by martyrdom, as Stephen, James the  
brother of John, and possibly [but see the  
matter discussed in Introd. to James]  
James the brother of the Lord: and  
possibly too, St. Peter [see Introd. to 1  
Pet.]) **of their conversation** (i.e. their  
Christian behaviour, walk, course. No  
English word completely gives it), **imitate  
the faith.**

**8.**] **Jesus Christ is yesterday  
and to-day the same, and for ever** (the  
verse stands as a transition from what has  
passed to what follows. “It was Christ  
whom these *leaders* preached, *when they  
spoke the word of God*: Christ who supported   
them to the end, being the author  
and finisher of their faith; and He remains  
still the same with regard to you,—*the  
same:* be not then carried away &c.” As  
to the *meaning* of the words, **yesterday**  
refers to the time past, when their *leaders*  
passed away from them, **to-day** to the time  
present, when the Writer and the readers  
were living. In our A.V., this verse, by  
the omission of the copula “is,” appears  
as if it were in apposition with “the end of  
whose conversation:” and in the carelessly  
printed polyglott of Bagster, the matter is  
made worse, by a *colon* being substituted  
for the *period*, after ‘conversation.’ Observe   
**Jesus Christ**, not common with our  
Writer: only e.g. ver. 21, where he wishes  
to give a solemn fulness to the mention of  
the Lord: Jesus, the Person, of whom we  
have been proving, that He is *the Christ*,  
the Anointed of God. Compare also ch. x.  
10). **Be not carried away** (the fixed point  
from which they are not to be carried away,  
is clearly that given in the last verse, viz.  
Jesus Christ) **by various and strange**  
(*strangers to the truth*) **doctrines** (teachings,   
Matt. xv. 9; Col. ii. 22; 1 Tim. iv.  
1): **for it is good that the heart be confirmed   
with grace** (God’s grace, working  
on us by faith), **not with meats** (it is a  
question whether this be meant of meat  
eaten after sacrifices, or of “meats” as  
spoken of so much by St. Paul, meats partaken   
of or abstained from as a matter of  
conscience: see 1 Cor. viii. 8, 13: ib. vi  
13: Rom. xiv. 15, 20. The former view is  
taken by Schlichting, Bleek, Lünnemann,  
&c., on the grounds, 1) that the expression  
will not suit meats *abstained from*, only  
those partaken of: 2) that ver. 10, which  
is in close connexion with this, speaks of  
an altar and of partaking of meats sacrificed:   
and 3) that this same reference, to  
meats offered in sacrifice, is retained  
throughout, to ver. 15. The other view is  
taken by Chrysostom, &c., the great body  
of later Commentators, and recently by  
Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. And I own  
the reasons urged in its favour incline me  
strongly to this view, to the exclusion of  
the other), **in which** (the observance of  
which: the word **meats** being used for *the  
observance of rules concerning meats and  
drinks, &c.*) **they who walked were not  
profited** (these, who walked in such observances,   
are the whole people of God  
under the Old Test. dispensation [notice  
the past tenses], to whom they were of  
themselves useless and profitless, though  
ordained for a preparatory purpose: so  
that Calvin’s objection is answered, that  
“the discipline of which the distinction  
between meats was a part, *was useful* to  
the fathers under the law.” Yes, and so  
was the shedding of the blood of bulls and  
goats part of the discipline: but it was  
useless to take away sin).

**10.**] *What  
is the connexion with ver.*9? It is represented   
as being entirely done away by our  
interpretation of **meats** above. If I regard  
it aright, it is not only not done away, but.  
established in its proper light. Those ancient   
distinctions are profitless: one distinction   
remains: that our true meat is not  
to be partaken of by those who adhere to  
those old distinctions: that Christianity  
and Judaism are necessarily and totally  
distinct. See more below. **We have an  
altar** (to what does the Writer allude?  
Some have said that no distinct idea was  
before him, but that he merely used the  
term altar, to help the figure which he was