is properly and logically opposed) **and in  
divers manners** (“in one way was He  
seen by Abraham, in another by Moses,  
in another by Elijah, in another by Michaiah. Isaiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel saw  
differing forms of vision.” Theodoret.  
Bleek remarks, that in Numb. xii. 6—8,  
the diversity of manner of revelation is  
recognized : dreams and visions being set  
beneath that open speaking, mouth to  
mouth, which the Lord used towards His  
servant Moses. It will be seen, that I  
cannot agree with Chrysostom and many  
others in regarding the two adverbs as  
a mere rhetorical redundance,—meaning  
merely, “ differently.” Both set forth the  
imperfection of the Old Test. revelations.  
They were various in nature and in form:  
fragments of the whole truth, presented in  
manifold forms, in shifting hues of separated colour: Christ is the full revelation  
of God, Himself the pure light, uniting in  
His one Person the whole spectrum: see  
below on ver. 3) **in time past** (generally  
interpreted of the Old Test. period, ending with Malachi. But there is no need for  
cutting off the period there. In the interim  
between Malachi and the Writer’s time,  
though the Old Test. canon was closed, we  
cannot say that God’s manifold revelations  
of Himself had absolutely ceased. Nay,  
strictly speaking, the Baptist himself be-  
longed to the former, though he pointed  
on to the latter period. No doubt he was  
not here in the Writer’s view, and the  
period of former revelations is here regarded as distinct from the final Christian one: but for all that, we must not put an  
artificial terminus where he puts none)  
**God having spoken to the fathers** (so in  
reff. The term *“the fathers”* is absolutely used in John vii. 22; Acts xiii. 32; Rom. ix. 5; xi. 28; xv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4.  
It is evident from this term being common  
to the Writer and his readers, where no  
reference is made to Jews in the context  
[as in Rom. ix. 5], that he was writing as  
4 Jew and to Jews) **in** (not equivalent to  
*“by,”* though it includes it. The **in** designates the *element in which* the *speaking* takes place, and holds therefore its own  
proper force. God spoke *in* the prophets,  
being resident in them. Bengel draws a  
distinction,—a human king speaks by his  
ambassadors, but not in them) **the prophets** (to be taken here apparently in the wider sense,—as including not only those  
whose inspired writings form the Old Test.  
canon, but all who were vehicles of the  
divine self-manifestation to the Fathers.  
Thus Enoch in Jude 14 is said to have  
*prophesied*. Moses is of course included,  
and indeed would on any view be the *chief*  
of those here spoken of, seeing that by  
him the greater part of God’s revelation of  
Himself to the fathers was made).

**2.] at the end of these days** (in order to  
understand this expression, it will be well  
to call to mind certain Jewish modes of  
speaking of time. The Rabbis divided the  
whole of time into *“this age,”* and *“the  
age to come.”* The days of the Messiah  
were regarded as a period of transition from  
the former to the latter,—His appearance,  
as the ushering in of the termination of  
*“these days,”* the beginning of the end,—  
and His second coming in glory as the  
accomplishment of *“these days”* or *“this  
age.”* And with this, New Test. usage  
agrees,—see 1 Pet. i. 20; James v. 3;  
Jude 18; 2 Pet. iii. 3. Thus **at the end  
of these days** would mean, ‘at the end  
of *this age,’* in the technical sense of these  
words as signifying the whole world-period,  
the latter boundary of which is the Resurrection. And thus is the manifestation of Christ in the flesh ever spoken of,  
and especially in this Epistle; compare ch.  
ix. 26; and notes on ch. ii. 5; vi.5. Stuart  
has mistaken the meaning, in rendering  
*‘during the last dispensation,’* and making  
*“these”* to import that the period had  
already *begun*. It is not of a beginning,  
but of an *expiring* period, the Writer is  
speaking. The ancient expositors principally use these words as ground of *consolation:* those who were in conflict would  
be consoled on hearing that it was soon to  
end) **spake** (not *‘hath spoken:’* the **end**  
just spoken of is looked back on as a definite  
point, at which the divine revelation took  
place. The attention of the readers is thus  
directed not so much to the present state in  
which they are, as to the act of God towards  
them) **unto us** (i.e. all who have heard that  
voice, or to whom it is to be announced.  
There is no distinction between those who  
received God’s revelation immediately from  
the Son, and those who received immediately through others.

**To this latter**