Israel; with whom *the promise* was ever the  
object of faith: a *land*, in which they were  
strangers: a son, who was not yet born: a  
people, who were yet to be.

**8.**] ABRAHAM’S *example*.   
**By faith Abraham, being  
called** (viz. by God, Gen. xii. 1 ff. Another  
reading, having considerable authority, is,  
“he that was called, named, Abraham.”  
And the sense thus would be very good,—  
whatever Bleek and Delitszch have said  
against it,—when we take into account  
the meaning of the name Abraham, a  
*father of nations*. That this change of  
name did not take place till twenty-five  
years after his removal from Haran, is  
no objection, but is just what would be  
the point raised: “By faith, he who was  
[afterwards] called Abrabam, father of  
nations, &c.” But on the whole, I adhere  
to the received text), **obeyed, to go out**  
(the infinitive explains *wherein* he obeyed)  
**to a** (or, ‘*the*’ **place which he was hereafter   
to receive for an inheritance** (not  
that he was conscious even of this promise  
when he went out, for it was made to him  
afterwards in Canaan, see Gen. xii. 7); **and  
went out, not knowing whither he was  
going** (coming).

**9, 10.**] **By faith  
he sojourned in the land of the promise**  
(concerning which the promise, Gen. xii. 7,  
had been given), **as a stranger’s** (as if it  
did not belong to him, but to another:  
see Acts vii. 6, which is strictly parallel,  
and Gen. xv. 13), **dwelling in tents** (see  
Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 3; xviii. 1 ff.) **with Isaac  
and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same  
promise** (what is implied is, not so much  
that the promise was renewed to them,  
as that all three waited for the performance  
of the same promise, and in this waiting,  
built themselves no permanent abode)

**10.**] **for** (reason of his sojourning in the  
land of promise as in a strange land) **he  
waited for the city which has the  
foundations** (beyond doubt, the heavenly  
city, the “*Jerusalem which is above,*” thus  
contrasted with the frail and moveable  
tents in which the patriarchs dwelt. No  
other interpretation will suit the language  
here used. The “*city of the living God*”  
of ch. xii, 32, and the “*city which is to  
come*” of ch. xiii. 14, must be here meant  
also. Of the earthly Jerusalem indeed it  
is said, Ps. lxxxvii. 1, “*its foundation is  
in the holy mountains:*” but it is impossible,   
that the earthly Jerusalem can be  
meant here. The lives of the dwellers in  
her rather corresponded to the precarious  
dwelling in tents than to the abiding in a  
permanent city: and the true reference of  
the expression “**having the foundations**”  
is to be found in Rev. xxi. 14, 19. As having  
these foundations, it forms a contrast to  
the tent, placed on the ground and easily  
transported. Ebrard objects to this view,  
that it is unhistoric to say that the patriarchs   
looked for the heavenly city: but  
Delitzsch well answers, that it is not the  
mere historic question, what they knew and  
expected, with which our Writer is concerned,   
but the question what it was that  
their faith, breaking through this knowledge  
in its yearnings for the future, framed to  
itself as matter of hope. The expectation  
of the literal fulfilment of a promise is one  
thing: the hopes and prospects and surmises   
built upon the character of that promise,   
another. The one is mere belief:  
the other is faith), **of which the architect  
and master-builder is God** (very similarly)