THE JUDGMENT OF THE Ancient JEWISH Church, Against the *UNITARIANS*, IN

The Controversy upon the Holy Trinity, and the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour.

With a Table of Matters, and a Table of Texts of Scripture Occasionally Explain'd.

By a Divine of the Church of England.

LONDON:

Printed for Ri. Chiswell; and are to be sold at the *Rose* and *Crown*, and at the *Rose* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCXCIX.

THE PREFACE.

ALTHOUGH *the* Jews, *by mistaking the Prophecies of Scripture concerning the Kingdom of their* Messias, *expected he should have a Temporal Kingdom; and because our Lord Jesus was not for* that, *therefore they would not acknowledge him for their* Messias; *yet all things considered, there is no essential difference between our Religion and theirs. We own the very same God, whom they formerly Worshipp'd, the Maker of the World, and their Lawgiver. We receive that very* Messias *whom God promised them by his Prophets, so many Ages before his coming. We own no other Spirit of God to have Inspired the Apostles, besides the Holy Ghost, who spoke by the Prophets, and by whose manifold Gifts the* Messias *was to*

be known, as one in whom all Nations should be Blessed.

This plainly appears in the way and method which both Christ and his Apostles followed in preaching the Gospel. They endeavoured to take off the prejudices the then Jews *laboured under, concerning the Nature of the* Messias, *and the Characters by which he was to be known: For they argued all along from the Books of* Moses *and the Prophets, and never proposed any thing to their Disciples but what was declared in those Writings which the* Jews *acknowledged as the Standard of their Religion; which may be seen in Christ's Discourse to the* Jews, John v. 46. *and to his Disciples after his Resurrection,* Luke xxiv. 47, *and* 44. *in the words of St.* Peter, Acts x. 43. *and of St.* Paul, Acts xxvi. 22.

The truth is, in those Sacred Books, although One only God be acknowledged, under the Name of Jehovah, *which denotes his Essence, and therefore is incommunicable to any other; yet not only that very Name is given to the* Messias, *but also all the Works, Attributes, and Characters, peculiar to* Jehovah, *the God of* Israel, *and the only true God, are frequently bestowed on him.*

This

This the old Jewish *Authors, as* Philo *and the* Targumists, *do readily acknowledge. For in their Exposition of those places of the Old Testament which relate to the* Messias, *they generally suppose him to be God; whereas the Modern* Jews *being of a far different Opinion, use all Shifts imaginable to evade the force of their Testimonies. The Apostles imitated in this the Synagogue, by applying to Christ several places of the Old Testament, which undoubtedly were primarily intended of the God of* Israel.

But because they sometimes only touch at places of the Old Testament, without using them as formal Proofs of what they then handled; Socinus *and his Disciples have fancied that those Citations out of the Old Testament, which are made use of by the Apostles, though they represent the* Messias *as being the same with the God of* Israel; *yet for all this are but bare Allusions and Accommodations, made indeed by them to Subjects of a like nature, but not at all by them intended as Arguments and Demonstrations.*

Nothing can be more injurious to the Writings of the New Testament, than such a Supposition: And there can hardly be an Opinion more apt to overthrow the Authority

thority of Christ and his Apostles, and to expose the Christian Religion to the Scorn both of Jews *and* Heathens. *For the bare Accommodation of a place of Scripture, cannot suppose that the Holy Ghost had any design in it, to intimate any thing sounding that way, and consequently the Sense of that Scripture so accommodated is of no Authority. Whereas it is a most certain truth that Christ and his Apostles did design, by many of those Quotations, to prove that which was in dispute between them and the* Jews.

To what purpose should Christ exhort the Jews to search the Scriptures *of the Old Testament*, because they testified of him, *John* v. 39. *if those Scriptures could only give a false Notion of him, by intimating that the* Messias *promised was the* God *of* Israel? *This were to suppose that Christ and his Apostles went about to prove a thing by that which had no Strength and no Authority to prove it: And that the Citations out of the Old Testament, are like the Works of the Empress* Eudoxia, *who writ the History of Christ in Verses put together, and borrowed from* Homer, *under the Name of* Ὁμηροκεντρα; *or that of* Proba Falconia, *who did the same in Verses and Words taken out of* Virgil. *It*

It follows at least from such a Position, That in the Gospel God gave a Revelation so very new, that it has no manner of Affinity to the Old, although he caused this old Revelation to be carefully written by the Prophets, and as carefully preserved by the Jews *to be the Standard of their Faith, and the Ground of their Hopes, till he should fulfil his Promises contained in it; and although Christ and his Apostles bid the* Jews *have recourse to it, to know what they were to expect of God's promises.*

The Christian Church ever rejected this pernicious Opinion. And although her first Champions against the Ancient Hereticks, did acknowledge that the new Revelation, brought in by Christ and his Apostles, had made the Doctrines much clearer then they were before, (which the Jews *themselves do acknowledge, when they affirm, that hidden things are to be made plain to all by the* Messias) *yet they ever maintained that those Doctrines were so clearly set down in the Books of the Old Testament, that they could not be opposed by them, who acknowledge those Books to come from God: especially since the* Jews *are therein told, that the* Messias, *when he came*

came should explain them, and make them clearer.

This Observation is particularly of force against those who formerly opposed the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and that of our Saviour's being God. These Hereticks thought they followed the Opinion of the old Jews. *Therefore they that confuted them, undertook to satisfy them, that the Christian Church had received nothing from Christ and his Apostles, about those two Articles, but what God had formerly taught the* Jews, *and what necessarily followed from the Writings of* Moses *and the Prophets; so that those Doctrines could not be rejected, without accusing the Divine Spirit, the Author of those Books, of shortness of Thought, in not foreseeing what naturally follows from those Principles so often laid down and repeated by him.*

These old Writers solidly proved to those Hereticks, That God did teach the Jews *the Unity of his Essence, yet so as to establish at the same time a Distinction in his Nature, which according to the Notion which himself gives of it, we call Trinity of Persons: And that when he promised that the* Messias *to come was to be Man, at the very same time he expresly told the* Jews, *that he was withal to be God blessed for ever.* The

The force and evidence of the Proofs of those Doctrines, is so great, and the Proofs themselves so numerous, that Hereticks could not avoid them, but by setting up Opinions directly opposite to the Scriptures: On the other side, the Hereticks were so gravelled, that they broke into Opinions quite contrary one to another, which greatly contributed to confirm the Faith of them whom they opposed in those Articles, so that it still subsisted; whereas the opposite Heresies perish'd in a manner as soon as broacht.

The meanness of Christ, and his shameful Death, moved the Ebionites, *in the very first Age after him, to look upon him as a meer Man, though exalted by God's Grace to the Dignity of a Prophet. But the* Cerinthians, *another sort of Hereticks, maintained that the* Word *did operate in him, though at the same time they denied the personal and inseparable Union of that Word with this human Nature.*

In the beginning of the Third Century, some had much ado to receive the Doctrine of the Trinity, by reason that they could not reconcile it with that of the Unity of God. But Praxeas, Noetus, *and* Sabellius, *who opposed that Doctrine, were soon obliged to recant: And then from one Extremity,*

tremity, they shortly fell into another. For being satisfied that the Scripture does attribute to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, the divine Nature, which is constantly in the Old Testament expressed by the Name Jehovah; *they undertook, contrary to the plain Notions of Scripture, to maintain, that there was but One Person in God, which had appeared the same under three differing Names. Whereas some others did so plainly see the distinction, which the Scripture makes between the Persons, that they chose rather to own Three distinct Essences, than to deny that there are Three Persons in God, as the Scripture does invincibly prove.*

Two sorts of Hereticks did formerly oppose the Divinity of Christ. Some did acknowledge, that, as to his divine Nature, he was before the World, and that by it he had made the World; though Himself, as to that nature, *was created before the World; and these afterwards formed the* Arian *Sect. Others, but very few, such as* Artemas *and* Theodotus, *denied that Christ was before he was born of the Virgin: They acknowledged in him no other besides the human Nature, which, said they, God had raised to a very high Dignity, by giving to it a Power almost infinite: And in*

in this they made his Godhead to consist.

But these two sorts of Hereticks were happily destroyed one by the other, for the Arians *on the one side did confound* Artemas *his Disciples, by proving from places of Scripture, that Christ was before the Virgin, nay before the World. And on the other side, Absurdity and Idolatry were proved upon the* Arians, *both because they acknowledged more than one divine Nature, and because they worshipped a Creature; whereas by the Christian Religion, God alone ought to be worshipped.*

Artemas *his Disciples were so few, and so severely condemned, even whilst the Church laboured under Persecutions, that their Name is hardly remembred at this day; which clearly shews how strange their Doctrine appeared to them who examined it by the Books of the Old and the New Testament.*

As for the Arians, *they made, it is true, more noise in the World, by the help of two or three of* Constantine's *Successors, who by violent Methods endeavoured to spread their Opinion. But that very thing made their Sect odious, and in a little time quite ruined the credit of it. Within a hundred and fifty years, or thereabouts, after their first Rise, there hardly remained any Professors*

fessors of it; which plainly shews, that they could not answer those Arguments from Scripture which were urged against them.

I observe this last thing, that Arius's *Heresy was destroyed by Proofs from Scripture for the Eternal Divinity of our Saviour, (though it was a long time countenanced by the* Roman *Emperours, by the* Vandal *Kings in* Africk, *and by the Kings of the* Goths *both in* Spain *and in* Italy;) *least any should fancy it was extinguished only by Imperial Laws, and Temporal Punishments. Besides, that the first Inventors of that Heresy had spread it before such time as* Constantine, *by vanquishing* Licinius, *became Master of the World. Whoever shall consider that the Christian Religion had, before* Arius, *already suffered ten Persecutions without shrinking under them, will easily see that all the Power of* Constantine, *and of his Orthodox Successors, who punished the* Arian *Professors, had never been great enough to suppress their Opinion, if it had not been a Gospel-doctrine: not to say that these Laws, and their Authority, extended no further than the* Roman *Empire.*

What had happen'd in those ancient Times, soon after the Christian Church was establisht, happened likewise again in the last

last Century, at the Reformation of the Western Church. As in those early days there arose many Heresies entirely opposite one to the other; so in these latter times the very same was seen among us. For when God raised up many Great Men to reform the Church in this and our neighbouring Kingdoms, there appeared soon after some Men, who being weary of the Popish Tyranny, both in Doctrine and Worship, did fancy that they might make a more perfect Reformation, if they could remove out of the Christian Religion those things which human Reason was apt to stumble at. And the Roman *Church having obtruded upon her Votaries such Mysteries as were directly repugnant to Reason, they imagined that the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of Christ's Divinity, were of that number; and thus used all their Endeavours to prove that they were absurd and contradictory.*

Had not these Doctrines been grounded on the Authority of the Books of the Old and the New Testament, they might easily enough have confuted them. But being forced to own the Authority of those Books, which they durst not attack for fear of being detested by all Christians, they fell into the same opposite Extremes, into which those Hereticks of old had fallen,

fallen, when they opposed these fundamental Doctrines of Christianity; and thus were as divided in Opinions about those matters, as the ancient Hereticks had been before them.

For whilst some of them, as Lælius Socinus, *and his Nephew* Faustus, *denied the Divinity of Christ, and thus revived the Opinion of* Artemas *and his Disciples; others seeing how absurd the Answers were that* Socinus *and his Followers gave to those places of Scripture, which assert the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, run so far to the contrary of this* Socinian *Heresy, that they acknowledged three Gods. And not only the Adversaries of* Socinus, *but even some of his Disciples did oppose his Opinion, moved thereto by the Authority of Scripture. For he held it a fundamental Article of the Christian Faith, that Christ is to be adored; in which he was a downright Idolater, in adoring Christ as true God, when he believed Christ to be a meer Creature. But his Disciples building upon this firm Maxim of Scripture, that God alone is to be adored, justly concluded against him that he was not to be adored, since strictly speaking he was but a Creature, and no God.*

This

This Division was plainly occasioned by the strength of Scripture-proofs, which on the one hand clearly shew, that none can be a Christian without adoring Christ; and on the other positively affirm, that none but the True God ought to be adored. Thus these two opposite Parties did unwillingly do the business of the true Church, which ever opposed to the Enemies of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of Christ, the Authority of the Holy Scripture, which teaches that Christ ought to be adored, and withal convinces the Arians *of Idolatry, who adored Christ without owning him to be the true God, though they bestowed on him a kind of a Godhead inferior to that of the Father.*

I cannot but admire, that they who within these few years have in this Kingdom embraced Socinus *his Opinions, should consider no better how little success they have had elsewhere against the truth, and that upon the score of their Divisions, which will unavoidably follow, till they can agree in unanimously rejecting the Authority of Scripture. Neither doth it avail them any thing to use Quibbles and Evasions, and weak Conjectures, since they are often unanswerably confuted even by some of their Brethren, who are more dextrous than they in expounding of Scriptures.*

But

But being resolved by all means to defend their Tenents, some Chief men amongst them have undertaken to set aside the Authority of Scriptures, which is so troublesome to them: And the Author of a late Book, intitled, Considerations, *maintains that the Gospels have been corrupted by the Orthodox Party, and suspects that of St.* John *to be the work of* Cerinthus.

It is no very easy Task to dispute against men whose Principles are so uncertain, and who in a manner have no regard to the Authority of Scripture. It was much less difficult to undertake Socinus *himself, because he owned however the Authority of Scripture, and that it had not been corrupted. But one knows not how to deal with his Disciples, who in their Opinion seem to be so contrary to him, and one another.*

They do now affirm the adoration which is paid to Christ is Idolatrous, thus renouncing Socinus *his Principles, who lookt upon it as an essential piece of Christianity. So that they can no longer be called* Socinians, *and themselves affect the name of* Unitarians: *And as their chief business seems to be to accuse the sincerity of Scripture-writers, so the main work of them who undertake to confute them, must be the establishing both the Sincerity and Authority of it, which is no*

no very hard task: For even Mahometans, *though they take some of the same Objections, that the* Socinians *are so full of, against the Divinity of Christ, yet are so far from accusing Christians of having corrupted the Scripture, that they furnish us with Weapons against the* Unitarians *of this Kingdom, as the Reader will find at the end of this following Book.*

And although there be but small hopes of bringing to right again Men of so strange Dispositions and Notions, yet they ought by no means to be left to themselves. They have been often confuted by them that argued from the bare Principles of Christianity, that is, the Authority of Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which are the very Word of God. And it has been plainly shewed them that what Alterations soever they have made in Socinus's *Opinions, yet their new Conceits are neither more Rational than his, nor more agreeable to Divine Revelation.*

I say that their Opinions are not more agreeable than his to right Reason. For when all is done, to affirm, That Christ received from God an Infinite Power to govern the World, without being essentially God, is to affirm a downright Contradiction, viz. *that without partaking of the Divine*

vine Essence he received one of the Attributes which are Essential to God.

It is true, some Popish Divines allow the Soul of Christ to be all-knowing, by reason of its immediate Union to the Divine Nature; wherein they do much service to the Socinians, *in holding as they do that a Creature is capable of receiving such Attributes. But Protestant Divines reject this Notion as altogether false, as false as many of the Schoolmens Speculations, even the absurdest of them that are exploded by the* Socinians.

They have been also further refuted as to what they aver, that Justin Martyr *was the first that taught the Doctrines of the Trinity, of* Christ's *Eternal* Godhead, *and of his Incarnation.*

And at last, that Learned Divine Dr. Bull *having observed, that the* Jewish *Tradition was favourable to those Doctrines of which the* Socinians *make* Justin *to have been the first Broacher. Howsoever* M. N. *treats him for this, neither like a Scholar, nor a Christian, I shall venture his displeasure in making out this Observation, without meddling at all with his Arguments drawn from the Fathers, to shew clearly, that the like Exceptions of* M. N. *against* Philo, *as being a* Platonick, *and*

and against the Ancient Jews, *and their Tradition, can help him no way in the Cause he has taken in hand.*

The Doctrine of our Church being the same which was taught by Christ and his Apostles, it will be an easy matter to prove it by the same places of Scripture by which Christ and his Apostles converted the Jews *and the* Gentiles *over to the Christian Faith; and by which the Hereticks were confuted, who followed or renewed the Errors which the* Jews *have fallen into since Christianity begun.*

But I will go farther, and prove, that the Ancient Jewish *Church yield the same Principles which Jesus Christ and his Apostles builded upon, and by this Method it will plainly appear, That the* Socinians *or the* Unitarians, *let them call themselves what they please, must either absolutely renounce the Authority of Scripture, and turn downright* Deists, *or they must own those Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, as being taught us by God himself in the Holy Scriptures, and acknowledged by the Ancient* Jewish *Church.*

Place this TABLE *next after the Preface.*

THE TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS.

THE Preface. Page

Chap. I. *The Design of this Book, and what Matters it Treats of,* 1.

Chap. II. *That in the times of Jesus Christ Our Blessed Saviour, the* Jews *had among them a common Explication of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, grounded on the Tradition of their Fathers, which was in many things approved by Christ and his Apostles,* 11.

Chap. III. *That the* Jews *had certain Traditional Maxims and Rules for the understanding of the Scripture,* 32.

Chap. IV. *That Jesus Christ and his Apostles proved divers points of the Christian Doctrine by his common Traditional Exposition received among the* Jews, *which they could not have done, (at least not so well) had there been only such a Literal Sense of those Texts which they alledged, as we can find without the help of such Exposition,* 52.

Chap.

Chap. V. *Of the Authority of the* Apocryphal *Books of the Old Testament,* 66.

Chap. VI. *That the Works which go under the Name of* Philo *the* Jew, *are truly his; and that he writ them a long while before the time of Christ's Preaching the Gospel; and that it does not appear in any of his Works that ever he had heard of Christ, or of the Christian Religion,* 75.

Chap. VII. *Of the Authority and Antiquity of the* Chaldee *Paraphrases,* 84.

Chap. VIII. *That the Authors of the* Apocryphal *Books did acknowledge a Plurality, and a Trinity in the Divine Nature,* 99.

Chap. IX. *That the* Jews *had Good Grounds to acknowledge some kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature,* 115.

Chap. X. *That the* Jews *did acknowledge the Foundations of the Belief of the Trinity in the Divine Nature, and that they had the Notion of it,* 138.

Chap XI. *That this Notion of a Trinity in the Divine Nature has continued among the* Jews, *since the time of our Lord Jesus Christ,* 158.

Chap. XII. *That the* Jews *had a distinct Notion of the Word as a Person, and of a Divine Person too,* 181.

Chap. XIII. *That all the Appearances of God, or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken of in the Books of* Moses, *have been referred to the Word by the* Jews *before Christ's Incarnation,* 201.

Chap. XIV. *That all the Appearances of God, or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken of in* Moses, *have been referred to the Word of God by the ancient* Jewish *Church,* 214.

Chap. XV. *That all the Appearances of God or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken after* Moses *his time in the Books of the Old Testament, have been referred to the Word of God by the* Jews *before Christ's Incarnation,* 233.

Chap. XVI. *That the ancient* Jews *did often use the Notion of the* Λόγος, *or Word, in speaking of the Messias,* 253.

Chap. XVII. *That the* Jews *did acknowledge the* Messias *should be the Son of God,* 265.

Chap. XVIII. *That the* Messias *was represented in the Old Testament as being* Jehovah *that should come, and that the ancient Synagogue did believe him to be so,* 278.

Chap. XIX. *That the New Testament does exactly follow the Notions which the Old* Jews *had of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the* Messias, 293

Chap. XX. *That both the Apostles and the first Christians speaking of the* Messias *did exactly follow the Notions of the Old* Jews, *as the* Jews *themselves did acknowledge,* 313.

Chap. XXI. *That we find in the* Jewish *Authors, after the time of Jesus Christ, the same Notions which Jesus Christ and his Apostles Grounded their Discourses on to the* Jews, 327.

Chap. XXII. *An Answer to some Exceptions taken from Expressions used in the Gospel,* 339.

Chap. XXIII. *That neither* Philo, *nor the* Chaldee *Paraphrases, nor the Christians have borrowed from the* Platonick *Philosophers their Notions about the Trinity. But that* Plato *should have more probably borrowed his Notions from the Books of* Moses, *and the Prophets, which be*

he was acquainted with, 413.
Chap. XXIV. *An Answer to some Objections of the Modern* Jews, *and of the* Unitarians, 365.
Chap. XXV. *An Answer to an Objection against the Notions of the Old* Jews *compared with those of the new Ones,* 380.
Chap. XXVI. *That the* Jews *have laid aside the Old Explications of their Forefathers, the better to defend themselves in their Disputes with the Christians.* 392.
Chap. XXVII. *That the* Unitarians *in opposing the Doctrines of the Trinity, and our Lord's Divinity, do go much further than the Modern* Jews, *and that they are not fit Persons to Convert the* Jews, 413.

A Dissertation concerning the Angel who is called the Redeemer, Gen. XLVIII. 433.

A

THE JUDGMENT OF THE Ancient JEWISH Church Against the UNITARIANS, &c.

CHAP. I.

The Design of this Book, and what Matters it treats of.

IF the Doctrines of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, and of the Promised *Messias* being very God, had been altogether unknown to the *Jews*, before Jesus Christ began to preach the Gospel, it would be a great prejudice against the Christian Religion. But the contrary being once satisfactorily made out, will go a great way towards proving those Doctrines among Christians. The *Socinians* are so sensible of this, that they give their Cause for lost if this be admitted: And therefore they have used their utmost Endeavours

vours to weaken, or at least to bring under suspicion, the Arguments by which this may be proved.

It is now about sixty years ago since one of that Sect writ a Latin Tract about the meaning of the word λόγος in the *Chaldee* Paraphrases, in Answer to *Wechner*, who had proved that St. *John* used this word in the first Chapter of his Gospel, in the same sense that the *Chaldee* Paraphrases had used it before Christ's time; and consequently, that it is to be understood of a Person properly so called in the Blessed Trinity: which way of interpreting that word, because it directly overthrew the *Socinian* Doctrine, which was then, that St. *John* by the word λόγος, understood no other than Christ as Man, it is no wonder that this Author used all his Wit and Learning to evade it.

The Construction which *Socinus* put upon the first Chapter of the Gospel of St. *John*, was then followed generally by his Disciples. But some years since, they have set it aside here, as being absurd and impertinent. And they now freely own what that *Socinian* Author strongly opposed, That the *Word* mentioned by St. *John* is the eternal and essential Vertue of God, by which he made the World, and operated in the Person of Christ. Only they deny that *Word* to be a Person distinct from the Father, as we do affirm. And whereas *Socinus* taught, That Christ was made God, and therefore is a proper Object of religious Worship; now the *Unitarians*, who believe him to be no other than a meer human Creature, following the Principles of Chri-

Christianity better than *Socinus*, condemn the Religious Worship which is paid to him.

As they do believe, that the *Jews* had the same Notions of the Godhead and Person of the *Messias* which they have themselves, so they think they have done the Christian Religion an extraordinary service in thus ridding it of this double Difficulty, which hinders the Conversion of the *Jews*. Mr. *N.* one of their ablest Men, having read *Justin Martyr*'s Dialogue with *Trypho*, in which *Trypho* says, that he did not believe that the *Messias* was to be other than Man, makes use of this Passage of *Trypho* for proof, that the Doctrines of the Divinity of the *Messias*, and by consequence of the Trinity, were never acknowledged by the *Jews*. This he does in a Book, the Title whereof is, *The Judgment of the Fathers against Dr.* Bull.

His design being to prove, that *Justin Martyr*, about 140 years after Christ, was the first that held the Doctrine of Christ's Divinity, and by consequence that of the Trinity, without which the other cannot be defended; he found it necessary to assert,

1*st*. That since the *Jews*, by *Trypho*'s Testimony, did own the *Messias* to be nothing more than meer Man, therefore the *Jewish* Authors, quoted by Dr. *Bull* against the *Socinian* Opinions, must have lived after the Preaching of the Gospel.

2*dly*, That the Books that are quoted against them, were written by Christians in Masquerade, that lived since *Justin Martyr*'s time: And this he applies in particular to the Works of *Philo* the *Jew*, and to the Book of *Wisdom*.

 3*dly*.

3*dly*. That since the *Jewish* Authors could not possibly mention any thing like the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of the *Messias* his being God too, to which they were such perfect Strangers; whatsoever occurrs in any of the ancient *Jewish* Books, that favours those Doctrines, must needs have been foisted in by Christians after *Justin Martyr*'s time.

Lastly, he supposes, That if any thing, either in the Scripture or *Jewish* Authors, sounds that way, it probably came from the *Platonics*, of whom both *Jews* and *Christians* borrowed many Notions, and mixed them with Christian Doctrines, to perswade the *Heathens* the more easily to embrace the *Christian* Religion.

Now though it seems unnecessary to dispute any further against him, having already clearly shewn, in my Discussion of Mr. *N*'s Judgment of the Fathers, that *Justin Martyr* was not the Broacher of those Doctrines, as Mr. *N*. pretends; yet I am willing to give a more full satisfaction to the World about it, by examining what either Mr. *N*. or any others have said or can say on this Subject, and shewing that the bold Answers to Dr. *Bull*'s Proofs concerning the Opinion of the *Jews* before Christ about those Doctrines, are no better than Mr. *N*'s supposition, that *Justin Martyr* was the first that maintained those Doctrines.

I was particularly induced to undertake this task, in hopes that by examining this matter to the bottom, I might set these Controversies in their true Light; shewing how little credit

credit some Divines do deserve, who playing the Criticks, have favoured the new *Jews* and the *Socinians* with all their Might, and abuse those who upon such ungrounded Authority too rashly believe, that these Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity came from the School of *Plato*; when on the contrary it is certain, that *Plato* himself, by conversing with the *Jews* in *Egypt*, borrowed of them his best Notions of God.

To do this in the best method I can, I will first of all consider in general, what the *Jewish* Tradition was before Christ: Let the Reader give me leave to use that word as the Fathers commonly use it; not for a Doctrine unknown in Scripture, but for a Doctrine drawn from Scripture, and acknowledged for the Common Faith of the Church; and I shall shew, That both before Christ, and in his time, the *Jews* had a current way of expounding the Old Testament, which they had received from their Fathers; and that Christ and his Apostles used and approved this way of expounding their Scriptures in many particulars.

2*dly*. I will examine the Grounds the *Jews* went upon, to come to the understanding of the Old Testament, particularly of that part which contains the Promises of the *Messias*, as they had it in Christ's time, and still have it to this day.

3*dly*. I will shew by some Examples, That Christ and his Apostles did prove many Articles of the Christian Doctrine by this Exposition, commonly received among the *Jews*; which they would hardly have done, had

had they had nothing else of their side, but only the Letter of those places which they quoted.

This being premised in general as a necessary Foundation, I shall particularly examine the Authority of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, and of the Books of *Philo* the *Jew* that are extant, and of the *Targum* or the *Caldaick* Paraphrases on the Books of the Old Testament; these being the chief Helps by which we may find out the *traditional sense* of the Old Testament as it was received in the Synagogue before Christ's time. This is absolutely necessary to be done; for without proving the Authority of those Apocryphal Books, of *Philo*, and of those Paraphrases, we cannot with any force and weight use their Testimony in this Controversy, as I intend to do.

This being dispatcht, I shall prove clearly, That the *Jews* before Christ's time, according to the received Expositions of the Old Testament, derived from their Fathers, had a Notion of a Plurality of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence; And that this Plurality was a Trinity. And further, That contrary to what Mr. *N.* has imagined, the most learned amongst them have constantly retained those Notions, though perhaps they were divided in their Opinions about the *Messias* his Godhead, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, as we do apprehend it.

And because, if it be granted that the Word was a Person, that goes a great way toward proving the Doctrine of the Trinity; And the *Socinians* affirm, that it was not the uncreated

uncreated Word, but a created Angel, that appeared to Men under the Old Testament-dispensation, and was adored as being God's Representative; I shall enquire what was the Opinion of the Old *Jews* concerning these Matters; and shew, that they owned the Word to be a Divine Person; and that it was that Word that appeared in the Old Testament; and consequently, that nothing is more false than what some *Socinians* teach after *Grotius* (upon the Book of *Wisdom*, ch. 18. 15.) grounding it upon his Opinion of an Angel's appearing and being adored; That therefore it was lawful for the *Jews* under the Old Testament to worship Angels; but it was first forbidden to *Christians* under the New; as namely, by St. *Paul*, Colos. 11. 18.

And that the *Socinians* may have nothing left them to reply against this, I shall descend to particulars, and shew at large, That according to the Doctrine of the Old Synagogue, the *Jews* apprehended the *Word* as a true and proper Person; and held, that that *Word* was the Son of God; That he was the true God; That he was to be in the *Messias*; and that the *Messias* was promised under the Old Testament, as *Jehovah*; and accordingly the Old Synagogue expected that he should be *Jehovah* indeed.

It is of great moment to satisfy the World of these Truths, and to make the *Socinians* sensible, that they can't truly profess the Christian Religion without owning those Doctrines, to which yet they seem to be so averse. Therefore I will go farther, and distinctly shew, that the whole Gospel is grounded

grounded on those very Notions which the *Jews* before Christ entertained. That the first Christians after the Apostles exactly followed them; And that the *Jews* themselves, following generally those very Notions upon the chief Texts of the Old Testament which Christians quote in those Controversies, bear witness, that they were the undoubted Doctrines both of them and of the *Christians* before *Justin Martyr*'s time.

The Men that we have to do with, do very confidently affirm any thing that comes into their heads, be it never so little probable, so they may thereby give any plausible Solutions of the Difficulties in which they find themselves entangled and perplext: and they are much given to vaunt of their unanswerable Arguments, so they call them, which are many times but weak Objections, such as Men of Learning and Wit should be ashamed of.

For this reason I thought it necessary to prevent, as far as it was possible, all that they can object against my Position of the Opinions the Old *Jews* held concerning those Doctrines, which were exactly followed and fully declared by the Apostles and first Christians. And because I foresee some Objections may arise, I will shew, that nothing can be more absurd, than to imagine, that the *Jews*, or the first *Christians*, borrowed their Notions about the Trinity, or the Divinity of Christ, from *Plato*'s Disciples; whereas *Plato* hath in truth followed the *Jewish* Notions of those things.

After

After this, I shall make it appear, that however some of the Modern *Jews* have changed their Opinions in these Articles, yet the *Socinians* can make no advantage thereof, because the *Jews* have in reality much alter'd their belief since Christ's time, and are guilty of great Disingenuity, as is common to all those who are obstinately set upon the maintaining of erroneous Doctrines.

In fine, I shall plainly shew, that the *Socinians*, to defend themselves against the Orthodox, have been forced to imitate those Modern *Jews*, and have much out done them in changing and shifting their Opinions when they dispute with Christians.

I hope to manage this Controversy with the *Socinians* so plainly and fully, as to satisfy the Reader, That as on the one side they most falsly accuse the Church of having corrupted the New Testament to favour the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of Christ's Godhead; So they cannot on the other side get any ground upon the *Jews* in their Disputes with them, though they fancy they got a great way towards their Conversion by rejecting those Doctrines.

In a word, both the Ancient and Modern *Jews* do so far agree in those things which make on the Church's side against the *Socinians*, that if they appeal to the *Jews*, they are sure to lose their Cause; which when they have better considered, they will find it their best way for the maintaining of their Opinions to abandon the *Jews* altogether, as Men that understood not their own Scriptures, *viz.* the Old Testament, and to reject

reject both, as they have gone a great way towards it, in rejecting that *traditional sense* of the Old Testament, for which it was quoted in the New; and without which it would have signified little or nothing to those purposes for which it was quoted. And so it will appear that for all their brags of the Aptness, and even Necessity of their way for the Conversion of the *Jews*, they have taken the direct way to harden them, by giving up that sense of the Old Testament Scriptures which Christ and his Apostles made use of for the converting of their Forefathers.

But we have the less reason to complain of them for this, when we see how apt they are to question the Authority of the Books of the New Testament, as oft as they find them so clearly opposite to their Doctrines, that they cannot obscure the Light of them by any tolerable Exposition. To shew that I do not say this without cause, I shall show some instances in the last Chapter of this Book.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

That in the times of Jesus Christ our Blessed Saviour, the Jews *had among them a common Explication of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, grounded on the Tradition of their Fathers, which was in many things approved by Christ and his Apostles.*

THE *Jews* have to this day a certain kind of Tradition received from their Forefathers, which contain many precepts of things to be done or avoided on the account of their Religion. This they call their Oral Law; by which name they distinguish it from the written Law, which God gave them by *Moses*. They make five Orders of such a Tradition, which are explained by *Moses de Trano in* his *Kiriat Sepher*, Printed at *Venice, Anno* 1551. The first is, of the things which they infer from *Moses* and the Prophets by a clear consequence, and they are certainly of the same Authority as the rest of the Revelation, although they call it a Tradition. We are not such Enemies to Names as not to like such a sort of Tradition, and we receive it with all imaginable reverence; we like very well the Judgment of *Maimonides* who leaves as uncertain whatsoever the *Jewish* Doctors speak upon many things, as being without ground when their Tradition is not gathered

gathered from Texts of Scripture, *de Regib. c.* 12. The second Order is of the Ceremonies and Rites, which they keep, as coming from *Mount Sinai*, but of which there is not a word in the Law. The third Order is of the Judiciary Laws upon which the two Schools of *Hillel* and *Shammai* were divided. The fourth is of some Constitutions of the Ancients, which they look upon as an hedge to the Law. The last is of their Customs, which are various in several places of their dispersion. Tho' in many things they cannot but see that those last four Orders of Tradition do not agree with the Law of *Moses*, or are quite unknown in it, yet they seem to like it never the worse. Nay, their Rabbins professedly ascribe a much greater Authority to this Oral Law, than to the Law of *Moses*. They say in the *Talmud Avoda zara, c.* 1. *fol.* 17. *Col.* 2. that a Man who studies in the Law alone without these Traditions, is a Man which is without God; according to the Prophecy of *Azariah*, 2 *Chr.* 15. 3. Of this sort were all the Traditions which were condemned by our Lord Jesus Christ: He plainly calls them *the Commandments of Men*, Mat. XV. 9. and has purposely directed several of his Discourses against them; because even where their observing these Traditions would not consist with their Obedience to God, as particularly in the case of *Corban*, Mat. XV. 3. yet they gave Tradition the preference, and so as our Saviour there tells them, *Ver.* 9. *They made the Commandments of God of no effect by their Tradition.*

The

The Author of these Traditions, or new Laws, as one may term them, did almost all of them live since the time that the *Jews* were under the power of the *Seleucidæ*; and they were the Leaders of those several Sects that corrupted their Religion, by adding to it a great number of Observations which were perfectly new. We have therefore no reason to look upon this sort of Tradition, as the fountain from whence the *Jews* in Christ's time took their measures of the sense and meaning of the Writings of the Old Testament.

But for the Interpreting of their Scriptures, the *Jews* in Christ's time had some other kinds of Traditions, much different from those which Christ so severely condemned. And these I shall explain more particularly, giving some examples of their use, and also of their Authority.

1. They had by Tradition the knowledge of some Matters of fact, which are not recorded in their Scriptures; and of other things they had more perfect and minute accounts, than are recorded in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets.

Particularly *Philo* the *Jew*, writing of the Life of *Moses*, declares that what he had to say of him, was taken partly out of Scripture, and partly received by Tradition from their Forefathers *. Of this latter sort was the long account he there gives of *Moses* being brought up in all the Learning of the *Egyptians*, for there is nothing of this in the Old Testament. Therefore when St. *Stephen* says

* *De vitâ Mosis pag.* 468. *Edit. Genev. Ib. p* 470. *F.*

says the same thing, *Act.* VII. 22. we know that he also had it not from Scripture, but from Tradition.

Hence also it is that St. *Paul* has gathered the names of *Jannes and Jambres*, Magicians that *resisted Moses and the Truth*, 2 Tim. iv. 8. for their names are no where in Scripture, but they are in *Jonathan's Targum* on *Exod.* i. 15. & vii. 11. from whence also they are taken into *Talmud Sanhedrin* מנחות *c.* 9.

Hence also St. *Paul* knew that the Pot wherein *Moses* laid up the Manna, was made of Gold, *Heb.* ix. 4. which also the Seventy and *Philo* the *Jew* [*de congr. quær. er. gr. pag.* 375. *Ed. Gen.*] do assure us of. And tho' the Modern *Jews* deny this, and say the Pot was of Earth; yet it is acknowledg'd by the *Samaritans* that is was Golden. This must have been from Tradition, because there is no such thing said in Scripture.

Mechil. fol. 20. *Col.* 1. & *Tanchumah, fol.* 29. *Col.* 4.

It was from hence that the Apostle had that saying of *Moses*, when he saw the dreadful appearance of God upon Mount *Sinai*, *Heb.* xii. 21. *So terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.* And another that writ soon after *Paul's* death, namely *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome*, in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *cap.* 17. has other like words that *Moses* said, *I am the Steam upon the Pot.* Both these sayings being no where in Scripture, they could not have known them otherwise than from the *Jewish* Tradition.

From hence also St. *Jude ver.* 9. had that passage of the dispute that *Michael* the Arch-Angel had with the Devil about the Body of *Moses*. Which Body, as *Josephus* probably says,

says, [*Ant.* iv. 8.] if any Relick of it had been kept, would have drawn the people into *Idolatry*. That passage, we are told by some of the Fathers, was taken out of an *Apocryphal* Book call'd the *Analepsis* of *Moses*, [*Clem. Alex. in Jud. & Origen. peri Archon.* iii. 2.] *Grotius* tells us the *Jews* have the like things in their *Midrash* on *Deut.* in the *Aboth* of *R. Nathan*, and in other of their Books.

It was from hence that St. *Paul* understood that some of the *Prophets were sawn asunder*, *Heb.* xi. 37. though he spoke in the Plural, he meant it only of one, saith *Origen*, namely of the Prophet *Esay*, who was Sawed asunder by the Command of *Munasses*, according to the *Jewish* Tradition. Which also is mentioned by *Justin Martyr*, as a thing out of dispute between him and *Tryphon* the *Jew*; and it is taken notice of in the *Gemara tr. Jevamot*, *Ch.* iv.

Origen Responf. ad African.

It was from hence that Christ took what he said of the Martyrdom of *Zechary the Son of Berachiah, who was killed between the Temple and the Altar*, Mat. xxiii. 35. which *Origen* there also mentions as a *Jewish* Tradition, tho', he says, they suppress it as being not for the Honour of their Nation.

Orig. Ib. p. 232, *&c.*

I do not deny, but that there might be some ancient Authors, besides the Canonical Writers, to keep up the memory of these names of Persons, and other matters of fact: As for example, that there were eighteen High Priests who Officiated in the first Temple, although they are not all mention'd in Scripture. But if there were any such Authors, it is very probable that they were lost

Joseph. Ant. l. 10. *c.* 22.

in the Captivity, or in the bloody Persecutions of the *Jewish* Church, long before the time of our Blessed Saviour and his Holy Apostles. *Josephus*, who lived in that Age, and writ the History of the *Jews*, makes no mention of them, and gives a very lame account of the things which passed under several Kings of *Persia*.

2. Besides the Canonical Books, they had Writings of a less Authority, wherein were inserted by the great Men of their Nation, several Doctrines that came from the Prophets, which were in very high esteem and veneration; though not regarded as of equal Authority with the Writings of the Prophets. It is not improbable that St. *Matthew* had respect to some Book of this nature, when he quoted that which is not found in express words in any of the Writings of the Prophets; That the *Messias* should be *called a Nazarene*, *Mat.* ii. 23. if he doth not allude to the Idea of the *Jews* who referred to the *Messias* the *Netzer*, or Branch spoken of by *Isa.* xi. 1. So Christ himself may seem to have alluded to a passage in one of these Books, *Joh.* vii. 38. where he saith, *He that believeth on me, as saith the Scripture, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water*; for there is nothing perfectly like this in any of the Canonical Books that are come to our hands.

St. *Paul* the Apostle, as *Jerom* [in *Ephes.* v. 14.] observes, has cited divers such Apocryphal Books, accommodating himself, no doubt, to the *Jews*, who gave much deference to their Authority. Thus he did, *Rom.* ix. 21. and perhaps in some other places of his Epistles, from the Book of *Wisdom*, which is still extant in our Bibles. Elsewhere he has Quotations out of Books that are lost, as, 1 *Cor.* ii. 9. out of an Apocryphal Book that went under the name of the Prophet *Elias*; and *Ephes.* v. 14. out of an Apocryphal piece of the Prophet *Jeremy*, as we are told by *Georgius Syncellus* in his *Chron.* p. 27. A. But the most express Quotation of this kind, is that which is alledged by *St. James* iv. 5, 6. For these words, *The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to Envy*, are not in any Books of the Old Testament; nor are the following words, *God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.* And yet both these sayings are quoted as Scripture by the Holy Apostle. Of the first he saith plainly ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, *the Scripture saith*, Then he goes on to the other, and of that he saith also λέγει, without any Nominative Case but ἡ γραφὴ before mentioned, which implies that the *Scripture* saith this also. Now what Scripture could he mean? for it is certain, that neither of these sayings is any where else in our Scriptures. He must therefore mean it of one or other of the Apocryphal Books. And one of the Fathers that was born within a hundred years after his death, gives us a very probable guess at the Book that he intended. It is *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who saith of the latter Quotation, These are the *words of Moses*, *Strom.* iv. p. 376. meaning in all likelihood of the Analepsis of *Moses*, which Book is mentioned by the same *Clement* elsewhere on *Jude* v. 9. as a Book well known in those times in which he lived. Therefore in all likelihood the words also of the

the former Quotation were taken from the Analepsis of *Moses*, and it was that Apocryphal Book that *S. James* quoted and called it *Scripture*.

This can be no strange thing to him that considers what was intimated before, that the *Jews* had probably these Books join'd to their כתובים or *Hagiographa*, and therefore they might well be called γραφαὶ without any addition. The Apocryphal Books that are in our Bibles were commonly call'd so by the Primitive Fathers. Thus *Clement* before mention'd, *Strom.* v. *p.* 431. B. quotes the words that we read in *Wisdom* vii. 24. from *Sophia* in the Scriptures. And the Book of *Ecclesiasticus* is called ἡ γραφὴ seven or eight times in his writings, [*Pæd.* i. 10. ii. 5. & *ver.* 8*vis* & 10*vis* iii. 3. & 11.] So it is quoted by *Origen* with the same Title, *Orig. in Jerem. Hom.* 16. *p.* 155. *D.*] There are many the like Instances to be found in the writings of the Ancientest Fathers. They familiarly called such Books, *The Scriptures*, and sometimes *The Holy Scriptures*; and yet they never attributed the same Authority to them, as to the Books that were received into the Canon of the Old Testament, which, as the Apostle saith, *were written by Divine Inspiration*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16.

The same is to be said of the Prophecy of *Enoch*, out of which St. *Jude* brings a Quotation in his Epistle, *vers.* 14, 15. *Grotius* in his Annotations on the place, saith, This Prophecy was extant in the Apostles times, in a Book that went under the name of the Revelation of *Enoch*; and was a Book of great credit

credit among the *Jews*; for it is cited in their *Zohar*, and was not unknown to *Celsus* the Heathen Philosopher, for he also cited is, as appears by *Origen*'s Answer to him; [*Orig.* in *Cels. lib. V.*] *Grotius* also shews, that this Book is often cited by the Primitive Fathers; and he takes notice of a large piece of it that is preserved by *Georg. Syncellus* in his *Chronicon*. And whereas in this piece there are many fabulous things, he very well judges that they might be foisted in, as many such things have been thrust into very Ancient Books. But whether his Conjecture in this be true or no, it is certain that the piece which is quoted by St. *Jude* was truly the Prophecy of *Enoch*, because we have the Apostle's Authority to assure us of the Historical truth of it.

3. It is clear that the *Jews* had very good and authentic Traditions, concerning the Authors, the Use, and the Sence of divers parts of the Old Testament. For Example, St. *Mat. Chap.* xxvii. 9. quotes *Jeremy* for the Author of a passage, which he there transcribes, and which we find in *Zechary* xi. 12. How could this be? but that it was a thing known among the *Jews*, that the four last Chapters of the Book of *Zechary* were written by *Jeremy*; as Mr. *Mede* has proved by many Arguments. It is by the help of this Tradition, that the Ancient Interpreters have added to the Psalms such Titles as express their design, and their usage in the Synagogue. Certainly these Titles which shew the design of many of the Psalms, contribute much to make us understand the sense of those Psalms; which

Mede's Works. p. 709. and 963. and 1022.

which a man that knows the occasion of their Composing, will apprehend more perfectly than he can do that reads the Psalms without these Assistances. And for the Titles of several Psalms in the Septuagint, and other of the Ancient Translations, which shew on what days they were sung in the publick Worship of the *Jews*; as *Ps.* xxiv. 48, 81, 82, 93, 94, *&c.* tho' these Titles are not in the *Hebrew*, and therefore are not part of the *Jews* Scripture; yet that they had the knowledge of this by Tradition, we find by *Maimonides*, who tho' a stranger to those Translations, yet affirms that those several Psalms were sung on such and such days; and he names the very days that are prefixt to them in the said Titles.

De cultu divino tract. de sacrificiis jugibus. c. 6. Sect. 9.

It is from the same Tradition, that they have these Rules concerning the Psalms: I. This Rule to know the Authors of them; namely, that all Psalms, that are not inscribed with some other name, are *David*'s Psalms, although they bear not his name; a Maxim, owned by *Aben-Ezra*, and *David Kimchi*; and we see an Instance of this Rule in that Quotation of *Ps.* xcv. 7. which is ascribed to *David* in *Heb.* iv. 7. II. From hence they have learnt also another Rule, by which they distinguish between the Psalms spoken by *David* in his own name, and as King of *Israel*; and those which he spoke in the name of the Synagogue, without any particular respect to his own time, but in a prospect of the remotest future times. From thence they have learned to distinguish between the Psalms in which the Holy Ghost spoke of the present times,

Præfat. in Psalmos

Tehillim. Rabbat. in Ps. 24. Fol. 22. col. 2.

Tehillim. Rab. Ib.

times, and those in which he speaks of the times to come, *viz.* of the time of the *Messias*. So *R. David Kimchi*, and others agree that the Psalms 93, 94. till the Psalm 101. speak of the days of the *Messias*. So they remark upon *Ps.* 92. whose Title is for the Sabbath-day, that it is for the time to come, which shall be all Sabbath. *Manasseh. Ben. Is. in Exod. q.* 102.

By the help of Tradition also, they clear the Text, *Ex.* xii. 40. where it is said, *That the sojourning of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Ægypt, was* 430 *years*. It would be a great mistake of these words, to think the meaning of them should be, that the Children of *Israel* dwelled in *Ægypt* 430 years: For in truth they dwelled there but half the time, as the *Jews* themselves reckon, and all Learned men do agree to it. But the *Jews* understand by these words, that the sojourning of the Children of *Israel*, all the while they dwelled in *Ægypt*, and in the Land of *Canaan*, they and their Fathers, was 430 years. Thus all the *Rabbins* do understand it, and thus it was anciently explained, by putting in words to this sense, in the *Samaritan* Text, and in the *Alexandrian* LXX. That they were in the right, we see by the Apostle's reckoning the time to have been 430 years, from the promise made to *Abraham* at his coming into *Canaan*, till the giving of the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, which was but 50 days after their coming up out of *Ægypt*.

In like manner from Tradition they filled up that place, *Gen.* IV. 8. where it is said, that *Cain* talkt with *Abel* his Brother, by adding

ding the words which he spoke, *Let us go into the field.* This Insertion is not only in the *Alexandrian* LXX. but the *Samaritans* have it in their Bibles, and they had it there in S. *Hierom*'s time. It is also extant in the *Jerusalem Targum. Philo* the *Jew* Philosophises on these words much after the same manner as doth the *Targum.*

Lib. q^d. det p. 120, 124, 125.

4. It is certain that they have had very common among them the knowledge of the most illustrious Prophecies of the *Messias.* This we may see in the Answer of the *Samaritan* Woman to our Blessed Saviour, *Joh.* iv. 25. where she saith, *I know that when the Messias is come, he will tell us all things.* For though it is no where plainly said, yet the *Samaritans* knew full well, that the *Messias* should explain all things, according to the Traditional sense of that Prophecy in *Deut.* xviii. 15, 18, 19. which hath been so constantly referr'd to the *Messiah,* that we find till this day in the *Midrash* upon *Ecclesiast. c.* 1.9. that the last Redeemer shall be like the first, that is, *Moses.* And in consequence of this knowledge commonly received among the *Jews,* did they of Christ's time hold for certain, *that the Messiah should remain for ever*; which their Posterity not knowing how to reconcile with their Notion of the *Messias,* they fancied that the *Messias* should dye after a long Reign, and leave his Crown to his Children from Generation to Generation.

Joh. xii. 34.

Hence it was that the *Sanhedrin* answered *Herod* without delay, *Mat.* ii. 5, 6. that the *Messiah should be born at Bethlehem,* according to

to *Micah*'s Prophecy, though it is not plainly said in the Text of that Prophecy, *Micah* v. 2. Hence also it was that *John Baptist,* Mat. iii. 5, 6. found the people of the *Jews* so disposed to repentance, that they might escape God's Judgments threatned on the Nation at the coming of the *Messiah,* according to *Joel*'s prediction recited *Act.* ii. 26. and that other Prophecy in *Malach.* iv. 5.

Hence it was that when *John* the *Baptist* sent his Disciples to our Saviour to ask him, *Whether he were the Messias or no*; our Saviour gave them this Answer, *Mat.* xi. 4. *Go and tell John the things which you hear and see*; *The Blind receive their sight, the Lame walk, the Lepers are cleansed, the Deaf hear, the Dead are raised, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them.* This is commonly taken to be a Quotation from *Isaiah.* xxxv. 1. There some indeed of these Characters do point out the *Messiah*; But our Saviour did not content himself with those, but added others that are not in that Text, nor in any other, but such as no doubt the *Jews* had at that time in their common Tradition.

This Remark is of great moment to confound the boldness of some Criticks, as *Grotius,* who suppose that some places in the Apocryphal Books, which shew that they were exactly acquainted with the Ideas of the Prophets upon the Divinity and the Glory of the Messias, such as we see in the Book of *Wisdom*, in *Ecclesiasticus*, and in *Baruch,* have been foisted in by Christians in those Books, when to the contrary they were to judge that the *Jews* have laid aside these Books

Books for that very reason, *viz.* Because they were a strong proof that the Apostles did apply the Prophecies of the Old Testament according to the sense of the Synagogue before Jesus Christ.

It was from hence that our Blessed Saviour in the same Chapter, *Mat.* xi. shew'd the multitude, that *John Baptist* was the Messenger promised by God in *Malach.* iii. 1. as he that should be the fore-runner of the *Messiah*, and that should prepare his way by exhorting the People to Repentance: and he proves that *John* the Baptist was so, by the great Effect of his Preaching, in the Conversion of those that seemed the most corrupt of the Nation.

5. It is as certain, that they had by Tradition sundry Explications of the Scripture grounded upon Allegories. *Philo* affirms this positively [*lib. de Therapeutis, p.* 691.] St. *Paul* gives us several Examples of it. We have one in *Heb.* iv. 9. where St. *Paul* thus argues from the Words of *David* in *Psal.* xcv. 11. *There remains therefore a Rest for the people of God.* His Argument depends upon the *Jewish* Exposition of the six days of the Creation, as foreshewing that the Age of the World should be 6000 years; and understands the Sabbath, or Rest, of the times after; founding their Exposition on the Words of the 90th *Psalm, A thousand years in thy sight are as but one day:* That is to be seen in *R. Abraham bar Hiya Hannashi Megillat ha Megillat Saar.* 2. in *Ramban* upon *Gen.* ii. 2. in *Abarbanel Mipbaloth Eloh. lib.* 1. *c.* 4. See *Menasseh Ben Is. Concil. q.* 30. in *Genes. & de Creat. Problem* XI.

Another

Another Example we have in the same St. *Paul, Galat.* iv. 24. drawn from *Sarah* and *Hagar*, as being Types of the two Covenants. *Philo* the *Jew* [*de Cherub. p.* 83.] found a Mystery there before St. *Paul*, as we see in a Book of his that was much more ancient than that Epistle.

A third Example may be found in the same St. *Paul*, who uses it *Rom.* v. 14. & 1 *Corin.* xv. 47. in comparing the *first Adam* with Jesus Christ, whom he calls *the second Adam.* The *Jews* have the same Idea of the *Messias*, as of the *second Adam*, who shall raise all his Followers from the Sepulchre, as we see in *Pirke Eliezer*, ch. 32.

This method of explaining Scripture ought to be carefully considered, because it gives us to understand the Reasons why the *Jews* have regarded the *Song of Songs* as a part of Canonical Scripture, and have referred it to the *Messias*, as we see they do in their *Targum*, in *Cant.* i. 8. iv. 5. vii. 14. viii. 1, 4. The same reflection may be made on their acknowledging of the Divine Authority of the Book of *Ruth*, wherein their *Targum* mentions the *Messias*, chap. iii. 15. And the like may be said of *Ecclesiastes*, certain Texts of which, as *ch.* i. 18. and *ch.* viii. 25. they refer to the *Messias*, which otherwise seem not to have much relation to him.

In truth, one cannot well deny that the *Jews* had this common knowledge of great Truths of their Religion, and a Traditional Exposition of great Prophecies, from their Ancestors, to clear their Ideas thereof, if he considers attentively these following Remarks.

First,

First, That since their return from the *Babylonian* Captivity, they were never guilty of Idolatry: Except, for a little while, in the time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, when some wicked men apostatiz'd, and brought a force upon others, by which many were driven to Idolatry. But some chose rather to die than to yield to it, 1 *Mac.* i. 62, 63. ii. 29, 30, 37, 38. Which is an argument, that the Rebukes of the Prophets had made great Impression on their Minds, and raised a great Concern in them for their Religion, and for the study of the Scripture, which contained the Precepts of it. But it was impossible that in reading the Writings of the Prophets, and hearing them explained by their Doctors, they should give no attention to the great Promises of the *Messias*, whose Coming was spoken of by some of the Prophets, as being very near at hand. See *Dan.* ix. *Hag.* ii. *Malach.* iii.

The Second is, That their Zeal for the Scriptures, and their Religion, was really much quickned by the cruel Persecution which they suffered from *Antiochus Epiphanes*; whose Tyrannical Fury did particularly extend to the Holy Scriptures, 1 *Mac.* i. 56, 57. and to whatever else did contribute to the maintenance of their Religion.

The Third is, That it appears from History, that there were more Writers of their Nation since the Captivity, than we read of at any time before: so saith *Josephus*, *lib. I. contr. Appion.* Especially since they came under the Power of the *Ptolomeys* and the *Seleucidæ*, who being Princes of a *Greek* Original, were

were great Lovers of Learning, and did much for the improving of good Letters.

The Fourth is, That learned Men among the *Jews*, applying themselves to this business, did write, either at *Jerusalem*, at *Babylon*, or at *Alexandria*, several Extracts of ancient Books of Morality for the instruction of their People. Such were the Books of *Baruch* and *Esdras*, which seem to have been written in *Chaldee*; and those of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, which were written in *Greek*.

The Fifth is, That the great Business of the *Jews* in their Synagogues, and in their Schools, hath been ever since to understand the Books of the Prophets, and to explain them in a Language intelligible to the People; the Knowledge of the *Hebrew* being in great part lost during the time of the *Babylonian* Captivity.

The Sixth is, That it does indeed appear, that this was the proper time in which the *Jewish* Paraphrases began first to be formed. They were began and carried on insensibly; One adding some *Chaldee* Words in the Margin of his Book, opposite to the Text, which the People did not understand so well: Another adding to these some Notes in another place; till at length *Jonathan* and *Onkelos*, or some other Doctor of *Jerusalem*, gathered together all these Observations, and made thence those Paraphrases which we have under their Name.

For the Confirmation of this Conjecture, consider, 1. That we find in these Paraphrases very many Explications, which by no means agree with the Ideas that the *Jews* have

have framed to themselves since the Propagation of Christianity. For since their Disputes with the *Christians*, they found themselves obliged in many particulars to reject the Opinions, and refute the Confessions of their Ancestors. 2. We see the very same thing has happened among the *Christians*, and among the *Greeks*, that set themselves to write *Scholia*, or Notes on the Scriptures: which are only Abstracts of Authors who have written or preacht more at large on these Books. The same thing, I say, hapned among *Christians* in the VIIIth Century, and the following Ages, when most of their Learning was reduced within this compass, To compile Glosses, and to collect the Opinion of those that went before them, upon difficult places; and after that, to form out of all these Glosses one continued Paraphrase upon the whole Book, as if it had been the Judgment and Work of one and the same Author. It's the Character of all the Books which they call *Catenæ* upon Scripture.

I know well, that some Criticks call in question the Antiquity of these Paraphrases; and have remarked how ridiculous the Miracles are which the *Jews* say were wrought in favour of *Jonathan* the Son of *Uzziel*. But what does this make for their doubting the Antiquity of these pieces? Do we question whether there was a *Greek* Version of the Old Testament before Christ's time, because we can hardly believe *Aristæas*'s History to be true, or because we cannot say that the *Greek* Version is deliver'd down to us in the same purity as it was at first written? Ought we

we to suspect St. *Chrysostom*'s Homilies on St. *Paul*'s Epistles, or those of Pope *Gregory* the First; because the *Greeks* have storied that St. *Paul* came to inspire St. *Chrysostom* with the Sense of his Epistles, while he was meditating an Exposition of them; and because the *Latins* do relate the like Fable in favour of *Gregory* the First?

After all, the Authority of these Paraphrases does still further appear, in that the Works themselves are spread almost as far as there are *Jews* in the World, and are highly esteem'd in all places of their Dispersion.

Some may perhaps imagin, that the *Jews* being fallen into great Corruptions about the time of our Blessed Saviour's coming into the World, must necessarily at that time have lost much of that Light, which their Ancestors received of the Prophets, and of those that succeeded the Prophets. They may think, it may be, that their Nation being become subject to the *Greeks*, did by insensible degrees change their Principles, and alter their Expositions of the Scripture, as they adopted the Ideas of the *Greek* Philosophers, whose Opinions they then began to borrow. In short, it may be conceived by some, that the several Sects, which arose among the *Jews* long before Christ's time, did considerably alter the Opinions of the Synagogue, and did corrupt their Tradition, and the Notions they had received from the most ancient Doctors of their Schools.

In answer to all this. It is certain the Corruption among the *Jews* was principally of their Morals; for which, though they had

very good Precepts in their Law; yet the true meaning of them was spoiled and corrupted with Glosses, which were devised, as I have shewn, in later times; and with these, being stampt with the Name of *Tradition*, they evaded the force of the Laws. There were then but very few that had not an aversion to the *Greek* Learning, and those few applied themselves to it, while they were in *Judæa*, with great Caution and Secrecy, lest they should be lookt upon as *Heathens*. *Josephus* witnesseth of that, *Antiq. l.* 20. *c. ult.* As to what is inferred from the many Sects among the *Jews*, the quite contrary is clear. For the opposition of one Sect to the other, hindred any one of them from becoming Masters of the People and their Faith in so general a manner, as to be able to corrupt absolutely their Traditional Notions of Religion.

Moreover, these Sects, all but the *Sadducees*, who were abhorred by the People, knew no other way to distinguish themselves and draw esteem, but by a strict Observation of the Law and its Ceremonies, to which they pretended that the Rules they gave their Disciples did very much contribute; whence they called their Traditions the Hedge and the Rampart of the Law.

To conclude, We ought carefully to take notice, 1. That St. *John Baptist* did not find it needful to correct the Errors in Opinions that reigned among the People; but only exhorted them to Repentance for their Sins and immoral Actions. 2. That one of the chief Concerns of our Lord Jesus Christ in his Discourses with the *Jews*, was to purge them

them of all that Corruption which their drowsy Casuists had introduced into their Morals; with which he charges the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in particular. 3. That the Doctrine of the *Sadducees* which he refutes on some occasions, had but a few Followers. 4. That the *Essens* and their Party, who applied themselves altogether to Piety, and the Study of the Law, had a great Authority with all the People that loved Religion. This we may learn from *Philo* in some Pieces of his Works, especially *Lib. quod omnis Probus sit liber*, p. 678. 5. That the *Jews*, though they have received very gross Ideas concerning a Temporal Kingdom of the *Messias*; and though to support these Ideas, they have confounded the Sense of divers Prophecies, endeavouring to reconcile them to their carnal Notions, and in bringing in new Explications of the Old Testament; yet have they not been able quite to extinguish their ancienter Ideas and Principles: Their new Ideas passing for no more at best than the Opinions of their celebrated Doctors, which another Doctor may oppose if he will, especially, when he is backt with those that are ancienter and of greater Authority.

CHAP. III.

That the Jews had certain Traditional Maxims and Rules for the Understanding of the Holy Scripture.

WHat I have now said concerning the Traditions of the Synagogue, will, I believe, be scarcely disputed by any Learned Man; I am sure he will have less reason to oppose it, that considers the Rules, which, as appears to us, were followed by the *Jews* in explaining the Prophecies concerning their Promised *Messias*.

1. It is certain that the *Jews* held this as a Maxim, That all the Prophets did speak of the *Messias*, and were raised up by God for this very end. This we find more than once in their *Talmud*; and that it was common among them in Christ's time, we see in many places of the Gospel. No doubt what they did in setling this Rule, was not without a due and serious Examination of it first. And here we cannot but deplore the rashness of some Criticks among Christians, who instead of making use of the Confessions of the Old *Jews* upon places of the Old Testament, which they referr'd constantly to the *Messias*; whereas some of the Modern *Jews* endeavour to wrest them in another sense, not only follow the new ones, but give occasion by these means to despise Prophecies, and the clearer ones, as things quite insignificant. What was the

Beracoth. c. 1. fol. 3. Sanhed. c. 11.

the Absurdity of *Grotius*, who in the 53d of *Isaiah*, by the Servant which is spoken of absolutely, understands *Jeremy* the Prophet; whereas the Old *Jews* refer that Chapter directly to the *Messias*, as you can see in the Old *Midrash Chonen*, in the *Targum*, in the *Talmud Sanhed. fol.* 98. *c.* 2. and that is acknowledg'd by *R. Alshek. in h. l.* to be the sense of the ancient *Jews*. And indeed they hold as a Maxim, That whensoever it is spoken absolutely of the Servant, the place must be understood of the Messias, *Zohar* in *Exod. fol.* 225. and by consequence they explained that Prophecy of *Isaiah* as concerning the *Messias*. I can say the same upon another Maxim of the Old *Jews*, which is of great Use, That whatsoever it is spoken of the King absolutely, the place must be understood of the Messias, *Zohar* in *Gen. fol.* 235. If *Grotius* had known it, he never would have related the 72d *Psalm*, and some others, to *Salomon* in his literal sense as he hath done, but would have referred it, as it must be directly to the *Messias*. Certainly that shews us, that many of the Old *Jews* understood the Prophets much better than, to their shame, such Criticks now do. I wonder many times Divines, who confess they cannot give any tolerable account of the *Song of Songs*, and look upon it as a Piece composed by *Salomon* upon the occasion of his Marriage with the Daughter of *Egypt*; whereas the *Jews* look upon it constantly as the last Piece he composed after his Repentance; and we have reason enough to believe, when we compare it with the 45th *Psalm* and the 5th of *Isaiah*, that *Salomon*

lomon spoke then of the *Messias*, the Essential Word spoken of by him, *Prov.* 8. chiefly when we see the ancient *Jews* do agree to it. See *Philo de Colon. apud Grot.* in *Prov.* viii.22. *Bresch. Rabba par.* 1. the first Words, and *Midrash in shir hash. in Mercessu.* But let us come back to our Subject.

2. I say 2dly, That it is reasonable to judge, that the later Prophets having considerably cleared the Prophecies of those that went before them, by diffusing throughout their Writings a much greater Light; they who read the later Prophets, were not so careless as to neglect these Helps for the understanding of the more ancient Prophecies, whose sense was otherwise not a little obscure. In these Cases it was necessary to begin with the Prophets that writ last, and by their Light to clear the ancient Prophecies. According to this Method, the Paraphrases ascribe to the *Messias*, what we read of the Seed of the Woman, *Gen.* iii. 15. and what *Balaam* prophecied, *Numb.* xxiii. and xxiv. And no one can doubt, but that after that great Light that *Isaiah* gave them concerning the *Messias* and his Unction, in his Prophecy *Chap.* xi. they referred to him those words also of *Moses*, *Deut.* xviii. 18. *God shall raise thee up a Prophet like unto me*, which is cited by St. *Peter*, as spoken of the *Messias*, following herein the Principles of the Synagogue, *Act.* iii. 22.

3. It is not to be doubted but that Experience was a great help towards their understanding of Prophecies. If it had not been for this, the *Jews* would have lookt no farther than to *Isaac*, for the fulfilling of that Prophecy, *Gen.* xviii. 18. *In thy seed shall all the nations of the Earth be blessed*; and likewise to *Salomon*, for that which we read 2 *Sam.* vii. 16. and *Psal.* lxxvi. But seeing the Prophecies were not accomplished in their Persons, nor did answer to their Characters; and it is impossible that the Prophecies should be false; the *Jews* were convinced, as they had reason, that they ought to refer these Prophecies to the *Messias*; as also St. *Paul* did, according to the way of his Nation.

4. It is clear there were certain general Characters of the *Messias*, which wheresoever they were found, were commonly thought to denote that that place should be understood of the *Messias*. And it is worth observing, that the Light still encreasing from one Age to the other, and the Characters of the *Messias* being every day more unfolded and opened, 'twas easy for them that studied the Prophecies to compare one with the other, and from thence to draw Rules to find out the Ideas of the *Messias*, in those Promises which seemed not so distinctly and evidently to speak of him.

To give some Examples of the Rules which they gathered for their direction in discovering the Prophecies that relate to the *Messias*; I say, that the most conspicuous Character of him, and that which they most set their hearts upon, was this, That he should come in the later Times to deliver his People from their Enemies, and to reign over the whole Earth in great Peace, and Prosperity, and Glory. This in Gross will be acknowledged by

by all the *Jews* in our Age. But to consider these Matters yet more particularly. It is worthy to be observed, that by comparing these Texts which speak of the low Estate and Sufferings of one that is there also described, as being in the highest Glory and Dignity; they have been convinced, that both these Descriptions are of one and the same Person; and therefore notwithstanding the Prophetical Descriptions of the Glory of their Promised *Messias* at his coming, they have acknowledged those Prophecies to concern him also, which speak of his Humiliation; as that in *Zech.* ix. 9. where he is represented Riding upon an Ass: so you see in the *Targum* and in the *Talmud*; and that in *Isa.* liii. where he is said to be loaded with Griefs, and to be the most despised of Men; as you see in the *Targum*, in the *Talmud*, and in *Midrash Conen.* To which may be added that of *David*, *Psal.* xxii. and that of *Zech.* xii. 10. which treat of the same Matter, and were referred to the *Messias*, as I shall shew afterwards.

Thus we see, wherever Salvation is spoke of, they refer those Prophecies to the *Messias*, as him who should be the Author of Salvation. It is by this rule that *Isa.* lii. and liii. and *Hab.* iii. are understood of the *Messias*.

Thus those places wherein the Subjection and Conversion of the Nations are foretold, were by them judged, without any hesitation, to regard the Times of the *Messias*. *Saadias Haggaon* interprets *Zech.* ix. 9. of the *Messias*, because *v.* 10. *his universal dominion is spoken of.* And

And so *R. David Kimchi* refers to the Messias time the place of *Zech.* ii. 10, 11. Upon this known foundation does St. *Paul* build his Interpretation of the Messias, *Heb.* i. 10. out of *Ps.* cii. 25, *&c.* and *Rom.* xv. 11. out of *Ps.* cxvii. 1. And, to be short, all those Psalms which represent God as reigning over the whole Earth, do relate to the Messias, according to the sense of the ancient *Jews*, as may be seen in the many places of their Paraphrases, and of their Interpreters; as *Rashi Kimchi* and *R. Joel Aben Soeb* upon the *Psalm* 99. and 100.

Thus again, when the Scripture foretells the calling of the Gentiles to the knowledge of the true God, they fail not to understand those predictions of the times of the Messias, who should spread true Religion throughout the World. Hence it is that *Isa.* ii. is so understood by them.

In this manner did they reflect on the Prophecies that spake of the Messias's Priesthood, after that *David* had enlightned them in *Psal.* cx. as may be seen from the Notions of *Philo* the *Jew*, touching the Priesthood of the Word, by an allusion to the History of *Melchisedeck*.

So likewise did they own that the Promises of God to reestablish the House of *David*, were to be accomplished by the Messias, and by this rule they affirm'd that the Song of *Anna* did concern the time of the Messias, for the words of that Song do not agree neither to *Saul*, nor to *David*, but to the time of the Messias. As also they understood in like manner the Prophecy of *Amos* ix. 11, 15, 16, 17. ac-

Lib de profug. p. 364. & lib. de Somn. p. 872. and *R. Menach. de Rekarati in Pentat. fol. 18. col. 1. & fol. 31. col. 1. Edit. Venet.*

Targum & Talmud in Megillah. & Abarb. in 1 Sam. 2. Sanhed. fol. 99. col. 2. Cited in the *Acts.*

according to the sense of the Synagogue and the Prophecy of *Zechary* vi. 12, *&c. Rabboth. fol.* 271. *col.* 4.

They acknowledged according to these rules of Interpretation, that where Ascension into Heaven, and sitting on God's right hand, was spoken of, they were spoken of the Messias; and thus they referred to him *Psal.* cx. and *Psal.* xlv. and *Psal.* lxviii. and *Psal.* xcvii. and what is said *Deut.* xxxii. being all so many Texts insisted by the Writers of the New Testament, as passages which in the Judgment of the *Jews* did concern the Messias.

We ought especially to observe that they never failed to make those reflections upon those particular Psalms, whereof the Composers, as they understood them, spoke in the name of the Synagogue, with respect to future times, and who mention there a Posterity that should partake of the deliverance there promised. And from this allowed Maxim also, does St. *Paul, Heb.* i. refer *Psal.* cii. to the Messias. For this Character is found expresly in *v.* 22. of this Psalm; as well as the calling of the Gentiles, and the Subjection of Kings to God is foretold, *ver.* 15, 16, 17.

We must take notice of another thing, which is a consequence of what they observed in some eminent Prophesies, *viz.* they understood them very rationally, by the help of those Ideas which they met with in other Prophesies which otherwise seem not so clearly to concern the same Messias which is spoken of in clearer Prophesies. 'Twas according to that rule that they referred the Hymn of *Anna*, 1 *Sam.* ii. 5. to the times of the Messias, *Kimchi* in *h. l.* compareth it with the words of *Isaiah*, ch. liv. *Rejoice thou barren that bearest not, &c.* 'Twas according to that method that they being convinced that the *Psal.* xxii. was to be referred to the Messias, did refer also to him the *Psal.* xli. as it is referred by St. *Paul, Heb.* x. the same Ideas of suffering being found in both Psalms. *R. Menach. de Rekam fol.* 19. *col.* 2. *in Pentat.* It was according to the same method that they referred to the *Sekinah* or Messias all the Psalms which have the Title, all *Shosannin*, viz. *Psal.* 45. 69. 80. as we see in the same *R. Menachem fol.* 106. *col.* 2. *in Pent.* The *Song of Songs*, as I have observed, was the Key which made them understand the subject of those Psalms, as the Song of *Isaiah* ch. 5. made them to understand the Song of Songs.

I am not ignorant that the greater part of the *Jewish* Nation being oppressed with the *Roman* Yoak, and finding no comfort for it in these Notions, which are for the most part Spiritual, did therefore about our Saviour's time frame to themselves more carnal notions concerning the Kingdom of the Messias: Fancying that he should come as a victorious Prince, to conquer, and to avenge them of their Enemies. They removed from their thoughts the accounts of his Death, as contrary to those Glorious descriptions which suited better with their minds. They expected the Messias should come to restore presently the Kingdom unto *Israel*; and, in a word, following their own Desires and Imaginations, they confounded Christ's first coming with his second; and then confirmed

ed themselves in this mistake, partly, because the Prophets seemed to describe the Kingdom of the Messias very carnally, partly, because they knew not what to think of a Cœlestial or Spiritual Kingdom, such as his should be, who was to sit on the Throne of God. And these false conceits of theirs, joined with the worldly Interests of their Leaders, brought them to reject the true Messias at his Coming.

But after all, it is certain, 1. That the contrary opinions, concerning the Spiritual sense of the Prophecies, was the constant ancient Doctrine of their Nation. 2. That those *Jews* that were converted to Christianity by the Ministry of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, were converted upon these Maxims, which were then the Maxims of the wisest and the Religiousest part of their Nation. 3. That the Apostles in their Writings, as well as Christ Jesus in his Discourses, cited the Texts of the Old Testament according to the commonly received sense of the Synagogue; And in truth the authority of these proofs in that received sense did not a little contribute to the Conversion of both *Jews* and *Gentiles*.

In order to make the Reader of my mind, I intreat him to take in good part my entring a little further into the examination, of what the most studious *Jews* in the Holy Scriptures do commonly propose under the name of Tradition. Let them be lookt upon by some Men as dreaming Authors, that busie themselves in Enquiries altogether vain and fruitless; yet it is no hard task to vindicate them from this

this hard Imputation. 1. I have this to say for them, That that which appears so phantastical, (because not understood by most of those which have been accustomed to the *Greek* Methods of Teaching,) ought not therefore to be despised and wholly rejected. None but Fools will think this a sufficient reason why all *Pythagoras* his Doctrines ought to be contemned; because that he having been a Scholar of *Pherecydes* the *Syrian*, and other learned Men in *Egypt* and *Chaldea*, did borrow thence his way of teaching Theology by Symbols, which is attainable only by few, and those of no common Capacity.

2. I observe that most of the true *Jewish* Doctors that followed the Tradition of their Schools, had this design principally in their eye, to make Men fully understand the Secrets of God's Conduct for the Restoration of fallen Mankind. To this in particular they bend their Thoughts, and in this they endeavour'd to instruct their Readers, explaining to them, according to this sense, some places of Scripture, which at first sight seem not immediately to regard so important a Subject.

3. I observe that oftentimes, where they attribute these Interpretations of Scripture to a Tradition delivered down to them from their Fathers, it is only in order to render their Reflections on the Scriptures so much the more venerable to their Hearers. For it is plain enough in some places, that an attentive Meditation on the Words might have discover'd the same things which they refer to Tradition.

For

For Example. They remark that God said concerning *Adam*, Gen. iii. 22. *And now lest he stretch out his hand, and eat of the tree of life, and live for ever; therefore God, as it follows, drove him out Paradise.* From hence they infer, that God gave *Adam* hopes of becoming one day immortal, by eating of the Tree of Life, which they thought should be obtained for him by the *Messias*. Now it appears that our Blessed Saviour did allude to this common Opinion of the *Jews*, which was then esteemed as a Tradition, *Rev.* ii. 7. *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree that is in the Paradise of God.* And this Notion is repeated, *Rev.* xxii. 2, 14.

See *Reuchlin Cabalæ, l.* 1. *p.*628.

Again they remark that God said, *Behold, Adam is become like one of us*, Gen. iii. 22. And they maintain that he speaks not this to the Angels, who had no common likeness to the Unity or Essence of God, but to him who was the Celestial *Adam*, who is one with God. As *Jonathan* has also observed in his *Targum* on these words of *Genesis*, calling him the *only-begotten in Heaven*. Now it is plain that St. *Paul* has described Jesus Christ as this Heavenly *Adam*, 1 *Cor.* xv.

They assert that the first Prophecy, *Gen.* iii. 15. was understood by *Adam* and *Eve* of the Saviour of the World; and that *Eve*, in prospect of this, being delivered of her first Son, she called him *Cain*, saying, *I have got a man, or this man from the Lord*; believing that he was the Promised *Messias*. They tell us farther, that *Eve* being deceived in this expectation, as also in her hopes from *Abel*, asked another Son of God, who gave her *Seth*;

Gen. iv. 1. *Reuchl. Ibid. p.* 629.

Seth; of whom it is said, that *Adam begot another Son after his own Image*, another with respect to *Abel* that was killed, not to his Posterity by *Cain*, for they bear the Image of the Devil, rather than that of God. They maintain the Name of *Enos* to have been given *Seth*'s Son upon the same account, because they thought him *that excellent man* whom God had promised. They make the like Remarks on *Enoch*, *Noa*, and *Sem*, and *Noah*'s Blessing of *Sem* they look'd on as an Earnest Wish, that God in his Person would give them the Redeemer of Mankind.

Reuchl Ibid. p. 630, & 631.

They affirm that *Abraham* had not been so ready to offer up his Son *Isaac* a Sacrifice, but that he hoped God would save the World from Sin by that Means; and that *Isaac* had not suffered himself to be bound, had he not been of the same belief. And they observe that it was said to *Abraham*, and afterwards to *Isaac*, on purpose to shew them the mistake of this Opinion, *In thy Seed shall all the nations of the Earth be blessed.* A plain Argument that the *Jews* anciently thought that these words did relate to the *Messias*, as did also St. *Paul*, *Gal.* iii. 16.

Reuchl Ibid. p. 632.

They maintain, that *Jacob* believed that God would fulfil to him the first Promise made to *Adam*, till God undeceived him by inspiring him with a Prophecy concerning *Judah*, *Gen.* xlix. 10. and by signifying to him; which also *Jacob* tells his Sons, that the *Messias* should not come but in the last days, *v.* 1. when the *Scepter* was departed from *Judah*, and *the Law-giver* from between his Feet, *v.* 10. They

Reuchl. Ib. p. 633.

Reuchl. Ib. p. 633. They declare that ever since this Prophecy, the Coming of the *Messias* for the Redemption of Mankind has been the Entertainment of all the Prophets to their Disciples, and the Object of *David*'s and all other Prophet's Longings and Desires.

Reuchl. Ib. p. 634. They maintain that *David* did not think himself to be the *Messias*, because he prays for his Coming, *Psal.* xliii. 3. *Send out thy Light*, *i. e.* the *Messias*, as *R. Salomon* interprets it. And from hence they conclude, that he speaks also of the *Messias* in *Psal.* lxxxix. 15.

They did think *Isaiah* spake of him, *ch.* ix. 6. So *R. Jose Galilæus præfat. in Eccha Rabbati*, as it is to be seen in *Devarim Rabba Paras.* ואתחנן at the end of it; and in *Jalk.* in *Is.* §. 284. And indeed what he there saith could not be meant of *Hezekiah*, who was born 10 years before; nor was his Kingdom so extensive, nor so lasting, as is there foretold the *Messias*'s should be, but was confined to a small part of *Palestine*, and ended in *Sedecias* his Successor not many Generations afterwards.

And it is the general and constant Opinion of the *Jews* that *Malachi*, the last of the Prophets, spake of him, *ch.* 4. under the Name of the *Son of Righteousness*: for this see *Kimchi*.

4. It ought to be well considered, that we owe the Knowledge of the Principles on which the Holy Ghost has founded the Doctrine of Types, to the *Jews*, who are so devoted to the Traditions of their Ancestors; which Types, however they who read the Scripture

Scripture cursorily, do ordinarily pass by, as things light and insignificant; yet it is true what St. *Paul* hath said 1 *Cor.* x. 11. That all things happened to the Fathers in Types, and were written for their instruction, upon whom the ends of the World are come, or who live in the last Times, as the Oeconomy of the Gospel is called, and *the last days* by *Jacob*, *Gen.* xlix. 1. That is, acknowledged by the Wisemen of the Nation in *Shemoth Rabba Parasha* 1, and by *Menasseh ben Israel q.* 6. in *Isaiah*, p. 23.

Indeed the *Jews*, besides the literal sense of the ancient Scriptures, did acknowledge a mystical or spiritual Sense, which St. *Paul* lays down for a Maxim, 1 *Cor.* x. 1, 2, 3, *&c.* Where he applies to things of the New Testament all these following Types; namely the Coming of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, their passage through the Red Sea, the History of the *Manna*, and of the Rock that followed them by its Water.

We see in *Philo* the figurative sense which the *Jews* gave to a great part of the ancient History: He remarks exactly, (and often with too much subtilty, perhaps,) the many Divine and Moral Notions which the common prophetical Figures do suggest to us.

We see that they turned almost all their History into Allegory. It plainly appears from St. *Paul*'s way of arguing, *Gal.* iv. 22, *&c.* which could be of no force otherwise.

Wee see that they reduced to an Anagogical sense all the Temporal Promises, of *Canaan*, of *Jerusalem*, of the Temple; in

 which

which St. *Paul* also followed them, *Heb.* iv. 4, 9. quoting these words. *If they shall enter into my rest*, from *Ps.* xcv. 11. which words he makes the *Psalmist* speak of the *Jerusalem* that is above; and this also is acknowledged by *Maimonides de pœn. c.* 8.

This Remark ought to be made particularly on the mystical Signification which *Philo* the *Jew* gives of several Parts of the Temple; of which the Apostle St. *Paul* makes so great use in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*. *Josephus* in those few words which he has concerning the Signification of the Tabernacle, *Antiq.* iii. 9. gives us reason enough to believe, that if he had lived to finish his design of explaining the Law according to the *Jewish Midrashim*, he would have abundantly justified this way of Explication, followed by St. *Paul*, with respect to the Tabernacle of the Covenant.

It is hard to conceive how the Apostles could speak of things which came to pass in Old time, as Types of what should be accomplished in the Person of the *Messias*, without any other proof than their simple affirmation: As for instance, that St. *Peter* should represent Christ as a New *Noah*, 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. and that St. *Paul* should propose *Melchisedeck* as a Type of the *Messias* in respect to his Sacerdotal Office, *Heb.* vi, vii. unless the *Jews* did allow this for a Maxim, which flows naturally from the Principle we have been establishing; namely, that these Great Men were look'd on as the Persons in whom God would fulfil his first Promise; but that not being completely fulfilled in them, it was necessary for

for them that would understand it aright to carry their View much farther, to a Time and Person without comparison more august, in whom the Promise should be perfectly completed.

It may be demanded, why the Prophecies seem sometime so applied to Persons then living, that one would think he should not need to look any farther to see the fulfilling of them; as namely the prophetical Prayer, as in behalf of *Solomon*, which is in *Psalm* lxxii. as the Birth of a Son promised to *Isaiah*, *ch.* vii. and *ch.* ix. 6. and where *Isaiah* seems to speak of himself, when he saith, *Isa.* lxi. 1. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*, and the like. But it is not hard to give a reason for this; with which the ancient *Jews* were not unacquainted. And it is this, That though all these Predictions had been directed to those persons, yet they had by no means their accomplishment in them, nor these persons were in any degree intended and meant in the Prophecy. To be particular, *Solomon* was in Wars during the latter part of his Life; and so he could not be that *King of Peace* spoken of in the Prophecy; and his Kingdom was rent in his Son's time, the smaller part of it falling to his share, as the greater was seized by *Jeroboam*; so far was the Kingdom of *Solomon* from being universal or everlasting, *Isai.* vii. 14. The Son born to *Isaiah*, neither had the Name of *Emanuel*, nor could he be the Person intended by it; as neither was his Mother a Virgin, as the word in that Prophecy signifies: And for the Prophet himself, though the Spirit of the Lord was upon him,

him, and spoke by him, as did it by all the other Prophets, 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. Yet that the Unction here spoken of, *Isaiah* lxi. 1. did not belong to him, but to the *Messias*, is acknowledged by the *Jewish* Writers, and seems to have been so understood by those that heard our Saviour apply this Prophecy to himself, *Luk.* iv. 22. So that nothing was more judiciously done, and more agreeable to the known Principles of the Synagogue, than the Question proposed to *Philip* by the Eunuch, who reading the liii. of *Isaiah*, asked from him, *Of whom did he speak, of himself, or of another?*

Saadia Gaon Emunoth c. 18 *&* D. *Kimchi in rad.* משח

Again, It may be asked, Why the Prophets called the Messias, *David*? and *John Baptist*, *Elias*? Not to trouble the Reader with any more than a mention of that fancy of some of the *Jews* that held the Transmigration of Souls; and say particularly, That the Soul of *Adam* went into *David*, and the Soul of *David* was the same with that of the *Messias*. I say, to pass by that, the true Reason of such use of the Names of *David* and *Elias*, is this; because *David* was an excellent Type of the *Messias* that was to come out of his Loins, *Act.* ii. 30, 31. And for *John Baptist*, he came in the Spirit and Power of *Elias*, *Luk.* 1. 17. That is, he was inspired with the same Spirit of Zeal and holy Courage that *Elias* was formerly acted with, and employ'd it, as *Elias* did, in bringing his People to Repentance and Reformation.

5. We ought to do the *Jews* that Justice as to acknowledge, that from them it is, that we know the true sense of all the Prophecies con-

concerning the *Messias* in the Old Testament. Which sense some Criticks seem not to be satisfied with, seeking for a first accomplishment in other persons than in the *Messias*. The *Jews* meaning and applying those Prophecies to the *Messias* in a mystical or a spiritual sense, is founded upon a Reason that offers it self to the Mind of those that study Scripture with attention.

Before *Jacob*'s Prophecy, there was no time fixed for the Coming of the *Messias*; but after the giving of that Prophecy, *Gen.* xlix. 10. there was no possibility of being deceived in the sense of those Prophecies which God gave from time to time, full of the Characters of the *Messias*. It was necessary, 1. That the Kingdom should be in *Judah*, and not cease till the time about which they expected the Coming of the *Messias*. 2. That the lesser Authority, called here the *Law-giver*, should be also established in *Judah*, and destroyed before the Coming of the *Messias*, which we knew came to pass by the Reign of *Herod* the Great, and some years before the Death of our Saviour. And indeed the *Talmudist* say, that forty years before the Desolation of the House of the Sanctuary, Judgments of Blood were taken away from *Israel*. *Talm. Jerus. l. Sanhedr. c. dine. mammonoth. & Talm. Bab. C. Sanhedr. c. Hajou Bodekim.* And *Raymondus Martini*, who writ this *Pugio* at the end of the XIIIth Century, quotes Part III. Dist. 3. c. 16. §. 46. One *R. Rachmon*, who says, that when this happened, they *put on sackcloth, and pull'd off their hair, and said, Wo unto us, the Scepter is departed from Israel, and yet the Messias is not come.*

And

And therefore they who had this Prophecy before them, could not mistake *David*, nor *Solomon*, nor *Hezekiah*, for the *Messias*: Nor could they deceive themselves so far as to think this Title was applicable to *Zorobabel*, or any of his Successors.

In short, there appeared not any one among the *Jews* before the Times of our Blessed Saviour, that dared assume this Title of *Messias*; although the Name of *Anointed*, which the word *Messias* signifies, had been given to several of their Kings; as to *David* in particular. But since Jesus Christ's coming, many have pretended to it. These things being so, it is clear, that the Prophecies which had not, and could not have their accomplishment in those, upon whose occasion they were first delivered, were to receive their accomplishment in the *Messias*, and consequently those Prophecies ought necessarily to be referred to him.

We ought by all means to be perswaded of this. For we cannot think the *Jews* were so void of Judgment as to imagine that the Apostles, or any one else in the World, had a right to produce the simple words of the Old Testament, and to urge them in any other sense, than what was intended by the Writer, directed by the Holy Ghost: It must be his Sense, as well as his Words, that should be offered for proof to convince reasonable Men. But we see that the *Jews* did yield to such Proofs out of Scripture concerning the *Messias*, in which some Criticks do not see the force of those Arguments that were convincing to the *Jews*. They must then have believed

believed that the true sense of such places was the literal sense in regard of the *Messias*, whom God had then in view at his inditing of these Books; and that it was not literal in respect of him, who seems at first-sight to have been intended by the Prophecy.

And now I leave it to the Consideration of any unprejudiced Reader that is able to judge, Whether, if these Principles and Maxims I have treated of were unknown to the *Jews*, the Apostles could have made any use of the Books of the Old Testament for their Conviction, either as to the Coming of the *Messias*, or the Marks by which he was distinguishable from all others, or as to the several parts of his Ministry. But this is a matter of so great importance, as to deserve more pains to shew that Jesus Christ and his Apostles did build upon such Maxims as I have mentioned: And therefore any that call themselves Christians, should take heed how they deny the force and authority of that way of Traditional interpretation, which has been anciently received in the *Jewish* Church.

CHAP. IV.

That Jesus Christ and his Apostles proved divers points of the Christian Doctrine by this common Traditional Exposition received among the Jews, which they could not have done, (at least, not so well,) had there been only such a Literal Sense of those Texts which they alledged, as we can find without the help of such Exposition.

IF we make some reflections which do not require a great deal of Meditation, it is clear, that Jesus Christ was to prove to the *Jews*, that he was the Messias which they did expect many Ages ago, and whose Coming they look'd on as very near. He could not have done so if they had not been acquainted with their Prophetical Books, and with those several Oracles which were contained in them. Perhaps there might have been some difference amongst them concerning some of those Oracles, because there were in many of them some Ideas which seem contrary one to another. And that was almost unavoidable, because the Holy Ghost was to represent the Messias in a deep humiliation and great suffering, and in a great height of Glory. But after all, the method of calling the *Jews* was quite different from the method of calling the Gentiles. They had the distinct knowledge of the chief Articles of Religion, which the

the Heathen had not. They had all preparations necessary for the deciding this great question, Whether Jesus of *Nazareth* was the Messias, or not. They had the Sacred Books of the Old Testament, they were acquainted with the Oracles as well as with the Law. They longed after the coming of the Messias. They had been educated all along, and trained up in the expectation of him. They had not only those Sacred Books in which the Messias was spoken of, but many among them had gathered the Ideas of the Prophets upon that subject, as we see by the Books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*. And indeed we see that Jesus Christ and his Apostles spake to the *Jews* according to the Notions which were received among them. What I say will clearly appear, if we reflect on some of the Citations made by Christ and his Apostles from the Old Testament. For altho Jesus Christ had in himself all the Treasures of Wisdom, and altho his Apostles were divinely inspired, yet they ought in proportion what they said to the capacity of their hearers. Their Miracles were to move and dispose them to the receiving of the Truth, but their proofs and arguments were the proper means to convince their hearers of it.

1. The Doctrines of the Immortality of the Soul, and the Resurrection from the Dead, being deny'd by the Sadducees, who required an express Text of *Moses* for the proof of those Doctrines, and affirmed that there was not any such to be found in the Writings of *Moses*; our Saviour proves it against them by these words, which stopped their

their mouths, and raised the admiration of the multitude, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; but God is not the God of the dead but of the living*, Mat. xxii. 32. His proof was by a known and necessary consequence from that Text out of the Law, which he inferred according to the received method among the *Jews*. For the *Jews* at this day do gather the same Doctrines from the same words, *Exod.* iii. 6, 15, 16. which Jesus Christ alledged to prove them by. The astonishment of the people on this occasion did not proceed from the newness of his argument, as if they had never heard the like before; for they gathered also the Doctrine of the Resurrection from *Moses* his Song, as we see in *Josephus de Maccbab.* p. 1012. But it arose from another cause, to wit, his giving them such a Spiritual notion of the Resurrection as was not clogged with the difficulties drawn from that instance of a Woman's Marriage to more Husbands than one, which the *Sadducees* justly urged against that gross Idea of a Resurrection that many of them had, wherein Marriage and other actions of mortal life should have place.

Vid. Mede *his Works*, p. 801.

2. Our Blessed Saviour in the same 22*th. ch.* of St. *Matth. asked the Pharisees whose Son the Messias was to be?* they answered, *the Son of David, i. e.* the Scripture saith, he should descend from the Line of *David*. Against which Christ raises this Objection, *How then does David in spirit*, or inspired by the Spirit, *call him Lord?* And he alledges for proof that *David* calls him Lord, the words of *Psal.* cx. 1. *The Lord said to my Lord sit thou at my right hand*

hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool. If then David by the Spirit called him Lord, how is he then his Son? It appears that Jesus Christ in making this Objection, did take these three things as granted by the *Jews* at that time. 1. That *Psal.* cx. was the work of the Prophet *David*. 2. That this Psalm concerned the Messias. 3. That the name *Adonai* is in this place equivalent to the name *Jehovah*. There is not any of these things which the *Jews* will not dispute at this day. But that their Forefathers did hold that these words were spoken to the Messias, it appears by their *Midrash* on the *Psalms*, and *Saadia Gaon* on *Dan.* vii. 13. Indeed their *Targum* justifies all that our Saviour said in this place, not only in acknowledging that this *Psalm* was composed by *David*, but also that it was written for the Messias, who is therefore instead of *Adonai* called *Memra*, or the *Word*, according to *Fagius* his reading, which is most natural to the place. But that *Memra*, the *Word*, denotes the Messias, shall be shown in the sequel of this Discourse.

St. *Paul* has taken the same way, *Act.* xiii. 24. where he quotes these words from *Isa.* lv. 3. *I will give you the sure mercies of David.* He refers this passage to the sending of the Messias, altho the Text seems obscure enough for such a reference. But he does it in pursuance of the explication given of it by the ancient *Jews*, who understood this Chapter of the Messias. So does *R. David Kimchi* upon this verse, and *Aben Ezra*, and *Sam. Laniado*, and *R. Meir Ararma* and *Abarvanel*. Upon the same ground he applies to the Messias

sias in the same Chapter, the words of *Psal.* xvi. 10. *Thou wilt not leave thy holy One to see corruption.* He proves that they could not be understood of *David*, seeing *that his Sepulchre*, the Monument of his Corruption, *remained till that day.* He ought first to have proved that this *Psalm* was spoken of the Messias, and then have proved that it could not belong to *David.* But this method was needless, since he went on this known Maxim among the *Jews*, That whatever *Psalm* was not fulfilled in *David*, ought to be understood of the Messias.

Let us proceed to another clear proof of this Proposition: St. *Paul* in *Heb.* i. 6. quotes a Text from *Moses* Song, *Deut.* xxxii. 43. according to the LXXth Version. 'Tis commonly believed that the Quotation is out of *Psal.* xcvii. 8. but the very words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, are not found in that *Psalm.* They are in the Greek of *Moses* Song without the least alteration, though it must be confessed they are not there in the Hebrew Text. I will not dispute, whether the *Jews* have lost out of their Bibles this part of the ancient Text, since St. *Paul*'s time. They may in their Vindication shew, that neither the *Samaritans* have in their Text this Quotation, which is extant in the LXX. It seems therefore that this Song of *Moses* was copied separately from the rest of the Pentateuch, for their convenience who were to learn it by heart; to which some pious People added a few Verses out of the *Psalms* that concerned the same Subject. Which Copy, with

with the Additions, was translated by the LXX, because the People had generally committed this to their Memory. What I conclude from hence is this, That St. *Paul* made no difficulty to quote words that were only in the LXX Version, because they contained things conformable to the ancient Sentiments of the *Jews*: and following the Genius and Doctrine prevailing in his Nation, he referrs these words to the second Appearance of the *Messias*, when all the Angels of God shall pay him adoration.

If we read St. *Paul*'s Citation, *Gal.* iii. 8, 16 of the Promise God made to *Abraham*, *that in his seed all the nations of the Earth should be blessed*, which he understands of the Promise of the *Messias*; we shall quickly judge that he followed herein the sense of the ancient Synagogue. I know the greatest part of the Modern *Jews* do understand it of *Isaac*: As if God had said, All the Nations of the Earth shall wish their Friends the Blessing which God gave to *Isaac.* But the Ancients understood it otherwise, as we can judge by the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, ch. xliv. 25. They referred it to the Calling of *Gentiles* by the *Messias*, as we see in *Sepher Chasidim*, §. 961. and to the abode of the *Sekinah* or λόγος, as it is explained by *R. Joseph de Carnisol Saare Isider*, *fol.* 3. *col.* 4. & *fol.* 4. *col.* 1. And so St. *Peter* supposes it to be spoken of the Messias, *Act.* iii. 25.

We may reflect in like manner on the promise God made the People, *Deut.* xviii. 15. *To raise them up a Prophet like unto Moses*: St. *Peter* makes use of it as being spoken of the *Messias*,

Messias, that he should give a new Law, *Act.* iii. 22. But the Modern *Jews* do all they can to evade this Application. Nevertheless, it appears to have been the Idea of the ancient Synagogue, because we read that they speak of the Law which was to be given by the *Messias*, as of a Law, in comparison to which all other Law was to be lookt upon as meer Vanity. So *Cobeleth Rabba* in *c.* ii. and in *c.* xi.

It is not without some surprize that we read the Application St. *Mat.* ii. 15. has made of these words in *Hos.* xi. 1. *Out of Egypt have I called my son*; which seem only to be spoken of the Children of *Israel*, and not of the *Messias*. And yet in the Book *Midrash Tehillim Rabba* on *Ps.* ii. we may see the *Jews* referred to the *Messias* what is written of the People of *Israel*, *Exod.* iv. 22. Which is an argument that St. *Matthew* cited this passage from *Hosea*, according to the sense the *Jews* gave it with respect to the Messiah. *The Actions of the Messias are related in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Books called Hagiographa* [or in the *Psalms*.] *In the Law*, Exod. iv. 22. *Israel is my first-born: In the Prophets*, Isai. lii. 13. *Behold my servant shall deal prudently. In the* Psalms, *as it is written*, *The Lord said to my Lord*, Psal. cx. 1.

St. *Matth.* viii. 17. referrs the words of *Isai.* liii. 4. to the miraculous Cures that Christ wrought. And he follows herein the ancient Tradition of the *Jews*, which taught that the *Messias*, spoken of in this Chapter of *Isaiah*, should pardon Sins, and consequently heal their distempers, which were the effects and

and punishments of their Sins. From hence it follows, that, according to their Tradition, the *Messias* should be God, even as Jesus Christ did then suppose, when he healed the Paralytick Man by his own power, *Matth.* ix. 6. and proves that he did not blaspheme in forgiving Sins, which the *Jews* thought belonged only to God.

St. *Matth.* i. 23. applies the words of *Isai.* vii. 14. to Christ's being born of a Virgin. *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a son*, &c. This he did likewise according to the ancient Idea of the *Jews*, which was not quite lost in the time of *Adrian* the Emperor. For *R. Akiba*, who lived and died under his Reign, makes the following Reflection on this Prophecy. He had considered that *Isaiah*, in the beginning of the following Chapter, received Order from God to take to him two Witnesses, *Uriah* the Priest who lived in his time, and *Zechary* the Son of *Berachiah*, who lived not (as he thought) till under the second Temple. Upon which he saith, that God commanded the Prophet to do thus, to shew, that as what he had foretold concerning *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* was true by the Witness of *Uriah*, who saw it accomplish'd; so what he had foretold concerning the Conception and Delivery of a Virgin, must be accomplished under the second Temple by the Witness of *Zechary*, who lived then. See *Gemara. tit. Maccoth. c.* 3. *fol.* 24.

3. We see that Jesus Christ, *Joh.* iv. 21, &c. alludes tacitly to the Prophecy of *Mal.* i. 11. concerning the Sacrifices of the New Testament. This is a matter at present controverted

verted between *Christians* and *Jews*. But Christ deliver'd the sense of the Synagogue, as it is evident from the *Targum* on those words of *Malachy*, which applies them to the Times of the *Messias*.

4. One would think it were only by way of Similitude that Christ applied to himself the History of the Brazen Serpent, in saying, *Joh.* iii. 14. *As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up.* But there appears to be more in it than so. The ancient *Jews* lookt upon the Brazen Serpent as a Type of the *Messias*, so we find by their *Targum* on *Numb.* xxi. 8. which expounds this Serpent which *Moses* lifted up, by the Word of the Lord, who is also called *God*, *Wisd.* xvi. 7. compared with *chap.* xv. 1. Although *Philo*, while he hunts for Allegories, gives another Idea of it, *de Agric. p.* 157.

5. It may also seem to be only by way of Allusion, that Christ calls himself the Bread that came down from Heaven, alluding to the *Manna* which came down from Heaven, as we read *Exod.* xvi. But he that looks into the ancient *Jewish* Writers shall find that herein also our Saviour followed the common *Jewish* Idea. For *Philo*, who writ in *Egypt* before Jesus Christ began to preach, tells us positively that the Word or λόγος was the Manna. *Lib. quòd Deter. pot. insid. p.* 137.

St. *Paul*, *Heb.* 1. 5. cites God's Words to *David* concerning one that should come out of his Loins, 2 *Sam.* vii. 14. *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, as if they respected the *Messias*. How could he do thus? When on the one hand he calleth Jesus Christ *holy*, *undefiled*, *harmless*, *separate from Sinners*; and on the other hand in that Promise to *David*, God takes it for granted that that Son of his might be a Sinner, and thereupon threatens in the very next words, 2 *Sam.* vii. 14. *If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men*; which suits well with *Solomon*, but not at all with the *Messias*. The reason is, St. *Paul* followed the sense of this place, which was commonly received among the *Jews*, who as they refer to the *Messias*, the *Psal.* lxxii, cx. and cxxxii. where the same Ideas occur, so they must have referred to the *Messias*, whatever is great in this Prophecy; and to others, whatever therein denotes humane infirmities. And indeed it was not very hard to give to that Oracle a further prospect, *viz.* to the *Messias*; 1*st*. Because *Solomon* was made King in the Life of his Father; whereas the Son which God speaks of was to be born after *David*'s Death. 2*dly*. Because it is spoken of a Seed not born from *David*, but from *David*'s Children. 3*dly*. Because the Mercy of God was to make the Kingdom of *David* last for ever; whereas the Kingdom of *Solomon* was divided soon after his Death, and but two parts of twelve were left to *Reboboam* his Son.

St. *Paul*, *Gal.* iv. 29. alludes to the History in *Gen.* xxi. 9. as a Type of the Persecutions which the *Jews* should exercise on the *Christians*. Whereon does he build this? First having proved it his way, that the Christian Church was typified in *Isaac*, the Son of the Free-woman, and *Israel* according to the Flesh, by *Ishmael* the Son of the Bond-woman;

woman; and having thus brought unbelieving *Israel* into *Ishmael*'s place, he proceeds upon the Old *Jewish* Nation recited in *Baal-Hatturim*, that *Ishmael* should pierce *Isaac* with an Arrow, which they illustrate by *Gen.* xvi. 12. instead whereof the Text saith only, that he laughed at, or mocked *Isaac*.

We see St. *Paul*, *Rom.* x. 6. applies to the Gospel those words of *Deut.* xxx. 11, 12, 13, 14. which seem to be spoken of the Law given by *Moses* to the *Jews*. But then the Old Synagogue applied these words of *Moses* to the times of the *Messias*, as is clear from *Jonathan*'s *Targum* on the place, which is enough to justify St. *Paul*'s Usage of the words.

We read in the Song of *Zacharias*, *Luk.* 1.69. that these words are referred to the *Messias*, *he hath exalted the horn of his Anointed*. The very same words are pronounced by *Hannah*, the Mother of *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* ii. 10. where the *Targum* referrs them in like manner as the sense of the Synagogue.

The same *Targum* understands of the *Messias* that passage 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 3. And the lxx have the like Idea with the *Targum*, which is a farther Confirmation of the Tradition of the Synagogue.

It is certain this Notion of the *Messias* was very common among the *Jews*; otherwise they would not have thrust it into their *Targums* on places where naturally it ought not to come in. For instance. It is said 1 *Kings* iv. 33. That *Solomon discoursed of all the Trees, from the Cedar of Libanus, even to the Hyssop that springeth out of the Wall.* Now the Remark of the

the *Targum* hereupon is this, And he prophecied touching the Kings of the House of *David*, which should rule in this present World, as also in the World to come of the *Messias*.

6. We see our Lord Jesus Christ was careful to instruct the *Pharisees* of the two different Characters of the Coming of the *Messias*, *Luk.* xvii. 20. Of which the one was to be obscure, and followed with the Death of the *Messias*; the other was to be glorious, and acknowledged by the whole World. Christ instructed them in this the rather, to remove their mistakes through which they confounded his two Comings. Though in truth they were both of them confessed by the *Jews* for some time after Christ's ascension into Heaven.

7. We see that Christ himself, *Matth.* xxi. 16. and also his Apostle St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xv. 27. *Eph.* i. 21. *Heb.* ii. 6, 7, 8. apply the words of *Psal.* viii. to the *Messias*. How could they do it, were it not before the sense of the Synagogue? Now that such was the sense of the Synagogue, ye see till this day, if we read what they say in their *Rabboth* upon the *Song of Songs*, ch. iv. 1. and upon *Ecclesiastes*, ch. ix. 1. that the Children were to make Acclamations at the Coming in of the *Messias*, the second Redeemer, according to those words of *Psal.* viii. 3. *Ex ore infantium, &c.*

Lastly, We see St. *Paul*, *Rom.* x. 18. does refer the words of *Psal.* xix. 4. to the Preaching of the Apostles; and saith, *Their sound went over all the Earth, and their words to the end of the World.* What would an unbelieving *Jew* have said to this, that *Paul* should apply

 the

the *Psalmist*'s words in this manner? But the Apostle was secure against this or any other Objection from the *Jews*, if he used the words in the sense of their Synagogue. And that he did so, there is little reason to doubt. The Encomiums which *David* gave to the Law of *Moses*, they would most readily apply to the Law of the *Messias*: And they expected he should have his Apostles to carry his Law throughout the World. To this expectation of theirs the *Psalmist*'s words were very applicable. That the Divine *Word* is called the Sun, *Philo* plainly affirms; and if I take *R. Tanchum* aright, he understands that it was the *Messias* that was called the *Sun of Righteousness*, *Mal.* iv. 2. St. *John* saw Christ in that figure of the Sun, and his Apostles as twelve Stars, and that in Heaven, which to him is the state of the Gospel, *Rev.* xii. 1.

According to this figure, in this *Psalm*, the Sun of Righteousness is described as a *Giant*, which rejoyceth to run a Race, *v.* 5. And here is a description of his Course, together with that of his Disciples, and of the manner by which they made their Voices to be heard. This Idea shocked *R. Samuel* in a Book he writ before his Conversion, *ch.* 18. which he communicated with a *Rabin* of *Morocco*. And whoever considers that Idea of the Writer of the Book of *Wisdom* xviii. 5. shall find it is no other than that of this xixth *Psalm*, mixed a little with that Idea in the *Canticles*, which the Old *Jews* refer to the *Messias*, and with that of the Song of *Isaiah* v. touching the *Messias*, which served the *Jews* for a Commentary to understand the *Song of Solomon* by.

I could

I could gather a much greater number of Remarks on this Head; but having brought as many here together, as I take to be sufficient for the proving of what I have said, I think I ought not to enlarge any further. So I come next to search out the Storehouse, where we may find these Traditions of the *Jews*, which Jesus Christ and his Apostles made use of, either in explaining or confirming the Doctrines of the Gospel.

They must be found in the ancient Books of the *Jews* which remain among us, such as the Apocryphal Books, the Books of *Philo* the *Jew*, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrases on the Old Testament. The Authority of all these ought to be well established. Let us begin by the Apocryphal Books, some of which Mr. *N.* hath ridiculed very boldly. Then we shall consider what he has said to *Philo*, whose Writings Mr. *N.* hath endeavoured to render useless in this Controversy: How justly, we shall consider in the next Chapters.

CHAP. V.

Of the Authority of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.

ALthough the Protestants have absolutely rejected the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, which the Church of *Rome* make use of in Controversies, as if they were of the same authority with the Books of the Law and Prophets, notwithstanding they keep them as Books of a great antiquity. And we make use of their authority, not to prove any Doctrine which is in dispute, as if they contained a Divine Revelation, and a decision of an inspired Writer, but to witness what was the Faith of the *Jewish* Church in the time when the Authors of those Apocryphal Books did flourish. Any body who sees the *Socinians* making use of the Authorities of *Artemas*, or of *Paulus Samosatenus* to prove that the Christian Church was in their opinion, must grant the same authority to the Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and the like, touching the Sentiment of the *Jewish* Church in the age of those Writers.

Grotius, a great Author for the *Socinians*, was so well satisfied of the truth of what I advance, that he thought fit to Comment those very Apocryphal Books, and to shew that they followed almost always the Ideas and the very words of the Authors of the Old Testament. But as he was a Man of a deep sense,

sense, seeing that they might be turned against the *Socinian* cause, which he favoured too much, he did things which he judged fit to make their authority useless against the *Socinians*. And first he advanced without any proof, that those things which were so like to the Ideas of the New Testament, had been inserted in those Books by Christians, according to their notions, and not according to the notions of the Synagogue. *2ly*, He endeavoured to give another sense to the places, which some Fathers in the second and third Century had quoted from these Books to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour.

Now since the *Socinian* Authors have employed, against the authority of these Apocryphal Books, the very Solutions which *Grotius* made use of to lessen their authority, it is necessary, being resolved to quote them for the settling of the Jewish Tradition, to shew how much *Grotius*, whose steps the *Socinians* trod in, was out in his Judgment.

1. Then I suppose with *Grotius*, that those Apocryphal Books were written by several *Jewish* Authors, many years before Jesus Christ appeared.

The third Book of the *Maccabees*, which is indeed the first, hath been written by a *Jew* of *Egypt*, under *Ptolomæus Philopater*, that is, about two hundred years before the Birth of our Saviour: It contains the History of the Persecution of the *Jews* in *Egypt*, and was cited by *Josephus* in his Book *de Maccabæis*.

The first Book of *Macchabees*, as we call it now, hath been written in *Judea* by a *Jew*, and originally in *Hebrew*, which is lost many Centuries ago. We have the translation of it, which hath been quoted by *Josephus*, who gives often the same acccount of things as we have in that Book. It hath been written probably 150. years before the Birth of our Saviour.

The second Book of *Macchabees* hath originally been written in *Greek* in *Egypt*, and is but an extract of the four Books of *Jason* the *Grecian* a *Jew* of *Egypt*, who had writ the History of the Persecutions which the *Jews* of *Palestina* suffered under the Reign of *Antiochus Epiphanes* and his Successors.

The Book of *Ecclesiasticus* hath been written Originally in *Hebrew* by *Jesus* the Son of *Syrac*, about the time of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, that is, about 280. years before Jesus Christ, and was Translated in *Greek* by the Grandson of *Jesus* the Son of *Syrac*, under *Ptolomy Eucrgetes*. Some dispute if that *Ptolomy* is the first or the second, which is not very material, since there is but a difference of 100. years. *R. Azaria de Rubeis* in his Book *Meor Enaiim*, *ch.* 22. witnesseth that *Ecclesiasticus* is not rejected now by the *Jews*, but is received among them with an unanimous consent; and *David Ganz* saith that they put it in old times among the כתובים, that is, the *Hagiographes*. So in his *Tsemac David*, *ad A.*3448.

The Book of *Wisdom* according to *Grotius* his Judgment is more ancient, having been written in *Hebrew* under *Simon* the High-Priest, who flourished under *Ptolomeus Lagus*. *Grotius*

Grotius thinks that the *Greek* Translation we have of that Book was made by some Christian who hath foisted into that Book many things, which belong more to a Christian Writer, than a *Jew*. He raises such an accusation against the Translator of *Ecclesiasticus*. But it is very easie to confute such a bold Conjecture: First, because that Book was in *Chaldaick* among the *Jews* till the Thirteenth Century, as we see by *Ramban* in his Preface upon the *Pentateuch*, and they never objected such an Interpolation, but lookt upon it as a Book that was worthy of *Salomon*, and probably his Works. It was the Judgment of *R. Azarias de Rubeis*, in the last Century *Imre bina*, *ch.*57.

The Epistle of *Baruch* and of *Jeremy* seem to *Grotius* the Writings of a Pious *Jew*, who had a mind to exhort his People to avoid Idolatry. And 'tis very probable that it was Penned under the Persecutions of *Antiochus*, when it was not sure to any to write in favour of the *Jewish* Religion under his own name.

The Book of *Tobith* seems to have been writ originally in *Chaldaick*, and was among the *Jews* in St. *Jerom*'s time, who knowing not the *Chaldaick* Tongue called for a *Jew* to his assistance to render it into *Hebrew*, that so he might render it in *Latin*, as he saith in his Preface to *Chromatius* and *Heliodorus*. *Grotius* supposes the Book to be very ancient; Others believe, but without any ground, that it was Translated into *Greek* by the Seventy; So that it would have been writ more than 250. years before Jesus Christ. Whatsoever Con-

Conjecture we may form upon the Antiquity of it, it is certain it was in great esteem among Christians in the second Century, since we see that *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Irenæus* have followed his fancy of seven created Angels about the Throne of God, and took that Doctrine for a Truth, although we see no such Idea among the *Jews*, who have the Translation of that Book, but do not now consider it very much.

Grotius thinks that the Book of *Judith* contains not a true History, but an Ingenious Comment of the Author, who lived under *Antiochus Epiphanes*, before the Profanation of the Temple by that Tyrant, to exhort the *Jewish* Nation to expect a wonderful Deliverance from such a Tyranny, which they groaned under: And we see no reason to discard such a Conjecture, although *R. Azarias* thinks *Imre bina, ch.* 51. that this History was alluded to in the Book of *Esdras, ch.* 4. 15. He judges the same of the Additions to the Book of *Daniel, viz.* the Prayer of *Azaria*, the Song of the Three Children in the Furnace, and of the History of *Susanna*, he looks upon them as written by some *Hellenist Jew*.

So the Additions to the Book of *Esther*, he judges to be the work of some *Hellenist*, who invented the Story, which were afterwards admitted among the Holy Writings, because they were Pious, and had nothing which could be lookt upon as contrary to the *Jewish* Religion.

Grotius saith nothing of the third and fourth of *Esdras*, and hath not judged them fit to be

be Commented, probably because they are not accounted in the Canon of the Church of *Rome*. And indeed the fourth is only extant in *Latin*. But after all a Man must have viewed the third with very little judgment who cannot perceive, first, that it is certainly the work of an ancient *Jew* before Jesus Christ his time. 2*ly*, That it was among the *Jews* as a Book of great Authority: *Josephus p.* 362. follows the Authority of that third Book of *Esdras*, in the History of *Zorobabel*.

We have not ancienter Writers than *Clemens Alexandrinus*, St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Ambrose*, who have quoted the 4*th*. Book of *Esdras*, so I am resolved not to make any use of it.

The Antiquity and the *Jewish* Origin of all these Books that we call Apocryphal, being so settled, there is nothing to be done but to consider what is the ground of the Conjecture of *Grotius*, who pronounces boldly in his Preface to the Book of *Wisdom*: *Eum librum nactus Christianus aliquis Græcè non indoctus in Græcum vertit, libero nec ineleganti dicendi genere, & Christiana quædam commodis locis addidit, quod & libro Syracidæ quem dixi evenit, sed in Latino huic magis quam in Græco, non quod nesciam post Esdram explicatius proponi cæpisse patientiam piorum, judicium universale, vitam æternam, supplicia gehennæ, sed quia locutiones quædam magis Evangelium sapiunt quam vetustiora tempora.*

But to speak my mind plainly, this Conjecture of *Grotius* is absolutely false and without any ground. 1. Whence had he this parti-

particular account of the *Jewish* Faith and Religion in the time of *Esdras*, so as to be able to judge by it which was written long after *Esdras*, and to shew that the Notions of these Books are clearer than the Ideas which were among the *Jews* before Jesus Christ? He goes only upon that Principle, that the *Jews* since they were under the *Greek* Empire began to be more acquainted with the Ideas of the Eternal Life, and of Eternal Punishment, and of the last Judgment, than they were before, which is the Principle of *Socinus*, and of his Followers, but that Christians had much clearer Ideas of those Notions than the *Jews* had since *Esdras* his time.

2*ly*. Is it not an intolerable boldness to accuse those Books of having been so interpolated, without giving any proof of it, but his meer Conjecture? I confess there are several various Readings in those Books as there are in Books which having been of a general use, were transcribed many times by Copists of different industry, one more exact and more learned than the other. But to say that a Christian hath interpolated them designedly, is a thing which can no more be admitted than to suppose that they have corrupted the *Greek* Version of the Books of the Old Testament, to which those Books were joined in the *Greek* Bible as soon as it came into the hands of the Christians.

3*ly*. To suppose that a Christian hath been the Author of the Translation of some of those Books, is a thing advanced with great absurdity, since there was a Translation of these

these Books quoted by *Philo* and by St. *Paul* in his Epistles. Now I would ask from *Grotius* how he can prove that there was a second Version of the Book of *Wisdom* made by a Christian after Jesus Christ? what was the need of it, since there was one before Jesus Christ? And if any Christian did undertake such a new one without necessity, how it came to pass that it was received instead of the Version which was in use amongst the *Jews*, and was added to the Books of Scripture, and of the Copies which were in the hands of Christians?

I need not to urge many other absurdities against *Grotius* his Conjecture. I take notice only, 1. That *Grotius* was far from ridiculiug the Book of *Wisdom*, as the *Socinian* Author of the Book against Dr. *Bull* hath done in his Judgment of the Fathers.

2*ly*. That the ridiculing of such an Author as the Book of *Wisdom* sheweth very little Judgment in Mr. *N*. He had better have made use of the Glosses of *Grotius*, than to venture upon such rough handling of an Author quoted by St. *Paul*, whose quoting him giveth him more credit, than he can lose by a thousand censures of a Man who writes so injudiciously.

3*ly*. That the very place which Mr. *N*. ridicules is so manifestly taken from the *Psalm* xix. which contains a Prophecy touching the Messias, and from the Song of *Isaiah*, *ch*. 5. that whosoever reflects seriously upon such a ridiculing of the Book of *Wisdom* made by Mr. *N*. can't but have a mean notion of his sense of Religion.

After all let Mr. *N*. do what he can with the Conjecture of *Grotius*, I am very little con-

concerned in his Judgment; First, because the matter which we are to handle is not the matter which *Grotius* suspects to have been foisted in by some Christian Interpreter. 2*ly*. Because I am resolved to make use in this Controversie only of those places of the Apocryphal Books in which they express the sense of the Old Synagogue before Jesus Christ, as I shall justifie they have done by the consent of the same Synagogue after Jesus Christ; and no body can suspect with any probability of the Old Synagogue that they have borrowed the Ideas of Christians, and have inserted them in their ancient Books, written so long time before Jesus Christ's Birth.

C H A P.

C H A P. VI.

That the Works which go under the name of Philo *the* Jew, *are truly his; and that he writ them a long while before the time of Christ's Preaching the Gospel; and that it does not appear in any of his Works that ever he had heard of Christ, or of the Christian Religion.*

TO shew the Judgment of the Ancient Synagogue in the Points controverted between us, and the *Unitarians*, we make great use of the Writings of *Philo* the *Jew*; which if they are his, it cannot be denied, do put this matter out of Question. Our Adversaries therefore, as it greatly concerns them, do deny that those Works which bear his name, were written by *Philo* the *Jew*.

By whom then were they written? They say by another *Philo* a Christian, who lived toward the end of the second Century, and who, as Mr. *N*. saith, counterfeited the Writings of the famous *Philo* of *Alexandria*, who was sent Embassadour to *Caligula* by those of his own Nation in the year of *Christ* 40.

It is easie to refute this Suggestion of theirs. And yet I cannot but acknowledge it has some kind of colour, from that which we read in *Eusebius* and *Jerome*, who tell us, that *Philo* has given a Character of the Apostolick Christians in his Book *de Therapeutis*: To which

which some have added, that at his second coming to *Rome* under *Claudius*, to be Embassadour at his Court, as he was before at *Caligula*'s, he then became acquainted with St. *Peter* the Apostle of Christ.

I am therefore to prove these Propositions.

1. That those Books we have under the name of *Philo*, are the Works of a *Jew*, of whom there is not the least appearance in his Writings that he knew any thing of Christianity, nor that he ever heard of Jesus Christ or his Apostles.

2. That it appears by the Books themselves that they were written before Jesus Christ began to Preach.

3. That there is no foundation for what *Eusebius* says, and also St. *Jerome*, who Copied from *Eusebius*, concerning *Philo*'s account of a sort of Christians, whom he describes under the name of *Therapeutæ*.

4. That the History of the Conversation between St. *Peter* and *Philo* is a ridiculous Fable, which *Eusebius* took upon hear-say, from he knew not whom, or from an Author, whom he did not think fit to name, for fear it should give no credit to his Story.

The first Proposition, namely, That these Pieces were written by one that was a *Jew* by Religion, this one cannot doubt of, if he considers these following things.

1. That in all these Pieces of *Philo*, wherever he has occasion to make use of Authority, he fetches it only out of the *Jewish* Scrip-

Scriptures. And those are the only Scriptures that he takes upon him to explain. He quotes *Moses* (whom he usually calls the Law-giver), as we do the Sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ. And sometimes, tho very rarely, he quotes other Writings of the Old Testament. But I dare affirm that in all his Treatises, he cites not one passage from the New Testament, which thing alone is sufficient to prove that he was no Christian. For the first Christians used to cite the New Testament with as much care, and even affectation, as the *Jews* did the Old.

But, Secondly, one had need have an Imagination as strong as Mr. *N.* to fancy that a Christian Author in the end of the Second Century could write, as *Philo* does, upon most part of the Books of *Moses* without mixing some touches at least at the Christian Religion. And yet there is no such thing in all *Philo*'s Works. He takes it for his business to make the *Jews* understand their Law, according to their *Midrashim* in an Allegorical way, and to teach the Heathens that their prejudices against the Law of *Moses* were unjust, and that they ought to acknowledg the Divinity of this Law, which he explained to them. This is the end or design of this Author in all his Works.

3*dly*. It appears that he, according to the opinion of the *Jewish* Nation, did expect the Messias as a great Temporal King yet to come, as is evident from the Interpretation he gives of *Balaam*'s Prophecy touching the Messias in his Book *de Præmiis*, *p.* 716.

4*thly*. In all his Works there is nothing peculiar to Christ that Mr. *N.* can alledg, ex-

cept in what is written of the λόγος, which is the very thing in dispute between us and him; but even that doth not hinder, but that the *Jews* themselves finding every thing in *Philo* so agreeable to the Notions that their Ancestors had in his Age, do own them to be the Writings of a *Jew*, and of *Philo* in particular. As we see in *Manasseh ben Israel*, who in many places alledges his Authority, and shews that his Opinions do generally agree with those of their most ancient Authors.

In *Exod.* p. 137.

The second thing I have to shew is, that it appears from the Books themselves and otherwise that many of them were composed before Jesus Christ began to Preach the Gospel. Christ's Preaching began in *Palestine* in the year of the Building of *Rome* 783. But the Author of the Book, *Quod omnis probus sit Liber*, which has always been accounted undoubtedly *Philo*'s, does note, that the obstinate resistance of those of *Xanthus* in *Lycia* against *M. Brutus*, was an affair fresh in memory, as having happened, ἐν ὀλίγῳ πρὸ τοῦ, not much before the writing of that Book. Now this which he tells us of the *Xanthians*, happened not long after the death of *Julius Cæsar*, who was killed on the 13*th.* of *March* in the year of *Rome* 709, for *Brutus* himself was kill'd at the time of the Battel of *Philippi*, which was in *Autumn* in the year 712. Therefore *Philo* could not say, it happened not long since, if he writ so long after as in the year, *Urb.Con.* 783. when Christ began to Preach; for according to the common manner of speaking, no man could say a thing happened not long since, that happened before the remembrance of any man then living. But

But if that Book was writ before Christ began to preach the Gospel, much more were all those Books which we make use of against the *Unitarians*: for according to the Order, in which these Books are rankt by *Eusebius*, this Book, *Quod omnis probus est Liber*, was one of the last that *Philo* writ. The first that *Eusebius* names were the Three Books of Allegories; after which he goes on to the Books of Questions and Answers upon *Genesis*, and upon *Exodus*; he tells us besides, That *Philo* took pains to examine particular difficulties, which might arise from several Histories in those Books; and names the several Books that *Philo* writ of this sort. This Order of his Books was observed in the Manuscripts, which *Eusebius* hath exactly followed; and it is agreeable enough to the *Jewish* Method of handling the Scripture by way of Questions and Answers, which is still the Title of many *Jewish* Books of this Nature.

We may gather the same truth from another part of *Philo*, which tells us expressly that he studi'd the Scriptures, *Primâ ætate*, when he was young; and he complains of being called afterwards to publick business; and that he had not now leisure to attend to the study of the Scriptures, as formerly [*Lib. de Leg. spec. p.* 599.] Therefore all his Books before were written in his younger days, and especially his Three Books of Allegories, which *Eusebius* placeth first before any of the rest.

Josephus in his *Antiq. Lib.* xviii. *c.* 10. assures us, That *Philo* was the Chief and most considerable of the *Jews* employed by those

of *Alexandria*, in the Embassy to *Caligula*. This man, saith he, eminent among those of his Nation, appeared before *Caligula* his Death, which was, *A. U. C.* 793. That is to say, in the 40th year of our Lord. Now *Philo*, in the History of his Legation to *Caligula*, says of himself, That he was at that time all grey with Age, that is, 70 years old, according to the *Jewish* Notion of a man with grey hair, *Pirke Avoth. c.* 5. Suppose then that he was 70 years old when he appeared before *Caligula*, it follows that he was born in the year of *Rome* 723. Suppose also that he began to write at 30 years old, it will fall in with the year of *Rome* 793. That is to say 30 years before Christ preach'd in *Judæa*. For Jesus Christ began not to preach till the year of *Rome* 783.

The Third Assertion is as easy to be justified. For though *Baronius* makes much of that fancy of *Eusebius*, who, to prove the Antiquity of Monastic Life, held that *Philo*'s *Therapeutæ* were Christians; and who was herein followed by St. *Hierom* without Examination; yet others of the most Learned Papists, as particularly *Lucas Holstenius*, and *Hen. Valesius* have confest, that herein *Eusebius* was mistaken. Indeed one need only read the Book *de Therapeutis* it self, or even the first period of it, to be convinced that those whom *Philo* there describes, were the *Jews* of the *Essen* Sect, and the *Essens* were, as *Josephus* plainly shews in the account he gives of them, as much *Jews* by Religion, as the *Pharisees* were. *Photius*, who was a better Critic than *Eusebius*, has very well corrected

rected his mistake, and shewn, That the Book *de Therapeutis* describes the Life of a Sect of the *Jews*, and not of the *Christians*. It is a surprizing thing that *Eusebius* should commit such a mistake, because he himself in his Books *de Præp. Evang.* do's cite a long passage from *Porphyry* taken out of *Josephus*, in the transcribing whereof *Eusebius* could not but see many thing related of the *Essens*, such as *Philo* brought into his account of the *Therapeutæ*.

But to this it may be Objected; do's not *Photius* report that *Philo* being at *Rome* in *Claudius* his time, met with St. *Peter* there, and contracted a friendship with him, which occasioned his writing that Book *de Therapeutis*, as of the Disciples of St. *Mark*, who was himself the Disciple of St. *Peter*? Doth not *Eusebius* fix this meeting of *Philo* with St. *Peter* to the reign of *Claudius*, when he saith he read in full Senate his Book, Intituled, *The Virtues of Caius Caligula*; (Tho it was the scope of that Book to shew the impiety of that Monster that would be worshipped as a God) for which *Philo* was so much admired, that not only this but his other pieces were ordered to be put into the publick Library, as pieces of such great value, that they were worthy to be preserved for ever?

I know all this, and do believe that *Eusebius* did not invent all this History. But if there be any truth in it, they might be those Books of *Philo*, which he writ against *Flaccus* (who died *A. D.* 38.) and the account of his Embassy to *Caius*, with three other Treatises containing the Sufferings of the *Jews* under

Caius, now lost, that were put in the Publick Library. For I cannot imagine, that the *Roman* Senate should lay up in their publick Archives his other pieces, which regarded only the Laws of the *Jews*.

But as for that which he tells us, that *Philo* saw St. *Peter* at *Rome*, and there made an acquaintance with him, it is a meer dream of *Eusebius*, who fancying that his Book *de Therapeutis* was written in praise of the first Christians of *Alexandria*, and that they were Disciples of St. *Mark*, did go on to imagine, that he might possibly have some conversation with St. *Peter*, and St. *Mark*, and so came to write in commendation of these first Christians. This meeting of St. *Peter* and *Philo* at *Rome*, in *Claudius* his time, (howsoever *Eusebius* fancied it as a thing that would give some colour to his Opinion concerning the *Therapeutæ*) could not be true, because, as it appears by the Writings of the New Testament, St. *Peter* was as far from being at *Rome* in the 42*d*. year of our Lord, that is, in the second year of *Claudius*, who succeeded *Caligula*, that he did not leave *Judæa* or *Syria* till after the Death of *Agrippa* (the same that imprisoned St. *Peter*, and) who died in the fourth of *Claudius*. All the Learned now a days know that St. *Peter* came not to *Rome* before the first year of *Nero* (if he came thither so early) *i.e. A. D.* 55. at which time it is necessary that *Philo* who was all Grey *A. D.* 40. and consequently was then about seventy years of age, should be full eighty five years old, which is an age very unfit for travel or business, or even for living so far from ones own home, as *Rome* was from *Alexandria*. This

This shews what credit may be given to this report in *Photius*, that *Philo* was a Christian, but afterward turned Apostate. So it is, all Errors are fruitful, and from one Fable there uses to arise many more.

As for *Eusebius* he is the less to be excused for writing what he doth of St. *Mark*'s Gospel, which he saith was first approved by St. *Peter* at this time of his being at *Rome*, and then made use of by St. *Mark* at *Alexandria* for the converting of those *Jews* whom *Philo* describes under the name of *Therapeutæ*. When as *Eusebius* sheweth us himself elswhere in his History, he had so great an Authority as that of *Irenæus* to assure him, that St. *Mark*'s Gospel was not written till after St. *Peter*'s Death. [*Euseb. Hist.* v. 8.] All that can be said for him, is only this, that when he was writing this passage of *Philo*, he did not think of what he had writ before. Indeed if he had thought of it, he had not been that man we take him for, if he had suffered it to pass, as it stands now in his History.

I thought it was proper to enter into this disquisition concerning the Writings of *Philo*, and the time when they were written, that I might leave no doubt in the minds of my Readers, concerning the Authority of *Philo*, whom I intend to produce as an authentick Testimony of the Opinions of the Synagogue before our Lord, in the matters disputed between us and the *Unitarians*.

Proceed we to the *Chaldee* Paraphrases.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Authority and Antiquity of the Chaldee *Paraphrases.*

I Shall have occasion, in many points, to cite the Paraphrases of the *Jews* upon the Books of the Old Testament; and perhaps it may appear strange to some, that I oftentimes cite them without distinguishing between those which pass for ancient, and those which are reputed by Criticks altogether modern. Therefore I think my self obliged once for all to give the reasons of my doing thus, and to satisfie my Reader thereupon.

I shall not spend time to discover the Original of these Paraphrases. It is enough to mind the Reader, that the *Jews* having almost forgot their *Hebrew* in the *Babylonian* Captivity, 'twas needful for the People's understanding the Holy Scriptures, which were read in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day, that some persons skilful both in the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* should explain to the People every Verse in *Chaldee*, after that they had read it to them in *Hebrew*. The *Jews* make this Practice as ancient as the times of their return from the *Babylonian* Captivity, *Neh.* viii. 8. as one may see in the *Talmud*, Title *Nedarim*, *ch.* 4.

The *Jews* all agree, that this way of Translating the Scriptures was made by word of

of mouth only for a long time. But it is hard to conceive that they which interpreted in that manner did write nothing for the use of Posterity. It seems much more probable to believe, that from time to time these Interpreters writ something, especially on the most difficult places, and those which were least understood.

The first, according to the *Jewish* Writers, who attempted to put into Writing his *Chaldee* Version of the Prophets first and last according to the *Jewish* distinction, (except *Daniel*) or rather, who interpreted the whole Text in order, was *Jonathan* the Son of *Uzziel*; who also not contenting himself always to render the *Hebrew*, word for word, into *Chaldee*, does often mix the Traditional explication of the difficultest Prophecies with his simple Translation. *Magill. c.* 3.

The *Jews* seem to agree that this *Jonathan* lived a 100. years before the destruction of *Jerusalem*; that is to say, he lived in the reign of *Herod* the Great, about thirty years before the Birth of our Lord. And some Criticks believe our Saviour does cite his *Chaldee* Paraphrase *Luc.* iv. 18. in quoting the Text *Isa.* lx. 2. Thus much may at least be said for it, that all that which is there cited, does agree better with his *Targum*, than with the Original Text.

Onkelos a Proselyte, was he according to their common account, who turned the five Books of *Moses* into *Chaldee*. This Work is rather a pure simple Translation, than a Paraphrase; notwithstanding it must be allowed, that in divers places he does not endeavour

vour so much to give us the Text word for word, as to clear up the sense of certain places, which otherwise could not well be understood by the people. This *Onkelos* according to the common opinion of the *Jews*, saw *Jonathan*, and lived in the time of that ancient *Gamaliel*, who was Master of the Apostle St. *Paul*, as some would have it.

We find in *Megillah*, *c.* 1. that he Composed his *Targum* under the Conduct of *R. Eliezer*, and of *R. Josua*, after the year of our Lord 70, and that he died in the year of our Lord 108, and that his *Targum* was immediately received into the publick use of the *Jews*; what other *Targums* there were on the five Books of *Moses*, having almost wholly lost their credit and their authority.

As to the other Sacred Books which the *Jews* call *Cetouvim*, or *Hagiographes*, they ascribe the *Targums* of the *Psalms*, the *Proverbs*, and *Job*, to *R. Joseph Cæcus*, and affirm that he lived a long time after *Onkelos*. And for the *Targums* of the other Books, they look on them as works of Anonymous Authors. However the most part of these *Targums* have been Printed under the name of *Jonathan*, as if he had been Author of them all.

There are moreover some scraps of a Paraphrase upon the five Books of *Moses*, which is called the *Jerusalem Targum*; and there is another that bears the name of *Jonathan* upon the *Pentateuch*, and which some Learned *Jews* have said to be his. As doth *R. Azaria* (*Imrebinah*, *c.* 25.) and the Author of the *Chain of Tradition*, *p.* 28. after *R. Menahem de Rekanati*, who cites it under the name of *Jonathan*, following some Ancient MSS. These *Targums* ordinarily exceed the bounds of a Paraphrase, and enter into Explications, some of which are strange enough, and appear to be the work of divers Commentators, who among some good things have very often mixed their own idle Fancies and Dreams.

Beckius nineteen years ago, published a Paraphrase on the two Books of *Chronicles*, of which also there is a MSS. at *Cambridge*. This deserves almost the same Character with these Paraphrases I spoke of last. For the Author of this, as well as those before mentioned, does often intermingle such Explications as taste of the Commentator, with those which appear to have been taken from the Ancient *Perushim*, or Explications of the most Eminent Authors of the Synagogue. A Man must be mighty credulous if he gives credit to all the fables which the *Jews* bring in their *Talmud* to extoll the authority of *Jonathan* his *Targum*, and he must have read these Pieces with very little attention or judgment, who should maintain that they are entirely and throughout the Works of the Authors whose names they bear, or that they are of the same antiquity in respect of all their parts.

Onkelos is so simple that it seems nothing, or very little, has been added to him, and he has been in so great esteem among the *Jews*, that they have commonly inserted his Version after the Text of *Moses*, verse for verse, in the Ancient Manuscripts of the *Pentateuch*. And

And from thence we may judge if there is any ground for the Conjecture of some *Jews* who would persuade us that it is only an Abridgment of the *Targum* of *Jonathan* upon the *Pentateuch*. Certainly *Jonathan* his *Targum* upon the *Pentateuch* must be of a very dubious origin, since we see that the *Zohar* cites from it the first words which are not to be found in it, but in the *Targum* of *Jerusalem*, (*fol.*79.*col.*1. *l.*17.) It is uncertain if the *Targum* of *Jerusalem* hath been a continued *Targum*, or only the Notes of some Learned *Jew* upon the Margent of the *Pentateuch*, or an abridgment of *Onkelos*, for it hath a mixture of *Chaldaick*, *Greek*, *Latin* and *Persian* words, which sheweth it hath been written in latter times according to the judgment of *R. Elias Levita*.

Jonathan, who explained the former and the latter Prophets, has not been so happy as *Onkelos*, for it seems those that Copied his *Targum* have added many things to it, some of which discover their Authors to have lived more than 700 years after him; one may also see there a medley of different *Targums*, of which the *Targum* on *Isai.* xlix. is a plain instance.

As to the *Targums* on all the other Holy Books which the *Jews* call the first Prophets, it is visible that all their parts are not equally ancient. Those which we have on *Joshua* and *Judges* are simple enough and Literal. That on *Ruth* is full of Talmudical Ideas. The same judgment may be made of those on the two Books of *Samuel*. Those which we have on the two Books of *Kings*, are a little freer from additions. But that on *Esther* is rather a Com-

Commentary, that collects several Opinions upon difficult places, than a Paraphrase. In that on *Job* attributed to *R. Joseph* in the *Jews* Edition at *Venice* in Folio, *Anno* 1515. there are divers *Targums* cited in express Terms, as there are also in the *Targum* on the *Psalms*, which bears the name of *R. Joseph* in the aforesaid Edition of *Venice*. One may also observe many Additions in the *Targums* on the *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes*, but especially in that upon the *Canticles*, all which have been published under the name of *R. Joseph*. I have said almost as much of that on the two Books of *Chronicles*, which *Beckius* published about eighteen or nineteen years ago.

This being so, one may very well ask, with what justice do you ascribe these Books to those, who as the *Jews* now say, were the Authors of them? when by their own confession *Onkelos* on the five Books of *Moses*, is perhaps the only Translator in whom you find none of these marks of corruption, which you acknowledg in the other *Targums* you quote. For the other *Targums*, it may be said, that we ought to leave them out of the Dispute; unless we would impose the new Sentiments of the *Jews* that lived long after Christ's time, under the pretence of producing the opinions of the ancient Synagogue before Jesus Christ. One may insist upon it that we are to quote the Books of *Onkelos* only, and lay the other aside as Books of no authority, since we do confess, that they are full of Additions, in which there are many Fables and Visions borrowed from the Talmudical *Jews*.

I might

I might hope to satisfie any reasonable Reader, that sticks at this difficulty, by telling him: First, in few words, that I will scarce ever cite any of these *Targums*, but when they say the same thing that *Onkelos* doth. And, secondly, that these as well as *Onkelos* are owned by the *Jews*. And it cannot with any colour of reason be imagined, that the *Jews* since Christ's time have adopted Books contrary to their Religion, and used them in their common reading, as true Versions of the Law and the Prophets. It is certain that the *Jews* many Centuries ago have taken them for such. And therefore these Books in whatsoever time they were written, are sufficient testimonies of the Opinions of the Synagogue.

But I have something more considerable to offer for the establishing of the Authority of these Paraphrases, as well as of that of *Onkelos* in our dispute with our *Unitarians*, against whom we shall have occasion to make use of the Testimony of these Paraphrases. For this one needs only examine these Paraphrases with an ordinary attention. I pray therefore the Reader to consider,

1. That whatsoever has been said in general, for the necessity that there was, for the making of these *Chaldee* Paraphrases, the same does also confirm the antiquity of all these Paraphrases; if not, as to every part of them, yet at least, as to the main of these Paraphrases, such as we now have them almost on every Book of the Old Testament.

2*ly*. We see in the *Misna* a clear mention made of some *Targums* upon the Law and the

the first Prophets, *Megillah*, *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 9, & 10. which must be *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*.

3*ly*. We read in the *Gemarah* of Sabbath, *cap.* 16. *fol.* 115. *col.* 1. an account of the *Targum* upon *Job* which *Raban Gamaliel* (the Grand-father to *R. Judah*, who compiled the *Misna*) had read. Now if the Paraphrase on the Books of *Job* was in common use so anciently; who can doubt, but that they had the like Versions also on the Books of *Moses*, and on the Prophets? Nay we see that Jesus Christ upon the Cross cites the xxii. *Psalm* according to the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, and not according to the *Hebrew*. This he did, that he might be understood by them that were present at that time; from whence it follows that the *Jews* in *Judea* had a Paraphrase of the Book of *Psalms*, and that that Paraphrase was already received among them, before the time of our Blessed Saviour.

I know some Criticks will not allow the *Misnah* which speaks of the *Targums* to be so ancient as I do. Their great reason is, that this Book is cited by none of the Fathers who lived just after it was written, and that it is mentioned by no body before *Justinian* the Emperour his time. But this Objection proceeds only from an oversight of these Criticks, who have not observed, that although I should grant, what they suppose to be true, it would not weaken the Authority of the *Misnah*, when the Author of the *Misnah* does witness the antiquity of the *Targums*; because the *Misnah* is not a Book of a common form, but a collection of many old Decisions, as the

the Book of *Justinian*, which is called *Digestum*, which is not *Justinian* his work, but his Collection; or as the Book of *Gratian*, which is called *Decretum*, which is nothing but the Compilation of Canons, or Decisions of Fathers, who lived six or seven hundred years before *Gratian*. That hath been judiciously remark'd by *Paul* Archbishop of *Burgos* in the Preface to his *Scrutinium*, and in this judgment he follows *Maymonides* in his Preface upon his *Jad Kazaka*. And indeed we must observe that almost all the famous *Rabins* which are mentioned in the *Misnah* are the very Men which are mentioned by St. *Jerome* as the great Authors of the *Judaick* Traditions.

Com. on *Isa.* 8. 14.

If the Learned Men do not like the Conjecture of *R. Elias Levita* upon the *Targum* of *Jerusalem*, but would have it to be the rest of an entire work upon the *Pentateuch*; Let them examine how it came to pass that the *Jerusalem* Paraphrase on the *Pentateuch* is almost all lost. So that there remain only some few bits of it here and there on some Texts; and then they will find that perhaps it is not lost, but that it subsists in great measure in that which is under *Jonathan* his name on the *Pentateuch*. Whence it is probably that in some MSS. it bears the name of the *Targum* of *Jerusalem*, and in other's the name of *Jonathan*'s *Targum*: It is easie to judge how this came to pass. The *Jerusalem* Targum differed from that of *Jonathan* but in some places; or perhaps it was the very *Targum* of *Jonathan* which was augmented from time to time by divers Explications. Then when the *Jews* came to make their

their Paraphrase no longer than their Text, that they might have the Text and the Paraphrase both together in their Bibles, they did not give themselves the trouble to transcribe the *Jerusalem* Paraphrase all at length; But they contented themselves with transcribing those parts where it appeared to have some difference from that of *Jonathan*; and this they did after so scrupulous a manner, that they transcribed the Passages of the *Jerusalem Targum*, that agree in the sense, and differ only in the words, as well as those that have a different sense from that of *Jonathan*.

I know very well that the *Jews* speak of several Paraphrases, besides that of *Jonathan* on the Prophets, and that of *Onkelos* on the Books of *Moses*. As for instance, they speak of a *Targum* of *R. Joseph*, who they say, has translated the Books of the Prophets.

But as to this it ought to be considered: 1. That it was the *Jews* Custom to teach their Scholars these Paraphrases not from a Book, but from their memory, and by heart; and so the Scholars might very well ascribe to their Masters, that which they had learnt from their mouths, and their verbal instructions, as well as if it had been delivered to them in writing. 2. That the same places, which are quoted from the Paraphrase of *R. Joseph* on some Books of the Prophets, are to be found in express terms in *Jonathan*'s Paraphrase, which the *Jews* esteem more ancient than *Onkelos* who writ on the Law. 3. *R. Joseph*, whom they quote, does himself cite the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, as being of

Authority in his time, and therefore it was not his work. And this appears from his Confession, that he could never have understood the words of *Isai.* viii. 6. without the help of the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, *Gemara, ch.* xi. *tit. Sanhedr. fol.* 95.

But notwithstanding the antiquity of these Paraphrases, I own they contain Additions very new, which shew that after they were written, they were in such places enlarged with the Glosses of Doctors that applied themselves to the Study of the Law, and took pains to shew how one part of it depended upon another; of which we find nothing in *Onkelos*, which is almost a verbal translation of the *Hebrew* Text into *Chaldee*. And thus 1. we find in many places the connexion of one History with another, which is very often the imagination of a *Rabbin* who fancied what he pleased, and fathered it upon *Moses*. 2. We find Explications in these later *Targums* different from the former ones, yet added to the former with an impudence not to be endured, and this in several places. 3. We there find long Narrations, which have no other foundation, than their method of explaining Scripture by the way of *Notarikon*, (as they call it) as where we read of the five Sins of *Esau* which he committed on the same day in which he sold his birthright to *Jacob*; and in pursuance of their manner of explaining Scripture by *Gematria*, of which *Rittangel* on *Jetzira* has given some examples, *p.* 31, 32, 33.

But all this makes nothing against the authority of those places in the Paraphrase, where

where they do little more than render the Text out of *Hebrew* into *Chaldee*. In them there was no occasion to shew any more than the sense of the words, such as the Paraphrasts had received by Tradition from their Forefathers. Whereas the Authors of those Additions thereby made a shew of Learning out of the common road, and gave themselves the pleasure to see their own fictions come into such credit, that they were received as the Oracles of God. But beyond that, we must take notice, that, as on one hand those *Targums* have been enlarged by so many Additions, so on the other hand they have been altered in many places, and new Ideas substituted to the old. To shew the alteration which was made in those *Targums* by Modern *Jews*, we can remark a thing which hath been often taken notice of by *Buxtorf*, in his Lexicon *Talmud*, *viz.* that there are many places cited from those *Targums* 500 years ago by the Author of *Arouk*, that are not to be found in them as they are now in Print. So we can prove clearly that new Ideas have been put in instead of the old, chiefly upon the points controverted between *Jews* and Christians. For in many places where St. *Jerome* in his Comments upon the Prophets brings the common explication of the *Jews* as agreeing with the explication of Christians, we find the *Targum* brings an explication quite different from what it was to be according to St. *Jerome*'s account.

It appears by this the *Jews* have done in their Books the same thing which Papists

 have

have done in the Books of the Fathers. They have added many things to help their Cause, and they have cut out many places which might have done great service to Truth.

As for the Additions then I will scarce cite any of them, but when it is evident that they speak the sense of the Ancients; and truly whatever one may say of the Corruptions of these *Jewish* Paraphrases, I will maintain that it is as easie for an attentive Reader to distinguish these Corruptions from the ancient Text (which it seems *Arias Montanus* had a design to do in a particular Treatise) as it is for one that looks on an old Pot or Kettle to tell where the Tinker has been at work, and to distinguish his Clouts from the Original metal. The ancient pieces have a sort of simplicity that makes them to be valued, and which easily shews their antiquity. The Additions are the rambling fancies of bold Commentators, which they devised in later times as occasion required, and thrust them upon the ancient Paraphrasts who lived in those times when there was no such occasion, nor could they foresee that there would be any such in after-times.

As for example, we do not find that the *Jews* before Christ's time ever spoke of two *Messias*; the one the Son of *David*, who was to reign gloriously; the other a suffering *Messias*, the Son of *Joseph*, of the Tribe of *Ephraim*. The reason is plain, for they had no occasion for that fancy of a suffering *Messias*. That arose upon their Disputes with the Christians, who proved that the Sufferings of Christ

Christ were no other than what the *Messias* was to suffer according to the Prophecies of Scripture. At first the *Jews* tried other ways to avoid the force of these Prophecies, but when no other would do, they came to this, to devise another *Messias* the Son of *Joseph*, and to give him the Sufferings which the Scripture attributes to the *Messias* the Son of *David*.

In a word, all these Conceits, of which the greatest part of these Additions do consist, do so evidently demonstrate their Novelty, that when one is acquainted with a little of the History of the World as well as that of the *Jews*, it is scarce possible that he should take them for the Text of *Jonathan*, or of the ancient Paraphrasts. Besides all this, in the Modern Paraphrases themselves we find very often these words, *Another Targum*, and sometimes *yet*, *Another Targum*, which shews that the following words are not the ancient *Targum*, but are the Additions of some Modern Authors, whom the Copyers of the Paraphrasts have joyned as a new light to the ancient.

Whether the *Jews*'s inserting such things into their Paraphrases, has been out of fondness of these Discoveries which appeared to them new; or whether they have found it turn to account, to insert these Additions in the Body of their ancient Paraphrases, thereby to enhance the value of them; or whether they thought, by publishing them under the Names of those ancient Commentators whose Authority is so venerable, to wrest from the Christians all the advantages they

might draw from any thing in their Paraphrases; the things that they added being oftentimes contrary to what the Ancients did teach; is a secret among the *Jews*; but a secret little worth, since the Providence of God has preserved the *Apocryphal* Books, and the Books of *Philo*, which can give us so much light into the knowledg of what is ancient, and what is modern, in these Paraphrases.

I will add nothing upon this matter, but this, that we see in the most ancient Books of the *Jews*, as in the Books call'd *Rabboth*, *Mechista*, and in their old *Midrashim* almost all composed before the *7th.* Century, and in the *Talmud* of *Babylon*, the same Ideas, and the same Doctrine which we meet in the *Apocryphal* Books, and in *Philo*'s Writings. And those Ideas have been constantly followed by the most considerable part of the *Jews*, those very Men who have their name from their constant sticking to the old Tradition of their Forefathers.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

That the Authors of the Apocryphal *Books did acknowledg a Plurality, and a Trinity in the Divine Nature.*

HAving finished our General Reflexions on the Traditional Sense of the Scriptures, which was receiv'd among the *Jews* before the time of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Books wherein we can find such a Tradition, it is time we should come to the chief matter we designed to treat of. The Question is, Whether the *Jews* before Christ's time had any notion of a Trinity. For the *Socinians* would make us believe, that *Justin Martyr* having been formerly a *Platonist*, and then turning Christian, was the first that invented this Doctrine, or rather adopted it out of the *Platonick* into the Christian Divinity; and that neither the *Jewish* nor the Christian Church had ever before conceived any Notion of a Trinity, or of any Plurality in the Divine Essence.

The Doctrine of the Trinity supposes the Divine Essence to be common to three Persons, distinguished from one another by incommunicable Properties. These Persons are called by St. *John*, 1 *Joh.* v. 7. the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. *There are Three* (saith he) *that bear Witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these Three are One.*

 This

This Personal distinction supposes the Father not to be the Son, nor the Holy Ghost, and that the Son is not the Father, nor the Holy Spirit; Revelation teaching that the Son is begotten of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father by the Son. And this distinction is the foundation of their Order, and of their Operations.

For although the Unity of the Divine Nature makes it necessary that these three Persons should all co-operate in the Works of God *ad extra*, as we call them, nevertheless there being a certain order among the Persons, and a distinction founded in their Personal Properties, the Holy Scripture mentioneth an Oeconomy in their Operations; so that one work *ad extra* is ascribed to the Father, another to the Son, and a third to the Holy Spirit.

But this distinction of Persons, all partaking of the same common Nature and Majesty, hinders not their being equally the Object of that Worship, which Religion commands us to pay to God.

I touch this matter but very briefly, because my business is only to examine whether the *Jews* had any notion of this Doctrine. And our Opinion is this, that though the Gospel has proposed that Doctrine more clearly and distinctly, yet there were in the Old Testament sufficient notices of it, so that the *Jews* before Christ's time did draw from thence their Notions concerning it.

On the contrary the *Socinians* maintain, that this Doctrine is not only alike foreign to the

the Books of the Old and New Testament, but that it was altogether unknown to the *Jews* before and after Christ, till *Justin Martyr* first brought it into the Church.

In opposition to which, I affirm for truth, 1. That the *Jews* before Jesus Christ, had a notion of a Plurality in God, following herein certain Traces of this Doctrine that are to be found in the Books of *Moses*, and the Prophets.

2. That the same *Jews* following the Scriptures of the Old Testament did acknowledg a Trinity in the Divine Nature.

I begin the Examination of this Subject by considering the Notions of the Authors of the *Apocryphal* Books. Now one cannot expect that these Authors should have explained their mind with relation to the notions of a Plurality, and of a Trinity in the Godhead, as if they had been Interpreters of the Books of the Old Testament. But they express it sufficiently without that, and speak in such a manner, that no body can deny that they must have had those very Notions, when it appears that their Expressions in speaking of God, supposes the Notions of a Plurality in the Godhead, and of a Trinity in particular. Let us consider some of those Expressions.

1. They were so full of the notion of a Plurality, which is expressed in *Gen.* i. 26. that the Author of *Tobith* hath used it as the Form of Marriage among the *Jews* of old, *Let us make unto him an aid.* So *Chap.* 8. 6. *Thou madest Man, and gavest him Eve his Wife for an helper and stay; of them came Mankind: Thou hast*

hast said, It is not good that Man should be alone; Let us make unto him an aid like unto himself; whereas in the *Hebrew* it is only, *I shall make.*

2*ly.* We see that they acknowledg the Creation of the World by the Word of God, and by the Holy Ghost; as *David, Psal.*xxxiii. 6. So the Book of *Wisdom, Ch.* ix. 1. *O God of my Fathers, and Lord of mercy, who hath made all things with thy Word*, or more properly *by thy Word*, as it is explained in the 2. *vers.* and *ver.* 4. he asketh Wisdom in these words, *Give me Wisdom that sitteth by thy Throne.* And *v.* 17. *Thy counsel who hath known? except thou give Wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above.* Where he distinguisheth the Λόγος, or Wisdom, and the Holy Spirit, from God, to whom he directs his Prayer. And so the Book of *Judith, ch.*xvi. 13, 14. *I will sing unto the Lord a new Song. O Lord, thou art great and glorious, wonderful in strength, and invincible. Let all creatures serve thee, for thou speakest, and they were made, thou didst send forth thy Spirit, and it created them, and there is none that can resist thy voice.*

3*ly.* They speak of the Emanation of the Word from God: Those are the words of the Book of *Wisdom, ch.* vii. 25. *For she is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty; therefore can no defiled thing fall into her.* That description of Wisdom deserves to be considered, as we have it in the same place, *ver.* 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. *For Wisdom which is the worker of All things, taught me; for in her is an understanding spirit, holy, one only, manifold, subtil, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good. Kind to man, stedfast, sure, free from care, having all power, over-seeing all things, and going through all understanding, pure, and most subtil Spirits; For Wisdom is more moving than any motion; she passeth and goeth through all things, by reason of her pureness. For she is the brightness of the everlasting Light, the unspotted mirrour of the power of God, and the image of his Goodness.* And indeed St. *Paul, Heb.* i. 3. hath borrowed from thence what we read touching the Son, that he is the brightness of God's glory, and the express Image of his Person. So the Book of *Ecclesiasticus* saith, *ch.* xxv. 3. *That it is come out of the mouth of the most High.*

4*ly.* There are several Names in Scripture which serve to express the second Person, the Son, the Word, the Wisdom, the Angel of the Lord, but who is the Lord indeed. Now those Authors use all these Names to express a second Person.

For they acknowledge a Father; and a Son, by a natural consequence: Thus the Author of *Ecclesiasticus, ch.* li. 10. *I called upon the Lord the father of my Lord*, in the same way as *David* speaks of the *Messias, Psal.* ii. and *Psal.* cx. and as *Solomon* in his *Proverbs, ch.* viii. 25. as of a Son in the bosom of his Father, and *ch.* xxx. 4. *What is his Sons name, if thou canst tell?*

They speak of the Λόγος as the Creator of all things, so the Author of *Wisdom, ch.* ix. 1. *O God of my Fathers, and Lord of mercy, who hath made all things with thy word.* Or more properly *by thy Word.* And so they call that Wisdom

Wisdom *the Worker of all things*, Wisd. *ch.* vii. 22.

They speak of the Wisdom in the same words as *Solomon* doth, *Prov.* iii. and *ch.* viii. 22. where he expresseth the true notion of Eternity. And indeed they attribute to her, to have been eternal, *Eccluſ. ch.* iv. 18.

They refer constantly to God himself, that is, to the Λόγος of God, as we shall hereafter shew at large, what is attributed to the Angel of the Lord in many places of the Books of *Moses*, as to have delivered the *Israelites* from the Red Sea, so *Wisd. ch.* xix. 9. *They went at large like horses, and leaped like lambs, praising thee, O Lord, who hadst delivered them.* Again, to have had his Throne in a cloudy Pillar, *Eccluſ.* xxiv. 4. To have been caused by the Creator of all things to rest and to have his dwelling in *Jacob*, and to have his inheritance in *Israel*, *Ibid. v.* 8. and so to have given his memorial to his Children, which is the Law commanded for an heritage into the Congregation of *Jews*, *Ib.* 23.

So they attribute to him to have spoken with *Moses*, *Eccluſ. ch.* xlv. 5. *He made him to hear his voice, and brought him into the dark cloud, and gave him commandments before his face, even the Law of life and knowledg, that he might teach Jacob his Covenants, and Israel his Judgments.*

Again, to come down from Heaven to fight against the *Egyptians*, Wisd. *ch.* xviii. 15, 16, 17. *Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce man of war into the midst of a land of destruction.* And brought thine unfeigned Commandment *as a sharp sword*, and standing up filled all things with *death*, and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the *Earth*.

So they maintain that the Angel who appeared to *Joshuah*, *ch.* 5. was the Lord himself, so the Author of *Ecclesiasticus*, *ch.* xlvi. 5, 6. *He call'd upon the most high Lord when the enemies pressed upon him on every side, and the great Lord heard him. And with hailstones of mighty power he made the battle to fall violently upon the Nations, and in the descent* [of Bethoron] *he destroyed them that resisted, that the Nations might know all their strength, because he fought in the sight of the Lord, and he followed the mighty one.* They refer the Miracles wrought by *Elias* to the Λόγος, as you see in *Ecclesiasticus*, *ch.* xlviii. 3, 4, 5. *By the Word of the Lord he shut up the Heaven, and also three times brought down fire. O Elias, how wast thou honoured in thy wondrous deeds! and who may glory like unto thee! Who didst raise up a dead man from death, and his soul from the place of the dead by the Word of the most High.*

As there is nothing more common in the Old Testament than to call the Λόγος the Angel of the Lord, because the Father sent him to do all things under the Old Dispensation, so one can see that there is nothing more ordinary in the Apocryphal Books, than to speak of an Angel in particular, to whom is attributed all things, which could not be performed, but by God.

Three things prove clearly that they did not conceive a created Angel, but an Angel who is God.

1. Be-

1. Because they have this Maxim, according to the constant Divinity of the *Jews*, built upon Scripture, *Deut.* xxxii. 9. that God did take *Israel* for his Portion among all the Nations of the World, as if he had left other Nations to the conduct of Angels; so *Esth. ch.* xiii. 15.

2*ly*. Because they refer to the Λόγος some Histories of the Old Testament, which the *Jews* till this day refer to an Uncreated Angel, or to the Λόγος or *Shekina* or *Memra da Jehova*, as I shall prove afterwards. We see that *Wisd. ch.* xvi. 12. *For it was neither herb, nor mollifying Plaister that restored them to health, but thy Word, O Lord, which healeth all things.* So *Wisd. ch.* xviii. 15, 16, 17. *Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce man of war, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword, and standing up filled all things with death, and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the earth.* I thought fit to repeat this place here, to make Mr. *N.* ashamed, who hath exposed those Ideas, and laught at them, which I believe he would not have done if he had reflected upon two things; one is, That this Λόγος who is spoken of, is that very *man of war* mentioned in *Moses* his Canticle, *Exod.* xii. 3. and in *Judith, ch.* ix. 7. The other is, that St. *Paul* hath followed the Notions of the Book of *Wisdom*, speaking of a sharp sword, which is to be understood not of the Gospel, but of the Λόγος, *Heb.* x. 12. But Mr. *N.* was in the right to laugh at such an authority, which destroys to the ground the *Unitarians* Principles; for nothing can be more

more clear, than that this Author acknowledges a Plurality in God; that the Λόγος must be a Person, and a Person equal to the Father, being set upon the Royal Throne.

3*ly*. Because they bring such appearances of that Angel, which shew they conceived him as the God who ruled *Israel*, and who had taken their Temple for the place of his abode. And on the contrary, they speak of God, whom they considered as dwelling in the Temple, in the same words which are used in Scripture, when it is spoken of the *name of God*, *Exod.* xxiii. 21. and 1. *Sam.* viii. 16. of the *Angel of the Covenant*, *Malach.* iii. 1. and such expressions. So you see in the 1. Book of *Esdras, ch.* ii. 5, 7. *If therefore there be any of you that are of his people, let the Lord even his Lord be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem that is in Judea, and build the House of the Lord of Israel; for he is the Lord that dwelleth in Jerusalem.* And *ch.* iv. *v.* 58. *Now when this young man was gone forth he lifted up his face to Heaven, toward Jerusalem, and praised the King of Heaven.* And *Judith* ch. v. 18. and *ch.* ix. 8. and 2. *Macch.* i. 25. *The only giver of all things, the only just, Almighty and Everlasting, thou that deliveredst Israel from all trouble, and didst chuse the fathers, and sanctifie them.* And *ch.* ii. 17. *We hope also that the God that delivered all his people, and gave them all an heritage, and the Kingdom, and the Priesthood, and the Sanctuary.* And *ch.* xiv. 35. *Thou, O Lord, of all things, who hast need of nothing, was pleased that the Temple of thine habitation should be among us.*

I can

I can add 4*ly*, that they distinguish exactly the Angel of God from the Prophets, although they are call'd by the same name of Angels or Messengers, and they distinguish him from Angels, which as creatures they exhort to praise God, as in the Song of *Azaria*, *v.* 36. *O ye Angels of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise and exalt him above all for ever.* Such a distinction appears in the 1. of *Esdras*, *ch.* i. 50, 51. Nevertheless, the God of their Fathers sent by his Messenger to call them back, because he spared them and his Tabernacle also. But they had his Messengers in derision; and look when the Lord spake unto them, they made a sport of his Prophets. So in *Tobith*, *ch.* v. 16. *So they were well pleased. Then said he to Tobias, prepare thy self for the journey, his father said; Go thou with this man; and God which dwelleth in heaven, prosper your journey; and the Angel of God keep you company.* Just according to the Prayer of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 48. 16. *The Angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.* And that very Angel is called God by *Jacob* in the verse before. So in *Eccluſ. ch.* xvii. 17. *For in the division of the Nations of the whole earth, he set a ruler over every people, but Israel is the Lord's portion.* So in the Epistle of *Jeremy*, *v.* 5, 6. *But say ye in your hearts, O Lord, we must worship thee. For mine Angel is with you, and I my self caring for your souls.* Where in the *Greek* that caring for their souls is referred to the same Angel. So 2 *Mac.* xi. 6. *Now they that were with Maccabeus heard that he besieged the holds; they and all the people with lamentation and tears besought the Lord that he would send a good Angel to deliver Israel.*

To

To shew that the *Jews* before Jesus Christ had such a notion of the Λόγος who was to save his people, we must take notice of two things: the first is, that the Author of the three Books of *Maccabees* speaks of God at the end of his Book in the same terms which are used by *Jacob*, *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16. and are to be referred to the Λόγος, not to a created Angel, as I have explained it in a particular discussion of that very place of *Genesis*.

The second is, that the *Greek* Interpreters of Scripture have used such method in translating some places of the Prophets, which sheweth they understood that the *Messias* should be the very Angel of the Lord who is called the Counsellor, and that the Angel of the Lord was the Lord himself. Two examples will shew that clearly; the first is in that famous Oracle of *Isaiah*, *ch.* ix. 6. they have these words, ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τῆς ὤμου αὐτοῦ, καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος, the Angel of the Great Counsel, whereas in the *Hebrew* it is said, he shall be called the admirable פלא (which is the very Word that the Angel of the Lord gives to himself, *Judg.* xiii. 18.) *the Counsellor of the mighty God*; and it is clear that they did understand these words of the *Messias*, who is spoken of as the Son of *David*, *v.* 7. in the same words which are used in *Psalm* lxxii. The other example is in this other famous place of *Isai.* lxiii. 9. they have translated *neither an Angel, but himself saved them*; as if they had read לא שר, instead of לא צר, which we read *now*. Some of the new *Jews* are mightily

in-

intangled in explaining that place, but it appears that these Interpreters of *Isaiah* look'd upon *the face of God* to have been God himself, which is the reason of their translation, and shews that they understood *the face of the Lord*, which is so often spoken of by *Moses*, to be the Λόγος, which is *Jehovah*. I can add a reflection upon their Version of the 3*d* of *Daniel*, *v.* 25. *Species quarti similis filio Dei*, as saith *Aquila* a *Jew*, who lived under *Hadrian*, but the ancient *Greeks* had translated it *similis Angelo Dei*, as saith an old *Scholion*, related by *Drusius* in *Fragmentis*, *p.* 1213. which shews that the ancient *Hellenist* had the same Notion of the Angel of God as of the Son of God. But all those things shall be more cleared, when we come to the authority of the other *Jews*, which we are to produce.

Some perhaps may think that the Book of *Ecclesiasticus* supposeth the Wisdom which we maintain to be eternal, to have been created; and so saith that Author, *ch.* i. ἐκτίσθη, and *ch.* xxiv. 9. But I take notice of three things, 1. That such an Objection may be good in the mouth of an *Arian*, but not at all in the mouth of a *Socinian*, and much less in the mouth of an *Unitarian* of this Kingdom, after their Writers have owned that the Λόγος or Word of God signifies the essential vertue of God. 2*ly*, That the Author of *Ecclesiasticus* follows in that expression the very words of the *Greek* Version of *Proverbs*, *ch.* viii. 22. in which it answers to the word *possessed*, which is not ἐκτίσθη, but ἐκτήσθη. 3*ly*, That the word ἐκτίσθη, although we should suppose it to be the true reading, hath a very large signification;

tion; and indeed *Aristobulus* a *Jew* of *Alexandria*, who lived about the same age of the Authors of those Apocryphal Books, and whose words are quoted by *Eusebius de Præp. Ev.* L. vii. §. 14. *p.* 324. declares that the Wisdom which *Solomon* speaks of in the Book of *Proverbs* was before the Heaven and Earth, and the very Author of *Ecclesiasticus* calls it positively *eternal*, *ch.* xxiv. 18.

There is another Objection which is backed by the authority of *Grotius*, who by the Λόγος, or Wisdom, understands a created Angel, but I shall shew afterwards the absurdity of that opinion of *Grotius*; and his error is so plain that Mr. *N.* and the *Unitarian* Authors have been ashamed to follow his authority in this point, daring not to maintain that the Λόγος in the first of St. *John* signified an Angel, which they would have done, if they could have digested the absurdity of *Grotius* his Notions upon that place of *Wisdom*, *ch.* xviii. 15.

As for the Holy Ghost, that they acknowledged him for a Person, and for a Divine one, there is as much evidence from the same Apocryphal Books.

1. I have noted they attributed to him the Creation of the World, as you see in *Judith*, *ch.* xvi. 14. *Thou didst send forth thy Spirit and it created them*; which is an imitation of *David*'s Notions, *Psal.* xxxiii. 6.

2*ly*. They call him the mouth of the Lord; so in the 3*d* Book of *Esdras*, *ch.* i. 28. and 47, and 57. *Howbeit Josias did not turn back his chariot from him, but undertook to fight with him, not regarding the words of the Prophet Jeremy, spoken*

spoken by the mouth of the Lord. And 47. *And he did evil also in the sight of the Lord, and cared not for the words that were spoken unto him by the Prophet Jeremy from the mouth of the Lord.*

3*ly.* They speak of the *Bina*, or *Understanding*, by which is to be understood the Holy Spirit, from *Prov.* iii. and viii. So in *Eccles. c.* i. 4. *Wisdom hath been created before all things, and the understanding of prudence from everlasting.* So the Book of *Wisdom, chap.* i. 4, 5, 6, 7. *For into a malicious soul wisdom shall not enter; nor dwell in the body that is subject unto sin. For the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide, when unrighteousness cometh in. For Wisdom is a loving spirit, and will not acquit a blasphemer of his words; for God is witness of his reins, and a true beholder of his heart, and a hearer of his tongue. For the Spirit of the Lord filleth the world, and that which containeth all things hath knowledge of the voice.*

4*ly.* They acknowledg him as the Counsellor of God which knew all his Counsels. So you read in the Book of *Wisdom, ch.* ix. 17. *And thy counsel who hath known, except thou give wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above?*

5*ly.* They speak of him as of he that discovers the secrets of God; so *Eccluſ. ch.* 39. 8. *He shall shew forth that which he hath learned and shall glory in the law of the covenant of the Lord.* And *ch.* 48. 24, 25. He saith of *Isaiah, He saw by an excellent spirit what should come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Sion. He shewed what should come to pass for ever, and secret things or ever they came.*

6*ly.*

6*ly.* They acknowledg him to be sent from God, *Wisdom, ch.* ix. 17. *And thy counsel who hath known, except thou give wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above?*

After all, if we consider what Notions they had of the *Messias* which was promised to them, we shall find that they had much nobler Ideas than those which are now entertained by the last *Jews*, and more like to them which we find among the Prophets.

1. It is clear that they lookt upon him as the Person which was to sit upon the Throne of God; the Title of *my Lord* which is given by the Author of *Eccluſ. ch.* li. 10. shews that beyond exception by so clear an allusion to the *Psal.* cx. and ii. which both speak of the *Messias.*

2*ly.* They did not look upon it as an absurd thing to suppose that God is to appear in the earth, as you see in *Baruch, ch.* iii. 37. *Afterward did he shew himself upon earth, and conversed with men.* For they refer that either to his appearance upon *Sinai*, or to the Incarnation of the Λόγος.

3*ly.* They suppose another coming of the *Messias*, and then *the Saints are to judge the Nations, and have dominion over the people, and their Lord shall reign for ever.* Wisd. *ch.* iii. 8. which words have been borrowed by St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. vi. 2.

4*ly.* They acknowledg such Appearances of God, as we have an example in 2 *Macc. ch.* xi. 6. and *ch.* xxi. 22, 23. *Now when they that were with Maccabeus heard that he besieged the holds, they and all the people with lamentation and tears besought the Lord that he would send a good Angel to deliver Israel,*

5*ly*. They speak of the Appearances of God as an ἐπιφανεία, which is the very word used by St. *Paul* for the first and second Appearance of Jesus Christ. So the 2. of *Macc. ch.* xv. 27. and 34. *So every man praised toward the even that glorious Lord, saying, Blessed be he that hath kept his own place undefiled. So that fighting with their hands, and praying unto God with their hearts, they slew no less than thirty and five thousand men; for through the appearance of God they were greatly cheared.*

6*ly*. They expected at the second coming of the *Messias* such a manifestation of his Glory as in the Consecration of the Temple. So 2 *Macc. ch.* ii. 8. *Then shall the Lord shew them these things, and the glory of the Lord shall appear, and the cloud also as it was shewed under Moses, and as when Solomon desired that the place might be honourably sanctified.*

I believe these Proofs are sufficient to demonstrate, 1. That there was before Jesus Christ's time a Notion of Plurality in the Godhead. 2*ly*, That they believed that such a Plurality was a Trinity. 3*ly*, That they look'd upon the Son or the Λόγος, and the Holy Ghost, as not created Beings, but as Beings of the same Divine Nature with the Father, by an Eternal Emanation from him, as having the same Power, and the same Majesty.

But these Ideas of the Apocryphal Books will appear more clear, when we take them in conjunction with the explication of the like Notions among other *Hebrew* Writers, which I shall now consider more particularly. And withal those places of Scripture on which they ground their Explications.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

That the Jews *had good Grounds to acknowledg some kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature.*

After what I have quoted from the Authors of the Apocryphal Books which are in the hand of all people, to prove, 1. That the *Jews* before Jesus Christ had a Notion of a Plurality in God, following herein certain Traces of this Doctrine that are to be found in the Books of *Moses* and the Prophets; And, 2*ly*, that the same *Jews* did acknowledg a Trinity in the Divine Nature; I will proceed to consider in particular the Grounds which they build upon to admit such Notions.

I begin with the first of those two Articles, which is, That the Stile of God in the *Jewish* Scriptures gave them a Notion of a Plurality in God. To establish this Proposition I do not intend to gather all the Texts of the Old Testament, which might be brought to prove a Plurality in the Divine Nature; nor will I answer the several Solutions which the *Unitarians* have invented to darken this truth, which they oppose.

It shall suffice me to do two things: 1. To shew that the Stile of God in Scripture, and of the Sacred Authors, leads one naturally to the Notion of a Plurality of Persons in the Divine Essence. 2. That this Stile made the like

like Impression on the *Jews* before Jesus Christ, as was made by it anciently, and is still made on it by the generality of Christians. So that the *Jews* generally have acknowledged, that the Divine Nature, which is otherwise perfectly one, is distinguishable into certain Properties, which we call Persons.

For the proof of the first Point, to wit, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament suppose a Plurality in God; I make these following Reflections.

1. *Moses*, the chief End of whose Writings was to root out of the minds of Men the conceit of Polytheism, does yet describe the Creation of the World in words that insinuate a Plurality. *In the beginning* (saith he) *Bara Elohim, the Gods created*, *Gen.* i. 1. He might have said, *Jehovah Bara*, Jehovah being the proper name by which God made himself known to *Moses*, and by him to his People, *Exod.* iii. 15. or he might have said, *Eloah Bara*, and so he had joyned the Singular Number of *Elohim*, which signifies God, with the Verb *Bara*, which is also the Singular Number, and signifies *created*. But *Moses* uses the Plural word *Elohim* with a Verb of the Singular Number, and he repeats it thirty times in the History of the Creation only, although this word denotes a Plurality in the Divine Nature, and not one single Person.

Had *Moses* joyned always the Noun *Elohim*, which is Plural, with a Verb or Adjective in the Singular, we might have judged, that by calling God by a name in the Plural, he had followed the corrupt custom which then

then obtained among the Heathens, of speaking of the Gods in the Plural, and that he designed to rectifie it by expressing the single action of God by a Singular Verb or Adjective.

But here this Excuse will not serve; for, 1. he had the word, *Eloah*, God, in the Singular, which he uses *Deut. xxxii.* 15, 17. and in other places: He had also several other Names of God, which he uses in other places, all of them Singular, and consequently any of them had been fitter for his use to root out Polytheism. 2. *Moses* himself sometimes joyns the Noun *Elohim* with Verbs and Adjectives in the Plural. There are several examples of this in his Books, and more in the other Sacred Writers that imitated him in it, you may see it in *Gen. xx.* 13. & *xxxv.* 7. *Job xxxv.* 10. *Jos. xxiv.* 19. *Psal. cxlix.* 1. *Eccles. xii.* 3. 1 *Sam. vii.* 23. *Es. liv.* 5. which shews the impudence of *Abarbanel*, who to elude the force of this Argument, maintains that the word *Elohim* is a Singular. In *Pent. fol.* 6. *col.* 3.

6. Another Reflection on the Stile of *Moses*, which ought to be every where Singular, and yet intimates a Plurality, is this, That *Moses* in the History of the Creation brings in God speaking to some one, thus, *Let such a thing be made*, and it follows, *it was made*; and again, *God said*—and—*God said*—This expression is repeated no less than eight times within the compass of one Chapter, which is a thing very surprizing in so concise an History. For to whom did God then speak? to whom did he issue out his Orders? or who was

was he that did execute them? There were then neither Men nor Angels to obey him, nor to hear him speak.

3. There is no one that reads the account of Man's Creation, but, if he considers what he reads, is struck with these words of God, *Gen.* i. 26. *Let Us make man after our Image and likeness.* These words in the Plural Number denote plainly a Plurality. *Let US make*, and *OUR Image*, are too lively Characters of Plurality to be passed over without particular regard.

4. We may make the same reflection on those words, *Gen.* iii. 5. which point out a Plurality of Persons, *And you shall be as Gods*; and a little after, *Adam is become as one of Us? ver.* 22. We find a like example, *Gen.* xi. 7. where God saith, *Let Us go down and confound their Language.* Again, *Gen.* xx. 13. *When God caused me to wander from my Father's house*; the *Hebrew* is, when the *Gods* caused me to wander. Again, *Gen.* xxxv. 7. *Jacob built an Altar, and called the place El-Bethel, because there God* (or *Gods*, as it is in *Hebrew*) *appeared unto him.*

All this is contained within one Book only, that of *Genesis*. We meet with the same Notion in these words of *Deuteronomy*, ch. iv. 7. *Who have the Gods so nigh unto them?*

We may trace the Idea of Plurality still further in the following Books; as in *Joshua*, *xxiv.* 19. *And Joshua said, You cannot serve the Lord, for he is an holy God*—where in the *Hebrew* it is, the *Holy Gods*. So *Solomon*, Prov. *xxx.* 3. *I neither learned wisdom, nor have the knowledg of the Holies*, instead of the *Holy*. And *Eccl.xii.*1. *Remember thy Creators.* Up-

Upon the whole we should remark, 1. That this Plurality is expressed in several passages of the Old Testament, and not in one place only.

2. That there is no kind of speaking, by which a Plurality in God may be signified but is used in the Old Testament. A Plural is joyned with a Verb Singular, *Gen.*i.1. *In the beginning the Gods created Heaven and Earth.* A Plural is joyned with a Verb Plural, *Gen.xxxv.*7: *And Jacob called the name of the place Beth-El, because the Gods there appeared to him:* A Plural is joyned with an Adjective Plural, *Jos. xxiv.* 19. *You cannot serve the Lord, for he is the holy Gods.* 2 Sam: vii. 23: *What one nation in the earth is like thy people, like Israel, whom the Gods went to redeem for a people to himself.* So *Eccles.* v. 8. *There be higher than they*, Heb. גבהים, which stands for Gods, God being called the Most High. And in *Eccles.* xii. 1. *Remember thy Creators in the days of thy Youth.* In conformity to which manner of speaking, *Isaiah* says, *ch.*liv. 5. *For thy Makers are thy Husbands, the Lord of Hosts is his name.* A Verb in the Plural is joyned with a name in the Singular; as you read, *Eccles.* ii. 12. as it has been observed by *R. Bachaie* in *Parash bresch. fol.* 11. *col.*2. of the *Edit.* in *fol.* from which he infers that God and the house of his Judgment are expressed there; for by the King which is there spoken of he doth not understand *Solomon*, but God; as they do in the *Targum* upon 1 *Chron.* iv. 23. which hath been followed by *R. Bachaie*, *Ibid. fol.*11. *col.* 3. and by *Lombroso* in his *Heb.* Bible, you have the same remark of St.

St. *Jerome* upon *Jer.* xxiii. 36. when you read אלהים חיים the Living Gods, and from which he draws an argument for the Doctrine of the Trinity.

3. That though there is but one only *Jehovah*, yet in the Holy Scripture we meet with several *Elohim* to whom the Title of *Jehovah* is given; this we see in a hundred places in the Law, where the words are *Jehovah Eloheka*, i. e. the Lord thy Gods, which does certainly deserve to be considered.

This also we more particularly see in the History of the destruction of *Sodom*, *Gen.* 30: 24. where it is written, *That Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of Heaven.* There is Jehovah, and Jehovah; and if they do not make two, I know not what will express a Plurality. But we shall have more to say of this afterwards.

I have given in short some Marks of a Plurality in the Divine Nature, which may be gathered out of the Writings of the Old Testament: For the fuller satisfaction of my Reader, I am next to shew that the ancient *Jews* made the same Reflections, and formed the same Notions that we have of the Divine Nature. To do this with the more clearness, I shall observe this Method: 1. To shew what were their Reflections on the Unity of the Divine Nature. 2. To shew what their Reflections were on those passages of the Scripture which note a Plurality in the Unity of the Divine Essence.

As to the first, *Philo*, who left a great many Pieces behind him, is best able to instruct us;

us; and he asserts that the Nature of God is incomprehensible, *i. e.* that we cannot form a just Idea of it. *Alleg.* 1. *p.* 43. *F. G. De Profug. p.* 370. *C.*

That God's Providence and Existence are known to us; but as to his Essence, we are altogether ignorant of it. *De Mund. p.*889. *D.*

And having in several places of his Writings observed, 1. That *Moses*, the Lawgiver of the *Jews*, made this his chief End to destroy the Notion of *Polytheism*. He then, 2. Affirms, that though it is said, *God is one*; yet this is not to be understood with respect to Number. *Alleg. L. III. p.* 841. Not that *Philo* would have it thought that there is more than one God, but hereby he intimates the Unity of God to be transcendent, to have nothing common with that of other Beings which fall under Number.

3. And indeed he acknowledges a Generation in God. If you ask him what he begets, he will tell you——

4. That God begets his Word. Who is therefore said to be not unbegotten like God, and yet not begotten like his Creatures? *Quis rerum Divin. hæres. p.* 398. *A.* And on account of this Generation, he calls him the First-born of God. *De Agricult. p.* 152. *De Confus. Ling. p.* 267.

Again, he will tell you, that God begets his Wisdom, *De Temul. p.* 190. *E.* And that his Wisdom is the same with his Word. *Alleg.* 1. *p.* 39. *F.* following, no doubt, *Solomon*'s Notion, *Prov.* viii. 22. But did he own that this Generation was made in time?

No:

No: For, 5. He asserts, that this Generation was from all Eternity; For he saith, the Word of God is the Eternal Son of God. *De Confus. Ling. p.* 255. *D. p.* 267. *C.*

6. When he would explain, in what respect, or for what reason God is called in Scripture, *The God of Gods*; he saith not, that it is in respect of the Angels, whose God he is, and who sometimes are called *Elohim*, or *Gods*, even by *Philo* himself. *De Opif. p.* 4. *F.* But he saith it is in relation to his two Powers, *Lib. de Victim. off. p.* 661. *G.* which would be a ridiculous thing, had he thought these two Powers were no other than two Attributes of God.

Indeed *Philo* is so far from thinking them meer simple Attributes, that he maintains, 1. That these Powers made the World, or by them God created the World. *De Victim. off. p.* 663. *F. de Confus. Ling. p.* 270. *B. de Plant. Noæ. p.* 176. *E. Quis rer. div. Hær. p.* 393. *G.* 2. That these eternal Powers appeared, acted, and spoke as real Persons, and in a visible and sensible manner. *Lib. de Cherub. p.* 97. *D. De Sacr. Ab. p.* 108. *B. C. Quod Deus sit immutab. p.* 229. *B. p.* 241. *C. D. p.* 242. *B. de Plant. Noæ. p.* 176. *D. E. Quod rer. div. hær. p.* 393. *G. De Somn. p.* 457. *G. de Mund. p.* 888. *B.*

He also maintains, that the two Cherubins which were over the Ark, were the Symbols of the two eternal Powers of God. *De Vit. Mos. III. p.* 517. *F. Quis rerum Divin. Hæt. p.* 393. *G.*

These are in general, the Notions which the *Jews* had of a Plurality in the Divine Essence, which is otherwise single and one.

I shall hereafter shew, that the very same Notions are spread throughout the ancient *Targums*, as far as the Nature of the Works, which for the most part are only naked Translations of the Hebrew into Chaldee, does give occasion to the Authors of these *Targums* to explain themselves on these Heads.

Now let us go on to examine the Foundations on which the ancient *Jews* grounded this Notion of a Plurality in God: For it is not to be imagined that they would have believed thus without some Authority for it in the Books of the Old Testament, upon which alone they pretended to found the Doctrines of their Religion.

Secondly then, As to the first Words of *Moses*. *In the beginning the Gods created*: I must own that *Philo*, writing in Greek, did not express his Notion of Plurality in expounding this Text: For he followed the Version of the LXX, which reads Θεὸς in the Singular, instead of the Hebrew *Elohim* in the Plural. But then he more than hints that this Reflexion was common among the *Jews*, seeing that he rarely speaks of God without mentioning his two Powers, as I have newly observed to you. And in one place he gives this reason why the Name Θεὸς is used throughout the History of the Creation; because that was the Appellation of one of God's Powers by which he made the World: ἔ χάειν καὶ τῇ κατὰ τὸν ἱερώτατον Μωϋσῆν κοσμοποιΐᾳ πάσῃ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄνομα ἀναλάμβανεται: ἤρμοττε γὰρ τὴν δύναμιν καθ' ἣν ὁ ποιῶν εἰς γένεσιν ἄγων ἔπεθετο καὶ διεκοσμεῖτο, διὰ ταύτης καὶ κατακληθῆναι. *de Plant. Noæ. p.* 176. *D. E.*

Which

Which shews evidently, that the Notion of Plurality did still remain among the Greek *Jews*, when the Plural *Elohim*, which was the Ground of it, was taken away by their Translators, for a reason that I shall shortly mention.

But to shew that the word *Elohim* in the Plural has always made this impression on the Minds of the *Jews*, we must observe, 1. That long before *Justin Martyr*'s time, there was a sort of Men who imagined that the Angels did create the World, grounding it upon this place, compared with those other Texts where the Angels are sometimes called *Elohim*, as *Psal.* viii. 6. & *Psal.* xcvii. 7. Such was the Opinion of *Menander*, the Scholar of *Simon Magus* in particular.

2. That the *Talmudists* themselves were so perswaded of a Plurality expressed in the word *Elohim*, as to teach in Title *Megilla*, *c.* 1. *fol.* 11. That the LXX Interpreters did purposely change the Notion of Plurality, couched in the Hebrew Plural, into a Greek Singular; as they did also on *Gen.* 1. 26. and xi. 7. lest *Ptolom. Philadelph.* should conclude, that the *Jews*, as well as himself, had a belief of *Polytheism*. That was taken notice of by St. *Jerom* in his Preface to the Book *De Quæst. Hebr.*

3. That however the Construction of a Noun Plural, with a Verb Singular, may render it doubtful to some, whether these words express a Plurality or no; yet certainly there can be no doubt in those places, where a Verb or Adjective Plural are joyned with the word *Elohim*; and such places, as I already have made appear, are often to be found in the Writings of the Old Testament. That the word *Elohim* is to be understood Plurally, this the *Jews*, since Christ's time, have acknowledged to be agreeable to their sense of the word. For in 1 *Sam.* xxviii. 13. where the Witch of *Endor* saith, *I see the Gods ascending*, אלהים עלים they conclude that there were two persons that appeared to her, and so they think *Moses* and *Samuel* to be the Persons. *Midrash Sam. Rabbatha, cap.* 27. *& Tanchuma fol.* 63. *col.* 2.

It is natural for Christians to conceive, that where it is said so often, *Gen.* i. *And God said*, there God spoke to his Word, by which St. *John* writes that all things were made, *Joh.* i. 3. *Socinus* will not have it that St. *John* speaking of the Word or Λόγος does mean it of the first Creation, but of the second. His Disciples here being convinced that this cannot be maintained, have forsaken him in it, and do now agree in what he denied. But then they suppose the Word signifies no more than the virtue and power of God; and therefore by this Phrase, *Let it be done*, and *it was so*, no more is imported, than God's exciting of himself to do this or that thing, or that God said to himself, Let such a thing be done, and he did it accordingly.

But if this Evasion can satisfie an *Unitarian*, as it easily may one that cannot maintain his opinion without it; yet it cannot satisfie an impartial Reader. For this we have the judgment of the ancient Synagogue, which looked on

on the Word or Λόγος, as a true Cause and Agent, to whom God spoke, and who by an infinite power wrought the several works of the six days.

Now that this was the judgment of the ancient Synagogue, and consequently that they acknowledged a Plurality in God, will be evident to any one that will be at the pains to consult *Philo* and the ancient *Targums*.

For *Philo*, he hath drawn so full a System of the Λόγος, as to leave himself nothing more to add on that Subject. According to him, it is the Λόγος in whom were represented the first Ideas of all things, and who afterwards stampt the impressions of them on matter: Whence he is called Κόσμος νοητὸς, *De opif. p.4.G. & p.24. C.* It is the Λόγος that created the World, as I shall have occasion to shew from several parts of his Works, in the following part of this Discourse.

And for the *Targums*, to cite all the passages in them that confirm this truth, would be a trouble next to that of transcribing those Books. I shall therefore collect only some of the principal places. *Jonathan* on *Isa.* xlv. 12. declares his opinion, that the Word created the Earth; and again on *Isa* xlviii.13. Thus *Onkelos* assures, that the Heavens were made by the Word of the Lord, on *Deut.* xxxiii.27. And he almost constantly distinguishes the Λόγος as another Person from the Father, of which I shall in the following Chapters produce many proofs.

Indeed

Indeed in this Paraphrase of the History of the Creation, he uses not the Word *Memra*, which in *Chaldee* answers to that of Λόγος in *Greek*. Nor was there any need, since he used all along the Verb *Amar*, from whence comes the Noun *Memra*, and so interprets the Text word for word, which seems to be his chief design in this Paraphrase.

And here I must take notice of one thing which is of great moment in this Question, *viz.* that the *Jews* make a great difference between that word *Vajomer*, which is found in the History of the Creation, and this word *Vajedabber*; the first having a natural and necessary relation to the *Memra*, and the last signifying no more than the speech of God or of any Man. *R. Menach. de Rekan. in Pent. fol.* 124. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 152. *col.* 1, 2.

But *Onkelos* does three things which are equivalent to it: the one is, that instead of *Elohim*, he uses the word *Jehova*, which the *Jews* read *Adonai*, because it has the Vowels of the word *Adonai*; and both the word *Adonim*, which is the Plural out of *Regimen*, so as God uses it in speaking of himself, *Mal.*i.6. and the Vowels of the word *Adonai* in *regimen*, which they put under the Letters of *Jehova*, being also Plural, both these things do express a Plurality in God as much as the word *Elohim* did in the *Hebrew* Text.

The second is, that he doth render the words, *in the beginning*, not by the *Chaldaick* word which answers to the *Hebrew*, but by another which signifies the first בקדמין and not by קדמיתא, as it is observed by all the *Jewish* Writers who make the same reflection

upon the Translation of the Targum *Jerusalami*, in which we read not *in the beginning*, but בחכמתא *by the Wisdom*. As you see in a Comment upon the *Targums*, Printed at *Amsterdam* not long ago, where he follows those Notions as the ancient and the common Doctrine of the Synagogue.

The third is, that in the sequel of his Paraphrase, he uses the word *Memra*, as signifying a Person by whom God acts and speaks in all his Appearances to Men.

That these words, *Let us make Man after our Image, &c.* have made a like impression on the ancient *Jews*, appears clearly from the pains they take to explain them. I am sure *Philo* was convinced, that they note a Plurality, when he, writing on this Text, maintained that God had fellow-workers in the Creation of Man. *De opif. p.12. B. E.* It is true he sometimes advances that God spoke these words to the Angels, or to the Elements; and he has been followed herein by some *Jews* after Jesus Christ, as we see in the Explication of them in *Bresh. Rab.* §. 8. and in *Jalkut.* §. 12, 13. wherein they pretend that God consulted the Angels also in the Creation of the World; although according to the Talmudical *Jews* the Angels were not created till the second or the fifth day; and such a consultation between God and his Creatures is rejected with scorn by *Abarbanel* in *Pentat. Fol.* 19. *Col.* 4.

But it is to be observed, that *Philo*'s reason for this Exposition, was to give the better account of the Original of Sin, which after the manner of divers of the Philosophers, with whom

whom he was much conversant, he searched for in the matter of which Man was composed in respect of his Body, as may be seen in the place which I have now quoted.

For in other places he maintains: 1. That God took his Λόγος or Word, for his fellow-worker. *De Opif. p.24. & p.25.* 2. That Man was created after the Image of the Λόγος, or Word. *De Plant. Noæ. p.199. D.* But he saith nothing of the Image of Angels, or of Matter, which yet he ought to have spoken of, had he writ coherently and suitably to that other Explication.

I say it again, that in many of his Pieces he asserts, The *Word* made Man, and after the Image of the Word was Man created, which he shews very largely. *Alleg.* 11. *p.60. C. D. De Plant. Noæ. p.* 169.

3. He maintains, that God spake this to his Powers, as may be collected from his Exposition of this Text. *De Confus. Ling. p.* 270. *A. C.* and as he saith expressly, *Lib. de Profug. p.* 357. *G.* Μόνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡς ἂν μετὰ συνεργῶν ἑτέρων ἐδήλωσε διαπλαττόντα· εἶπε γὰρ, (φησὶν ὁ Μωϋσῆς) ὁ θεὸς, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, πλήθει, διὰ τὸ ποιήσωμεν ἐμφαινομένου· διαλέγεται ἐν ὁ θεὸς ὅλων πατὴρ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσιν. ——— That is, he shews that Man only was formed by God with fellow-workers; for *Moses* tells us that God said, *Let us make Man after our Image*, implying a Plurality in the expression, *Let Us make*. God therefore speaks here to his *Powers*.

4. He expresses himself in so particular a manner on this head, as to leave no doubt concerning his opinion of this place. It is in his

his first Book of Questions and Solutions, which is now lost, all but a fragment preserv'd by *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* vii. 13. *p.* 322, 323. His words are these: Διὰ τί ὡς θεὸν ἑτέρου θεοῦ φησι τὸν, ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ ἐποίησα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ; παγκάλως καὶ σοφῶς τοῦτο κεχρημάσθαι, θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀπεικονισθῆναι θεοῦ τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πατέρα τῶν ὅλων ἐδυνάτο, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ τὸν δευτέρου θεόν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου λόγος· ἔδει γὰρ τὸν λογικὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ τύπον, ὑπὸ θεοῦ λόγου χαραχθῆναι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λόγου θεὸς, κρείττων ἐστὶν ἢ πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις· τοῦ ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ βελτίστῃ καὶ τίνι ἔξεστι φέτω καθεστῶτ' ἰδέᾳ οὐδὲν θέμις ὦ γενητὸν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι. Why does God say in the Image of God made I Man, and not in his own Image, as if he had spoken of another God? This Scripture-expression is for wise and good reasons, for nothing mortal can be fashioned after the Image of the Supreme God and Father of all things, but of his Word or Λόγος, who is the second God. For the rational part of Man's soul, ought to receive its impression from the Word or Reason of God, because God himself who is Superior to his Λόγος, is vastly beyond the nature of all Rational Beings; and consequently it was not fit that any created Being should be made after his likeness, whose Nature doth subsist in the highest degree of Excellence.

To speak next of the ancient *Targums*, they are not unacquainted with this Notion, which they shew as far as the nature of their Versions would permit. God made Man by his Word, saith the *Jerusalem* Targum, *Gen.* i. 26. and the same thing *Jonathan* teaches, *Is.* xlv. 12.

The

The *Jerusalem* Targum, *Gen.* i. 1. does indeed say, God made all things by his *Wisdom*, but then he shews that this is but another name for the Λόγος, by saying elsewhere, *ver.* 27. the Λόγος or the Word of the Lord created Man after his Image.

I know that in *Jonathan*'s Targum on *Gen.* i. 26. God is brought in as speaking to the Angels, when he said, *Let Us make Man.* But he who reads this and the following verse in the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, and compares them with the *Jerusalem* Targum, will soon see that these are not the words of the ancient Paraphrast, but an Addition made to them by the *Jews* since Christ's time. What I have said above is a convincing proof of it.

The *Socinians* cannot avoid being shockt a little with the expression, *Gen.* xix. 24. *The Lord—rained from the Lord out of Heaven. Menasseh ben Israel* confesses the place too hard for him, unless by the Lord who is on Earth, you understand the Angel *Gabriel*, who, as God's Ambassador, bears the name of God, *q.* 44. in *Genesis.* But the ancient *Jews* found no such difficulty in it, as he and the *Socinians* do at present find.

For *Philo* the *Jew* holds, that it was the Λόγος that rained fire from Heaven, *de Somn. p.* 449. *F.* As he otherwhere saith, it was the Λόγος that confounded the Language at *Babel.* Again, *Philo* saith in his History of *Sodom*, God and his two Powers are spoken of. *De Abr p.* 290. *B.*

The *Targum* of *Onkelos*, though it speaks of Angels in this 19*th. Chap.* yet it treats one as *Jehova* who rains fire from Heaven, *v.* 24.

 and

and thus it Paraphrases the Text, *The Jehova rained from before the face of the Jehova from Heaven.*

3. This Notion of Plurality must have sunk deep into the minds of the *Jews*, seeing they have constantly read the word *Jehova*, which is singular, with the Vowels of the word *Adonai*, which is Plural, instead of *Adoni*, which is Singular: And this notwithstanding their dispute with the Christians, whom they accuse of Tritheism. I am not ignorant that this manner of reading *Jehova* was long in use before the Birth of Jesus Christ. But this it is that renders my Remark the more considerable. For all the other names of God, which represent him by some one of his Attributes are Singular, as well as the name *Jehova* is Singular, which is the proper name of God; And yet the *Jews* all agree to forbear rendring the name *Jehova* by any of his many Names that are Singular, but interpret it by that of *Adonai*, whose Plural Vowels make *Jehova* to signifie Plurally, as much as to say my Lords; and that for this reason, as it seems, because there is more than one in the Godhead, to whom the name *Jehova* is given in Scripture.

It is clear how sensible the *Jews* have been that there is a Notion of Plurality plainly imported in the *Hebrew* Text, since they have forbidden their common people the reading of the History of the Creation, lest understanding it literally, it should lead them into Heresie. *Maimon. Mor. Neboch. p.* 11. *c.*29. The *Talmudists*, as I before noted, have invented this excuse for the *Seventy*, as to their changing

ging the *Hebrew* Plural, into a *Greek* Singular; they say it was for fear *Ptolomy Phil.* should take the *Jews* for Polytheists. And to this they have added another Story, that *Moses* himself was startled at God's speaking these words, *Let Us make Man*, in which he thought a Plurality was expressed, and that he remonstrated to God the danger which might arise thereby; and at length resolved not to write them, till he had God's express order for it, which God did give him, notwithstanding the danger that *Moses* represented might follow. *Beresh. Rab.* §. 8.

Another thing relating to this Head, which deserves our consideration, is this; That the *Samaritans* who were originally of the same Religion with the *Jews*, but receive only the five Books of *Moses*, have shewn that they had in the Apostles times the same Notions that are met with in *Philo* of a Plurality in God. We have a proof of it, *Act.* viii. 9. where we read that *Simon Magus* had bewitched that people, giving out that himself was τὶς μέγας, some great one; he did not say what, but gave them leave to understand it their own way. And how did they take it? This follows *v.* 10. *They said*, ὗτος ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη, *this person is the great power of God.* This they would not have said, if they had not believed, that besides the great God, there was also a person called ἡ δύναμις θεοῦ I say a Person, for I suppose Mr. *N.* can't think they took *Simon Magus* to be only an Attribute.

But looking yet nearer into this Text, I conceive it is plain, that they understood there

there was more than one δύναμις, for as it is in the Text, *they said this is the great* δύναμις, which seems to imply that they believed there was another power less than this. It seems yet plainer in another reading of the Text, which I take to be the true reading, for we find it not only in the now vulgar *Latin*, but also in *Irenæus*, i. 20. which sheweth it was the current reading in his time, and we find it also in several Manuscripts, some of which are of the highest esteem with Learned Men, as namely, the *Alexandrian* in the King's Library, and the ancient Manuscript of *Lions* in the *Cambridge* Library: In all these the words are, ἔτος ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. *This person is the power of God which is called the great power.* For their calling him the power of God, what that means we cannot better learn than from *Origen*, who speaking of *Simon*, and such others as would make themselves like our Lord Jesus Christ, saith, they called themselves, *Sons of God*, or the *Power of God*; which he makes to be two Titles of one and the same signification. [*Orig. cont. Celsum, lib.* 1. *p.* 44.] And both these Titles are given to the λόγος by *Philo* in more places than we can number. For their calling him *the Great Power of God*, which implies that there was another power besides; this also perfectly agrees with the Notions of *Philo*, who so often speaks of the two Powers of God, describing them as true and proper Persons.

We have a farther proof of the *Samaritans* having these Notions, in the account which their Country-man *Justin Martyr* hath given us

us of the honour they had for *Simon Magus* in his time, which was about eighty years after the writing of the *Acts of the Apostles*. It may seem very strange that when the charms of that *Magus*, wherewith he had bewitched that poor people, were so intirely dissolved by *Philip*'s Preaching and Miracles, that not only they but the Impostor himself had embraced the Christian Religion, yet after this he could so far bewitch them a second time as to raise himself in their opinion from being the great power of God, (as they called him before). to be, in their new style, the God above all power whatsoever. Yet that was the Title they gave him in *Justin*'s time, as he sheweth in his Dialogue with *Tryphon*, [*Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 349. G.] elswhere *Justin* saith [*Apol.* 11. *p.* 69. *E.*] of *Simon*, they confess him as the first God, and as such they worship him. This Notion of a first God is manifestly the same with that of *Philo*, who called the λόγος the second God. [*Euseb. Prep. Evang.* vii. 13. *p.* 323.] But if the *Samaritans* in the Apostles time took *Simon* to be the λόγος, or second God, as I have shewn it more than probable that they meant it by calling him the *Great power of God*, Who should be the second God now, since *Simon* was so advanced in their opinion, that now they accounted him to be the First? *Justin* sheweth in the place before mentioned [*p.* 69. *E.*] that in his time as they called *Simon* the first God, so they called his Companion *Helen*, the second God. His words are, Τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν πρώτην, what is that? one may easily guess; for certainly the first emanation from the

the νοῦς is the Λόγος. And so according to *Justin* himself, the πρώτη ἔννοια signifies. For in the same Book he interprets it of the Λόγος, [*Apol.* 11. *p.*97. *b.*] So that as the second God was the Λόγος in *Philo*'s account, so was *Simon*'s Companion the same in the opinion of the *Samaritans.*

This poor bewitched people were almost Singular in this opinion in *Justin*'s time; for he saith, then there were but few of their way in other Nations. And *Origen* who wrote within sixty years after, saith, That when he wrote, there were of *Simon*'s Sect scarce thirty at *Samaria*, and none any where else in the World, [*Orig. cont. Cels.* 1. *p.* 44.] Possibly there might remain some of them till those times when other Writers give other accounts of their Opinions, and possibly their Opinions might vary, so that those later accounts are not to be much heeded; we can't be certain of any thing concerning them, but what we have from *Justin Martyr*, who lived when they were at the highest, and writing as he did to the Emperour an Apology for the Christians, and acquainting him with the Errors of his Country-men at *Samaria*, which as he more than intimates was not without some hazard of his being torn in pieces by the Mobb, [*Just. Dial. cum Tryphon. p.* 340.] we may be very sure he would write nothing of them, but what was so evidently true that it could not be denied by any that lived in those days.

But from the account that *Justin Martyr* gives of them, together with what we read in the *Acts of the Apostles*, I think it is sufficiently

ciently proved, that the *Samaritans* held a Plurality in the Divine Nature; which not a little confirms that which I undertook to prove of the *Jews* having these Notions in the times of Christ and his Apostles.

I shall not insist longer on the Arguments which confirm a Plurality in the Divine Nature, because I shall touch on some of them again in the Sequel of this Discourse, where I shall shew that those places of the Old Testament, that speak of the Angel of the Lord, are to be understood not of a created Angel, but of a person that is truly *Jehova*; and that this has been acknowledged by the ancient *Jews*; which alone is proof enough of this Notion's being sufficiently known by that Nation, to which God committed his Sacred Oracles, *Rom.* ix. 6.

Pass we now to the second Article, that the *Jews* did so acknowledg a Plurality in God, as that at the same time they held that this Plurality was a Trinity.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

That the Jews *did acknowledge the Foundations of the Belief of a Trinity in the Divine Nature; and that they had the Notion of it.*

IN pursuance of the Method laid down in the foregoing Chapter, I am now to shew these two things: 1. That there are in the Scriptures of the Old Testament so many and so plain Intimations of a Trinity in the Divine Nature, as might very well move the *Jews* to take them for a sufficient ground for the Belief of this Doctrine. 2. That these Intimations had that real effect on the *Jews*, that as they found in their Scriptures a Plurality in the One Infinite Being of God; so they found these Scriptures to restrain this Plurality to a Trinity; of which they had, though much more darkly and confusedly, the same Notions that are now among Christians.

1. To shew that there is ground for this Doctrine in the Scriptures of the Old Testament; I might shew this oftentimes in these Scriptures where God is spoken of, there is some kind of intimation given of Three in the Divine Nature: But of this I shall only touch upon it; my intention being chiefly to shew, That there are Three that are called God in the Old Testament, and to shew who they are.

I need

I need not prove it of the Father, since it will not be denied that he is called God, by them that will deny it of any other. But I shall shew that sometimes the Son is called so, whether by that name of the *Son*, or of the *Word*, or some other name, without mention of the Spirit. Next I shall shew that the Spirit is spoken of as God; even he is mentioned without the Son. And lastly, That the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, are all Three mentioned as God, and all Three spoken of together in some Texts of the Old Testament Scriptures.

To keep to this order, I am first to shew that there is some kind of Intimation of a Trinity, in places where God is spoken of in these Scriptures. I shall name but two or three Texts of many; for I call it but an Intimation, and it may amount to thus much, that we find the Name of God repeated three times over; for it was certainly no vain Repetition. Thus in the Blessing of *Israel*, Numb. vi. 24, 25, 26. *The Lord bless thee and keep thee; The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace.* So Isa. xxxiii. 22. *The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king, he will save us.* So *Dan.* ix. 19. *O Lord hear, O Lord forgive, O Lord hearken and do — defer not for thy own sake, O God.*

The like Intimation we find in those words of the Prophet *Isaiah*, which do both shew a Plurality in the Divine Nature, and restrain it to a Trinity. *Isa.* vi. 3. The Prophet heard the Seraphims cry one to another, *Holy, Holy, Holy,*

Holy, *Lord God of hosts*. These are Titles which taken together can belong to no one but God; and the Repetition of them shews something in it which cannot but seem Mysterious, especially to any one that considers those other words of God speaking in the same Chapter, *ver.* 8. *Who will go for us?* words which clearly note a Plurality of Persons, as also in *Hos.* xii. 4, 5. and in some other places.

To shew who these are, we must consider those places of the Old Testament where the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinctly spoken of as several Persons.

The Son is expresly spoken of by *David*, (who himself was a Type of the Messias, and is so acknowledged by the *Jews*), Psal. ii. 7. *The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* That the Λόγος, who, as has been already proved, is called *Wisdom* according to the *Jewish* Notions, is the Son of God by Eternal Generation, himself sheweth, *Prov.* viii. 23, 24. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was; when there were no depths, I was brought forth.* So in *Prov.* xxx. 4. *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, or what is his Son's name?* The Son can be understood of no other than of that Eternal Wisdom that assisted in the Creation, as was before mentioned.

Elsewhere the Son or the Word is spoken of according to the *Jewish* Expositions of such Texts, where he is not named, and yet he

he is called God and Lord; as *Psal.* xlv. 7. *O God, thy God hath anointed thee.* And *Psal.* cx. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool.*

It was the same Son who appeared oftentimes under the Character of the Angel of the Lord, though he was not a Created Angel, but the Lord *Jehovah* himself. This I only mention here, being to treat of it largely in some of the following Chapters.

That the Spirit is spoken of as a Person in Scripture, none can be ignorant of, that reads but the beginning of *Genesis*, where in the 2d Verse he is named *the Spirit of God*, and said to have his part in the Work of the Creation. The *Jews* could not make this Spirit to be an Angel, because they all agree the Angels were not yet created, when the Spirit moved upon the face of the Waters. Nor was the Spirit of God a mighty Wind, as some render it in that place; for as yet there was no Air, much less Exhalations, till this Work was past. But that *Moses* meant a Person, sufficiently appears by that which followeth, *Gen.* vi. 3. Where God saith, *My Spirit shall not alway strive with man.* It was the Holy Spirit of God that inspired the holy Patriarchs to give those Admonitions and Warnings to the wicked World of Mankind before the Flood, by which he strove to bring them to Repentance. It was the same Divine Spirit whose Operations the *Israelites* were sensible of, in his inspiring the Seventy Elders, *Numb.* xi. 25, 26.

The *Psalmist*, no doubt, thought of those words of *Moses* in the beginning of *Genesis*, when he said, in speaking of the Works of the Creation, *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. *All the hosts of them were made by the Spirit of his mouth*; and this Spirit he sensibly knew to be a Person; for thus he saith of himself, 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 2, 3. *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his Word was in my tongue.*

Lastly; In some places of the Old Testament there are plainly Three Persons spoken of together, and especially in the beginning of *Genesis*, where it ought to be remembred, that the word *Elohim*, Gods, does naturally import a Plurality. [*R. Bechai in Gen. chap.* i. 1. and others quoted in the former Chapter.] Now there can be no Plural of less than Two in number, and therefore at least God the Father, and the Word, are to be understood in the first Verse; the second Verse adds the Spirit of God, as it has been just now mentioned. And it is very natural to think that God spake to these Two, the *Word* and the *Spirit*, in Verse 26. of that Chapter, when he said, *Let Us make man after Our Image*; as also afterward, *Gen.* iii. 22. *Behold the man is become as one of Us:* And again, speaking of the Builders of *Babel*, Gen. ix. 7. *Let Us go down and confound their Language:* This must be to Two at least; for had he spoke to One only, he would have said in the Singular Number, *Come thou, and let us confound their language:* The manner of speaking plainly imports a Plurality; and they could be no other than those Three which were spoken of in the first Chapter.

As

As *Moses* brings in these Three Persons into his History of the first Creation, so does the Evangelical Prophet in speaking of the Mission of Christ, *Isa.* xi. 1, 2, *&c. The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him*, i. e. upon the Messias, according to the received Opinion of the *Jews*, Isa. xlviii. 16. *The Lord hath sent Me and his Spirit.* Again, *Isa.* lix. 19, 20, 21. *When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him, and the Redeemer shall come unto Sion.* Again, *Isa.* lxi. 1. *The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon Me, because the Lord hath anointed me.* They are the words which Christ applied to himself, *Luke* iv. 18.

It may not be amiss here to answer an Objection against the use that we have made of those Texts wherein God saith W E and U S in the Plural; which manner of speaking, the *Jews* cannot but see does denote a Plurality. *R. Kimchi* on *Isa.* vi. 8. makes that Observation: But then he fancies it is spoken with relation to Angels, whom God is pleased to call in by way of Consultation.

In the Text *Isa.* vi. those whom God consults with are to send as well as he; and those in *Gen.* i. 26. are to make Man as well as he. And surely God would not join the Angels with himself in the sending of his Prophets; much less would he give Angels a share in the Glory of making Man, the Master-piece of the Creation. Angels are Creatures as well as Man, and were but a Day elder than he, according to some of the *Jews*; a Week older than he they could not be: And at the making of Man it is believed with very good

 reason,

reason, that those Angels were not yet fallen, whom we now call Devils. It seems not very likely, that as soon as they were made God should call them into Council for making of another of his Creatures; much less that he should make them Creators together with himself; especially when this gives them a Title to the Worship of Intelligent Beings, such as Man; who if this had been true, ought to have worshipp'd not only Angels but Devils, as being his Creators together with God. But the Truth is so far on the contrary, that as at first Man was made but a little lower than the Angels, so there is a Man since made Lord both of Angels and Devils, whom they are to worship: This I know our *Unitarians* will now deny. But to come to an end of this matter; It is certainly below the Infinite Majesty of God, in any of his works whatever to say to any of his Creatures, *Let us make*, or, *Let us do this or that*. And for that idle Fancy of a Consultation, it is not only absurd in it self, but it is contrary to the holy Scripture, that asks *Isa.* xl. 13. *Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or who hath been his Counsellor?* Which in effect is a flat denial that there is any Creature to be call'd into Consultation with God. And therefore whoever they were to whom God said this, *Let us make*, or, *Let us do this or that*, they could be no Creatures, they must be uncreated Beings like himself, if there were any such then in being. But that then at the Creation such there were, even the *Word* and the *Spirit*, has been shewn from the beginning of that History, I think beyond contradiction.

Thus

Thus we have collected a number of Places from the Old Testament, which speak of a Trinity, and consequently do reduce the Plurality which we proved before, to a Trinity in the Unity of the Divine Nature. We see there Three distinct Characters of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We see the Generation of the Son express'd, and the Mission of the Holy Spirit upon the Son, when he came to live in our Nature. We see the number Three still observed in begging Pardon of Sins, of Blessings, and in returning Praises to God, intimating there were Three from whom all good things come, and who are therefore the Objects of Prayer. It remains that we enquire whether the like Inferences which we draw from these Texts, were made by the *Jews* before Jesus Christ; which is the second Particular of our proposed Method.

I shall not repeat here what in the preceding Chapters I proved, That both *Philo* and the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts had such Notions of the Unity of God, as were not repugnant to his Plurality. The Reader can't have forgotten already a thing of such importance. My business now is to shew that the Ancient *Jews* plainly own Two Powers in God, which they distinguish from God, and yet call each of them God; the one being the Son of God, the other the Holy Spirit, who is called the Spirit of God.

Notwithstanding that I take the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts to be ancienter than *Philo*, yet I chuse to begin with *Philo*'s Testimonies rather than theirs, for three Reasons. First, Because

 he

he writ in the way of Treatises, and therefore much larger and clearer than they did that writ only in the way of Translation or Paraphrase, adding nothing of their own but only sometimes a very short Note on the Text: And therefore their Writings are much likelier to be explained by his, than his by theirs. *2dly.* Because the Passages in *Philo* for the Existence of the Λόγος as a Person coeternal with the Father, are so evident, as to leave the *Socinians* no other way of answering them, but to deny with Mr. *N.* that the Books that contain them were written by *Philo* the *Jew*. *3dly.* A third Reason is, because these Passages of *Philo* being written at *Alexandria*, and abounding with Expressions used by the Apostles when they speak of Jesus Christ as the Λόγος, will contribute to explain some of the Quotations we shall take out of the Paraphrases in use at *Babylon* and *Jerusalem*. These three great Cities *Babylon*, *Jerusalem*, and *Alexandria*, were the three great Academies of the *Jews*, till the destruction of the Temple under *Vespasian*. So that whatever was received among the *Jews* in these three Cities before our Saviour's time, may well pass for the Opinion of the *Jewish* Church at that time.

Let us proceed then to some of those Passages in *Philo* the *Jew*, wherein he declares that there are Two such Powers in God, as we call Two Persons; and no one shall make sense of those Passages, that calls them otherwise.

1. In general, he acknowledges that God hath Two Chief Supreme Powers, one of which

which is called Θεὸς, God, the other Κύριος, Lord. *De Abrah. p.* 286, 287. *F. De vit. Mos.* iii. *p.* 517. *F.*

2. That these Two Powers are Uncreated, [*Quod Deus sit immut. p.* 238. *A.*] Eternal, [*De Plant. Noæ*, 176. *D.*] and Infinite or Immense, and Incomprehensible, [*De Sacr. Ab. p.* 168. *B.*]

3. On many occasions he speaks of these Two Powers; as *De Cherub. p.* 86. *F. G.* 87. *A. De Sacr. Ab. p.* 108. *A. B. De Plant. Noæ, p.* 176. *D. E. Quod Deus est immut. p.* 229. *B. De Confus. Ling. p.* 270. *E.* 271. *Lib. de Prof. p.* 359. *G.* and especially *p.* 362, and *p.* 363. *B. C. D. Quis rerum divin. Hær. p.* 393. *G. p.* 394. *A. C. De Somn. p.* 457. *F. De Monar. p.* 631. *A. B. C. De Vict. Offeren. p.* 661. *B. De Mund. p.* 888. *B.*

4. In particular; Though he doth not directly name these Two Powers, yet it is clear that by the first he means the Λόγος; for he saith it is the Power by which all things are created, or to which God spoke when he made Man: Which two Characters are ascribed to the Λόγος by *Philo* in many of his Tracts. The other, which we call the Holy Spirit, is often acknowledged by *Philo*, [*Lib. Quod Deus sit immut. p.* 229. *B.*]

5. These things being considered, he saith, it appears how God is Three, and yet he is but One: He sheweth how this was represented in that Vision to *Abraham*, *Gen.* xviii. where it is said, Verse 1. That *Jehovah appeared to him.* And Verse 2. *Abraham looked, and behold Three men stood by him:* Yet he spoke

spoke but to One, Vers. 3. saying, *My Lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant*, &c. This Vision according to the Literal Sense he expounds of the Λόγος and Two Angels, as I have quoted him elsewhere *. But he saith here was also a Mystery that lay under this Literal Sense, like to *Sarah*'s ἐγκρυφία, so the LXX. calleth the Cakes that were hid under the Embers: According to this Mystical Sense, he saith, here was denoted, ὁ ὤν, the Great *Jehovah*, with his Two δυνάμεις, of which one is called Θεὸς, and the other Κύριος. These are *Philo*'s words, [*De Sacrif. Ab. & Cain, p.* 108. *B.*] ὁ Θεὸς δορυφορούμενος ἅμα δυοῖν τοῖν ἀνωτάτω δυνάμεων ἀρχῆς τε αὖ καὶ ἀγαθότητος, εἷς ὢν ὁ μέσος τεττάρας φανταστὰς ἐνεργάζεται τῇ ὁρατικῇ Ψυχῇ. God attended with his Two Supreme Powers, Principality and Goodness, being himself but One in the middle of these Two, makes these Three Appearances to the seeing Soul, which is represented by *Abraham*. That these words did not drop from *Philo* by chance, the Reader may see in another place, where he speaks purposely of this matter. [*De Abrahamo p.* 287. *E.*] Πατὴρ μὲν τῶν ὅλων ὁ μέσος, *&c.* In the middle is the Father of all things, on each side of him are the Two Powers, the oldest and the nearest to the ὁ ὤν, or *Jehovah*; whereof one is the Creative Power, the other is the Royal Power: The Creative Power is called God, the Royal Power is called Lord. He therefore in the middle, being attended by these Powers on each side of him, represents to the seeing Faculty the appearance of sometimes One,

* V. *Phil. All.* 11. *p.* 77. *E.*

One, and sometimes of Three. *Philo* after all, warns his Reader that this is a Mystery, not to be communicated to every one, but only to them that were capable to understand and to keep it to themselves: By which he sheweth that this was kept as a Cabala among the *Jewish* Doctors: for fear, if it came out, the People might misunderstand it, and thereby fall into Polytheism.

As for the *Targums*, they likewise are very clear in this matter. For besides the Lord *Jehova* without any addition, they speak of the *Word* of the Lord, or the *Shekinah* of the Lord, and that so often, that it will be endless to quote all the places: some of them however must be cited, to put the thing out of dispute.

1. Where ever the words *Jehovah* and *Elohim* are read in the *Hebrew*; There *Onkelos* commonly renders it in his *Chaldee* Paraphrase, the Word of the Lord, as *Gen.* xxviii. 20, 21. xxxi. 49. *Ex.* ii. 25. xvi. 8. xix. 17. xxxii. 20. *Lev.* xx. 23. xxvi. 49. *Numb.* xi. 20. xiv. 9. xxiii. 21. *Deut.* i. 30, 32. ii. 7. iii. 12. iv. 24, 27. v. 5. ix. 3. xx. 1. xxxi. 6, 8.

The *Targums* commonly describe the same Person under the Title of *Shekinah*, which signifies, the Divine Habitation.

The Origin of that expression is in the *Hebrew* word which we find in *Gen.* ix. 27. and is repeated in many places of the Old Testament. I acknowledg freely that in some few places of the *Targums* it seems to be employed to express the Holy Ghost; so that *Eliah* in his Dictionary, and some others who have followed him, and transcribed his Book in

in their Lexicons, takes the *Shekinah* and the Holy Ghost to be the same. But after all I believe that *Eliah* hath been mistaken by not being fully acquainted with the Ideas of the most learned of his people. And indeed we see that the most famous Writers of the Synagogue put quite another sense upon the *Targums*, and decide that question against *Eliah*. looking upon the *Memra* and the *Shekinah* as the same. So doth *R. Moses Maimonides*, *R. Menachem de Rakanaty*, and *Ramban*, and *R. Bachaye*.

It is very easie to be satisfied that these famous Authors are in the right: For if you consider the places where *Philo* the *Jew* speaks of the Λόγος, you shall see that they are in the *Targum* explained either by the *Memra da Jehova*, or by the *Shekinah*. And on the contrary if you except very few places you shall find that the *Targums* employ the term of *Holy Ghost* as the proper name which we have in the Original. And even to this day the *Jews* do oftner call the Spirit as by his proper name *Ruach hakkodesh*, the Holy Spirit.

That the *Targumists* had the same Notions of these two that *Philo* had, is, I think, plain, if we compare what *Philo* saith of the two Powers of God, [*De Plant. Noæ. p.* 172.] (whereof as we shewed before he hath one on each side of himself) with what we read, of the two Hands of God, in *Jonathan* and the *Jerusalem* Targum on *Ex.* xv. 17. The like expressions are to be found in other places, too many to be here collected; but we shall consider them afterwards.

The

The mean while, we cannot but take notice, how that Doctrine of the Trinity past current among the *Jews* of the ancient Synagogue, though they were as zealous Asserters of the Unity of the Godhead as our *Socinians* can pretend to be at this day. No doubt the ancient *Jews* could have found as many Contradictions in these two Doctrines of Trinity and Unity, as the *Socinians* do, if they had not been more disposed to study how to reconcile them together, being satisfied that both these Doctrines were part of the Revelation which God had made to their Fathers.

We cannot say so altogether of the Modern *Jews*, who are very much alienated from the Doctrine of the Trinity, by seeing much clearer Revelations of it in the New Testament, and especially since they are treated with disputes against the Christians, that make Christ to be the *Messias*, or second Person in the Trinity, which they can by no means endure now to hear. This has set them to hunt for ways to avoid the Evidence of these Texts that speak of a Plurality in the Divine Nature, and in this pursuit they forsake their ancient Guides, and strangely intangle themselves, and contradict one another.

Some of them flatly deny that any of those Plural words do denote any Plurality in God, but say, they ought to be understood as if they were written in the Singular.

Others confess, that truly they do denote a Plurality. But that Plurality consists of God and his Angels, whom he joyns with himself as his Counsellors. Ask but what instance

stance they have in Scripture of such a strange way of speaking, which makes God and his Angels as it were Fellows and Companions, they presently alledg that one passage of *Dan.* iv. 17. *This matter is by the decree of the Watchers, and the Demand of the Holy Ones.* Now these Watchers, and these Holy Ones, say they, are the Holy Angels. But admit they are Angels, all that is said of them in this Text, will not prove what they infer from it. For, 1. the thing that they would prove is false and contrary to Scripture, *Es.* xl. 13. which expresly denies, that God has any Companions or Counsellors, as hath been already shewn.

2. The nature, of the Works consulted on in those Texts to which they would apply this, is such, as is infinitely above the power of any Creature, such as the Creation of Man, and the confounding of Languages, *&c.*

3: In this very Text their most Learned Commentators *R. Saadia Gaon*, and *Aben Ezra*, do not find any such Consultation of God with his Angels, as these *Jews* imagin; they do indeed find that these Watchers and Holy Ones, are the Holy Angels; but they say for the Decree גזרין מפי הקב"ה, they pronounce it from the mouth of God, and it is called their Decree, because they are the Ministers of God to do whatever he commands them. Thus *Jer.* i. 10. that Prophet is said *to be set over Nations and Kingdoms to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant*; not that God shared that power with his Prophet, or took him into Councel for such things, but only

only that he by the appointment of God, as his Minister, was to declare the Sentence and Judgment of God for the doing of such things.

4. This appears in the very Decree here spoken of, which concerns a revolution in a great Empire: But the disposal of Kingdoms is that which properly belongs to the Eternal Wisdom of God, as *Solomon* declares, *Prov.* viii. 15, 16. and not to Angels any farther, than they are employed by God for the publishing, or for the executing of his Sentence.

But after all this, though I have admitted it that the Angels are here called Watchers, and Holy Ones, yet I am rather of opinion that these words do not signifie Angels, but the three Persons in the Trinity. My reason is, because however that Notion of ἐγρήγορεσι, being Angels has obtained among the *Jews*, I do not find them called so any where in the Old Testament Scriptures. But God is often said to watch over his People, *Gen.* xxxi. 49. *Psal.* vii. 6. *&* cxxvii. 1. *Jer.* xxxi. 28. *&* xliv. 27. and even by this Prophet, *Dan.* ix. 14. And for the other word that is here joyn'd with the Watchers, *viz.* the Holy Ones, however this may be used of Angels elswhere, yet here it is certainly used of God in this Chapter, *v.* 8, 9, 18. and that in the Plural, as it is in *Josh.* xxiv. 19. and yet as there in *Joshua* the *Holy Gods* in the Plural are the same with the *Jehovah* in the Singular Number; so here the Watchers and the Holy Ones in the Plural are the same with the Watcher and Holy One in the Singular,

gular, *v.* 13. and the Decree of the Watchers and Holy Ones in this verse, is called the Decree of the Most High, *v.* 24. and it is he whom *Nebuchadnezzar* glorifies as the sole Author of his abasement, and also of his restauration. I hope the Reader will easily pardon this digression, if he thinks it is one: It seemed necessary that I should consider this Text at large, because it is as far as I know, the only place in Scripture which is brought by the *Jews* to colour that Interpretation with which they think to elude the force of our Arguments.

After all that I have alledged from *Philo*, and the Paraphrases, I do not pretend to affirm that they had as distinct Notions of the Trinity as we have; nor do I deny but that sometimes they put a different construction on the Texts which we have cited in proof of this Mystery; Nay, I own that their Ideas are often confused when they speak of these things, and particularly they refer sometimes that to the second Person which should be ascribed to the third, and that to the third which properly belongs to the second; Nay, more, I acknowledg that *Philo* by the Spirit, *Gen.* i. 2. understands the Wind, [*de Gig. p.* 223.] which is something strange; seeing the *Greek* Interpreters whom he followed read πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, *i. e.* the Spirit of God, and not simply the Spirit, which might have stood for Wind here, as it does in some places of the Old Testament.

But *Philo*'s Error is easily accounted for; He fell into it by endeavouring to accommodate *Moses* his Notions to the Notions of the Philo-

Philosophy, that makes four Elements of all things. And probably for such a reason some of the *Targums* might come into the same Interpretation. But for the other ancient *Jews* they expounded this Spirit, not by Wind, but by that Spirit which was to rest on the *Messiah* in *Isaiah*'s Language, *Isa.* xi. 1. See *Bresh. Rabba* in *Gen.* i. 2. And truly *Rashi* on these words affirms, that the Throne of Glory was in the Air, and that it warmed the Heavens by the Spirit of the Goodness of God blessed for ever. Where by the way the Spirit of Goodness is the same with the latter of *Philo's* two Powers above mentioned. *De Sacr. Ab.* 108.

Those among the *Jews* who take the Spirit of God for the Will of God, as *R. Abr.* doth in *Tzeror hammor*, and some mentioned in the Book *Cozri*, [*p.* 5. *p.* 329.] are not far from this Opinion: And this is the sense *Maimonides* gives to those words, *The Spirit of the Lord*, in explaining of *Isa.* xl. 13. [*Mor. Neb.* i. 40.] It appears from *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. That *the Host's of Heaven were made by the Spirit of his mouth*; words which no *Jew* has yet interpreted of the Wind.

I know *Philo* expresses his thoughts obscurely, speaking of the two Powers of God, [*de Cherub. p.* 86.] he saith, that the Word joyns these two Powers, which he afterwards calls his Principality and his Goodness.

But this can raise no prejudice against our Position. It shews indeed that our Author, who had gathered his Notions, as other *Jews* did, from reading the Books of the Old Testament, together with their Traditional Interpre-

terpretations, was not so much a Master of them, as to make them always consist with one another. Others perhaps will say, he was not always constant to himself; nor am I concern'd to have it granted that he was so. We look not on him, nor any of these Writers to be inspired; but esteem them only as Eminent Divines of the old *Jewish* Church, and consequently as subject to several weaknesses and oversights, which are common to the greatest as well as to the meanest men. Even the most Learned Men in all Ages, though they agree in the truth of certain Doctrines, are yet often divided in their ways of expressing them; and also in their grounding them on this or that place of Scripture.

For the *Jews* since Christ's time, we are less concern'd what they say, because when they had once rejected their *Messias* the Lord Jesus Christ, they soon found that if they stood to their Traditional Expositions of Scripture, it could not be denied, but he whom they had rejected was the Word the Son of God, whom their Fathers expected to come in our Flesh; but rather than yield to that, they would alter their Creed, and either wholly throw out the Word the Son of God, or bring him down to the state of a created Angel, as we see some of them do now in their ordinary Comments on Scripture. And so they deal with the *Shekinah* likewise, confounding the Master with the Servant, as we see that some few perhaps one or two Cabalists have done in their Books.

In

In consequence of this alteration, they are forc'd to acknowledg, the Patriarchs *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, worshipped a created Angel; and have left themselves no way to excuse them from Idolatry therein, but by corrupting their Doctrine concerning Religious Worship, and teaching that it is lawful to pray to these Ministring Spirits, which is effectually the setting up of other Gods, plainly contrary to the first Commandment of their Law. Some of themselves are so sensible of this, that they cannot deny it to be Idolatry. Which is certainly the more inexcusable in the *Jews*, because on other occasions they constantly affirm, that when God charged the Angels with the care of other Nations, he reserved to himself the sole Government of his people *Israel*, *Deut.* xxxii. 8, 9. And therefore it must be a grievous sin in them to worship Angels, howsoever they should imagin it might be permitted to other Nations.

After all this they have not been able so totally to suppress the ancient Tradition, but that in their Writers since Christ's time there appear some footsteps of it still: And that it is so I am next to shew, that notwithstanding their aversness to the Christian Doctrine, they yet have a Notion distinct enough both of a Plurality and Trinity in the Divine Nature, which will be the whole business of my next Chapter.

CHAP. XI.

That this Notion of a Trinity in the Divine Nature has continued among the Jews, *since the time of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

TO begin with the *Jewish* Authors who have writ *Medrashim*, that is, a sort of *Allegorical Commentaries* upon Scripture, and the *Cabalistical Jews*, whom their people look upon as the wisest Men of their Nation, *viz.* those that know the truth more than all others, among them *this truth* passes for undoubted.

I know very well that the method of those Cabalistical Men, who seek for Mysteries almost in every Letter of the words of Scripture, hath made them justly ridiculous. And indeed one cannot imagin an occupation more vain or useless, than the prodigious labour which they undergo in their way of *Gematria*, *Notarikon*, and *Tsirouph*.

But besides that Vice is not so general among the *Jews*, I am fully resolved to lay aside in this Controversie all such remarks; my design being only to shew that the ancient Tradition hath been kept among those Authors, who have their Name from their firm adherence to the Tradition of their Forefathers.

So I am not willing to deny that some of the Books of those Cabalistical Authors, which

which the *Jews*, who are not great Criticks, look upon as very ancient, are not as to all their parts of such an antiquity as the *Jews* suppose them to be. But I take notice that those who attack the antiquity of those Books are not aware that notwithstanding some additions, which are in those Books, as for example in the *Zohar*, and in the *Rabboth*, the very Doctrine of the Synagogue is to be found there, and the same as it is represented to us by the *Apocryphal* Authors, by *Philo*, or those who had occasion to mention the Doctrine of the *Jews*.

After all, let us suppose that almost all those Books have been written since the *Talmud*; and that the *Talmud* was written since the beginning of the seventh Century, that could not be a prejudice against the Doctrine which the *Jews* propose as the ancient Doctrine of the Synagogue; But to the contrary it would be a strong proof of the constancy of those Authors in keeping the Tradition of their Ancestors in so strange a dispersion, and among so many Nations; chiefly since in the Articles, upon which I shall quote their Authorities, they so exactly follow the steps of the Authors of the *Apocryphal* Books of *Philo* the *Jew*, and of their ancient Paraphrast, who had more penetrated into the sense of Scripture.

I say then, that both the Authors of the *Midrashim* and the Cabalistical Authors agree exactly in this, that they acknowledg a Plurality in the Divine Essence, and that they reduce such a Plurality to three Persons, as we do.

To prove such an assertion, I take notice first, That the *Jews* do judg as we do, that the word *Elohim*, which is Plural, expresses a Plurality. Their ordinary remark upon that word is this, that *Elohim* is as if one did read, *El kem*, that is, *They are God*. *Bachajè* a famous Commentator of the *Pentateuch*, who brings in his work all the senses of the four sorts of Interpreters among the *Jews*, speaks to this purpose upon the *Parascha Breschit. fol.* 2. *col.* 3.

2*ly*. It is certain that they make use of the word πρόσωπον, to express those Persons, as they use to express the two first human Persons, *viz. Adam* and *Eve*. Thus speaks of them the same *Bachaje*, *Ibid. fol.* 13. *col.* 2.

3*ly*. They fix the number of three Persons in the Divine Essence, distinguishing their Personal Characters and Actions, which serve to make them known.

4*ly*. They speak of the emanation of the two last from the first, and that the last proceeds by the second.

5*ly*. They declare that this Doctrine contains a Mystery that is incomprehensible, and above human reason, and that in such an unsearchable secret we must acquiesce with the Authority of the Divine Revelation.

6*ly*. They ground this Doctrine upon the very same Texts of Scripture, which we alledg to prove the several Positions of ours, which deserves a great deal of consideration.

And indeed those things being so, we must necessarily conclude, either that they mock their Readers, or that they do not understand

stand what they say, or one must acknowledg that the consequences and conclusions, which Christians draw from the Scriptures to this subject of Trinity, are not so easie to be avoided as the *Socinians* believe.

Let the Reader reflect upon each of those Articles, while I shall bring him witnesses to establish them.

I know that they pretend commonly the name of *Elohim*, which is Plural, is given to God to express his several Virtues: But beyond that, they maintain that Scripture hath affected this style of Plurality because of those two, the *Cochma* or Wisdom, and the *Bina* or understanding which are spoken *Prov.* 3. 19. where *Solomon* reflects upon the Author of the Creation, and they alledg upon this Subject, the place of *Ecclesiastes*, *ch.* xii. 1. where *Creators* are mentioned. *Bachaje in Pentat. fol.* 4. *col.* 2. *&* *col.* 4. *&* *R. Joseph de Karnitol in Saare Tsedec. fol.* 7. *col.* 2.

As they study in a special manner the History of the Creation, and consider very nicely every expression thereof, they take notice that the *Jerusalem* Targum hath translated those words in the beginning, *Bereshit*, God created Heaven and Earth; by these, God created by his Wisdom, which is call'd the beginning, *Prov.* viii. and so that *Onkelos* hath not translated the word *Bereschit*, by the word *Kadmita*, which signifies the beginning of time; but by the word *Bekadmin*, which signifies the ancient or the first, which is the Title they give to Wisdom, according to the same place of *Solomon*, which I have quoted. This is the Notion of the Book *Habbahir*, of the

the *Zohar*, of the *Rabboth*, whose words are related at large by *R. Menachem de Rekanati* in *Pentat. fol.* 1. *col.* 1, & 2. of the *Venice* Edit. by *Bombergue*.

They maintain the Wisdom which is spoken of by *Solomon* to be the cause by which all particular Beings have been formed, and they call it the second number, which proceeds from the first, as from his spring, and brings from it the influx of all blessings. This is the Doctrine of *R. Nechouniah ben Cana*, and of the Author of *Rabboth*, which *R. Menachem* quotes at large, *Ibid. fol.* 1. *col.* 1.

They teach that because God hath created by his Wisdom, as the Soul acts by her Body, they cannot say there was not an absolute and perfect unity in the work of the Creation. This is the Doctrine of the *Zohar*, followed by *R. Menachem de Rekanat. Ibid. col.* 2.

And indeed they acknowledg not only that Wisdom to have been the efficient cause of the Word, but they acknowledg also the *Bina*, as such an efficient cause with God; from hence they pretend that God hath founded the World by his two Hands, as it is said by *Isa. ch.* xlviii. 13. so *Bachaje* in *Gen. fol.* 3. *col.* 2.

And this Notion agreeth exactly with what is said by *Moses* that the Spirit of God moved it self upon the face of the Abyss. For it was not of a created wind, but of a Divine and Increated Being which *Moses* speaks there, and which is spoken of by *David*, *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. as it is acknowledged by *Leo Hebræus Dial. de Amore*, and by *Menasseh ben Israel Concil. in Gen.* Q. 2. §. 7. and by many others.

It

It is to be noted, as the first Christians make use of the word *Number*, when they speak of the Divine Wisdom, acknowledging that it differs in Number, but not in Substance from the Eternal Father; So *Justin* doth against *Tryphon*; and do acknowledge some degrees between the Three Persons: So doth *Tertullian* in some places; and afterwards they have made use of the word Person: So the Ancient *Jews* have among them the same Terms, which shews they had the same Ideas: They speak of the *Sephiroth*, that is, of the *Numbers* in the Godhead; they speak of the several *Madregoth*, which is *Degrees*; they speak of *Prosopin*, which is *Persons*, as I have shewn before.

They cannot express their mind more distinctly, than when they distinguish, 1. *He* and *Thou*, which is the Characteristical distinction of Persons, and when they apply these Pronouns to the Persons which they conceive in the Godhead: So they say that *Thou* belongs to Wisdom, and *He* to the God which is absconded. *R. Menach. Ibid. fol.* 22. *col.* 2. & *fol.* 45. *col.* 1.

They give to them their Characteristical Names; so they make the name *Anochi* to belong to God absconded; they refer the name of *any* to the *Shekinah* or *Memra*, which is the same to them, as I shall shew afterwards. See *R. Menach. in Pent. fol.* 149. *col.* 4.

They refer to these Persons the Consultations and Speeches of God, as directed to many; as, *Let us make man*, which contains a deep Mystery, as says *Bachaje*; (but which others would elude, by maintaining that God

 speaks

speaks to Angels): So doth *R. Menach. de Rek. fol.* 35. *col.* 4. So they conceive that when it is said in Scripture that God speaks with his Heart, then God speaks with his *Shekinah*: 'Tis their Remark upon *Gen.* xi. *Let us come down. R. Men. fol.* 27. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 28. *col.* 2. So they acknowledge distinctly in these words, *Gen.* xix. 24. *And* Jehovah *rained upon Sodom from* Jehovah; that those Two *Jehovah* are Two Persons, which they call expresly *Two Prosopin. R. Menach. fol.* 11. *col.* 1. *& fol.* 63. *col.* 4. So in the History of the Tower of *Babel. Ibid. fol.* 28. *col.* 3.

They distinguish exactly the Characteristical Actions which belong to these Persons. So they attribute to the God absconded, to have acted in the Creation by his Wisdom, and by his Understanding. *R. Menach. fol.* 1. from *Breschit Rabba*; and that according to *Solomon*, Prov. iii. and to *David*, Psal. xxxiii. 6.

They say that this Wisdom is called the *Beginning*, although she is but the second *Sephira*, because beyond her they can know nothing, the first *Sephira* being unknown to all Creatures. 'Tis the Doctrine of the Book *Jetzira*, and of the *Zohar* related by *R. Men. fol.* 1. *col.* 3. They maintain that 'tis the *Shekinah* or Wisdom which rules the World, according to *Solomon*'s words, *Prov.* viii. *R. Men. fol.* 35. *col.* 1.

I shall shew in one of the next Chapters, that they refer to the *Shekinah* or *Memra*, almost all the Appearances of God which are mentioned in Scripture, according to the Ideas of the *Targum*. That can be seen in the Comments of *Ramban* and of *Bachaje* upon

upon the *Pentateuch*. I quote here only *R. Menachem*, because he brings the very Words of the Authors who lived before him; so that his Authority is not alone, but upheld by the Consent of old Authors.

Now he and his Authors teach constantly, That 'twas the *Shekinah* which appeared to *Adam* after his Sin, and made him some Cloaths, *fol.* 59. *col.* 4. That it appeared to *Abraham, fol.* 35. *col.* 2. That it appeared to *Jacob* at Night, *fol.* 36. *col.* 2. And to the same upon the Ladder, *fol.* 41, *&* 42. That it appeared to *Moses*, Exod. iii. *fol.* 55. *col.* 2. And to the People upon Mount *Sina, fol.* 56. *col.* 2. That it spake to *Moses*, and gave the Law to the People, *fol.* 57. *col.* 2, *&* 3. *fol.* 58. *col.* 1. *& fol.* 84. *col.* 1. *& col.* 2.

There are many other special Acts which they refer constantly to the *Memra* or *Shekinah*; as you may see in the same Comment of *Menachem*. I shall only point at some of them; not to enlarge too much in this Chapter.

So they give to the *Shekinah* the Character of Ruler and Conducter of the Animals of Glory, who receive their Virtue from the *Shekinah*, and live by his Glory, *fol.* 65. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 66. *col.* 4. According as we read in *Ezek.* i. 13. So *R. Menachem*, following the *Zohar, fol.* 5. *col.* 3. *& fol.* 8. *col.* 1.

They call the *Shekinah* the *Adam* of above, after whose Image *Adam* was created: And they give to him the Titles of *Exalted* and *Blessed*, which they give only to the True God, *R. Men. fol.* 14. *col.* 3. They say, That 'twas

'twas he to whom *Noah* offered his Sacrifice, *Ibid. fol.* 27. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 34. *col.* 4.

They pretend that the *Shekinah* is the Bridegroom of the Synagogue, according to the Idea of God by *Isaiah* lxii. 3. *R. Men. fol.* 15. *col.* 1. And that God having committed to Angels the Care of other Nations, the *Shekinah* alone was intrusted with the Care and Conduct of *Israel*, *fol.* 28. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 153. *col.* 2.

They pretend that he hath been in Captivity with their Fathers, *R. Men. fol.* 17. *col.* 2. *&* *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 51. *col.* 2. That he hath smote the *Egyptians*, *fol.* 56. *col.* 4. without the help of Angels, although the Angels attended him as their King, *fol.* 59. *col.* 1. *&* *col.* 2. *&* *fol.* 61. *col.* 3.

They pretend that the Temple was built to the Honour of the *Shekinah*, *fol.* 63. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 70. *col.* 2. And that it was to him, and not to the Ark, that the *Levites* said, *Arise, O Lord, into thy rest, Thou and the Ark of thy strength*, Psal. cxxxii. 8. *fol.* 121. *col.* 4.

In a word, they look upon the *Shekinah* as the Living God, *fol.* 2. *col.* 1. The God of *Jacob*, *R. Men. fol.* 38. *col.* 3. And they acknowledge him to be that very Angel whom *Jacob* looks upon as *his Redeemer*, *his Shepherd*, and whom the Prophets call *the Angel of the Presence*, and *the Angel of the Covenant*, *Ibid. fol.* 73. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 83. *col.* 4.

They are no less positive, when they speak of the Third *Sephira*, which they call *Binah*, and which we take justly to be the Holy Ghost. For they teach that it proceeds from the First by the Second; and who can conceive that the

the Spirit of God is not God? And 'tis also the Doctrine of the *Zohar*, and of the Book *Habbahir*, related by *R. Menachem*, *fol.* 1. *col.* 3. The very Book of *Zohar* saith, That the word *Jehovah* expresses both the Wisdom and the *Binah*, and calls them Father and Mother, *R. Men. fol.* 3. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 10. *col.* 4.

This Idea is grounded upon what is said, *Thou art our Father*, which they refer to the *Shekinah*, *fol.* 22. *col.* 2. *&* *col.* 3. And they call her upon that account the Mother of *Israel*, and her Tutor, *R. Men. fol.* 62. *col.* 3. *fol.* 64. *col.* 4. That Idea of the Holy Ghost as a Mother, which *R. Menachem* hath, *fol.* 114. *col.* 2. is so ancient among the *Jews*, that St. *Jerom* witnesses that it was the name which the *Nazarenes* gave to the Holy Ghost, *Hieronym. in Ezek.* xvi. *in Isa.* viii. *&* *in Matth.* xiii.

They speak of the Spirit as of a Person, when they look upon a Man as a Prophet, who is sent by God, and by his Spirit, *Isa. chap.* xlviii. *R. Menach. fol.* 34. *col.* 2. *&* *fol.* 56. *col.* 1. And by whom the Holy Ghost hath spoken; *fol.* 122. *col.* 2. And who for that reason is called *the mouth of God*, *fol.* 127. *col.* 4. (Which is now turned by some other *Jews*, as signifying only a Created Angel; as you see in *Bachaje*, at the end of the *Parasha Breschith*, *fol.* 18. *col.* 1.) So they speak of the Holy Ghost as being the *mouth of God*, *fol.* 127. *col.* 4. And that the Angels have been created by the Mouth of God, *fol.* 143. *col.* 3.

I acknowledg that sometimes some of them seem to take the *Shekinah* for the Holy Ghost, and

and the Holy Ghost for the *Shekinah*, although they commonly call one the Second *Sephira*, and the other the Third, *viz.* the *Binah*, that is to be seen in *R. Men. fol.* 80. *col.* 2. So some of them refer to the *Binah* the Title of King of *Israel*, which occurs so often in Scripture: See *Men. fol.* 132. *col.* 3. Although it is the common Name of the *Shekinah*, *fol.* 113. *col.* 1. Some other refer to the *Shekinah* the Name of the Spirit of God, which is mentioned *Gen.* i. 1. So says the Author of the Book *Jetzira*, *in R. Menachem*, *fol.* 3. *col.* 2.

But if some are mistaken in their Ideas, I can say that they are very few, and almost not worth taking notice of. And indeed if we consider a little what is the general Sense of those Authors about the Emanations which are spoken of in Scripture, as by which the Divine Nature is communicated to the Λόγος or *Shekinah*, and to the Holy Ghost, we shall know evidently that they had as distinct a Notion of a true Trinity, as they have of the Plurality of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence.

And first the Author of the *Zohar*, and the Author of the Book *Habbahir*, pronounce that the Third *Sephira* proceeds from the First by the Second; and *R. Men.* follows their Doctrine, *fol.* 1. *col.* 3.

2*dly*. They attribute equally the Name of *Jehovah* to the Second and the Third *Sephira*, *viz.* the Wisdom, and the *Binah*, or Understanding. So does the *Zohar in R. Men. fol.* 3. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 10. *col.* 4.

3*dly*. They propose the manner in which *Eve* was *Taken* from *Adam*, as an Image of the

the manner of Emanation of the Wisdom from the *En soph*, that is, Infinite, *Ib. fol.* 105. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 14. *col.* 1.

4*thly*. They propose the Image of the two Cherubims who were drawn from the Ark, to give the Idea of the Two last Persons; for the distinction of the Cherubims was evident, although there was an Unity of them with the Ark. So *R. Men. fol.* 74. *col.* 3.

But we must add some of their Expressions upon this matter, so much contradicted by the *Socinians*.

And first, *R. Menachem*, with the *Jewish* Authors suppose that not only the Three Persons, which they call *Sephiroth*, are spoken of in the History of the Creation, but that they are also express'd in the first Command of the Law. See him, *fol.* 66. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 68. *col.* 1.

2*dly*. They acknowledge those Three *Sephiroth*, and attribute to every one his Operations, *Ibid. fol.* 139. *col.* 4.

3*dly*. The Author of *Zohar* is a Voucher of great Authority; and he cites these words of *R. Jose* (a famous *Jew* of the second Century), where examining the Text, *Deut.* iv. 7. *Who have their Gods so near to them?* What, saith he, may be the meaning of this? *It seems that* Moses *should have said, Who have God so near them? But* (saith he) *there is a Superior God, and there is the God who was the Fear of* Isaac, *and there is an Inferior God; and therefore* Moses *saith, The Gods so near. For there are many Virtues that come from the only One, and all they are one.*

See

See how the same Author supposes that there are Three *Degrees* in the Godhead, in *Levit. col.* 116. *Come and see the Mystery in the word* Elohim, viz. *There are Three degrees, and every degree is distinct by himself; and notwithstanding, they are all One, and tied in One, and one is not separated from the other.* And again, *in Exod. col.* 75. *Upon the words of* Deut. vi. 4. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; *they must know that those Three* (viz. יהוה, אלהים, יהוה) *are One* unum; *and that is a Secret which we learn in the Mystery of the Voice which is heard: The Voice is One* unum, *but it contains Three Modes,* viz. *the Fire, the Air, and the Water. Now these Three are One in the Mystery of the Voice, and they are but One* unum. *So in this place,* Jehovah, our Lord, Jehovah, *are one* unum.

You have this Remark of the same Author in *Gen. fol.* 54. *col* 2. *de Litera* ש, That the Three Branches of that Letter denote the Heavenly Fathers, who are there named *Jehovah, our Lord, Jehovah.*

R. Hay Hagahon, who lived Seven hundred Years ago, said there are Three Lights in God; the Ancient Light, or *Kadmon*; the Pure Light, or צח; the Purified Light, or מצוחצח; and that these make but One God: And that there is neither Plurality nor Polytheism in this. The same Idea is followed by *R. Shem Tov.* in his Book *Emunoth, part.* 4. *cap.* 8. *p.* 32. *col.* 2.

See again *R. Hamay Hagaon* in his Book העיון of Speculation cited by *Reuchlin*, p. 651. *Hi tres qui sunt unum inter se proportionem habent ut* אחד מיוחד יחיד *unum uniens & unitum.*

unitum. He said before והם ראש ואמצע וסוף *sunt principium & medium & finis, & hæc sunt unus punctus & est dominus universi.*

R. Joseph ben Gekatilia, and the other Cabalists are in effect for three *Elohims* when they treat of the three δυνάμεις, or three first *Sephiroth.* For they agree that the three first *Sephiroth* were never seen by any body, and that there is no discord, no imperfection among them.

The Note of this *R. Joseph Gekatilia* is very remarkable. The *Jews,* saith he, have been under the severity of judgment, and shall continue so till the coming of the *Messias,* who shall be united (saith he) with the second *Sephirah,* which is Wisdom, according as it is written *Isa.* xi. 2. *And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of Wisdom,* &c. And he shall cause the Spirit of Grace and Clemency to descend from the first *Sephirah,* who is called, אין סוף *the Infinite*; and he follows in that *Rabbi Salomon Jarchi,* who saith upon *Isa.* xi. that the *Cochma* which is the second *Sephira* shall be in the middle of the *Messias.*

In a word this Notion of Plurality and Trinity expressed in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets hath not only been observed by the *Jews,* but they have found and acknowledged it as well as the Christians to be a great and profound mystery. And for the explaining of it the *Jews* have employed very near the same Ideas that the Christians use in speaking of the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. For they conceive in God פנים Faces, and הויות Subsistences, which we

we call Persons, as one may see in *Sepher Jetzirah.*

Moreover, we may observe, 1. That when they speak of the three first *Sephiroth*, they understand the same thing by them, as we do by three Personalities, three Modes of Existence, active or passive Emanations or Processions, which are the foundation of the Personalities.

2*ly*. That though they hold ten *Sephiroth* in all, yet they make a great difference between the three first *Sephiroth*, and the seven last. For they regard the first as Persons, but the last as Attributes, according to which God acts in the ordinary course of his Providence, or according to his several dispensations towards his Creatures. Hence they call the seven last, *Middoth*, or Measures, that is to say, the Attributes and Characters which are visible in the Works of God, namely, his Justice and Mercy, *&c.* And this is confessed in plain words by the great Cabalist *R. Menachem de Rekanati*: *Tres primariæ numerationes, quæ sunt intellectuales, non vocantur mensuræ*, i.e. they are not Attributes, as are the seven last which he explains under that Notion. *Rittangel* hath already quoted that place in his Notes upon *Sepher Jetzira, p.* 193.

It may be objected, that the ancient *Jews* were ignorant of the Names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which Names the Christians give to the three Persons in the Deity. But this, if it were true, would not weigh much with a reasonable mind. For who can doubt but a new Revelation may distinguish those Notions clearly by proper and suitable Names, which

which the *Jews* by what Revelation they had, knew but more confusedly. And yet to remove the Objection wholly, it is certain the ancient Cabalists were acquainted with the Names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

They gave the Name of Father to the first of their *Sephiroth*, whom they called *En Soph*, *i. e. Infinite*, to express his Incomprehensibility. This we have in *Zohar*, from whence it is easie to conclude that they must own the Son also, the Name of Father being relative to the Son. But further they knew that second Person by the name *Cæma* Wisdom, even that Wisdom by which the Word was created, *&c.* according to *Prov.* 3. 19. *The Lord by Wisdom hath founded the Earth.* This Notion was so ancient among the *Jews*, that the *Jerusalem* Targum hath rendred the first verse of *Genesis* thus, *The Lord created by his Wisdom.* The Christians call'd him the *Word*, and *Wisdom*, alluding to divers places, especially *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. and *Prov.* viii. 14. The *Jews* commonly call him כבוד שני the second Glory, and the Crown of the Creation. *Rittanget.* brings their Authorities for this in *Seph. Jetzira p.* 4, *&* 5.

They knew the third Person by the name of *Binah*, or Intelligence, because they thought it was he that gave Men the knowledg of what God was pleased to reveal to them. In particular, they called him the Sanctifier, and the Father of Faith: nor is any thing more common among them than to give him the name of the Spirit of Holiness, or the Holy Spirit.

The same Doctrine is to be found in several other Books of the Cabalists which are known to most Christians, because they are Printed; and the same thing is to be found in their Manuscripts, which are more rare, because the *Jews* have not yet Printed them. Of this sort is *Iggereth Hassodoth*, cited by *Galatinus*, whose Authority is vindicated by *Plantavitius Bibl. Rabb. p.* 549. Of this sort also is the Manuscript called *Sod Mercava Eliona* quoted by *Rist. p.* 35. where are mentioned the three Modes of Existence in God. Notwithstanding which they are all unanimous, that the Lord is one, and his Name is one.

If you would know on what foundations it was that the Cabalists built this Doctrine, you need but look over the Texts on which they have reflected, and you'l find them almost all the same with those that were quoted to the same purpose by the Apostles and Apostolical Men in their Writings.

Particularly if you would know their opinion to whom it was that God did speak at the Creation, *Gen.* i. 26. *R. Juda* will tell you God spoke to his Word.

If you would know of them who is the Spirit of whom we read, *Gen.* i. 2. *that he moved on the face of the Waters. Moses Botril* will inform you, it is the Holy Spirit.

If you would learn of them to whom it was that God spoke, *Gen.* i. 26. saying, *Let Us make Man. Moses Botril* tells us that these words are directed to the Wisdom of God.

If you would know what Spirit it was that

that is spoken of, *Job* xxviii. 12. Again *Moses Botril* will tell you, it is the Holy Spirit.

If you would know of whom they understand those words in *Psal.* xxxvi. 6. They say plainly that they are spoken of that very Trinity.

If you would know what they think of that Wisdom, *Psal.* civ. 24. *R. Moses Botril* describes it to you as a Person, and not an Attribute.

If you would know to whom that is to be referr'd, which we read of, *Isa.* xl. 14. *R. Abraham ben David* will tell you, to the Three *Sephiroth*.

All this is to be found in their several Comments on the Book *Jetzira*, which were printed at *Mantua* in the last Century, *A. D.* 1562. & 1592. and have been quoted in *Latin* by *Rittangelius*.

But it may be said, That the *Jews* have adopted this Doctrine inconsiderately, without reflecting upon the Absurdity of it. For how is it possible to conceive such Emanations in God, who is Immutable and Eternal; and such an Idea of Plurality and of Trinity in God, who is over and above all Ideas of Composition?

But I answer, 1. All these they have considered, and yet have owned this Distinction in the Divine Essence, as a Truth not to be contested. But assert these Three *Sephiroth*, which they call sometimes Spirits, to be Eternal and Essential in God; which they say we ought not to deny, because we can't easily conceive it: For the Divine Nature is Incomprehensible, far exceeding the Limits

of our narrow Understandings: And the Revelation God hath given us does no more put us in a capacity to judge of the nature of the things revealed, than the borrowed Light of the Moon, which is all that the Owls can behold, does render them able to judge of the Sun's far more glorious Light. Such are the Thoughts of *R. Sabtay in Rit.* on *Jetz. p.* 78, 79, 80. Such are the Reflections of *R. Menach.* who cites *Job* xxviii. 7. to this purpose; and the Caution of the *Jewish* Doctors, who forbid to undertake the Examination of things that are incomprehensible.

2. They have expressed their Notions of this matter much after the same manner as the *Thomists* have done theirs. The Book *Jetzira, chap.* 1. distinguishes in God, *Sopher, Sepher,* and *Sippour*; which *R. Abraham* explaining, says they answer to Him that understands, to the Act of Understanding, and to the Thing understood.

All this is still the more remarkable, 1. Because the common *Jews* have well nigh quite lost the Notion of the *Messias* being God; and they generally expect no other than a mere common Man for their Redeemer.

2. Because the main Body of the *Jews* are such zealous Asserters of the Unity of God, that they repeat every day the words of *Deut.* vi. 4. *The Lord our God is One Lord.* It is a Practice which though now they have turn'd against the Christians, yet doubtless was taken up first in opposition to the *Gentiles*, whose Polytheism was renounced in this short Confession of the *Jewish* Faith. And hence

hence it is that they do so much celebrate *R. Akiba*'s Faith, who died in Torments, with the last Syllables of the word *Echad* in his Mouth, which signifies the Unity of God.

3. Because the *Jews* at the same time dispute against the Christians Doctrine of the Trinity; as doth *R. Saadia*, for instance, in his Book entituled *Sepher Emunah, chap.* 2.

4. Because from the beginning of Christianity some *Rabbins* have applied themselves to find out other Senses of those Passages which the Christians urge against them. This we see in *Gem.* of *Sanhedr. chap.* 4. *sect.* 2.

And yet notwithstanding all this opposition, the *Cabalists* have past and do still pass for Divines among the *Jews*, and the *Targumists* for Inspired Men.

Nor is it to be imagined that these Notions of the Cabalistical *Jews* are new things, which they pick'd up since their more frequent Converse with the Christians: For we find them in the Book *Zohar*, the Author of which is reputed one of the chief *Jewish* Martyrs (*Jebhamoth, tr.* 1. *fol.* 5. *col.* 2.), and to have lived in the Second Century. I know some have suspected that this Book is a counterfeit, and falsly fathered on *R. Simeon*, whose Name it bears. The *Zohar* was not known, say they, till about the time of *R. Moses Bar Nachman*: So saith the Book *Juchazin, p.* 42. *& R. D. Ganz in Tzemach David, p.* 106. But we find these Notions in the beginning of the *Rabboth*, which Books they will have to be more Ancient than the *Talmud*. Furthermore, we see in the *Gemara* of *Sabbath*, that

R. Simeon was dispensed with the necessity of his being present at Prayers in the Synagogue, because he and his Scholars were at work upon the Study of the Laws; which supposes that he was writing some such Comments as we have now, although 'tis probable that they have been increased in following Ages. Besides, who can imagine that in all places the *Jews* should have adopted Opinions unknown to their Religion, and in effect destructive of those Points for which they then zealously contended, if they had not been convinced of the Truth of such a Doctrine?

And now give me leave to propose one Argument to the *Unitarians*, which I believe they will not be able to answer, and adhere to their new-advanced Position, That the *Nazarenes* were the true Primitive Christians, and the only Depositaries of the Apostolick Doctrine. It is a Passage taken from the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, as cited by St. *Jerome* on *Ezek.* xvi. Where after noting that the word *Ruach*, Spirit, in the *Hebrew* Tongue is Feminine; he adds, *In Evangelio quoque Hebræorum, quod lectitant Nazaræi, Salvator inducitur loquens*, Modo me arripuit Mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus. This Passage of the *Nazarene's* Gospel would never have been understood, if we had not known that the *Jews* call the Holy Spirit *Imma*, Mother, as well as *Binah*, Understanding; as we see in *Zohar* and other Cabalists. And perhaps from hence *Philo de Temul.* calleth ἐκκλησίαν, the Mother of the World.

Nor are we to fancy that the *Talmudists* oppose the *Cabalists* herein. No; *Maimonides*, who is a *Talmudist*, agrees in this with the *Cabalists*; as appears from his Book *de fundament. legis, ch.* 2. & *Mor. Neb. p.* 1. *ch.* 68.

Lastly, Nor is it to be urged against what I have said, that the *Jews* have formal Disputes against the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *Saadiah Sepher Emunoth, ch.* 2. & *Maim. Mor. Neb. p.* 1. *c.* 71. For we may remember, 1. That all their Disputes with the Christians are built on this wrong bottom, That the Christians are Tritheists, and deny the Unity of the Deity. 2. That almost all those who dispute against the Christians on this Head, contradict themselves in their Writings that are not Polemical, but are drawn up in cool Blood, out of the heat of dispute; of which *Saadiah Haggaen*, as I have shewed before, is a Proof. 3. The Study of their Rites having been the great business of the *Jews* for many Centuries, it hath happen'd that their greatest Authors have applied themselves but little to the Study of the Traditions concerning their Doctrines. In *Maimonides*, one of the greatest Men the *Jews* ever had, we have a plain Example of it: He tells us, That it was towards the declension of his Life before he could turn himself to study their Traditions; and he laments his Misfortune, in that he could not begin this Study sooner. This is related by *R. Elias Chaiim*, who saith he had it from a Letter of *Maimonides* to one of his Scholars.

I have said before, that these Notions of the Cabalist *Jews* are received in all parts of the World where the *Jews* are found in any numbers: And I say it not without good rea-

reason: For 1. The *Rabboth* are Books received whereever there are *Jews*: Now this Book begins with the Notion of a Second Person. 2. For the *Cabalists*, they are dispersed with the other *Jews*; and in all places where Learning is cultivated, and Study encouraged, there they are to be found. 3. We may well infer the Universality of this Tradition, from the several different Authors that have written alike on this Subject, without any Consent or Communication together that we know of.

R. Saadiah Hagaon writ in *Babylon* in the Tenth Century. He was an *Egyptian* by Birth, and the Translator of the *Pentateuch* into *Arabick*, and wrote a bitter Book against the Christians (which hath been printed at *Thessalonica*, and since at *Amsterdam*) where he disputes against the Christians Trinity; yet he teaches not only the Unity, but this distinction from everlasting in the Deity.

R. Moses Bar Nachman in the Thirteenth Century, and *R. Judas* the *Levite* writ in *Spain*, and yet we see how they agree in their Notions with the *Cabalists* which flourished other-where.

R. Aaron writ at *Babylon*, and yet his Notions are as exactly like those of *Spain*, as if he had trod in their Steps.

R. Moses Botril writ in *France*, and he teaches the same things. He that would see the Places at large, may consult their Comment on the Book *Jetzira*.

It is now time to return to the Judgment of the Ancient Synagogue, and to consider how it agrees or differs with us in the other Matters we have in hand.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

That the Jews *had a distinct Notion of the Word as of a Person and of a Divine Person too.*

A Great part of the Dispute we have with the *Socinians*, depending on the true meaning of the first Chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel, where the Λόγος is spoken of, as being he that created the World, and was at length made Flesh, and whom we Christians look upon as the promised *Messias*, I think I can't do the Truth a greater service, than in clearing this Notion of the Λόγος, and shewing what thoughts the ancient *Jews* had concerning it.

Socinus confesses that the Λόγος is a Person, for he owns that St. *John* did describe the Man Christ Jesus by the Λόγος, and attributed to him the Creation of the Church, which is according to him the new World. But here in *England* the followers of *Socinus* will not stand by this Exposition, but understand by the Λόγος that virtue by which God created Heaven and Earth, as *Moses* relates, *Gen.* i. They obstinately deny this Virtue to be a Person, *i.e.* an Intelligent Subsistence, and rather look upon it as a Divine Attribute, which they say was particularly discovered in the Mission of Jesus Christ for the Salvation of Mankind.

It

It cannot be denied us that St. *John* being one of the Circumcision did write with an especial respect to the *Jews*, that they might understand him, and receive benefit by it; and therefore it cannot be doubted but that when he called Jesus Christ the Λόγος, he used a word that was commonly known among the *Jews* of those times in which he lived.

Otherwise, if he had used this word in a sense not commonly known to the *Jews*, he would have signified to them the new Idea he had affixed to it. But he gives not the least intimation of any thing new in it, though he uses the word so many times in the very beginning of his Gospel. It is certain therefore that he used it in the sense wherein it was then commonly understood by the *Jews*.

Now the Idea the *Jews* had of the Λόγος, was the same they had of a real and proper Person, that is, a living, Intelligent, free Principle of Action. That this was their Notion of the Λόγος, or Word, we shall prove by the Works of *Philo* and the *Chaldee* Paraphrases.

To begin with *Philo*, He conceives the Word to be a true and proper cause. For he declares in about a hundred places, that God created the World by his Word. He conceived the Word to be an Intelligent Cause. Because in him, according to *Philo*, are the Original Ideas of all things that are expressed in the Works of the Creation.

De Opif. p. 3. *G.* & 4. *C.D.*

He makes the Word a Cooperator with God in the Creation of Man, and says that God spake those words to him, *Let Us make Man*, *Gen.* i. 26. It may be added, that he calls the Word the Image of God, and makes Man the Image of this Image *.

* *Lib. Quis rer. Divin. Her. p.* 400. *E. F.*

These are some of the Characters that represent the Word as a true Person.

But there are others no less demonstrative of this Truth: As, 1. where *Philo* asserts, that the Λόγος is begotten of God, *Alleg.* ii. *p.* 76. *B.* Which can agree only to a Person. And, 2. where he proves that the Word acted and spoke in all the Divine Appearances that are mentioned in the Old Testament, which certainly supposes a Person. 3. Where he describes the Word as presiding over the Empires of the World, and determining the Changes that befall them, *Lib. quod Deus sit Immutab. p.* 248. *D.* 4*ly*. Where he brings in the Word for a Mediator between God and Men, *Quis rer. Div. hær. p.* 393. that renders God propitious to his Creatures, *de Somn. p.* 447. *E. F.* That is, the Instructer of Men, *Ib. p.* 448. and their Shepherd, alluding to *Psal.* xxiii. 1.

The *Chaldee* Paraphrases are full of Notions and Expressions relating to the Word, conformable to those of *Philo* touching the Λόγος. So that he must wink hard who does not see that in their sense the word is truly a Person.

And, 1. they almost always distinguish the *Memra*, or Word of the Lord, which answers to *Philo*'s Λόγος, from the word *Pithgama*, which signifies a Matter or a Discourse, as ῥῆμα does in *Greek*.

2. They ascribe the Creation of the World to the Word.

3. They

3. They make it the Word that appeared to the Ancients under the name of the Angel of the Lord.

4. The Word that saved *Noah* in the time of the Flood, and made a Covenant with him. *Onkelos* on *Gen.* vii, & viii

5. They say that *Abraham* believed in the Word, which thing was imputed to him for Righteousness. *Onkel.* on *Gen.* xv. 6.

6. That the Word brought *Abraham* out of *Chaldea*, *Onk.* on *Gen.* xv. 7. and commanded him to Sacrifice, *Gen.* xv. 9. and gave him the Prophecy, related *v.* 13.

7. That *Abraham* swore by the Word, *Onk.* on *Gen.* xxi. 23.

8. That the Word succoured *Ishmael*, *Gen.* xxi. 21. and *Joseph* in his Bondage, *Gen.* xxxix. 2, 3.

The like Notions has *Onkelos* in his *Targum on Exodus*.

1. It is the Word's assistance, that God promises *Moses*, *Exod.* iii. 12. iv. 12. xviii. 19.

2. It is the Word in whom *Israel* believed, as well as in *Moses*, *Exod.* xiv. 32.

3. It is the Word that redeems *Israel* out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* xv. 2.

4. It is the Word against whom *Israel* murmur'd in *Sin*, *Exod.* xvi. 8.

5. It is the Word before whom the People marched to receive the Law, *Exod.* xix. 17.

6. It is the Word whose Presence is promised in the Tabernacle, *Exod.* xxx. 6. xxxvi. 42. which is repeated *Numb.* viii. 29.

7. It

7. It is the Word between whom and *Israel* the Sabbath is made a Sign, *Exod.* xxxi. 13, 17. and so *Lev.* xxxvi. 46.

8. It is the Word whose Protection was promised *Moses* when he desired to see God, *Exod.* xxxiv. 22.

Much the same has *Onkelos* on *Leviticus* and *Numbers*.

1. It is the Word whose Commandments the *Israelites* were to observe carefully, *Lev.* viii. 35. xviii. 30. xxii. 9. *Numb.* ix. 19. xx. 23.

2. It is spoken of the Word, that he will not forsake the People, if they continue in their Obedience, *Lev.* xxviii. 11.

3. By the Word God regards his People, *Ib.*

4. The Majesty of the Word did rest among the *Israelites*, *Numb.* xi. 20.

5. It is the Word whom *Moses* exhorts the *Jews* not to rebell against, *Numb.* xiv. 9. xx. 24.

6. They believed in the Word, *Num.* xiv. 11. xx. 12

7. The Word meets *Balaam*, *Numb.* xxiii. and opens his Eyes, xxii. 31.

The same things, or the like, we find in Onkelos on Deuteronomy.

1. The Word brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and fought for them, *Deut.* i. 30. iii. 22. viii. 2. xx. 1.

2. The Word led *Israel* in the Pillar of a Cloud, *Ib.* i. 32.

3. The Word spake out of the fire at *Horeb*, *V.* 34, 36. *Moses* was Mediator between the Word and his People, *V.* 5.

5. *Moses* Exhorts the *Jews* to obey the Word, xiv. 18. xv. 5. xxvii. 14. xxviii. 1, 3, 15, 45, 62. xxx. 8, 19, 20.

6. The

6. The Word conducts *Israel* under *Joshua* to the Land of *Canaan*, *xxxi.* 6, 8.

7. The Word created the World, *Chap. xxxiii.* 27.

So agreeable, as you see, are the Notions of *Onkelos*, to those of *Philo*, though the one writ in *Egypt*, the other in *Palestine*, and both before the time of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But besides *Onkelos* on the *Pentateuch*, we have two other Paraphrases, the one which is very diffuse is said to be *Jonathan*'s, the other which is called the *Jerusalem* Targum, and is short, and as it seems imperfect. The Reader may soon judg by comparing them, whether they differ from *Philo* and *Onkelos*, or no.

The *Jerusalem* Targum saith, That God Created the World by his Wisdom, which he grounds on the word *Bereshith*, *Gen.* i. 1. And *Philo* means the same things, when he calls the Λόγος, ἀρχὴ, the first Emanation, *de Confus. Ling. p.* 267. *B.*

The same *Targum* saith, the Word made Man after his Image, *Gen.* i. 27.

Jonathan's affirms the Garden of *Eden* was planted by the Word for the Just before the Creation of the World, *Gen.* ii. 8.

And both *Jonathan*'s and the *Jerusalem* Targum say, the Word spoke to *Adam* in the Garden, *Gen.* iii. 9. the Word lifted up *Enoch* to Heaven, *Gen.* v. 24.

Jonathan's affirms that the Word protected *Noah*, and shut the Door of the Ark upon him, *Gen.* vii. 16.

That the Word threw down the Tower at *Babel*, *Gen.* xi. 6.

And

And both have it, That God promised *Abraham* that his Word should protect him, *Gen.* xv. 1.

Jonathan's makes it the Word that plagued *Pharaoh* for *Abraham*'s sake, *Gen.* xii. 17.

The *Jerusalem Targum* saith, it was the Word that appeared to *Abraham* at the Door of the Tent, *Gen.* xviii. 1. And that the Word rained Fire from before the Lord, *Gen.* xix. 24.

And both that *Targum* and *Jonathan*'s say, That *Abraham* taught his People to hope in the Name of the Word of the Lord, *Gen.* xxi. 33.

The *Jerusalem Targum* makes *Abraham* say, The Word of the Lord will prepare a Sacrifice, *Gen.* xxii. 8. And asserts that *Abraham* invoked the Word, and called him Lord in his Prayer, *Gen.* xxii. 14.

Jonathan's *Targum* brings in *Abraham* swearing by the Word of the Lord, *Gen.* xxiv. 3. And God promising his Word should succour *Isaac*, *Gen.* xxiii. 24, 28. repeated *Gen.* xxxi. 3, 5, 42. xxxii. 9.

The same *Targum* says, That the Word of the Lord made *Rachel* bear a Child, *Gen.* xxx. 22. Which is consonant to what *Philo* saith, That the Λόγος caused *Isaac* to be born, *Alleg. l.* 2. *p.* 77.

According to this *Targum* the Word sent *Michael* to save *Thamar*, *Gen.* xxxviii. 25. The Word went down with *Jacob* into *Egypt*, *Gen.* xlvi. 1, 2, 3, 4.

The Word succours *Joseph*, *Gen.* xlix. 25. Which *Joseph* acknowledges, *Gen.* l. 20.

We may trace the same Notions in their *Targums* on *Exodus*.

According

According to *Jonathan's*, The Word built Houses for the Midwives that feared God, *Exod.* i. 21.

The Word caused that miraculous Heat which disposed *Pharaoh's* Daughter to go and bathe her self in the *Nile*, *Exod.* ii. 5.

It was He that spake, and the World was made, according to *Jonathan's Targum*; or the Word of the Lord, according to the *Jerusalem Targum*, that spoke to *Moses*, *Exod.* iii. Which clearly shews that they made use of the word *Memra*, to express what is so often repeated, *Gen.* i. *And God said.*

It is the Word who, as God promised *Moses*, was to be his Mouth, *Exod.* iv. 12, 15.

According to the *Jerusalem Targum*, the Word appear'd to *Abraham* by the Name of the God of Heaven; and the Name of his Word was not declared to the Patriarchs, *Exod.* vi. 3.

The Word of the Lord slew the First-born of *Egypt*, *Exod.* xii. 29.

The Word of the Lord hath appeared on Three remarkable Occasions: First, At the Creation of the World: Secondly, To *Abraham*: Thirdly, At *Israel's* departure out of *Egypt*: And a Fourth time he shall appear at the coming of the *Messiah*. Thus *Jonathan*, and *Targ. Jerusalem*, *Exod.* xii. 42.

The Word wrought Miracles by *Moses*, *Exod.* xiii. 8.

The Word raised up those *Israelites* which were killed by the *Philistines*, that left *Egypt* Three Years before the Departure of their Brethren out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* xiii. 17.

For

For the neglect of the Commands of the Word were the *Israelites* killed, *Exod.* xiii. 17.

It is the Word that looked on the Host of the *Egyptians*, and to him the *Israelites* cried, *Exod.* xiv. 24, 31.

It is the Word that gives the Law concerning the Sabbath, *Exod.* xvi. 25. and he against whom *Israel* murmur'd, *ver.* 8.

The *Israelites* hear the voice of the Word, *Exod.* xix. 5. who speaks, *v.* 9. and pronounces the Law, xx. 1. being the same that redeemed *Israel* from *Egypt*, *Ib.* and *Lev.* i.

God promises to send his Word with his People, and *Israel* is strictly enjoyned to obey him, *Exod.* xxiii. 20, 21, 23.

The Word punishes *Israel* for the Golden Calf, *Exod.* xxxii. 35.

The Word talks with *Moses* in the Tabernacle, and the People worship him, *Exod.* xxxiii. 9, 11. *Lev.* i.

It is the Word whose Appearance is promised *Moses*, *Exod.* xxxiii. 19. and the Word is distinguished from the Angels that attend him, *Exod.* xxxiii. 23.

It is the Word to whom *Moses* prays, and who is called the Name of the Lord, *Exod.* xxxiv. 5.

The Word makes Statutes, *Lev.* xxiv. 11. *Numb.* xxii. 18. according to the same *Jonathan*.

It is the Word of whom the *Jerusalem* Targum understands what is spoken by *Jonathan* of the Face of the Lord, *Numb.* ix. 8.

By the order of the Word of the Lord the *Israelites* Encamp, *Numb.* ix. 19, 23.

O It

It is the Word to whom Prayer is made upon removing the Ark of the Covenant, *Numb.* x. 35, 36.

The Word spoke to all the Prophets before *Moses*, *Numb.* xii. 6.

The Word gives Answer, *Numb.* xiv. 20.

The Word sent fiery Serpents, and those that were healed, were healed by the Name of the Word of the Lord, *Numb.* xxi. 6,9,10.

It is before the Word that the Idolatrous *Isralites* were hanged, *Numb.* xxv. 4.

It is the Word that wrought Wonders in the Desert in behalf of *Israel*, *Deut.* i. 1. iv. 34. vi. 22. and whom the *Israelites* provoked, *Deut.* i. 1.

The Word multiplied *Israel*, and fought for them, yet they believed not in him, *Deut.* i. 10, 30, 32. and iii. 2. both in *Jonathan*, and the *Jerusalem* Targum.

The Word punished *Israel* for the Business of *Peor*, *Deut.* iv. 3.

The Word sits on a raised Throne, and hears the People's Prayers, and speaks from the midst of the fire, and gives the Law, *Deut.* iv. 7, 12, 33. v. 23, 24, 25.

Moses is a Mediator between the Word and the People, *Deut.* v.

It is by the Name of the Word that *Israel* ought to swear, *Deut.* vi. 13.

The Word was to drive out the Nations before *Israel*, *Deut.* xi. 23.

The Word chose the Levites for his Service, *Deut.* xxi. 5. and the whole People of *Israel*, *Deut.* xxvi. 18.

The Word protected *Jacob* from *Laban*, *Deut.* xxvi. 5.

The

The Word destroyed *Sodom*, *Deut.* xxix. 23.

The Word sware to the Patriarchs, *Deut.* xxxi. 7.

The Word shall Judge the People, *Deut.* xxxii. 36.

The Word saith of himself, that he was, is, and is to come, v. 32, 39.

The Word takes *Moses* up to Mount *Abarim*; and *Moses* prays to him for a Sight of the Land of *Canaan*, *Deut.* xxxii. 49.

The Word shews *Moses* the Generations of the Great Men of *Israel*, *Deut.* xxxiv. 1.

The Word said, he had sworn to give *Israel* the Land of *Canaan*, xxxiv. 4.

To conclude, *Moses* dies according to the decree of the Word of the Lord; that is to say, the Word recalls his Soul with a Kiss; and with a huge Train of Angels Inters his Body; being the same Word that had appeared to him, and sent him into *Egypt*, and by so many Miracles redeemed *Israel* from thence, *Deut.* xxxiv. 5, 6, 10, 11, 12.

There is no need of making any profound Reflections on these many places of *Philo*, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrases, to convince the Reader, that the *Jews* before Jesus Christ did regard the Word as a true and real Person. The consequence is easily drawn by him that looks them over but with half an eye.

I know the word *Memra* in *Hebrew* is sometimes taken in another sense, as well as that of Λόγος is in the *Greek*. But all the Personal Characters of Action, of Commanding, of Speaking, of Answering, of giving Laws, of Issuing out Decrees, of being prayed to, of

receiving Worship, and the like, are so expressly given that Word we now Treat of, as render it absurd to take it for any thing else but a Person.

Let us next enquire into the Nature of this Person, according to the same Testimonies of the ancient *Jews*, whether it be Angelical, or Divine, and consequently whether this Person be truly God.

I propose this, not that I think there is any necessity of proving it after all that I have already observed from the ancient *Jews* touching the Word; but for the clearer manifestation of the absurdity into which our Adversaries fall, in their striving to force another sense upon the word, as the more knowing Men among them cannot but see, when they consider these Proofs with attention.

He who writ against *Vechnerus* Endeavours in general to perswade us, that in those places of the *Targums* where the *Memra* is spoken of, it is used to express the Divine Providence over the Faithful of ancient times; or else in particular it signifies the Attributes of God, his Affections or Actions, his Miracles, his Appearances, his Inspirations, and the like. This he repeats in several parts of his dissertation, and at the end of his work he trys to apply it to several Texts in the *Targum*.

One might reasonably doubt whether he himself were satisfied with his own performance in this. I have two great reasons to think he was not. The first is, that it seems he never consulted *Philo*'s Notions of the Λόγος before he made this Judgment, notwithstanding that he could not but see them in *Grotius* on St. *John*'s Gospel, which he quotes; and he could not but know how much they were insisted upon by those Writers whom he pretended to answer. They do indeed so distinctly and clearly establish the Personality of the Λόγος, that they render useless and unsuitable all the Interpretations he has found out for the Texts in the *Targums*.

The second is, that he himself, though he fitted his Interpretations to divers passages in the *Targum*, thereby to break the force of them when turned against him, is yet forced to acknowledg, that sometimes the word *Memra* signifies a Person properly so called, according to our sense of it. The several places where the Word is said to create the World, give him much trouble to elude them. And though he endeavours to rid his hands of them, by asserting the Word does there signifie the Power of God; nevertheless he lets you understand that if you are not pleased with that Solution, you may have his consent to take it in the *Arian* sense of the word, for a created God, by whom, as by a real and Instrumental cause, God did truly create the Universe.

This is the strangest answer that could be returned to so great an Objection. For he must have lost his Reason, who imagins that God can make a Creature capable of creating the Universe. Grant this, and by what Character will you distinguish the Creature from the Creator? By what right then could God appropriate, as he doth very often in the Old

Old Testament, the work of the World's Creation to himself, excluding any other from having to do in it but himself? Why should God upon this score forbid the giving worship to the Creature which is due to the Creator? The *Arians* who worship Jesus Christ, though they esteem him a Creature, and those Papists who swallow whole the Doctrine of Transubstantion; they may teach in their Schools that a Creature may be inabled by God to become a Creator. But for us, who deny that any thing but God is to be adored, as *Philo* did before us, *de Decal.p.*581. *de Monarch. p.* 628. We reject all such vain conceits of a Creature being any way capable to receive the Infinite Power of a Creator.

There are other places also which he found he could not easily evade, so at length he consents that the *Memra* does often denote a Person in the Language of the *Targums*; as where we read, the Word spake, and the Word said. But what kind of Person? An Angel, a Created Angel in his Judgment, that speaks in the Name of God. And thus he thinks the Word is to be understood in those Paraphrases, when they ascribe to the Word the leading of *Israel* through the Desert.

The Reader may judge how many Texts this Answer will fit, by reviewing what has been said in the two foregoing Chapters. He will find I have there prevented this Answer, and shewed that *Philo* and the *Targums* did not take this for a created Angel, but for a Divine Person; who was called an Angel in respect

respect of the Office he discharged according to the Oeconomy between the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity; and of whom the *Targums* generally make express mention in places where the *Hebrew* Text hath *Jehovah Elohim*, or the Angel of the Lord; and sometimes where it hath simply the Name *Jehovah*.

However, to leave no doubt in this matter, we will undertake to prove further, that the Word doth not signifie a Created Angel in *Philo*, or in the *Targums*, but a truly Divine Person.

It is true, that *Philo* sometimes calls the Angels Λόγοι in the Plural. But elswhere he speaks of the Λόγος singularly in terms that express his acknowledgment of him for the Creator of Angels, and consequently for God: This he does in his Book *de Sacrif. Abel. p.* 202. where he declares him to be the Word that appeared to *Moses*, and separates him from the Angels, which are the Hosts of God.

Again, he describes the Λόγος under the Name of ἐπιστήμη, as true God, as Creator of the World, *Lib. de Temulentia, p.* 190. *D.* 194. *B.* But the Angels after another manner, *de Plant. Noæ, p.* 168. *F. G. de Gigant. p.*221. *E. de Mundo, p.* 391.

It is true, he calls the Word an Archangel, *de Conf. Linguar. p.* 267. *B.* But in the same place he calls him the first-born of God, the Image of God, the Creator of the World, *p.* 258. *A.* And in another place, the Son of God, that conducted *Israel* through the Wilderness, *Quis rer. Divin. Hæres, p.* 397. *F.G.*

 He

He was so far from taking the Word to be an Angel, that he affirmed, the Word used to appear to Men under the form of an Angel; thus saith he, the Word appeared to *Jacob*, *de Somn. p.* 465. *D.* And to *Hagar*, *p.* 466. *B.* We are to observe this carefully, that we may make *Philo* agree with *Philo*. For one while he saith an Angel appeared to the Patriarchs, and another time he saith the Λόγος appeared to them; his design being to acquaint us that the Λόγος is named an Angel, because he appeared as an Angel in these kinds of Manifestations of himself.

Now as to the *Targums*, they likewise understand by this Angel a Person that is truly God. For,

1. Could they ascribe the Creation of the World to the Word, as they do, and yet think him to be a Creature? Could they profess him the Creator of Mankind, without asserting his Divinity? Could they think him to be no better than an Angel, and yet make him to be Worshipped by Men, whom they know to be little lower than Angels? Could they imagin him to have given the Law on Mount *Sinai*, and not reflect on the Preface of the Law; wherein the great Law-giver says, I am *Jehovah*, thy God that brought thee out of the Land of *Egypt*? The Word is not so often called an Angel in the *Targums*, as he is set forth with these Characters of God; as the Reader may see especially in *Jonathan*'s *Targum*, and in that of *Jerusalem*, *Exod.* iii. 14. xii. 42. and in many other places.

2. The

2. The *Targums* always distinguish the Word from the Angels; representing them as Messengers employed by the Word, as the Word himself is often described as God's Messenger. Thus the *Targ.* on 1 *King.* xix. 11, 12. on *Psal.* lxviii. 13, 18. on 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 21.

They say the Word was attended with Angels, when he gave the Law, *Targ.* on 1 *Chron.* xxix. 11. and when he assisted at the Interment of *Moses*. *Jonathan* on *Deut.* xxxiv. 6.

3. The *Targums* represent the Word, as sitting on a High Throne, and hearing the Prayers of the People. *Jon.* on *Deut.* iv. 7.

4. *Jonathan* saith expresly, that the Word that spake to *Moses*, was the same who spake and the World was made, and who was God of *Abraham*, *Exod.* iii. 14, 15. vi. 4. So then if he who was the God of *Abraham*, was only an Angel that Personated God, then he who created the World was a created Angel; which, as I have shewed, is absurd.

5. It is impossible to explain otherwise what the *Jews* so unanimously affirm, that God revealed himself face to face to *Moses*; which is more than he granted any Prophet besides, unless the Word that appeared to *Moses* was true God, and not a meer Angel. See *Onk.* on *Deut.* xxxiv. 10, 11. and the other *Targums*.

But what? say they, may not an Angel bear the Name of God, when he sustains the Person of God? was not the Ark called *Jehovah*, because it was a Symbol of his Person?

Does

Does not *Jonathan* on *Numb.* xi. 35, 36. say to the Ark, *Revelare Sermo Domini & redi?* This is indeed a Notion which the *Socinians* have borrowed of *Abenezra* on *Exod.* iii. and *Joseph. Albo de fund. c.* 8. And so they pretend that the Pillar of Cloud is called the Lord, *Exod.* xiii. 21. xiv. 19. that the Ark is called the Lord, *Numb.* x. 35. that the Angel is called the Lord, *Judg.* vi. 15. The Name being given to the Symbol, *viz.* the Ark; and to the second Cause, namely, the Angel; because of their representing God.

But to the great displeasure of our Modern *Jews*, and *Socinians*, that borrow their Weapons, we have still enough of the ancient *Jewish* Pieces left, to shew their quite contrary Sentiments in these matters.

For, 1. they (as has been already observed) believed that the Angel spoken of in *Judg.* vi. 15. was the Word; and that this Word created the World, as has been largely proved.

2. Just the reverse of what our Moderns say, did the Ancients hold, as we gather from *Philo.* For instead of an Angel's taking the place of God, he saith, the Λόγος took the place of an Angel. *De Somn. p.* 466.

As to the Ark, it is folly to imagin that because God promised to dwell and to hear Prayers there, and enjoyned Worship toward it, therefore the Ark was called *Jehovah.* The ancient *Jews* spoke not to the Ark, but to God, who resided between the Cherubims. This is plainly expressed in those words of *Jonathan, Numb.* xi. 35, 36. *Revelare Sermo Domini, &c.* where the words are not addressed to the Ark it self, but to him that promised to give them some Tokens of his Presence; namely to the Word, who created the World, who redeemed *Israel* from *Egypt*, who heard their Prayers over the Ark, and who had shut up therein the Tables of the Law, which he had given them on Mount *Sinai.*

And thus the *Targum* on 1 *Chron.* xiii. 6. *David and all Israel went up to remove the Ark of the Lord, that dwelleth between the Cherubims, whose Name is called on it*; or as 2 *Sam.* vi. 2. *Whose Name is called by the Name of the Lord of Hosts, that dwelleth between the Cherubims.* In short, the Scripture never gives to any Place or Creature the Name *Jehovah* in the *Nominative* Case, either singly, or joined with any other *Noun* in apposition: But either in an *Oblique* Case, as ארון יהוה, or with a *Verb Substantive* understood, as *Jehovah Nissi, Jehovah Shamma.* What the *Socinians* have to say more against this, the Reader may see fully answered by *Buxt. Hist. of the Ark, c.* 1. And the Reader shall have a full Satisfaction upon it, out of the following Chapters.

It remains therefore certain, That the *Word* mentioned in *Philo* and the Paraphrases, is not an Angel, but a Divine Person; Θεός, as *Philo* calls him many times; and if the Expression be allowable, Δεύτερος Θεός, as he speaks in *Euseb. Præp.* vii. 13. p. 322, & 323.

But

But we must now go on to that which will remove all difficulties from this Subject, and convince the Reader, if any thing can do it, That the *Jews* looked upon the Λόγος as a Divine Person. I speak of the Appearances of an Angel who is called God, and worshipped as God under the Old Testament: And I thought fit for this very reason to enlarge more upon this Subject, to prevent at once all the Objections of the New *Jews*, and of the *Unitarians*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That all the Appearances of God, or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken of in the Books of Moses, *have been referred to the Word by the* Jews *before Christ's Incarnation.*

SOME of the late *Jewish* Commentators that have had Disputes with the Christians, particularly those whose Comments are collected in the *Hebrew* Bible printed by *Bomberg* at *Venice*, do oppose this Proposition with all their Might. They have laid it down for a Rule, That *wherever God is said to be present, there all the Celestial Family is with him*; i. e. the Angels, by whose Ministry (as they say) God has ordinarily acted in his Appearances to men. So saith *Rabbi Solom. Jarchi* on *Gen.* xix. 24. Whereas those Old *Jews* who followed the Tradition of their Forefathers, being not biassed by the Spirit of Dispute, understood it of the *Cochma* and *Bina*, *viz.* of the Wisdom and of the Holy Ghost; as we were admonished by *R. Joseph de Karnitol* in his *Saare Tsedec*, *fol.* 25. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 26. *col.* 2.

This Collection of Commentators being of great use for the interpreting the Scriptures, several Divines that have applied themselves to the Study of the Rabbins Comments, have been led by them unwarily into this Opinion. The renowned *Grotius* fell into this Snare, and has had but too many Followers.

ers. We have no cause to wonder that Papists do the same, being concern'd, as they are, to find Examples in the Old Testament, of Religious Worship paid to Angels, the better to cover their Idolatry.

But in truth, the Modern *Jews* do in this quite abandon the Ancient Sentiments of their Fathers: And they who follow the Modern *Jews* herein, do weaken (I hope, without thinking of it) the Proofs of the Godhead of Jesus Christ, by yielding up to the Modern *Jews*, as an agreed Point between them and the Christians, that which is quite contrary to what the Apostles and Primitive Christians supposed in their Disputes with the *Jews* of their Times; and which our later *Jews* themselves would never have submitted to, if they had known any other way to avoid the Arguments that were brought against them out of their own Scriptures.

It behoves us therefore to give their just Force to those Arguments that were used by the Apostles and Fathers, and to recover to Truth all her Advantages, by shewing how bad Guides our Modern *Jews* are in the matters now before us; and how they have deviated from the constant Doctrine of their Ancestors, to find out ways to defend themselves against the Christians.

I affirm then for certain, That the Appearances of God, or of any Angel that is called *Jehovah*, or the God of *Israel*, or that is worshipp'd, spoken of in the Old Testament, were not referred by the Ancient *Jews* to created Angels, who personated God. And further, I maintain, That generally the Ancient

Ancient *Jews* referred these Appearances to the *Word*, whom they distinguish'd from Angels, as they do God from the Creature; and thereby justified the Patriarchs in paying him that appeared to them Divine Worship and Adoration.

To prove this, I must return to *Philo*'s Opinion, which I have had occasion to alledge in several places. I would willingly spare my self the Trouble, and my Reader the Nauseousness of repeating the same things. But this is a matter of such Importance, as necessarily obliges me, by a particular Enumeration of Passages, to produce *Philo*'s Judgment in this Point, as I have done in the former. He is indeed so ample, and so much ours in his Testimony concerning the Dignity of the Angel that appeared to the Fathers, as more he could not well be, if we had hired him to depose on our side:

In general, he asserts, That it was the Word that appeared to *Adam*, *Jacob*, and *Moses*; although in the Books of *Moses* it is only an Angel that is spoken of, [*De Somn.* *p.* 461.]

It was the Word that appeared to *Abraham*, *Gen.* xviii. 1. according to *Philo*; for he saith, It was the Word that promised *Sarah* a Son in her Old Age, and that enabled her to conceive and bring forth, [*Lib.* 11. *Alleg.* *p.* 77. *E.*]

It was the Word that appeared to *Abraham* as an Angel, and that called to him not to hurt his Son, when he was about to sacrifice him, [*De Somn.* *p.* 461. *A—E.*

It

It was the Word that appeared to *Hagar*; [*De Cherub. p.* 83. *C. De Profug. p.* 352. *De Somn. p.* 446. *B.*]

It was the Word that appeared so many times to *Jacob*; although he be called the Angel that delivered him out of all his Trouble, *Alleg.* 11. *p.* 71. *D. E.*] It was the Word that appeared to *Jacob* in *Bethel*, [*Lib. de Migr. Abr. p.* 304. *E. p.* 305. *A. De Somn. p.* 460. *G.*] And afterwards directed him how to manage *Laban*'s Flock, [*De Somn. p.* 461. *F.*] and advised him to return to the Land of his Kindred, [*De Somn. p.* 460. *G.*] It was the Word that appeared to *Jacob* in the form of an Angel, and wrestled with him, [*De Somn. p.* 454. *E.*] and changed his Name to *Israel*; [*De nom. mut. p.* 819. *C.*]

It was the Image of God, which in other places is the same with the Word, that appeared to *Moses* in the Bush, [*De Vit. Mosis*, 1. *p.* 475. *E.*] It was God that called to him at the same time, [*De Somn. p.* 461. *D.*] Even the Word, [*p. Ib. A.*] Whom *Moses* desired to see, [*Alleg.* 11. *p.* 61. *A. De Sacr. Ab. p.* 102. *A. C.*]

It was the Word who led *Israel* through the Wilderness, *Exod.* xxiii. [*De Agric. p.* 152. *B.*] He was the Angel in whom God placed his Name, [*De Migr. Abr. p.* 324. *E. F.*] That Word which is called the Prince of Angels, and who was within the Cloud, [*Quis rer. Divin. Hær. p.* 397. *F. G.*] and is called Θεῖα ὄψις πυρὸς, [*De Vit. Mosis, p.* 534. *G.*] And this Angel was he that appeared to *Moses* and the Elders of *Israel* on Mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* xxiv. [*De Confus. p.* 261. *E.*

De Somn. p. 447. *C.*] It was the Word whom those *Jews* rejected, that said, *Let us make a Captain and return into Egypt*, Num. xiv. 4. [*Alleg.* 11. *p.* 71. *B.*]

It was the Word that governs the World, that appeared to *Balaam* like an Angel, [*De Cherub. p.* 87. *F. G. Quod Deus sit immut. p.* 248. *G.* 249. *A.*]

It was the Word by whom *Moses* when he was to dye was translated, [*De Sacr. Abr. p.* 162. *C. D.*

II. Let us come next to the *Chaldee* Paraphrases, and see how they render those Texts that speak of the Divine Appearances in Scripture; and let the Reader take these Remarks along with him: 1. That whatsoever he finds in those Paraphrases, he may be assured that it was the General Sense of the *Jewish* Church in Ancient Times. 2. That any Judicious Writer can justly suspect those who first published those *Targums*, to have cut many parts of them, to favour the new Method of their last Writers, which I have explained in the beginning of this Chapter.

The first Appearance of God to Man was when having *created* our first Parents, *Gen.* i. 27. *He blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth*, *Gen.* i. 28. He that gave them this Blessing was he that created them, as we read in the *Jerusalem Targum* on *Gen.* i. 27. *The Word of the Lord created Man in his own Image.* For his giving them the Blessing, we have it in that *Targum* on *Gen.* xxxv. 9. We have these following words, O *Eternal God, thou hast taught*

us the Marriage-blessing of Adam and his Wife; for thus the Scripture saith expresly, And the Word of the Lord blessed them, and the Word of the Lord said to them, Be ye fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.

God appeared again to our first Parents after their Sin, *Gen.* iii. 8. Where it is said, that *they heard the Voice of the Lord God walking in the midst of the garden.* Now as *Philo* said to us, that it was the Word of the Lord that appeared to *Adam*; so both *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* have it, that *Adam* and his Wife *heard the Voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden.* Likewise in the *Jerusalem Targum*, ver. 9. it is said, *The Word of the Lord called to Adam, &c.* And again, *ver.* 10. Where *Adam* makes this Answer to God, *I heard thy Voice in the garden*; both *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* have it, *I heard the Voice of thy Word in the garden.*

In the History of the Deluge, we see that there was a Revelation to *Noah* the Preacher of Righteousness, to build the Ark, and to warn others while that was preparing, 1 *Pet.* iii. 20. But who gave *Noah* that warning? *Jonathan* saith, That *the Lord said this by his Word.* And the *Jerusalem Targum, It was the Word of the Lord that said this.* And accordingly *Jonathan* has it in *Gen.* vi. 6. That the *Lord judged them by his Word*; and said, *I will destroy them by my Word.* Likewise for the saving of *Noah*, *Gen.* vii. 16. all the Paraphrasts attributed this to the Word: The *Jerusalem Targum* saith, *The Word of the Lord spared Noah.* And *Gen.* viii. 1. *Jonathan* has it, That *the Word of the Lord remembred Noah.* Lastly, according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, *The Lord said by his Word, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake*, Gen. viii. 21.

After the Flood, God appeared often to *Abraham.* Now according to *Jonathan* on *Gen.* xv. 6. a Promise being made unto *Abraham*, that his Seed should be as the Stars of Heaven for Number, *Abraham's believing in the Word of the Lord*, was accounted to him for Righteousness: Therefore it was the *Word of the Lord* that came to him in a Vision, *ver.* 1. and that made him that Promise, *ver.* 5. It followeth, *ver.* 7. that he said to *Abraham*, *I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees.* Who said this to *Abraham*? Even the Word of the Lord, according to *Jonathan's Targum*; for there is no other Nominative Case of the Verb in his Paraphrase. You see the same upon *Abraham's* dividing the Beasts, in order to his making a Covenant with God; it was done at God's Command, who thereupon did appear between the Pieces to *Abraham*, and did solemnly enter into a Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen.* xv. 9, *&c.* Now saith the *Jerusalem* Paraphrase on *Exod.* xii. 42. It was *the Word of the Lord that appeared* to *Abraham* between the Pieces. And according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, *Exod.* vi. 8. It was *by his Word* that God made this Covenant with *Abraham.*

We must take notice that he that appeared then to *Abraham*, saith, I am *El Shaddai*, which is here translated, *The Almighty God*: For according to *Onkelos* on *Gen.* xlix. 25. in the Blessing of *Jacob* to his Son *Joseph*, these Names, The *Word of God*, and *El Shaddai*, are

are of the same Extent: Thus it runs according to *Onkelos*, *The Word of the God of thy Father shall help thee; and El Shaddai shall bless thee:* Where plainly *El Shaddai* is the same that is called, *The Word of the God of thy Father.*

As *Philo* taught us that the Appearance of God to *Abraham*, mentioned *Gen.* xviii. 1. was an Appearance of the Word, *Alleg.* 11. *p.* 77. *E.* where he calls one of the Three Angels that appeared to *Abraham* the Λόγος, the Word of God; and *Josephus L.* 1. *Ant. c.* 12. calls him God: So the *Jerusalem* Paraphrase has it in the end of the next Verse; *The Word of the Lord appeared to Abraham in the Valley of Vision, as he sat warming himself in the Sun, because of his Circumcision.* Elsewhere the same Paraphrase quotes these Words as being the Words of Scripture; saying on *Gen.* xxxv. 9. *The Scripture hath declared, and said, And the Word of the Lord appeared to him in the Valley of Vision. Jonathan* also in his Paraphrase on *Deut.* xxxiv. 6. hath these words, The Lord hath taught us to visit the Sick, in that *he revealed himself by the Vision of his Word to Abraham,* when he was sick of the cutting of Circumcision.

When God gave him a Command for the sacrificing of his Son, *Gen.* 22. 2. then, as *Abraham* was doing it, the Angel of the Lord called to him out of Heaven, and told him, *Now I know thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son from M E.* This last word plainly sheweth that this Angel was God himself, even the same that spake to *Abraham,* and gave him that Command,

mand, *ver.* 1, 2. And that Command was given by the Λόγος, the Word, according to *Philo,* as it has been already shewn. The *Jerusalem* Paraphrase hath the same on *ver.* 8. where, upon *Isaac*'s enquiring for the Lamb that was to be sacrificed, *Abraham* answereth him, *My Son, the Word of the Lord will prepare me a sheep.* And so when *Abraham* found that the Word did provide him a Sheep, and accepted of that for a Sacrifice instead of his Son, *Abraham worshipped, and pray'd to the Word of the Lord,* saying (among many other things), *Thou, O Lord, didst speak to me, that I should offer up Isaac my Son.* In the other *Targums, ver.* 16, 17. where the Angel of the Lord calls to *Abraham* out of Heaven *the second time* (which last word sheweth that this Angel was God himself, for it was God that called to him out of Heaven *the first time,* as it has been already shewn), and saith to *Abraham, By my self I have sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thine only son from me, therefore in blessing I will bless thee,* &c. There both *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* have it, *By my Word I have sworn, saith the Lord.* What should be their meaning in this? For the manner of speaking, *Thus saith the Lord,* it was properly used by the Word appearing here as an Angel, and not according to his own Natural Being: But for the Form of the Oath, where, according to the *Hebrew* Text, *chap.* xx. *God swore by Himself*; the Paraphrasts render it, that *God swore by his Word*; and well they might, who understood that the Word was God. And indeed these *Targums* shew elsewhere, That where this Form

From me, *is in the* Samaritan *and* LXX.

of Swearing was used, it was the Word of the Lord that swore, and held himself obliged to perform what was sworn: Compare *Exod.* vi. 8. with *Deut.* xxvi. 3. And *Numb.* xiv. 30. with *Deut.* xxxi. 7.

We read of an Angel appearing to *Hagar* in the Wilderness, *Gen.* xvi. 7. He bid her return and submit to *Sarah* her Mistress, *ver.* 9. telling her withal what a numerous Issue she should have by the Child she now went with, and what sort of man he should be. But as this Angel spoke in the Stile of God, saying, *I will multiply thy seed exceedingly*, ver. 10. So she owned it was the Lord that spake to her, and she said to him, *Thou God seest me*, ver. 13. 'Tis clear that it was God himself that appeared, tho he is called an Angel in the Text. And therefore not only *Philo* calleth him the Λόγος in those places above-mentioned, but the *Targums* likewise shew that he was the Word of the Lord, according to the Sense of the *Jewish* Church; for so *Jonathan* renders *ver.* 13. *She confessed before the Lord Jehovah, whose Word had spoken to her.* And the *Jerusalem Targum*; *She confessed and prayed to the Word of the Lord who had appeared to her.*

Again, an Angel called to *Hagar* out of Heaven, *Gen.* xxi. 16. But he also said to her that which no created Angel could say; speaking of her Son *Ishmael*, *I will make him a great Nation*, ver. 18. *Philo* saith that it was the Λόγος. And who perform'd it? 'Twas God the Word, according to the *Targums*: For whereas the Text saith, *ver.* 20. *God was with the Lad*; it is thus rendred both by *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, *The Word of the Lord was his Support or Assistance.* We

We read also of Two Divine Appearances to *Isaac*; one in *Gerar*, *Gen.* xxvi. 2. and the other at *Beersheba*, ver. 24.

In the former of these places, *Isaac* being ready to have gone down into *Egypt*, God bid him continue in *Canaan*, and gave him a Promise in these words, *Gen.* xxvi. 3. I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee and thy Seed I will give all these Countries, and I will perform *the Oath which I sware unto Abraham thy Father.* So then, he that appeared now to *Isaac*, is the same that swore this to *Abraham*; so much we learn from this Text: But according to the *Targums*, it was God the Word that swore all this to *Abraham*: Elsewhere they also tell us, That it was the Word that swore as well to *Isaac* as to *Abraham*, that he would give them the promised Land, *Exod.* vi. 8. xxxii. 13.

At the second Appearance that God made to *Isaac*, *Gen.* xxvi. 24. he told him, *I am the God of Abraham thy Father*: But as the *Jerusalem Targum* on *Gen.* xxii. 16. saith, That *Abraham worshipped and prayed to the Word of the Lord*: So according to *Jonathan*'s *Targum* on *Gen.* xxvii. 28. *Isaac* prayed for his Son *Jacob* in these words, *The Word of the Lord give thee of the Dew of Heaven*: And in the same *Targum* on *Gen.* xxxi. 5. where *Jacob* saith, *The God of my Father hath been with me*; it is rendred, *The Word of the God of my Father*; or, *The Word being the God of my Father.*

Of thy Father; *so the* Samaritan *and* LXX.

Amongst the Divine Appearances to *Jacob*, those two at *Bethel* were more remarkable than the rest; one at his going to *Padan-Aram*, *Gen.* xxviii. 13. the other at his Return

turn from thence, *Gen.* xxxv. 9. where it is said expresly, that *then God appeared to him the second time.*

The History of the first of these is given us at large, *Gen.* xxviii. 13,—16. *Jacob* himself gives this account of the last to his Son *Joseph*, *Gen.* xlviii. 3, 4. *God Almighty appeared to me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, and said unto me, Behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee*, &c. That it was the Word that appeared to him, we have shewn already from *Philo* in several places; and that this was the Sense of the *Jewish* Church in his time, we have reason to believe: For as to this first Appearance; in the Introduction, *ver.* 10. where the Text speaks of *Jacob*'s setting out from *Beersheba* to go to *Haran*, there both *Jonathan* and the *Jerusalem Targum* tell us of the Sun's making haste to go down before his time, because the Word had a desire to speak with *Jacob*. Again, in the Conclusion of this History, *Gen.* xxviii. 20, 21. Where *Jacob* vowed a Vow, saying, If God will be with me, *&c.* then shall the Lord be my God: Here we read in *Jonathan*'s *Targum*, That *Jacob vowed a Vow to the Word, saying, If the Word of the Lord will be my help*, &c, *then shall the Lord be my God.* Why should the Paraphrast say, That *Jacob* made this Vow to the Word; and not rather, to God, as it is in the *Hebrew* Text; but that they believed that it was *the Word* that appeared to him? And this being so, we cannot be to seek who that Angel was that spake to *Jacob*, *Gen.* xxxi. 11. for he declares, *ver.* 13. *I am the God of Bethel—where thou vowedst a Vow unto me.*

We see in the *Targum* on *Gen.* xxviii. 20. That it was the Word to whom *Jacob* vowed a Vow at *Bethel*; therefore according to this *Targum* it must be the Word that is called an Angel in the place next before mentioned.

The second time that God appeared to *Jacob* was in his Return from *Padan-Aram*, *Gen.* xxxv. 9. and it is expresly said in the *Jerusalem* Targum, *The Word of the Lord appeared to Jacob the second time, when he was coming from Padan-Aram, and blessed him*; which is as clear a Testimony as can be desired for our purpose.

Whosoever will reflect with some attention upon those Appearances of God to *Jacob*, and compare them with what we read *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16. and with what *Hosea* the Prophet saith, *ch.* xii. concerning the Angel who was God, could not but take notice of two things: The first is, that the Λόγος which is call'd an Angel was God indeed. The second is, that the wrestling of that Angel with *Jacob* was a preparation for the belief of the Mystery of the Incarnation by which the Apostles were made able to say, which *we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life, this is our Message*, 1 Joh. i. 1. 5. But we must go on upon such important a Subject.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

That all the Appearances of God, or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken of in Moses *his time, have been referred to the Word of God by the ancient* Jewish *Church.*

WE read of no other Appearance of God, or of an Angel of the Lord, till that which *Moses* saw on Mount *Horeb*, *Exod.* iii. 2. There we read that *the Angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a Bush.* This is the only place where *Moses* calleth him an Angel that now appeared. Elswhere he always calleth him God, as particularly *v.* 4. where he saith that upon his turning aside to see why the Bush was not burnt, *When the Lord saw this, God called to him out of the midst of the Bush, and said to him, I am the God of thy Father, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, v.* 6. whereupon *Moses* saith of himself, that *he hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.* After this he goeth on still calling him God, as we read almost in every verse; so *ver.*16. He saith God commanded him to go to the Elders of *Israel, and say to them, The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, appeared to me.* God would not have him tell them that which was not true, and therefore we may be sure that it was not a Created Angel, but God that appeared to him. But why then should *Moses* once call him an Angel? as we see he did in the second verse. A created Angel he could not be, for the reasons now mentioned; he must therefore be God, and yet he must appear as an Angel that came on a Message from God. This is what *Philo* saith in one word, He was the Λόγος, or Word, who is both God, and the Messenger of God, as we have shewn from him in several places.

As for the *Targums* the matter is clear, for when *Moses* was sent to the Children of *Israel*, to tell them that their God had appeared to him, and sent him to bring them forth out of *Egypt*, and that *Moses* askt him his Name; and that God said unto *Moses*, tell them, *I AM THAT I AM*, or in fewer words say, *I AM, has sent me unto you*; that which here God calls himself, is the sense of the Name *Jehovah*, that signifieth the Eternal Being. Now see how this is rendred in the *Jerusalem* Targum. There we read, that *the Word of the Lord said to Moses, He that said to the World, let it be, and it was, and shall say, Let it be, and it shall be.* Here *Moses* askt God, and the Word answereth his question. But certain it is, that he that answered the question, was the same that he had been speaking with all this while; even the same that appeared to him in the Bush.

Moses being thus employ'd by the Word of God, as his Messenger to the Children of *Israel*, for the discharge of his Ministry, had both his Instructions and Credentials from the

the Word, according to the *Targums*.

For the first of these, God appeared to him oftener than to any before him. *R. Akiba*, who lived since Christ's time, saith that *Moses* acted as Mediator between the *Gevura*, that is, the Word of God, and the People of *Israel*; and observeth, that God spake to him 175 times. They were times without number that God spake to him, from off the Mercy-seat, upon the Ark of Testimony, from between the two Cherubims, *Numb.* vii. 89. But those which *R. Akiba* reckons, were Appearances upon extraordinary occasions. In both these Appearances ordinary and extraordinary, it was the Word of God that spake to *Moses* according to the *Targums*; Thus of God's speaking to him from the Mercy-seat to appoint my Word for thee, as God promised there according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* on *Exod.* xxv. 22. xxx. 36. So *Numb.* vii. 89. *Jonathan* saith *it was the Word that spake to him.* And thus likewise in those Occasional Appearances, both *Jonathan* and the *Jerusalem Targums* tell us, once for all, *Deut.* xxxiv. 10. *The Word of the Lord knew Moses* ממרל כל ממלל קבול speaking to *Moses*, as oft as *Moses* spake to him on any occasion. For his Credentials were as we see, *Deut.* xxxiv. 11. All the Signs and Wonders which the Lord sent him to do, or according to the *Targums* which *the Word of the Lord sent him to do, in Egypt, to Pharaoh, and his Servants, and all his Land; and in all that mighty Land, and that great terrour, which Moses shewed in the sight of all Israel.*

For

For the Acts of his Ministry, they were chiefly these three: 1. His bringing the People out of *Egypt*. 2. His giving them Laws and Statutes, and Judgments from God. 3. His Leading them through the Wilderness to the Confines of *Canaan*. In each of these was the Word that appeared to him according to the *Targums*.

His bringing the People out of *Egypt* is wholly ascribed to the Word, by *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* on *Deut.* xx. 1. and by *Jonathan* on *Deut.* xxiv. 18. The People were commanded to teach this to their Children, that it was *the Word of the Lord* that did all those Signs and Wonders in *Egypt*, saith *Jonathan* on *Exod.* xiii. 8. It was the Word that sent all those Plagues on *Pharaoh*, and his Servants, and all the Land of *Egypt*, saith *Jonathan* on *Deut.* xxviii. 6. and xxix. 2. Especially, it was the Word that gave that stroke which finisht the work, according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *Exod.* xii. 29. namely, It was *the Word of the Lord that appeared against the Egyptians at midnight; and his right hand kill'd the first-born of the Egyptians, and delivered his own first-born the Children of Israel.*

After this, the Word of the Lord led the People through the Desert to the Red-Sea, saith the same *Targum* on *Exod.* xiii. 18. The Word of the Lord being their Leader, in a Pillar of Fire by night, and of a Cloud by day, saith *Onkelos* on *Deut.* i. 32, 33. And when the People being come to the Red-Sea, and seeing *Pharaoh* with his Army behind them, were in a rage against *Moses*, and he cried to God, *Exod.* xiv. 15. according to the

the *Jerusalem* Targum, *the Word of the Lord said to Moses*, How long dost thou stand and pray before me?—Bid the Children of *Israel* come forward, and do thou reach out thy Rod, and divide the Red Sea; He did so, and according to the *Jerusalem* Targum on *Deut.* i. 1. *The Word divided the Sea* before them. So that the Children of *Israel* went into the midst of the Sea on dry ground, *Exod.* xiv. 22. the *Egyptians* following them. And at morning, *v.* 24. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *The Word of the Lord lookt upon the Army of the Egyptians*, and threw upon them *Bitumen*, and Fire, and Hail out of Heaven; and *v.* 25. The *Egyptians* said, Let us fly from before the People of *Israel*, for *this is the Word of the Lord that gets them victory*; But their flight was in vain, for *by the Word of the Lord, the waters were made heaps*, according to *Onkelos* on *Exod.* xv. 8. And according to him also, when *God spoke by his Word, the Sea covered them*, *v.* 10. Thus, as the whole work of the People of *Israel*'s Deliverance out of *Egypt*, so every part of it, has been ascribed to the Word of the Lord by the *Targums*.

For the giving of the Laws, by which they were to be formed into a Church and Kingdom; First, immediately after their coming out of the Red-Sea, *Exod.* xv. 25. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *the Word of the Lord gave them Precepts and Orders of Judgments*; particularly, as *Jonathan* has it, *the Word of the Lord* gave them there the Law of the Sabbath, and that of Honouring Father and Mother, and Judgments concerning Bruises and Wounds,

Wounds, and for the Punishment of Transgressours. Afterwards, when they were come into the Wilderness of *Sinai*, *Exod.* xix. 3. the Text saith, *Moses* went up to God, and the Lord called to him out of the Mount, saying, *Thus shalt thou say to the House of Israel, &c.* there *Onkelos* saith, according to one of *Clark*'s various Readings, *Moses went up to meet the Word of the Lord*, *Exod.* xix. 8. *Moses* returns with the People's Answer to the Lord, then, *v.* 9. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *the Word of the Lord said to Moses*, Go to the People, and sanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their Clothes, and be ready against the third day, for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the People upon Mount *Sinai*. Accordingly the People having prepared themselves, on the third day, according to *Onkelos*, *Exod.* xix. 17. *Moses brought the People out of the Camp to meet the word of God*; Yet the People only saw Thunder and Lightning, and the Mountain smoking, and felt the Earth quake under them: They also heard the noise of the Trumpet, which so affrighted them, that they removed and stood at a distance, and said to *Moses*, Speak thou to us, and we will hear, but *let not the Word from before the Lord speak with us, lest we die*, Exod. xx. 19. according to *Onkelos*, in one of *Clark*'s various Readings. *Moses* therefore according to *Jonathan* on *Deut.* v. 5. *Stood between them and the Word of the Lord*, to shew them the *Pithgama*, the matter and words that were spoken to him from the Lord. What they were, we read *Exod.* xx. 1, *&c.* where, according

cording to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *the Word of the Lord spoke* the tenor of all these words, saying, *I am the Lord thy God*, which brought thee out of the Land of *Egypt*, out of the House of Bondage; then follow the Ten Commandments, commonly called the *Decalogue*. That it was God the Word that spoke this to the People, the ancient Church could not doubt, as we see in the Book of *Deuteronomy*, where *Jonathan* tells us, that thus *Moses* minded his People of what they had heard and seen at the giving of the Law, *Deut.* iv. 33. *Is it possible that a People should have heard the voice of the Word of the Lord, the Living God, speak out of the middle of the fire, as you have heard, and yet live?* Again, *v.* 36. *Out of Heaven he hath made you hear the voice of his Word, —and ye have heard his words out of the midst of the fire.* Again, he puts them in mind of the fright they were in, *Deut.* v. 23. *After ye had heard the voice of the Word out of the midst of the Darkness on the Mount burning with fire, all the Chiefs of you came to me, and said, Behold the Word of the Lord our God has shewed us the Divine Majesty of his Glory, and the Excellence of his Magnificence, and we have heard the voice of his Word out of the midst of the fire, why should we die? as we must, if we hear any more of the voice of the Word of the Lord our God*; for *who is there living in flesh, that hears the voice of the Word of the Living God speaking out of the middle of the fire, as we do, and yet live?* Again, *Deut.* xviii. 16. he minds them of the same thing in some of the same Words. Many more such Quotations might be added, but these are sufficient, to prove that it was the undoubted Tradition

Tradition of the ancient *Jewish* Church, That their Law was given by the Word of God, and that it was he that appeared to *Moses* for this purpose.

As the Word gave the Law, it was he that made those many Appearances to *Moses* throughout his whole Conduct of the People of *Israel* through the Wilderness.

To begin with that Divine Appearance, which was continually in sight of all the People of *Israel* for forty years together throughout their whole Travel in the Wilderness; namely, the Pillar which they saw in the Air day and night. Where this Pillar is first spoken of, namely, at the coming of the People of *Israel* up out of *Egypt*, there it is expressly said, That *the Lord went before them in the Pillar of Cloud by day, and fire by night*, *Exod.* xiii. 21. Afterward indeed he is called the Angel of God, *Exod.* xiv. 19. where we read that the People being come to the Red-Sea, and being there in imminent danger of being overtaken by the *Egyptians*, by whom they were closely pursued, the Angel which had gone before the Camp of *Israel* all day, removed at night, and went behind them.— That this Angel was God, it is certain, not only because he is called God, *Exod.* xiii. 21. xiv. 24. *Numb.* xii. 5. But also because he was Worshipped, *Exod.* xxxiii. 10. which was a sure Proof of his Divinity. Being therefore God himself, and yet the Messenger of God, it must be that this was the Λόγος, or Word; and that this was the Tradition of the ancient Church, we are taught not only by *Philo* in the place above mentioned, but also

Quis rer. Div. hæres p. 397. F.G.

also by the *Jerusalem* Targum on *Exod.* xiv. 24. and *Jonathan* on *Exod.* xxxiii. 9. and by *Onkelos* on *Deut.* i. 32, 33. as has been mentioned.

When the Children of *Israel* after the first three days march, found no other Waters but what were too bitter for them to drink; at which they murmured, *Moses* cried unto the Lord, who thereupon shewed him a Tree, which they threw into the Waters, and thereby made them sweet, *Exod.* xv. 25. Here was a Divine Appearance, and it was of the Word of the Lord according to the *Jerusalem* Targum.

A Month after their coming out of *Egypt*, for want of Bread they murmured against *Moses* and *Aaron*; at which God shewed himself so much concerned, that he made *his Glory appear to them in the Pillar of Cloud*, *Exod.* xvi. 7, 10: That according to the sense of the ancient Church, this was the *Shekinah* of the Word, has been newly shown, both from *Philo*, and from all the *Targums*; and the same we find here in this place, *v.* 8. where *Moses* tells them, your murmurings *are not against us, but against the Word of the Lord*, according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*.

When, *Exod.* xvii. 8, *&c.* the *Amalekites* came against this poor people that had never seen War; and smote the hindmost of them, God not only gave his people a Victory over them, but also said unto *Moses*, write this for a Memorial in a Book,—That *I will utterly put out the Remembrance of Amalek from under Heaven*, *Exod.* xvii. 14. See how *Moses* performs this, *v.* 15. In the place where they had

had fought he set up an Altar inscribed, *Jehovah Nissi, The Lord is my Standard*; meaning that it was the will of God they should be in perpetual War against *Amalek*; and this reason for it he entreth in his Book, *v.* 16. according to *Jonathan*, *for the Word of the Lord has sworn by his Glory, that he will have war against Amalek for all Generations.*

The next Divine Appearance we read of, was at the giving of the Law on Mount *Sinai*; whereof enough has been already said, and we must avoid being too long. For which reason we omit much more that might be said of the following Appearances in the Wilderness, which are all ascribed to the Word in one or other of the *Targums*. But I ought not to omit to take notice of some special things.

So for their places of Worship, God promised according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *Exod.* xx. 24. Wheresoever you shall mention my Holy Name, *my Word shall appear to you, and shall bless you*; and the Temple is called, *the place which the Word of the Lord your God will chuse to place his Shekinah there*, according to *Jonathan*'s and the *Jerusalem* Targums on *Deut.* xii. 4. Especially at the Altar for Sacrifice, which was before the Door of the Tabernacle, God promised *Moses*, both for himself and the People, according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* on *Exod.* xxix. 42. *I will appoint my Word to speak with thee there, and I will appoint my Word there for the Children of Israel.* Above all, at the Mercy-seat, where the Ark stood, God promised to *Moses*, according to those *Targums* on *Exod.* xxv. 22. xxx. 36. *Numb.* xxvii.

4. *I will appoint my Word to speak with thee there.* And in sum, of all the Precepts in *Leviticus*, it is said at the end of that Book, according to those *Targums* on *Levit.* xxvi. 46. *These are the Statutes, and Judgments, and Laws which the Lord made between his Word and the Children of Israel.*

When they entred into Covenant with God, obliging themselves to live according to his Laws; Hereby they made the Word to be their King, and themselves his Subjects. So *Moses* tells them, *Deut.* xxvi. 17. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *You have made the Word of the Lord King over you this day, that he may be your Glory.* And v. 18. *The VVord of the Lord is become King over you in his own Name, as over his beloved and peculiar people.* In consequence hereof, as being their King, he ordered them by his chief Minister *Moses*, to make him a Royal Pavilion or Tabernacle, and to set it up in the midst of their Camp. Both that, and all the furniture of it, he ordered *Moses* to make according to the Pattern show'd him in the Mount, *Exod.* xxv. 40. Especially for the Presence of the great King, there must be an Apartment in the inner part of the Tabernacle separated from the rest with a Veil Embroidered with Cherubims, *Exod.* xxvii. 31. which part was called the Most Holy Place, or the *Holy of Holies*, *Exod.* xxvi. 33. There was to be placed the Ark overlay'd with pure Gold, and having a Crown of Gold round about it. In the Ark were contain'd the Tables of the Law. Upon it was placed the Mercy-seat, overshadowed with the Wings of two Cherubims that stood on

on the two Ends of the Mercy-seat, *Exod.* xxxvii. 9. looking each of them toward the other, and both of them toward the Mercy-seat. This Provision being made for the place of his *Shekinah*, the Word, which shewed it self before in a Pillar of Cloud by day, and fire by night, that stood over the Camp; now from thence came to take possession of his Royal Seat in the Tabernacle over the Ark; from whence, out of the void space between these Cherubims, it was, that the Word used to speak to *Moses*, and to give him Orders from time to time for the Government of his People, according to the Paraphrasts on *Exod.* xxv. 22. xxx. 36. *Numb.* xvii. 4. and especially *Numb.* vii. 8, 9. as has been above mentioned. Henceforward, throughout their whole Journey through the Wilderness, the Pillar was constantly over the Tabernacle, and the People attended his motion. But whensoever he gave the Commandment, then the Pillar removed, and shewed which way the Camp was to go. Upon notice of that, then *Moses* first gave the word, in a set form of Prayer, which we have in the first six verses of the lxviii *Psalm.* The first verse of it is *Numb.* x. 35. in these words, according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *Arise now Oh Word of the Lord in the might of thy strength.* According to *Jonathan*'s Paraphrase, *Appear now Oh Word of the Lord in the strength of thy wrath.* In both the *Targums* it followeth, as in the *Hebrew* Text, *and the enemies of thy people shall be scattered, and they that hate thee shall flee before thee.* When they had performed their Journey according to the will of their King,

which they knew by seeing the Pillar stand still, then *Moses* used the Form for the resting of the Ark, *Numb.* x. 36. according to the forementioned Targums, *Return now Oh Word of the Lord to thy people Israel, make the Glory of thy Shekinah dwell among them, and have mercy on the Thousands of Israel.* This being said, the Priests (who carried the several Pins of the Tabernacle) took down their Burdens, and set up all things as before; and the Pillar returned to its place over the midst of the Tabernacle.

In this State of *Theocracy*, their keeping of God's Laws is called by their Targums, *The believing and obeying of the Word*; their breaches of his Laws are called, *their despising and rebelling against the Word.* Of the use of both these manners of speaking there might be given more instances than can be easily numbred.

The *Targums* likewise ascribe to the Word both the rewarding of their Obedience, and the punishing of their Transgressions. On their Obedience, according to the *Targums*, it was the usual promise, that *the Word should be their help or support*, *Numb.* xxiii. 8, 21. that *he should bless them and multiply them*, *Deut.* xxiv. 19. that *he should rejoice over them to do them good*, *Deut.* xxviii. 63. xxx. 9. They were told that *he would be a consuming fire to their enemies*, *Deut.* iv. 24. particularly, that he was so to the *Anakims*, *Deut.* ix. 3. *That it was he that delivered Og into their hands*, *Deut.* iii. 2. *That it was he that would cast out all the Nations before them*, *Deut.* xi. 22.

On

On the other hand, according to the sense of the ancient Church, it was the Word that punished them for their disobedience, and also it was he that forgave them upon their Repentance. Of both these kinds there are many remarkable instances, as particularly, of the punishing of their disobedience, according to *Jonathan* on *Exod.* xxxii. 35. It was *the Word* that *destroyed the people for worshipping the Calf that Aaron made.* For their lusting at *Kibroth-hattaava*, *Moses* told them whom they provoked by it, *Numb.* xi. 20. according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, *You have despised the Word of the Lord, whose Shekinah dwelleth among you.* Their refusing to go forward toward the promised Land upon the Spies evil report of it, *Moses* tells them, according to those Targums, *Deut.* i. 26. It was *rebelling against the Word of the Lord.* Afterward, when they would go up contrary to order, *Numb.* xiv. 41. *Moses* asks them, *Why do you transgress the decree of the Word of the Lord?* In their murmuring at *Zalmona*, *Numb.* xxi. 5. according to *Onkelos* in one of *Clerk*'s various Readings, *They spoke against the Word of the Lord, and against Moses.* Wherefore v. 6. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *The Word of the Lord sent fiery Serpents among the People.* Upon their Whoring with *Baal-Peor*, *Numb.* xxv. 4. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *The Word of the Lord said to Moses, take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord.* In short, according to the *Targums* on *Deut.* xxviii. 20, 21, 22, *&c.* It was *the Word of the Lord* that would send all his Judgments and Curses that are there denounced against impenitent Sinners.

Polyglot. Vol. IV.

But on the other hand, according to those Targums, *the Word had* the dispencing of pardon to them that were Qualified for it. So when *Moses* beg'd pardon for his People that had sinned beyond mercy, if it had not been infinite, *Numb.* xiv. 20. according to the *Jerusalem* Targum, *the Word of the Lord answered him, and said, behold I have forgiven, and pardoned according to thy word.* And in case, upon the inflicting of God's Judgments above mentioned, God's People should be thereby brought to repentance; It was promised, *Deut.* xxx. 3. according to *Jonathan*'s Targum, *that then the Word should accept their repentance according to his good pleasure, and should have mercy on them, and gather them out of all Naons, &c.* So likewise *c.* xxxii. 36. according to the same *Targum*, it is promised that *the Word of the Lord by his mercy should judge the judgment of his people, and should repent him of the evil that he had decreed against his Servants.* It were easie to add many more such Instances out of the *Targums*, but these are abundantly enough to shew the sense of the ancient Church, what they thought of him that so often appeared to their Fathers in the Wilderness, and spoke to them by his Servant *Moses*.

When *Moses* understood that God was not willing he should live to bring his People into the Promised Land; thereupon he besought God to send him a Successor, in these words, according to *Jonathan*'s *Targum*, *Numb.* xxvii. 16. *Let the Word of the Lord, who has dominion over the souls of men,— appoint a faithful man over the Congregation of his People.* God having

having appointed *Joshua* in his stead, *Moses* gave him this Charge in the hearing of the People, *Deut.* iii. 21, 22. according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, *Thy eyes have seen what the Lord hath done to Og and Sihon, so shall he do to all the kingdoms where thou art to pass; therefore fear them not, for the Word of the Lord your God shall fight for you.* The same he repeated afterward to all the People, telling them first, *Deut.* xxxi. 2, 3. according to *Jonathan*, *The Word of the Lord hath said to me, Thou shalt not pass over this Jordan*, but the Lord your God, *and his Shekinah will go before you*, Josh. iv. He addeth, *And Joshua will go over before you*, as the Lord has spoken: And for all your Enemies, *ver.* 5. *The Word of the Lord shall deliver them up before you*; therefore saith he, *ver.* 6. according to *Onkelos*, *Fear them not, for the Word of the Lord your God goes before you*; he will not fail nor forsake you. After this he calleth to *Joshua*, and saith to him before them all, *ver.* 7. according to *Jonathan*, Be strong and of a good Courage, for thou must go with this People into *the Land which the Word of the Lord has sworn to their Fathers that he would give them —— and the Shekinah of the Word of the Lord shall go before thee, and his Word shall be thy help; he will not leave thee nor forsake thee*; fear not therefore, neither be dismay'd. He repeats it again from God to *Joshua*, *ver.* 23. according to *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, Thou shalt bring the Children of *Israel* into the Land which I have sworn to them, and *my Word shall be thy help.*

It was the same day, that together with this Charge, *Moses* gave to *Joshua* his Prophetical

tical Song, *Deut.* xxxi. 22, 23. And the selfsame day, xxxii. 48. God bade him *Get thee up into Mount Nebo, and dye:* After which *Moses* staid no longer than to give the Tribes of *Israel* his Blessing before his Death, xxxiii. 1. That being done, he went up to Mount *Nebo*, xxxiv. 1. There, according to *Jonathan*, *It was the Word of the Lord* that gave that Satisfaction to his Bodily Eyes, to see all the Land of *Canaan* before they were closed: So *ver.* 5. *Moses* the Servant of the Lord died there — *according to the Word of the Lord.* He was translated by the Λόγος, according to *Philo.* It was certainly the current Tradition of the Church in his Age, that his Soul was taken out of his Body *by a Kiss of the Word of the Lord*, as *Jonathan* renders it; or according to the *Jerusalem Targum, at the Mouth of the Decree of the Word of the Lord.*

De Sacr. Abr. p. 162. C. D.

After his Death, *Joshua* entred into the Government, *ver.* 9. and according to the *Jerusalem Targum*, the Children of *Israel* obeyed *Joshua*, and they did *as the Word of the Lord had* commanded *Moses.*

Besides all these Divine Appearances to *Moses* and the Children of *Israel*, there are also some few that were made to *Balaam* on their account, and are therefore recorded in the same Sacred History. Where these are first mentioned, *Numb.* xxii. 9. both *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* have, That *the Word came from before the Lord to Balaam, and said* what followeth in that place. So again the second time, *ver.* 20. according to the same *Targums, The Word came from before the Lord to Balaam by night, and said* to him what follow-

eth in that second place. It is plain that so far the Ancient *Jewish* Church took these Appearances to have been made by the Word.

But what Opinion had they of the *Angel's* appearing to *Balaam, ver.* 22.? Others may ask what they thought of the Dialogue between *Balaam* and the Ass that he rode upon, occasioned by the Fright that the Beast was in at the Angel's appearing to him. All this, as *Maimonides* * saith, happened only in Vision of Prophecy: But that it was a thing that really happened, we are assured by St. *Peter*, who tells us, 2 *Pet.* ii. 16. *God opened the mouth of the dumb beast to rebuke the madness of the Prophet.* As it cannot be doubted that *Balaam* was used to have Communication with Devils that spake to him in divers manners; so there is reason to believe they spoke to him sometimes by the mouth of dumb Beasts; and if so, then to hear the Ass speak could not be strange to him. And why God should order it so, there is a reason in *Jonathan* and the *Jerusalem Targum:* The Reader may see other Reasons elsewhere †, but they are not proper for this place. But we are here to consider, whether this that appeared to *Balaam* was a created Angel or no. It appears by the words, *ver.* 35. to have been the Lord himself that appeared as an Angel to *Balaam*; for thus he saith to him, *Go with the men, but only the word that I shall speak to thee, that thou shalt speak.* Now it doth not appear after this, that any other spoke to him from God, but God himself. Therefore *Philo* saith plainly, that this Appearance was of the Λόγος, as has been already

* *More Nebochim* 11. *p.* 42.

† *Muis Varia, p.* 95.

ready shown. And that this was the Sense of the Church in his Age, we may see in the two following Appearances to *Balaam*; where as well as in the two that were before this, the *Targums* say, It was *the Word that met Balaam, and spoke to him.* Thus both *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, on *Num.* xxiii. 4, and 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

That all the Appearances of God or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken after Moses *his time in the Books of the Old Testament, have been referred to the Word of God by the* Jews *before Christ's Incarnation.*

THUS far it has been our business to shew, that it was the Word that made all those Appearances, either of God, or of an Angel of God that was worshipt, in any part of the five Books of *Moses.* We have been much larger in this than was necessary for our present occasion. But whatsoever may seem to have been too much in this Chapter, it is hoped the Reader will not wish it had been spared, when he comes to reflect upon the use of it, to prove that the Word was a Person, and that he was God. At present there will be some kind of amends for the prolixity hitherto, in the shortness of what we have to say in the following part of this Chapter. For being now to treat of those Divine Appearances that are recorded in the other Books of Scripture after the *Pentateuch*, we shall find those Appearances fewer and fewer, till they come quite to cease in the *Jewish* Church. For when once the Λόγος was setled as the King of *Israel* between the Cherubims, He is not to be look'd for in other

other places. And of those Books of Scripture in which the following Appearances are mentioned, we have not so many Paraphrases as we have of the five Books of *Moses*. One Paraphrase is all that we have of most of the Books we now speak of. But after all, we have reason to thank God, that that Evidence of the Divine Appearances of the Word of God has been so abundantly sufficient, that we have no need of any more. So that of the following Appearances of God, or of a Worshipt Angel, it will be enough to shew that the ancient *Jewish* Church had the same Notion that they had of those already mentioned out of the five Books of *Moses*.

We read but of one Divine appearance to *Joshua*, and that is of one that came to him as *a man with a drawn-sword in his hand*, calling himself *the Captain of the Lord's Host*, Josh. v. 13, 14. Some would have it that this was a created Angel: But certainly *Joshua* did not take him to be such, otherwise he would not have fallen down on his face and worshipped him, as he did, v. 14. Nor would a created Angel have taken it of him without giving him a present reproof, as the Angel did to St. *John* in the like Case, *Rev.* xix. 10. xxii. 9. But this Divine Person was so far from reproving him for having done too much, that he commanded him to go on, and do yet much more, requiring of him the highest acknowledgment of a Divine Presence that was used among the Eastern Nations, in these words, *Loose thy Shoo from off thy foot, for the ground whereon thou standest is holy.* Now considering that these are the very

very same words that God used to *Moses* in *Exod.* iii. 2, 3. We see a plain reason why God should command this to *Joshua*. It was for the strengthening of his faith, to let him know that, as he was now in *Moses*'s stead, so God would be the same to him that he had been to *Moses*. And particularly with respect to that trial which required a more than ordinary measure of faith, the difficulty of taking the strong City of *Jericho* with such an Army as he had, without any provision for a Siege, the Lord said unto him, *Josh.* vi. 2. *See I have given Jericho into thy hand.* None but God could say and do this; and the Text plainly saith, *It was the Lord.* And that the Lord who thus appeared as a Warrier, and called himself *Captain of the Lord's Host*, was no other than the Word, this was plainly the sense of the ancient *Jewish* Church; as appears by what remains of it in their Paraphrase on *Josh.* x. 42. xxiii. 3, 10. which saith, *It was the Word of the Lord that fought for them*; and v. 13. which saith, *It was the VWord which cast out the Nations before them.*

And indeed this very judgment of the Old Synagogue is to be seen not only in their *Targums* till this day, but in their most ancient Books, as *Rabboth fol.* 108. *col.* 3. *Zohar par.* 3. *fol.* 139. *col.* 3. *Tanch. ad Exod.* 3. *Ramb. ad Exod.* 3. *Bach. fol.* 69. 2. The learned *Masius* in *Josh.* v. 13. 14. hath translated the words of *Ramban*, and he hath preferred his Interpretation, which is the most ancient amongst the *Jews*, to the sense of the Commentators of the Church of *Rome*.

Of

Of Divine Appearances in the Book of *Judges*, we read of one to *Gideon*, that seems to have been of an Angel of God, for so he is called, *Judg.* vi. 11, 12. And again, *v.* 20, 21, 22. In this last place it is also said that *Gideon perceived he was an Angel of the Lord, (i.e.)* He saw that this was an Heavenly Person that came to him, with a Message from God. And yet that he was no created Angel it seems by his being oftner called the Lord, *v.*14, 16, 23, 24, 25, 27. And *Gideon* in that whole History never address'd himself to any other but God. The Message delivered from God by this Angel to *Gideon*, *ver.* 16. is thus rendred in the *Targum*, *Surely my Word shall be thy help, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man.* The Word that help'd *Gideon* against the *Midianites*, was no other than he that appeared to *Joshua* with a Sword in his hand, *Josh.* v. 13. That was now *the Sword of the Lord, and of Gideon*, *Judg.* vii. 18, 20. And what the Ancient *Jewish* Church meant by the Word of the Lord in this place, one may guess by their *Targum* on *Judg.* vi. 12, 13. Where the Angel saying to *Gideon*, *The Word of the Lord is thy help*; he answered, *Is the Shekinah of the Lord our help*; *whence then hath all this happen'd to us?* It is plain by this Paraphrase that they reckoned the Word of the Lord to be the same with the *Shekinah* of the Lord, even him by whom God so gloriously appeared for their deliverance. And indeed they could hardly be mistaken in the Person of that Angel, who saith that his Name is *Pele*, the Wonderful, which is used *Isaiah* ix. amongst the Names of the *Messias*, which Name

Name the *Jews* make a shift to appropriate to God, exclusively to the *Messias*.

The Angel that appeared to *Manoah*, Judg. xiii. could seem to have been no other than a created Angel; but the Name which he takes of *Pele*, the Wonderful, shews that he was the Word of the Lord, or the Angel of the Lord, *l.* lxiii. 8.

In the first Book of *Samuel* we read of no other such Appearance, but that which God made to *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* iii. 21. and that was only by *a Voice from the Temple of the Lord, where the Ark was* at that time, *ver.* 3, 4. The same word היכל signifieth a Temple and a Palace, and so the Tabernacle was called in which the Ark was then in *Shiloh*. There it was that *God revealed himself to Samuel by the Word of the Lord*, ver. 21. But that in the Opinion of the Ancient *Jewish* Church the Word of the Lord was their King, and the Tabernacle was his Palace, where his Throne was upon the Ark between the Cherubims; and that from thence the Word gave his Oracles; all this has been so fully proved before in this Chapter, that to prove it here again would be superfluous; and therefore I take it for granted, that in their Opinion it was the Word of the Lord from whom this Voice came to *Samuel*.

In the Second Book of *Samuel* we read how upon *David*'s Sin in numbring the People, God sent the Prophet *Gad* to give him his choice of Three Punishments, either Three Years Famine, or Three Months Destruction by Enemies, or Three Days Pestilence throughout all the Coast of *Israel*. This last being a Judgment from Heaven, that falls

as soon upon the Prince as the Peasant, *David* made choice of it rather than either of the other; saying withal, *Let me not fall into the hands of Man, but into the hands of the Lord; for great are his Mercies*, 1 *Chron.* xxi. 13. Thereupon God sent a Pestilence upon all the Coasts of *Israel*, by which there fell Seventy thousand Men, 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 15. And to represent to *David*'s Bodily Eyes an extraordinary Instance, as well of God's Justice in punishing Sinners, as of his Mercy to them upon their Repentance and Prayer, God made him see *an Angel standing between the Earth and the Heaven, having a drawn Sword in his hand stretch'd out over Jerusalem* to destroy it, 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 16, 17. And 1 *Chron.* xxi. 16. And when at this Sight *David* fell upon his face, and prayed, as it followeth, *ver.* 17. God said to the destroying Angel, *It is enough, stay now thy hand:* Then the Angel came down, and stood by the Floor of *Ornan* the *Jebusite*, (on which Place God designed that *Solomon* should build his Temple, and declared it to *David* upon this occasion.) There, according to the Angel's Order by the Prophet *Gad*, *David* now built an Altar, and sacrificed thereon; upon which *the Lord commanded the Angel, and he put up his Sword into his sheath*, 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 17. This was no other than a Created Angel, whom God that employ'd him in that Service, appointed to appear in that manner, for all those purposes before-mentioned.

What the Ancient Church thought of all this Passage of History, we may easily guess by what has been already shewn, of their ascri-

ascribing all Rewards and Punishments to the Word, that had the Conduct and Government over God's People. And though it seems that Care has been taken to conceal this Notion of theirs, as much as was possible, in the *Targums* of the Books now before us; yet here is a Passage that seems to have escaped the Correctors, by which we may perceive the Church's Sense here was agreeable to what we find of it in all other places. For in 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 14. where we find in the Text that *David* said, *ver.* 6. *Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, for his Mercies are great*; the *Targum* thus renders these words, *Let me be delivered into the hand of the Word of the Lord, for great are his Mercies.* It was therefore *the Word of the Lord* into whose hands *David* fell: It was his Angel by whom the Judgment was executed: And it was also *his Mercy* by which the Judgment was suspended and revoked. The *Targum* on this Text sufficiently shews that all this was the Sense of the *Jewish* Church.

In short, the Ancient Church considered the Word as being their Sovereign Lord and King of the People of *Israel*. All those Kings whose Acts are described in the Two Books of Kings, they look'd upon as his Lieutenants or Deputies, that held their Title from and under him by his Covenant with *David* their Father. This *Solomon* declared in these words, 1 *Kings* viii. 15. *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who by his Word made a Covenant with David my Father.* Whatsoever God did for his People under their Government, in protecting and delivering them from their

Enemies; they own'd that it was *for his Word's sake, and for his Servant David's sake*, 2 *Kings* xix. 34. xx. 6. When they had quite broken his Covenant, then *God removed them from before his Word*, and gave them up to be a Scorn to all Nations, as he threatned he would, 1 *Kings* ix. 7. according to their *Targum*.

In these Books we read of no more but Two Divine Appearances in *Solomon*'s time, and both these were made to *Solomon* himself, 1 *Kings* ix. 2.

The first was at *Gibeon*, *chap.* iii. 5. where the Lord appeared to *Solomon in a dream by night*, and said to him, Ask what I shall give thee. He asked nothing but Wisdom; which so pleased the Lord, that he gave him not only that, but also Riches and Honour above all the Kings then in the Word. The *Targum*, as it is come to our hands, doth not say, It was the Word of the Lord that appeared to him, and that gave him all this. But that it was so according to the Sense of their Church, may be gathered from the Text, which tells us, *ver.* 15. That as soon as *Solomon* was *awake*, he went presently to *Jerusalem* (which was about seven Miles distant) and there *he stood before the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord* (which was there in the Tabernacle set up by *David* his Father;) *and he offered up both Burnt-Offerings and Peace-Offerings, and made a Feast to all his Servants*. The haste in which all this was done, brings us presently to the Occasion of it; for of all Peace-Offerings for Thanksgiving to God, the same day that they were offered, the Flesh must be eaten, *Lev.* vii. 15. the Breast and

and Right Shoulder by the Priests, all the rest by the Offerer, and those that he had to eat with him. It is plain therefore that this was a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving to God. But why should not *Solomon* have staid at *Gibeon*, and there paid this Duty where he had received the Obligation? Especially since there at *Gibeon* was the Tabernacle which *Moses* made by God's Command; and there was the Brazen Altar which *Bezaleel* made, 2 *Chron.* i. 2, 3, 4. and *Solomon* had come on purpose to *Gibeon* to sacrifice upon that Altar at that time. The very day before this Appearance of God he had offered a thousand Burnt-Offerings upon it, *ver.* 6. and *in that very night did God appear to him*, *ver.* 7. Now *Solomon* having found that good Success of his sacrificing at *Gibeon*, that presently God appeared to him, and gave him so great a Boon, would certainly have staid there to have paid his Thanksgiving in that Place, but that he understood that he that appeared to him was the Word, whose especial Presence was with the Ark at *Jerusalem*, as we have abundantly proved. To Him therefore he hasten'd immediately to pay his Burnt-Offerings, and Peace-Offerings of Thanksgiving to the Word of the Lord. This we cannot doubt was the Sense of the Ancient *Jewish* Church, though it doth not appear now in their *Targums*.

And if it was the Word that made that first Appearance to *Solomon*, then it must be He that made the second also; for both these Appearances were of the same Person. So it is said expresly in the Text, 1 *Kings* ix. 2.

The Lord appeared to Solomon the second time, as he had appeared to him at Gibeon. But of this second Appearance, that it was of the Word of the Lord, there is a clearer Proof than of the former; as the Reader will certainly judge, if he considers the Circumstances of this second Appearance, and the Words which God spake to *Solomon* on this occasion. First, the time of this Divine Appearance to *Solomon*, was when he had finish'd the building of the House of the Lord, 1 *Kings* ix. 1. He had brought the Ark into the most Holy Place, even under the Wings of the Cherubims, 1 *Kings* viii. 6. The Glory of the Lord had taken possession of this House, *ver.* 10, 11. and *Solomon* had made his Prayer and Supplication before it, *ver.* 12,—— 61. Thereupon God appears, and tells him, *I have heard thy Prayer and Supplication that thou hast made before me. I have hallowed this House* which thou hast built, ix. 3. that is, I have taken it for my own *to put my name there for ever*, 1 Chron. vii. 12. *I have chosen this place to my self for a House of Sacrifice.* This was a plain declaration from God, that it was of this House that he had spoken by *Moses* in these words, Deut. xii. 5, 11. *There shall be a place which the Lord your God shall chuse to place his Name there; thither shall you bring all that I command you, your Burnt-offerings and your Sacrifices*, &c. Now see how those words of *Moses* are rendred in *Jonathan's Targum* on *Deuteronomy*: *There will be a place which the Word of the Lord will chuse to place his Shekinah there: Thither shall you bring your Offerings*, &c. Here the Reader cannot but see that he that appeared to *Solomon*, and said to him, *I have chosen this place*, &c. all along in the First Person; is the same of whom *Moses* said all the same things, speaking of him in the Third Person. And that as it appears in *Jonathan's Targum* both *ver.* 5. and *ver.* 11. of that Chapter, this was no other than *the Word*, according to the mind of the Ancient *Jewish* Church; though in their *Targum* on 1 *Kings* ix. (which also is called *Jonathan's*, but how truly, the Reader may see by this Instance) there is not the least mention of the Word upon this occasion.

The Word of the Lord being now in his Resting-place in *Solomon's* Temple, 1 *Chron.* viii. 41. and having put an end to his Theocracy, by setting up Kings of *Solomon's* Race, that came in by Hereditary Succession, and governed after the manner of the Kings of other Nations; after this, in the Scripture-History of those Times, while the first Temple was standing, we read of no more such Divine Appearances as we had formerly.

There is only one to be excepted, namely, that which was made to *Elias* in a small still Voice, 1 *Kings* xix. Of which something ought to be said more particularly. It may be observed that this was in that part of *Israel* which had no Communion with the Temple. It was in *Ahab's* time, when the Children of *Israel* had not only cast off the Seed of *David*, but seem'd to have quite forsaken the Covenant which God had made with their Fathers by his Servant *Moses*. To reduce them to their duty, God had now sent *Elias*, who was a kind of second *Moses*. God shewed

shewed he was so, by putting him into so many of *Moses* his Circumstances. After a Fast of Forty Days, such as none but *Moses* had ever kept before him, he comes to *Horeb* the Mount of God, 1 *Kings* xix. 8. So called first, *Exod.* iii. i. in the History of God's first appearing to *Moses* in that place. And as there, *ver.* 6. *Moses* hid his Face, being afraid to look upon God; so did *Elias* in this place, 1 *Kings* xix. 13. He wrapt his Face in his Mantle; and then God spoke to him as he had done at first unto *Moses*. He that spoke now was the same that spoke then, as appears by comparing the Circumstances; and he that spoke then, was God the Word, as we have proved before in this Chapter. This must needs have been the Sense of the Ancient *Jewish* Church. And to us Christians it cannot but look very agreeable, That as when *Moses* and *Elias* were upon the Earth, the Word appeared to them, and spoke with them on Mount *Horeb*: So when he was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, *Moses* and *Elias* came to him on Mount *Tabor*, and spoke with him at his Transfiguration.

Of those Appearances of Angels to *Elias*, 1 *Kings* xix. 5, 7. 2 *Kings* i. And of the Angel that made that Slaughter in *Sennacherib*'s Army, 2 *Kings* xix. 35. we have no more to say in this place; because they seem to have been no other but Created Angels, and neither of them is called the Word of the Lord in their *Targum*.

But we are concerned for that Vision of God which was seen by the Prophet *Micaiah*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 19. although he doth not

not say that God appeared to him, nor that he saw any thing more of God than a meer resemblance of a King sitting in State, which was at that time visibly represented before him. For we must take notice of one thing, which is of some moment, that is, that when he saith, *I saw the Lord sitting on his Throne, and all the Host of Heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left, &c.* the most Learned *Jews* conceive that he saw the *Shekinah* with the Angels of his Attendance, and that this Vision of *Micaiah* is the same which was shewn to *Isaiah*, *ch.* vi. and to some other Prophets.

In the Prophetical Books of *Isaiah* and *Ezekiel*, there are two Appearances of God, or of the *Shekinah* in his Temple, which we are obliged to give some account of. And of these, as I shall shew, we have no reason to doubt but that it was the *Word* that appeared to those Prophets according to the sense of the ancient *Jewish* Church.

First for that in *Isai.* vi. 1, &c. The Prophet saith, *I saw the Lord sitting upon a Throne, high, and lifted up, and his Train filled the Temple; above it stood the Cherubims, &c. crying one to another, and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of thy glory:— and the House was filled with smoke.* That this House was the Temple is expresly said in the end of the first verse. And the smoke was the token of the *Shekinah* of God, with which the Temple was filled now, as it was at his first entrance into it, 1 *King.* viii. 10, 11. So that here, *the Lord sitting upon his Throne*, was no other than God sitting upon his Mercy-seat over

over the Ark; that is, He was the *Word* of the Lord, according to the opinion of the ancient *Jewish* Church, as has been abundantly proved before in this Chapter. Of which here is also some remain in their Paraphrase; for whereas the Prophet speaking still of the Lord whom he saw sitting on his Throne, *v.* 1. saith, *v.* 8. *Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send?* The *Targum* thus renders it, *I heard the Voice of the Word of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send?* We Christians need not thank them for this, being fully assured as we are by what the Apostle saith, *Job.* xii. 41. that this was no other than our Lord *Jesus Christ*. For there the Apostle having quoted the words that *Isaiah* heard from the Lord that spoke to him, *Isai.* vi. 9, 10. tells us, *These things said Isaiah when he saw his Glory, and spoke of him.* That the Apostle here speaks of *the Word made flesh*, is clear enough from the Text. But besides it has been proved by our Writers beyond all contradiction.

See *Plac.* lib.ii. Disput. 1.

In like manner that which the Prophet *Ezekiel* saw, was an Appearance of God, represented to him as a Man sitting on a Throne of Glory, *Ezek.* i. 26, 27, 28. x. 1. Which Throne was then upon Wheels, after the manner of a *Sella Curulis.* They were living Wheels, animated and supported by *Cherubims*, i. 21. each of which had four Faces, i. 6. such as were carved on the Walls of the Temple, xli. 19. In short, that which *Ezekiel* saw, though he was then in *Chaldea*, was nothing else but the Appearance of God as yet dwelling in his Temple at *Jerusalem*; but quite

quite weary of it, and now about to remove, and to leave his dwelling-place to be destroyed by the *Chaldeans.* To shew that this was the meaning of it, he saw this Glorious Appearance of God, first, *in his place*, iii. 12. (*i. e.*) on the Mercy-seat in the Temple, ix. 3. Next, he saw him gone from his place, *to the Threshold of the House.* Judges use to give Judgment in the Gate; so there over the Threshold of his House God gave Sentence against his rebellious people, *v.* 5, 6, 7. Afterward, from the Threshold of the House, x. 4. the Prophet saw the Glory departed yet farther, and *mounted up from the Earth over the midst of the City*, x. 18, 19. And lastly, he saw it go from thence, and *stand upon the Mountain on the East-side of the City*, xi. 23. That is, on Mount Olivet, which is before *Jerusalem* on the East, *Zech.* xiv. 4. and so the *Targum* has it on this place. After this departure of the Divine Presence, *Ezekiel* saw his forsaken Temple and City destroyed, and his People carried away into Captivity, xxxiii. 21, *&c.* After this he saw no more Appearance of God, till his People's return from Captivity. And then the Temple being rebuilt according to the measures given from God, xl, xli, xlii, the Prophet could not but expect that God would return to it as of old. So he saw it come to pass in his Vision, xliii. 2. *Behold the Glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the East*, (where the Prophet saw it last, at M. *Olivet.*) So again, *v.* 4. *The Glory of the Lord came into the House by the way of the Gate whose prospect is toward the East*, And *v.* 5. *Behold the Glory of the Lord filled the House.* So again, xliv. 4. *It filled the House* now, as it

it had done in *Solomon*'s time, 1 *King*. viii. 11. All along in this Prophecy of *Ezekiel*, it was but one Person that appeared, from the beginning to the end. In the beginning of this Prophecy, it was God that appeared in his Temple over the *Cherubims*; and there we find him again in the end of this Prophecy. But that it was no other but *the Word* that so appeared *in the Temple*, according to the sense of the ancient *Jewish* Church, has been proved so fully out of their *Targums* elswhere, that we need not trouble our selves about that any farther, though we cannot find it in the *Targum* on this Book.

In the Books of *Chronicles* there is nothing remarkable of this kind, but what has been considered already, in the account that we have given of the Divine Appearances in the Books of *Kings*. And there is no mention of any such Appearance in any of the other Books that were written after the *Babylonian* Captivity, except on the Books of *Daniel* and *Zechariah*. Of *Daniel* the *Jews* have not given us any *Targum*, therefore we have nothing to say of that Book. They have given us a *Targum*, such as it is, of the Book of *Zechariah*, which is the last we have to consider.

In this Book of *Zechariah* we read of three Angels that appeared to the Prophet. The first appeared to him as a Man, i. 8,-10. But is called an Angel, *v.* 9. In *Zechary*'s words, *The Angel that talked with me*: By which Title he is often distinguisht from all others in the same Book, i. 13, 14, 19. ii. 3. v. 5, 6. vi. 4. A second Angel appeared to him also as *a Man* with a Measuring Line in his hand, ii. 1. But whosoever compares this Text with *Ezek.* xl. 3, 4, 5, *&c.* will find that this, who appeared as *a Man*, was truly an Angel of God. Next, the first Angel going forth from the place where he appeared, ii. 3. *Another Angel* comes to meet him, and bids him, *Run, speak to this young man*, (whether to the Angel Surveyor, or whether to *Zechary* himself) and tell him, *Jerusalem shall be inhabited, &c.* ii. 4. He that commands another should be his Superior. And yet this Superior owns himself *sent* from God. But he own'd it in such terms as shew'd that he was God himself. This the Reader will see more than once in his speech, which is continued from *v.* 4. to the end of the Chapter. It appears especially in *v.* 8, 9, 11. of this Chapter. First in *v.* 5. having declared what God would do for *Jerusalem*, in these words according to the Targum, *The Lord hath said, my Word shall be a wall of fire about her, and my Glory will I place in the midst of her*; He goes on to *v.* 8. and there he delivers a Message from God to his People, in these words, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, After the Glory* * *hath he sent me to the Nations that spoiled you, &c.* Here the sense is ambiguous, for it seems strange that the Lord of Hosts should say, another hath sent me. But so it is again, and much clearer exprest in *v.* 9. where he saith, *Behold, I will shake my hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their Servants.* This none but God could say: But he addeth in the next words, *And ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me*; which words plainly shew that, though he stiled himself God, yet he came as a Messenger from God. This is plainer yet, *v.* 11. where he

* After the *Glory* of his *Shekinah* being returned into the Temple, when that was rebuilt, they should soon after see *Babylon* it self taken, and *spoiled* by their ancient Servants the *Persians*.

he saith, *Many Nations shall be joyned to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee*, (Thee, Oh *Zion*, *v.* 10.) This again none but God could say: And yet it followeth, *Thou* (Oh *Zion*) *shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me to Thee*, (Oh *Zion.*) Here are plainly two Persons called by the name of *Jehovah*; namely, one that sends, and another that is sent; So that this second Person is God, and yet he is also the Messenger of God.

Thee, Thou, Thee, are all Feminines in the *Hebrew*, and therefore all three refer to *Zion*.

So likewise in the next Chapter, *v.* 1. the Angel that used to talk with the Prophet shewed him *Joshua* the High Priest, standing before the Angel of the Lord, and *Satan* standing over against *Joshua* as his Adversary. And *v.* 2. the Prophet hears the Lord say unto *Satan* twice over, *The Lord rebuke thee*, for being so maliciously bent against *Joshua*, that was come out of the Captivity *as a brand pluckt out of the fire*. He that was called the Angel, *v.* 1. is here called the Lord, *v.* 2. and this Lord intercedes with the Lord for his Protection of *Joshua* against *Satan*. That which gave the Devil advantage against *Joshua* was his Sins; which, as the *Targum* saith, were the Marriages of his Sons to strange Wives. His Sins, whatsoever they were, are here called *filthy Garments*; and *Joshua* standing in these before the Angel, *v.* 3, 4. The Angel commands them that stood about him, saying, *take away the filthy garments from him.* Here again, by commanding the Angels, he sheweth himself their Superior. Afterward, when the filthy Cloaths were taken off, this Angel saith to *Joshua*, *Behold I have caused thy Iniquity*

Iniquity to pass from thee; words, that if one Man had said to another, the *Jews* would have accounted *Blasphemy*, Mat. ix. 2, 3. *For who* (say they) *can forgive Sins but God only?* But here was one that exercised that Authority over the High Priest himself. This could be no other than he that was called of God, *a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek*, Psal. cx. 4. of whom the *Jewish* High Priest, even *Joshua* himself, was but a figure. But he goes farther, adding, *I will cloth thee with change of raiment*, that is, according to the *Targum*, *I will cloth thee with righteousness.* ver. 5. *And he* * *said*, (again commanding the Angels) *Let them set a fair Miter on his head, and they did so, and clothed him with Garments, and the Angel of the Lord stood by.* Here again he is called an Angel, at last, as he was at first, ii. 3. It is an Angel's Office to be the Messenger of God; and so he often owned himself to be, in saying, *The Lord sent me.* And yet this Messenger of God commands the Angels, ii. 4. iii. 4, 5. and himself stands by to see them do his commands, *v.* 5. This Angel calleth *Israel* his People, and saith, he will dwell among them, ii. 10, 11. He takes upon him to protect his People, *v.* 5. and to avenge them on their enemies, *v.* 10. He intercedes with God, iii. 2. He forgives sin, and confers Righteousness, iii. 4. If all these things cannot be truly said of one and the same Person; then here are two Chapters together that are each of them half Nonsense, and there is no way to reconcile them with sense, but by putting some kind of *force* upon the Text, whether by changing the words,

* ואמר And he said, Jon. Targ.

Socin. in Wiek 1.ii. p. 565.

words, or by putting in other words, as *Socinus* honestly confesseth he has done in his Interpretation. And he saith, they must do it that will make sense of the words. It is certain they must do so that will interpret the words as he would have it. But he and his followers bring this necessity upon themselves. They that will set up new Opinions must defend them with new Scriptures. For our parts we change nothing in the words; and in our way of understanding them we follow the Judgment of the ancient *Jewish* Church, that makes all these things perfectly agree to the Λόγος. This we see in *Philo*, who often calleth the Λόγος * God; and yet as often calleth him an † Angel, the Messenger of God; and ‖ our High-Priest, and * our Mediator with God. The same hath been shewed of the *Word* elswhere out of the *Targums*. And here in this *Targum*, though no doubt it hath been carefully purged, yet by some oversight it is said, ii. 5. That *the Word shall be a wall of fire about Jerusalem*. And if the Modern *Jews* had not changed the third Person into the first, it would have followed, that his *Shekinah* should be in the midst of her; as himself saith afterward, *v.* 10, 11. He would *dwell in the midst of her*; meaning in the Temple, where the *Word* of God had his dwelling-place always before its destruction, as has been abundantly shewn in this Chapter, and as we shewed from *Ezekiel* it was promised he should dwell there again after its Restauration.

* De Somn. p. 466. B. Euf. præp. vii. 15. Μύστης Θεός. Philo L. 1. Quæst. & Sol. as Philo calls the Father, πρῶτος Θεός, De migr. Abr. p. 416. B. 418. C. Quis rer. Divin. hæres, B. p. 397. G. De Somn. p. 457. B. Quod Deus sit immut. p. 249. B. Quis rer. Divin. hær. p. 397. G. † De Somn. p. 463. F. De Prof. p. 364. B. De profug. Mos. iii. p. 466. B. De Somniis, p. 594. E. Quis rer. Divin. p. 397. G. Vit. 521. B.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

That the Ancient Jews *did often use the Notion of the* Λόγος, *or Word, in speaking of the Messias.*

I Hope what I have said upon the Appearances of the Word in the Old Testament, proves beyond exception that the Word, which is spoken of in the ancient Books of the *Jews*, is a Person and a Divine one. From thence it is natural to conclude that St. *John* and the other Holy Writers of the New Testament who made use of the word Λόγος, could not rationally give to that word Λόγος, any other Idea, than that which was commonly received in the *Jewish* Nation.

Nothing more can be required from me than to refute fully the *Unitarians*, who pretend that the Word signifies no more than an Attribute or the eternal vertue of God, and who to confirm this assertion of theirs observe that in the *Targums* the term Λόγος is never employed when they speak of the Messias. The *Socinian* Author who wrote against *Wecknerus* insists very much upon this observation.

Let us therefore examine how true that is which he affirms, and supposing it true, how rational the consequence is which he draws from thence in opposition to it I lay down these three Propositions, which I shall consider in as many Chapters: The first is, that in several places of the Ancient *Jewish* Authors

the *Memra* or the Λόγος, is put for the Messias. And so that it is certain that St. *John* hath followed the Language of the *Jews* before Jesus Christ in taking the Λόγος for a Divine Person that in the fulness of time, as it was foretold by the Prophets, did assume our flesh, *Joh.* i. 14.

The second is, that the *Jews* of old did acknowledge the Messias should be the proper Son of God.

The last is, that the Messias was represented in the Old Testament as being *Jehovah* that should come, and that the ancient Synagogue did believe him to be so.

I begin with the first of these three Articles.

And upon this I must put my Reader in mind, that it should not be a just subject of admiration, if we could not prove such a thing by many of the *Jewish* Books. It is clear that when the *Jewish* Authors did consider the Λόγος, they considered him as the true Lord of Heaven and Earth, and chiefly of their own Nation. Whereas the Messias is often represented to the Prophets as one that should appear in a very mean condition; and whatsoever glory is attributed to him in other places of the Ancient Revelation, which brought them to believe till the last times that the *Shekinah* was to be in him; there were some Characters which could hardly be applied to him as being Personally the Word himself. Such are his Sufferings described, *Psal.* xxii. and *Isa.* liii. Such is his riding upon an Ass, and coming to *Jerusalem*, which they refer constantly to the Messias, as you may see

see in their Ceremonial Book or *Aggada* of *Pesach.*

But altho we should suppose that the places we are going to cite cannot expresly convince the Reader of this truth: yet we might establish it by necessary consequences from them.

For example, It is universally received, that *Jacob* speaks of the Messiah, *Gen.* xlix. 10. *Onkelos* Paraphrases it, the People shall obey him. And yet, *Gen.* xlix. 24. he makes the *Word* the Governour of *the People.*

The ancient *Jews* hold, that the *Word* delivered *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and to the *Word* they apply all the Appearances ascribed to the Angel of the Lord. Does it not follow from hence, that they understood the Messiah by the *Word*? since they confess, the Messiah is called the *Angel of his Presence*, Isa. lxiii. 10. *the Angel of the Covenant*, Mal. iii. 1. which words they refer constantly to the Messias.

The ancient *Jews* affirm, that it was upon the motion of the *Word* that their Ancestors were to move, and that *He* ordered them to prepare themselves for a sight of God. *Onk.* on *Exod.* xix. 17. And is not this it which *Amos* demands of the People with respect to the Messiah? *ch.* iv. 12.

The *Jews* relate that the Temple was built for the *Word*, as was also the Tabernacle, where the Majesty of the *Word* resided. After this, whom could they understand, but the *Word* of the Lord, of whom *Malachy* promised that he should come to his Temple? *chap.* iii. 1. which words relate constantly to the Messias.

The *Jews* thought him to be the Messias, that is spoken of by *Zech.ch.*vi.22. And whom else could they think him but the *Word*, who is named by *Zechariah* the East? and the Sun of Righteousness by *Mal.* iv. 2. Especially since *Philo* interprets that place of *Zechariah* of the Λόγος, *De Confus. Linguar. p.* 278. where he speaks of him as of the first-born of God, and of the Creator of the World.

The *Jews* held, that it is said of the *Word*, God is a consuming fire, *Onk.* on *Deut.* iv. 24. which renders it natural to understand him what is to the same sense spoken of the Messias, *Mal.* iii. 2. iv. 1.

The *Jews* believed a promise of the Messias, *Deut.* xviii. 15. But *Onkelos* notes here, that the *Word* shall revenge himself of them that disobey the Messias.

They maintained with *Philo, de Agric.p.*152. *B. de Somn. p.* 267. *B.* that the Λόγος was the first begotten of God. Could they then imagin that any other but he was meant in the places where the like Titles are owned even down to our times to be given the Messias? as *Psal.* ii. 7. lxxxix. 28. lxxii. 1.

They held, as did *Philo*, that the Λόγος led the People through the desert, and referred to him *Psalm* xxiv. wherein he is called the Shepherd. And could they do this without reflecting, how often this Title of *Shepherd* is given by the Prophets to the Messias?

They held that the Λόγος was adored in his Appearances to the Patriarchs, and could they doubt whether the Messias, whom all the

the Kings of the Earth must adore, *Psal.*lxxii. 11. had any affinity with the Λόγος?

They assert, that the Λόγος is the great High Priest, *Phil. de Somn. p.* 463. *F.* And how could they deny that the Λόγος should be the Messias, when they constantly ascribed to the Messias, what we read of his Priesthood, *Psal.* cx. 4.

Whom did *Isaiah* see in that Vision, *ch.*vi. but the Messiah? And yet the *Targum* there calls him the *Word* of the Lord.

When *Isaiah* speaks of the Messias, *ch.* viii. 14. that the Lord shall be a stone of stumbling; the *Targum* reads the *Word* of the Lord, using it as one of the Names of the Messias. The like it does on *ch.* xxviii. 16. where it is manifest the Messias is spoken of.

Isaiah saith, *ch.* xii. 2. *Behold God my Saviour, I will trust in him. Jonathan* renders him, *I will trust in the* Word *of Salvation, i.e.* in the Word the Saviour.

The same Prophet, *ch.* xli. 4. having called *Jehovah* the First and the Last, he attributes to the Word the Title of Redeemer, *v.*13, 14, 16. which Title properly belongs to the Messias. And so the whole is applied by Jesus Christ to himself, *Rev.* i. 8, 17. xxii. 13.

God is called, *Isa.* xlv. 15. *the Saviour of Israel*; and the same thing is said of the *Word*, *v.* 17, 22, 24. where the Messias is treated of.

But I foresee these consequences will not seem strong enough to a *Socinian*. Let us therefore produce out of *Philo* and the *Targums* some places where the Notions of the Λόγος, and the Messias, do appear positively the same.

For *Philo*, 1. He declares that the Λόγος is the first begotten of God, in *Euseb. Præp.* vii. 13. *p.* 323. which he had from *Prov.* viii. 25. *Psal.* ii. 7. But this proves unanswerably that in the judgment of the Old *Jews*, the Messias should be the same Person with the Λόγος, seeing the Messias is called the first-born, *Psal.* lxxxix. 28.

2. He explains the last, *Zech.* vi. 12. by the Λόγος. The Text runs thus, *Thus speaks the Lord of Hosts, saying, behold the man whose name is the Branch,* (or, as the *Greek* has it, *the East,*) *he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the Temple of the Lord.* This is understood by the *Jews* of the Messias. But *Philo* plainly says, that this *East* here spoken of, is the Word, the first-born of God, the Creator of the World. *De Confus. Ling. p.* 258. *A.*

This place of *Philo* deserves a very particular consideration. For it teaches us what Notion the *Jews* had of the Messias before our Lords Ministry; and discovers the Tricks and Fopperies of the modern *Jews*, who having a mean opinion of the Person of the Messias, have invented quite another sense of the *Memra*, so frequent in their Paraphrases, than what the ancient *Jews* had of it.

Nor is it of less use to confound the *Socinians*. For it is a proof not to be denied of St. *John*'s following the Language of the old Synagogue, when he speaks of the Λόγος in the first Chapter of his Gospel; and shews that they have no other answer to the many Testimonies of the *Targum* objected against them, but what they borrow of the *Jews*.

3. Ano-

3. Another place of *Philo* in the same Book, *p.* 266. *F.* is much to the same purpose, where he calls the Λόγος a Man. We know the Messias is intimated to be a Man in many places; as *Psal.* xxii. 22. *I will declare thy name to my Brethren. Psal.* lxix. 9. *I am become a stranger to my Brethren. Psal.* cxxii. 8. *For my Brethrens sake.* For these Psalms do all regard the Messias. So also where he is called *David*, *Ezek.* xxvii. 25. as the *Targum* and the Modern *Jews* do own he is, *Hos.* iii. 5. and where he is called *Solomon*, as in the *Targum* on *Canticles*.

But saith *Philo*, the Λόγος is called a Man, which must be understood either upon account of his frequent Appearances as a Man, and so he is called, *Exod.* xv. 3. or to his intended manifestation in human shape, as a Servant. This latter is the Notion of *Psal.* xxii. above quoted, and of *Isa.* xlii. 1. *Behold my Servant*, which *Jonathan* refers to the Messias. And again of *Isa.* liii. where the Messias is represented as a Man afflicted and tormented; which has been their sense so constantly, that from hence the *Jews* since Jesus Christ have taken occasion to assert that the Messias was Leprous.

As for the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, it is visible from *Isa.* xlix. where the Messias is spoken of throughout, that the *Memra* should become the Messias: These are the words of *Isaiah*, *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Listen, O Isles unto me, and hearken you people from far. The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name, and he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, in the shadow*

of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a polished shaft, in his quiver hath he hid me, and said unto me, Thou art my Servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified: Then I said, I have laboured in vain — yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God. And now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb, to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him; tho Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, is it a light thing that thou shouldst be my Servant to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel? I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou maist be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth. Now as *Philo* hath observed that the Λόγος is not only called a Man, but *Israel. De Confus. Ling. p.* 266. which hath a natural relation to this place of *Isaiah*, so the *Targum* expressly ascribes *v.* 5. as also *v.* 16. to the *Word*, which speaks of the calling of the Gentiles. And so every *Jewish* Writer confesses that the Restauration of the Ten Tribes which is foretold there shall be the work of the Messias.

We read *Isa.* lxiii. 14. *As a beast goeth down into the valley, the Spirit of the Lord causeth him to rest, so didst thou lead thy people to make thy self a Glorious name.* Where, notwithstanding the Text hath *the Spirit of the Lord*, the *Targum* reads the *Word*, whom it treats as Redeemer, *v.* 14. that guided them through the Wilderness, that is in the Heavens, *v.*15. and hath the name of Redeemer from everlasting, *v.* 16.

Indeed,

Indeed, that the *Word* should become the Messias, *i. e.* should reveal himself in him, according to the judgment of the old *Jewish* Church, may be gathered from the method of the *Jews* in explaining certain places of the Messias which they referred to the *Word of the Lord.* Till now they do agree, that *Moses* spake of the Messias, *Exod.* iv. 13. *Send I pray thee by the hand of him whom thou wilt send:* *R. Meyr Aldabi* so interprets it, as he treats of the Messias, in his Book *Sevile Emunoth, ch.*10. But the *Jews* formerly referred it to the *Word* of the Lord, as we see in *Onkelos* on *Exod.* iii. 12. *And God said, certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be a token unto thee that I have sent thee, when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, you shall serve God upon this mountain.* On which words *Onkelos* observes, that God promised *Moses* to assist him by his *Word* in the trust committed to him, and repeats it on *Exod.* iv. 12, 15. from which it is to be concluded, that it is whom he intends, *v.* 13. The like remarks are made by *Jonathan's Targum* on the same Texts, from whence the like inference may be drawn.

I shall only mention a few more places: as, 1. It was the *Word* that promised to march among the *Israelites*, and to be their God, *Philo de Nom. mutat. p.*840. this, saith *Philo* in an 100 places, it was the *Word* that promised *Israel* his Presence, saith *Onkelos* on *Levit.* xxvi. 9, 11, 12. But it is certain the *Word* was to manifest himself in the Messias, בקרבו *in the middle of him*, as saith *Rashi*, whom I have quoted before.

2*ly*, The

2dly, The Ancient *Targums* acknowledge that the *Messias* should be a Prophet. So *Jonathan* owns on *Is.* xi. 2. The same *Isaiah* declares, liv. 13. *That they shall be all taught of God:* which is explained by *Jonathan* of the *Messias*, as also *Is.* liii. 5. 10, 11, 12. From whence it is evident, that they took the *Messias* and the Word of God to be the same.

3dly, You see that God having said, *Hos.* i. 7. that he would save his people by *Jehova* their God, which is translated by the *Targum*, by the word of the Lord, the *Jews* kept always for a Maxim, that the Eternal Salvation was to come to them by the Messias. *Rashi* refers to that which we read in *Isaiah*, *ch.* xlv. 17. and he follows in this the *Targum* of *Jerusalem* upon *Gen.* xlix. 18. where the Salvation by the Messias is called by *Jacob* the Salvation by the Word of the Lord. 'Tis upon the same foundation that they refer to the Messias which is spoken *Isai.* xliv. 6. that the Messias shall be the last King, as he hath been the first, which they infer from *Psal.* lxxii. 8. and *Dan.* ii. 35. 44. in *Bresh Rabba ad Gen.* xlii. 6. Now it is the very description of the Word of God as you see in *Jonathan*'s *Targum* upon *Deut.* xxxii. 39. *Quando revelaverit se Sermo Domini ad redimendum populum suum, dicet omnibus populis, Videte quod ego nunc sim qui sum & fui, & ego sum qui futurus sum, nec alius Deus præter me.*

4thly. *Jonathan* on *Micah* vi. 14. has the same Notion. The Text runs, *Feed thy people with thy Rod, the flock of thy heritage, which dwell solitarily in the wood, in the midst of Carmel: let them feed in Bashan, and Gilead, as in the days*

days of old. But *Jonathan* paraphrases it thus, Feed thy People by thy *Word*, the People of thy Heritage, in *the Age to come*; a Term always used to denote the Times of the Messias, and consequently shews that the *Word* shall be in the *Messias*.

5thly. The same *Jonathan*, who affirms that the *Word* gave the Law on *Horeb*, and made a Covenant with *Israel*, refers to the *Messias* what *Philo* saith of the *Word*, Zech. vi. 12. as we see him on *Mal.* iv. 2.

We might infer the same thing from those Prophecies that speak of God as anointed, as *Psal.* xlv. 7. Of God as sent, *Isa.* xl. 9. Of God, for the sake of whom God forgives, *Dan.* ix. 17. For the *Targum* in many places applies these Expressions to the *Word*, though the Passages themselves are supposed by them to concern the *Messias*.

The same Truth may be also collected from hence, That the *Word* is clearly distinguished from God who sends him, and from the Holy Spirit who is to rest on the *Messias* in respect of his Human Nature. Which is a good Argument that the *Word* and the *Messias*, according to the common Notion of the Ancient *Jews*, was to be one and the same Person.

That Sense was so well known in the Synagogue, that you see in *Midrash Tehillim* upon *Psal.* xxxiii. that the *Shekinah* which was in Heaven was to leave them and to be upon the Earth; and that although it was not possible for any Mortal to see her in this Life, in the future Age, which is the second coming of the *Messias*, she is to be seen by *Israel*, who

who are then to live for ever, and to say as you see in *Isa.* xxv. 9. *Here is your God.* And according to *Psal.* xlviii. 15. *He is God our God,* as it is observed by *Tanchuma* and many others.

But this I shall shew more distinctly, in evincing 2*dly*, That the *Jews* who esteemed the Λόγος as the Son of God, did likewise believe the *Messias* should be the Son of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

That the Jews *did acknowledge the* Messias *should be the Son of God.*

GOD having by a great Number of Appearances settled it in the Minds of the *Jews*, That there was a true distinction between the Lord, and the Angel of the Lord, to whose care they were committed; did afterwards more plainly intimate to them, than he had done to the Ancient Patriarchs, who and what this Angel was: I mean he gave them Revelation in Scripture concerning the Nature of the *Messias*, in the expectation of whom he had trained them up by so many extraordinary Appearances.

For this purpose he raised *David* to the Throne, and made him a Prophet, that his Dignity might cause attention to his Prophecies, and his Authority establish the *Psalms*, which he writ by Inspiration, into a Form of Worship most acceptable to God. We therefore find in his *Psalms* all the Passions which the Promise and hope of the *Messias* naturally produce, arising from more distinct Notions of him than were formerly given. And afterwards God raised up other Prophets until *Malachi*, who all tread in *David's* steps, and pursue his Notions, as far as they concern the *Messias*.

It

It might be gathered from several things in the Writings of *Moses*, as *Gen.* iii. 15. that the *Messias* should be more than a man, because he was to destroy the Works of the Devil; and whosoever did that, must be stronger than he, as our Saviour shews in the Parable of the strong man, *Matth.* xii. 29. Because God respecting the coming of the *Messias*, promised to dwell in the Tabernacles of *Sem*, Gen. ix. 27. which the Ancient *Jews* understood of the *Shekina*, *Talm. Babyl. Joma, fol.* 9. *col.* 2. Because he was to bless all Nations, as was promised *Abraham*, Gen. xii. 3. as it is acknowledged by the Author of the Book *Chasidim*, §. 961. and that could not be done but by the *Shekinah dwelling* among them, as the *Jews* acknowledge it. Because he was to be King of all Nations of the Earth, as *Jacob* prophecied, *Gen.* xlix. 10. and as *Balaam* foretold of the *Messias*, according to *Onkelos*, he was to smite the corners of *Moab*, and destroy all the Children of *Seth*; or as *Onkelos* renders it, to have dominion over all the Children of men, *Num.* xxiv. 17.

But it was necessary that the notion of the *Messias* should be yet more distinct. And to this end, there was a constant Succession of Prophets from *David* to *Malachi*, who by their particular Characters of the *Messias* excited a more ardent desire in the *Jews*, that God would fulfil his promise concerning him.

Let us enquire a little, by what degrees this Light became more distinct, and shew what impression it caused in the *Jews* before the coming of our Lord.

I lay

I lay it down then as a truth, that the Prophets from *David* do constantly represent the *Messias* as the proper Son of God, one begotten by a proper, and not a figurative Generation.

That God hath a Son is declared in *Solomon*'s Question, *Prov.* xxx. 4. *What is his name, and what is his Son's name?* For it appears clearly by the description of God's Works and Attributes, which goes before these words, that this Question cannot be understood but of the true God, and of his true Son, the same which is spoken of *Prov.* viii. 22. as being Eternal, and Verses 24, and 25. as being begotten by God. And indeed although the Author of the *Zohar* refers sometimes those words, *What is his Son's name?* to the People of *Israel*, who is called the first-born of God; nevertheless he gives them their true sense in referring them to the *Messias*, who is spoken of in *Psalm* ii. in these words, *Thou art my S*[illegible] and *kiss the Son*, Part 3. fol. 124. col. 3.

Philo in his Pieces hath preserved the sense of the Ancient *Jews* in this matter that this Son was the Λόγος; as where he saith, that the *Word* by whom they swear, was begotten. *All.* 11. *p.* 76. *B.* that God begat his Wisdom according to *Solomon*, Prov. viii. 24. *De temul. p.* 190. *D.* which Wisdom is no other than the Λόγος, *Ibid. p.* 194. that the Λόγος is the most Ancient Son, the Eternal Spirit of God; but the World is the Son of God in time, *Quod Deus sit immut. p.* 232. that his *Word* is his Image, and his First-born. *De confus. ling. p.* 266. 267. *B.* that the Word is the

the Son of God, before the Angels, *Quis rer. div. h. p.* 397. *F. G.* that the Unity of God is not to be reduced to number, that God is *unus non unicus*, אחד ולא יחיד as the *Jews* say in their Book of Prayers, which are the very steps we take to shew that an Eternal Generation in the Divine Nature is no contradiction.

Nothing can be more express for to prove that there is a Son in the Godhead, than what we read in the *Targum* of *Jerusalem*, Gen. iii. 22. The Word of *Jehovah* said, Here *Adam*, whom I created, is the only begotten Son in the World, as I am the only begotten Son יחיד in the high Heaven.

3. The Prophets positively teach the Son of God (who, the *Jews* thought (as under the former Head appears) was the Λόγος, the Eternal Wisdom of God) to be the *Messiah*. Thus *David*, Psalm ii. brings in God speaking of the *Messiah*: *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, v. 6. V. 8. *Kiss the son lest he be angry, and lest you perish.* For thus it ought to be rendred according to *Aben-Ezra*, and the *Midrash* on this *Psalm*, and the *Zohar* in the place I have quoted just now, which Expression is also used by *Solomon*, Cant. i. 2. *Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth*, which the old *Jews* refer to the *Messias* in *Shir hashirim Rabba, fol.* 5. *Col.* 2, & 3. and in *Midrash Tehillim ad Ps.* lxviii. *v.* 4.

I confess that we read in *Tehillim Rabbathi* upon this iid *Psalm*, a kind of answer to this place אינו אומר בן לי אתה but בני אתה he doth not say, thou art a Son to me, but thou art my Son; and they pretend that God speaks

speaks to the *Messias* as a Master to his Servant. The *Inquisitors of Italy* take great care to blot out that Answer in the Books which they give leave to the *Jews* to keep in their Houses: But it is a ridiculous fear, for the solution is so absurd, that it is exploded as soon as you look upon the description of that Son which is in the Book of *Proverbs*, Chap. xxx. 4.

I own also, that we find not in the body of *Philo*'s Works any formal Explication of these words, *This day have I begotten thee*; from whence we can directly conclude, that he understood them of an Eternal Generation. But we find something equivalent to it. For speaking of these words, *You who were obedient to the Lord, are alive this day*; he adds, οὐ (τῇ σήμερον) ὄντιν ὁ ἀπέρατος καὶ ἀδιεξίητος αἰῶν, μιμῶν καὶ κ ἐνιαυτῶν καὶ σωμολῶς χρόνων περιόδοι, δόξμαλα ἀθρόπων εἰσὶν ἀριθμῶν ἐκτεμνικότων, τὸ δ ἀλλὰ ὄνομα αἰῶνος ἡ σήμερον. De profug. p. 358. E.

That this is not a simple Conjecture, appears from the manner of *Philo*'s explicating of himself, as he speaks of the Λόγος in two places cited by *Eus. Præp. Ev.* vii. *p.* 323. out of *Phil. de Agric.* 1, & 11. For in the first place, he calls the Λόγος the First-born of God: And in the other, the Eternal Word of the Eternal God, begotten by the Father. Λόγος ὁ ἀΐδιος Θεοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου.

The same Title of Son is given to the *Messias*, Psal. lxxii. 17. That this *Psalm* was understood of the *Messias* by the Ancient *Jews*, 'tis acknowledged by *Raschi*, who against their unanimous Consent thinks fit to apply

ply it to *Solomon*; now the *Hebrew* word there is *Innon*, being formed from *Nin*, which signifies a Son. Hence it is that the *Jews* make *Innon* one of the Titles of the *Messias* in *Midrash Tillim* on *Psalm* xciii. and in the *Talmud Sanhedrim*, *c.* 11. *fol.* 98. *col.* 2. and in *Rabboth*, *fol.* 1. *col.* 3. And it follows in the Text, that he had this Name before the Son, that is, before the Creation, as Eternity is described, *Psal.* xc. 2. *Prov.* viii. 22, 29.

Again *Psal.* lxxx. 15. where the *Psalmist* prays God to look down and visit his Vine, and the Vineyard which his right hand hath planted; the *Targum* renders these last words, and the Plant which thy right hand hath planted, that is, King *Messias*. The *Psalmist* goes on in these words, and the Branch which thou madest strong for thy self. The *Targum* reads them, even for thy Son's sake, and interprets them, even for the sake of King *Messias*. So likewise in *v.* 17. where we render the words, *Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thy self*, the LXX. have only, on the Son; and the *Targum* interprets them of King *Messias*.

God saith, *Psal.* lxxxix. 25, 26. *I will set his hand in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, thou art my father.* The Ancient *Jews* refer this to the *Messias*, and also many of the Modern *Jews* finding such difficulty in applying to *Solomon* many of the Characters in this *Psalm*, agree with the Ancients in their Interpretation.

The following Writers of the Holy Scriptures are as express as *David* is in this matter, *Prov.*

Prov. viii. 22, 23, 24, 25. is well worth perusing, principally for this Title given Wisdom, of a Son in the bosom of her Father. Upon which take *Philo*'s Reflection *de Profug. p.* 358. *A.* To the Question, Why is Wisdom spoken of in the *Feminine*, he Answers, it is to preserve to God the Character of a Father; from whom he thought the Λόγος drew his Nature; as being, as he elsewhere, *de Agric.* calls him υἱὸν τοῦ αἰωνίου Πατρὸς ὑός, the Eternal Son of the Everlasting Father. And nothing is more common amongst the *Jewish* Writers, than 1. To maintain that the *Shekinah*, the Wisdom, and the Λόγος, are the same. 2*dly*, To refer to the *Messias*, as being the same with the *Shekinah*, those very Places which are to be understood of the *Shekinah*, and to the *Shekinah* those Places which are to be understood of the *Messias*. If any man cast his eyes upon *Jonathan Targum* and the *Targum Jerusalami* commented by *R. Mardochay*, and printed lately at *Amsterdam*, he shall find that by the common consent of the *Jewish* Interpreters, whose words he fully relates, the Wisdom which is spoken, *Prov.* iii. and *Prov.* viii. is the same by which the World hath been created. 2*dly*, That this Wisdom is the same which is called the *Shekinah*, the *Memra*, it is called by *Philo* the Λόγος. Let him now look upon the Places of the Prophets which are constantly spoken of the *Messias*, and he shall find that they are referred by the best Authors of the Synagogue to the *Shekinah*; so that it is clear they had the same Idea of the *Shekinah* and of the *Messias*, and must have lookt upon the *Messias* as he that

must have been the proper Son of God. I will shew some Instances of what I advance, to spare the trouble to my Reader.

1*st*, They maintain that this Wisdom by which God hath founded the Earth, as *David* tells us, *Psal.* ciii. 24. is the same which is spoken by *Solomon*, Prov. iii. 19. 'tis the sense of all the *Targums*, *Midrashim* and *Cabalistic* Authors upon the first of *Genesis*, as you see in *R. Mardochay*, and in *Menachem de Rakanati* upon the 1*st* of *Genesis*.

2*dly*, They take indifferently this Wisdom and the *Shekinah*, or the *Memra* or Λόγος, for the same Person, referring to it the same Actions, the same Power, the same Worship, the same Majesty.

3*dly*, They understand the Wisdom which rules the World, as it is said, *Prov.* viii. to be the same which is spoken of, *Prov.* iii. 19. and to be the Son of the living God, the same who spoke by *Ezek.* xxii. 2. see *R. Menach. in Pent. fol.* 1. *col.* 2. from *Bereshit Rabba*, and from *Zohar. Ibid. fol.* 2. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 35. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 44. *col.* 1.

And *fourthly*, They refer many Places to that Wisdom which is the Λόγος, the *Shekinah*, and the Son, to the *Messias*; for example, it is clear that *Psalm* xlv. belongs to the *Messias*, as being the Bridegroom of the Church. Now they suppose that the *Shekinah* is the Bridegroom of the Synagogue, *R. Menach. in Pent. fol.* 15. *col.* 1. and they refer to the *Shekinah* the place of *Isaiah*, *chap.* lxii. 3. which is nothing but the same Idea of *Psalm* xlv.

So

So they refer the *Song of Solomon* to the *Shekinah* or Λόγος, *R. Menach. de Rekan in Pent. fol.* 58. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 76. *col.* 1. *&* *col.* 3. which is manifestly to be understood of the *Messias*, and so they pretend that the Kiss which is mentioned there, *Cant.* i. 1. signifies mystically the *Shekinah R. Menach. fol.* 44. *col.* 1.

It is notorious that the *Goel*, that famous Redeemer which is promised in so many Prophets to the Synagogue, is the *Messias*. Now the constant Idea of the *Jewish* Writers is, that the *Shekinah* is to be that very Redeemer. *Rab. Menach. de Rekanati in Pent. fol.* 58. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 59. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 83. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 97. *col.* 4.

So that nothing is more evident, than that the *Jews*, who took the Wisdom to be the Λόγος, and the proper Son of God, and look upon the *Shekinah* or the Λόγος, as being to be the *Messias*, must have lookt upon the *Messias* as being the proper Son of God.

In *Isaiah* iv. 2. the *Messias* is called the *branch of the Lord*, no doubt as properly as he is called *the branch of David*, Jerem. xxiii. 5. *In that day*, saith he, *the branch of the Lord shall be beautiful and glorious*, which is in *Jonathan*'s Paraphrase interpreted of the *Messias*. From which it is natural to conclude, that the proper Son of God was to be the *Messias*, and the *Messias* was to be the proper Son of God.

In *Isaiah* ix. 6, 7. we read of *a Son given*, and what are the Characters of this Son? they follow. *His name shall be Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting*

 Father,

Father, the Prince of Peace. The *Jews* long after Christ understood this place of the *Messias*; and *Solomon Jarchi*, who dyed in the Year 1180. is perhaps the first after *R. Hillel* that fell from the common Traditional Sense of his Nation in referring these Titles to God, and not the *Messias*.

But I have taken notice before in speaking of the several appearances of the Λόγος, that the Angel who appeared to *Gideon*, and who was the Λόγος, did take the same name of *Wonderful* which is given here to the *Messias*.

Jeremiah keeps to the same notion *of a branch* to denote a Son, *Jerem.* xxiii. 5. xxxiii. 15. and the *Targum* explains it of the *Messias*.

Zachary, ch. vi. 12. doth also call him the *branch*, which not only the *Jews* before Christ, as we have shewn from *Philo*, but those after Christ (*Echa Rabbathi, p.* 58. *col.* 2.) interpreted of the *Messias*, as being the Word.

And here let me remark to you a few of *Philo*'s Notions, which may serve for a Key to the right understanding of the Sentiments of *Philo* concerning divers Prophecies in the Old Testament. One while he saith, *Lib. de conf. Ling.* 267. that God is one, but without excluding his *Word* who is his Image and first-born, from being one with him. Another time, he calls the *Word* an Archangel, a Man, he that sees *Israel, &c.* Whence comes this, but that he saw the Λόγος was sometimes represented as Head of the Angels in respect of his Divinity, and at other times as a Man with regard to his intended coming in the Flesh?

Flesh? To this coming he seems to apply the Promise, *Levit.* xxvi. 11, 12. *I will walk among you, and be your God, De nom. mut. p.* 840. C. I am sure the later *Jews*, as *Ramban* upon that place after the Author of *Torath Cohanim*, do build here the opinion of a real habitation of the Divinity amongst them in the times of the Messias, and that they derive from one of their most ancient Traditions, that the Salvation of *Israel* shall be made by God himself which they prove by *Zech.* ix. 9. where it is spoken of the Messias by the confession of the *Jews* till this day.

Again, *Philo* calls the Word of the Lord the Shepherd, and quotes for it, *Psal.* xxiii. 1. *The Lord is my Shepherd, De nom. mut. p.* 822. & 823. *A. De Agric. in Euseb. p.* 323. Now the Word being the same with the Messias, *c.* 13. it is plain this Psalm was in his days applied to the Messias, who consequently is the Lord *Jehovah*, and the people his sheep. I have before observed the rules by which the *Jews* were led to the knowledg of this Truth, and therefore it is unnecessary to touch again on them.

It suffices to remark here, first that the Synagogue in *Philo*'s time held it a Maxim, that the name *Jehovah* express'd the Essence of God. *Philo Lib. Deter. pot. ins. p.* 143. C. Secondly, that the name *Jehovah* was the proper name of God, the name of the first Cause, and consequently communicable to no Creature. *Philo de Abrahamo, p.* 280. a Truth of great moment, which is confessed also by *Manass. ben Israel, q. in Exod.* 3. Thirdly, that the Λόγος whom he takes to be meant by

by the Branch in *Zech.* vi. 12. was to become the Messias, and therefore that the Messias is justly called in this respect the Son of God.

And now it is easie to judge of the sense the ancient Synagogue had of the Person of the Messias. It acknowledges this Son and this Λόγος as a Person subsisting from all Eternity: Of this, if we had no other, the Text of *Mic.* v. 2. is a good proof, which the *Jews* in Christ's time expounded of the Messias, *Mat.* ii. 7. *Joh.* vii. 42. But the Notions of *Philo* every where do confirm it. *Eusebius* remarks it, *De Præp.* xi. 15. *p.* 533. and his Book *de Somn. de confus. Ling. & de prof. p.*466. are full to this purpose.

To conclude, Let it be observed that the *Sanhedrim* calls the Messias the Son of God, *Mat.* xxvi. 63. and when Jesus applied to himself a Prophecy of the Messias in *Dan.* vii. 13. *Hereafter shall you see the Son of Man coming in the Clouds of Heaven*, Mat. xxvi. 64. We are told by St. *Luke* what they replied, *Then said they all, art thou then the Son of God?* Luk. xxii. 70. which is an argument that though the Title of Son of Man did very well express the humble estate of the Messias, yet they were not ignorant that the Λόγος should be the Messias, and that the Messias should be the proper Son of God; such a Son, as for whom the Clouds, the Chariot of the Divinity, should be prepared to attend his Triumph, in the time when he should reveal himself from Heaven.

2. That this Notion is so deeply riveted into the minds of the *Jews* even since Christ's time,

time, that because the word *Anan*, the Clouds is spoken of in this passage of *Daniel*, therefore they have asserted, in consequence of this opinion, that the Messias shall be called by this name. This we see in *Targum* on 1 *Chron.* iii. 34. where speaking of the Children of *Elioenai*, it adds, the seventh which is *Anani* is the King Messias. And thus it is explained in *Sanhedrim*, *fol.* 62. in the Comments of *Saadia* and *Jarchi* on *Dan.* vii. 13. and in *Jalkut* on *Zech.* iv. 7.

But having shew'd that the *Word* is God, and that this *Word* should be the Messias, we will now shew, that the *Jews* in conformity to their Scriptures did believe that the Messias, as being *Jehovah*, should appear for the Salvation of Men.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

That the Messias was represented in the Old Testament as being Jehovah that should come, and that the ancient Synagogue did believe him to be so.

I Have shewed, that from *David*'s time the Notion of the Messias was considerably cleared by several Prophets, whom God raised up, to exercise and increase the desires of his people. It is no less certain, that the same Prophets do describe the Messias as the true *Jehovah*, and that the ancient *Jews* so understood them.

This we may discern in the earnest longings of the Faithful, so frequent in all the Writings of the Prophets, and in those several passages of the Old Testament, which the *Jews* constantly interpret of the Messias; although some of them seem not to be spoken of *Jehovah*, but of the Messias, others to be spoken of *Jehovah* only, without mention of the Messias; but all have a particular regard to that Salvation which the *Jews* expected from the Messias.

Jacob blessing his Sons bursts out in Prayer to God, *I look for thy Salvation, O Lord, Gen.* xlix. 18. which the *Jews* by their *Targums* are taught to understand of the Messias. Of him likewise they understand those words of *Moses*, praying that God would *send him whom he would send, Exod.* iv. 13. which words *Raschi* himself refers to the Redeemer to come, in

in *h. l.* and so *Ramban* and others. So they understand *David*'s using this expression, *Psal.* lxxx. 2,3. *Stir up thy strength and come and save us, bring back, O God, and cause thy face to shine and we shall be saved.* The *Targum*, and *Rabbi Salomon Jarchi* understand it of the Messias bringing back his people from the present Captivity.

The Ground which they built upon, to refer those words to the Messias, is clearly seen to those who shall reflect upon the constant Notion of the Synagogue, which believes:

1. That the *Shekinah* is *Jehovah*, a second *Jehovah* to whom God spake in saying, *Let us make Man. R. Menach. fol.* 8. *col.* 3. the *Jehovah* merciful, the Wisdom which hath founded the Earth. *R. Men. fol.* 145. *col.*3.

2*ly*. That it is the only Ruler of *Israel*, *R. Men. fol.*153. *col.*2.

3*ly*. That it is the *Shekinah*, to which all the Prayers of the *Jews* were directed, *R. Men. fol.* 159. *col.*2.

4*ly*. That as they look upon the *Shekinah* as the Angel, the Redeemer, so all their Ideas of the Redemption, and of their Salvation have a necessary relation to that Redeemer who is *Jehovah*; so that all that is spoken of in all the Prophets, of the Redemption by the Messias, must by a necessary consequence be referred by them to *Jehovah*'s being the Messias, or to the Messias, as being *Jehovah* indeed: *Isaiah, ch.* lxiv. 1. begs, *Oh that thou wouldst rent the Heavens, that thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence.* Who doth not see that

that he speaks of the coming of God in the time of the Messias, by an allusion to the time of the coming of God to give the Law upon Mount *Sinai*; and now the *Jews* confess 'twas the *Shekinah* who gave the Law upon Mount *Sinai*. *R. Menach. fol.* 57. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 48. *col.* 1. and who can imagin that a meaner person than the same, and the very *Shekinah* it self, should raise such desires and such Prayers?

Micah speaks with great assurance, *Ch.* vii. 7. *I will look unto the Lord, I will wait for the Lord of my Salvation.* Again, *v.* 19. *He will again have compassion upon us, he will subdue our iniquities, and will cast all our sins into the depths of the Sea.* So *Hab.* ii. 3. *Though he tarry, wait for him, because he will surely come, he will not tarry.* And *ch.* iii. 13. *Thou wentest forth for the Salvation of thy people, even for Salvation with thine Anointed: Thou woundest the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering the foundation unto the neck.*

So *Ezek.* iii. 15, 17. *The Lord hath taken away thy judgment, he hath cast out thine enemy: the King of Israel even the Lord is in the midst of thee; thou shalt not see evil any more — The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty: he will save, he will rejoyce over thee with joy: he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing.*

So *Zech.* viii. 13. *And it shall come to pass, that as you were a curse among the heathen, O house of Judah, and house of Israel; so will I save you, and you shall be a blessing.*

So *Mal.* iv. 2. *But to you that fear my name, shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings.* Which the *Jews* refer to the *Shekinah*. *R. Menach. fol.* 54. *col.* 2.

These are the places that have exercised the thoughts of the *Jews*, and all these are by their *Targum* referred to the Word, or to the times of the Messias, and most of them (of such a force is Truth) are still applied so, by the greatest part of their Writers, as may be seen in the famous Book of *Gimnath Eggoz*, from which *Reuchlin* hath almost extracted his Books *de Cabala*.

But especially we ought to remark, 1. That the *Targum* plainly owns on *Psal.* xlv. 6. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* And *ver.* 7. *O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows*; That the Messias is God. This Truth is yet more clear in *Isa.* ix. 6. applied to the Messias by *Jonathan*; and the present *Jews* cannot satisfie themselves with any answer they make to it, as appears by their different ways of evasion, and their changing the very Text to avoid the evidence of it.

2*ly*. The *Targum* on *Isa.* xxviii. 5. hath these considerable words, *In that day the Messias of the Lord of Hosts shall be crowned with joy*, instead of *the Lord of Hosts*, as it is in the Text.

3*ly*. The *Targum* on *Jer.* xxiii. acknowledges the Messias to be there treated of, and yet he is called in this place, *the Lord of our Righteousness*. See to the same purpose the *Targum* on *Jer.* xxxiii. 14. The learned *M. Edzardi* has proved that the same Interpretation of these words of *Jeremy* hath continued among the *Jews* from the time of Jesus Christ without interruption till these latter days; and this

this he hath done from a great number of *Jewish* Authors, and even their Liturgies themselves which I have no mind to transcribe. His Book was Printed at *Hamburgh, A.* 1670.

4*ly*. They have been so sensible that the Messias is represented by the Prophets as God, that in *Psal.* cx. where it is said of the Messias, that he shall be a Priest according to the order of *Melchisedeck*, they refer the Priesthood of the Messias to God, or to the *Shekinah* which is *Jehovah*. So doth *R. Menach. fol.* 18. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 31. *col.* 1.

Without that, it is hard to conceive how *Philo* should so often mention the Λόγος as a Priest and Prophet of God, and at the same time believe the Λόγος to be God, unless he gathered it from *Psal.* cx. 1. where the Messias, that is represented as sitting at the right hand of God, and equal to God, is also described as an High Priest of a new Order; and from *Isa.* xi. 2. where the Messias is promised to receive the Spirit of Prophecy in the highest degree.

I need not cite the Paraphrasts any further on this Subject. What I have already quoted out of them is more than enough to shew how common this Idea was among their Nation.

For the *Jews* in the Ages next to these Paraphrases I ought to observe this one thing of *Pirke Eliezer*, *ch.* xiv. There they assert that God descended nine times, and that the tenth time he shall descend in the Age to come, *i.e.* in the time of the Messias. The first time was in the Garden of *Eden*. The second at the Confusion of Tongues. The third at the destruction

of *Sodom*. The fourth at his talking with *Moses* on Mount *Horeb*. The fifth at his appearance on *Sinai*. The sixth and seventh where he spake to *Moses* in the hollow of the Rock. The eighth and ninth in the Tabernacle. The tenth will be, when he shall appear in the times of the *Messias*. Such is their ancient Opinion.

The Prophecies that speak of it, as one end of the coming of the *Messias*, to judge his People and the Nations, do constantly ascribe the Name of God, or of *Jehovah*, to the *Messias*. We see it in *Psalm* lxxxii. 8. *Arise, O God, and judge the earth, for thou shalt inherit all nations.* Which is followed by *Daniel, ch.* vii. 13, 14. in these words; *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and there was given him dominions, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*

The *Jews* confess three things; one is, that *Psalm* lxxii. is to be understood of the *Messias*; The second is, That in the Vision of *Ezech. ch.* i. that form of a man sitting upon the Throne, signifies the true God; the third, That the Vision of *Daniel, ch.* vii. is the same in substance with that of *Ezek.* i. So that the *Messias*, as a Man, receives an absolute Empire upon all Nations, and sits upon a Throne as God. Now it should be the most absurd thing in the World, to conceive the *Messias* as only a Man, when he is invested with such an Empire which cannot be governed

verned but by a true God, and by *Jehovah*, whose Character is represented so often as the Ruler of all Nations; *See* Gen. xviii. 25.

The Prophecies that speak of *Jehovah* as the King and Bridegroom of his Church, are constantly interpreted of the *Messias*. For example, where God said to his People, *Hos.* ii. 19, 20. *I will betroth thee unto me for ever, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the Lord.* This the *Jews* generally understand of the *Messias*. 'Tis the judgment of *R. Menachem* in *Genes. fol.* 15. *col.* 1. where he reflects upon *Isaiah*, *ch.* lxii. 3. And it is agreeable to what is said *Psal.* xlv. 7, 9, 10, 11. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever, and ever, the scepter of thy kingdom is a scepter of righteousness; thou lovest righteousness and hatest iniquity, wherefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows. Kings daughters were among thy honourable women; upon thy right hand did stand the Queen in gold of Ophir. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, forget thy own people, and thy father's house. So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty; for he is thy Lord, and worship thou him.* Whereas the *Targum*, *v.* 2. interprets it all of the *Messias*; so *R. Meir Arama* says, all agree that that *Psalm* is to be understood of the *Messias*.

We cannot have a better proof that the *Messias* should be *Jehovah*, than *Zech.* xii. 10. which the *Targum* also interprets of the *Messias*, and the new *Jews* would refer to the feigned *Messias*, Son of *Joseph*. The words are

are these; *I (Jehovah) will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son.*

In *Malach.* iii. 1. we find this expression, *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger, or the Angel, of the Covenant, whom you delight in.* Now take notice, that whereas it is said after in the *Hebrew*, here he is coming, the *Greeks* have read αὐτὸς παρεσόμενος. Now since it is certain that he is the *Jehovah* to whom the Temple is here said to be built and dedicated, and who is worship'd in it; and since the *Jews* understand this place of the *Messias*, it must follow that the *Messias* is *Jehovah*.

It is evident, that the Lord, and the Messenger or the Angel of the Covenant, are the same Person, whose coming is promised to the *Jews* as a thing very near. But it is no less evident, that this Angel of the Covenant is the same which is spoken by *Jacob*, Genes. xlviii. 15, 16. as the Redeemer, and is named by *Isaiah*, *ch.* lxiii. *the Angel of the face.* Now all the Ancient *Jews* agree, that that Angel, or Messenger, is the *Shekinah*, or *Jehovah* himself; as we see in *R. Menachem de Rekanati*, *fol.* 54. *col.* 2. & *fol.* 66. *col.* 2. *fol.* 72. *col.* 4. & *fol.* 73. *col.* And they agree all that the *Shekinah* and *Jehovah* is the same. It is a Point agreed by the *Talmudist*, and by the *Cabalist*, as it is explained by *R. Menach.*

 fol. 73.

fol. 73. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 77. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.* 79. *col.* 3. This being so, who can deny that the Text of *Malachi* is an undeniable proof that the *Messias* was to be *Jehovah* himself, according to the Ideas of the most Ancient *Jews*?

If we had not such Confessions of the *Jews*, 'twill be easy to supply the want of them, by the help of the general Tradition that reigns among them, and proves clearly that the *Messias* was to be *Jehovah* himself.

They hold that the *Messias* shall be greater than all the Patriarchs, and even the Angels themselves. *Neve shalom*, *l.* 9. *c.* 5. How can this be, unless he be truly *Jehovah*? And whence could they take this Notion, except from *Psalm* xcvii. 7. where the Angels are commanded to worship him?

It is very easy to reconcile that Idea with the Notions of the old *Jews*, touching the *Messias*, supposing him to be the *Shekinah* and *Jehovah*, and that this *Shekinah* or *Jehovah* was to be the same Person with the *Messiah*, as they confess. *R. Menach. fol.* 73. *col.* 3. and *fol.* 77. *col.* 4. and *fol.* 79. *col.* 3. They teach constantly that Angels receive their virtue from the *Shekinah*, *R. Menach. fol.* 8. *col.* 1. and *fol.* 12. *col.* 1. They teach that the *Shekinah* is the God of *Jacob*, *R. Men. fol.* 38. *col.* 3. that he appeared to him at *Bethel*, and promised him to govern him without the Ministry of Angels, *R. Menach. fol.* 41, *&* 42. They said the *Shekinah* is the *Jehovah* who appeared to the Patriarchs, *R. Menach. fol.* 56. *col.* 1. They maintain that the Temple was built to worship the *Shekinah*, *R. Menach. fol.* 63. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 70. *col.* 2. *&* *fol.* 73. *col.* 4. *&* *fol.*

& *fol.* 74. *col.* 2. They maintain on the other side, that 'tis not lawful to pay any religious worship to Angels, although sent by God as Messengers of him, or as Mediators. *R. Menach. fol.* 68. *col.* 2. They deny that the Ancient Patriarchs have paid other worship than a civil one to an Angel, when he appeared to them, *R. Menach. Ibidem col.* 3. But it is impossible to reconcile those Ideas with the Opinion of the *Messias*, being only a meer Man.

Indeed, he that will reflect on all these Prophecies, will very hardly think, that then, when the High-Priest demanded of Jesus whether he was the Son of God, and Jesus answered that he was so; the *Jews* did understand only that he made himself a great Prophet. Both the *Jews* and *Socinians* own that in this Answer he made himself the *Messias*, which, according to both of them, is more than a great Prophet, and the High-Priest was so sensible of it, that he called it Blasphemy.

In short, the Angels who are God's Ministers, could not serve nor obey one that was only, as well as themselves, a Creature. He must be God, to have the Angels Subjects to him. He must be God, to govern the World, and to discern the thoughts of the heart, without which he could not be a competent Judge. And they that imagine a Creature could be made capable to know hearts, and to exercise those other Acts, which are the Characters of the Divinity, do form to themselves the greatest *Chimera* in the World.

It is therefore necessary, that the Ancient *Jews*, having these Notions of the *Messias*, should have conceived an intimate and close habitation of the *Word* in his Person, by which, all these Prophecies should receive their accomplishment, and all the Promises of God, concerning the Messias should be perfectly fulfilled.

The *Unitarians* conceive they have done a great service to the Christian Religion, when to court the *Jews* favour they deny the Divinity of the Messias, and condemn as Idolatry the *Worship* which Christians pay to Jesus Christ. In this they argue more consistently than *Socinus* himself, as I have said in my Preface to this Book. But after all I can say that besides they cannot answer *Socinus* his Argument for the Worship of Jesus Christ, they shall not get from the *Jews* what they pretend by their opinion: Indeed the *Jews* would be in the right to condemn us as Idolaters, if we did worship Jesus Christ as a meer Creature. But they cannot do that justly, if they reflect seriously upon the Grounds which we lay for the Adoration of the Messias.

As it is a thing which I hope shall be of some use to undeceive the *Unitarians*, I am willing to add to the foregoing observations upon the Trinity and Divinity of the World the sense of the Synagogue to this Article. And indeed it would be unconceivable that the *Jews* should have believed the Messias to be true God, and should not be ready to worship him.

It is a thing which Christians and *Jews* are agreed upon that there is but one God, who

who is to be Worshipped. The *Jews* and the ancient Christians did agree that Angels must not be Worshipped. From which it follows that if the *Jews* acknowledged that the Messias is to be Worshipped, they must have acknowledged him to be God, and *vice versa*.

Now there are positive Orders of God to Worship the Messias, as *Psal.* ii. 12. *Kiß the Son.* Who is that Son spoken in this place, it is the Messias, as it is granted by the ancient Synagogue, as we see in *Ecclesiasticus*; *I called upon the Lord the Father of my Lord.* And *Tehillim Rabba*, with many others, use this place of *Psal.* ii. to the Messias. So the *Breshit Rabba* in *Gen.* xlix. so the *Talmud in Succa*, *c.* 5. *Saadias* in *Dan.* vii. 13. with the ancient, witness *R. Salom Jarchi* in his *Comment.*

I know well that the *Greek* Interpreters have Translated those words of the second *Psalm*, ἐδίδαξε πατέρας. But that Version is rejected by the *Jews* who read now in their *Spanish* Translation Printed at *Ferrara*, *Besad hiio pro que non se insame*, which is the sense of *Lombroso* in his short Notes upon that place. So it is understood by *R. Abensuch in h. l.*

We read in *Psal.* viii. 3. *From the mouth of babes, &c.* It was so well known that this place was related to the Messias, that it was used at our Saviour's Entry into *Jerusalem*, Mat. xxi. 16. Since that time it is related to the Messias as we see in the *Midrash* upon *Cant.* i. 4. where these very words are referred to God, whom the Babes of *Israel* were to bless, which shews plainly that the praises which are spoken of are praises which are acts of Adoration, and so in the *Midrash* upon *Eccl. ch.* ix. 1.

The same positive order for the Worship of the Messias is given in *Psal.* xlv. 11. *He is the Lord, worship thou him.* There is no doubt but that *Psalm* is to be referred to the Messias; It is so acknowledged by the *Targum*, and by all the *Jewish* Interpreters. What then can be said against the Worship of the Messias? If the *Jews* of old had denied that the *Shekinah* was to be in the Messias, then it should be rational to conclude that they did not acknowledge the Worship which is to be paid to him. But they have acknowledged the Divinity of the Messias, as we read in *Midrash Tehillim* in *Psal.* x. *Stetit Divinitas Messiæ & prædicavit.* From whence it follows by necessary consequence that they thought themselves obliged to worship him.

We have the same Worship of the Messias setled in *Psal.* lxviii. 32. where it is said that the Princes shall extend their hands to him from *Egypt*. All the *Jews* agree that such a thing is to happen at the coming of the Messias which we call the second. So *Rashi*.

We read the same in *Psal.* lxxii. where it is said *v.* 11. that they shall *fall down and worship him.* No body doubts but that Psalm relates to the Messias.

I have taken notice in the second Chapter of this Book that the *Jews* refer constantly to the time of the Messias all the Psalms from the xc. to the c. Now in *Psal.* xcv. *v.* 6, *&* 7. the words seem to be spoken of *Jehovah*, but they were understood by the *Jews* of the Messias who was to have the name of *Jehovah*, as you see in *Midrash* in *Echa.* i. 6.

After *David* what saith *Isaiah* of the Worship of the Messias? he speaks as distinctly as can be, *ch.* xlix. *v.* 23.

The *Jews* understand it of the Messias, whom they look upon as the Redeemer to whom all people are to make their confession from their heart, as you see in *Breshit Rabba* upon *Gen.* xli. *v.* 44. where they refer these words to the Messias, *Isa.* xlv. 23. You see the same in *Midr. Tehin.* in *Psal.* ii. 2. these words, when they have seen his great tribulation, they shall come and shall worship the King Messias as it is said *Isa.* xlix. 23.

Some perhaps shall think they can avoid the strength of this Argument, drawn from the Worship to be paid to the Messias, by allowing that it is spoken in those places which I have quoted of a civil worship to be paid to the Messias as a great King.

But it should be in vain for a *Socinian* to employ such an evasion, because we find that the ancient *Jews* have prevented it by giving us instances of all the several Parts of such a Worship, either Faith, Vows, or Prayers, or Sacrifices, which cannot be paid but to a true God, and I have quoted so many places upon that point, that I do not think fit to enlarge more upon it.

I shall then conclude this matter by the solemn Prayer of the *Jews* in the Feast of *Succoth*, where they have these words אני והו הושיעה נא *Ego, & ille, Salva nunc, p.* 53. of the *Venice Edit.* in 8*o.* which words the *Jews* labour very much to explain who is that *ille*, but which the most understanding explain to the two first *Middoth*, *viz.* to the Father and to his Λόγος, as we have shewn before.

Having now produced the Sentiments of the old *Jews*, as to several points that concern the Trinity and the Divinity of our Lord, we ought next to consider how Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians, did follow these Notions of the Synagogue.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

That the New Testament does exactly follow the Notions which the Old Jews *had of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Messias.*

WHoever shall attentively examine the method which our Saviour and his Apostles follow in the New Testament, will find it exactly suited to the Notions which the *Jews* had entertained, and which they had from the Writings of the Prophets.

It was absolutely necessary it should be so, because the Doctrine concerning the coming of the Messias, began to be more narrowly inquired into among the *Jews*, when they saw *Herod* who was an *Idumean*, setled in the Throne of *Judæa*; it being at the just time markt out for the coming of the Messias by *Jacob*'s Prophecy, *Ge.* xlix. 10. *The Scepter shall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Law-giver from between his feet, until* Shilo *come, and unto him shall the gathering of people be.* An Angel therefore appears to the Virgin *Mary* that was to be the Mother of Christ, and shews the manner of his Conception, which was to be by the operation of the Holy Ghost. He names the Child who was to be born of her, *Jesus*, and declares that he should be *the Son of the Highest*, and that *of his Kingdom there should be no end*: Alluding to *Psal.* ii. and to many other

ther places of Scripture, where the *Messias* is described as one that was to be the Son of God.

Next the Angel appeared to *Joseph*, who was upon parting with his betrothed Wife, the Blessed Virgin, and told him, she should bring forth a Son, and must name him *Jesus*, because he should *save* his People from their sins. Whereupon the Evangelist saith, that this Child was he of whom the Prophet foretold he should be *Emanuel*, God with us. He was to do that for his People, which none but God was able to do, to save them from their sins. How could he shew it better that he was the God of the *Jews*, to whom *Judea* belonged as his Country, and the *Jews* as his People, as it was foretold, *Is.* vii. and viii? That God, whose very Name *Habakkuk* had named, *Hab.* iii. 18. the God of my Salvation, so called, saith *Jonathan's Targum*, because of the wonderful things that God would do by his *Messias*.

Another Angel brings to the Shepherds the news of Christ's Birth; and what words does he use? He names him the *Christ*, the *Lord*, *Κυριος* or *Jehovah*, God's own proper name, *Luk.* ii.

The Wisemen came from the *East* to *Bethlehem*, guided by a new Star, to worship him; and amongst other Gifts, presented him with Frankincense, which by the Law was to be offered to God alone: Shewing thereby that they owned him for that heavenly Star spoken of by their Countryman *Balaam*, Numb. xxiv. 17. And for that King of whom it was foretold, *Psal.* lxxii. 10, 11. *The Kings of Tharshish,*

Tharshish, and of the Isles, shall bring presents; the Kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts: Yea all Kings shall fall down before him, all Nations shall serve him.

Simeon inspired by the Spirit of Prophecy, said, that Christ was to be *a light to lighten the Gentiles*, Luk. i. 79. alluding to *Isaiah* xlii. 6. and lx. 1. which speaks of the *Messias*.

He said further, that this Child was to prove *the fall of many in Israel*, according to that Prophecy, *Is.* viii. 13, 14. *Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread: And he the Lord of Hosts shall be for a sanctuary: but for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* In which place the Prophet speaks of the Lord of Hosts, and clearly points out the *Messias*, or the *Word* according to *Jonathan's Targum*.

And because the Angels had celebrated the Nativity of Christ with their Acclamations, St. *Paul*, Heb. i. 6. applies to him what the *Jews* had added to the Song of *Moses* in the LXX. *Deut.* xxxii. 43. *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, at his coming into the World: which words are also found *Psal.* xcvii. 7. from whence they had added them; as well as some others borrowed from other places of Scripture, which the *Jews* understand of the *Messias*.

Hitherto a judicious Reader will find no notion, but what is perfectly like to those of the *Old Testament*, and of the Writings of the *Jews*, about those places of Scripture which call

call the *Messias Jehovah*, or represent *Jehovah* as him that should be the *Messias*.

Mr. *N.* who does suspect the Primitive Christians to have added these words, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, to favour the new Doctrine of the Trinity, might as well at one blow have cut off those places in St. *Matthew*, *Matth.* i. 20. and St. *Luke*, *Luk.* i. 79. which do more strongly assert that Doctrine. For there we find *the Highest*, *the Son of the Highest*, and *the Holy Ghost*, three Persons as distinct as words could make them: And the *Messias* is as plainly called *Jehovah* as can be. Both Angels and Prophets either shew or own the Ancient Prophets to have been fulfilled in Christ. There is nothing in all this that looks like a Collusion.

John the Baptist, Luk. iii. 3. preacht Repentance, as it is written, *Is.* xl. 3. *The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths strait; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God*; owning the *Messias* to be God and *Jehovah*. When the *Jews* took him to be the *Messias*, he told them, that *he was not worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoes*; that *he was before him*; that *he shall baptize them with the Holy Ghost, and with fire*. And that *he was spoken of*, Mal. iii. 1. Now *Malachi* calls him *Jehova*, though he also calls him *the messenger of the Covenant*, as I observed before.

Christ is baptized by *John*, who at first refused to baptize him, knowing the dignity of his Person, whose Forerunner he only was. But

But God the Father cries from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*; confirming what he had said of the *Messias*, *Is.* xliii. 10.

The Holy Spirit descended upon him in the form of a Dove, to fulfil the Prophecy of *David*, Psal. xlv. 7. *O God, thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows*: And that of *Is.* xi. 2. *And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.* The three Persons of the Trinity did then so visibly manifest themselves, that the Ancients took from thence occasion to bid the Arians, *Go to the river Jordan, and you shall see the Trinity.*

He was in the Wilderness tempted by the Devil, but the main stress of his Temptation the Devil laid on these words, *if*, or rather, *since thou art the Son of God*: For, knowing the illustrious Testimony which was given him at *Jordan*, and by *John the Baptist*, Joh. i. 34. *I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God*, He took from thence occasion to tempt him.

In his conversation with *Nathanael* he begins to discover to him the Mystery of his being God, by comparing himself to the Ladder which *Jacob* saw in a Dream, *Joh.* i. 51. *Hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the Angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.* And I observed before, that *Philo* attributed that Apparition to the Λόγος, as the Restorer of intercourse between God and Man.

At a Marriage in *Cana*, to shew that his Commission was much above the meanness of his Education and Trade, he spoke something

thing sharply to his Mother, *Joh.* ii. 4. *Woman, what have I to do with thee?* Much as he had done, being yet but Twelve years old, when upon her complaining that his *Father* and *her self* had *sought him sorrowing*, he gave her this Answer; *How is it that you sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business*, Luk. ii. 49?

Soon after he went to *Jerusalem*, and drove out of the Temple the Sellers and Money-Changers, and told them, *Take these things hence, make not my Father's house a house of merchandise*, Joh. ii. 16. The *Jews* surprized at that commanding Style, askt him a Sign, to shew his Authority: To whom he answered, *Destroy this Temple, and in three days I'll raise it up*, ver. 19. foretelling his Resurrection, and declaring that he was to be the Author of it, *v.* 21. which, in the opinion of the *Jews* themselves, is the proper Character of God, who has, say they, the Key of the Womb to make it fruitful, the Key of the Heavens to send down Rain, and the Key of the Grave to raise the Dead out of it. *Beth Israel ex Sanhedrim, fol.* 140. *col.* 3.

To satisfy *Nicodemus*, a Ruler of the *Jews*, about the greatness of his Person, he tells him, contrary to the opinion of some *Jews*, *Pirke R. Eliezer. c.* 41. who believed that *Moses* had ascended up into Heaven from Mount *Sina*; That *no man had ascended up thither, but he that was come from thence, even the Son of man which was there*, Joh. iii. 13. But how could he be in Heaven, and have descended from thence? Because he was *the Son of God, whom God had sent to save the world*, v. 17. In which

which Expressions he alludes to the Prayers of the Old *Jews*, before mentioned, where the Church begs, that a Saviour would come down from Heaven, even the true *Jehovah. Is.* lxiv. 1.

When *John*'s Disciples came to their Master to complain that he whom he had lately baptized, did himself baptize, and draw the Multitude after him: To give them a nobler notion of Christ than they had before, he told them plainly, that he was only *the friend of the bridegroom*, but that *Christ was the bridegroom himself*, Joh. iii. 29. Intimating by that Similitude that Christ was God, according to the Prophecy in *Hosea, ch.* ii. 19, 20. *I will betroth thee unto me for ever.* This *John*'s Disciples well knew; and that the *Messias* was spoken of, *Psal.* xlv. in which he is expresly named God: That *Solomon's Song* did speak of him: And the *Jews* believe to this day, that God was spoken of there by *Solomon.* And this has obliged the Holy Writers to give to the *Messias* the name of *Bridegroom*, and to the Church that of a *Bride*, as may be seen in St. *Paul*, and in the *Revelation.*

John the Baptist further tells his Disciples that Christ was before him in Dignity, because he was in being before him, *Joh.* i. 15, 30. and yet *John* was born six Months before our Blessed Saviour.

Jesus tells them that he *came from above*, whereas himself, though inspired and a Prophet, was only *of the Earth*: That Christ was *come from Heaven*, and *above all*, That God was his *Father*, and that *he had given all things into his hand*, Joh. iii. 31, 35. shewing thereby,

by, that it was he whom God spoke of, *Psal.* ii. 8. *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*

Christ said, *Luk.* v. 20, 21, 24. to a man sick of the Palsie, *thy sins are forgiven thee*; which the *Pharisees* taking ill, because as they told him, *God alone could forgive sins*; he cured the poor man, to shew that he had power to forgive sins; and consequently, that he was God by their own confession. And he performed that according to the Prophecies which attribute to God, and to the *Messias*, the forgiveness of sins, *Jer.* xxxi. 34.

The *Jews* being angry with him, because he had cured an impotent man on the Sabbath-day, *Joh.* v. 16. he tells them, to justify what he had done, *My Father works hitherto, and I work*, *v.* 17. At which words they *sought more to kill him, because he had not only broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God*, *v.* 18. What would a good man have done in this case, one that had been only Man as we are? He would certainly have declared his abhorrence of such Blasphemy as was contain'd in these words. But then he would have told them these were not his words, but theirs. He would have them understand him aright, by saying, he did not make himself equal with God, but that in working a Miracle on the Sabbath, he only acted as the Prophets did, to whom, say the *Jews*, it was lawful to break some one Precept of the Law.

But instead of making any such Interpretation, he goes on in the same tenor of words, and

and a second time gives himself the title of the Son of God, and tells them, that whatever his Father did, he might do likewise, *v.* 19. That he would raise the dead, to prove himself equal with God, *That as the Father raised up the dead, and quickens them, even so the Son quickens whom he will*, v. 21. That that extraordinary Power was given him by his Father, it being his will *that all men should honour the Son, even as they did the Father*, v. 23. He proves again that he was the Son of God, by the power he had to raise up the dead; *As the Father has life in himself, so has he given to the Son to have life in himself: And has given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man*, v. 26, 27. He applies to himself what was said in *Daniel* xii. 2. concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, *v.* 28, 29. *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.* He appeals to *John the Baptist*, who had testified he was the Son of God, *v.* 33. At last he bids them *search the Scriptures*, v. 39. in which they would find that he was that Son of Man described *Dan.* vii. 13, 14. and consequently equal with God: For who can sit on God's Throne besides the true God, as it is declared *Psal.* cx. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* Which words the *Jews* understood of the *Messias*, agreeably to other Prophecies, in which he is so often called *Jehovah*, and the Son of God.

He justified his curing Sick People on the Sabbath-day, because he *the Son of man was Lord of the Sabbath.* But how could he be so, but because he was that *Word* which had given the Law to the *Jews*; that Son of God equal with his Father, who consequently was Master of his own Laws?

He opened the Eyes of the Blind, and made the Lame to walk, to fulfil the Prophecy, *Is.* xxxv. 4, 5, 6. *Behold your God will come, he will come and save you; then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopt: Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.*

He multiply'd the Loaves in the Desert, to shew that he was that same *Word*, to which the *Jews* attributed the Miracle of *Manna* in the *Wilderness*. He tells the *Jews*, to the same purpose, that he was the Bread come down from Heaven, *Joh.* vi. 51. upon which it may be observed that *Philo* maintains that the *Word* was *Manna*, or at least *Manna* the Type of the *Word*. *Lib. quod deterior. p.* 137.

Having wrought so many great Miracles before the *Jews*, he askt his Disciples, what People said and thought of him? To which St. *Peter* answering according to the People's various Opinions, and at last confessing the Faith of himself and the other Disciples, that he was *Christ the Son of the living God*; he commends this Confession in *Peter*, though he had before refused to receive it from the Devil; and tells *Peter*, that God, even *his Father*, *had revealed it to him*, and therefore it must be true, *Matth.* xvi. 16, 17. And so it was, for God had spoken of it by many of

of his Prophets, as I shewed before, by the very confession of the *Jews*.

He shews his Disciples how *Elijah* was come in the Person of *John the Baptist*, Matt. xvii. That therefore himself, to whom *John* had born witness, was the *Messias*, the true *Jehovah*, whose Fore-runner *Elias* was to be, according to the Prophecy, *Mal.* iii. 1. *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before ME; and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, saith the Lord of hosts.*

He gives his Disciples the power of Binding and Loosing, that is, of forbidding some things which *Moses* had permitted, and permitting some which he had forbidden; reserving still to himself the power of directing them infallibly by his Spirit in those Acts of their Ministry; To shew that he was that very God who was to make a new Covenant, as *Jeremiah* had foretold, *chap.* xxxi. 33. And that he had in him the Authority of a Supream Law-giver. For, who can give Laws to mens Consciences but the only true God?

In the Treasury of the Temple he tells the *Jews* that *God was his Father*; that *he did nothing of himself, but as his Father had taught him*, Joh. viii. 28. *That he had spoke that which he had seen with his Father*, v. 38. naming thus God, his Father, many times, which no Prophet ever had done, nor no meer Man could do without the highest presumption.

He tells the *Jews* (who objected to him, that by saying that they who believed in him

should never see death, v. 51. he made himself *greater than Abraham*, v. 53.) That *Abraham had seen his day, and was glad*, v. 56. And as they replied, that what he said was impossible, because *Abraham* had been dead many hundred years, whereas himself *was not yet fifty years old*, v. 57. he answers with a repeated Asseveration, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I A M*, v. 58. plainly affirming two things, first, that he was the Λόγος which had appeared to *Abraham*, and secondly, that he was God, whose name is, *I A M*, Exod. iii. 14. which the *Jews* apprehending, *took up stones to cast at him*, *v.* 59. as a Blasphemer, who made himself God, and equal with God.

Soon after he restored sight to one that was born blind, and had this confession from him, which he had before suggested to him, that he was the Son of God; and accordingly accepted his Adoration, *Joh.* ix. 35, 38.

He said, he was *the good Shepherd*, that he *gave his life for the sheep*, Joh. x. 11. That he had *other sheep* whom he would bring into his Fold, *v.* 16. that is to say, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles* belonged to him. That he *laid down his life for them*; and that he had *power to lay it down, and to take it again*, v. 18. shewing by all these Expressions, that he was God, and the *Messias*, for the Title of Shepherd is given to God, *Ps.* xxiii. 1. and in many other places, which the *Jews* understood of the *Messias*.

Being in the Temple of *Jerusalem* at the Feast of the Dedication, the *Jews* desired him to tell them *plainly* whether he was *Christ*, *Joh.* x.

Joh. x. 24. To whom he answered from *v.* 25. to *v.* 37. *I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me: But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, for which of those works do you stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because thou being a man, makest thy self God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?* It may be observed from these last words, that having been already accus'd of Blasphemy, because he made himself equal with God, not only he affirms it still, but proves it besides by an Argument from a lesser thing to a greater. For, says he, If God names Magistrates *Elohim*, because they are his Deputies; how much more may his Son be called so, whom he has consecrated and sent into the World? Alluding to the *Psalms* ii. and cx. in both which *Psalms* mention is made of the *Messias*, as the Son of God, and God.

Some days before his Passion he declared that the death of *Lazarus* had happened, *that the Son of God might be glorified thereby*, Joh. xi. 4. He affirmed that he had power to raise the dead, *v.* 25. *I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.* And he received *Martha*'s Confession in these words; *Lord, I believe, that thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the world*, v. 27.

Having kept his last Passeover with his Disciples, he promised them the Holy Ghost, as another Comforter, *Paraclet*, or *Menahem*, (by which last Name the *Jews* mean the *Messias*) which shews the Holy Ghost to be another Person. He speaks of this very emphatically, *Joh.* xiv. 16, 17. *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it sees him not, neither knows him: but you know him, for he dwells with you, and shall be in you.* And again, *v.* 26. *But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance.* And *John* xv. 12, 13, 14, 15. He gives the very same Notion about him which the *Jews* had.

He expreſt himself so plainly concerning his coming from above, that his Disciples had no further doubts or difficulties about it. *John* xvi. 27, 28, 29, 30. *The Father himself loves you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World. Again, I leave the World, and go to the Father. His*

His Disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee. By this we believe that thou camest forth from God.

Finding them so well informed in the space of four years Discipline under him, he puts up a Prayer to God in their behalf, *John* xvii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the Earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do: And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the World was.* He could not more clearly express his eternal Pre-existence, and shew he was the Λόγος which had appeared to *Abraham*, but was before *Abraham*, because he was God. As *Philo* affirms it in divers places which I have already quoted.

Being by *Judas*'s Treason apprehended, he declared that the Angels were his Ministers, had he been pleased to make use of their Service, *Matt.* 26. 53. *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father? And he shall presently give me more than twelve Legions of Angels.* For, what he said about his asking his Father for them, was, because he was then in a state of Humiliation. He did not ask, when he came attended with them at his giving of the Law on Mount *Sinai*, nor when *Isaiah* saw his Glory

ry in the Temple, and heard them sing, *Holy, Holy, Holy.* They were then in their Duty, which, as the *Jews* understand, their Prophets say is to adore the *Messias.*

Being brought before *Caiaphas*, at whose House the Counsel of the *Jews* was met, upon *Caiaphas* his *adjuring him by the living God to tell them, whether he was the Christ the Son of God*, Matth. xxvi. 63. Jesus said unto him, *v. 64. Thou hast said: Nevertheless I say unto you; Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* Upon which he was condemned to dye as a Blasphemer. From whence it appears what notion the *Jews* had of the *Messias*: And that they believed that Son of man spoken of, *Dan.* vii. 13, 14. to be the very Son of God; who had a second Throne set for him, and came with the Clouds of Heaven as God: This being the ordinary description the Prophets make of him.

Being condemned as a Blasphemer, for taking the Title of *Jehovah*, and of the Son of God, the People, by way of mockery, called him the King of the *Jews*, the Son of God, and Saviour; which justified his Pretension. Luke xxiii. 35, 36, 37, 38. *And the people stood beholding, and the rulers also with them derided him, saying, He saved others, let him save himself, if he be Christ the chosen of God. And the Souldiers also said, If thou be the King of the Jews, save thy self. And a superscription was written over him, This is the King of the Jews.* And *Matt.* xxvii. 39, 40, 41, 42, 43. *They that passed by reviled him, saying, Save thy self, If thou be the Son of God, come down from the Cross. Likewise also the Chief Priests said, He saved others, himself he cannot save: If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the Cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him; For, he said, I am the Son of God.*

He cried upon the Cross with a loud voice, *Eli, Eli, Lamma sabachthani, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me, Mat.* xxvii.46. These words are the beginning of the 22*th. Psalm*, and very agreeable to those words in *Psal.*xlv. where he that is God himself, or the Psalmist for him, does nevertheless call the Father his God; saying, *O God thy God has anointed thee.* Accordingly the Centurion that guarded him, having heard this Cry, and also that with which he expired, saying, *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*; said, *Truly this was the Son of God, Mark* xiv. 39.

After his Death, his side was run through, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, *Joh.* xix. 37. relating to that Prophecy, *Zech.* xii. 10. which the Ancient *Jews* understood of the Messias. [*Breshit Rabba* on *Gen.*xxviii.and *Rabbi Abenezra* on this Text.] And yet the words of that Prophecy come from the mouth of the Lord *Jehovah*, *Zech.* xii. 1, 4. saying, *I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon ME whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for his only Son.*

Being risen from the Dead the third day, as he had foretold, the Angel that gave the Women the first news of it, called him *Lord*, that

that is, *Jehovah*, *Mat.* xxviii. 6. as the Angel had done, who gave the Shepherds the tidings of his Birth, *Luk.* ii. 11.

Soon after, he appeared to his Disciples, and did constitute them Heralds of the New Covenant, which he had made with Mankind in his Blood; of which Covenant *Jehovah* is said to be the Author, *Jer.* xxxii. 40. *I will make an everlasting Covenant with them: And I will put my fear in their hearts, they shall not depart from me.* Afterwards he did promise to send them the Holy Ghost, *Luk.* xxiv. 46, 47, 48, 49. *He said to them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preacht in his name, among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you: But tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.*

Before his Ascension he gave them Symbolically the Holy Ghost, which he was to send fully upon them forty days after, *Joh.* xx. 22. *He breathed on them, and said, receive the Holy Ghost.*

Thomas not being then present, nor believing what others told him, that they had seen the Lord Jesus, Christ appear'd to him, and so throughly satisfied him of the truth of his Resurrection, that thereupon he remarkably owned him his *Lord* and his *God*, *v.* 28.

He bids them Baptize in the Name of the Trinity, *Mat.* xxvii. 18, 19, 20. *All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth, Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the World.* In which words he visibly relates to many Persons, and where he represents himself as the *Shekinah* that was always with the people under his conduct.

Being ready to go up into Heaven, he received their Adorations, *Luk.* xxiv. 51, 52. *While he blest them he was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven: And they worshipt him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.*

And St. *John* declares that the end for which he writ his Gospel, was, *That we might believe, that Jesus is Christ the Son of God; and that believing we might have life through his Name*, *Joh.* xx. 31.

I thought it necessary, thus in short, to sum up the chief Particulars which the *Four Evangelists* have observed about the Life of our Saviour. To shew plainly and briefly to the Reader, that the Gospel follows the same Notions which the *Old Testament* had given of the *Messias*, and which the *Jews* in Christ's days had generally received. First, That in the Divine Nature there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Ghost. Secondly, That the Son, which was the Λόγος, is the promised *Messias*, Thirdly, That the Holy Ghost was to be given by the *Messias*, and to come, being sent both by the Father and the Son, as the Son was sent by the Father to save the World.

This is a Subject of moment; our Adversaries are Men of Parts and Wit. And because

cause, to rid themselves of all Difficulties in these Mysteries, they maintain that the Gospel proposes only this one fundamental Article of Faith, *That Jesus, as man, is the Messias.* It will be convenient to add to what has been observed out of the Gospels, some more Observations drawn from the Writings of the Apostles, and the first Christian Writers, to shew what Notions they had of these things: Namely, the very same which are exprest in the Gospels, and were then acknowledged by the *Jews.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

That both the Apostles and the first Christians speaking of the Messias, did exactly follow the Notions of the Old Jews, *as the* Jews *themselves did acknowledge.*

IT being of great moment to shew that the Apostles did not make a new Platform out of their own heads, when they Preached the Gospel; I will examin several Hypotheses of *Philo,* which the Apostles did follow in their Doctrine and ordinary Expressions, when they spoke of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Philo maintains that the Ideas of the World were in the *Word* of God; therefore he calls him the Vertue which made the World, which came out of the True Good, as its Original. *De Opif. p.* 3, 4, 5.

That the World was made by the *Word. Lib.* 2. *All. Seq. p.* 60. and *Lib. quod Deus sit Immut. p.*255. *F.* He says, he is *Sermo omnium artifex. Lib. Quis rerum divin. hæres. p.* 388.*F.* That by it as by an Instrument God made the World, *Lib. de Cherubim, pag.* 100. That it is the *Word* of him who is not begotten, which made all things. *Lib. de Sacr. Abel. pag.* 109. That he is the Wisdom which created all things, and that the Wisdom is the Word; manifestly alluding to the 3*d.* and 8*th. chap.* of

of *Proverbs*. *Lib. de Temul. pag.* 190. *E.F.* and *pag.* 144. *B.* and *Alleg. Lib.*1. *pag.* 36. *F.* and *de eo quod deterior. pag.* 128.

And these very things are taught by St. *Paul*, *Col.* ii. and *Heb.* i. and by St. *John* in the first *chap.* of his Gospel.

Philo affirms that the *Word* of God governs the World. *Lib. de Cherub. p.*87. *F. G. Lib. de Agric. pag.* 152. And he affirms according to the Notion which *Solomon* gives *Prov.* 8. that he presides over the Revolutions which happen in Kingdoms. *Lib. Quod Deus sit Immut. p.* 248.

And this very thing St. *Paul* affirms, *Heb.* i. 2, 3. where he says, he is *the heir of all things*, and *upholds all things*; that is, guides and governs them.

Philo says, that the Eternal *Word* appeared to *Abraham. Lib. de Sacrif. Abel. pag.*108. And else where he names that Angel or Word *Jehovah. Lib. de Confus. Ling. pag.* 290. In the same sense St. *John* saith that he was the Eternal *Word*, though *made flesh* in time, *chap.* i. *v.* 14.

Philo maintains that Wisdom (which according to him is the same with the Word) was the Rock in the Wilderness. *Lib.* 3. *Alleg. Seg. p.* 853. *A.* In the same sense St. *Paul* affirms that *the Rock was Christ*, 1 *Cor.* x. 4.

Philo saith that it was the *Word* which appeared to the *Jews* upon Mount *Sinai. Lib. de Conf. Ling. pag.* 265. *D.* That God spoke to the *Jews* when he gave them his Laws. *Lib. de Migr. Abrah. pag.* 309. *D. E. F.* That himself immediately gave his Law, *Lib. de Decal. pag.* 576. and 592. And *Lib. de Præm. p.*705. That

That he created the Voice which was heard by the *Jews*, *Lib. de Decal. pag.* 577. *F.* And this very thing St. *Paul* affirms, *Heb.* xii. 25, 26. where he supposes that Christ uttered that *Voice* upon Mount *Sinai*.

R. Solomon owns that the Messias is pointed at *Psal.* xxxvi. 10. by the *Light* of which the Psalmist there speaks: And *Psal.* cxix. 105. *Isaias* likewise means him, *ch.* lx. 1. and *v.*19, 20. he says that the *Lord* was to be that *Light*, naming him *God*. *Micah* also, *ch.* xii. 18. says that *the Lord* was to be a *Light* to his people. *Daniel* says, *ch.* i. 22. that the *Light* dwells with *God*. And *Malachi*, *ch.* iv. 2. names him *the Sun of Righteousness*.

These very Expressions St. *John* has followed *ch.* 1. because the Messias was to be God indeed; because he was that *Jehovah* who had *gone before Israel*, *Exod.* xiii.21. whom the *Jews* affirm to have been the *Word*, as we observed before.

If any one desires to know how the Apostles came to apply to the Messias those things which the *Jews* understood of God's *Word*: He may for his satisfaction observe the following things.

Philo owns that the *Word* was the Eternal Son of God, *Lib. Quod Deus sit Immut. p.* 232. *F. G.* But withal that this Eternal *Word* is spoken of *Zech.* v. 12. *Behold the Man whose name is the Branch*, or *the East* acccording to the *Greek* Translation, *Ibid.* He calls him the first-born, and the Creator of the World, *Lib. de Confus. Ling. pag.* 258.

Now the *Jews* did unanimously understand that place of *Zechary* of the Messias, as appears

appears by their *Targum*, by their most ancient *Midrashim*, and by the consent of the latter *Jews*, as *Abarbanel*, who confutes *R. Solomon Jarchi*, by whom they were applied to *Zorobabel*.

This being so, what could be more natural for the Apostles, than to teach that the Messias was to be that Eternal *Word*; and that that *Word* was to appear as the true Messias?

Another Ground upon which they applied to the Messias what the Old *Jews* understood of the *Word* was this: The Old *Jews* did own that the Λόγος which guided the *Israelites* in the Desert, was their Shepherd. *Philo de Agric. pag.* 152. From whence they concluded that the 23*d*. Psalm, *The Lord is my Shepherd*, was to be understood of the Messias, *Phil. de Mutat. Nom. pag.* 822, 823.

The Apostles therefore did of course apply to the *Word*, as him who was to be the Messias, those Prophesies which mention the Messias as the Shepherd, whom God was to send to his people. *Isa.* xl. 10, 11. *Jer.* xxxi. 10. *Ezek.* xxxiv. 11, 12. and *ch.* xxxiv. 24. *Mich.* ii. 12. *Zech.* xiii. 7. For all these places are understood of the Messias, by the Ancient Paraphrases, and by the *Midrashim*.

The Old *Jews* did own that that *Word* was God, that he had made the World; and that he was to be the promised Messias. Upon this Ground the Apostles applied to the Messias those places of the Old Testament, which say that *Jehovah* made Heaven and Earth, as St. *Paul* did, *Heb.* i. where he applys to Jesus Christ, as the confessed Messias, the words of *Psal.* cii. 26.

Philo

Philo affirms that the *Word* was the true and Eternal Priest, *Lib. de Profug. pag.* 364, 365. That it was he that divided the Victims, when he appeared to *Abraham*, *Lib. Quis divin. rerum hær. pag.* 390. *A.* 399. and 401. That he is God's Priest, *Lib. de Somn. p.* 463.

From this common Doctrine it was natural to conclude that the Messias being the same with the *Word*, was to be the High Priest of the New Testament, as St. *Paul* explains it at large in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

Philo says that the *Word* is Mediator between God and Man, *Lib. Quis divin. rer. hær. pag.* 398. *A.* That he makes Attonement with God, *Lib. de Somniis, p.* 447. *E.F.*

From this it was easie to see that the Messias was to be indued with a Noble Priesthood, especially *David* having mentioned it, *Psal.* cx. representing the Messias, whom the *Chaldaick* Paraphrase often calls the *Word* of God, as being a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec*. And this St. *Paul* affirms likewise in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

Philo says that God having appeared by the *Word* to the Patriarchs, and to *Moses*, spoke by the same Word to the *Israelites*; and that he was the Prince of Angels, *Lib. Quis rer. divin. hær. pag.* 397. *F. G.* And the Light and the Doctor of his people, *Lib. de Somn. pag.* 448. calling the *Word* ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ, *de Nom. Mutat. pag.* 810. *E.*

It was therefore but agreeably to these Notions, that the Apostles applied to the Messias those places of the Old Testament, where God promised to speak to his new people, by the Messias, as *Deut.* xviii. 15, 16. which St. *Pe-*

ter, *Act.* iii. 22. and St. *Stephen*, *Act.* vii. 37. apply to our Saviour; and that St. *John* calls him the *Light of the World*, *Joh.* i.

It is necessary to take notice of these Principles of the Old *Jews*: First, that we may well understand the reason for which Jesus Christ and his Apostles quoted several places as relating to the Messias, which are meant of *Jehovah* in the Old Testament.

Secondly, That we may see for what reason, they supposed, as a thing owned by the *Jews*, for whom they writ, that those places related to the Messias, though the *Jews* applied them to the Λόγος.

And, Thirdly, That we may understand how naturally they applied to the Messias those places of the Old Testament, which by the confession of the Old *Jews*, related to the Λόγος.

And certainly the meanest capacity may apprehend that if under the Old Testament God acted by the Λόγος, (though that Dispensation was much below that of the New) much more he was to act under the New, by that same Λόγος, by his own Son, as St. *Paul* concludes, *Heb.* i.

What I said of the Apostles, and the other Writers of the New Testament, that they exactly followed the Doctrines of the Old *Jews*, which followed the Divine Revelation in the Old Testament, may justly be said of *Justin Martyr*, and of those who both before and after him writ in defense of our Saviour's Divinity. I need not quote many of them, to shew that they went upon the same Grounds with the *Jews* before Christ.

It

It will be enough to examine *Justin*'s Writings; for, he disputed with a *Jew*, who received no other Scripture besides the Old Testament, and therefore he could not convince him, but by the Authority of those Books. And if his method be well examined, it will be found that he argues all along as the Apostles did; *viz.* from the sense received by the *Jews*; supposing that such and such places of Scripture, from which he draws consequences, were applied to the Messias by them.

Justin having proved that nothing certain can be learned from Philosophy, by *Plato*'s example, who entertained gross Errors about the Nature of God, and of the Soul: And declared that he came to the knowledg of the Truth only by the help of Divine Revelation. He affirms in general that the Christian Religion which he had imbraced, is all grounded upon the Doctrine of *Moses* and the Prophets. He does particularly instance in that of our Saviour's Person and Office, though the *Jews* looks upon it as impious, that Christians, as they reckoned, trusted in a Man Crucified.

He lays for foundation, that the Scripture speaks of two Comings of Christ; the one indeed Glorious, mentioned, *Dan.* vii. and *Psal.* cx. and *Psal.* lxxii. But to be preceded by another altogether mean and despicable, as *David* had also foretold, *Psal.* cx. at the end.

He maintains that the Messias is clearly described as God, *Psal.* xlvii. where he is called *the Lord*, *our King*, and *the King of all the Earth*: *Psal.* xxiv. where he is called *the Lord*

 strong

strong and mighty, and *the King of Glory*. Psal. xcix. where it is said that he *spoke* to the *Israelites in the cloudy Pillar*. And *Psal.* xlv. where he is named *God's anointed, the Lord God*, and proposed as the object of our Adoration.

He affirms that Christ was to be God, and though the same in nature, yet a different person from him who made Heaven and Earth: He proves by the several Apparitions, where a true God is mentioned, appearing to *Abraham* in the Plains of *Mamre*, *Gen.* xviii. 1. To *Jacob* in a Dream, *Gen.* xxxi. with whom he wrestled in the figure of a Man, *Gen.* xxxii. and assisted him in his Journey to *Padan Aram*. And to *Moses* he appeared in the Burning-bush, *Exod.* iii.

He maintains that he was to be God, because he executed the Counsel of God: Hence he is named by *Joshua* the Prince of the Army; and an Angel which is the Lord. And because the Scripture describes him as begotten of God, and called the Son, the Wisdom of God, and the Word, *Prov.* viii.

He affirms that God spoke to the Word, when he said, *Let us make Man in our image*, *Gen.* i. 26. And, *Behold the Man is become as one of us*, *Gen.* iii. 22. which also clearly argues a Plurality.

He proves from *Psal.* ii. *This day have I begotten thee*; that his Generation is from all Eternity.

And from *Psal.* xv. that the Church ought to adore Christ, because it is said, *He is thy Lord, worship thou him.*

He repeats the same things towards the end of his Dialogue, where he proves that the Messias

Messias appeared to *Moses*, *Exod.* vi. 2. To *Jacob*, *Gen.* xxxii. 30. To *Abraham*, *Gen.* xviii. 16, 17. To *Moses*, *Numb.* xi. 3. and *Deut.* iii. 18. and to all the Patriarchs and Prophets.

He prevents an Objection, (that this was not a Person, but a Vertue from the Father, which is called sometimes an Angel, sometimes his Glory, sometimes a Man, sometimes the *Word*.) By shewing that the Scripture makes out first a real distinction between the Son and the Father, as between *Jehovah* and *Jehovah*, *Gen.* xix. 24. 2*ly*, a true Plurality, as *Gen.* iii. 22. the *Man is become as one of Us*. 3*ly*, a true Filiation, as *Prov.* viii. whence he concludes, that he that is begotten is different from him who begot him.

He answers Mr. *N.*'s Objection, borrowed from the *Jews*, who quote those words of *Isaiah*, where God says, *He will not give his Glory to another*. By saying that the Son is the Glory of the Father, and that in this respect he is not another Being from him. These words have another sense in the *Targum*, but which seems an addition. For they are thus rendered, *I will not give my Glory to another Nation*: That is, my *Shekinah* shall not go from the *Jews* to another people.

I shall not mention here that which relates to our Saviour's Office, especially his estate of Humiliation, which *Justin* proves by Texts taken out of the Old Testament. I shall only observe: 1*st*. That he quotes all the places of Scripture which he uses, as relating to the Messias by the confession of the *Jews*; and thus he shews by the circumstances of those

places, which had obliged the *Jews* to apply them to the promised Messias.

2*ly*. That he confutes the false Explications which the *Jews* gave to many places of Scripture; for instance that which understands (*Isa.* ix.) of King *Hezekiah*; for this mistake was older than *Justin*; some *Jews* in his days had revived it, and the Author of it was not *Rabbi Hillel*, who lived after *Justin*, but he made himself famous by propagating it. That *Rabbi* by the destruction of *Jerusalem* having lost all hopes of the Messias whom God had promised them, made this a Maxim, *There is to be no Messias in Israel, because they had him in the days of Hezekiah King of Judah*. Gemara ad Sanhedr. cap. Chelek.

It may be Mr. *N.* will be something disposed from the method which *Justin* used to believe, that he advanced nothing new against *Trypho* the *Jew*, who probably was that famous *R. Tarphon*, so often mentioned in the *Mishnah*, but whose Name the latter *Jews* have corrupted. But I will if possible go further to convince him, and prevent all his Objections. To that end I will make it appear that most places of Scripture which *Justin* used, were objected to the *Jews* by the Christians before *Justin*'s Birth. I prove it thus. *Justin* was born at soonest 105. years after Christ. But it appears by the Testimony of the *Jews*, that long before, their Doctors were divided amongst themselves about the manner in which those Objections were to be answered, which the Christians made to them, drawn from the Old Testament.

R. Eliezer,

R. Eliezer, who lived under *Trajan*, had this Maxim, *Study the Law with diligence, that thou mayst be able to answer the Epicureans*. *R. Jochanan* explains that Maxim of *R. Eliezer*, as regarding not only Heathens, but chiefly the *Jews* who had renounced their Religion. And who could these Apostate *Jews* be? It is easie to guess, by the Objections which they made to the *Jews*, and by the Maxim which *R. Jochanan* proposes, to prevent the *Jews* from being overseen in their disputes with these *Jews*. *Beth Israel. fol. 105. col. 3.*

In a word, they were Christians, who proved that there was a Plurality, and a Trinity, in the Divine Nature; Alledging to this effect against the *Jews* those places out of the Law and of the Prophets, where mention is made of God in the Plural Number.

As *Gen.* i. 26. *Let us make Man in our Image.* *Gen.* xi. 7. *Let us go down and confound their Language.* *Gen.* xxxv. 7. where *Elohim*, that is, *the Gods* appeared to *Jacob*. *Deut.* iv. 7. *What Nation has the Gods so near unto them?*

2 *Sam.* vii. 23. *What Nation is like Israel, whom the Gods went to redeem.*

Dan. vii. 9. *Till the Thrones or Seats were set, and the Ancient of days did sit.*

Exod. xxiv. 1. where *God bids Moses come up to the Lord.*

Exod. xxiii. 21. where God having promised to send his Angel, bids them beware of him, because he would not pardon their transgressions, for *Gods name* was in him.

And *Gen.* xix. 24. *The Lord rained upon Sodom fire from the Lord.*

These nine Arguments the Christians made use of to prove a Plurality in the Godhead. And we find that they were grounded upon the exact quotation of the *Hebrew* Text, not the *Greek* Version. For the *Greek* leaves room only to few of these remarks, which shews that *Justin*, who was born a Heathen, had them from Men bred among the *Jews*, who had read the Bible in *Hebrew*, and had made their Observations upon the Original Text of *Moses*, and other Sacred Writers.

Beth Isra. ibid. If a Man should ask, how ancient were those Objections about a Plurality in God. I answer that they were as old as the Preaching of the Gospel amongst the *Jews*. For, *R. Meir*, *R. Akiba*'s Master, had endeavoured to answer in his Sermons the Objection taken out of *Gen.* xix. 24. now *R. Meir* was born under *Nero*, and *Akiba* died in *Hadrian*'s days, about 120. years after Christ.

Neither were the *Jews* agreed in the manner of answering those Objections, about a Plurality in the Divine Nature.

1st. They thought they might answer most of them by this general Maxim, That God never did any thing without consulting with his Family above, that is, the Angels. And this they pretended to prove by these words, *Dan.* iv. 17. *This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the Holy Ones.* Which answer was destroyed by what others said, that God spoke of himself in the Plural Number; that *Moses* did also speak of God, they having regard to his Sovereign dignity. Though at the same time they observed that in those places, *Moses* joined a Verb

Verb in the Singular with that Noun in the Plural, to assert the Unity of God, and for fear the Reader should think there were many Gods. Thus when Men dispute against the Truth, what one of them builds up, is presently pulled down by another.

2ly. They were also divided about the *Thrones set*, *Dan.* vii. 9. For to what purpose many Thrones? if there were but one Person? *R. Akiba* maintained that there was one for God, and another for *David*. He seems by *David* to have understood the Messias. But *R. Jose* lookt upon this as impious, and affirmed that one of these Thrones was set for God's Justice, the other for his Mercy. *R. Akiba* was at last convinced, and received this explication, which *R. Eliezer* Son of *Azaria* hearing, was so far from approving of, that he sent away *Akiba* with indignation, and told him, *Why dost thou meddle with expounding the Scripture? Go to the army and fight*; this he said, because *Akiba* had followed *Barcosba*. As for *R. Eliezer* himself, he said that these two Thrones signified only that there was one for God, and a footstool to it. *Beth. Isr. ibid.*

3ly. They were hard put to it by the Objections drawn from *Exod.* xxiii. 21. about that Angel whom God had promised to guide *Israel*, in whom God's Name was to be, and who is called by the *Jews*, *Metatron*. For, said the Christians, If the name of *Jehovah* was in him, he was to be adored. This the *Jews* evaded by altering the Text, and reading with the LXX. *Thou shalt not rebell against him*; or, *Thou shalt not change me with him*; that is to say, *for him*. When the Christians objected that

that this Angel must needs be God, because God said of him, he shall not pardon thy transgressions, and the property of God is to forgive sins, as the *Jews* did object to Christ; They answered, This is our opinion, therefore we did not receive him as Ambassador.

4*ly*. In time they took this prudent method in their divisions, they forbad their people to dispute with Christians upon those Subjects, unless they were well used to the Controverversie; *Let him dispute with Hereticks, that can answer them*; as *R. Idith. But if a man can't answer them, let him forbear disputing*. This was the Counsel or Law of *Rab. Nachman*, one of the Authors cited in the *Ghemara, de Sanhedrin, ch.* 4.§.11, In *Beth Israel*. For, *R. Eliezer*, who lived under *Trajan*, had observed that the reading of the Old Testament made the *Jews* turn Hereticks: *i. e.* Christians; Himself was suspected to be inclinable that way. So that in after times they preferred much the study of the *Mishna*, that is to say, of their Traditions, before that of the Law it self.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

That we find in the Jewish *Authors, after the time of Jesus Christ*, the same Notions *which Jesus Christ and his Apostles grounded their Discourses on to the* Jews.

ALtho what I have said shews clearly that all the Notions which are in the New Testament are exactly agreeable to those that are in the Old *Jewish* Church, yet I believe that I can add some light to it by some particular remarks upon some places of the New Testament, which are mightily cleared, if compared with the Ideas of the *Jews* since Jesus Christ his time. And this (I hope) will serve to shew that the Apostles did advance nothing but what was commonly received by the Learned Men of the Synagogue, and that they have offered no violence to the Sacred Context of the Old Testament, but that they quoted it according to its natural sense; those *very Ideas* being common till this day among the Learned *Jews*, and among those very Men who applying themselves fully to the Studies of the Holy Scripture, are lookt upon as the *Keepers and Depositaries* of Tradition. I will bring those remarks without an exact niceness or care as to their order, choosing, to follow only the order of the New Testament.

If

If any one would know why St. *Matthew, ch.* ii. 18. has quoted the words of *Jeremy, ch.* xxxi. 15. *Rachel weeping for her children because they were not.* He may conceive the reason of such a quotation, if he knows that the *Jews* do look upon the Messias as the servant which is spoken of by *Isaiah, ch.* liii. See *Zohar, fol.* 235. in *Genesis*; and the Messias being described there, as a Sheep, that is called *Rachel* in *Hebrew* by the Prophet; they have taken occasion to apply that Oracle of *Rachel*'s weeping, not to the Wife of *Jacob*, but to the *Shekinah*, which they call *Rachel*. See *R. Menach.* of *Reka, fol.* 41. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 42. *col.* 4.

No body can read the 5*th.* of St. *Matthew*, but he must take notice with what authority Jesus Christ speaks upon the Mount in that famous Sermon, in which he vindicates the Law from the corruption of the *Pharisees*. *But I say unto you.* But he will be more sensible of that, if he reflects upon the common Notion of the Synagogue, in which the proper name of the *Shekinah* is, אנכי; as, *I the Lord have spoken. R. Menach. fol.* 33. *col.* 4. *& fol.* 40. *col.* 4. and that 'twas the *Shekinah* which gave the Law upon Mount *Sinai. R. Menach. fol.* 67. *col.* 3. *&* 68. *col.* 1. They cannot but take notice of the Title of the Bridegroom, which is given by *John Baptist* to Jesus Christ, and which Jesus Christ assumes, *Mat.* ix. 15. It is evident that they make an allusion to *Psal.* 45. and to *the Song of Songs*, which is of the same argument. But this will be clearer to those that know that the *Jews* maintain that 'tis the Λόγος, or the *Shekinah*, which

which gave the Law, and then sought after *Israel* as his Bride, that St. *John Baptist* speaks of himself as the Paranymph, and as *Moses* who said, that he came out to meet God, *Exod.* xix. 17. as it is noted in *Pirke Eliezer, ch.* 41. and that 'tis the *Shekinah* that is spoken of in that *Psal.* xlv. under the name of *the King*; that the name of *the King* exprest the Messias when absolutely used, *Zohar in Exod. fol.* 225. and that they acknowledg in this an inexplicable mystery. *R. Menach. fol.* 7. *col.* 3. *& fol.* 143. *col.* 4.

Jesus Christ saith to the people who followed him, *Mat.* xi. 29. *Take my yoke upon you, for my yoke is easie.* If a Man ponders that expression, he shall find that Jesus Christ speaks as God. And indeed nothing is more common than to see the Prophets reproach the *Jews* that they have cast off the yoke of God. *Jer.* ii. 20. and *th.* v. 5. But who doth not see that he speaks as the very Son of God, who is spoken of, *Psal.* ii. 3. the *Shekinah* who gave the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, and so had the Sovereign Authority to bring Men under his Law, let their authority be never so great.

We see *Mat.* xxi. 13. why Jesus Christ speaks of the Temple, as the House of his Father, and as his own House; and the *Jews* perceived well enough that he made himself God. But he did that according to the Notions of the *Jews*, who maintain till this day, that the *Shekinah*, or the Λόγος are the same, and that the Temple was dedicated to God, and to his *Shekinah. R. Men. fol.* 63. *col.* 1. *& fol.* 70. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 73. *col.* 3. *&* 4. *& fol.* 79. *col.* 3.

So

So in the same Chapter, *v.* 42. Jesus Christ quotes these words from *Psal.* cxviii. 22. *The stone which the builders refused, &c.* and applies them to himself. But he did that, to shew them that he was the true *Shekinah.* For this is the constant Title that they give to the *Shekinah,* or to the Messias. See *R. Menach. fol.* 8. *col.* 2. *& fol.* 53. *col.* 1. *&* 3. He is the Stone, and the Shepherd of *Israel.*

How often, saith Jesus Christ, *Mat.* xxiii. 37. *would I have gathered thy Children together, even as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her wings:* What signifies that expression? A *Jew* understands it very well, that Jesus Christ had a mind to tell them that he was the *Shekinah.* For 'tis the common Notion of the *Jews* till this day, That the people of *Israel* is under the Wings of the *Shekinah. R. Men. fol.* 107. *col.* 4.

Jesus Christ speaks to his Disciples, *Matth.* xxvi. 53. *He shall presently give me more than twelve Legions of Angels.* Those who read those words do not understand them well, if they do not know, that Jesus Christ speaks as the *Shekinah* in the Camp of *Israel,* and that he hath the twelve Legions of Angels as the twelve Armies of the twelve Tribes, at his Command, and under his Authority; this is the Doctrine of the *Jews. R. Menach. fol.* 51. *col.* 3.

Pilate put upon the Cross *the King of the Jews,* Providence having ordered it so, because 'twas the Title of the *Shekinah,* or of the Messias, as you find it often in the *Zohar. And Jesus Christ on the Cross,* make use of *Psal.* xxii. not only because he would shew the

the accomplishment of that Prophecy, but also because 'twas the common Idea of the Nation which lasts till this day, that *Psal.* xxii. is to be referred to that righteous, and to the *Shekinah* which was promised to *Israel* as his Saviour. *R. Men. fol.* 62. *col.* 2.

Jesus Christ promiseth to his Apostles to remain or be with them till the end of the world, *Mat.* xxviii. 20. What is the import of such a promise, but that he had a mind to tell them, that he was the *Shekinah* by which God remaineth in *Israel,* according to a promise of the like nature, as it is acknowledged, by the Jews. *R. Men. fol.* 85. *col.* 4.

St. *Luke* takes notice *ch.* v. 23. that Jesus Christ proves his right to forgive Sins by curing the sick of the Palsie; but he doth that, to prove that Jesus Christ was willing to shew that he was the *Shekinah,* because of the power of forgiving Sins, which the *Jews* allow to the *Shekinah* as its proper Character. *R. Men. fol.* 84. *col.* 3.

The same St. *Luke* saith *ch.* xi. 20. that the people who saw a great Miracle wrought by Jesus Christ, exclaimed, *Here is the finger of God.* Why hath he made that remark? Because 'twas a true confession that they acknowledged him to be the *Shekinah.* For till this day it is one of the Titles which they give to the *Shekinah,* which they look upon as the cause of all Miraculous virtues. *R. Menach. fol.* 62. *col.* 1.

St. *John* speaking of the Messias before he was in the Flesh, calls it *the Word,* he saith that *the Word was God, and that it was with God;* that *all things were created by it, and that nothing*

nothing was made without it. This is exactly what the *Jews* teach of the Wisdom which is the *Memra*, the Λόγος, whom they conceive to have been in the bosom of God, and being so, the *Amon*, the Son, or as it is the *Omen*, the Creator of all things. *R. Menach. fol.* 1. *col.* 1, 2. where he quotes the most authentick Authors of the Synagogue, who agree exactly upon that Notion.

It is clear that St. *John* has called him the Λόγος, by relation to the History of the Creation, in which these words, *And God said*, are so often repeated. And indeed till this day the *Jews* derive the Title of *Memra da Jehovah* from this repetition; and they take notice that *Moses* hath made a vast difference between these words *vajedabber*, where he speaks to Men in giving the Laws, and the word *Vajomer*, which is used in the first of *Genesis*. You see that remark in *Men. fol.* 65. *col.* 2. & *fol.* 124. *col.* 2. & *fol.* 154. *col.* 1. & *col.* 2.

It is visible that the same St. *John* hath affected the term of ἐσκήνωσεν, *ch.* 1. *v.* 14. when he speaks of the Λόγος, supposing that the Λόγος, or *Memra*, and the *Shekinah* are the same, and that is acknowledged by the *Jews*, who maintain that the *Memra*, so many times spoken of in their *Targums*, is the *Jehovah*, the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel Redeemer whom *Jacob* invoked, *Gen.* xlviii. 15. this very Ruler of *Israel*, to whom they refer all things related in the Books of *Moses*. *Men. fol.* 59. *col.* 2. And such an expression of St. *John* is the more to be remark'd, because he manifestly looks upon the words of

of Jesus Christ to the *Jews*, Joh. v. *You have not the Word of God dwelling in you*, which St. *Athanasius* hath well judged to be understood of the Λόγος, or the *Shekinah*, not of the Doctrine of the Law, as many Interpreters would have it to be understood.

The same St. *John* saith, *ch.* i. 18. *That the Father never appeared*; which he hath from Jesus Christ, who saith so, *Joh.* vi. 46. And all that, according to the Notion of the *Jews*, who acknowledging the Λόγος, as the Angel that is the Messenger of God, refer to it all the Appearances under the Old Dispensation, and have established as a Maxim, That the *Shekinah* is called *Thou*, and the God absconded is call'd *He*. *R. Men. fol.* 22. *col.* 2.

John Baptist speaks of Jesus Christ as of *the Lamb which takes away the sins of the world*, *Joh.* i. 29. The allusion to the Type of the Paschal Lamb, is sensible enough, but it is more sensible if we consider two things, which are commonly taught among the *Jews*; first, that 'tis the *Shekinah* that delivered *Israel* out of *Egypt*. 2*ly*. That the *Shekinah* was typified by the Paschal Lamb. *R. Menach. fol.* 5. *col.* 1.

Jesus Christ saith, *Joh. ch.* iii. 13. that he descended from Heaven, which is the style of the *Jews*, who acknowledg that the *Shekinah*, or Λόγος, was he that descended from Heaven in all the Appearances of God to the People of old, as to judge *Sodom*, &c. *R. Men. fol.* 36. *col.* 2.

Jesus Christ saith, *Joh. ch.* v. 22, & 26. *That God gave all judgment to the Son, that the Son hath the life in himself.* All that according to

to the style of the *Jews* touching the Λόγος. For they refer those words to the *Shekinah*, *He shall judge the world in righteousness*. *R. Men. fol.*46. *col.*1. *&* *fol.* 122.*col.*4. And so the *Zohar* mentions that it is he which is spoken of in these words, *Thou quickens all things*, the word *Thou* being the proper Name of *Adonai*, that is, of the *Shekinah*. *R. Menach. fol.* 2. *col.* 1, *&* 2.

He speaks of himself as of the *Manna*, and of his coming down from Heaven, and by that he shews that he was the *Shekinah*. For the *Jews* (as *Philo* witnesses) had that Idea of the *Shekinah*'s being the *Manna*, and that it was promised that he should come down from Heaven as the *Manna* did. See *R. Men. fol.* 65. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 137, *&* 138. *col.*3.

He saith, *Before Abraham was I am*, to shew that he was the Λόγος, as well as the Messias, of whom *Micah* saith, that he was *Mikkedem*, which expression the *Jews* relate to the Eternity of the Divine Essence, from which the Λόγος or the *Memra* proceeds. *R. Men. fol.* 12. *col.* 1.

He saith to the *Jews*, *Joh.* xiv. 6. *No man cometh unto the Father but by me*; to hint to the *Jews*, that he was the Λόγος. For their Maxim is, That they cannot approach to the Eternal King in the Sanctuary, but by the *Shekinah*. *R. Men. fol.*107. *col.*2.

Jesus Christ saith of his Father, *The Father is greater than I*; but in these very words he shews he was the Λόγος, because the *Jews* believe till this day, that although the Λόγος is *Jehovah*, nevertheless the Father is the Superior Light, and they call it the great Luminary. *R.Men. fol.*135. *col.*2. He

He saith to his Disciples, *Joh.* xv. 16. *Whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my Name, he may give it you*; to hint to them that he was the *Shekinah*, by whom they were to have access to the Father. The same of whom God said, *My Name is in him*, as the *Jews* acknowledge. *R. Menach. fol.* 56. *col.* 3. *&* *fol.* 53. *col.*4.

He speaks of the Holy Ghost, *Joh.* xv. 26. as proceeding from the Father; and the *Jews* have this Idea, when they suppose, that the third *Enumeration* or Person, which they name *Bina*, and which they render by the Holy Ghost, as you see in the famous Book, *Saare Ora*, proceeds from the first by the second. So *Zohar*, and the Book *Habbahir*, quoted by *R. Menach. fol.* 3. *col.* 1.

In the same Chapter he represents his Emanation from the Father as the *Jews* conceived the Emanation of the Wisdom, or Λόγος, from the first Enumeration, from which it draws all the Influxes and Blessings. This is the Doctrine of *R. Nechounia ben Cana*, and of the *Rabboth* quoted by *R. Menac. fol.* 1. *col.* 2.

He saith *Joh.* xvii. 21. *That all may be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee.* Just according to the Idea of the *Jews*, who say of the time of the Messias, that God then shall be one, and his Name one, *Zech.*xiv. *R. Men. fol.*135. *col.* 4.

We see in the *Acts of the Apostles*, ch.vii.52. St. *Stephen* reproaching the *Jews*, that they sold the just for Money: What is the Ground which St. *Stephen* builds upon? It is clear according to the *Jewish* Notions, who give to

the *Shekinah* the name of Just, and apply to him the words of *Amos, ch.* ii. *6.* where it is spoken of the just sold for Money. *R. Men. fol.* 17. *col.*3. *&* *fol.*19. *col.*2.

St. *Paul, Act.* xx. 28. saith *that God hath redeemed the Church by his Blood*; and that according the *Jewish* Notions, whose constant Doctrine is, That the Salvation of *Israel* is to be made by God himself, who refer to him *Psal.* xxii. and the place of *Zechary, ch.* ix. 9. and who pretend that the *Shekinah* shall be their Redeemer, *R.Men. fol.*19. *col.*4. *&* *fol.*58. *col.*4. *&* *fol.*59. *col.*1.

The same St. *Paul,* 1 *Cor.* xv. calls Jesus Christ, *the Adam from above*; shewing that he followed the Notions of the *Jews,* who call the *Shekinah,* the *Adam from above,* the *heavenly Adam,* the *Adam* blessed, which are the Titles which they give only to God, *R. Men. fol.* 14. *col.* 3.

He makes a long and deep Reflection, *Ephes.* v. upon the love of Jesus Christ to the Church, who gave himself for her Redemption; he considers the Church as his Wife; and seeks in the first Match between *Adam* and *Eve,* a great and a deep Mystery, and a Type of that between Jesus Christ and the Church. In all these he follows the *Jewish* Notions, who look upon the *Shekinah* as the Bride of the Church. *R. Men. fol.*15. *col.*3.

St. *Paul, Hebr.* vi, and vii. considers *Melchisedek* as a Type of Jesus Christ, and that according to the Notion of the *Jews* who agree that *Melchisedek* was the Type of the *Shekinah,* which they call the King of Peace, and the Just. *R. Men. fol.* 18. *col.* 1. *&* *fol.* 31. *col.*1.

He

He calls God, *Hebr.* x. *a consuming fire*; and applies to Jesus Christ that *very Idea.* But he speaks so, after the *Jewish* manner, for they believe the power of judging the World belongs to the *Shekinah,* and they refer to him what is said in *Exodus,* that *God is a consuming fire. R. Menach. fol.*6. *col.*4. *&* *fol.*8. *col.*3.

He supposes *Hebr.*xii. that Jesus Christ gave the Law, and spoke upon Mount *Sinai,* but this, according to the *Jewish* Idea of the Λόγος, or *Shekinah,* which they believe to have given the Law, and to have appeared then, and to have spoken with the *Israelites. R.Men. fol.* 56. *col.* 2.

Jesus Christ calls himself, *Apoc.* i. *the First and the Last,* because *Isaiah* hath spoken so, *ch.* xlix. but chiefly according to the Notion of the *Jews* who did acknowledge the Word to be the first King, and that he shall be the last; all Nations being to be subjected to him after the destruction of the fourth, and last Monarchy spoken of in the ii*d.* and in the vii*th.* of *Daniel.* He calls himself *King of Kings, Apoc.* xix. 16. But exactly according to the *Jewish* Notion, which is that such a Title belongs to *Jehovah,* and to the *Shekinah,* that is *Jehovah. R.Men. fol.*64. *col.*2.

So in the last Chapter of the *Revelation,*xxii. 2. you see that it is spoken of the *Tree of Life,* as of the Eternal Food. What is that *Tree of Life* according to the *Jewish* Notion? They conceive 'tis the very *Shekinah,* or Λόγος, who is the food of Angels, as saith *R. Men. fol.*65. *col.*2. *&* *fol.*66. *col.*4. And they give him that Name in relation to the happiness it will cause

to those which shall be saved by him. *R.Men. fol.*143. *col.*3. *& fol.*146. *col.* 1.

I could easily enlarge much more upon this Article, but it should be more fit for a Comment upon the New Testament, than for such a Work which we are now engaged in. What has been said shews sufficiently that the first Christians followed exactly the steps of the Apostles, and that the Apostles and Jesus Christ himself followed exactly the Notions of the ancient Synagogue.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

An Answer to some Exceptions taken from Expressions used in the Gospel.

WHat has been said about the Notions which the Writers of the Gospels, the Apostles and the first Christians had of the Messias, shews plainly that they were the same that were then common among the *Jews*. But because some Objections are made against what has been said, I will for the satisfaction of the Reader, examine those which seem most material, and might prejudice which I have already established.

The first is raised from our Saviour's Expressions when he speaks of himself: It is that which St. *Chrysostome T.* i. *Hom.* 32. observes, that although Christ declared himself to be God, (as appears by his way of speaking all along) and named himself the Son of God; yet he never actually took upon him the Name or Title of God, while he lived upon Earth. Which seems very strange, for there was great reason to expect that he should have exprest himself more clearly upon so important an Article, on which the Authority of the Christian Religion does depend.

I answer first, that Christ used that caution for fear of destroying in the opinion of the *Jews* the reality of his humane Nature. Had he said plainly, I am God, the *Jews* who in their Scriptures were so much used

to Divine Appearances, might have had just Grounds of doubting the truth of the Incarnation of the *Word*. They had lookt upon his Flesh as a Phantasm; which persuasion of theirs would have destroyed the Notion of his Humane Nature. Therefore to persuade them of the truth of his Humane Nature, he was born as other Men are, he grew by degrees as other Men do, he suffered hunger and thirst, was subject to weariness, and to all the other infirmities incident to a real Man; growing even in Knowledg and Wisdom by degrees, as other Men do. It was absolutely necessary it should be so, because he was to be *like his Brethren in all things, sin only excepted*, as St. *Paul* says, applying to him that place of *Psal.* xxii. where the Messias says, he would *declare the Name of God to his Brethren*; and of *Psal.* xlv. 7. where he mentions his *fellows*: And also because he was to be the seed of the woman spoken of, *Genesis* iii. 15.

And if, for all these real marks, his being a true Man, some Hereticks called the *Valentinians*, believed his Body to have been only a Phantasm, without any reality. And others, named the *Apollinarians*, affirmed that the *Word* supplied in Christ the functions of a Rational Soul, though he had really no such Soul; Had Christ expresly stiled himself God, he had given the *Jews* and Hereticks occasion of fancying that his Humane Nature was not a reality; but that this last Apparition of God in a Humane Body, was like the old ones, when God appeared in the form of a Man, and wrestled with *Jacob*, though it was without

out a true Incarnation, the thing being done by a Body made of Air on purpose, or by the Body of a real Man, but borrowed only for the time, and presently after put off.

Secondly, Let it be considered that Christ used that caution, that he might not give the utmost provocation to the *Jews*, who were much offended to see him in so mean a condition. For, though they might perhaps have owned such a despicable Man to be a Prophet, yet they could by no means own him to be the Messias, of whom they expected that he should be a Temporal and a great King. Therefore they could hardly bear our Saviour's discourse about the Dignity of his Person; they took up stones to throw at him, when he told them he was greater than *Abraham*, and before *Abraham*, *Joh.* viii. They said he had a Devil, when he told them he had power to raise himself from the dead, and also those who did believe in him. How then could they have heard from him an express declaration, that he was God, Maker of Heaven and Earth?

Thirdly, It must be also observed that there being many Prophecies, by the fulfilling of which the Messias was to be known; Christ declared himself by degrees, and fulfilled those Prophecies one after another, that the *Jews* might have a competent time to examine every particular. To this end he did for some years Preach the Gospel; He wrought his Miracles at several times, and in several places; He wrought such and such Miracles, and not others; imitating herein the Sun, which by degrees appears and enlightens the World

World. This might easily be shewn more at large, but that the thing is plain to any that have attentively read the Gospel. What I have noted is sufficient to shew that Jesus Christ was not to assume the Name of God in the time of his Humiliation, although he hath done the equivalent in so many places, where he speaks of himself as of the Son of God, the *Memra*, the *Shekinah*, the Λόγος, who is God. 2*ly*. That it was more fit for him to let it be concluded from his performing all the Ministry of the Messias as it was by *Thomas*, *Joh.* xx. 18. Not that they knew then and not before that he was he from whom Life, and an Eternal Life should be expected: Upon which *Grotius* seems to Ground his Godhead *in b. l.* but because then they saw in him a full demonstration that he was the true God, the Λόγος, from whom the Life of all Creatures is derived, as is said *Joh.* i.

A second Objection is taken from the word Λόγος, which St. *John* has used in the first Chapter of his Gospel, to denote our Saviour's Divinity. For if we hear the *Unitarians*, First, it is not clear that any other of the Writers of the New Testament has used it in that sense. And then, the Notion of the word Λόγος seems to be grounded only on the *Greek* Expressions, and not on the *Hebrew* Tongue, as it is used in the Original of the Old Testament.

To answer that Objection, I must take notice, 1. That the word Λόγος was not unknown to the *Jews* before Jesus Christ, to express the *Shekinah*, that is, the Angel of the

the Covenant. So we see in the Book of *Wisdom*, chap. xviii. 15. *Omnipotens sermo*, Λόγος, *tuus de cœlo à regalibus sedibus durus debellator*; and so in some other places of the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, as *chap.* i. 5. πηγὴ σοφίας Λόγος θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις.

I know that *Grotius* pretends upon the place of *Wisdom*, that Λόγος there signifies a created Angel; and quotes *Philo* to confirm his Explication. But I maintain that no body but *Grotius* could have advanced such a false Explication, and be so bold as to quote *Philo* for it, whose Testimonies which I have quoted before, are so clearly against him, and distinguish so exactly the Angels from the Λόγος. I pray the Reader only to remark this, that if the Λόγος signifies here a created Angel, then it was the current Notion of the Synagogue concerning the Λόγος; so that when St. *John* speaks of the Λόγος in his first Chapter, either 'twas only his meaning that such a created Angel was made Flesh, and the *Hellenist Jews* could not understand it otherwise; or St. *John* was to explain the sense of the Λόγος according to a new, an unknown, and unheard signification; that he never did, and so he help'd the *Arians*, and confounded the Orthodox.

Some body will perhaps excuse *Grotius*, who saith in the Preface to his Annotations upon this Book, that such a piece hath been inserted by a Christian, who hath fobb'd in many other things; and it was the sense of Mr. *N.* in his Judgment of the Fathers. But *Grotius*, who believes the Works of *Philo* true, hath shut that Door against this Evasion, when he con-

confirms the truth of that Saying of the Author, by the Authority of *Philo* the *Jew*; and 'tis so strange an Accusation, and without any ground, that it came in no body's head before *Grotius*.

2*dly*. I answer, That according to St. *Athanasius*'s meaning, Jesus Christ himself speaks of the Λόγος, when he saith, *John* v. 8. *Ye have not the Word of God remaining in you*. And 'tis true that it cannot be understood of the Law and Prophecy, which St. *Paul* affirms to have been trusted to the *Jewish* Nation. And 'tis mighty probable that St. *John* taking the *Shekinah* and the Λόγος for the same, saith that the Λόγος ἐσκλώσεν ἐν ἡμιν, by an opposition to his Absence from the *Jews*, who had rejected his direction and conduct.

I answer 3*dly*. That many of the Ancient Doctors of the Church did remark, that St. *Luke*, Luk. i. 2. Acts i. and St. *Paul*, Heb. iv. 12. used the word Λόγος in the same sense, to denote the Second Person of the Trinity; and that therefore it was not peculiar to St. *John* to do so.

4*thly*. I say that the word *Davar*, in the room of which the *Jews* since the *Babylonian* Captivity do ever use that of *Memra*, to express the Second Person of the Trinity, was in use even in *David*'s time; as appears by *Psal*. xxxiii. 6. where the LXX have render'd it by Λόγος; which Version being common among the *Jews*, and generally received, St. *John* could not use a term more proper to express the Divinity of the Second Person taking our Nature upon him. And if it is no matter of wonder, that the other Evangelists

gelists should give to our Saviour the Name of the Messias, or that of the Son of God, which were first given him by *David*; it ought to be none, that St. *John* has given him that of Λόγος, which likewise was given him by *David*; and does withal so well express the Author of the Creation, who was this very Λόγος, who said *Let* such or such a thing be, and *it was*: For which reason St. *Paul* says, that God made the Worlds by him, *Heb*. i. 2. and St. *Peter*, 2 *Epist*. *chap*. iii. 5. where he ascribes the Creation of the World to the Λόγος, or Word, as it is acknowledged by *Grotius*.

The reason why St. *John* is more particular in his Expressions about the Second Person, whom he makes to be the Creator of the Worlds, and then represents as being made Man; was because the other Evangelists had given so full an Account of his Birth, and Genealogy, and every thing else that was needful to prove the Truth of his Human Nature against the *Simoniani* and other Hereticks, that would make him a Fantasm; that this Evangelist found himself obliged to be the more express in asserting his Divinity, against the *Ebionites*, who abused some places of the other Gospels, to maintain that Christ was a mere Man; and against the *Cerinthians*, who affirmed that the *Word* was not inseparably united to the Flesh.

Lastly, St. *John* used the word Λόγος, to express the Unity of God, tho there be Three Persons in the Divine Nature: Therefore he says that the *Word* was with God, and that he was God. He observes that Christ said that

that he was in the Father, and the Father in him: That he and the Father were one; as he had before express'd himself in his first *Epist.* chap. v. 7. *These Three are One*; to shew the Unity of the Divine Monarchy, after the manner in which the *Jews* did apprehend it; wherein he was followed by the first Christians.

Another Objection, which seems very plausible, and therefore is confidently made by the *Socinians*, is grounded upon those places in the *Jewish* Writers, where they attribute to the Λόγος what is affirmed in Scripture to have been said or done by an Angel, in very many Apparitions; as *Exod.* iii. 2. and *Acts* vii. 30. where St. *Stephen*, after *Moses*, affirms that *the Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in the bush*: In which places of Scripture, a created Angel, not the Son of God, seems to have appeared to *Moses*. Whereas the *Jewish* Writers take this Angel to have been the *Word*, as I shewed before. Which Mistake must invalidate their Testimony in this case.

Accordingly, some Interpreters, as *Lorinus* the Jesuit, and others Papists, suppose him to have been a created Angel, but which represented the Person of the Son of God, and therefore acted in his Name, and spoke as if he had been the Lord himself. This Opinion they ground upon two things: First, Because he is expresly distinguish'd from the Lord, both by *Moses* and St. *Stephen*, who call him the Angel of the Lord. And Secondly, Because the Son of God never took upon him the Nature of Angels, as he did that of Men; and therefore can't be called by their Name. This

This has been thoroughly considered before, to which I might refer the Reader for an Answer. But to save him trouble, we shall here shew him reason enough to believe that those Texts speak of one that was more than a Creature. First, Because the Angel is presently named the *Lord*, or *Jehovah*, both by *Moses* and St. *Stephen*; even as *Gen.* xxxi. the Angel which wrestled with *Jacob* is called *God*. Secondly, Because he declared formally, that he was the Lord, when he said to *Moses*, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*; which can never be said of a mere Creature, under whatsoever Commission or Dignity.

The Prophets did formerly represent God, and they acted as well as spake in his Name; but for all this they never spoke as the Angel mentioned by St. *Stephen*: They said barely, *Thus saith the Lord*, or *Jehovah*, *I am God*, &c.

Likewise Christ represented his Father, as being his Ambassador and his Deputy; and yet he never took the Name of Father. We read of many Apparitions of Angels in the New Testament, yet no man can pretend to shew that any of them either spoke or acted as God, though sent by him, and speaking to Men in his Name. It had been as absurd and as great a crime for them to have done so, as for a Viceroy, to tell the People whom he is sent to govern, I am your King, tho' he does represent the King's Person.

It is true, the Angel mentioned by St. *Stephen*, is named the Angel of the Lord; and as true that Christ did not take the nature of Angels on him. He did this favour only to Men;

Men; for them only he humbled himself, and was made like them in all things, sin excepted; and for this reason he is truly named Man, and the Son of Man, as well as the Son of God. For Apostate Angels he forsook them, and left them for ever in their Rebellion.

But it must be observed that the word *Angel* signifies properly a Messenger, and denotes rather the Office than the nature of those blessed Spirits, sent forth to Minister. And consequently their Name may well be given to the Son of God, who ever had the care of the Church committed to him, and by whom the Father has communed with Man ever since his fall into sin.

Upon this Ground *Malachi, ch.* iii. *v.* 1. names the Son of God the *Angel*, or *Messenger of the Covenant*. Which Prophecy is owned to this day by the *Jews*, to speak of the Messias. *Isaiah, ch.* lxiii. *v.* 9. names him *the Angel* of the Presence of the Lord, who saved and redeemed the *Israelites*. According to what the Lord said to *Moses*, *Exod.* xxiii. 23. *My Angel shall go before thee.* And *Exod.* xxxiii. 14. *My presence shall go with thee.*

The Primitive Christians never doubted, but that the Angel which appeared to *Moses* in the Desart, and guided the *Israelites*, was the Son of God: St. *Paul* says expresly thus much, 1 *Cor.* x. 9. when he affirms that the *Israelites* tempted Christ in the Wilderness, by their Rebellions. *Lorinus* himself, quoting some places from the most Ancient Fathers, is forced to acknowledge it on *Acts* vii. And I shewed before, that St. *Paul* has affirmed nothing

nothing upon this Point, but according to the common Notion of the *Jews*.

It ought not therefore to seem strange, that St. *Stephen* does distinguish the Angel of whom he speaks, from the Lord himself, when he names him the Angel of the Lord: For the Son is distinct from the Father, and the Son was sent by the Father: But because they so partake of the same Divine Nature, that they are in reality but one and the same God, blessed for ever; the Son in this regard might well say, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. and be called *the Lord Jehovah.*

If it be askt why *Moses* did rather call him an Angel, than otherwise. I answer, that he did so, for these two reasons: First, because the distinction of the Divine Persons was not so clearly revealed under the Old Testament, by reason that it did not so well suit that Oecomy. Secondly, because God since he created the World, commonly imploying Angels in those works which were not above their power and capacity; It may very well be that the Son of God, when he appeared to Men, used the Ministry of Angels, either to form the voice and the words which he spoke to his Prophets, or to make the Body or the Figure under which he appeared.

It is objected in the last place, that St. *Paul* seems to suppose, that an Angel gave the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, and not the Λόγος, or the Son of God; and that that Angel is called God, because he spoke in God's Name. Thus *Gal.* iii. 19. he says that the Law was ordained by Angels. *Heb.* ii. 2. that it was spoken *by Angels.* And *Heb.* i. 1, 2. making

 oppo-

opposition between the Law and the Gospel, he says to elevate this last above the former, that God having formerly spoke to Men *by his Prophets*, has in these last days spoken to us by *his Son*: which could not be true, if he had before made use of the Λόγος to give his Law to the *Jews*. The *Socinians* look upon this Argument as unanswerable. And the truth is, it has imposed upon many Learned Writers, as *Lorinus*, *Grotius*, and others.

But it will be no difficult business to answer it, if it be observed: First, that it hath been always the opinion of the old *Jews*, that the Law was given by *Jehovah* himself: Secondly, that it was likewise their opinion, that *Jehovah* who gave the Law was the Λόγος: And 3*ly*, that 'tis affirmed by *Moses*, *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. *That when the Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir, He came with ten thousands of Saints; from his right hand went a fiery Law*: I say that 'tis enough to prove those three things, to convince any Man that when St. *Paul* says that the Law was spoken by Angels, δι' ἀγγέλων, he means only that they were present, as witnesses where it was given; not that they represented God's person.

The first appears by *Philo*, who affirms that it was God who spoke, when he gave the Law, *de Migrat. Abrah. p.* 309. *D. E. F.* And *de Decal. p.* 576. *D. C.* and *p.* 593. *F.* he spoke by a voice which he created. And *Lib. de Præm. p.* 705. The *Targum* affirms the same that *Jehovah* revealed himself, with multitudes of Angels, when he gave his Law, 1 *Chron.* xxix. 11.

The

The second is clear by *Hag.* ii. 6. where the Lord speaking of the time when he brought his People out of *Egypt*, saith, *that he had shaken the Earth*; which relates to his giving the Law, as appears from *Psal.* lxviii. 8. and *Heb.* xii. 25, 26. where St. *Paul* applies that place to our Saviour. And it is acknowledged also by the *Jews* as the Author of *Rabboth*, *fol.* 135. *col.* 3. *Onkelos*, *Deut.* iv. 33, 36. the People heard the voice *of the Word of the Lord out of the fire*. And also *Deut.* v. 24. And likewise, *Exod.* xx. 7. *Deut.* v. 11. and vi. 13. where the third Commandment is mentioned in these words, *None shall swear by the Name of the Word of the Lord*.

The third Point is evident according to the constant Maxim of the *Jews*, that the *Shekinah*, or Λόγος, is always accompanied with several Camps of Angels who attend him and execute his Judgments.

Those things being noted, I maintain that when St. *Paul* saith that the Law hath been Ordained by Angels, δι' ἀγγέλων, *Gal.* iii. 19. the Text must be rendred *between Angels*, as St. *Paul* hath used the word δία, 2 *Tim.* ii. 2. not to say by many Witnesses, but among or before many Witnesses.

2*ly*. That when St. *Paul* speaks *Heb.* ii. of the Word that hath been spoken by Angels, he doth not speak of the Law, but of the several threatnings which were made by the Prophets, to whom the Λόγος sent his Angels to bring back the People of *Israel* from their wickedness: And of the several punishments which fell upon *Israel*, and were inflicted by Angels as Executors of the judgment of God.

It must be understood so necessarily; or it is impossible to save St. *Paul* from having contradicted himself in the same Epistle: For he supposeth *ch.* xii. 25, 26. that 'twas Jesus Christ, that being the Λόγος, shook the Earth, in which he follows the words of *Haggai* the Prophet, and of the Psalmist, *Psal.* lxviii. 8. and who can reconcile that with St. *Paul*, saying, that many Angels Ordained the Law? Did they all personate God in that occasion? No body hath ever imagined such a thing.

It cannot be objected to me that St. *Paul* opposes the Person of Jesus to *Moses* as it hath been done by St. *John*, *ch.* i. where he saith, that the Law was given by *Moses*, but *Grace and Truth by Jesus Christ*. The reason is clear, and it is because he opposes the Ministry of Reconciliation to the Ministry of Condemnation: *Moses* hath been the Mediator of the first Covenant, but Jesus Christ is the Minister of the second, although both Ministries were originally from God.

I need not spend much time to confute the fancy of those who say that the Angel of the Lord is named *Jehovah*, because he was *Jehovah*'s Ambassador. For it is a Notion which the *Unitarians* have borrowed from the Modern *Jews*, such as *Menasseh Ben Isr.* in *Gen.* i. 44. But I have fully proved that it is a new Notion forged by them to save their new System. It is so certain that the Old *Jews* believed that an Angel could not say, I am *Jehovah*, as we read, *Exod.* xx. that even the *Talmudists* affirm, that *Jehovah* himself spoke these words, *I am the Lord thy God, which*

which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; Though they say that the rest of the Law was spoken by *Moses*. *Shir. Hashirin Rabba, fol.* 5. *col.* 1.

CHAP. XXIII.

That neither Philo, *nor the* Chaldee *Paraphrasts, nor the Christians, have borrowed from the* Platonick *Philosophers, their Notions about the Trinity. But that* Plato *should have more probably borrowed his Notions from the Books of* Moses, *and the Prophets, which he was acquainted with.*

HAving in the foregoing Chapters shewn that the Doctrine of the Trinity has its Ground in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets; and that the ancient *Jews* before Christ, did acknowledge it, as appears from many places in the *Apocryphal* Authors in *Philo*, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts, who were exactly followed by Christ, his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians: It may be seen how falsly the *Socinians* pretend that *Justin Martyr* was the Author of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

But to put them altogether from this Evasion, I will shew that nothing can be more absurd, than to say, that if *Philo* was not a Christian, he was at least a *Platonist*; and that the Fathers, particularly *Justin Martyr*

 brought

brought into the Christian Religion a Doctrine which they borrowed from *Plato*.

As to *Philo*'s being a *Platonist*, I say first, that though this were granted, yet it would do the *Unitarians* no good. The reason is, because whatever Notions the *Greeks* had of Divine matters, they had from *Pherecides*, a *Syrian*, who lived a long time before *Plato*, and was *Pythagoras*'s Master. *Pythagoras* (who afterwards was much followed by the *Greeks*) travelled into *Egypt*, into *Arabia*, and into *Chaldea*, after he had had *Pherecides* to his Master. *Plotinus* does ingenuously confess that the three Original Hypostases were not of *Plato*'s inventions but were known before him; and this he makes out from *Parmenides* his Writings, who had treated of this Notion, *Plot. Enn.* 5. *Lib.* 1. Now *Parmenides* had the Notion of the Trinity from the *Pythagoreans*, whose Master *Pythagoras* had probably borrowed it from the *Jews*, with whom he conversed in *Egypt*.

Secondly, I own that *Philo* was compared by many with *Plato*, as to his Stile, and that lively Eloquence for which *Plato* was so admired. One may see by his Book, *Quod omnis probus sit Liber*, and many other of his Works, that he was very conversant in these *Greek* Authors, both Poets and Philosophers. But he had been so little acquainted with *Plato*'s Works, that he brings some of *Plato*'s opinion upon the credit of *Aristotle*. We see that in his Book, *Quod mundus sit*, p. 728, & 729. He never proves his Doctrines by the Authority of *Plato*. He Grounds all he says upon the Divine Authority, speaking in the Old

Old Testament, well reflected upon as you see p.288. where he speaks of the Three who appeared to *Abraham*. A *Jew* as he was, could not well have suited his Notions with *Plato*'s. For, *Plato* believed, for instance, That Matter was Eternal, and uncreated, which is positively contrary to what *Moses* says of the Creation of the World; and as positively rejected by *Philo*, in his Books of Providence; and that Matter had a Beginning.

As to the Doctrine of the Trinity, *Plato* speaks of it so obscurely, that one may justly wonder, how some Christians formerly made use of his Testimony to prove it. Probably he had heard of it in *Egypt*. But what he says about it in his *Parmenides*, though quoted by *Eusebius*, shews that he had not a very true Notion of it. He speaks of an Eternal and unbegotten Being. He attributes to that Being, which he calls αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν, a first Understanding, and a first Life. And *Proclus* does distinguish those three Principles of *Plato*, as three different Beings. But *Plotinus* does not agree in this with *Proclus*, and affirms that these Three are but one and the same thing.

The reason why many Christians have so much esteemed *Plato*, is the nobleness of his Morals; the Maxims of which are much more elevated and Christian-like, than those of other Heathen Philosophers.

It is true, *Philo* seems to have followed *Plato*'s Expressions, when he calls the Word of God, Δεύτερον Θεὸν, a second God. But it must be observed, First, that *Philo* never owns above one God. And secondly, that he used

that expression, to mark the distinction which is between *Jehovah* and *Jehovah*, as I shewed already.

Let the thing be considered in its self. It is certain that the Notion of the Trinity cannot be had from Reason. It must therefore be a Doctrine, either revealed by God, or devised by *Plato*, or some other from whom he received it. But the *Platonists* are so far from believing their Master to be the first inventer of it, that *Proclus* affirms it to be θεοπεμπὴ θεολογία, a *piece of Divinity delivered by God himself*. And,

Numenius a famous *Platonist*, who lived under the two *Antonines*, and was therefore *Justin*'s Contemporary, expresly maintains that *Plato* during his thirteen years stay in *Egypt*, had learnt the Doctrine of the *Hebrews*; as *Theodoret* tells us in his first Sermon against the *Greeks*. For, it is certain that many *Jews* fled into *Egypt*, after *Nebuchadnezzar* destroyed *Jerusalem*, and after the death of *Gedaliah*.

These two Testimonies are enough to prove that *Plato* was not the first Inventer of the Notion of a Trinity.

And that *Philo* borrowed not his Notions from *Plato*, may further appear, because *Philo* lived at a time when *Plato*'s Philosophy had long ago lost much of its credit. *Aristotle* did much lessen it. But it was much more crest-fallen when the opinions of *Zeno* and *Epicurus* prevailed. *Zeno*'s Philosophy spread it self as far as *Rome*, although the Maxims of it were barbarous and unnatural. And in St. *Paul*'s days that of *Epicurus* was much followed at *Athens*. That of the *Pyrrhonians* got much

much Ground likewise. So that *Plato* had but a very few Disciples left him. In *Plato*'s days there started up at *Alexandria* a Sect of Philosophers, the Head of whom was one *Polemo*, who lived under *Augustus*: These freely rejected the most famous Opinions, and pickt out what they found most rational in the several Sects of Philosophers, for which reason they were called *Electicks* or Chusers. And one needs but read *Philo* with Judgment, to find that he followed this Sect.

It appears that *Philo*'s great design in all his Works, is to shew, That the *Jews* were infinitely above the Heathens, both as to Virtue and Knowledge: In which he followed *Aristobulus*'s Notions, who had writ long before him, and was a *Jewish* Philosopher. And of this Opinion the *Jews* are to this day, as may be seen in *Cozri*, *p.* 29,—and *p.* 131. And as the *Egyptians* lookt upon the *Greeks* as Children in learning, which they were fain to fetch from *Egypt*; so *Philo* calls often the *Egyptians*, even of the most ancient times, a heavy People, and who wanted common Sense, by reason of the many gross Errors they entertain'd, unworthy of rational Creatures.

In a word, I affirm, that if *Plato* had any distinct Notions in Religion, he most certainly had them from the *Jews* while he sojourned in *Egypt*, as it is maintained by *Josephus* in his first Book against *Appion*.

As for the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts, I do not see how they can be suspected to have had a Tincture of *Plato*'s Doctrine: It must be a mere Fancy to suppose it. Let those Gentlemen read exactly the Books of *Philo*, and find therein,

therein, if they can, such an Expression as we have in the *Targum* upon *Hag.* ii. 4, 5. *I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts, with the Word which covenanted with you when you came out of Egypt, and my Spirit which abideth in the midst of you.* *M. N.* hath been sensible of that; and therefore he does not accuse them of having been *Platonists*; but he accuses the Orthodox Christians in general to have inserted in the *Jewish* Books whatever in them is favourable to the Doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Λόγος. But certainly the *Unitarians* must have very little Correspondence with the *Jews*, to fancy that they are so simple as to be thus abused. How can it be imagined that the *Jews* should be such Friends to Christians, as to trust them with their Books in order to falsify them? And afterwards so sottish, as to spread every where their Books and their *Targums* which they falsified? This Supposition is so ridiculous, that I cannot imagine how any Author can write such a thing, or even conceive and suppose it.

What I said of the Gospel Notions in the 15*th* Chapter, shews plainly that neither Christ nor his Apostles did adopt the System of Philosophy which was taught by the *Platonists*.

The Angel who declared his Conception, used the word Lord or *Jehovah*, to denote his being God: But when he named him Jesus, because he was to save his People from their sins, which no other could do but God, he intimated that it was he who was foretold, not by *Plato*, but by *Habakkuk*, chap. iii. 8, 13, 18. *I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.* In which place the Prophet expressly calls God *Saviour* or *Jesus*, by which Name Christ by Divine Appointment was named.

In short, a man must be out of his Senses, to find any thing in the Gospel that savours of *Plato*'s Hypothesis. When the Devils own Christ to be the Son of God, were they *Platonists*? When St. *Peter* owns him to be the Son of God, had *Plato* told him this? When he was ask'd in the Council of the *Jews*, whether he was the Son of God, was the question made in a *Platonick* sense?

It is true, St. *Paul* has sometimes quoted Heathenish Authors; he was brought up at *Tarsus* amongst Heathens; he had read *Aratus*, whom he quotes against the *Epicurean* Philosophers at *Athens*; and he quotes a place out of the *Cretan Epimenides* in his Epistle to *Titus*, who was Bishop of *Crete*. But we never find that he quoted *Plato*, or used his Testimony.

Christ chose illiterate men for his Apostles; St. *John*, who speaks of the Λόγος, had been a Fisherman about the Lake of *Tiberias*: St. *Paul* only, and St. *Luke* were Scholars. St. *Paul* was brought up under *Gamaliel*, a Doctor of the Law; and St. *Luke*, who had been a Physician, and was a Learned Man, followed St. *Paul* in his Travels, and by his directions writ his Gospel. But it does not appear that our Saviour taught his ignorant Disciples the Notions of *Plato*; nor that the Learned ones, as St. *Paul* and St. *Luke*, ever used *Plato*'s Authority in their Preaching.

This

This appears plainly in the Book of the *Acts*, in which St. *Luke* gives an account of it. If at any time St. *Paul* had a fair opportunity to make use of *Plato*'s Testimony, it was when he disputed at *Athens* against the *Stoicks* and the *Epicureans*. These last laughing at Miracles, St. *Paul* wrought none there to convince them: But he might have quoted places out of *Plato*'s Republick, to prove the Resurrection, and a Judgment in the Life to come; yet he quotes never an Author, and was contented to argue the Case by strength of Reason; and this he did with that force, that he converted one of the Judges of *Areopagus*, who probably was an *Epicurean*, and knew what *Plato* said in his Books, and did laugh at it.

This Method of the Apostles was followed by the first Christians; *Plato* was not mentioned amongst them, till some Philosophers turned Christians; *Justin Martyr*, amongst others. This *Justin* scorned all other Philosophers as mean-spirited Teachers; but commended *Plato*, as being one of a great Genius, that made him think of God and the Immortality of the Soul, in a more elevated manner than other Philosophers. But when all is done, How much did he value *Plato*? But indifferently: He declares that it was from the Gospel, together with the Law and the Prophets, that he had the true Notions of the Christian Religion. He quotes *Plato* neither against the Heathens, nor against the *Jews*. If we had the Book he writ against *Marcion*, who out of *Plato*'s Writings had broach'd his detestable Opinions, we might very

very probably have seen how little he valued *Plato*'s Authority. *Tertullian*, who had read *Justin*'s Book, and who saw that both the *Gnosticks* and the *Valentinians* made much of *Plato*'s Authority; shews plainly how little he valued *Plato*, when he says he was grown *omnium hæreticorum condimentarium*, the sawce which all Hereticks used to propagate their Doctrines, by which they corrupted the Purity of the Christian Religion. And much the same Opinion of *Plato* had they that opposed the *Arian* Heresy; of which it is thought *Origen* was the first Broacher.

However, I aver, First, That the first Christians were no more *Platonists* than the *Jews*, that is, did not use *Plato*'s Notions in their System of Divinity. They were so far from it, that they declared that what they believed about the Trinity, they had it from the Holy Writers; *Justin Apol.* 2. *Athenagoras p.* 8, 9. *Theophilus of Antioch, p.* 100.

Secondly, It is false that any of the Ancient Christians made any other use of *Plato*, than by shewing that *Plato* had borrowed from *Moses* the Doctrine he taught; *Justin* in his Exhortation to the *Greeks, p.* 18, 22, 24. *Clemens* of *Alexandria, Strom. l.* 4. *p.* 517. and *l.* 5. *p.* 598. *Pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *Origen* against *Celsus*, *l.* 1. *p.* 16. *l.* 4. *p.* 198. *l.* 6. *p.* 275, 279, 308. *l.* 7. *p.* 351, and 371.

Thirdly, The very Heathen Authors own that *Plato* borrowed his Notions from *Moses*; as *Numenius*, who (as *Theodoret* tells us) did acknowledge that *Plato* had learnt in *Egypt* the Doctrine of the *Hebrews*, during his stay there for 13 years; *Theod. Serm.* 1.

If

If any of the Ancient Fathers have quoted any thing out of *Plato* concerning the Trinity, they look'd upon it not as *Plato*'s Invention, but as a Doctrine which he had either from *Moses*, or from those who had it from him. Not to say, That, in what manner soever *Plato* proposed this Doctrine, it is much at one. For his Notions about it are not very exact; and no wonder, since it was natural enough for a *Greek* to mix fabulous Notions with what he had from others, and they to adulterate it.

The truth which we profess, and draw from a Divine Original in this matter, is not at all concerned with *Plato*'s Visions. And yet, since the Notion of the Trinity could not possibly be framed by any mortal Man, Two considerable Uses may be made of *Plato*'s Notion about it. *First*, To shew, That this Doctrine is not of *Justin Martyr*'s Invention, since *Plato*, who lived five hundred Years before *Justin*, had scattered some Notions of it in his Books, which he had probably learned from the *Jews*, or from some other Philosophers who conversed with the *Jews*. And *Secondly*, To make Men sensible that the greatest Scholars among the Heathens did not find so many Absurdities in it, as the now *Socinians* do.

There is an Objection of greater moment than all the Objections which the *Unitarian* Authors can oppose, to my using the Authority of the Judgment of the Old Synagogue; and I will not dissemble it, although they have not been sensible of it. It is the Authority

thority of St. *Paul*, in his Epistle to *Timothy* and *Titus*, where he rejects with an abhorrence the *Jewish* Fables and Genealogies as the fruits of the falsly named Knowledge, ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, 1 *Tim.* vi. 20, 21. which he compares with a *Cancer*.

I acknowledg freely that *Ireneus*, *Lib.* 1. *c.* 20. and *Tertul. adv. Valentin.* understood those expressions of St. *Paul* against the *Gnosticks* of their time, who were come from *Simon Magus*. And I acknowledge with *Grotius* upon 1 *Tim.* i. 4. that by those infinite Genealogies, which are spoken of by St. *Paul* as coming from a vain Philosophy, and controverted by some of the Heretick *Jews*, Saint *Paul* had a mind to speak against several Notions of the then new *Jewish* Cabbala, which was in truth a mixture of the true Tradition of the Synagogue, and of the Notions of the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*, who had borrowed their Notions from the *Egyptians*. And I will not insist now too much upon the judgment of those who think probably enough that the *Egyptians* had borrowed their Notions from the *Jews*.

But after all I maintain that this Objection against this part of the new *Jewish* Cabala, which I mention as having such an impure birth, and having been corrupted amongst the *Jews*, doth not abate the authority of the proofs of the Trinity, and of the Notions of the Messias, which I have brought from all the *Jewish* Writers, and which hath nothing common with those innumerable *æones* which are mention'd by *Ireneus* and *Tertullian*, as received by the *Valentinians*, and which the Apostle

Apostle St. *Paul* hath condemned in some of the Doctors of the Synagogue.

Let us suppose that there had been in the Body of the Synagogue before Jesus Christ some *Sadducees*, and some *Baithusæi* whose Birth the *Jews* say was as old as that of the *Sadducees*, but who seem not so ancient, but to have their Origin from one *Simon Boethus* an *Alexandrian Jew* mentioned by *Josephus*. Let us suppose that from the time of the Persecutions of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, some amongst the *Jews* had adopted some *Platonick* or *Pythagorean* Notions, What is that to the Body of the *Jewish* Nation, which was not included in *Palestina* or *Egypt*, but spread every where?

To the contrary, I maintain justly that when Saint *Paul* condemns the *Jewish* Genealogies, he confirms all my Proofs from the *Jewish* Writers, who did not ground their Ideas upon the Doctrine of *Pythagoras* or *Plato*; but upon the Text of the *Old Testament*. When St. *Paul* hath used the same Notions which are in the Apocryphal Books, in *Philo*, and in the *Chaldee* Paraphrases, which no body accuses to have used those foolish Genealogies which were found amongst the *Valentinians*, and are to be found now amongst some of the *Cabbalists*; he hath secured my Argument taken from the pure Traditional Exposition of the Ancient *Jews*; this is all I have a mind to contend for in this matter, leaving those *Cabbalists*, who have mixed some heathenish Notions with the Ancient Divinity of the Fathers to shift for themselves, and being not concerned in all their other Speculations;

lations, although, since they have quite forgot this impure Origin they have very much laboured to uphold them upon some Texts of Scripture, but not well understood, and taken in another sense.

CHAP. XXIV.

An Answer to some Objections of the Modern Jews, *and of the* Unitarians.

THAT the Reader may be fully satisfied of the Truth which I have asserted by so many proofs taken out of the *Apocryphal* Books, of the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts, and out of *Philo* the most ancient *Jewish* Author we have as to expounding the Scripture; I must solve some difficulties made by the Modern *Jews* and *Socinians*, about the use of the word Λόγος, so frequent amongst the ancient Interpreters of Scripture.

Moses Maimonides who lived about the end of the Twelfth Century, affirms that the word *Memra*, which in *Chaldaick* is the same as that of Λόγος in *Greek*, was made use of by the ancient Paraphrasts on purpose to prevent Peoples thinking God had a Body: *More Nevoch. Lib.* 1. *c.* 21. He says also, that for the same reason they often used the words *Jekara*, Glory; *Shekinah*, Majesty, or habitation.

But he does manifestly wrong them: For if it had been so, they would have used that caution on other occasions, whereas they often

ten render places of Scripture, where mention is made only of the Lord, by these words, *before the face of the Lord*, which are apt to make people fancy God as being Corporeal. Besides, if what he says were true, they would have used the same caution where ever the Notion of his being Corporeal might be attributed to God. But it is certain that in many places, as apt to give that Notion of God, they do not use the word *Memra* or Λόγος: And as certain, that in many others, they use it where there is no danger of fancying God as having a Body. As *Gen.* xx. 21. *Exod.* ii. 25. *Exod.* vi. 8. *Exod.* xix. 17. *Lev.* xxvi. 46. *Numb.* xi. 20. *Numb.* xxiii. 21. and in many more, quoted by *Rittangel* on *Jetzira*, *pag.* 96. and in his Book *Libra Veritatis*.

Besides, it is so palpable that the ancient *Jews*, particularly *Philo*, have given the Notion of the Λόγος, as being a Divine Person, that *Maimonides* his answer can be no other than an Evasion. Nay it is observable that the word *Davar*, which in *Hebrew* signifies *Word*, is sometimes explained by that which is a true Person, in the Books of the Old *Jewish* Authors, who lived since Christ; even in those whose authority *Maimonides* does acknowledge: One of their ancient Books, namely *R. Akiba*'s *Letters*, has these words on the Letter *Gimel*, God said, *Thy Word is setled for ever in Heaven*; and this Word signifies nothing else but the healing Angel, as it is written, (*Psal.* cvii. 20.) *He sent his Word, and he healed them.* He must needs mean a Person, namely, an Angel, though perhaps he might mistake him for a created Angel.

Lastly,

Lastly, The Notion which *Maimonides* does suggest can never be applied to *Psal.* cx. 1. which is thus rendred by the Paraphrast, *The Lord said to his Word*: where the *Word* does manifestly denote the Messias, as the ancient *Jews* did fairly acknowledge. It is true, that in the common Edition, that place of the *Targum* is rendered thus, *The Lord said in his Word*, or *by his Word*; but it is a poor shift: For *in his Word*, does certainly signifie *to his Word*, or *of his Word*, the ב of the *Chaldeans* having naturally that double signification; as appears from many places. Thus it signifies *concerning*, or *of*, *Deut.* vi. 7. *Jer.* xxxi. 20. *Cant.* viii. 8. *Job* xix. 18. *Psal.* l. 20. It signifies *to*, in *Hos.* i. 2. *Hab.* ii. 1. *Zech.* i. 4, 9, 13, 14. *Numb.* xii. 2, 6. 1 *Sam.* xxv. 39.

You may to this observation about *Psal.* cx. 1. add that of the Text of *Jonathan*'s *Targum* on *Isa.* xxviii. 5. where the Messias is named in the room of the Lord of Hosts.

The second Evasion used by *Moses Maimonides* is *More Nevoch. pag.* 1. *c.* 23. where he tells us in what sense *Isaiah* said, that God comes out of his place, namely, that God does manifest his Word, which before was hidden from us. For, says he, all that is created by God is said to be created by his Word, as *Psal.* xxxiii. *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the breath of his mouth*: By a comparison taken from Kings, who do what they have a mind to, by their word, as by an Instrument. For God needs no Instrument to work by, but he works by his bare Will; neither has he any Word properly so called. Thus far *Maimonides*.

 But

But it is not true, as I shewed before, that *the Word* in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, signifies no more than the manifestation of the Will of God. I have quoted so many places out of the *Apocryphal* Books, out of *Philo*, and out of the Paraphrase it self, which shew the contrary, that *Maimonides* is not to be believed upon his bare word against so many formal proofs. It is not true neither, that *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. expresses only the bare act of the Will of God, as *Maimonides* does suppose. I shewed before that the great Authors of the *Jewish* Traditions (which *Maimonides* was to follow when he writ his *More Nevochim*) give another sense to those words, and do acknowledge that they do establish the Personality of the Λόγος, and of the Holy Ghost; which they do express by the second and third *Sephira*, or Emanation, in the Divine Essence.

That which made *Maimonides* stumble, was that he believed that Christians made the *Word* to be an Instrument different from God, which is very far from their opinion. For they do, as well as *Philo*, apprehend the *Word* as a Person distinct from the Father, but not of a different nature from his; but having the same Will and Operation common to him and the Father, and this they have by Divine Revelation.

A famous *Socinian* whom I mentioned already, being hard put to it, by the Authority of the *Targums*, has endeavoured in a Tract which he writ (and which has this Title, *Disceptatio de Verbo, vel Sermone Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphrastas Chaldæos, Jonathan,*

Jonathan, Onkelos, & Targum Hierosolymitanum) to shake it off, by boldly affirming that *the Word of the Lord*, is barely used by them to express the following things: The Decree of God: His Commands: His inward Deliberation: His Promise: His Covenant and his Oath to the *Israelites*: His design to punish or to do good: A Prophetick Revelation: The Providence which protected good Men. In short, *the Word* by which God does promise or threaten, and declare what he is resolved to do: Of which the said Author pretendeth to give many instances.

I have already proved how false this is what that Author so positively affirms, that the term *Word* is never found to be used by the Paraphrasts, to denote a Person. The very place which I just now quoted out of *R. Akiba*'s Alphabet, were enough to confute him. I need not repeat neither what I said, that supposing all were true which he affirms of the use of the word *Memra* in the Paraphrasts, yet he could not but acknowledge that *Philo* gives quite another Notion of the Λόγος, namely, as of a real Person; in which he visibly follows the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*; The *Unitarians* of this Kingdom do for that reason reject *Philo*'s Works as being Supposititious, and written after our Saviour's time.

I say therefore that the sense which he puts upon the *Targums*, is very far from the true meaning of the words which they use when they speak of the Λόγος in many places. I shall not examine whether in any place of the *Targums* the word *Memra* is used instead

stead of that of *Davar*, which in *Hebrew* signifies the Word or Command of God. *Rittangel* positively denies it: And the truth is that the *Targums* commonly render the word *Davar* by *Pitgama*, and not by *Memra*. To be fully satisfied of it, one needs but take an *Hebrew* Concordance upon the word *Davar*, and search whether the Paraphrasts ever rendered it by *Memra*.

But supposing *Rittangel* should deny the thing too positively, however the *Targumists* do so exactly distinguish *the Word* when they mention him as a Divine Person, that it is impossible to mistake him in all places, by putting upon them those senses which the *Socinian* Author endeavours to affix to them, that he may destroy the Notion which they give of *the Word*, as being a Divine Person. And though I have already alledged many proofs of it, yet this being a matter of great moment I will again briefly speak to it, to confute that Author, and those who shall borrow his Arguments.

Let an impartial Reader judge whether any of the *Socinian* Author's senses can be applied to the word *Memra*, in *Onkelos* his *Targum*, *Gen.* iii. 8. They heard the voice of the Word of the Lord. And *Gen.* xv. 1, 5, 9. where the *Word* appeared to *Abraham*, brought him forth, and commanded him to offer a Sacrifice to him.

And suppose that the word *Memra* should in some places have some of the senses which the *Socinian* Author mentions, does it follow that it has not in many other places the sense we give to it, and which *Philo* gave to

to it before Christ? Let it be granted it signifies sometimes the Command of God, as *Gen.* xxii. 18. can it have the same sense in a number of places where mention is made of the Laws of the Word of the Lord? Let the word *Memra* be taken sometimes in the *Targums* for the Decree of God, can it be taken in that sense in *Jonathan*'s *Targum* on *Hag.* ii. 6. where it is distinguisht from that Decree? or in those lately Printed in the Books of *Chronicles*, where mention is made of the Decree of *the Word* of the Lord, as 1 *Chron.* xii. 23. Were it not a ridiculous Tautology, if in that place *the Word* should be said to signifie the Decree? The same may be said of all other places where the Decree of the Word is spoken of, as 2 *Chron.* vi. 4, 15. xxix. 23. xxxiii. 3.

Supposing that *Memra* signifies sometimes the Word of God, can it signifie so too, where we read, *according to the word of the Memra*, 1 *Chron.* xxix. 23. Let it be granted that *the Word* signifies sometimes the Oracles of God, can it signifie them also, where it is expresly distinguisht from them, as 2 *Chron.* xx. 20. *ch.* xxxvi. 12. And from the Law of God in the same place? The truth is, the Paraphrast does suppose that it was the *Memra* who gave the Law and the Oracles to the *Jews*: And that it was for refusing to offer Sacrifices to him, that the *Jews* often fell into Idolatry, 2 *Chron.* xiii. 11. *ch.* xxviii. 19. xxix. 19. xxx. 5.

There are so many proofs, that the Paraphrasts mention it in many places in the very same sense the Old *Jews* gave to it, who acknow-

knowledged the *Word* of God to be a Person, that no Man can mistake, unless he does it wilfully. Many of their Works have been Printed almost two hundred years, and I have produced so many proofs out of them, that I need not alledge any more. I shall therefore only produce a few out of the two Books of *Chronicles*, which the Learned *Beckius* publisht about sixteen years ago.

The *Targum* on those two Books of *Chronicles* affirms the following things. That it is the Λόγος who appeared in most Apparitions in which God appeared to the Patriarchs: To *Abraham*, to whom he spoke from between the Victims, *Gen.* xv. 1 *Chron.* vii. 21. To *Solomon*, 2 *Chron.* vii. 12. To *Phinehas*, 1 *Chron.* ix. 20. To *David*, 1 *Chron.* xvii. 2. To *Solomon*, 1 *Chron.* xxii. 11.

That the Angel who hindered *Abraham* from killing *Isaac*, was the *Word* of God, 2 *Chron.* iii. 1.

He plainly distinguishes the Angel from the Λόγος, 1 *Chron.* xiv. 15. and xv. 1. He affirms that *the Word* sent *Gabriel* to help *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 20. whereas *David* had said he sent his *Word* and healed them, *Psal.* cvii. 20. See *Cosri*, *pag.* 45.

He affirms that to *the Word* the Temple was built, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 1, 3. and 2 *Chron.* vi. 1, 10. and xx. 8. To whom Sacrifices were offered, 2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 17.

David exhorts *Solomon* in the presence of all the People, and of the Word of the Lord who chose him King, to keep the Law of God, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 8, 10. He says that the Judges judg before the Word, and before the Holy Spirit, 2 *Chron.* xix. 6. He

He affirms that it was the *Word* who helped *David*, 1 *Chron.* xi. 9. xii. 18. And *Solomon*, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 20. And *Abijah* against *Jeroboam*, 2 *Chron.* xiii. 15.

That the faithful seek the Word of the Lord, and his Power, and ever regard his Face, 1 *Chron.* xvi. 10, 11.

He says the *Word* decreed with God, 2 *Chron.* vi. 4.

That the *Word* helps them that trust in him, and destroys the wicked, 1 *Chron.* xii. 18. xvii. 2. 2 *Chron.* xiii. 18. and xiv. 11. and xv. 2. and xvi. 7, 8. and xx. 20. and xxv. 7. and xxxii. 8. and xvii. 3. and xviii. 31. and xx. 22, 29.

That the *Word* drove out of *Canaan* the Inhabitants of it, 2 *Chron.* xx. 7. and fought for *Israel*, 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 8.

That by *Solomon*'s Orders the *Word* was pray'd to, 2 *Chron.* xx. 8.

That Men are adjured by the Name of the Word, 2 *Chron.* xviii. 15. Speak according to the mouth of the Word, 2 *Chron.* xxii. 7. That it was the *Word* that gave *Moses* leave to shew the Tables of the Law, 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 31.

That the *Word* saved *Hezekiah* from being burnt in the fire, through which *Ahaz* made his other Children to pass, 2 *Chron.* xxviii. 3.

That the *Word* blest the People, 2 *Chron.* xxxi. 10.

That the Prophets spoke to *Manasseh* in the Name of the *Word* of the Lord, who is the God of *Israel*, 2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 18.

That Men repent before the *Word* of the Lord, 2 *Chron.* xxxiv. 27.

That

That the *Word* of the Lord the God of Heaven commanded *Cyrus* to build him a Temple, 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 23.

In a word the Author of this *Targum* leaves no room to doubt, but that by the *Word* he understood and meant in many places a Divine Person, a Principle of Action, such as we conceive him to be. Though in some others he might use the word *Word* in those other different Significations, which the *Socinian* Author who writ against *Wecknerus*, was pleased to put upon it.

Another Objection of the same *Socinian* Author, which seems more plausible is this, That there are some places in the *Targum*, where instead of the Holy Spirit, as it is in the *Hebrew*, they render it by *Memra*, or *the Word*; of which he gives some instances, as *Isa.* xxx. 28. *Zech.* iv. 6. To which may be added, *Isa.* xlviii. 16. which in the *Hebrew* is, *the Lord and his Spirit has sent me*; and in the Paraphrase, *the Lord and his Word.*

I answer, that though in some few places the *Targums* have a confused Notion of the thing, yet this ought not to ballance the constant stile of those Books, in others, and much more numerous places: It being easie to confound those Notions before the Gospel-times, when they were not, by much, so clearly apprehended, as they have been since. Otherwise, the stile of the *Targums* is pretty equal: And here comes in very naturally *Maimonides* his observation about the stile of *Onkelos* his Paraphrase, which he was well versed in. He thinks in his *More Nevochim*, *p.* 1. *c.* 48. that three or four places of the *Targum*, in which his remark about the constant method had no room, might have been altered; and wishes he could get some Copies of it, more ancient than those he used; and owns that he did not well apprehend the reason which had obliged the Paraphrast to render, in some places otherwise than he usually rendered, which yet he did for great reasons.

One great Objection of the *Socinian* Author, which he much insists upon, is that the Christians never quoted the Authority of the *Targum* against the *Jews*, before *Galatinus*, who lived at the beginning of the 16*th*. Century. But that since him, *Heinsius*, *Vechnerus*, and some others, followed him in that fancy.

Supposing this to be true, I cannot see what advantage it would be to him. Put case the Ancients were not capable Scholars enough to peruse the *Jewish* Books, can this ever prejudice truth? And ought not they to be received, how late soever they come, by whose care soever they be vindicated and asserted?

But it is absolutely false that Christians before *Galatinus*, have nothing of the *Jewish* Opinions about this matter. I shewed in the vii. *Chap.* of this Book, that *Ribera* and others, which would have these Paraphrases to be written after St. *Jerome*, are much mistaken: And consequently this *Socinian* Author who followed them, and *Vorstius* in his Notes on *Tsemach David*, was also mistaken about the Antiquity of the *Targums*. But our *Socinian* says, if they are so ancient, how comes it to pass

pass that they have not been quoted by the Christians that disputed against the *Jews* in ancienter Times? They were very few of ancient Christians that writ upon these matters. And of them yet fewer understood the *Chaldee*, or even the *Hebrew* Tongue; most of them rested upon the Authority of *Philo*, of the Book of Wisdom, and of other Authors, who were famous among the *Jews* before Christ, and who had writ full enough upon this Subject, as may be seen by what *Eusebius* quotes out of them. And no doubt those places of *Philo*, and those other *Jewish* Writers, were well known to *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and to *Origen*, whose Work *Eusebius* much followed, as appears by reading his Books, and as he himself does acknowledge.

The *Socinian* Author affirms too positively, that *Galatinus* is the first that used that Authority of the *Targums*. He must not suppose a thing which is absolutely false. *Origin, lib.* 4. *in Celsum*, speaks of a Dispute between *Jason* and *Papiscus*, in which saith *Origin*, *Christianus ex Judaicis Scriptoribus cum Judæo describitur disputans, & plane demonstrans quæ de Christo extant & vaticinia Jesu ipsi congruere*, &c. What were those Writings of the *Jews*, but the *Targums*, who had translated *Becocma* for *Breschith*, according to the *Jewish* Notion which I have explained so many times; and for which St. *Jerome* reflects upon *Jason*, who hath quoted the *Targums*, as if he hath read them in *Hebrew*.

Besides, it appears by *Justin* the Martyr's Dialogue with *Trypho*, That in his time some *Jews*

Jews had already endeavoured to invalidate the Proofs taken out of Scripture in their so frequent Stile, about the λόγος, as we see them in the *Targums*. For *Justin* undertakes to prove, that the *Word* is not barely an Attribute in God, nor an Angel, but a Person, and a true Principle of Action. And this he proves by his Apparitions, and by other Characters and Signs of a real Person, such as are his executing his Father's Counsels, his being his Off-spring, and his Son, properly so called. Here I must add one thing, which is, that St. *Jerome* hath express'd the Sense of the *Targum* in many places, especially upon the Prophets, which Sense he had no doubt from the learned *Jews* whom he had consulted, and they from the *Targums*. I confess, that *Jerome* never made his business to write against the *Jews*; nor did any other Christian, that was ever able to make use of the *Targums*. Some, indeed, of the Fathers took the pains to learn *Hebrew*, because the Old Testament was writ in that Language; but those were very few, and none of them ever troubled himself with the *Chaldee*. St. *Jerome* himself, how skilful soever in the *Hebrew*, understood not the *Chaldee*, as appears by his Writings. The first that set himself to beat the *Jews* with their own Weapons, was *Raimundus Martini*, a convert *Jew*, who lived about the Year of Christ, 1260. He writ a Book against them, call'd *Pugio Fidei*, which shews he had well studied their *Rabbins*, and he makes use of their *Targums* to very good purpose. Out of this Book, there was another compos'd, and call'd *Victoria adversus*

versus Judæos, by *Porchetus Salvaticus*, that is said to have lived in the next Century. Neither of their Books was much considered in those ignorant times wherein they lived. So that when Learning came more in request, one might venture to make use of their labours, and set them forth as his own, with little danger of being discover'd. This very thing was done by *Galatinus*, who lived about the end of the Fifteenth Century. He did with great Impudence almost transcribe his Notions, and the Arguments against the *Jews* out of that Work of *Porchetus*, without so much as mentioning his Name. That *Socinian* mentions the *Pugio* in the close of that Book against *Vechner*, by which it may be supposed he read that Book of *Raimundus* above mentioned. Which if he did, and consider'd it with *Galatinus*, he could not but see that this Work of *Galatinus* was, as to the main of it, a Stream from that Fountain of *Raimund's Pugio*. And if he saw it, he did very disingenuously in making *Galatinus* the first among Christians that made use of the *Jewish* Notions.

The last Objection of the *Unitarians* (against what I have proved about the *Word's* being a Person, from the consent of the *Chaldee* Paraphrases, when they speak of the *Memra* of the Lord, and his Actions) is made by the same *Socinian* Author, who affirms, that in the *Targums* the *Memra* implies no more than that God works by himself, because the word *Memra* is used of Men, as well as of God.

I will

I will not deny but that here and there in the *Targums*, the word *Memra* has that Sense, as *Hoespan* well observes in his Notes on *Psalm* cx. and produces many Instances of it, to which many more might be added.

But when all is done, this Objection, much the same with that of *Moses Maimonides*, can't absolutely take away that force of those Texts where the *Memra* is used of God; and to be satisfied of this, it is but making the following Reflexions.

First, That *Philo*, one of the most famous *Jews* of *Egypt*, very well apprehended, and clearly declared, That by the λόγος, which answers to the Hebrew *Memra*, the old *Jews* understood a real Principle of Action, such as we call a Person. *Secondly*, That the *Jewish* Authors more ancient than *Philo*, had the very same Notion of it, as may be seen in the Book of *Baruch*, and in that of Wisdom, the Notions of which *Philo* has clearly followed in his Book, *de Agric. apud Euseb. de Præpar. Evang. pag.* 323. And *Lastly*, That even since Christ, the *Cabalistical* Authors followed, and to this day do follow the same Notion; making use of those places where the *Memra* and the *Cochma*, that is to say, the λόγος are mentioned; to make out their second *Sephira*, as I shewed before.

Neither must it seem strange, that the *Jewish* Paraphrase should use that word in various Senses: For the word λόγος had many Senses in *Greek*, and so might that of *Memra* have in *Chaldee*, without prejudicing our Arguments. For the places which I have quoted

quoted are of that nature, that there can be no Equivocation in them, as any Man will own, that is not resolved to dispute against truth.

CHAP. XXV.

An Answer to an Objection against the Notions of the Old Jews *compared with those of the new Ones:*

A Greater Objection than all these, may be very naturally made by a Judicious Reader, concerning what I said of the Testimonies of the *Jews* before Christ, about the distinction of Divine Persons, and the Divinity of the Λόγος. On the one side, may he say, you own that the *Jews* after Christ, have opposed the Doctrine of the Trinity, as being contrary to the Unity of God; there are plain proofs of it, even in the second Century. And it is certain that *Trypho* did not believe that the Messias was to be any other than a meer Man, and so did the *Jews* believe as it is witnessed by *Orig. lib.2. contr. Cels. pag.*79. And on the other side you affirm that the *Jews* in the old times before Christ taught a Doctrine much like that of the Trinity; and that all their ancient Authors affirmed that the Messias was to have the Λόγος dwelling in him.

In answer to this difficulty, I cannot say that the *Jews* have altered their opinion upon this Subject, since the beginning of Christianity; for to this day their Cabalistical Doctors, whom they respect as great Divines, do profess the same which *Philo* and the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts did. I cannot say neither that they are divided into two Sects, the one of which follows these Notions, the other opposes them: For though the Cabalists are fewer in number than those who stick to the letter of the Law, and study only to understand the Ceremonies of it, to which they add the Traditions contained in the *Misna*, and the *Guemarra*, yet it is certain that there is no great controversie between them about those Doctrines which I have mentioned.

I answer therefore, first by owning that whatever Notions the old *Jews* had of these matters, they were neither so clear or distinct but that they were mixt with divers Errors, of which there are many instances both in *Philo* and the *Targums*.

Secondly, I maintain withal, that how confused soever some of those Notions are in those ancient Authors, yet it is certain that those *Jews* that turn Christians do it by going upon Principles I have mentioned, namely by following what is in them conformable to Scripture, and rejecting what is contrary to it. And I dare affirm that all Learned *Jews* who sincerely turn Christians, do it by reflecting upon those old *Jewish* Principles, which they originally find in the Old Testament, and afterwards to be agreeable with the Principles of Christianity. This plainly appears in the Dialogue between *Justin* the *Martyr*, and *Trypho* a *Jew*. For *Justin* having

 quoted

quoted those places out of the Old Testament, in which God calls the Messias, his Son, the Almighty God, and one that is to be adored. *Trypho* answers in these words, *I allow that those so many and so great proofs are enough to perswade, Pag.* 302. *B.* All the difficulty he makes, is about the Application which Christians and *Justin* in particular, made to Christ, of those places of Scripture. For it appears that *Trypho* applying *Psal.* cx. and *Isa.* ix. to *Hezekiah*, was of the same opinion with *Hillel*, who afterwards affirmed that *Hezekiah* was the promised Messias, and that no other was to be expected.

Thirdly, I say farther, that the *Jews* prepossessed with the opinion of the Messias's coming to have a Temporal Kingdom, and offended by the mean Circumstances of Christ and his Apostles, did reject Christ's Revelation, and were thereby hindered from seeing, how conformable it was with their old Notions. This will not seem strange to one that considers the force of their prejudices, and what was done by their Ancestors in a like case. For these killed the Prophets, no doubt finding much contradiction at first, as they imagin'd, between the old Prophecies and the new ones, for which cause they rejected the new Prophets, and put the Authors of them to death: Though afterwards they were forced to receive those very Prophecies, the Authors of which they had put to death, as going upon the same Grounds with the old Prophecies, the Truth and Authority of which they acknowledged.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, I say, that the *Jews* who lived immediately after Christ, endeavoured to represent his being put to death, as a just and legal Act; for tho' the *Synagogue had Excommunicated him*, yet he had continued to teach to draw his Disciples from observing the Law; so that they pretended that he was a false Prophet; that he wrought his Miracles by the power of the Devil; and that he had been justly punisht, according to the Law, *Deut.* xiii. 5. and xviii. 20. To this end, before the destruction of *Jerusalem* they sent to their Synagogues all the World over, Men of great Authority, to make them receive and subscribe the *Anathema* which they had drawn up against Christ and his Disciples; as *Justin* the *Martyr* tells us in his *Dialogue with Trypho, pag.* 234. *E.* To which *Anathema* it seems St. *Paul* alludes *Heb.* vi. 6. And 1 *Cor.* xvi. 22. as may be seen in the very place of *Justin* now quoted, and in *pag.* 266. *E.*

In the fifth place, I say, that soon after the Preaching of the Gospel they begun to defame our Saviour horribly, about the manner of his Birth, as may be seen in a Book called *Toledoth Jesu*, which was known long before *Origen*: And about his Life and Conversation, as may be seen in the *Talmud.* They likewise defamed the Apostles, as Magicians, who laboured to draw off the People from observing the Law. And though such Calumnies were very gross, and visibly false, yet they found credit with their people to make them cry down Christianity; as it is usual in such cases. Thus when *Papists* im-

pute to *Protestants*, that they believe thus and thus, though their Accusations are visibly false, and themselves are forced to acknowledge it, yet at the same time they prevail with their People, and turn them quite from the *Protestants*.

I say in the sixth place, that afterwards they yet more horribly traduced our Saviour, accusing him to have trained up his Disciples to Idolatry, and to have himself been guilty of it. This they took occasion to do, from the superstitious respects some Christians had for the Cross; which made them give out, that Jesus Christ having been Excommunicated by his Master, and refused the Absolution which he begged of him; thereupon he had withdrawn himself from him, and brought up his Disciples after his example, to worship a Brick, by which they understood the figure of a Cross. *Sanhedrin, fol.* 107. & *Sota, fol.* 47.

Lastly, It may be observed, that the many Heresies which arose in after-times among Christians concerning our Saviour's Person and Natures, gave the *Jews* very great prejudices against the Gospel. The *Arians* for two hundred years; then the *Nestorians*, and *Eutychians*, but chiefly the *Tritheists*, visibly taught Doctrines contrary to truth. In particular the Writings of *John Philoponus*, who was a *Tritheist* were much perused by the *Mahometans* and *Jews*, because they begun to study Philosophy, (at which *John Philoponus* was very good) as *Maimonides* tells us, *More Nevochim, p.g.* 1. *ch.* 71. Now this Heresie destroying the Unity of God, which is the fundamental Article of the *Jewish* Religion, could not but give the *Jews* just matter of horror and detestation for Christianity.

Besides, the *Jews* themselves confess that in their dispersion they have lost the knowledge of many of the Mysteries of their Religion. One cannot think how it could be otherwise, if one considers, 1. The long time they have been dispersed, which confounds the most distinct, and darkens the clearest matters. 2. Their extreme misery in so long a captivity, which subjected them to so many different Nations, and many of them such as had a particular hatred both of their Nation and Religion. 3. But chiefly if one considers that those Mysteries were communicated only to a few Learned Men, and kept from the knowledge of the common people; as *Maimonides* does acknowledg, and proves by many Reflections worth considering, in *More Nevoch. p.*1. *ch.*71.

After this, the *Jews* having still great aversion to Christians, it ought not to seem strange that the Cabalists should be so few in number among them; and that most of the *Jewish* Doctors should follow in their Disputes against Christians, Explications and Notions contrary to Scripture, about the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Messias. For, even before Christ there were amongst them many Errors crept amongst some of them, about those matters; so that they that lived after Christ did easily follow the worst Explication, and prefer it before the better, in the heats of their Disputes against Christians.

 Nei-

Neither is it to be wondered at, that the same Men should maintain contrary Propositions, and defend them equally in their turns, as they come to have to do with different adversaries. The *Papists* are a remarkable instance of this; when they dispute and write against the *Eutychians*, to prove the Truth of Christ's Human Nature, one would admire at the strength and soundness of their Arguments: But when they are upon the manner of our Saviour's existence in the Sacrament, as to his Flesh and Blood, nothing can be more contrary to their former Positions, than what they affirm on this occasion; they destroy quite what they said before, and one would think they had forgot themselves.

The *Jews* do perfectly like the *Papists* in this; and having less knowledg, and labouring under greater prejudices than they, no wonder if they maintain contrary Principles one to another. This may be seen in some of the old Hereticks, which sprung from amongst the *Jews*, and brought their Opinions into the Christian Religion; the *Cerinthians* for instance, who owned that the *Word* had dwelt in Christ, but did imagin that it was but for a certain time. And if the *Patripassians*, and afterwards the *Sabellians* who had the clear Revelation of the Gospel, yet for all this, opposed the Doctrine of the Trinity, as contrary to the Unity of God, and affirmed that there was in God but one Person which had appeared under three differing Names; It ought not to appear strange that the *Jews* blinded by their hatred against Christians, should

should through their prejudices, apprehend that what their old Masters taught about the three *Sephiroth*, did not signifie three Persons in God, but only the three different manners in which God works by one and the same Person.

I have already hinted, that the *Jews* even about the end of the fourth Century had great offence given them by the Christians in their Worship of Saints and Relicks; which being at last as Idolatrous as the Heathenish, made the *Jews* look upon them as no other than Heathens. This may be seen in many places of the *Talmud*, which they pretend was finisht about five hundred years after Christ. But especially in their Additions to those Books which they made when Idolatry was so ripe both in the East and the West.

One might make a Book of those too just Accusations of the *Jews* against the Christians, which caused them to be Banisht out of many Kingdoms. The *Dominican* Friers made a Collection of most of them in the Thirteenth Century, when Christians going much into the *Holy Land*, did something retrieve their lost knowledg of the *Greek* and other Eastern Languages. Since that time the *Jews* transcribing their *Talmud*, and their other ancient Books, begun to use the words of *Samaritans*, instead of those of Apostates and Hereticks, which they used before in speaking of Christians, against whom in the old Times they had made many Rules.

Besides, the violent and Antichristian methods which some Christian Princes used against them by a false Principle of Religion to

to make them, against their Will, profess Christianity, made them look upon Christians as no better than savage Beasts, which besides their outward Form had nothing of Humanity, and regarded neither Justice nor Religion: For, though their own *Jewish* Principles are persecuting enough, yet they can't but condemn the same Principles when used against them; nothing being more apt to make Men reject Truth, than Persecution, because Conscience ought to be instructed not inslaved, as Experience in all Ages does abundantly confirm.

It cannot be denied but that the *Jews* Crucified Christ for affirming himself to be the Son of God. Neither can it be supposed that he meant no more by it, but that he was God's adoptive Son, as the *Jews* were, or some of their Kings: For, he spoke in an ordinary plain intelligible sense. He meant therefore by it, not only that he was the Messias, but that the *Word* of God dwelt in him, the same which the *Jews* acknowledged to be the Off-spring of God. And for this the *Jews* Crucifyed him, as he hints plainly enough in the Parable of the Husbandmen, for he designs the Prophets by the name of meer Servants, and himself he calls the Son, in opposition to the Prophets; and tells the Scribes and Pharisees, that though they knew him to be such, yet would they for all this put him to death. So that by Crucifying him they did purpose to destroy a Person whom they knew to be the true Messias, but by whom they were like to have lost their credit with the People; He having called them

them a parcel of Hypocrites, who made a Trade of Religion, who in their hearts laught at it, and only endeavoured to get by it. This is the meaning of those words which Christ puts in their mouths, and which was near really in their hearts, *Come let us kill him, and let us seise on his inheritance.* And not only out of hatred, but out of policy also, they opposed him, that they might keep themselves safe and quiet. They lookt for a Conquering Messias, who should subdue all Nations, and bring all their Enemies under them. But here they saw Christ, a Man destitute of all human succours necessary to bring about so great a design: They thought it therefore more advisable to set him aside without following his Doctrine, than to espouse a Quarrel which might incense the *Romans* against them, and cause the ruin of their Nation: This they meant by saying, *The Romans shall come and take away both our place and Nation.*

To be satisfied of this, one ought to observe that Speculative Doctrines are not the common Rules of publick Deliberations and Counsels. Let the *Papists* be an instance of it. They proceed in their decisions upon the Principle of the Pope's Infallibility; when at the same time hardly any one of them believes it, and many do confute it both by reasons and matters of fact not to be answered.

The *Jews* likewise, though they knew themselves to be fallible enough, yet *Papists* like they acted in their publick Assembly, as if they had been infallible. And this was enough to

to satisfie those who could not distinguish, or would not further inquire into the business, which was the case of most ordinary people. Accordingly, of the two Thieves that were Crucifyed with Christ, one had observed the Injustice of that violent hatred the *Jews* had for him: But the other curs'd him looking on him as a false Prophet, justly condemned by the greatest Authority known to him in the World.

Lastly, It is certain, that when a decision is once made, the People for the most part, do not much inquire into the justice or reasonableness of it, but quietly acquiesce in it, and relye upon the Authority of those who made it. The *Jews* had a particular reason to do so, being assured that their Religion came from God, and not seeing any danger in professing it, as it was delivered to them by their Forefathers. And this is now the only reason they have for professing *Judaism*; Neither is it to be wondered at, that the Notions the old *Jews* had of it should make but little impression on their minds, no more than the Doctrines of their Doctors, which they call *Cabalists*, because they follow the Traditions of the old Synagogue.

For their late Teachers, moved by a spirit of contradiction, have raised many new Questions about the Characters of the Messias, and other like Articles of Religion, controverted between them and the Christians, by which they have plunged their People into inextricable difficulties; and they are so exasperated now against us, that they can hardly be calm enough to take notice of those visible

visible Contradictions which may be seen between their ancient Writers, and their now Doctors writing upon the same subject. They deny now adays what the old *Jews* freely granted, and their whole study is to keep their People in a blind submission to their Authority: Insomuch that they have this Maxim amongst them, that the People are obliged to believe that the right Hand is the left, when their Rabbies have once so declared. But I shall make some more particular Reflections upon the proceedings of the now *Jews*, and shew that their obstinacy is altogether unreasonable, and that there is no fairness at all in their way of disputing against Christians.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

That the Jews have laid aside the Old Explications of their Forefathers, the better to defend themselves in their Disputes with the Christians.

Euſ. dem. Ev. Lib. iv. 1.

IT hath been long ſince obſerved by *Euſebius* that the *Jews* have varied from the belief of their Fathers as to the ſenſe of ſeveral places in the Old Teſtament, and it is no more than they themſelves freely own in their Diſputes with us. The ſpirit of Diſputation hath wrought much the ſame effect among the *Papiſts*, (as *Maldonat* was not aſhamed to confeſs, on St. *John, ch.* vi.) Of this alteration in the *Jewiſh* Sentiments, (which is acknowledged by one of the *Socinian* Writers, *viz. Volzogenius* in *Luc.* xxiv. 27.) *R. Salomon Jarchi* fully witneſſes. He was the moſt famous Commentator the *Jews* had about five hundred years ago; yet he in his Expoſition of *Pſal.* xxi. 1. hath theſe words, Our Maſters did underſtand this *Pſalm* of the Meſſias, (as indeed they did *Gemar.* on *Talm. tr. Maſſechet* סוכה *ch.* v. *&* *Targ.* on this *Pſalm*, ver. 8, *&* 18.) but it is better to underſtand it of *David* himſelf, that we may the more eaſily reply to the Hereticks, that abuſe ſome paſſages in it.

But this is not the only place where the *Jews* have changed the faith of their ancient Maſters. There are many others examples of it,

it, ſome of the chief of which I ſhall produce, after I have obſerved the ſeveral degrees by which they arrived to ſo wide a diſagreement with their Anceſtors.

1. Their Doctors, as I have already noted, did early introduce new Notions of ſeveral Texts of the Old Teſtament. I ſpeak not now of their Fabulous fancies only, ſuch as that of *Philo*, who *Lib. de Septenar.* ſuppoſes the Voice of God uttered on Mount *Sinai*, to have been heard in all parts of the World; to which the *Jews*, *Pirke Eliez. c.* 41. *Tankuma, fol.* 73. *col.* 1. have added many more new conceits; but I ſpeak of ſuch their Explications, as were contrary to, and in effect did overthrow the ancient Notions of the Prophets. As for inſtance, where *Philo* ſeems in ſome manner to maintain the Tranſmigration * of Souls, where he delivers the Doctrine of the Souls Preexiſtence before the Body †, where he ſeems to hint the Eternity of Matter, according to *Plato* *, although it is certain in his Treatiſe of Providence, he doth aſſert the Creation of Matter.

** Lib. de Somn. pag. 455.*
† De Mund. p. 891.
** Mund. op. p. 214. De mund. Incor. pag. 728. A. De Vitat. off. p. 669. F.*

2*ly*. It is obſervable that after the Emperour *Hadrian*'s time, ſome of the *Jews* who expected the Meſſias, according to *Daniel*'s Prophecy of the *Seventy Weeks*, but were out in their Accounts of thoſe Weeks, had almoſt intirely loſt the hopes of his coming: This we gather from the Hiſtory of *R. Hillel in Gemara, tit. Sanhed. fol.* 98. *col.* 2. *&* *fol.* 99. *col.* 1. who maintained that the Promiſe of the Meſſias was accompliſhed in the Perſon of *Hezekiah*, and that there was no more Meſſiah to be expected by the *Jews*. Now they ſay

say that this *Hillel* was the Grandson to *R. Juda* the Compiler of the *Misna*.

3. We see how careless they have been in preserving the *Apocryphal* Books formerly in esteem with them, and which indeed but for the Christians, had totally perished. *Philo* has borrowed some of his Notions in his 2*d*. Book of *Agriculture*; and let any one compare *Job* xxviii. 20. *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. *Prov.* viii. 12, 22. with what is written *Wisdom* vi. 24, 22. and so on till *Chap.* viii. 11. and he will find a great likeness, if not the very same Notions and words.

4. Through the same neglect they have quite lost the Works of other ancient and famous *Jews*, as namely of *Philo* the *Jew*, who was in such reputation amongst them, as to be chosen the Agent or Deputy of the *Alexandrian Jews* in their Embassy to the *Roman* Emperour; and of *Aristobulus*, who lived in the time of the *Ptolomees*, and Dedicated to one of them his Explication of the Law, of which we have a fragment in *Eusebius*; which shews that his Notions were the same with *Philo's*, and that they did generally prevail in *Egypt*, before Christ's Incarnation, as well in the time of *Philo*.

It is no hard matter to give some reasons of this neglect. For, 1. their first destruction by *Titus*, and after by *Hadrian*, involved with it a great part of their Books. They thought then only of saving their Bibles, with which (it seems) their *Targum* was joined, and so this came to be preserved with the Scriptures. This was by the great care of *Josephus* (as he himself relates) desiring of *Titus* this favour alone, that he might preserve the Sacred Books.

2. After their second destruction by *Hadrian*, they applied themselves straight to gather their Traditions and Customs, which now make the Body of their *Misna*, or Second Law, as they call it. This spent them a deal of time: For to compose such a work, it was necessary to collect the several pieces in the hands of several men, who had drawn certain Memoirs for the observation of every Law that did more immediately concern them.

3. They then began to increase their hatred for the study of the *Greek* Tongue, abandoning themselves wholly to the study of their Traditions. This we see in the *Misna Mas. sota c.* 9. § 14.

4. About this time, being pressed with Arguments out of these Books by the Christians that disputed against them, they thought best to reject the Works themselves: And because the Christians used the LXX Version against them, they invented several Lyes to discredit it, as we see in the *Gemara* of *Megilla*; and lest that should not do, they made it their business to find out some that were able to make a new Version; such as *Aquila* in the time of *Hadrian*, and *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, who turn'd *Jews* toward the end of the Second Century. These Three Interpreters were designed to change the Sense of those Texts which the Christians (according to the Old *Jewish* Traditions) did refer to the *Messias*. Of this *Justin Martyr* has given some Instances in his Dialogue with *Trypho*,

Trypho, *R. Akiba*'s great Friend; and we see that St. *Jerom*, *Ep.* 89. complains of the same.

And now what wonder is it, if the *Jews* in this humour did neglect, or rather rejected those Apocryphal Books, whose Authority in some points were set up against them by the Christians, as were the Books of *Baruch*, *Wisdom*, and *Ecclesiasticus*?

As for *Philo*, tho he wrote in a lofty Stile, and after an Allegorical way, (and therefore we find in the *Rabboth* several Thoughts common to him and the Cabalists, and other Allegorical Authors, whose Notions are gathered in the *Rabboth*); yet the *Jews* soon lost all esteem for his Works. First, Because he writ in *Greek*, which was a Language most despised by them at this time; they having establish'd it as a Maxim, That he who brought up his Children in the *Greek* Tongue was cursed, as he who fed Swine. *Bava kama fol.* 82. *col.* 1. & *Sota fol.* 49. *col.* 2. Secondly, Because some Christians challenged him for their own. For finding some of his Principles to be agreeable to those of the Christian Religion, it came into their head (tho it is a Fancy without any Foundation) that he while he was at *Rome*, was converted by St. *Peter*. The same thing befel *Josephus* as soon as the Christians began to use his Authority against the *Jews*; notwithstanding that the *Jews* have no better Historian than *Josephus*. Thirdly, Because the *Jews* had then almost forsaken the study of the Holy Scriptures, and given themselves up entirely to the study of their Traditions, or Second Law, as they call it.

The

The Catalogue of their Ancient Commentators is very small. Their first literal Commentator is *R. Saadiah*, who writ his Comments on the Scripture in the beginning of the Tenth Century. As for the others that were long before him, as *Zohar*, *Siphre*, and *Siphri*, *Siphra*, *Mechilta*, *Tanchuma*, and the *Rabboth*, they all make it their business to explain allegorically, or to establish their Traditions.

As to the *Targum*, we see how heat of Dispute hath carried the *Jews* to such strange extremities, that now they reject no small part of those Interpretations that were Authentick with their Forefathers. It may not be amiss to give some Proofs of this, to shew that we do not accuse them without cause.

And in general, there is not a more idle Romance than that which the *Jews* have devised touching two *Messias's* that are to come unto the World. One must be of the Race of *Joseph* by *Ephraim*, and called *Nehemiah* the Son of *Hustel*, who (as they will have it) after a Reign of many Years at *Jerusalem*, and after having sack'd *Rome*, is at last to be killed himself at *Jerusalem* by a King of *Persia*. The other *Messias* is to be *Menahem* the Son of *Hammiel*, who is to appear for the delivery of the *Jews*, being sent from God on that Errand, according to *Moses*'s Prayer, *Exod.* iv. 13.

For the time of this second Messias's coming shall be when the Mother of the deceased *Messias* the Son of *Joseph*, having gathered the *Jews* dispersed from *Galilee* to *Jerusalem*, shall be there besieged by one *Armillus*

millus the Son of Satan, who is to proceed out of a Marble Statue in *Rome*, and who in this close Siege shall be at the very point of destroying them. Then they say *Messias* the Son of *David* shall come with seven Shepherds, to wit, the Three Patriarchs, *Moses*, *David*, and *Elias*, and eight of the principal Fathers or Prophets, who are to rise before the rest.

They say, That *Moses* at the head of them shall convert the *Jews* without working any Miracle, and then all the *Jews* shall rise at the sound of a Trumpet, passing under ground till they come to Mount *Olivet*, which shall cleave in two to let them out. Then the *Jews* shall come from all Quarters to form the Messias's Army, and the Messias the Son of *Joseph* shall be raised from the dead, to come in among the rest; and so the two *Messias*'s shall reign without jealousy of one another; only the Son of *David* shall have the chief Power, reigning from one end of the Earth to the other, and that for Forty Years.

All this time the *Jews* shall continue in Feasting and Jollity, using the other Nations as Slaves: And then *Gog* the King of *Magog*, with the Kingdoms of the *North*, shall come to attack the *Jews* in *Palestine*, but he and they shall be destroyed by Rain and Hail; after which the Land shall be purged of the dead Bodies, and they shall build the Third Temple, and then the Ten Tribes shall return, and offer Sacrifices to God in the Temple, and God shall pour out his Spirit on all *Israel*, and make them Prophets, as *Joel* hath foretold, *chap.* xi. 28. This

This is the Notion in short of the Two Messias's, which *R. Meyr Aldabi* gives us in his Book Intituled *Sevile Emuna*, *ch.* 10. *p.* 123. But it is certain, 1. the ancient *Jews* knew but of one Messias. *Trypho* knew not of two, as we see in *Justin Martyr*'s Dialogue, which is a clear proof, that those passages of the *Targum*, which speak of two Messias's, are Additions to the ancient Text, made since the *Jews* invented the conceit of a double Messias.

2. It is certain the *Talmudists* did not believe firmly the Return of the Ten Tribes, *Tr. Sanh. c.* 10. §. 3. Some did hope for it, as doth also *R. Eliezer Massech. Sanh. c.* 30. §. 3. But *R. Akiba* was of quite another opinion. And yet their Posterity hath been so much inclined for *R. Eliezer* his opinion, that one of their greatest Objections against Jesus being the Messias, is this, that if he had been the Messias, he would have gathered the Ten Tribes.

3. Their confining of the Messias's Reign to forty years, is contrary to the opinion of their Fathers, who held that the Messias should reign for ever. Some afterward thought that he was to reign forty years, others that he was to reign seventy years, as you see in the *Gemara* of *Sanhedrim*, *ch.* 11. *fol.* 97. *col.* 2.

4. They suppose now that the Messias shall build a third Temple. Whereas *Haggai* describing the second Temple as that under which the Messias should appear, expressly calls it the last. *Hag.* ii. 9. And this *R. David Kimchi* and *R. Azariah*, and the *Talmud* of

 Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, Megillah, fol.72. col. 4. The *Talmud* of *Babylon, Tit. Baba batra, fol.* 3. *col.* 1. and several others do acknowledg. Though some few suppose *Haggai*'s Prophecy to have reference to a third Temple. See *Abarbanel & Men. ben Israel* on *Hagg.*

5. It is the remark of one of the most celebrated Authors of the *Talmud*, and received amongst the other *Jews*, that all the times noted by the Prophets for the coming of the Messias are past. *Dixit Rav Omnes termini de adventu Messiæ transierunt, nec jam remanet nisi in conversione, si Israel convertatur, redimetur, quod si non convertatur, non redimetur.* Since that they have been forced to quit that miserable shift; and now they maintain that all the Promises of the coming of the Messias were conditional, and that he shall come when his People the *Jews* shall be by Repentance prepared to receive him. *Manas. Ben. Isr. q.*27. on *Es.* And yet the Ancient in the same place before did affirm that the Messias must come in the most corrupt Age, *fol.*97. *col.*1.

To be a little more particular, the *Jews* did maintain, that all the Prophets spoke of the Messias. See *Bethlem Juda* in the word *Goel.* At present, they dispute almost every Text that we urge for the Messias, so that instead of convincing them, we can only shame them by laying before them the Authorities of their Fathers, who understood these Texts in the same sense that the Apostles did.

The Modern *Jews* are very sensible of the Notion of a Plurality of Persons in the words, *Let us make Man after our Image, Gen.*i. Some of them therefore are for changing the reading,

reading, and instead of, *Let Us make Man*, would have it, *Let Man be made*, though the *Samaritan* Text, the Old *Seventy* Version, and the *Talmudists*, and all their Ancient and Modern Translations read as we do. See *Aben Ezra* on the place, and *R. David Kimchi* in *Michlol, p.*9.

They will scarcely allow the Messias to be spoken of in *Gen.* iii.15. Although *Jonathan*'s *Targum*, and that of *Jerusalem* do clearly understand it of the Messias.

The Old *Jews* affirmed that the Angel who appeared, *Gen.* xix. and in other places, and who is called the Lord, was (as I have before shewed) the Word of the Lord, but many of their Disciples do say it was a created Angel, as we learn from *R. Shem Tov.* in his Book *Emun. & Men. ben Israel, q.* 64. on *Genesis.* Such a thing cannot be done but by an extream impudence, since we see that they profess just the contrary in their own Prayers, where you read in their Office of *Pesach*, *And he brought us out of Egypt*; Not, *say they*, by the hand of *an Angel*, neither by the hand of a *Seraphim*, nor by the hand of *an Envoy*, but the *Holy Blessed*, by his Glory, and by himself, as the Scripture saith, *Exod.* xii. 12. And so there they refer almost all the appearances of the *Angel of the Lord*, to *God* himself, exclusively, to any created Angel: And such are those Appearances, *Gen.* xiv. 15. *Gen.* xx. 6. *Gen.* xxxi. 24. *Gen.* xxxii. 24. where *they say* that *Israel* wrestled with God. *Exod.* xii. 29, *&c.*

The present *Jews* are not for applying the Text, *Gen.* xlix. 10. to the Messias, but some refer

refer the words to *Moses* himself, as *R. Bechay*, others to *David*, others to *Abijah* the *Shilonite*, and others to *Nebuchadnezzar*. Notwithstanding both *Jonathan*'s and the *Jerusalem Targum*, note expresly this Prophecy to be spoken of the Messias.

And thus in the same Text, the Scepter there spoken of was explained in the Old *Talmudists* by Power and Dominion which should not depart from *Judah* till the coming of the Messias; Though now among some of the Modern *Jews* it signifies only Affliction and Calamities. *R. Joel aben Sueb.*

At this day the *Jews* do obstinately deny any Promise to be made of the Messias, *Deut.* xviii. 18, 19. And some of them will have it spoken of *Joshua*, some of *David*. So the Author of *Midrash Tehil* in *Psal.* i. and some of *Jeremy*. But it is visible, that in and before the times of Jesus Christ they were of another opinion, as may be gathered from 1 *Mac.* xiv. 41. and is clear from what the multitude say, *Joh.* vi. 14. *This is that Prophet who was to come into the world.* See also *Luc.* vii. 16. *Joh.* i. 19. *Mat.* xxi.

It was not questioned in St. *Paul*'s time, whether the 2*d. Psalm* did relate to the Messias, else St. *Paul* could not have applied it to Christ, as he doth *Act.* xiii. 33. nor was it questioned for some Ages after; the *Talmudical* Doctors agreeing to it. You see that in the *Gemara* of *Succoth*, *c.* 5. in *Jalkuth* in *Psal.* ii. in *Midrash Tehillim.* But their new Expositors have done their utmost to make it belong to *David* only, or to apply these words, *Thou art my Son*, *Psal.* ii. to the People of *Israel.* So

So doth *R. Mose Israel Mercadon* upon that *Psalm* in his Comment, Printed at *Amsterdam.*

The *Jews* in Christ's time, did believe the xxii*d. Psalm* to be a Prophecy touching the Messias. And Jesus Christ to shew the accomplishment of it in his own Person, cites the first verse of it on the Cross, *Mat.* xxvii. 46. Yet soon after as we see in *Justin Martyr*'s Dialogue, they denied that *Psalm* to belong to the Messias. But their folly appears because they cannot agree among themselves; some referring it to *David*, others to *Esther*, and others to the whole People of the *Jews. Menass. q.* 8. in *Psalm.*

The 16*th. ver.* of the same xxii*d. Psalm* is thus Translated by the *Seventy*, *They pierced my hands and my feet*: This reading is proved by *de Muis* on this place, and by *Walton* in *Prolegom. p.* 40. But our *Jews* now read it, *As a Lion my hands and my feet*, which is not sense. Their own *Masora* Notes that it should be read, *they have pierced.* However they have espoused the other reading, and will not be beaten from it by any Argument, because they think this reading will best destroy the Inference which the Christians draw from this place to shew that the Messias was to be Crucifyed, according to this *Psalm.*

The *Psalm* lxviii. by the ancient *Jews* was referred to the Messias, and so doth *R. Joel. Aben Sueb* refers the last part to the time of the Messias, *p.* 158. *in h. Ps.* It was also by St. *Paul*, *Ephes.* iv. 8. referred to the Ascension of our Lord: *Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led Captivity captive, and gave*

gave gifts unto men. The very same subject is handled in *Psal.* xlvii. 5. which Psalm *David Kimchi* does acknowledg belongs to the Times of the Messias, and there they cannot deny but the true God is spoken of, the same *Memra* who conducted the People in the Desert, and gave the Law at *Sinai*, as it is spoken *v.* 8, & 9. And yet the Modern *Jews* will apply those words of *Psal.* lxviii. 10. to the Ascension of *Abraham*, or *Moses*, or the Prophet *Elias*, to any rather than the Messias.

It is granted by the Modern *Jews* that their Fathers understood *Psal.* lxxii. of the Messias. So *R. Saadia* on *Dan.* vii. 14. *Salom. Jarchi* on *Psal.* 72. 6. and *Bahal Hatturim ad Numb.* xxvi. 16. and yet now they stick not, (of which *R. David Kimchi* is a witness) to interpret it only of *Salomon.*

In Jesus Christ's time the *Jews* confessed *Psalm* cx. did belong to the Messias, *v.* 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool.* Christ's argument, *Mat.* xxii. 44. necessarily supposes it. So it was understood in the *Midrash Tehillim*, and by *R. Saadia Gaon* on *Dan.* vii. 13. But notwithstanding this, our later *Jews* affirm that it was made for *David*, or *Abraham.*

'Twas of old constantly believed, that Wisdom, *Prov.* iii. and viii. did denote the Λόγος. I have shewed it from *Philo* the *Jew*, from the *Apocryphal* Book, and from the *Cabalists*, and yet at this day they explain it of the Law of *Moses*, or the Attribute of Wisdom.

Jonathan in his Paraphrase on *Isa.* ix. 6. interprets the Text of the Messias: *For unto us a child*

a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his Name shall be called, Wonderful, Counseller, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. And so did the most ancient *Jewish* Writers. But after Jesus Christ, the *Jews* having broken up a new way, it has pleased some of their late Writers to tread in the steps of *R. Hillel*, and to apply it to *Hezekiah.* So does *Salomon Jarchi*, *David Kimchi*, *Abenezra* and *Lipman.* As for the rest they quite change the present Text by referring to God all the Names, which are evidently given to the Messias, except that of the Prince of Peace.

For much the same reason do the latter *Jews* make *Zorobabel* to be spoken of in *Isa.* xi. 12. *Manas.* q. 18. on *Isaiah.* Though not only St. *Paul* understood it of Jesus Christ, *Rom.* xv. 12. 2 *Thes.* ii. 8. But the ancient *Jews* did generally refer it to the Messias, as appears all along in the *Targum* of that Chapter, and the *Jews* shewed they understood it so, by their rejecting *Barcochba*, when they found he could not smell Souls as they thought the Messias should do according to the second verse of the said Chapter. And St. *Jerome* witnesses upon that Chapter that all the *Jews* agreed with Christians, that all that Chapter was to be understood of the Messias.

The old *Jews*, as St. *Jerome* witnesses upon this Chapter, ascribed *Isa.* xxv. 6. *Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams*

streams in the desert, to the times of the Messias.

But the Modern *Jews* have endeavoured to wrest it, and to make it agree to other times, because they saw how the *Evangelists* applied it to the Miracles of our Lord. See *Menass. q.* 17. on *Isaiah*. And they are gone so far in that fancy that they give it out now for an Axiom amongst their People, that the Messias shall not work any Miracle. So *Rambam. R. Meyr Aldab.* and *R. Menass. ben Israel*, who would have the Miracles which are there spoken of, either to be understood Metaphorically, or to be referred, to the time of the Resurrection.

The Impudence of *R. Salomon* on *Isa.* xlviii. 48, 16. is amazing: The words of the Text run thus, *From the time that it was, there am I, and now the Lord God and his Spirit have sent me.* From hence it appears that the Messias, who is here spoken of, according to the *Targum*, was on Mount *Sinai*, when God gave the Law from thence. This *R. Salomon* will by no means grant of the Messias, but affirms that it is spoken of *Isaiah*. But how was he on Mount *Sinai* when the Law was given? Why, he answers, His Soul was there, as were the Souls also of all the Prophets, God then revealing to them all those things that were to come, which each of them in his time have since Prophesied of. A fancy, that *R. Tanchuma*, who lived a long while before *R. Salomon*, never hit on: For he maintains from *Isa.* lvii. 16. that the Souls are then created, as God orders Men to be born in every Generation.

We

We see how positive they are in expounding the Sufferings of the Messias, which are described *Isa.* liii. of the People of the *Jews*. And yet they can't but know that *Jonathan* refers the end of the lii. *Chap.* and the beginning of the liii. to the Messias, as the Apostles refer it to Jesus Christ, following herein *John* the *Baptist*, *Joh.* i. 29. And so did *R. Alexandri* among the *Talmudist*, as we see in *Sanhedrin, fol.* 93. *col.* 2. and in the *Midrash Conen* in *Arze Levanon, fol.* 3. *col.* 2.

The Prophet *Micah, ch.* v. 2. speaks of the Messias: *But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.* The *Jews* can't deny this. But then to evade what is there spoken of his Eternity, they pretend it means no more than his descent from *David*; as if the distance of time from *David* to Jesus Christ could be called Eternity. This is the way *Manasseh ben Israel, q.* 5. on *Micah*, takes to get over this difficulty. Before him others took another way, and affirmed that God decreed before the Creation of the World, to send the Messias, and that in this respect it is said in *Micah*, that *his goings forth are from the days of eternity.*

Jeremy, ch. xxiii. 26. saith very expressly, that the Messias shall be called the *Jehovah*, our Righteousness; and he repeats the same, *ch.* xxxiii. 15, 16. *In those days, and at that time will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the Land. In those days shall Judah be*

be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: And this is the Name wherewith he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness. R. *David Kimchi* owns it, and quotes the Authority of two Eminent *Rabbins* for it, namely, *R. Aba Bar Caana*, and *R. Levi in Eccha Rabati.* But they will none of them own that this Name *Jehovah* belongs any otherwise to him, than it doth to the Ark; which is altogether impertinent; for the Ark is never called *Jehovah*; nor doth *Menasseh* prove that it is with all his talking, *q.* 18. in *Isaiah.*

Jonathan, as well as *Philo*, ascribes to the Messias the Prophecies, *Zech.* vi. 12, 13. And so *Jonathan* applies to the Messias what is said in the same Prophet. But many of the Modern *Jews*, among whom *R. Salomon* is one, do refer them to *Zorobabel.*

These several places I have now mentioned may serve as a Sample of the confusion the *Jews* are in, while they attempt to interpret the ancient Prophecies; and I may confidently affirm, that all those other places which I have omitted, that intimate a Trinity, or the Divinity of the Messias, or the time when he should come into the World, are in like manner explained so very triflingly, and forcedly, as that oftentimes their own Authors, convinced by the Evidence of the Texts themselves, have refuted them, and given a new Interpretation of them. Whence it comes to pass, that their Reader can find no certain sense of those Texts to rest on, but his understanding continues in an entire darkness, and unsetledness.

This

This ill luck they have of Explications, is not of yesterday, as I have already observed, Soon after Jesus Christ's time, they set themselves to oppose what the Christians held of the two Comings of the Messias, though so distinctly described, one of them *Zech.* ix. 9. and the other, *Dan.* vii. 13. And still to this day do they reject that Notion of his two Comings, as may be seen in *Menass.* on *Zech.* ix. *p.* 185.

But others of them, who found it impossible to deny that the Scripture speaks of two Comings of the Messias, whom they expected, thought it better to make two Messias's, than to acknowledg that the Messias whom they expected was to be a suffering Messias. And thus they thought they removed the difficulties in the other opinion, that made but one Coming of the Messias, by owning the Messias the Son of *Joseph* should be a Man of sorrows, but Messias the Son of *David* was to be a Glorious Deliverer.

As the *Jews* Disputes with the Christians encreased, they advanced certain Characters of the Times of the Messias; and all of them very miraculous; which they inferred from some Allegorical Descriptions in the Prophets concerning the Times of the Messias. These they run up to ten, as we see in *Shemoth Rabba, Parascha* 15. And they make a great use of those Miracles, which they conceive should have been in the time of Jesus Christ, if he had been the true Messias. Notwithstanding all which *Menasseh q.* 7. on *Isaiah*, finds himself obliged to assure us that *David Kimchi* and *Abarbanel*, and many Interpreters explain

plain most of these passages as Allegorical Descriptions of the Times of the Messias. And *Maimonides* is of this opinion, that when the Messias comes there shall be no change in the Order of Nature, *Jad Chaz. Lib. de Regibus*. And in that he follows the opinion of one *Rabbi Samuel* that is quoted in the *Talmud Tit. Beracoth*, where he saith that there shall be not any difference between the Times of the Messias, and the other Times of the World, but the subduing of the Kingdoms by the Messias.

To conclude, the *Jews* being so often deceived in their Expectations of the Messias, and finding themselves abused by a great number of false pretenders to that Character, have almost lost their hopes of his Coming: And finding his Coming to be a thing uncertain, few of them do regard the Promise of the Messias, with that assurance with which the Ancients did expect it.

Indeed it is observable that though *Maimonides* professes to own the Messias, and hath inserted the hope of it among the Articles of the *Jewish* Faith, which he hath given us; yet he otherwhere speaks very indifferently of it. In one place he asserts the observation of *Moses*'s Law, and the recompenses annexed to it, to be the chief end of the *Jews* enquiry, and not the time of the Messias's appearance; as we are informed by the Author of the Chain of the *Cabala*.

The same judgment may be made of *Joseph Albo*, who writ with great bitterness against the Christians: For, 1. he maintains in his Book of the Principles that *R. Hillel* was no

no Apostate, though he denied the coming of any other Messias, but of *Hezekiah*, who was already come. And *Albo* gives this reason for it, because the Coming of the Messias is no Fundamental Article of the *Jewish* Religion. *Orat.* 1. *chap.* 1. Nothing can be more wretched than this excuse of his. For if the Messias had come before the *Babylonian* Captivity, as *R. Hillel* would have it in the Person of King *Hezekiah*; and if no other was to be expected, why did the *Jewish* Church take those Books into her Bible that were written by the Prophets that lived under the second Temple? and why did not *R. Hillel* and his Followers declare against them as false Prophecies, that spoke of the Messias as being yet to come? namely, *Zechary*, *Haggai*, and *Malachy*, who did all Prophecy of the Messias, as has been abundantly shewn, with Proofs out of the *Targums* of those Books, and the general consent of *Jewish* Writers.

2. The same *Albo* is not afraid to assert, That the Article of the Messias, has no other foundation than the authority of Tradition. For, saith he, there is not any Prophecy either in the Law, or in the Prophets, that foretells his Coming by any necessary Exposition of it, with respect to him, or which may not from the circumstances of the Text be well explained otherwise. This is his Position in examination of *Gen.* xlix. 10. where he doth his utmost to evade the Text, *v.* 10. *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, &c.*

3. He looks on the Article of the Messias's Coming to be a matter of that small importance

tance to the *Jews*, that he leaves it doubtful, whether the Messias be come since the time of *Onkelos* their famous Paraphrast, who expresses his expectation of this Promise in many places of the Books of *Moses*; and if he be not already come, whether he shall come in the Glory of the Clouds of Heaven, or whether he shall come poor, and riding on an Ass; and because of Men's sins, not distributing those great Blessings promised at his Coming, nor Men on the other hand regarding him as the Messias?

Certainly, *R. Lipman* in his *Nitzachon*, where he examines the above mentioned Text, *Gen.* xlix. 10. advances a Rule which quite overthrows all Proofs from the Holy Scripture. This *Rabin*, seeing the *Jews* give such opposite Interpretations of *Jacob*'s Prophecy, concerning the Scepter's continuance in *Judah*, as were impossible to be reconciled, some understanding Empire, by the Scepter; and some Slavery and oppression; he lays this down for a Maxim, That the Law was capable of divers Explications, and all of them, though never so incompatible and contradictory, were nevertheless the words of the Living God.

This is very near the Sentiment of *R. Menasseh Ben Israel*, in his Questions on *Genesis*, where he collects the several *Jewish* Expositions of this Text. But granting this once for a Principle, it is in vain to consult the Scriptures, or to think of ever discovering the meaning of them. The sense of them must absolutely depend on the Authority of the *Rabins*; and what they teach must be all equally received as the Word of God, though they teach things contradictory to one another. Such Positions put one to a loss, whether their blindness, or their spite, is therein most to be pitied.

CHAP. XXVII.

That the Unitarians *in opposing the Doctrines of the Trinity, and our Lord's Divinity, do go much further than the Modern* Jews, *and that they are not fit persons to convert the* Jews.

WHAT I have observed of the alteration made by the Modern *Jews* in their Belief, is enough to shew that they were forced to adopt new Notions, because of the evident Proofs drawn from the Opinions of their Ancestors, which the Christians used against them.

The very same prevarication may be charged on the *Socinians*, in their Explications of those places of Scripture, that prove the Blessed Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour.

And, *1st*. They have borrowed many of the *Jews* answers to the Christians, and often carried them much further than the *Jews* themselves did intend them. *2dly*. They have invented the way of accommodation, for the evading of those Quotations in the New Testament, that are taken out of the Old Testament, as finding this the most effectual means to escape those difficulties, which they

they can no other way resolve. 3*dly*. The *Unitarians*, especially those of *England*, to make short work, do not stick to assert, that the Christians have foisted those Texts into the Gospel, which speak of the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Lord.

It is fit I should give particular Instances of each of these, in proof of what I say.

* De Divin. Chr. c. 10.

Smalcius * maintains in the general, That the Books of the Old Testament are of little use for the Conversion of the *Jews*. He gives this reason for it, That almost all that which is said to be spoken of the Messias in the Old Testament, must be interpreted mystically, before it can appear to be spoken of him, and by consequence very remotely from what the words do naturally signify.

Then in particular: When we would prove a Plurality of Persons in the Deity against the *Jews*, from those Expressions of Scripture that speak of God in the Plural Number; although the *Jews* (as you may see in their Comments on *Gen.* i. 26. xi. 7. and especially on *Isa.* vi. 8.) are forced to own that a Plurality is imported in those Expressions, and therefore pretend that the Number is Plural, because God speaks of himself and the Angels his Counsellors; yet the *Socinians*, as *Enjedinus* witnesses for them, do deny that these Plural Expressions do denote any Plurality in the Deity, no more than Expressions in the Singular Number do. As for *Socinus*, he solves it by a Figure, by which, as he saith, a single Person speaks plurally when he excites himself to do any thing. A Figure of which we have no Example in the Writings of the Old Testament. *So-*

Socinus has followed the *Jews* Evasion on the words *Gen.* iii. 22. *Behold the Man is as one of Us*, in maintaining that God does herein speak of himself and of the Angels. And *Smalcius* has followed him in this Solution. The very same Eplication they give of the words, *Gen.* xi. 7. *Let us go down and confound their Language*; borrowing entirely the Subterfuge of the *Jews*, who at this day teach that God spoke it to the Angels.

Crellius on *Gal.* iii. 8. espouses the *Jewish* Sense of the Text, *Gen.* xii. 3. *In thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed*; by which he overthrows the force of St. *Paul*'s Citation, and makes it nothing to the purpose. He supposes that St. *Paul* did herein allude only to the Passage in *Genesis*; but on the contrary, it appears that he followed the Literal Sense, as we have it, *Gen.* xii. 3. xviii. 18. xxii. 18. xxvi. 4. xxviii. 14. and as the Ancient *Cabalists* do acknowledge at large in *Reuchlin*, *L.* 1.

Smalcius ch. 2. *Ib.* asserts, That the Promise of *the Seed of the Woman*, *Gen.* iii. 5. can very hardly be understood of the *Messias*. And yet the Ancient *Jews* acknowledged it in their *Targum* of *Jerusalem*, and by the Cabalists, *Tikunzoh.* 21. *fol.* 52. *col.* 2. & *Bachaie fol.* 13. *col.* 3. in *Gen.*

Schlichtingius affirms that *Psal.* xlv. does literally relate to *Solomon*, and that this is its first and principal sense. Altho the Ancient *Jews* do all agree that it treats of the *Messias*, and cannot be understood of *Solomon*.

Socinus persuading himself that St. *Paul* cites *Heb.* i. 6. from *Psal.* xcvii. 8. *And let all the*

Angels of God worship him; does maintain that he cites it in the mystical Sense, because Jesus Christ could not be adored by the Angels before he was advanced to be their Head. And yet the *Jews* of old did refer it to the *Messias*, adding these words in the end of *Moses*'s Song, *Deut.* xxxii. as we see there in the LXX Version, from whence it was indeed that St. *Paul* took the words in *Heb.* i. 6.

Again, *Socinus* to rid himself of *Psal.* xxiv. where according to the Ancient *Jews* Opinion the Messias is spoken of, does pretend that the *Messias* is not meant here in this Psalm, or at least he is described only as the Messenger of God. A Salvo as ridiculous as his Answer: For most of the Characters and Works of God are ascribed to him that is there spoken of, and he is expresly called the Lord of Hosts.

But this is not all. For our *Socinians* not only follow the *Jews*, but exceed them in the bold ways they take to get over those Authorities which make against them. Because that the words of *Psal.* xl. 7. *Thou hast bored my ears*, are cited by St. *Paul* in this manner, *A Body hast thou prepared me*, *Heb.* x. 5. who follows herein the LXX Text, which thus paraphrases the Psalmist's words; from thence *Enjedinus* takes occasion to accuse the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, for not having cited the Original, and to traduce him as an Apocryphal Writer.

They go further than the *Jews* do on *Psal.* xlv. 6. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* A Text cited by St. *Paul*, and applied to Jesus Christ, *Heb.* i. 7, 8. The LXX translate

it as we do. But the *Jews* have tried all ways to deliver themselves of this Authority, which proves so evidently that the *Messias* is God. As for *Socinus*, he pretends to reject the *Jews* Solutions. But his Disciples have invented another, which is worse than that of the *Jews*, as may be seen in *Enjedinus* and *Ostorodius*.

Psalm. xc. throughout relates to the *Messias*. Jesus Christ applies it to himself, *Matth.* xxii. and from thence proves that he is *David*'s Lord, although he is the Son of *David*. But *Enjedinus* refutes this Argument of Jesus Christ: And *Schlichtingius* treats it as absurd. This is a thing that deserves to be reflected on; because these Gentlemen pretend that among them only true Christianity is continued.

The like way they take to answer what the Apostle saith of Christ's creating the Heavens and the Earth, *Heb.* i. 10, 11. and his Proof of it from *Psal.* cii. 27, 28.

And with the same Impudence do they elude the Citation from *Psal.* cxviii. 22. which is quoted Mat. xxi. 42. Altho *R. D. Kimchi*, among other *Jews*, refers it to the *Messias*.

It is strange to see how they take the *Jews* part in explaining as they do, *Isa.* vii. 14. A Virgin, that is, say they, a Prophetess, *Crell.* on *Matt.* i. The only reason of this Explication is the word *Immanuel*, which there follows, to their great perplexity. They therefore say, that *Immanuel* is spoken of the Father in *Isaiah*'s Prophecy, and of Jesus Christ in St. *Matthew*'s Gospel in a Mystical Sense.

Isaiah, chap. xxxv. 5. has distinctly noted the Miracles which the *Messias* should work, and has given us a clear Character of his Person. *R. Solomon Jarchi* endeavours to shift off this Text, and to explain it of the deliverance of the People out of *Babylon*. *Socinus*, who could not but know how the Evangelists have referred it to the Miracles of Jesus Christ, does nevertheless establish as well as he can the Explication of the Modern *Jews*. And this he does for no other reason, but because the Appearance of God himself is spoken of in the 4*th* Verse of this Chapter.

How audaciously does *Crellius* destroy the Proof of the Place where Christ should be born, *Matth.* ii. 5. taken out of *Micah* v. 2.? Saith he, The *Jews* cited it only according to the Mystical Sense. But we know the *Jews* took it to be the Literal Sense, as appears by their *Targum*.

The viii*th* Chapter of *Proverbs* was understood by *Philo* of the Λόγος. And indeed such Attributes are given to Wisdom in that Chapter, as belong only to a Person, such as being conceived, born, creating, governing, exercising of Mercy, and the like. But *Socinus* is not content it should go so: He will have all this attributed to the Wisdom of God by a *Prosopopeia*, just as our later *Jews* do interpret it of the Law.

Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. relates to the *Messias* in the Judgment of all the Ancient *Jews*. Our *Socinians* will not allow this; but rather than own that the *Messias* is named God, they refer the Title of, *The Lord our Righteousness*, to the People there spoken of.

We

We have a remarkable Prophecy for the Proof of the Divinity of the Messias, in *Zech.* xii. 10. *They shall look on him whom they have pierced.* The *Jews* anciently did, and still do, understand it of the Messias. And Jesus Christ does apply it to himself, *Rev.* i. 7. What saith *Socinus* to this? He declares that this Text which is so like *Psal.* xxii. has been corrupted by the *Jews*, and thus he trys to render its Authority useless.

Here you have a Sample of their conduct, in rejecting the Literal, and setting up a Mystical sense: But there are other Quotations cited in the New Testament, from which it is manifest that our Lord Jesus Christ is the God spoken of in the Old Testament, the Authority of which Texts cannot so easily be eluded. And to take away the evidence of these, they have invented the way of accommodation.

David speaking of the God of *Israel*, has these words, *Psal.* lxviii. 19. *Thou art ascended on high, &c.* Hence we conclude that Jesus Christ is the God of *Israel*, because St. *Paul* saith they had their accomplishment in our Lord's Ascension into Heaven, *Ephes.* iv. 8. The *Jews* say, those words in the *Psalm* were spoken of *Moses*. The *Socinians* cannot deny they were spoken of God; but deny they were spoken of the Messias literally. But, say they, these words were applied to Jesus Christ by St. *Paul*, only by way of accommodation. Strange! Is it not plain, that *David* saith no more in this lxviii. *Psalm* of the Messias, than he saith in *Psal.* cx. which the *Jews* do refer to the Messias? Is not the calling of the

Gentiles here clearly foretold *v.*33,34. which is owned on all hands to be the work of the Messias? Is it not then visible that St. *Paul* in citing these words has followed the sense of the Ancient Synagogue, who understood *Psal.* cx. of the Messias, according to the Literal sense?

Socinus owns that the words *Psal.* xcvii. 7. which are applied to Jesus Christ, *Heb.* i. 6. do respect the Supreme God. He cannot therefore deny Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God to whom they are applied. But he does it, as he pleases, by this way of accommodation, which he saith the Sacred Author used in applying this Text to Jesus Christ. And so the Adoration commanded to be given him, terminates not in him, but is referrable to the Supreme God who commanded this Adoration.

Isa. ch. viii. 13,14. has these words, *Sanctifie the Lord of Hosts.* The *Jews* interpret them of the Messias. *Gemar. Massech. Sanhedr. in ch.* iv. and they are cited by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* ix. 32. St. *Luke* ii. 34. St. *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* ii. 7. who apply them to Jesus Christ. The *Socinians*, whose Cause will not bear this, that Jesus Christ should be called the Lord of Hosts, do therefore deny that the Messias is here treated of, or that any one else is here meant, but God only; adding, that the Holy Writers of the New Testament, in applying them to Jesus Christ, turned these Texts to quite another sense than was intended by the Holy Spirit at the inditing of them.

The Prophet *Isaiah* again has these words, *ch.* xxxv. 4, 5, 6. *Behold your God will come— and*

and save you, &c. *Sal. Jarchi* and *D. Kimchi*, expound them of the Deliverance from *Babylon*; contrary to the ancient *Jews* opinion, who, as these *Rabbins* confess, understood them of the Messias. The *Socinians* will not deny that Jesus Christ assumed them to himself, but to shew how little ground he had for so doing, they insist on it, that he only accommodated the words to himself.

The same *Isaiah* writes thus, *ch.* xli. 4. *I am the first and the last*; and Jesus Christ has the same expressions of himself, *Rev.* i. 17. The *Chaldee* Paraphrast thought they belonged so properly to the True God, as to Paraphrase them in this manner, *I am the Lord Jehovah who created the World in the beginning, and the Ages to come are all mine.* *Joseph Albo* makes this Text a proof of the Eternity of God, and notes that it is a parallel Text to *Isa.* xliv. 6. But if you'l have *Socinus* opinion of the place, when it is applied to our Lord Jesus Christ, it does not at all regard his Eternity.

Once more, we read *Isa.* xlv. 23. *I have sworn by my self, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness — that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.* St. *Paul* refers these words to Jesus Christ, *Rom.* xiv. 11. nay he proves our standing before Christ's Judgment-seat by this Quotation. Notwithstanding the *Socinians* believe them only a simple accommodation, and not the prime scope of the Text.

I know the Apostles have sometimes cited Texts from the Old Testament, which have not their exact accomplishment in that sense wherein they are used. As for example, 2 *Cor.* viii.

viii. 15. St. *Paul* exhorting the *Corinthians* to supply the *wants of their Brethren with their abundance*, addeth, *As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack.* Thus alluding to the History of the *Manna*, *Exod.* xvi. 18. it is plain that he accommodates that Story to the Beneficence of the Christians, without any thing, either from Letter, or Allegory, to justifie this accommodation.

They who think that *John*, *ch.* xix. 37. does allude to *Exod.* xii. 46. *Neither shall you break a bone thereof*, go upon this ground, that Christ was typified by the Paschal Lamb, and therefore what was spoken of the Paschal Lamb is truly applicable to Christ. But some others believe that St. *John* cited this passage from *Psal.* xxxiv. 21. and applies what *David* saith of all the just in general, to the Messias, who is often called the Just One, as being eminently so.

I know that some think that a Prophecy which has been already accomplish'd literally, was accommodated by the Holy Penmen to a like event. And thus they think St. *Matthew*, *ch.* ii. 17. applies the voice that was heard at *Ramah*, and *Rachel*'s weeping for her Children, to those Expressions of sorrow used by the Women of *Bethlehem*, when *Herod* slew their Children: Although this Prophecy was before accomplished in the Captivity of *Judah* and *Benjamin* under *Nebuchadnezzar*.

But besides what I have said upon such places, the Examples of this nature are but few, and those may be easily discerned by a careful Reader from such Citations as are not Ac-

Accommodations, but Proofs; and for the Texts which are commonly and generally quoted by the Holy Writers, they expose the Books of the New Testament to the scorn and contempt of *Jews*, who suppose that the Apostles went about to make Converts from the Synagogue by such passages of the Old Testament, as had nothing of strength or reason to convince any Man, for such are the places quoted by way of Accommodation; and let any one but consult the Writings of the *Jews* against Christianity, and he will find that the main Argument they make use of against the Proofs brought by the Apostles, is, that the passages they cite, were never designed by the Spirit, to that purpose Literally taken, but were only made use of by them by way of Accommodation.

But the most wonderful thing of all in the *Unitarians* management of this Controversie, especially in our *English Unitarians* is this, that they do not only side with the *Jews*, and dress up their sense of those Texts of the Old Testament which are cited in the New as Proofs of our Lords Divinity; or which are objected in confirmation of the Holy Trinity; and that they have not been content to bring in the Notion of Accommodation to elude the force of those Quotations on which the Apostles grounded several Doctrines; but for the most part they give broad intimations, as if the New Testament Writings were on purpose falsified by the Christians, and many things there inserted which were never thought of by the Authors of those Writings.

If

If they could have made good this accusation, it would have saved them a great deal of pains which it has cost them to find out Answers to the several Objections proposed to them. 'Tis the most easie, natural, and shortest way to joyn with the *Deists* in destroying the Authority of the Gospel, and to endeavour to shew that nothing certain can be drawn from thence, seeing that since the Apostles Times the Christian Faith hath been corrupted, and new Doctrines have been foisted into their Books, which from the beginning were not there.

For my part I see no other way left them for the defence of their bad Cause. But by ill luck, *Socinus* has stopped their retreat even to this last Refuge, by the Treatise he writ concerning the Authority of the Holy Scriptures. When they have solidly refuted this Book of their great Leader, it will be then time to take their Charge against the Sacred Books into more particular consideration.

Let them do this when they will. We promise them when they have done it, to reproach them no more with *Socinus*'s Authority, in defence of the Integrity of the Scripture. But for the present we refer them to the Book of a famous *Mahometan* called *Hazzadaula*, who has handled this matter with length and force enough to confound both the *Unitarians* and *Deists*. I mean his third Book of the comparison of the three Laws, the *Jewish*, *Christian*, and *Mahometan*; of which there is an Extract in *Jos. de Voisin de Lege Divina*, in a Letter from *Gabriel Syonita*.

It

It has been thought by some, that *Mahomet* and his Followers did accuse the *Jews* and Christians of corrupting the Old and New Testament Writings. But we see this Accusation is proved false by such as have managed the Controversie against *Mahometanism*. And the more knowing *Mahometans* do insult the Christian Missionaries for charging it on them, when *Mahomet* accused the Christians only for wresting several passages in Scripture, and putting a false and forced sense on them.

But with what face the *Mahometans* can object this I know not, when they themselves do so grosly pervert the passages in *Deut.* xxxiii. 33. *Hab.* iii. 3. *Deut.* xviii. and xxxiv. in favour of *Mahomet* and his Law; and in favour of *Mahomet* only many Texts in *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Zephany*, and other Prophets, as you may see them alledged by *Hazzadaula* in his Fourth Book; but especially when they urge all those places in St. *John*'s Gospel, where the Paraclete is spoken of, as so many Promises of *Mahomet*'s coming.

I must confess some warm indiscreet *Mahometans* in dispute with the Christians have given them occasion to believe that the *Mahometans* generally accused the Christians with falsifying their Scriptures. Just as the petty Controvertists of the Church of *Rome* have impudently averred the Scripture to be corrupt in many places, the better to establish their Church's Authority. And thus we find *Ahmed* the *Mahometan*, charging both *Jews* and *Christians* with altering of their Bibles. *Hotting. Hist. p.* 364.

But

But as there are in the *Roman* Church Men wiser and calmer that see the consequences of so rash an Accusation, and have therefore proved unanswerably the Integrity of the Sacred Text; so are there among the *Mahometans* more wary and cautious Disputants, who despise and disallow those false Charges advanced by some of their party against the *Jews* and *Christians*. Such a one was *Hazzadaula* in the Book before cited, who solidly proves that by the care the *Masorite Jews* took to ascertain the Text of the Old Testament, it was impossible they should be willing to corrupt it; and that if they had been willing, yet they were divided into so many Sects of unreconcileable hatred to one another, as rendred it impossible for them to do it.

He then shews that the difference which is between the several Versions, as between the *Seventy* and *Syriack* for Example, was no prejudice to the Purity of the Text it self; but that this arose from the several Views the Interpreters then had, from the different Notions and senses they affixed to the Original words. He then passes to the Examination of the various Readings, which our *Unitarians* triumph in; and shews that neither their number nor variety ought to diminish the Authority of the Originals. He gives Reasons for his preference of the *Jewish* Bible to that of the *Samaritans*. He proves the corruption of the Books of the Old Testament could not be made before Jesus Christ's time, since he never reproached them for it, which he would certainly have done, had they been guilty

guilty of it; nor could the corruption come in after Christ's time, because the *Jews* and *Christians* who are such mortal Enemies, have had these Books in keeping, and daily read them, though they interpret them very differently.

In a word, we cannot easily meet with a more perfect Treatise on this Subject, nor one more proper to refute the bold insinuations of some who under the name of Christians, and Men skilled in Critical knowledg, have undertaken to shake the Foundations of the Christian Religion; and for this purpose would discredit the Authority of the Holy Scripture, under the disguise of making it rest on the Authority of Tradition.

The Reader will, I hope, reflect on what I have said concerning the conduct of the *Socinians* in their Disputes with us, relating to the Divinity of Christ.

To which I may add, that some of them, less modest, though more sincere than *Socinus*, being convinced that no Answer could be given to the Quotations from the Old Testament that were used in Proof of our Lord's Divinity, thought fit to reject the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which contains those Quotations, as an *Apocryphal* Piece. This *Enjedinus* has done, and thought it a quick way to deliver himself at once of many difficulties, from which otherwise he could not extricate himself. For had he believed *Socinus*'s Answers Satisfactory, he had never betaken himself to this last and desperate shift.

Others, of whom Mr. *N.* is one, do suppose that whatever makes for the advantage of

of the *Trinitarians* Cause *is all forged.* And so they abandon the fanciful Explications *Socinus* has given of the first Chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel, as having no need of them, so long as they can make one believe that the *Trinitarians* have foisted into the New Testament whatever they pleased. This is still a shorter answer than the former. The first rendred one particular Book only, useless to the *Trinitarians*; but this makes all those Books of the New Testament useless, from whence any Objection may be drawn against the *Unitarians.*

What end the *Socinians* have in these dangerous attempts, whether to facilitate the Conversion of the *Jews*, as they pretend, or to do service to the Atheists and *Deists*, as it seems to be their real design, is worthy every Christian's serious enquiry. If they intend the Conversion of the *Jews*, we may well demand of them what way they will take to effect it. *Smalcius*, one of their chief Writers, has affirmed that the Books of the Old Testament are of little use to convert the *Jews. De Div. Christ.* c. x. already quoted. His reason is, because if we interpret any Text in the Old Testament of Jesus Christ, we must interpret it Mystically, that is, according to quite another sense than that which the words do naturally import. And now admitting this to be true, what use can a *Socinian* make of the Old Testament against the *Jews*?

Sommerus, and *Francis David*, (whose Opinions as to the denial of the Worship of Jesus Christ, are embraced by Mr. *N.*) being forced to own that the Author of the Book of *Proverbs* did ascribe a Son to God, *ch.* xxx. 4. and yet being not willing to acknowledg it as a truth, took the readiest way to defeat the Authority of this Book, and placed it among the *Apocryphal* Writings. One should wonder how such *Socinians* are like to be Converters, who call the *Jews* Canon of the Scriptures into question, and consequently leave no Books from whence, as from a common Principle, they may on each side deduce their reasonings.

As for the Books of the New Testament, what use can they make of them? Yes, very great, saith the *Socinian*. If the Books of the New Testament were reformed, and those Patches intirely taken from them, which were never written by the Apostles, though added under their Names, such as the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which was brought in after the year 140. of *Christ*, and stuffed with Doctrines of a Trinity, and Christ's Divinity, contrary to the Faith of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians; then we might hope to have success in the Conversion of the *Jews*.

But in truth they are not likely to succeed with their reformed *Socinian* Gospel, so well as they would have us believe: For 'tis reasonable to think that every *Jew* of common sense would retort the Book on themselves, and tell them frankly, This is not the Christians Gospel from whence you offer to convince me, this is a Book of no Authority, but an Imposture, of which you are the Father. We *Jews* who are spread throughout all parts of the World, and are intermingled among

among Christians of all Persuasions, never yet met with these Books, such as you now produce them, to shew that Jesus is the Messias.

You tell us, they were corrupted by the Christians of the second Age: Produce Copies more ancient, as Vouchers of this Truth. The Books which you contend were falsified, are of no Authority. What other Books have you besides these falsified Books, to prove there ever was such a Man as Jesus Christ, who did and suffered what you tell us of? Since you accuse these Books of Additions, and defalcations, and all sorts of corruption, you have no solid proof for the matters in them, which you say are true. They who thus falsified the Scriptures, by adding and substracting as they please, or rather you your selves by advancing this Position, have spoiled all use that might be made of these Books in Points controverted between us.

Thus much it is natural for a *Jew* of but an ordinary capacity to say, and to quote his *Tanchuma*, and all the *Rabins* who have disputed ever since there were Christians, against the Gospel, on the score of their attributing Divinity to Jesus Christ.

This *Tanchuma* is a famous Book among the *Jews*, and has a passage in it in the *Parascha va-elle Massahe*, which the *Italian* Inquisitors blot out of all those Books which the *Jews* Printed by *Bomberg* at *Venice*. But this passage is still preserved, and is to this effect, that Jesus Christ whom they call wicked *Balaam*, taught that he was God, and on the contrary, *R. Tanchuma* argues that he was a meer Man.

But

But should we call into the Dispute a Learned *Jew*, that understands the Original, and the meaning of his Prayers, he would laugh in the face of a *Socinian* that should go about to persuade him, that Jesus is not represented in the Gospels as God, or that the Christians were not of this belief till after the 140th. year after Christ.

And good reason for it: The Learned *Jews* know well, that that Prayer which in the Christian Countries is called the Prayer against the *Sadducees*, and in other Countries the Prayer against the *Minnim*, the Hereticks and Apostates, was truly and originally written against the Christians, for being Teachers of a Trinity, and of Christ's Divinity, and so as they judged, destroyers of the Unity of the Godhead. And this is *R. Solomon*'s sense of that Prayer in his Notes on the *Talmud*. The *Jews* otherwise know that this Prayer was composed under *R. Gamaliel*, who died *A. D.* 52. *i. e.* eighteen years before the Destruction of the Temple. That this is no Fable of the *Talmud*, which in more than one place * does relate it, they may evidently prove from *Justin Martyr*'s Dialogue, written *A. D.* 139. who mentions this Prayer, or rather Curse, against the Christians, as already spread and received throughout all the Synagogues of the World.

* *Talm. tr. Berac. ch. 5. & Beth. Isr. sect. 69.*

Our Learned *Jew* deriding these *Socinians*, would represent that he knew not how they could refuse Jesus Christ that Worship which the Christians ever since the first Preaching of the Gospel throughout the World have paid him, on supposition of his being

 the

the true God. He reads how his Ancestors saw him adored by the Christians in the first Century, and he proves it to the *Socinians* from the *Talmud* *, wherein are divers Relations of *R. Eliezer* the great Friend of *R. Akiba*, who lived in the end of the first Century, and the beginning of the second Century, concerning the Gospels, and the Publick Worship rendred to Jesus Christ by the Christians.

* *Sanhedr. c.4 in Gem.*

In a word, any *Jew* who has sense enough to reflect on it, may see that the Gospel proposes Jesus Christ as the Object of Christian Worship. And not to mention now their other prejudices; The single prejudice which will be taken against such a *Socinian* Novel-Gospel, will tend more to make them disesteem the Gospel, and reject it altogether, than it will dispose them to attend to the Arguments of a *Socinian* drawn thence in behalf of Christianity. These things I leave to the consideration of our *Socinians*. For other Christians, they see whither the *Socinian* Methods of treating Scripture lead, and cannot but behold with sorrow the wounds they give to the Christian Religion, under pretence of making it more apt to gain the *Jews*, but in truth making it so ridiculous to Men of any ordinary capacity, that we cannot wonder at their not having after all their boasts, converted so much as one *Jew* to the Christian Faith.

F I N I S.

A Dissertation concerning the Angel who is called the Redeemer, Gen. XLVIII.

S I R,

YOU do very truly observe that the Subject of our last but short Conversation, is a matter of the greatest moment, and deserving the utmost care in the discussion of it. When mention was there made of the Angel, whose Blessing *Jacob* prayed, might descend on the Sons of *Joseph*, I then asserted he was no other than the Λόγος, or *Word*. You were not then very forward to embrace this Notion, being carried away with the Authority of some great Names, and especially of *Grotius*, who understand this Angel in *Jacob*'s Prayer to be only a created Angel.

But having not time to hear the Grounds of my Assertion, you were desirous I should put them with what perspicuity I could into writing, in hopes that the same Arguments, if they should prove cogent to bring you over to my opinion, might be of use to others who were in the same Sentiments with your self. So good an end being proposed, I set my self without delay to your commands; and having digested my thoughts in this Paper, I now send them to you, intreating you to judge of them, as you are wont of the Labours of your Friend, with all impartiality and humanity,

nity, still remembring that I made it only my care to express my thoughts clearly, and to find out the truth, and to deliver it simply according to the best of my understanding. And so I come to the Question in hand.

SECT. I.

Moses having related how *Joseph* took his two Sons along with him to *Jacob* his Father that lay sick, in order to obtain his Blessing on them before he died, goes on to give us the form in which he Blessed them, *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16. ויברך את יוסף ויאמר האלהים אשר התהלכו אבתי לפניו אברהם ויצחק האלהים הרעה אתי מנעורי עד היום הזה המלאך הגואל אתי מכל רע יברך את הנערים ויקרא בהם שמי ושם אבתי אברהם וגו׳

These Words are thus rendred by the *Greek* Interpreters commonly called the *Septuagint* : Καὶ ἐυλόγησεν αὔτοις καὶ εἶπεν : Ο Θεὸς ᾧ ἐυηρέσησαν οἱ πατέρες μοῦ ἐνάτιον αὐτοῦ Αβραὰμ καὶ Ισαὰκ, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιμαίνων με ἐκ νεότητος ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, ὁ Ἄγγελος ὁ ῥυόμενος με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐυλογήσαι τὰ παιδία ταῦτα, καὶ ἐπικληθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα ἐμοῦ πατέρων μοῦ, Αβραὰμ καὶ Ισαὰκ, &c.

And in the Vulgar *Latin* Version, *Benedixitque Jacob filiis Josephi, & ait: Deus in cujus conspectu ambulaverunt patres mei, Abraham & Isaac, Deus qui pascit me ab adolescentia mea usque in præsentem diem, Angelus qui eruit me de cunctis malis benedicat pueris istis, & invocetur super eos nomen meum, nomina quoque patrum meorum Abraham & Isaac*, &c.

You

You see there is little or no difference between these Versions and the *Hebrew*, with which also agrees the *Spanish* Version of *Athias* and *Usquez*, which was Printed in the last Age at *Ferrara*, and which is of great Authority with the *Jews*, and serves instead of the Text for them that know not *Hebrew*. It renders indeed, *The God which fed me*, by, *El Dio governan a mi*, and the word גואל *that hath redeemed me*, by *El redimien a mi*, or, *my Redeemer*, but the sense is not altered thereby.

Drusius notes in his Fragments of the ancient Interpreters of the Old Testament, that the Participle גואל here attributed to the Angel, is rendred, ἀγχιστεὺς by the *Greek* Translators in *Ruth* iv. 8. which imports the next of kin, to whom the right of inheritance belongs, and with it the Relict of his deceased Relation. From this Translation of the word, St. *Hierom*, and after him many other Divines taking this Angel to be the Messias, have collected a relation peculiar of this Angel to the Family of *Jacob*, of which the Messias was to be born. Christ, saith he *, shall come and redeem us with his Blood; who, as the *Hebrew* has it, is of kin to *Sion*, and is descended from the stock of *Israel*; for so the word גואל or ἀγχιστεὺς signifies.

* *Hier. on Isa.* 59.

But there is another sense of the words, גאל and גואל according to which the *Greek* Interpreters do more commonly render them, I mean that of λυτρῶν and λυτρωτὴς, which confirms the use of the like word in the *Spanish* Version. If you would see the places, you may consult *Kircher*'s Concordance.

 The

The whole difficulty therefore of the place may be reduced to three Heads, which I shall propose by way of Question:

I. Whether the אלהים spoken of, *v.* 15. is the very יהוה whom the *Jews* acknowledge for their God?

II. Whether the גואל mentioned in *v.* 16. is the same with that אלהים *v.* 15. or differs from him as a Creature doth from its Creator?

III. Whether the Prayer contain'd in *Jacob*'s Blessing be made to God alone, or to the Redeeming Angel together with him.

SECT. II.

In Answer to the first Question we need not be much to seek: For *Onkelos* in his *Chaldee* Paraphrase Expounds the word אלהים by יהוה The like *Jonathan* has done in his Version. Nor do I know any Christian that ever blamed them for it. How should they? since it is evident to them that consider this Text carefully, as the Christians generally do the Holy Scriptures, that these *Targumists* have herein faithfully exprest the mind of *Jacob*.

Jacob had been newly remembring that Appearance in which God had blessed him at *Luz*, in these words, * *God Almighty appeared to me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, and said, Behold I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people, and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession.* Now what can be more absurd than to imagin, that *Jacob* when he blesses *Joseph's* Sons, and prays for the encrease

* *Genesis* xlviii. 3, 4.

crease of his Posterity by them, should direct his Prayers to any other than him whose kindnesses he had so abundantly experimented, and whose Promises for the multiplication of his seed, were even now fresh in his Memory?

This I thought fit to observe against those of the *Jews* that doubt it, following as they think the Author of the Book *Rabboth*, who notes that a lesser Title is given to the Angel, than to him that is call'd *Elohim*; as if he had a mind thereby to * tell us that by the Angel here mention'd, *Jacob* intended an Angel and not God.

* *Matthenot Kehun. f.* 23. *col.* 4. *& f.* 108. *col.* 3.

If the Author of the *Rabboth* had understood this of a created Angel, he had certainly been in a very great mistake. For, besides the absurdity of this, it is a wicked thing to suppose that *Abraham* and *Isaac* did walk before the Angel, as *Jacob* asserts they did before God. *God*, saith he, *v.* 15. *before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk.* For the word *walk* in this place comprehends all the acts of their Religion throughout their whole lives, and so *Moses* uses the word to describe the intire obedience of *Enoch*, *Gen.* v. 22. This a Modern *Jew*, *R. Salomon Aben Melek*, acknowledges in his *Michlol Jophi* on this place, where he says the word *walk* denotes the worship of the heart which a Creature owes to God.

But that the Author of the *Rabboth* understood it of an uncreated Angel, who often is called in the Old Testament, *Elohim*, and *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah Elohim*, I little doubt, because he quotes the same authority in this place,

place, which we meet with in the *Bab. Talm. Pesachim c.* x. *f.* 118. *col.* 1. and which makes this Angel to be God.

But if he was of another mind, we should have other *Jews* to confront him, of no less Authority that understand it our way, particularly; we have the Prayers of the *Jewish* Church, many of which alluding to this and the like places in *Genesis* do refer to God only, exclusively to a created Angel, the Title of Redeemer, who delivers from all evil. See *Talm. Hier. tr. Berac. c.* 4. *f.* 8. *c.* 1. and their Liturgies.

* *Lib.* vi. *in Gen. p.* 210.

I know *Cyril* of *Alexandria* *, would have *Jacob* to understand God the Father by אלהים *v.* 15. and the Eternal Son of God by the Redeeming Angel; which Explication he would confirm by *Ephes.* i. 2. *Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* Because Grace is nothing but the Blessing of God communicated to the Church by the Father and the Son. But St. *Chrysostom*'s Opinion is much more probable to me, who asserts *Elohim* to be the Eternal Son of God, that is described in both the 14, and 15 *verses* by different Titles.

Chrys. Hom. 66. in Gen. p. 7.

And herein he followed all the ancient Christians, who used to ascribe to the Son all the Appearances of God, or of the Angel of *Jehovah* that are mentioned by *Moses*; and in particular they teach that the Blessing of the Λόγος was prayed for by *Jacob* in this place.

I scruple not to assert that the ancient Christians ascribed all the Appearances of God in *Moses* Writings to the Eternal Λόγος, having the following Authorities for my assertion.

Just.

Just. Mart. cont. Tryph. Clem. Alex. Pæd. i. 7. *Tertul. cont. Jud. cap.* 9. *Orig. in Isa.* 6. *Cyprian. cont. Jud.* ii. 5. *Constit. Apost.* v. 21. *Euseb. H.E.* i. 3. *Cyr. Hieros. Cat.* xii. the *Concil. Sirm. c.* 13. *Gregor. Bæt. tr. de fide. Theodor. Q.* 5. *in Exod. Leo.* i. *Ep.* 13. *ad Fulch.* and many others.

In like manner they refer to the Word those Appearances of God, which he vouchsafed to *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* himself, as you may see in *Just. Mart. Apol.* for those to *Abraham* and *Isaac*; and for those to *Jacob*, in *Clem. Alex. Pæd.* i 7. *Novat. l. de Trin. c.* 26, 27. *Proc. Gaz. in h. l.*

The ancient Christians did in this no more than the ancienter *Jews* did before them, who by *Elohim* in this place did not understand a created Angel, but the Λόγος, whom the *Targumists* and the strictest Followers of their Fathers Traditions are wont to express by the שכינה and the ממרא.

Philo makes all the Appearances which we meet with in the Books of *Moses* to belong to the *Word*, and the latter *Cabalists* since Christ's time not only do the same, but deny that the Father ever appeared, saying, it was the Λόγος only that manifested himself to their Fathers, whose proper name is *Elohim*. For this consult *R. Menachem de Rekanati* from *Beres. Rabba.* on the *Parasch. Breschit. f.* 14. *c.* 3. *Ed. Ven.* and on *Par.* לך לך *f.* 30. *c.* 1.

I have often wondred how it came to pass, that most of the Divines of the Church of *Rome*, who would seem to have the greatest veneration for Antiquity, should so much despise it in this Question wherein the ancient *Jewish* and Christian Church do agree. *Sancti-*

us in his Notes on the *Acts*, *ch.* 7. says, it is a difficult question among Divines, whether God's Appearances in Scripture were performed immediately by God himself, or by his Angels. And then having cited several ancient Fathers, who thought it the Λόγος that appeared, he adds, *Sed Theologis jam illa sententia placet, quæ statuit Angelorum ministerio antiquis hominibus oblatam esse divinam speciem, quæ est sententia Dionys. de cæleſt. Hier. c.* 4, *&c.* To the same purpose *Lorinus* another Jesuit speaks in *Act.* vii. 31.

But this is not the worst of it that they forsake the judgment of the Ancients; they do herein make bold to contradict the plain words of Christ himself, *Joh.* i. 18. Christ saith thus, *No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him.* And parallel to this Text is *Joh.*vi.46. Certainly he must be very blind who does not see that Christ in these words not only denies the Father to have shewn himself in those Appearances that were made to the ancient Patriarchs, but also asserts them to himself, and not to the Angels.

Away then with such Divines who setting aside the Authority of Christ, do chuse to Theologize in the principal Heads of Religion according to the sense and prejudices of the Moderns. We desire to be no wiser in these matters than the Primitive Christians were, among whom it passed for an establisht truth, that the *Elohim* in *Jacob*'s Prayer, was the very *Jehovah* of the *Jews*, termed by them sometime *Shekinah*, and sometime *Memra*.

SECT.

SECT. III.

As to the second Question it would be no Question at all, but for the obstinacy of some latter *Jews*. He that reads the *Hebrew* Text without prejudice, cannot but see the *Elohim* in *v.* 15. is called המלאך גואל אתי in the following verse, whence it follows that this Redeeming Angel is *Jehovah*.

But because this opinion is contradicted by some of the chief Modern *Jews*, as *Abarbanel* and *Alshek* on this place, and by most of the Popish Divines, as well as some few of the Reformed, that have not sifted this matter accurately, we will offer some proofs for the conviction of them that are not obstinately bent against it.

And, 1. If *Jacob* had had two Persons then in his mind so different as God and a created Angel are, he would have coupled them together by the particle ו, which is not only conjunctive, but very proper to distinguish the Persons of whom we speak, and said, God before whom my Fathers walked, God who fed me from my youth, and the Angel that delivered me, bless the Lads. But *Jacob* is so far from doing thus, that on the contrary he puts a ה demonstrative as well before the Angel as before God, without any Copulative between, which sufficiently demonstrates, he means the same Person by God and the Angel. *Munster* was well aware of this, and therefore being willing to distinguish the Redeeming Angel from God, he Translates it with an addition, the *Angel also*.

2. It

2. It cannot be easily supposed, That *Jacob* would in a Prayer use the Singular Verb יברך in common to Persons, in Nature so very different, the Creator and a Creature. He certainly ought to have said, God and the Angel, יברכו may they bless the Lads, if he had spoken of two. But his speaking in the the Singular, may *he bless*, is an Argument of his having in his Eye one Person alone, whose Blessing he prayed for on his Seed. Otherwise it would have been a Prayer of a strange Composition. For according to *Athanasius*, we do no where find that one prays to God and the Angel, or any other created Being at the same time for any thing. Nor is there any like instance of such a Form as this, God and an Angel give thee this.

3. But setting aside those Rules with which the contrary Opinion can never be reconciled, consider the thing it self in *Jacob*'s Prayer, and you will find it absurd to distinguish between the Offices of God, and those of a created Angel toward *Jacob*. The Office ascribed to God, is feeding him from his Youth; the Office ascribed to the Angel, is delivering him from all Evil; which must be very distinct Offices, if the Persons be distinguished. And so *R. Jochanan* accounts them, *Gem. Pesasch. f.* 118. Tho he believes the Angel to be the same with *Elohim*, yet he contends that feeding, the greater Work, is attributed to God; and delivering, the lesser Work, to an Angel. The same thing is said by the Author of *Jalkut* on this place; and *R. Samule* on the Book *Rabboth* abovementioned. But in the Phrase of these *Jewish* Masters,

sters, this Distinction is very insipid; it is harshly formed, without considering that *Jacob* in this Blessing reflected on the Words of the Vow which he made at *Luz*, afterwards called *Bethel*, because of God's appearing to him there. Now, these were the Words of *Jacob*'s Vow, *If God will be with me, and keep me in the way in which I shall walk: if he will give meat to eat, and cloathing to put on, and bring me home in safety to the house of my Father, then shall the Lord be my God*, Gen. xxvii. 20, 21. Here you see it is from God that *Jacob* expects to be kept in his way, *i. e.* to be redeemed from all Evils that might happen, and that he esteems this to be no less a benefit than Sustenance or Cloathing, which he mentions in the second place. Here is no Angel spoken of here; and since the redeeming Angel is to be expounded from this place, he cannot be a created Angel, for here is no other spoken of, but the Lord.

4. By fancying him a created Angel, who delivered *Jacob* from all Evil, they make *Jacob* to be a mere Idolater, as ascribing that to a Creature, which belongs only to the Lord of the Creation. The Scripture appropriates to God the Title of Redeemer, κατ' ἐξοχὴν; nor do godly Men ever say of a Creature, that it delivers them from all Evil. *David*, I am sure, never does, but when he speaks of *the Tribulations of the Righteous*; he adds, but the Lord delivers him out of all, *Ps.* xxxiv. 20. And *Jacob* on another occasion, directs his Prayer to the Lord that appeared to him at *Luz*, saying, *Save me from the hand of*

of my brother Esau, for I fear him much, Gen. xxxii. 9, 10, 11.

5. God, as I said, has so appropriated the Name of *Redeemer* to himself, that *Jacob* could not without Sacriledge communicate this Title to any Creature, though never so excellent. We cannot be ignorant, that *David* makes this the proper Name of God, *Psal.* xix. 14. as does *Isaiah*, *Chap.* xliii. 14. xlvii. 4. And this *Jonathan* confesses on *Isa.* lxiii. 16. in these words, *Thou art our redeemer, thy name is from everlasting*, *i. e.* this is the Name that was designed for God from the beginning, which yet can't hold true; if in this place, *Gen.* xlviii. 16. it be ascribed by *Jacob* to a created Angel.

6. It appears plainly from *Gen.* xlix. that *Jacob* neither desired, nor expected any Blessing from a created Angel, but only from God. Thus he prays, *&c. The God of thy Father shall be thy helper, and the Almighty shall bless thee with the Blessings of Heaven above*, &c. Not a word of a mere Angel that redeemed him from all Evil; so far was the Patriarch in his former Blessing, from begging of an Angel the Multiplication of his Seed, which was the only thing which he could now expect of God, as the *Jews* own. *Bechai Præf. in Pent. f.* 1. *c.* 1.

7. The same Conclusion may be drawn from the very Order of *Jacob*'s Prayer. Had *Jacob* intended a created Angel by him whom he names in the last place as a Redeemer from Evil, and whose Intercession with God he bespeaks in behalf of his Children, would he not have prayed to the Angel in

in the first place? It is most rational so to do. He that wants the Interest of a great Man to introduce him to the King; he does not in the first place direct his Petition to the King immediately, but first to the great Man, and afterwards by him to the King. Let the Papists therefore look to the Absurdity of their proceeding, while they first pray to God, and then to Saints and Angels. Let those *Jews* who are of the mind of *Isaac Abarbanel* and *Franco Serrano*, in his *Spanish* Notes on this place, and stickle for Angel-worship, see how they can clear themselves of this difficulty, as well as reconcile themselves with those ancienter *Jews*, who abhor this sort of Idolatry. *Maim. Per. Misna ad tit. Sanh. c.* xi.

SECT. IV.

How firm these Reasons are, to shew the Angel here spoken of to be an uncreated, and not a created Angel, is I hope evident to every one. Something however of great importance may be still added to illustrate this weighty Argument, and that is the Judgment of the Ancient Synagogue. The most ancient *Jewish* Writers, and they that received the Traditionary Doctrine from them, though mortal Enemies of the Christian Religion, yet agree with the Christians in the Sense of this Text. For, God be thanked, such Truths were not renounced all at once by these Enemies of our Faith, but they began to dissemble them by degrees, as they found them turning against them in their Disputes with the Christians.

To begin with the Writings of the *Jews* before Christ, we find it is *God* the Word, *ver.* 12. who is described as he that delivers from all Evil, in the Book of *Wisd.* xvi.8. no doubt with respect to this place, where he takes the Angel that delivered *Jacob* from all Evil, to be God.

The same Doctrine is to be met with in *Philo* the *Jew*, that lived before Christ, and in Christ's time. He * expresly affirms of the Angel that delivered *Jacob* from all Evil, that he was the Λόγος. And so does *Onkelos* in his *Chaldee* Paraphrase, translating the Words of *Jacob* simply, as they lie in the Text, without any Addition.

* *Allegor.* ii. *p.* 71. *D.*

Jonathan indeed seems to be of another mind in his Paraphrase, that runs thus, God before whom my Fathers, *Abraham* and *Isaac* worshipped, the Lord that fed me from the time I began to be till this day, may be pleas'd that the Angel may bless the Lads, whom thou hast ordained to deliver me from all Evil. Here he distinguishes the Angel from God; but that he did not mean a Creature by this Angel, is clear, for that in other places he translates this Angel by the Word, or ממרא דיי, and especially in that remarkable place where the same Angel is treated of, *Isaiah* lxiii. 8, 9, 10. he saith it was the *Word* that redeemed *Israel* out of all their Afflictions.

Let us pass to the *Jews* after Christ's time, and shew that they did not immediately renounce the Doctrine of their Forefathers.

The

The Author of the Book *Zohar* in *Par.* ויחי *fol.* 123. hath these words, which he repeats often afterwards, תא חזי המלאך גואל אתי שכינתא דאיל עמיה *come, see the Angel, that redeemed me,* is the *Shekinah* that went along with him.

This is sufficiently intimated by the ancient Author *Tanchuma* in his Book *Jelammedenu*, who notes on *Exod.* xxxiii. that the *Jews* would not have a created Angel go before them, but God himself, in these words, *Moses answered, I will not have an Angel, but thy own self.* Now the *Jewish* Commentators on this place of *Exod.* xxxiii. explain of the *Shekinah*, the words, *thy own self*, and always distinguish the *Shekinah* from all created Beings.

R. Salomon in his Notes on this Text has these words, *The Angel that delivered me, i. e.* the Angel who was wont to be sent to me in my affliction; as it is said, *And the Angel of God spake to me in a dream, saying, Jacob, I am the God of Bethel, &c.* Gen. xxxi. 11, 13.

The Note of *R. Moses Ben Nachman* on this Text, *Gen.* xlviii.16. is very remarkable. The *Redeeming Angel*, saith he, is *he* that answered him in the time of his affliction, and who said to him, *I am the God of Bethel*, &c. *he* of whom it is said, that *my name* is in him. The like he has on *Exod.* iii. where the appearance in the Bush is mentioned: *This is he of whom it is said, and God called Moses out of the Bush.* He is called an Angel, because he Governs the World; for it is written in one place, And *Jehovah*, that is, *the Lord God, brought us out of Egypt*; and in another place, *He sent his Angel and brought us out of Egypt.* And again,

gain, *The Angel of his Presence saved them, viz.* that Angel who is the face of God, of whom it is said, *My face shall go before you.* Lastly, that Angel of whom the Prophet *Malachi* mentions, *And the Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the Angel of the Covenant whom you desire.* At length he adds, The face of God is God himself, as all Interpreters do acknowledge; but no one can rightly understand this, without being instructed in the Mysteries of the Law.

R. Menachem of *Rekan.* on *Gen.* xlviii. 16. the same that afterwards commented on the whole *Pentateuch*, was no stranger to this Notion. Saith he, He means the *Shekinah*, when he speaks of the Redeeming Angel, *f.* 52. See also *f.* 55.

The like has *R. Bechai*, the famous *Jewish* Writer, whose Comments are constantly in the hands of the *Jewish* Doctors. He proves that this Blessing is not different from that which is afterwards repeated, *Gen.* xlix. where no Angel is mentioned. Whence it follows, that the three terms in *Gen.* xlviii. *God, God that fed me, the Angel that redeemed me*, are Synonimous to the mighty one of *Jacob*, *Ch.* xlix. which Title the *Jews* in their Prayers do frequently ascribe to God. *Bech. f.* 71. *c.* 4. *Ed. Rivæ di Trento.* He also there teaches, that this Angel was the *Shekinah.* As does *R. Joseph Gekatilia*, in his Book called *Saare Ora*, according to *Menasseh Ben Israel q.* 64. *in Gen. p.* 118. *Aben Sueb* on this place, a Man of Name among his Party, writes much to the same purpose on this place.

These

These are followed by two Eminent Authors of the *Cabalists.* The one in his Notes on *Zohar, f.* 122. toward the end, saith, *the Angel that delivered me from all evil, is the Shekinah*, of whom *Exod.* xiv. 19. *And the Angel of the Lord, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them, and may God bless us in the age to come.* The other is he who contracted the *Zohar* on *Genesis*, and is called *R. David* the less. He in that Book *Ed. Thessalonic. f.* 174. professes to follow the opinion of *R. Gekatalia* in his *Saare Ora.*

Nor does *Menasseh Ben Israel* himself much dissent from these in the above-mentioned place. For though he attempts to reconcile *Gen.* xxviii. 16. with the first Commandment, *Exod.* xx. *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, by saying it was the opinion of several of their Masters, that there was no contradiction between them; yet at length he produces the opinion of the *Cabalists*, for the satisfaction of his Readers, who possibly would not acquiesce in his former reason drawn only from Modern Authorities.

I mention not *R. Levi ben Gersom*'s opinion, who denies the Angel here spoken of to be a Creature, but calls him the *Intellectus Agens*, because he seems to have borrowed the Notion from the *Arabian* Philosophers; nor is it commonly received by those of his Religion. Many others might be added to these *Jewish* Testimonies, but what I have already produced is I think very sufficient.

SECT. V.

Having thus shewed the Opinions of the ancient *Jews* concerning *Jacob*'s Angel, and that to this day the Tradition is not quite worn out that exalts him above a created Angel; I now proceed to the third Question, the clearing of which will fully justifie that Opinion of the Ancients concerning this Text.

And that is, Whether this form of Blessing, be not an express Prayer? The soundest and most part as well of *Jews* as Christians do agree, That we can't worship Angels without Idolatry. This *Maimonides* affirms, as I quoted him above; and the Protestants, as all Men know, do abhor this Idolatry in the *Roman* Church.

I do therefore positively assert, That these words contain a Prayer to the Angel, as well as to God, for a Blessing on his Children. This the *Jews* can't gain-say, since *Jonathan* their Paraphrast, and other Writers after him, do commonly term this Blessing תפילה or a Prayer And for this reason *R. Menasseh* thought it necessary to endeavour to reconcile this Prayer of *Jacob* with the first Commandment, which forbids Angel-Worship according to the *Jews* Interpretation. *R. Menach. de Rek. in Pent. f.* 97. *c.* 4.

It is true *Jacob*'s form of Blessing does seem to proceed from him either as a Wish, or a Prophecy: A Wish, as if he had said, Would to the Lord, God and his Angel would bless the Lads. A Prophecy, as if he had fore-

foretold that God and his Angel should in after-times fulfill what he now wished. But it might be both Wish and Prophecy, and notwithstanding be a direct Prayer to God and the Redeeming Angel. 'Tis well known how the *Jews* commonly delivered their Petitions to God in this form. And yet I can't forbear giving one instance to confirm it. You may read it in *Deut.* vi. 22, *&c. And the Lord said to Moses, saying, Speak to Aaron and his Sons, thus shall you bless the children of Israel, and say, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall invoke my name for the children of Israel,* (so our Translation is to be mended) *and I will bless them.* So that in plain terms the form of Blessing here prescribed by God, is called *Invocation.* יברך

I cannot therefore see what should hinder, but that we after *Jacob*'s example may offer up our Prayers to a created Angel, supposing, as some do, that *Jacob* prayed for a Blessing to such a kind of Angel. It is a necessary consequence that *Bellarmine* and others of his Communion draw from this instance: Holy *Jacob* invoked an Angel, therefore it is not unlawful for the pretended reformed to do the like; therefore one may worship others besides God; these things, saith he, cannot be denied, unless you reckon Prayer to be no act of Worship, not peculiar to God alone. *De Sanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 29. *Corn. A Lap.* on *Gen.* xlviii.

But let them of his Church get out of these difficulties as they can, who believe *Jacob*'s Angel to have been a meer Creature. Let them

them try how they can convince a *Socinian* from *Ephes.* i. 2. and other places of Scripture, where Worship is ascribed to Christ. The *Socinian* has his answer ready, he may wish and pray to Christ for Grace, though he be not God, since he does no more than *Jacob* did, when he prayed for a Blessing on his Children to a meer Angel.

I am more concerned for these Divines of the Reformed Church, who have given the same Interpretation of *Jacob*'s Angel, with the Generality of Papists, though they cannot be ignorant, they therein dissent from the Divinity of the ancient *Jews*, and the Fathers of the Christian Church, and even the more Learned and candid *Romanists*, such as *Masius* was; I might add, (which perhaps they have not considered) though they therein contradict the whole strain of the New Testament. See *Mercerus ad Pagnini Lexicon*, *p.* 1254.

The intended shortness of this Treatise will not permit me to enlarge on this Head. However one thing I must not pass over, which is worthy the examination of the less cautious Divines. It is very certain, that the God that appeared to *Jacob* in *Bethel* was the very God that fed *Israel* in the Desert, and against whom the *Israelites* in the Wilderness did rebel. Now the Apostle is express, 1 *Cor.* x. that he was Christ, whom the *Jews* tempted in the Wilderness, *i.e.* that he was the Λόγος and not a meer Angel. The Apostle takes it for granted, it was a thing undisputed by the Synagogue in his time. And indeed unless this be allowed, St. *Paul*'s reasoning in this Chapter is trifling and groundless.

Well! what can *Bellarmine* say to this? he who asserts a created Angel to be spoken of, *Gen.* xlviii. 16. He has forgot what he said on that Text when he is come to this place. He here strenuously urges it against the *Socinians*, to prove that Christ was then in being when the *Jews* tempted him in the Wilderness. And since hereby he owns that Christ in his Divine Nature was he that led *Israel* through the Wilderness, who is sometimes called God, and sometimes an Angel, he inconsiderately grants what he had denied before, that the Angel who redeemed *Jacob* from all evil, being the same Angel that conducted *Israel*, was also God.

SECT. VI.

You see what Contradictions *Bellarmine* falls into, out of his zeal to promote the Doctrine of *Invocation of Saints*. I wish there were not something as bad in our Divines that carries them in the like Contradictions. The best I can say for their excuse is only this, They have not carefully attended to the Stile of Holy Scripture. Two or three things therefore I will mention, which occur frequently in Scripture, that methinks would have suggested higher thoughts of this Angel to one that considered what he read.

He that considers how often our Lord Christ is called in the New Testament, *the Spouse, or Husband of the Church*, and compares it with the same Title that God appropriates to

to himself under the Old Testament Estate, will make little doubt that it was the same Christ who was then married to *Israel*. By the same rule one may infer, that our Lord Christ in calling himself a Shepherd, had a respect to that Title, by which he is so often ascribed in his dealings with *Jacob* and his Posterity. This the ancienter *Jews* were sensible of, and therefore both here, *Gen.* xlviii. 15. and *ch.* xlix. 24. where God is mentioned as a Shepherd, they understand it of the *Shekinah* or Λόγος. *R. Menachem de Rekanah* from the Book *Habbahir in Pent. f.* 84. *c.* 2. Of this also the *Jews* in Christ's time were not ignorant, who hearing Christ in one of his Sermons likening himself *to the good Shepherd*, Joh. x. did presently apprehend that he would be thought the Messias, and therefore took up stones to stone him. And then in the process of his Discourse to maintain this Character, he made himself one with the Father.

As Christ called himself a Shepherd, to shew that he was the God that had fed *Jacob* and his Posterity like sheep; so also is Christ most frequently represented in the New Testament under the Notion of a Redeemer; intimating thereby that he was the same Redeeming Angel of whom *Jacob* had spoken. It was he that was called * the *Angel of his Presence*, by whom God redeem'd his ancient People: And he is also called the *Angel of the Covenant* †, in the promise of his coming in the time of the Gospel.

* Isa. lxiii. 9.

† Mal. iii. 1.

Here I should have put an end to this Tract, but for two Objections that lye in my way

way, and seem to require some kind of Answer.

The first is taken from the *Jews* who many of them expound this Redeeming Angel by *Metatron*, and *Metatron* according to them, being a created Angel, or as some say, no other than *Enoch* that was Translated; there seems to be as many Authorities against us as for us.

But let it be observed, 1. Though the *Jews* have several Names of Angels which are not mentioned in Scripture, yet they are all formed out of the Names of God, according to the Rules of their *Cabala*, and that with respect to the Ten *Sephiroth*, as *Buxtorf* has noted, *Lex. Talm. p.* 828.

2. This is plain from the word *Actariel*, which is at the head of the *Jewish* forms of Excommunication *. This is derived from כתר the Name of the first of the Ten *Sephiroth*, whence the *Talmudists* place *Actariel* upon the Throne, *Beracoth, f.*7. *c.*1. and distinguish him from the Ministring Angels that stand before the Throne. But I refer the curious Reader that would know more of this to the ancient *Jewish* Book Intituled, *Berith Menucha, c.* 1.

* v. *Bartolocci, f.*4. & 450.

3. This is no less plain of the Angel *Metatron*, who as they say was he that discoursed with *Moses*, *Exod.* iii. and the Angel in whom God placed his Name. So that they acknowledge, though it is framed from the *Latin* Tongue, yet it expresses the same that the *Hebrew* word שדי does as *R. S. Jarchi* on *Exod.* xxiii. confesses. Now St. *Hierome* on *Ezek.* i.24. notes, that the *Greek* Interpreters some-

sometimes render God's Name שדי by Λόγος, which leads us into the meaning of those ancient *Jews* that accounted שדי and *Metatron* to be the same.

4. The Generality of *Jews* are so far from believing *Metatron* to be *Enoch*, that they believe him to be the Messias, the Λόγος before his Incarnation, in our phrase, but in theirs, the Soul of the Messias, which they look on as something between God and the Angels, whom nothing separates from the Living God. See *Reuchlin*, *l.* i. *de Cabala*, *p.* 651. where he proves *Metatron* to be the Messias from their Writings: Or in short, take the confession of *Menasse ben Israel*, *Q.* 6. *in Gen.* §. 2.

And truly if one would compare all those places of the Old Testament that mention the Angel, whom the later *Jews* call *Metatron*, he would find such Properties belonging to this Angel, as are incommunicable to a Creature. And this shews that they who have departed in this point from the Tradition of their Fathers, did it on this ground, because they were loth to acknowledge the Divinity of the Messias, which seemed to be clear upon allowing *Metatron* to be the Messias. They were more careful to defend their own prejudices, than the Opinions of the Ancients.

II. Another Objection is made from the place in *Rev.* i. 4. the words are these, *John to the seven Churches that are in Asia, Grace be to you, and peace from him that was, and is, and is to come, and from the seven Spirits that are before his Throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, &c.* For *John* here seems to wish and pray for Grace, not only from the Father,

Father, but also from the Seven Angels that are before the Throne of God, and so to be reckoned among the Ministring Spirits.

This place is indeed abused by those of the *Romish* Church, to shew that Prayers may be lawfully directed to Angels. And the *Jews* themselves have contributed to lead some Men of Note into the mistake. For, besides the four chief Angels, whom they make to preside over the four Armies of Angels, which they have chiefly grounded on *Ezek.* i. they speak of seven other Angels, that were created before the rest, and that wait on God before the Vail, that divides them from the *Shechinah.* *R. Eliezer, in capit. c.* 4.

The hearing of these things so often repeated by the *Jews*, has given occasion, I say, to some considerable Divines to believe those seven to be proper Angels, whom St. *John* mentions in his *Revelation.* But then not apprehending how Prayers could be offered to them, nor why the precedency is given them before Christ, they would not have *John* here to have spoken a Prayer, but only to have wisht Grace on the Seven Churches; and this they thought a sense consistent enough with the Angel-worship forbidden by St. *Paul*, Col. ii. 18. and even in this very Book, *Revel.* xix. 10. & xxii. 9.

But to shorten this matter, I altogether deny that St. *John* intended here any created Angels. What then did he mean by them? Nothing else but the Holy Spirit, for whose most perfect Power and Grace on the Seven Churches he here makes Supplication. For as *Cyril* on *Zech.* iii. 9. Τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ τελείως ἔχοντος δεῖ πῶς

πᾶς ἔστι σημαντικόν. The Number seven is always a mark of Perfection in the thing to which it is applied. St. *John* therefore thought of no allusion to the *Jewish* opinion of seven Angels, when he prayed for Grace from the Seven Spirits before the Throne; but had in his mind to express the far more plentiful effusion, and more powerful efficacy of the Holy Spirit under the Gospel than under the Law, and his never ceasing Ministration for the good of the Church, for which purposes he hath received a Vicarious authority under God, immediately to Christ, as *Tertullian* speaks, *de Præsc. Hæret. c.* 13. and for this Interpretation I have *Justin Martyr, Paræn. ad Græc.* and St. *Austin* on my side.

St. *John*'s way of expressing himself is borrowed from *Zech.* iii. 9. where God is represented as having seven Eyes running through the Earth, to signifie by this Figure God's perfect knowledge of all things, as *Cyril Alexandrinus* Notes. Hence we read of Christ, *Revel.* iii. 1. *These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God.* And in another place seven Eyes, and seven Horns are ascribed to him. But we never read (which is worth our observation) of these seven Spirits, as we do of the four Beasts, and twenty-four Elders, that they fell down and Worshipped God.

But why does St. *John* put the Holy Spirit before Christ? If I should say St. *Paul* has done the like in *Gal.* i. 1. and *Ephes.* v. 5. to teach us the unity and equality of each Person in the Blessed Trinity, or because St. *John* in the following Verses was to speak more at large

large of Christ, I think I should not answer improperly. But I shall add another reason, which may explain the whole matter.

In a word, I do believe this difficulty must be resolved another way; for that which makes this place so intricate according to the judgment of many Interpreters, is their referring to the Father, the words of the 4*th.* verse, *Grace be unto you, and peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come*; which ought to be referred particularly to Christ himself, who is described, *Chap.* iv. *v.* 8. according to the description of the Λόγος in *Jonathan*'s *Targum* on *Deut.* xxxii. 39. But then some will say, Why is there any mention made of the seven Spirits, if we conceive that the Grace which is asked for the Church, in the first words, is asked from Jesus Christ? The thing is so clear, that *Socinus* has perceiv'd it.

Now seven Spirits are here mentioned, to denote the Spirit of God, which was to reside with his sevenfold Gifts in the Messias, according to the Prophecy of *Isaiah, ch.* xi. 2, 3. and from thence it comes, that in *Revel. ch.* v. 6. the Lamb is described having seven Horns, and seven Eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the Earth. To Christ there are attributed seven Horns, which denote his Empire, in opposition to the Empire of the little Horn, which is spoken of *Dan.* vii. 8. So there are seven Eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, attributed to him; likewise, to denote the Gracious Providence of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, and that in opposition to the little Horn, in which there were Eyes, *Like the Eyes of man, Dan.* vii. 8.

Here

Here then *the Grace asked*, is from the seven Spirits, that is, from the Holy Ghost, who is united in one with the Messias Jesus Christ, and is sent by him; and so it is said to be asked from Jesus Christ himself, who both has those Spirits as his Eyes, and does cause the Mission of them to his Church.

St. *John* therefore doth not place the Holy Spirit before Christ, but mentions him with Christ, because he after Christ's Ascension, and during the time of Christ's continuance on God's right hand, has a more particular hand in the immediate Government of the Church, and is especially watchful to do her good. And for this reason I think it is, the Holy Spirit is placed as it were without the Veil, like a Ministring Angel. Many of the Ancients knew this, as *Victorinus Petavionensis*, *Ambrose*, *Beda*, *Arethas*, *Autpertus*, *Walafridus Strabo*, *Haymo*, *Rupertus*, from whom *Tho. Aquinas*, and *Cælius* of *Pannonia*, who rebukes those that understand it otherwise, and other Elder Divines of the *Roman* Church learnt it, to say nothing of those of the Reformed Church: But it is time to give over.

THE

A

TABLE

OF

TEXTS of Scripture Occasionally Explained in this Treatise.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
i.	1	116, 119, 123, 142
	2	141
	26	101, 117, 320, 323, 400, 414
iii.	5	118
	8	370
	15	401
	22	42, 118, 320
iv.	7	118
	8	21
vi.	3	141
ix.	7	142
xi.	7	118, 323
xv.	1, 5, 9	370
xviii.	1, 2, 3	147
	18	35
	20, 21	443
xix.		401
	24	323
xxi.	9	61
xxv.	7	118
xxx.	24	120
xxxv.	7	323
xlviii.	15	285
	16	108, 285
	15, 16	433
xlix.	10	43, 293, 401
	18	278

EXODUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
iii.	2	346
	6	54
	14	304
	15, 16	34
iv.	13	261
xii.	3	106
	4	21
xvi.		6
xix.	17	329
xxiii.	23	348
xxiv.	1	328
xxxiii.	14	348

LEVITICUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xxvi.	11, 12	275

NUMBERS

Chap.	V.	Pag.
vi.	22, 24, 25, 26	139, 453
xi.	25, 26	141
xxi.	8	60
xxiv.	17	294

DEUTERONOMY.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
iv.	7	169
vi.	4	176

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xviii.	15, 16	317
	18	57, 402
	19	402
	34	57
xxx.	11, 12, 13, 14	62
xxxii.	2	350
	9	106
	43	56

JOSHUA.

xxiv.	19	118.

JUDGES.

xiii.	18	109

I SAMUEL.

ii.	5	38
	10	62

II SAM.

vii.	14	61
	16	35
	23	323
xxiii.	2	142
	3	62, 142

I CHRON.

xiii.	6	199

NEHEM.

viii.	8	84

PSALMS.

ii.		103, 320, 402
	2	293
	6	267
	7	140, 256
	8	267, 300
	12	289
viii.		63
xvi.	10	55
xix.	4	63
xxi.	1	391
xxii.		36, 39, 91, 309
	16	403
xxiii.	1	275, 304
xxxiii.	6	111, 141, 344, 155, 162
xli.		39
xliii.	3	44
xliv.	69, 80	39
xlv.		38, 272, 299, 309
	6	281
	7	281, 284, 297
	9, 10	284
	11	284, 290
xlvii.		319
	5	404
lxviii.		38, 403
	10	404
	19	414
lxxii.		33, 319, 404
	17	269
	10, 11	294
lxxx.	15, 17	270
lxxxii.	8	283
lxxxix	15	44
	25, 26	270
	28	256
xcv.	11	24, 46
xcvii.	1	37, 38
	7	295
	20	366
xcix.		37
cii.	15, 16, 17, 22	38
	25	37
cx.		24, 38, 55, 103, 282
	1	301, 404

PROVERBS.

iii.	8	102, 404
viii.		404
	15, 16	153
	22	110, 171
	23, 24	140, 171
	25	171
xxx.	4	140, 267

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xxxi.	4	429

ECCLESIASTES.

i.	4	112
xii.	1	161, 119

ISAIAH.

iv.	2	273
v.		39
	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	259
vi.	3	139
	8	414
vii.		47
	14	59
viii.	13, 14	295, 420
ix.	6	44, 109, 273, 405
	7	273
xi.	1, 2, 3	143, 297, 405, & 459
	2	143, 405
xxv.	6	405
xxviii.		281
xxxiii.	22	139
xxxv.	4, 5, 6	302, 420
xl.	3	296
	13	144
	14	175
xli.	4	421
xliii.	6	295
xlv.	23	421
xlviii.	16	406
xlix.	23	291
lii.		36
liii.		33, 36, 48, 328, 407
	4	58
	10	297
liv.		39
	13	262
	5	119
lx.	1	295, 315
	2	85
	19, 20	315
lxi.	1	48, 143
lxii.	3	166
lxiii.		285
	9	119, 346
	10	355

JEREMIAH.

ii.	20	329
v.	5	108, 329
	6	108
xxiii.	26	407
xxxi.	21	328
	33	303
xxxii.	4	310
xxxiii.	15, 16	407

EZEKIEL.

i.		283
xxii.	2	272

DANIEL.

iii.	25	1 0
vii.	13	377, 383, 308, 319
	9	323
	14	283, 308
ix.	8, 9, 13, 14, 18	153
xii.	2	301

HOSEA.

ii.	19, 20	284, 299
xi.	1	58

AMOS.

ix.	11, 15, 16, 17	37

MICAH.

v.	2	276, 407
vii.	7	280
	14	262
	19	280
	18	315

HABAKKUK.

ii.	3	280
iii.		36
	8	358
	13	280, 359
	18	294, 359

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
	HAGGAI.	
ii.	4, 5	358
	9	399
	ZECHARIAH.	
ii.	10, 11	37
iii.	9	456
v.	12	315
vi.	12	38,258,274,409
ix.	9	36
xii.	10	36,284,409
	14	306
	MALACHI.	
i.	11	59
iii.	1	107,255,285,296, 303, 348
iv.		44
	2	64,256,280,315
	The Apocryphal Books. **IESDRAS.**	
ii.	5, 7.	107
iv.	58	107
	III ESDRAS.	
i.	28, 47, 57	111
	TOBIT.	
viii.	6	101
	JUDETH.	
ix.	7	106
xvi.	14	111
	WISDOM.	
i.	4, 5, 6, 7	112
iii.	8	113
vii.	22, 23, 24, 25	102
ix.	1	103
	2, 4	102
	17	102, 113
xvi.	12	106

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xviii.	5	64
	15, 16, 17	104, 106
	ECCLESIASTICUS.	
xvii.	17	108
xxiv.	9	110
	18	111
xlvi.	5, 6	105
xlviii.	3, 4, 5	105
li.	10	103
	I MACCAB.	
xiv.	41	402
	II MACC.	
ii.	8	114
	22, 23	113

MATTHEW.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
i.	20	296
	23	59
ii.	7	276
	15	58
	17	422
	18	328
v.		328
viii.	17	58
ix.	15	328
xi.		29
	4	23
xix.	6	59
xxi.	16	63, 289
	13	329
	42	330
xxii.		54
	32	54

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xxiii.	37	330
xxvi.	53	307, 330
	63	276, 308
	64	276, 308
xxvii.	18, 19, 20	310
	39, 40, 41, 42, 43	308
	46	309
xxviii.	6	310
	19	296
	20	331
	MARK.	
xiv.	39	309
	LUKE.	
i.	2	344
	17	48
	69	62
	79	295, 296
ii.		294
	11	310
	49	298
iv.	18	85, 143
v.	20, 21, 24	300
	23	331
vii.	16	402
xi.	20	331
xvii.	20	63
xxii.	70	276
xxiii.	35, 36, 37, 38	308
xxiv.	46 310, 44, 47	Pr. p. ii.
	47, 48, 49	310
	51, 52	311
	JOHN	
i.		258, 315, 318
	14	332
	15	299
	18	333
	30	299
	29	333
	34, 51	297
	18	446

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
ii.	4	298
	16, 19, 21	298
iii.	13	298
	14	60
	17	298
	29	299
	31, 35	299
iv.	21	59
v.		333
	8	344
	16, 17, 18	300
	19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 39	301, 333
	39	Pref. p. iv.
	46	Pref. p. ii.
vi.	41	334
	46	333
	51	302
	14	402
vii.	38	36
	42	276
viii.	28, 38	303
	51, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59	304
ix.	35, 38	304
x.	11, 18	304
	24, 25, 37	305, 454
xi.	4, 25, 27	306
xiv.	6	334
	16, 17, 26 28,	305, 334
xv.	12, 13, 14, 15	306
	16	335
	26	335
xvi.	27 28, 29 30	306
xvii.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	307
	21	335
xix.	37	309
	32	422
xx.	22, 28	310
	31	311

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
	ACTS.	
i.		344
ii.	30, 31	48
iii.	22	34, 58, 318
	25	57
vii.	30	346
	37	318
	52	335
x.	43	in the Pref. ii.
xiii.	24	55
xx.	28	336
xxvi.	22	in the Pref. ii.
	ROMANS.	
v.	14	25
x.	6	62
	18	63
xv.	11	37
	I CORINTH.	
x.	1, 2, 3	45
	9	348
	4	314
	11	45
x.		454
xv.		336
	27	63
	47	25
xvi.	22	422
	II CORINTH.	
viii.	15	422
	GALATIANS.	
iii.	8	37
	16	43, 57
	19	349, 351
iv.	22	45
	24	25
	29	61

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
	EPHESIANS.	
i.	21	63
v.	14	16
vi.		336
	I TIMOTH.	
i.	4	363
	II TIMOTH.	
vi.	20, 21	363
	HEBREWS.	
i.		38
	1	349
	2	314, 345, 349
	3	103, 114
	5	60
	6	56, 295, 416
ii.		351
	2	349
	6, 7, 8	63
iv.	4, 9	46
	12	10, 106, 344
vi.		46, 336
	6	383
vii.		46, 336
x.		39
xii.	22	337
	25, 26	315, 351
	29	337
	I PET	
iii.	21	46
	II PET.	
i.	21	48
ii.	16	231
iii.	5	345
	I JOHN.	
i.	1, 5	213
v.	17	99, 347

Chap.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
	REVELATIONS.	
i.		337
	4	458
ii.		7
iii.	1	458
xii.	1	64
xix.	10	234
	6	337
xxii.	2	42, 337
	14	42
	9	234

THE

TABLE

OF

MATTERS.

Page

ALlegorical *Expositions in use before Christ's time,* 24, 45, 57.
Angel *of the Face, or Presence of* God, *Called the Redeemer,* vid. Differt. 433.
Apocryphal *Books among the* Jews, *cited and followed in the New Testament,* 14,15,16,17,18.
Apocryphal *Books in our Bibles, their Antiquity,* 67, 68.
Their freedom from corruption, 71, 72.
Appearances. 201, &c.
Cabalistical Divinity *receiv'd by the* Jews, 179, 180, 381.
Embased about Christ's time, 363.
Chaldee Paraphrases, *their Original,* 27,84,85.
And Antiquity, 91.
Progress, 28, 86, *&c.*
Antiquity of those we have, 85,86,88,89.
Their Interpretations, 94,95,96, *&c.*
Christ. *See* Messias.
Divine Essence, *its kind of Unity,* 121,268.
Plurality of Persons in it, 116,118,120, *&c.*

Di-

Pag.

Distinguished by the Name Sephiroth, 163,
Prosopa, 160,167,164,171.
Panim *or Faces, and* Havioth *or Substance,* 171.
And Madregoth, *or degrees,* 163.
Wisdom coming from the Infinite, 169.
And Understanding from the Infinite by Wisdom, 168.
Yet they are all one, 170,174.
Elias *a kind of second* Moses, 244.
Enoch's *Prophesie, how anciently known,* 319.
God, *His Name* Eloah *in the Singular, used in Scripture,* 117.
His Name Elohim *in the Plural joyned with a Singular,* 116.
He speaks in the Plural, and why, 117,118.
God understood by the Jews *where only King is exprest,* 119.
Why called God of Gods, 122.
His Name Elohim *signifies Plurally,* 125,161.
Greek *Learning discouraged among the* Jews, 30.
Jews *early Provision against the Christian Objections,* 323,324.
Law, *by whom given,* 349, 350.
Messias *to be like* Moses, 22.
Spoken of by all the Prophets, 32,266.
By Isaiah, *chap.* liii. 33.
In Canticles, 25,33,268.
Rules for Interpreting Prophecies concerning him, 34, 35.
Messias *expected according to the* Jews, *ever since* Adam's *time,* 42, 43.
To be united with the second Number or Wisdom at his Coming, 171.
The same with the Word, 254, *&c.*

With

Pag.
With the Shekinah, 333, 334, *&c.*
To be a Prophet, 261.
Messias *s the Son of God,* 267, *&c.*
And Bridegroom of the Church, 272, 284, 299.
The true Jehovah, 278, *&c.*
His Great Dignity, 286.
Messias *is God according to the Gospels,* 300, 301, *&c.*
He is to be Worshipped, 289.
Messias *a Shepherd,* 304, 316.
Why Christ did not expresly assume the Title of God, 339.
Christ, or Messias, *Crucified for affirming himself to be the Son of God,* 388.
Moses's *Education in* Egyptian *Learning,* 13.
Platonick Philosophy *out of credit in* Philo's *time,* 356, 360.
Occasioned the Heresies in the Christian Church, 361.
If Plato's *Morality and not his Divinity followed by the first Christians* 360, 361.
Plato *borrowed the Notion of a Trinity from the* Jews, 362.
Powers of God what, 122, 146, 147, 150.
They made the World, Ib. 129.
Philo's *Notions of them, but not so clear,* 155, 156.
They are said to be the same as Wisdom and Understanding by the Cabbalists, 161, 162.
Simon *called himself the Power of God,* 134.
Those Powers called Prosopa, 160.
Psalms, *their Titles by whom affixed,* 19.
Rules for Interpreting them. 20.
Pythagoras *had many Notions from the* Hebrews, 354, 356.
Scripture-Reading *discouraged by the* Jews *after Christ's*

Pag.
Christ's time, 326.
Misinterpreted by way of Accommodation, 423.
By the Modern Jews, 392, *& Talm.*
By the Socinians, 414, 415, *&c.*
Shekinah, *the same with the Word,* 149, 272.
And sometimes used for the Spirit, Ib. 168.
The several Appearances of it to the Patriarchs, and under the Legal Dispensation, 165, 166, *&* 286.
Called Father, 167.
And Jehovah, *to whom Prayers of the* Jews *were directed,* 279.
Its coming into the Tabernacle, 225.
And Temple, 243.
Leaving the Temple, 247.
Its Return, 248
Its expected Appearance in a visible manner in the age of the Messias, 263, 275.
Shekinah *to be a Priest,* 282.
To be the same with the Messias, 286, 333, *&c.*
Shekinah *called* Rachel, 328.
A Stone, 330.
The Finger of God, 331.
Simonians, *some of their Opinions,* 135, 136.
Spirit, *made all Things,* 102, 111, *&c.*
Is a Person in Gen. i. 2. 141.
An Uncreated Being, 162.
And not Air or Wind, 155.
Called sometimes the Shekinah, 149.
But more commonly Bina *or Understanding,* 167
Called by the Cabbalists, *Mother,* 167.
And the Mouth of God, and the Spirit of Holiness, and the Sanctifier, 173.
Seven Spirits, the Spirit of God, 456, 459.

Tradi-

Pag.
Traditions, *how many sorts,* 11, 12.
Time of the Authors of them, 13.
One kind useful to clear the Text, 20, 21.
To understand the Prophecies of the Messias, 22.
Used by the Apostles in the sense of Texts quoted by them, 316, 317, 318.
And Justin Martyr, 319, 320, 321.
Types, *their Ground,* 45.
Oft used by the Apostles, 46.
Unity, *of Divine Essence according to the* Jews, 121, 268.
Wisdom, *made all Things,* 102, 104, 162, 173.
Begot by God, 121.
To be united with the Messias, 171.
Word, *or* Λόγος, *whence so called,* 127.
The Use of it among the Jews, 365.
Made all Things, 102, 103, 126, 129.
Man especially, 130.
After his Image, 129, 131.
Is an Emanation from God, 102.
The same with an Uncreated Angel, 104, 106, 108, 194, 195, 203, 206, 215.
That acted in all the Divine Appearances in the Old Testament, 183.
Objections against this answered, 346, 347, 348.
The Son of God, 121, 183.
A Person, 193, 372.
A true Cause or Agent, 125, 126,
A Divine Person, 196, 197, 366, 373.
Used by the Chaldee *Paraphrasts for* Jehovah *and* Elohim, 372, 374.
In the Text, 149.
And by the Targums, *a Word, a Man,* 259.
The same with the Shekinah, 149, 272.

And

Pag.
And with Wisdom, 162, 163, 164, 272.
And Messias, 254, *&c.*
A Mediator, 183.
A Teacher, Ibid.
A Shepherd, Ib. & p. 275.
The Sun of Righteousness, 256.
God swears by his Word, 209.
The Word prayed to, 210, 211.
The Word gave the Law, 219, *&c.*
And spoke from off the Mercy-seat, 225, 245, 247.
Zohar, *its Author probably,* 177.

ERRATA

ERRATA Præcipua sic Corrigenda.

Page	Line	
13	1	*for* Author, *read* Authors.
23	31	*for* upon *r.* concerning.
25	28	*for* cap. viii. *r.* cap. vii.
ibid	32	*for* of great, *r.* of the great.
64	28	*for* with *r.* to.
69	22	*for* sure, *r.* secure.
ibid	35	*for* would, *r.* must.
71	13	*for* not, *r.* no.
ibid	15	*for* who have quoted, *r.* have quoted.
117	25	*for* 6*ly*, *r.* 2*ly*.
161	3	*after* Scriptures, *add*, with relation.
163	29, 30	*for* which is the same, *r.* which Names are the same.
173	13	*for* Cæma, *r.* Cochma.
205	20	*for* can, *r.* may.
ibid	22	*for* cut many, *r.* cut away many.
213	29	*for* such, *r.* so.
233	15	*for* this, *r.* the former.
244	16	*for* this, *r.* the former.
262	32	*for* Micah vi. 14. *r.* Micah vii. 14.
288	16, 17	*for* besides they, *r.* besides that they.
291	30	*for* אני והו הושיעה *r.* אהיוהו הושיעב
ibid	34, 35	*for* to the *two*, to the Father, to his Λόγος, *r.* of the two, of the Father, of his Λόγος.
315	11	*for* chap. xii. 18 *r.* vii. 8.
320	32	*for* Psal. xv. *r.* xlv.
327	20	*for* Context, *r.* Text.
331	4	*after* righteous, *add*, Word.
339	13	*for* which, *r.* what.
340	23	*for* marks, his. *r.* marks of his.
364	17	*for* To, *r.* On.
376	3	*for* they were very few of, *r.* there were very few.
392	1	*for* Chap. XXIII. *r.* XXVI.
400	21	*for* Ancient, *r.* Ancients.
433	16	*for* understand, *r.* understands.
434	15	*for* מנעורי *r.* מעודי
451	9	*for* Deut. *r.* Numb.

BOOKS

BOOKS Printed for Ric. Chiswell.

THE Fathers Vindicated, or Animadversions on a late *Socinian* Book, Intituled, [*The Judgment of the Fathers touching the* Trinity, *against Dr.* Bull's *Defence of the* Nicene *Faith.*] By a Presbyter of the Church of *England.*

Reflections upon a Libel lately Printed, Intituled, [*The Charge of Socinianism against Dr.* Tillotson, *Considered, 4to*]

Dr. *Williams* (now Lord Bishop of *Chichester*) his Vindication of Archbishop *Tillotson's* Sermons against the *Socinians*; and of the Bishop of *Worcester's* Sermon of the Mysteries of the Christian Religion. To which is annexed, a Letter from the Bishop of *Salisbury* to the Author, in Vindication of his Discourse of the Divinity of our Saviour. 4*to.*

SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM *Historia Literaria facili & perspicua methodo digesta. Pars Altera. Qua plusquam DC. Scriptores novi, tam Editi quam Manuscripti recensentur; Prioribus plurima adduntur; breviter aut obscure dicta illustratur; recte asserta vindicantur. Accedit ad finem cujusvis Sæculi* CONCILIORUM *omnium tum Generalium tum Particularium Historica Notitia. Ad Calcem vero Operis Dissertationes tres,* (1) *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis incertæ ætatis.* (2) *De Libris & Officiis Ecclesiasticis Græcorum.* (3) *De Eusebii Cæsariensis Arianismo adversus Joannem Clericum. Adjecti sunt Indices utilissimi Scriptorum Alphabetico-Chronologici. Studio & labore* Gulielmi Cave, *S. T. P. Canon. Windesorsensis.* Fol.

Bishop *Wilkins*, of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion. In two Books. The 4*th* Edition.

Primitive Christianity: Or, the Religion of the Ancient Christians in the first Ages of the Gospel. In Three Parts. By *William Cave*, D. D. The fifth Edition. *Octavo.*

Several Discourses, *viz.* Proving Jesus to be the Messias. The Prejudices against Jesus and His Religion considered. Jesus the Son of God, proved by his Resurrection. The Danger of Apostacy from Christianity. Christ the Author: Obedience the Condition of Salvation. The Possibility and Necessity of Gospel-obedience, and its Consistence with Free Grace. The Authority of Christ with the Commission and Promise which he

gave

gave to his Apostles. The Difficulties of a Christian Life considered. The Parable of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*. Children of this World wiser than the Children of Light. By the most Reverend Dr. *John Tillotson*, late Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*. Being the *Fifth Volume*, Published from the Originals, by Dr. *Barker*, Chaplain to His Grace. 8*vo*.

—Several Discourses upon the Attributes of God, *viz.* Concerning the Perfection of God. Concerning our Imitation of the Divine Perfection. The Happiness of God. The Unchangeableness of God. The Knowledge of God. The Wisdom and Soveraignty of God. The Wisdom of God in his Providence. The Wisdom of God in the Redemption of Mankind. The Justice of God in the Distribution of Rewards and Punishments. The Truth of God. The Holiness of God, *&c.* Being the *Sixth Volume*; Published from the Originals, by Dr. *Barker*. Octavo.

Sermons Preached on several Occasions. By *John Conant*, D.D. The first and second Volumes. The Second Edition Corrected. Published by Dr. *John Williams*, now Lord Bishop of *Chichester*. 8*vo*.

A Commentary on *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Numbers* In Four Volumes. In 4*to*. By Dr. *Sim. Patrick*, Lord Bishop of *Ely*.

—*His Commentary on* Deuteronomy *is now in the Press*.

A Discourse of the Government of the Thoughts. By *Geo. Tully*, Late Sub Dean of *York*. The 3*d* Edition, 1699.

A New Account of *India* and *Persia*, being Nine Years Travel begun 1672, and finished 1681. By *John Fryer*, M.D. Fellow of the *Royal Society*. Fol. 1698. Illustrated with Cuts.

The Life of *Henry Chichele* Archbishop of *Canterbury*; In which there is a Particular Relation of many Remarkable Passages in the Reigns of *Henry* the Fifth and Sixth, Kings of *England*. Written in *Latin* by *Arthur Duck*. LLD. Chancellor of the Diocess of *London*; and Advocate of the Court of Honour. Now made *English*, and a Table of Contents Annexed. 8*vo*.

FINIS.