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 bok L728 , time past unto \*the fathers in| w#o the fathers by the pro-   
 vat Acts 2+at the end ‘of phets, ? hath in these last   
 tival'us’ the prophets, days spoken unto us by his   
 ASS. e Deut. Gal-iv.4, Eph.i.10, ix.20.   
   
   
 properly and logically opposed) and in phets {to be taken here apparently in the   
 divers manners (“in one way was He wider sense,—as including not only those   
 seen by Abraham, in another by Mos whose inspired writings form the Old Test.   
 in another by Elijah, in another by Mi- canon, but all who were vehicles of the   
 chaiah. Isaiab, Daniel, and Ezekiel saw divine self-manifestation to the Fathers.   
 differing forms of vision.” Theodoret. Thus Enoch in Jude 14 is said to have   
 Bleek remarks, that in Numb. xii. 6—8, prophesied. Moses is of course included,   
 the diversity of manner of revelation is and indeed would on any view be the chief   
 recognized : dreams and visions being set of those here spoken of, seeing that. by   
 beneath that open speaking, mouth to him the greater part of God’s revelation of   
 mouth, which the Lord used towards His Himself to the fathers was made).   
 servant Moses. It will be seen, that 1 2.] at the end of these days (in order to   
 eannot agree with Chrysostom and many understand this expression, it will well   
 others in regarding the two adverbs as to call to mind certain Jewish modes of   
 a mere rhetorical redundance,—meaning speaking of time. The Rabbis divided the   
 merely, “ differently.” Both set forth the whole of time into “this age,” and “the   
 imperfection of the Old Test. revelations. age to come.” The days of the Messiah   
 ‘They were various in nature and in form: were regarded as a period of from   
 fragments of-the whole truth, presented in the former to the latter,—His appearance,   
 manifold forms, in shifting hues of sepa- as the ushering in of the termination of   
 rated colour: Christ is the full revelation “ these days,” the begiuning of the end,—   
 of God, Himself the pure light, uniting in and His ‘second coming in glory as the   
 His one Person the whole spectrum: see accomplishment of “these days” or “ this   
 below on ver. 3) in time past (generally age.” Aud with this, New Test. usage   
 interpreted of the Old Test. period, end- agrees,—sce 1 Pet. i. 20; James v. 3;   
 ing with Malachi. But there is no need for Jude 18; 2 Pet. iii. Thus at the end   
 cutting off the period there. In the interim of these days would mean, ‘at the end   
 between Malachi and the Writer’s time, of this age,’ in the technical sense of these   
 though the Old Test. canon was closed, we words as signifying the whole world-period,   
 cannot say that God’s manifold revelations the latter boundary of which is the Re-   
 of Himself had absolutely ceased. Nay, surrection. And thus is the manifesta-   
 strictly speaking, the Baptist himself be- tion of Christ in the flesh ever spoken of,   
 longed to the former, though he pointed and especially in this Epistle; compare ch.   
 on to the latter period. No doubt he was ix. 26; and noteson ch.ii.55 vi.5. Stuart   
 not here in the Writer’s view, and the has mistaken the meaning, in rendering   
 period of former revelations is here re- « during the last dispensation,’ and making   
 garded as distinct from the final Christian “these” to import that the period had   
 one: but for all that, we wust not put an already begun. It is not of a beginning,   
 artificial terminus where he puts none) but of an expiring period, the Writer is   
 God having spoken to the fathers (so in speaking. The ancient expositors prin-   
 reff. The term “the fathers” is abso- cipally use these words as ground of con-   
 lutely used in John vii. 22; Acts xiii. 32; solation: those who were in conflict would   
 Rom. ix. 5; xi. 28; xv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. be consoled on hearing that it was soon to   
 It is evident from this term being common end) spake (not ‘hath spoken’ the end   
 to the Writer and bis readers, where no just spoken of is back as a definite   
 reference is made to Jews in the context point, at which the divine revelation took   
 [as in Rom. ix. 5], that he was writing as ‘ec. attention of the readers is thus   
 4 Jew and to Jews) in (not equivalent to directed not so much to the present state in   
 “by,” though it includes it. The in de- which they are, as to the of God towards   
 signates the element in which the speaking them) unto us (i. e.all have heard that   
 takes place, and holds therefore its own voice, or to whom it is to be announced.   
 proper force. God spoke in the prophets, There is no distinction between those who   
 being resident in them. Bengel draws a received God’s revelation immediately from   
 distinction—a human king speaks by his the Son, and those who received it me-   
 ambassadors, but not in them) the pro- fintely through others. To this latter