodit." Paulus Tossanus, Index in Sacra Biblia Locupletissimus, ex Latina Immanuelis Tremellii et Francisci Junii Versione, quoad Vetus; et Theodori Bezae, quoad Novum Testamentum . . . Collectus (Hanau, 1624), last page (unnumbered).

49. M: Is. 7 (the reference being to verse 14).

50. I. e., "a dark intimation." See Stephanus (see note II:1), VIII, col. 110.

51. See note 69 below.

52. I. e., "with reference to a homonym, or equivocal word." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1229.

53. I. e., "with reference to the synonym." In Aristotelian logic συνώνυμα were things with the same name, nature, and definition. Liddell-Scott, p. 1730. In Junius they do not necessarily possess the same name.

54. I. e., "with reference to a correlative or derivative name." See Liddell-Scott, pp. 1345, 1670.
55. I. e., "with reference to a word similar in sound." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1339.

56. I. e., "with reference to history."

57. I. e., "with reference to a foreign word." Liddell-Scott, p. 353.

58. I. e., "by means of a dark intimation." See note 50.

59. Is. 11:1.

60. See note 16.

61. I. e., "from the homonym." See note 52.


63. "Hypernumata" is, of course, merely the transliteration of the Greek word defined in note 50 (here in the plural form).

64. Presumably, "act the Pythia in clear matters." The Pythia, the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, was renowned for her enigmatical oracles. See Liddell-Scott, pp. 1551, 1968-1969. In the translation we have made the present indicative of Junius an infinitive due to the presence of the word "does."


66. I. e., "Concerning the Use of Striking Language." The word was used as a technical term in ancient literary criticism. Liddell-Scott, p. 449.


68. I. e., "thought." The word is used by Hermogenes in opposition to λέξις, "diction." Liddell-Scott, p. 570.


70. Ibid., pp. 340-341.

71. I. e., "from Aetolia." The actual form, as it occurs in the Odyssey, XIV: 379, is Ἀἰτωλός. The irony evidently occurs when one recalls that the verb ἄιττεω means "to beg." Therefore, by saying that
a man is from Ἀτωλία, or "Begging-land," one may be intimating more about his financial status (according to Junius) than about his nationality.


73. I. e., "his hand is amongst the Aetolians, and his mind is amongst the Klopidians," or to make the irony more obvious, "his hand is amongst the inhabitants of Begging-land, and his mind is amongst the inhabitants of Thief-deme." The last word in this quotation from the Equites of Aristophanes (line 79) is a "mock Attic deme-name," derived from the word χλωψ, "thief." Liddell-Scott, p. 963. Robert Alexander Neil, ed., The Knights of Aristophanes (Cambridge, 1901); p. 17.

74. In Casina (line 814), for example, Pardalisca (or another character) announces: "iam oboluit Casinus procul." The masculinization of "Casina" is an intimation that Casina's place has been taken by a man in disguise, and the "oboluit" may refer "to the aromatic spice cinnamon (casia) hidden in the name Casina." W. T. MacCary and M. M. Willcock, eds., Plautus: Casina (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 82; 186-187.

75. I. e., "Mentes, ruler of the Taphians," in whose guise Athene appears to Telemachus (Odyssey, I, lines 105, 180, 418). W. Walter Merry and James Riddell, eds., Homer's Odyssey (Oxford, 1876), I, pp. 11-12. Richard John Cunliffe, Homeric Proper and Place Names: A Supplement to "A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect" (London, 1931), p. 37b. The beauty of the occasion for Junius, however, is that Ἀφος not only is the name of the island which Mentes ruled, but also means "astonishment, amazement," and so provided a title of deep significance for the disguised goddess.

76. See note 50.

77. Junius identifies the name with ἀσφος, "silence," derived from the root ἄσφω, according to Brown-Driver-Briggs (p. 189a).

78. See note 55.

79. See note 56.


83. M: Jer. 51:41.

84. Brown-Driver-Briggs (p. 1058b) explains the word as a late Babylonian name of Babylon.

85. See note 57.

86. M: Dan. 5.

87. See note 52.


89. See note 56.


92. See note 55.

93. M: Mic. 7:12. Brown-Driver-Briggs considers this name a poetical equivalent and cognate of Miṣrayim, "Egypt" (p. 596a). Junius, however, is presumably identifying the name with māṣūr, "sLee-enclosure, sLeege, entrenchment," which is derived from swr, "confine, bind, besiege." Brown-Driver-Briggs, pp. 848-849.


95. Sperber (see note VI:49), p. 25.

96. I.e., "by means of a dark intimation." See note 50.

97. I.e., "with reference to the homonym." See note 52.


100. M: Zech. 6:12.


102. I.e., "by way of a homonym." See note 52.
103. I.e., "by way of a synonym." See note 53.


105. I.e., "by way of imitation." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1134.


PARALLEL IX

1. See parallels 59 and 50.

PARALLEL X

1. The fact that Junius introduces this statement with an imperfect ("dicebat") probably indicates that he is intending to reproduce here Jerome's thinking in a general way, but not necessarily his specific words. In his Commentaria in Matheum Jerome states: "Testimonium de Deuteronomio sumptum est. Ideo autem sic respondit Dominus quia propositum ei erat humiliare diabolum vincere, non potentia ... Sed et ipsa responsio Salvatoris hominem fuisse indicat qui temptatus est ... " D. Hurst and Marcus Adriaen, eds., Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, Pars I, 7. Commentaria in Matheum Libri IV (CCL, LXXVII; Turnholti, 1969), p. 20.

PARALLEL XI

1. Actually verses 11 and 12.

2. In medieval Latin "divisio" and "divisus" are sometimes used when "voces in propositione non ita sensu coniungendae sunt, ut iuxta se ponuntur." Michael Twarog de Bystrzykow states: "modi arguendi sophistice in dictione sunt sex, scilicet equivocatio, amphibologia, compositio, d-o, accentus et figura dictionis." Marian Plezia et al., Lexicon Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis Polonorum (Warsaw, 1953ff.), III, coll. 779, 785.

3. Ps. 91:1.
PARALLEL XII

1. This "your" represents the plural form "vestrum."

2. This "your" represents the singular form "tuum."

3. The Greek word transliterated here by Junius refers to the "general question," as opposed to the ἐνδοθέτισθεν, the "special case" to which a general principle must be applied. Liddell-Scott, p. 795.

4. See note 3. Two of the closely related meanings of this word in the classical authors are a "practical problem" and a "subject proposed (to oneself or another) for discussion." Liddell-Scott, p. 1882.

5. i.e., "appropriation." Liddell-Scott, p. 1202.

PARALLEL XIII

1. This is one of those occasions on which Junius leaves an omega in a Greek loan-word, while printing the remainder in Roman letters. See note VII:4. The word has been re-transliterated into Greek characters at this point in the translation, since Junius proceeds to define the word in the following phrase, "the case at hand." See note XII:4.

2. Aristotle uses the Greek word transliterated here in opposition to a sound, logical argument. Liddell-Scott, p. 1622. See the second quotation in note XI:2.

3. Hermogenes and others used the Greek etymon of this word to mean "explanatory." Liddell-Scott, p. 593.

PARALLEL XIV

1. Junius doubtless objected, for one thing, to the way in which the editors of the Massoretic text divided the two verses of this passage into different chapters (numbering them 8:23 and 9:1 respectively). Rud. Kittel et al., eds., Biblia Hebraica (third ed.; Stuttgart, 1937), p. 620. See also M. Friedländer, ed., The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah; Edited from Mss. and Translated, with Notes, Introductions, and Indexes (London, 1873), p. 50.

2. Sperber (see note VI:49), p. 18.

(Göttingen, 1939), pp. 154-155.


5. Johannes Aubertus, ed., S. P. N. Cyrilli, Alexandriae Archeipiscopi, Opera Quae Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia, III (MPG, LXX), coll. 245-249, (Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam, I, Oratio 5.)


8. Verses 5-6.


10. Liddell-Scott, p. 1118.


12. This use of "determinatio" as a rhetorical technical term arises readily enough from the meaning of the verb "determino," that is, "appoint or prescribe limits or bounds," but it differs from the noun's usual application to the conclusion of a speech. See Lewis-Short, p. 562; and Corradini (see note VI:8), II, p. 96.

13. See note XIII:3.


16. The meanings in Liddell-Scott are "on the other side, across," "over against, opposite," "beyond," and "right through" (p. 1365).

17. One meaning of 'über' is "side," according to Brown-Driver-Briggs (p. 719).


22. Is. 9:2.
23. Matt. 4:16.
24. The idea is that one thing is expressed by means of two terms.
27. Matt. 4:16.
28. I. e., "arose."
29. I. e., "shone forth."

PARALLEL XV

2. An "apex" is a "mark placed over a vowel to show that it is long; the tip or angle forming part of a letter." Oxford Latin Dictionary (see note VI:7), p. 147.
5. I. e., "from a counter-proposition." See Liddell-Scott, p. 156.
8. I. e., "base covetousness." Liddell-Scott, p. 43.

13. I. e., "with reference to a practical problem and by way of concession." See note XII:4. One of the meanings of οὐγγυμώρεω is "to concede or grant" something. See Liddell-Scott, p. 1669.


17. Cicero makes a similar use of the word "tacite" in his Oratio pro Milone: "tacite dat ipsa lex potestātem defendendi." Lewis-Short, p. 1833.

18. I. e., "utterance."


25. I. e., "the latter first."

26. I. e., "by way of a refutation, or a cross-examination for the purposes of refutation." See Liddell-Scott, p. 531.

27. Matt. 5:46-47.


PARALLEL XVI

1. See note XII:4.

2. MPG, LVII (see note VIII:40), coll. 299-301. (Homiliae in Matthaenum, XXII al. XXIII:1.)
3. Ibid.

4. Hurst and Adriaen (see note VIII:38), p. 41. (Commentariorum in Matheum Libri VI, ad 6:28.)

5. I. e. , "with reference to essence." One of the meanings of εχω is "be" in some state. Liddell-Scott, p. 750.

6. MPG, LVII (see note 2), loc. cit.

PARALLEL XVII

1. I. e. , "in a parallel manner." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1316.

2. "Synecdoche" is the understanding of one thing by means of another, especially "when the whole is put for a part or vice versa." Liddell-Scott, p. 1706.

3. "Metalepsis est dictio gradatim pergens ad id quod ostendit, ut 'speluncis abdicit atris' et post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor aristas." Henricus Keil and Theodorus Mommsen, eds., Probi Donati Servii Qui Feruntur de Arte Grammatica Libri (Grammatici Latini, IV; Leipzig, 1864), p. 400. (III:6.) Quintillian uses the word as a technical term for the use of one word in place of another which suggests it. Liddell-Scott, p. 1113.


PARALLEL XIX

1. I. e. , "from a synonym." See note VIII:53.

2. I. e. , "infirmities."

3. I. e. , "sicknesses."

PARALLEL XX

1. See note XII:4.


PARALLEL XXI

1. Also verse 6.

2. MT; EV, 4:5.

3. Also verse 31.

4. Also verses 12-13.

PARALLEL XXII

1. MT; EV, verses 5-6.

2. Actually verse 6, as in parallel 20.


4. "Derogare" is used as a technical term in jurisprudence to mean "repeal a part of a law." Lewis-Short, p. 554.

5. Also verses 5-8.


PARALLEL XXIII

1. These verses refer, of course, to Isaiah 42.

2. E.g., Mark 1:34, 44; 3:12.
3. Liddell-Scott gives the meaning as "choose" (p. 41), as does Bauer, who suggests that in this passage it is perhaps used "in the specific sense 'adopt' as 1 Ch 28:6; Mal 3:17." Walter Bauer, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, 1957), p. 23.


5. MT; EV, v. 12.

6. MT; EV, v. 8.

7. See note XVII:3.


PARALLEL XXIV


2. The basic idea is that of a "pattern, model." Liddell-Scott, p. 1307.

3. The meanings include "sign, token, indication," "pattern," and "example." Liddell-Scott, p. 1878.


11. I.e., "in reference to something," that is, used in reference to something else.


15. Ex. 12:46.

16. The word "numus" was used specifically of a Roman silver coin equivalent to a sesterce.


19. I. c., "antitype," that is, the thing represented by the type.


23. The Roman consul Caepio took Tolossa (modern Toulouse) "and captured the sacred (but accursed) treasure there, said to be that taken by the Gauls from Delphi. The gold disappeared en route, not (it was thought) without his knowledge." E. Badian, "Caepio," in N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, eds., The Oxford Classical Dictionary (second ed.; Oxford, 1970), p. 188. The ill fortune which befell Caepio and everyone else associated with this gold made its name the proverbial equivalent of "deadly." See parallel 80 (SP, p. 167).

24. Dodona in Epirus was famous as the site of an oracle of Zeus. Accord-
ing to a late legend, the god delivered his message through the echoes of a brass gong. Herbert W. Parke, "Dodona," in Oxford Classical Dictionary, p. 358. Junius, therefore, equates "Dodonaean" with "ringing" in parallel 80 (SP, p. 167).

25. In restoring the lordship of Samos to its former ruler Syloson, the Persians supposedly slew all its male inhabitants. Syloson was associated, therefore, with a reign of cruelty and devastation. Georg Wissowa et al., eds., Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft (Stuttgart, 1893-1972), LV (Zweite Reihe, Siebter Halbband), coll. 1071-1072.

26. According to Athenian tradition, Draco was a lawgiver of the seventh century B.C. He prescribed very severe penalties for the transgression of these laws; "when asked why he specified death as the penalty for most offenses, he replied that small offenses deserved death and he knew of no severer penalty for great ones; and the fourth-century orator Demades remarked that Draco wrote his laws in blood instead of ink," Douglas M. MacDowell, "Draco," in Oxford Classical Dictionary, pp. 363-364.

27. The plain of Thessaly was the most fertile of ancient Greece, yielding much corn and supporting many cattle. William Smith, ed., Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography (London, 1854-1857), II, p. 1166.

28. "Thuscus" is an alternate form of "Tuscus," referring to the inhabitants of Etruria, the Etruscans or Tuscans, and to a street of unsavory character in Rome. Lewis-Short, pp. 1919-1920.


31. Matt. 12:41-42. Christ actually speaks not of "Sheba" but of "the South," although his reference is obviously to the land of Sheba.


33. Jonah 3:5.
PARALLEL XXV

1. The word "assumit" sometimes carries the added force of appropriation of a statement as the minor premise of one's syllogism. Lewis-Short, p. 182.

2. Is. 6:10.

PARALLEL XXVI

1. I. e., "that it might be fulfilled." The reference is to Matthew 13:35a.

2. I. e., "that which was spoken,"

3. I. e., "fabulous and figurative." See Liddell-Scott, pp. 69, 1151.

4. See verses 52 and 65.

PARALLEL XXVII

1. Parallel 15.

2. "Gradatio" is a technical term in rhetorical literature for the use of climax. Lewis-Short, p. 821.


4. The word "tractatio" does not ordinarily possess the connotation of substitution which Junius here ascribes to it (on the basis of a problematic passage in Varro). It usually refers to a "rhetorical figure, the treatment, handling, discussion of a subject," or a "special use, usage of a word." Lewis-Short, p. 1882.

5. Jean Collart, ed., Varron, De Lingua Latina, Livre V (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, CXXII; Paris, 1954), p. 6. (Marcus Terentius Varro, De Lingua Latina Libri XXV, V.1.) Collart, following Joseph Scaliger, has emended the word "tractationem" (found in Manuscript Laurentianus LI, 10) to read "traelectionem." Others have suggested "adtractionem," "tralotionem," and "translationem."

6. I. e., "by means of this" gift. This is the of instrument. Liddell-Scott, p. 552.

7. I. e., "and let him no longer honour." The καὶ and the subjunctive
aorist form of τυμάω were elements of the textus receptus.

8. The Greek word transliterated here as "enallage" was used by the ancient grammarians to refer to an "interchange" or "variation." Liddell-Scott, p. 554.


PARALLEL XXVIII

1. Junius is proposing that one understand the verse as saying "they remove their hearts far from me," as opposed to 'their hearts are far from me." Liddell-Scott, p. 188.

2. I.e., "words having the same meaning." Liddell-Scott, p. 1227.

3. The Greek etymon of the adjective "perissologica" literally means "over-talking." Liddell-Scott, p. 1387.

4. See note XIII:3.

5. Is. 29:11-12.

PARALLEL XXXI

1. MT; EV, 4:5.

2. The word "praecursor" was used especially of John the Baptist in patristic literature. Lewis-Short, p. 1415.

3. An "anteambulo" was a servant who walked in advance of a distinguished person in order to clear the way. Lewis-Short, p. 129.

4. I.e., "transmigration of souls." Liddell-Scott, p. 1119. Pythagoras of Samos supposedly taught that the soul was eternal and changeless, but was imprisoned within successive bodies unless it became pure enough through study and meditation to escape this cycle. The Pythagoreans held that the soul retained the memory of its previous incarnations. Paul R. Helsel, "Pythagoreanism," in Vergilius Ferm, ed., Encyclopedia of Religion (Paterson, New Jersey, 1959), pp. 629-630. John B. Noss, Man's Religions (third ed.; London, 1963), p. 89.

5. See parallel 48.

PARALLEL XXXV

1. Quintillian and others used the term for a rhetorical "figure by which
dissimilar things were associated." Liddell-Scott, p. 1692.

2. A "congeries" was literally a heap or pile, especially a wood-pile. Lewis-Short, p. 418.

PARALLEL XXXVI

1. In his Bibelwerk Junius translated the last phrase of this verse as follows: "& insidens asino, idq; pullo nato asinabus." Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1593), ad locum.

2. Actually verse 5.


4. E.g., Ps. 48:2.


8. The form in the Greek text is, of course, the adjective ποιγό, "gentle."

9. The Greek etymon of "paronymus" means "derivative" or "by-name." Liddell-Scott, p. 1342.

10. Junius is presumably referring to the Hebrew root חָנָה, "be bowed down, afflicted," from which is derived חָנָה, "poor, afflicted, humble," and חָנָה, which has the same range of meanings. The associated nouns חָנָה and חָנָה have somewhat more distinct connotations, meaning "affliction, poverty" and "humility" respectively. Brown-Driver-Briggs, pp. 776-777.

PARALLEL XXXVII

1. See note VI:19.

2. Junius actually means the twenty-seventh verse here, since the fourth part of the psalm is supposed to comprise two verses, and there are only twenty-nine verses altogether.


6. I.e., the stone "at the corner or extreme angle." See Liddell-Scott, p. 56.

7. Ps. 118:22.


12. Ps. 118:26b.

13. The form in Psalm 118:25 is hōšî'āh; that in Matthew 21:9 is ἀνανάκτησις.

PARALLEL XXXVIII

1. In logic "assumptio" was a technical term for the minor premise of a syllogism. In jurisprudence it was an additional circumstance. Lewis-Short, p. 182.


PARALLEL XXXIX

1. MT; EV, Ps. 8:2.


3. The significance here is "praise." See Liddell-Scott, p. 40.

4. See note XVII:3.

5. See Liddell-Scott, p. 249.

(two thousand talents of silver and 3,993,000 gold staters) to the Persian war effort: "I make you my friend, and of my own wealth I give you the seven thousand staters which will make up your full tale of four millions, that your four millions may not lack the seven thousand, but by my completing of it you may have the full and exact tale." A. D. Godley, tr., Herodotus (Loeb Classical Library; London, 1922), III, pp. 343-345.

7. Presumably, "a sum which fits together well, or which has been fit together." Liddell-Scott, p. 243.

8. The word to which Junius is referring is צז, which Brown-Driver-Briggs defines here as "a stronghold" (p. 739).

PARALLEL XL

1. The demonstrative pronouns, "hic" and "iste" in the translations of Psalm 118 and Matthew 21 respectively, are masculine; and the ensuing discussion makes it clear that they are intended to refer back to "angulus."


5. Ps. 118:22.


7. Junius is referring to בדי in Psalm 118 and αὐρη in Matthew 21.

8. The word to which Junius is referring is כֶּבֶן, which is generally, if not always, feminine. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 6.

9. I. e., "head."

10. The Hebrew word to which Junius is referring is פִּינָה, which is sometimes used figuratively of a ruler. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 819. The Greek word is stated below.

11. I. e., "the very one, the same." Liddell-Scott, p. 283.


PARALLEL XII

1. See note XII:4.

PARALLEL XII


2. On "qualitativus" see Corradini (see note VI:8), III, p. 997: "adject. qui qualitatem significat."

3. The reference is evidently to the form of τελευτάω used in Matthew 22:25.


7. I.e., "the latter first."


PARALLEL XLI

1. Actually verse 39.

2. I.e., "power, might."

3. I.e., "strength," the word employed in the parallel passages.


PARALLEL XLIV

1. Matt. 22:46. The question was, "If David calls him Lord, how is he his son?" (Matt. 22:45).
PARALLEL XLV

1. The reference is to kānāp, which is applied to invading armies in Isaiah 8:8; Jeremiah 48:40; 49:22.


5. The basic idea of the root qdšh is "separation," "apartness." Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 871.


7. Ex. 26:33.

8. II Chron. 29:7.


11. Ps. 87:1.


PARALLEL XLVI

1. See parallels 80-82, 84.

PARALLEL XLVII

1. In the rhetoricians "occupatio" is a technical term for the anticipation of an opponent's objections. Lewis-Short, p. 1252.

2. I Cor. 1:23.

PARALLEL XLVIII

1. Verse 2.


3. The translator has been unable to locate any assertion of Chrysostom to this effect. Indeed, Tischendorf cites Eusebius, Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Cyril in discussing the text of Matthew 27:9, but he quotes no statement of Chrysostom of the sort described by Junius, even though such a quotation would be quite significant. Constantinus Tischendorf, ed., Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior (Leipzig, 1869), I, pp. 192-194. Similarly Lagrange does not cite such a statement of Chrysostom when it would be quite apposite to his rebuttal of Schmidtke's contention that Jerome had simply invented his story of seeing a copy of a writing attributed to Jeremiah containing the words quoted in Matthew 27:9-10. M.-J. Lagrange, "L'Évangile Selon les Hébreux," Revue Biblique, XXXI (1922), pp. 341-342. Likewise, if Denis knew of such a statement of Chrysostom, it would surely receive mention in his discussion of pseudo-Jeremianic writings. Denis does note, incidentally, the existence of an Ethiopian fragment "d'une 'Prophétie de Jérémie chrétienne, sur les 30 deniers de Judas (Mt. 27,9)." Albert-Marie Denis, Introduction aux Pseudepigra phes Grecs d'Ancien Testament (Leiden, 1970), pp. 76-78.

4. Junius proceeds, however, to describe only six varieties of response.


6. Weihrich (see note IV:6), pp. 303-308.

7. I.e., "clerical error." The phrase is so employed by Polybius. Liddell-Scott, p. 360.

8. Some manuscripts lack any name; some substitute the name of Zechariah. Tischendorf, I, p. 192.

9. Ibid. The Arabic translation in the London Polyglot, however, has the name of Jeremiah. Brian Walton (see note IV:2), V, p. 145.

10. Hurst and Adriaen (see note VIII:38), p. 265. Jerome states that a Hebrew of the Nazarene sect had recently shown him a copy of a Hebrew book ascribed to Jeremiah which contained the words quoted in Matthew 27:9-10. Jerome prefers, however, to see in these words a quotation ad sensum from Zechariah. (Commentariorum in Matheum
Libri VI, IV: ad 27:9-10.


12. I. e., "according to opinion." See Liddell-Scott, p. 444; and note IV:23.


15. Verses 13-16.


18. II Sam. 8:17; I Kings 2:26.

19. II Chron. 36:2; I Chron. 3:15; although Joahaz, or Jehoahaz, should probably be identified with the fourth son mentioned in the latter verse, Shallum (cf. Jer. 22:11).


22. I Chron. 6:21, 42(EV).

23. I. e., "Jah has given."

24. I. e., "God has given."

25. I. e., "God has given."


28. Brown-Driver-Briggs suggests that the name states that Jah loosens the womb, deriving the word from a hypothetical root rmh having to do with loosening (p. 941b). Junius, on the other hand, evidently derives the name from rūm, "be high, exalted."

29. Brown-Driver-Briggs likewise derives the name from zākar, "re-
member" (pp. 269-272).


PARALLEL XLIX

1. MT; EV, Ps. 22:18.

2. Junius translates the psalm title as follows in his Bibelwerk:
"Magistro symphoniae ad primam auroram, psalmus Davidis," Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1593), ad locum. The RSV, on the other hand, renders the title as, "To the choirmaster: according to The Hind of the Dawn. A Psalm of David," understanding it as a direction to use a certain tune in singing the psalm.

3. Junius deals with the use of Psalm 22:22 (EV) in Hebrews 2:12: "I will proclaim thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will praise thee." Opera Theologica (see note XXIV:20), I, coll. 1543-1547.


PARALLEL LX

Romae, De Haeresibus (CCSL, XLVI; Turnholti, 1969), p. 128.

2. See note XXXI:2.

3. Mark 1:4-8.

4. See parallel 59.


7. Mal. 3:1b.

8. Mal. 3:1c.

9. See note XXXI:3.

PARALLEL LI


3. See parallel 22.

4. See parallel 25.

5. See parallel 27.

6. Also verse 13.

7. See parallel 31.

PARALLEL LII

1. This clause is absent from Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and many other manuscripts.


5. Tischendorf (see note XLVIII:3), I, p. 317.
7. See parallel 35.
8. Also verse 10.
9. See parallel 37.
10. See parallel 38.
11. Also verse 11.
12. See parallel 40.
13. See parallel 41.
15. See parallels 42-44.
16. See parallel 45.
17. See parallels 80-82, 84.
18. See parallel 47.

PARALLEL LIII

1. See parallel 93.
2. See parallel 49.

PARALLEL LIV

2. The classical definition of the "causa efficiens" was provided by Aristotle in his Metaphysica, V:2; where he briefly enunciates the four causes essential to Aristotelian philosophy (material, formal, efficient, and final): "That by which a change is begun or stopped. For instance, the adviser is a cause of the act, the father of the child, and in general the maker is a cause of that which is made and the one who makes a change of the change." Louise Ropes Loomis, ed. and tr., Aristotle: On Man in the Universe: Metaphysics, Parts of Animals, Ethics, Politics, Poetics (Roslyn, New York, 1943), p. 12.
3. The effect to which Junius is referring here is presumably indicated by the words, "you shall beat in pieces many peoples," in Micah 4:13; the efficient cause is presumably indicated by the words, "one who should be lord in Israel." Cf. parallel 5 on Micah 5:1 MT (5:2 EV).

PARALLEL LV

1. MT; EV, Mal. 4:2.

2. Cf. parallel 14, where the first words of Isaiah 9:2 are translated, "Populus eius, qui ambulant."

3. See Liddell-Scott, p. 123.

4. Ibid.


8. I. e., "from on high."


10. I. e., "visit." In the textus receptus this verb occurred in the third person singular aorist form in this verse. (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and other manuscripts have a present form instead.)

11. I. e., "the flaming up or the shining out." See Liddell-Scott, p. 110.

12. I. e., "the culmination and standing at the zenith." The former verb is derived from μεσημβρία, "midday." Liddell-Scott, pp. 1105-1106.

13. I. e., "be at the meridian." Amongst Egyptian authors to use members of this word-group were Plotinus and Ptolemy (in his Almagest). Liddell-Scott, p. 1108.

14. Ps. 19:4-6 (EV; 5-7 MT).

15. I. e., "from the rising of the morning." See Liddell-Scott, p. 751.
16. See note VII:3.


18. According to the interpretation of Junius, Malachi 4:2 and Isaiah 60:1 would be passages which apply these terms to Christ.

19. Jerome had similarly attacked the reliability of the Septuagint on the basis, for one thing, of the divergencies between it and various apostolic quotations of the Old Testament. Schwarz (see VII:3), pp. 31-33.

20. Literally, "light-bearer," that is, the planet Venus. Lewis-Short, p. 1080.


23. Matt. 4:16; see parallel 14.


29. MT; EV, Mal. 4:2.


PARALLEL LVI


3. I.e., "that opens the womb."

4. See note XIV:12.

5. I.e., "according to generation." See Liddell-Scott, p. 344.

7. The classical authors use this word especially of divine oracles or commands. Liddell-Scott, p. 663.

8. I.e., "according to precept." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1306.


PARALLEL LVII


PARALLEL LVIII

1. See note XVII:3.

2. Is. 8:18.

3. Is. 8:8.


5. Opera Theologica (1613), I, coll. 1543-1547.

PARALLEL LXI

1. The translation by Junius of Isaiah 40:3 is different here than in parallel 50. Likewise, his translation of Luke 3:4 differs from that of Mark 1:3, even though the Greek is the same in both cases. It is obvious that Junius made no attempt to conform his translations of individual verses to any established version (not even his own); they were quite extemporaneous.


3. When used substantively, the word is usually translated "saving power" or "salvation."

5. E.g., Dan. 9:24-27.

6. Is. 40:5.

**PARALLEL LIX**

1. In connection with Matt. 1:12.

2. I.e., "contradiction." Liddell-Scott, p. 158.


5. Tischendorf, I, p. 453.


7. Weihrich (see note IV:6), p. 94. (De Consensus Evangelistarum, II:4.)


9. Petavius (see note IV:5), III (MPG, XLI), col. 121. (Ancoratus, LIX.)

10. See parallel 2 on this usage.

11. Gen. 11:12-13, etc.

12. The English translation here provides one name in place of the two Latin variants: "Selaa vel Sale." The modern edition of Bede cited below spells the first form of the name "Sela."


18. I. e., "blameless concession." Jesus uses the adjective to mean "without sin" at John 8:7 in the textus receptus in the story of the woman taken in adultery.


23. Also verse 11.


PARALLEL LXI


2. Is. 53:11.

3. Is. 54:1.

4. The nouns in the first clause are both plural, according to the Massoretic Text: bōšalayik āsayik.

5. See note XIV:12.
6. Junius translates the pertinent phrase of Isaiah 61:1 slightly differently here than in the diagram at the beginning of this parallel, substituting "corde" for "animo."

7. See note XVII:3.

PARALLEL LXII

1. I Kings 17:1, 8-16; II Kings 5:1-14.
2. Also verses 4-5.

PARALLEL LXIII

1. II Kings 1:9-16.
2. Also verse 30.

PARALLEL LXIV

3. This clause seems at first sight to contradict parallel 24, since there the word "singularis" is used, in general, as a technical term for an "exclusive type," one which has been especially designed by God to designate one specific person or thing or action. (SP, pp. 80-81.) Here, however, Junius uses the phrase "exempla singularia"; and "exemplum" is a word which usually refers to the "typus communis," (SP, p. 33.) We may assume, therefore, that Junius is here using the word "singularis" in a non-technical sense, and we may translate it as "individual."

4. Also verse 43.
5. Actually parallel 44.
6. Actually parallel 53.
7. Actually the three following verses, i.e., Luke 24:45-47.
John 1:23

1. Actually parallels 50 and 51, with a cross-reference at parallel 9.
2. Actually John 1:45.
3. Parallel 8.

PARALLEL LXV

1. MT; EV, Ps. 69:9.
2. i.e., "with reference to a type."
4. i.e., "according to prophecy." Cf. note VI:20.
5. i.e., "appropriation." See note XII:5.
6. MT; EV, Ps. 69:20.
7. MT; EV, Ps. 69:4.

PARALLEL LXVI


PARALLEL LXVII


PARALLEL LXIX

1. Num. 14:28-35; Ps. 95:11.

PARALLEL LXX

1. In connection with Matt. 12:5.
2. Verse 3.

3. I.e., "with respect to a correction or amendment." Liddell-Scott, p. 609.


5. On "occupatio" see note XLVII:1.

PARALLEL LXXI


PARALLEL LXXII

1. Actually Deut. 16.


PARALLEL LXXIII


PARALLEL LXXIV

1. Junius translates Deuteronomy 19:15 in a slightly different way here than in parallel 32. For one thing, he uses "ore" here in place of "sermone," even though one would expect him to do the opposite, if he were endeavouring to produce a translation of the Old Testament passage as close as possible to the way in which it is quoted in the corresponding New Testament passage.

2. I.e., "incontrovertible, undeniable." The word is applied by the town clerk to the religious beliefs of the Ephesians in Acts 19:36. See note V:4.

PARALLEL LXXV


7. See note XCII:80.

PARALLEL LXXVI

1. I.e., "expelled from the synagogue." Liddell-Scott, p. 221. The word is used in John 9:22.


PARALLEL LXXVII


6. The antitheses to which Junius is referring are evidently verses 37 ("do not believe") and 38 ("believe").

PARALLEL LXXVIII


5. See note XXIV:20.

PARALLEL LXXIX

1. In his Old Testament Junius translated this verse as a single sentence: "Quis credit praedicationi nostra: & brachium Jehovae in quo revelatur?" He explains the "brachium" as the gospel, the power of God for
salvation to those who believe, but which is veiled to those who are perishing. Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1581), ad locum.


3. The last clause in the English translation, "which are entirely possible," represents the force of the adverb "potissimum." Admittedly, this word usually signifies "chiefly, principally, especially, in preference to all others, above all, most of all." (Lewis-Short, p. 1409.) The form is, however, the superlative of "pote," which means "able, possible." The point is that in the words which follow Junius seems to be stating two alternate views of John's reason for applying Isaiah's words to the experience of Christ. Both of these views are quite possible and acceptable; but they cannot both be true, because they contradict each other.

PARALLEL LXXX

1. MT; EV, Ps. 41:9.


3. II Sam. 15:31.


5. See note XXIV:23.

PARALLEL LXXXII

1. On "dilectio" see note VI:44.

2. I.e., "salvation." See note LIX:3.

PARALLEL LXXXIII

1. On "assumptio" see note XXXVIII:1.


PARALLEL LXXXIV

1. MT; EV, Ps. 69:21. The extemporaneity of the translations of scripture passages in the Sacri Paralleli appears once again from the minor differences between Psalm 69:21 here and the verse as it occurs in the course of parallel 65: "Dant pro alimento meo amarorem, & in siti mea
bibendum exhibent acetum." (SP, p. 155.)

PARALLEL LXXXV

4. I.e., repentance and faith.
5. See parallels 88 and 95.

PARALLEL LXXXVI

1. MT; EV, Ps. 69:25.
2. Corradini (see note VI:8) provides the following definition and explanation of the technical use of "status conjecturalis" among the rhetoricians: "quum facti controversia est, h.e. cum quaeritur factumne sit aliquid, an non: quia conjecturis utimur in hujusmodi causis tractandis." (I, p. 787.)
8. Note especially Matthew 23:38: "Behold your house is forsaken and desolate."
10. Acts 1:19.
12. I.e., "a transposition of words or clauses." Liddell-Scott, p. 1861.


15. M: II Cor. 2:16.

**PARALLEL LXXXVIII**

1. Actually Ps. 16.

2. Aristotle in his Sophistici Elenchi distinguishes between ἀναφορεῖς, the "direct confutation" of an argument, and διάφορεῖς, "confutation by drawing a distinction." Liddell-Scott, p. 106.


4. Ps. 16:9.

5. Ps. 16:10.

6. Ps. 16:11.


8. Ps. 16:5-6.


10. Ps. 16:8-11.

11. Also verse 35.


**PARALLEL LXXXIX**

1. In his Bibelwerk Junius appeals to Acts 3:22 and 7:37 as proof that the prophet of whom Moses speaks in these verses of Deuteronomy is Christ, the eternal Word of God, true man, and the one mediator between God and man. Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra (1593), ad locum.

2. Deut. 18:15a.

3. Deut. 18:15b.
5. Deut. 18:19.
12. Also verses 24-27.

PARALLEL XC

   The rhetorician Herodianus used the word to mean "a figure by which
   a predicate belonging to one subject is attributed to several." Liddell-
   Scott, p. 1673.

PARALLEL XCI

1. Ps. 2:7.
2. Ps. 2:2, etc.
3. Ps. 2:8.
4. Ps. 2:9.
5. Ps. 2:11.

8. Ps. 2:1.

9. I.e., "stand beside" one another for mutual help. The RSV translates the form of the verb which occurs in Acts 4:26 as "set themselves in array."

10. The RSV translates the phrase as "were gathered together." Bauer similarly explains the prepositional phrase as an idiom meaning "at the same place, together" (p. 123).


PARALLEL XCI


5. The word "anteclematica" represents a Latinized adjectival form of the Greek noun defined in the following note.

6. The term is used by the rhetoricians for a "counter-charge." Liddell-Scott, p. 150.


13. I.e., "five."

14. I.e., "all."
15. *I.e.*, "Accordingly, they go down to Egypt, as I stated previously, Jacob and his sons and wives and descendants having been counted as seventy-five souls, as the first book of the Pentateuch of Moses encompasses them." Petavius (see note IV:5), I (MPG, XLI), col. 209. (Contra Haereses, I: 1; Haeresis VIII:4.)


19. Presumably, "and all his kindred in the case of seventy-five souls."


21. The word "dicitur" ("said") has Stephen in Acts 7:14 as its subject.

22. See note 15.

23. The Peshitta version of Acts 7:14 runs literally as follows: "And Joseph sent and there was to his father Jacob and to all his family and they were in number seventy and five souls." R. Kilgour *et al.*, eds., The New Testament in Syriac (London, 1919), II, p. 10.

24. On the problems which Junius sees here and the difficult discussion of them which follows, see the translator's remarks above in the introduction, pp. 149-152.


26. See note XVII:3.

27. The exact words of the 1578 translation by Junius are as follows: "Et translatus est in Sichernum, positusque in sepulchro quod Ebrahim sibi comparaverat pretio a filiis Chamoris." Sacrorum Apostolorum Acta, pp. 69-70 (chapter 10:31 in the Arabic text translated by Junius).


30. Motion from a place is, however, a viable signification of παρά with
the genitive in classical Greek. Liddell-Scott, p. 1302. In the New Testament such passages as John 6:46 convey the sense of derivation, but not of actual motion.

31. Isodorus Hilberg, ed., Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Opera. Sect. I. Pars II. Epistulae LXXI-CXX(CSEL, LV; Vienna, 1912), pp. 322-323. (Epistula CVIII. Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae, 13.) It is not apparent, however, how near to "Sychem" was the site to which Jerome is referring, since he states: "atque inde deuertens uidit duodecim patriarcha- rum sepulchra et Sebasten, id est Samariam . . . ."


34. Acts 7:16.

35. The textus receptus has τοῦ where the original form of Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Ephraemi Rescriptus have ἐν. The textus receptus, however, has Ἐμμόρ instead of the Ἐμμώρ in Junius, and Εὐχέμ instead of his Εὐχέμ.


40. Acts 7:17-19; Ex. 1:7, 8, 11, 22.


42. Ex. 2:2-10.


44. Actually Ex. 2:11-15.

45. "Geneseos" is a lapsus calami for "Pentateuchi."

47. Ex. 32:1-6.


49. i.e., "in a parallel manner." See note XVII:1.

50. Presumably, "written out in a parallel fashion." Strabo used the word to mean "bounded by parallel lines," the neuter form being employed substantively by Euclid to denote a parallelogram. Liddell-Scott, p. 1316.

51. The word refers in the most basic sense to the victim itself, although it is transferred to the sacrifice as well.

52. See Liddell-Scott, p. 813.

53. i.e., "gift, tribute, offering," especially a "grain offering (whether raw, roasted, ground to flour, or prepared as bread or cakes...)." Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 585.


55. i.e., "by way of a syllepsis." See notes VII:4; XC:2.

56. The word means both "portable" and "notorious," Liddell-Scott, p. 1392. The former significance is the appropriate one here, but perhaps a pun is intended.

57. Letter of Jeremiah (Baruch 6) 4, 26.

58. Junius is evidently referring to one of the רטנ, the "old race of giants" in Canaan, of whom Og, the king of Bashan, was the last, Deuteronomy 3:11; Joshua 13:12. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 952a.


text on the basis of Codex Ambrosianus F128 and Codex Medicæus Bibliothecæ Laurentianae, while he notes that three other codices have ḥαפוה (Antiquitates Iudaicae, XII:8.)

61. Ibid.


63. "Tutanus" was originally the name of a specific Roman guardian deity who, according to legend, put Hannibal to flight. Lewis-Short, p. 1920.

64. I.e., "from the general proposition." Liddell-Scott, p. 969. The general proposition here is that "you" made the images mentioned in order to worship them. Therefore, the pronoun "your" could be omitted in the phrase "your Melech."

65. I.e., "explanation, interpretation." Liddell-Scott, p. 593.


68. II Sam. 7:2.

69. Also I Kings 7:15-51.

70. I.e., "interrogatively." Liddell-Scott, p. 696.

71. I.e., "stiff-necked." The term is applied to Israel at various points in the Septuagint, such as Exodus 33:3.

72. II Chron. 36:15-16.

73. Especially Ex. 19:7-8.

74. Deut. 33:2-4.

75. Ps. 68:17 EV (MT, 18).

76. Especially Hab. 3:3.

77. Gal. 3:19.


80. Acts 7:35-38. Junius is assuming that this angel was the pre-incarnate Christ. Thus, at Genesis 22:11 in his Bibliothek Junius identifies the "Angelus Jehovae" as "Christus sermo aeternus Patris, qui idem appellatur Deus, v. 12. Itemque Jehova, v. 16." Testamenti Veteris Bibliia Sacra (1593), ad locum.

81. Heb. 2:2.

PARALLEL XCIII

1. In connection with Matt. 8:17.

2. The margin cites Acts 2 (with reference to verse 23) and another chapter which is illegible. Most of the later editions of the Sacri Parallel read the number "3," and they are doubtless correct. Junius presumably has Acts 3:15 in mind at this point. The folio editions of the Sacri Parallel, however, erroneously read "8."

3. The first autō and the 66 are distinctive elements of the textus receptus.
4. I. e., "equivalent," Liddell-Scott, p. 837. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus notes that "what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have exactly the same sense (ἰσοδυναμεν) when translated into a different language." Joseph Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis Editum, XII, 2. Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach (Göttingen, 1965), p. 125.

PARALLEL XCIV

1. I. e., "respecer of persons." Liddell-Scott gives no reference to this word outside of Acts 10:34 (p. 1533). Bauer explains the small and unusual word-group of which this word is a member as the result of Hebrew influence on the New Testament writers through the medium of the Septuagint (p. 728).

2. See note XVII:3.

PARALLEL XCV


2. Gen. 11:31-12:3; Ex. 1-15.

3. Ex. 16-Deut. 34.


5. II Sam. 7:12-16.

6. Junius is following, of course, the textus receptus. Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, papyrus 74, the Vulgate, and other authorities place "and after that he gave them judges" after the number of years.

7. I. e., "the latter first."

8. "In the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, he began to build the house of the Lord." I Kings 6:1.

9. I. e., "and after these things were taking place during the course of about four hundred and fifty years," the ταῦτα referring to the events described in verses 17 to 19.

10. The Vulgate reading is as follows: "... et destruens gentes septem
in terra chanaan sorte distribuit eis terram eorum quasi post quad- 

11. I. e., "He gave them their land as an inheritance in the course of about four hundred and fifty years. And after these things, he gave them judges. . . ."

12. The translation by Junius of the Arabic version of Acts 13:19-21 runs as follows: "Et evellens septem gentes in terra Canahanis, dedit illis haereditario possidendam terram eorum: /Deinde vero postquam de- 
disset eis iudices quadringentis quinquaginta annis usque ad Semuelem Prophetam, /Usque dum potentibus ab eo Regem dedit eis Deus Savu- 
lem filium Kissi, virum de tribu Binjaminis, & amovit eum." Sacror- 


17. Gen. 21:5.

18. Exodus 12:40-41 MT defines the duration of the Egyptian sojourn alone as exactly 430 years, while Genesis 15:13 gives a figure of four centuries for the same period. Presumably Junius is relying here on the Septuagint and Galatians 3:17.

19. Junius is possibly referring here to Joshua 11:23, or he is simply assuming that the national assembly at Shiloh meant that the people were observing a sabbatical year (18:1). The words of Caleb, to be sure, in Joshua 14:6-10 would imply at least a six-year interval between the entrance into Canaan and the beginning of the allotment. For the rebellion at Kadesh-barnea took place somewhat more than a year after the exodus, and it was now forty-five years after that rebellion, according to Caleb.

20. See Liddell-Scott, p. 347.

21. See note 4 above.
25. Also verse 33.
26. Also verse 33.
28. By "the etymon" Junius is presumably referring to the word 'σωμάτιον which has been combined with άφαντο to form the word used in verse 33.
29. Ps. 2:7.
33. I.e., "consubstantial." The word was used by Plotinus, Porphyry, and other pagan authors. The Christian writers and the Council of Nicæa applied it, of course, to the relationship between the persons of the Trinity.
34. Cf. the exposition of Hebrews 5:1-10 in Opera Theologica (1613), I, coll. 1559-1561, in the course of which the use of Psalm 2:7 in Hebrews 5:5 is noted.
35. Ps. 2:10-11a.
36. The Greek word transliterated here is used by the rhetoricians to refer to a "phrase added by way of ornament or as a finishing touch." Liddell-Scott, p. 672.
37. Ps. 2:11b.
39. I.e., "arrangement or management of things." The most basic meaning of the word is the management of a household. Liddell-Scott, p.
1204. Paul uses it of God's plan of the ages in Ephesians 1:10 and of his own apostolic function in 3:2.


41. I. e., "according to nature." In philosophical works the word is used with a variety of nuances—the elementary substance, creation, a species, etc. Liddell-Scott, p. 1965.

42. I. e., "according to the true nature." See note IV:21.


44. The word to which Junius is referring is יִתְפָּרֶד, which sometimes means "beget," according to Brown-Driver-Briggs (p. 408), but less often than "bear, bring forth."


46. Heb. 1:5. See note 32 above.

47. Gal. 4:4.


50. Tractate Berakoth 9b-10a of the Babylonian Talmud reads as follows: "You must assume therefore that 'Happy is the man' and 'Why are the nations in an uproar' form one chapter. For R. Samuel b. Nahumani said in the name of R. Johanan: Every chapter that was particularly dear to David he commenced with 'Happy.' He began with 'Happy,' as it is written, 'Happy is the man,' and he terminated with 'Happy,' as it is written, 'Happy are all they that take refuge in Him.'" Maurice Simon and I. Epstein, eds., Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Berakoth (London, 1960), pp. 9b-10a.

52. I.e., "in a circular manner." See Liddell-Scott, p. 1006.


55. Is. 55:3.

56. Brown-Driver-Briggs (p. 339b) defines the word as "kind" or "pious, godly, either as an exhibition of 'duteous love' toward God . . . , or . . . because kindness, as prominent in the godly, comes to imply other attributes, and to be a designation of the godly character."

57. The basic concept of the word is "hallowed, sanctioned or allowed by the law of God." Liddell-Scott, p. 1260.

58. See note XVII:3.

59. Brown-Driver-Briggs (pp. 338-339) derives ḫasād, "goodness, kindness," and ḫāṣid from ḫāṣād, "be good, kind."


61. Is. 55:3 (paraphrase).

62. Is. 53:11-12.

63. Ps. 16:10.

64. Actually parallel 88.


68. Hab. 1:5.


**PARALLEL XCVI**

1. Is. 49:1.
5. M: I Cor. 9. The reference is to verse 16.

**PARALLEL XCVII**

7. I.e., "lawlessness." In I John 3:4 the word is used as a definition of sin.
8. I Cor. 10:23.

**PARALLEL XCVIII**

1. I.e., "disorderliness." The most basic usage is that of lack of dis-
cipline among soldiers. Liddell-Scott, p. 268.


5. Is. 6:9.