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Sir,

The dedication of books unto persons of worth and honour hath secured itself from the impeachment of censure, by taking sanctuary in the usage of all times and ages. Herein, therefore, as none is needed, so I shall make use of no apology. But the consideration of some circumstances (needless to be repeated) seem to render an account of the reason of my particular address unto you in this manner necessary. This therefore, I shall give but briefly;

Ne longo sermone morer tua tempora

That which principally in this matter I resolved my thoughts into, was a design to answer my own inclination and desire, in testifying a respectful honour to a person who in a place of eminency, hath given so fair an example of a singular conjunction in himself, of civil prudence, and all manner of useful literature, with their mutual subserviency unto each other; an endeavour whereof, the wisdom of all ages hath esteemed needful, though few individuals have attained unto it. For whereas a defect in learning hath tempted some, otherwise prudent and wise in the management of affairs, unto a contempt of it; and skill therein hath given unto others a mistaken confidence, that it alone is sufficient for all the ends of human life, an industrious attempt, for a furnishment of the mind with a due mixture of them both, hath been greatly neglected, to the no small disadvantage of human affairs. It cannot therefore seem strange, nor ought any to be offended, that one who dares to profess a great honour unto, and admiration of both these endowments of the mind of man, should express them with that respect, which alone he is capable to give unto him, who in a place of eminent trust and employment, hath given a singular instance of their happy conjunction, and readiness to coalesce in the same mind, to enable it unto a regular and steady pursuit of their common ends. Whether I shall by this address attain that end or no, I know not; but this is that which principally I aimed at therein: and to the reason whereof I leave the judgment of my undertakings. But yet I may not omit, that your favour hath also given me particular grounds for this confidence; and
such as have been prevalent against those impressions of discouragements, which I am naturally very liable to admit of and receive. Your candid esteem of some former endeavours in this kind (and which when carried without the verge of those lines of communication, within whose compass men and their writings are judged by party and scarce otherwise, have received a fair acceptance in the world) were no small encouragement unto me, not to desert those wearisome labours which have no other reward or end, but the furtherance of public good; especially having this only way left me to serve the will of God, and the interest of the church in my generation. It was also through the countenance of your favour, that this and some other treatises have received warrant to pass freely into the world; which though I am uncertain of what advantage they may be unto any, by reason of their own defects, and the prejudices of others; yet I want not the highest security, that there is nothing in them tending to the least disadvantage unto those, whose concernment lies in peace and truth in these nations.

For the treatises themselves, which I desire herewith to represent to some of your leisure hours, I shall not offend against the public service, in detaining you with an account of them. Their subject matter, as to its weight, worth, and necessity, will speak for itself; the main objects of our present faith, and principal foundations of our future expectations, our pleas and evidences for a blessed eternity, are here insisted on. And whether the temptation, opinions, and bold presumptions of many in these days, do not call for a renewed consideration and confirmation of them, is left to the judgment of persons indifferent and unprejudiced; the manner of their handling is submitted unto yours, which is highly and singularly esteemed, by

Sir,

Your most humble and obliged Servant,

John Owen.

March 20, 1667.
PREFACE

CHRISTIAN READER,

If thou intendest to employ any part of thy time in the perusal of the ensuing Discourses and Exposition, it may not be amiss to take along with thee the consideration of some things concerning the design and aim of their author, in writing and publishing of them. It is now sundry years since I purposed, if God gave life and opportunity, to endeavour, according to the measure of the gift received, an Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. A subject this was, I then knew, and now acknowledge, in which many eminent and learned men, both of old and of late, had laboured much. In particular, some entire commentaries, composed with good judgment, and to very good purpose, have been published in our own language. Yea, from him who first began a serious Exposition of this Epistle, and whom none in all things have to this day exceeded, there have passed few ages wherein some or other have not endeavoured the explication of it. And this also hath been done by men of all sorts and parties, of all persuasions and opinions in Christian religion; an account of whose several endeavours shall elsewhere be given: Somewhat there was of encouragement unto me in my designed undertaking, and somewhat of quite another tendency, in this consideration.

The help which I might receive from the sedulous labours of so many learned men, and those in times, places, principles, distant, and distinguished from each other; as also managing their common design with great variety as to particular intentions; I looked on as a matter of no small advantage unto me. Some I found had critically examined many of the words, phrases, and expressions of the writer; some compared his quotations with the places in the Old Testament from whence they are taken. Some had endeavoured an analysis of the several discourses of the author, with the nature and force of the arguments insisted on by him. The labours of some were to apply the truths contained in the Epistle unto practice; others have collected the difficulties which they observed therein, and scanned them in a scholastical way, with objections and solutions after their manner. Others had an especial regard unto the places, whose sense is controverted amongst the several parties at variance in Christian religion; all in their way and manner endeavouring to give light to the intentions of the Holy Ghost, either in particular passages, or in the whole Epistle. The helps and advantages in the investigation of the mind of God, which by their labours might be obtained, I looked on as a great encouragement to undertake the same work with them, and to promote the light of truth thereby.

But on the other side, no small objection unto the whole work and design did hence also arise. For it might seem to some altogether needless to engage in that, in which so many had already been employed, to the great profit and edification of the church. And nothing can or ought more
justly to weaken and take off the resolution of any man in this kind of undertaking than that it is needless. For whatever is so, will also thereby be useless, and because useless, burdensome. This consideration, I confess, did for a long time deter me from executing my purpose, of casting my mite into this sanctuary. But yet after I had made a thorough perusal of all the Comments, Expositions, Annotations, or Observations, on the Epistle, which by any means I could obtain; sundry considerations led me to return again to my former thoughts and resolutions. For, first, I found the excellency of the writing to be such; the depth of the mysteries contained in it to be so great; the compass of the truth asserted, unfolded, and explained so extensive and so diffused through the whole body of Christian religion; the usefulness of the things delivered in it so important, and indispensible necessary; as that I was quickly satisfied that the wisdom, grace, and truth, treasured in this sacred store-house, are far from being exhausted and fully drawn forth by the endeavours of all that are gone before us. So far did these truths then seem from being all perfectly brought forth to light by them; that I was assured that there was left a sufficient ground, not only for renewed investigation after rich ore in this mine for the present generation, but for all them that shall succeed till the consummation of all things. For we find in human sciences, that no ability, no industry, no combination of the most happy wits for their improvement in former ages, hath hindered persons of ingenuity and learning in the present day from adding considerably in several kinds unto their respective advancement. Nor shall the sedulity of this age in the furtherance of these sciences, be ever able to bring them to any such perfection, as to condemn succeeding generations to the slothful and servile drudgery of the mere perusal of their dictates and prescriptions, and so by their inventions leave to others only the use of their memories. If new discoveries are thus constantly making in human science, how much more may we expect, that renewed researches will advance the spiritual knowledge of the things of God, whose stores are absolutely inexhaustible in this life, and whose depths can never be fully fathomed.

Again, it is evident that the principal things asserted and taught in this Epistle, such as is the doctrine of the Person and the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, have received a more eager and subtile opposition since the labours and endeavours of the greater part of Expositors, than they had done before. And as this renders the vindication of the places wherein they are taught and asserted necessary, so it is not unknown unto those who are conversant in these kind of studies, what advantage may be obtained in the investigation of truth by the opposition that is made unto it; especially when that opposition is managed with a curious search into every word and syllable which may seem to give it countenance, as also in the sifted every tittle and particle that stands in its way; in which course of procedure, the enemies of the truths mentioned, have with much art and industry engaged.

But that which most of all took off the weight of the discouragement that arose from the multiplied endeavours of learned men in this kind, was an observation, that all of them being intent on the sense of the words, as absolutely considered, and the use of them to the present church, had much overlooked the direct regard that the author had in the writing of this Epistle to the then past, and to the present and the future condition of the Hebrews, or church of the Jews. Looking at these things as dead and buried, and of no use in the present state of the church, they did either wholly neglect them, or pass them over in a light and perfunctory manner. Nor
indeed had many of them, though otherwise excellently qualified, a competence of skill for the due consideration of things of that nature. But yet those that shall seriously and with judgment consider the design of the writer of this Epistle, the time wherein he wrote it, the proper end for which it was composed, the subject-matter treated of in it, the principles he proceeds upon, and his manner of arguing, will easily perceive, that without a serious consideration of these, it is not possible in many things to come to a right understanding of the mind of the Holy Ghost. Many principles of truth he takes for granted, as acknowledged amongst the Hebrews during their former church state, and makes them a foundation for his own superstructure; many customs, usages, ordinances, institutions, and received sense of places of Scripture amongst the Jews, he either produceth or reflects upon, and one way or the other makes use of the whole Mosaical economy, or system of divine worship under the law, unto his own purpose. The common neglect of these things, or slight attention to them by most Expositors, was that which principally relieved me from the forementioned discouragement.

And this also at length gave rise unto those Exercitations, which I have prefixed to the ensuing Exposition. Some of them are indeed indispensably due to the work itself. Such are those which concern the canonical authority of the Epistle; the writer of it; the time of its being written; the phraseology of the author; with the way in which he proceeds in quoting testimonies out of the Old Testament; and some others of the same tendency. The residue of them were occasioned merely by the consideration before insisted on. I observed that the apostle supposed some great principles on which he built all his arguings and exhortations, not directly proving or confirming the principles themselves, but as taking them for granted; partly from the faith of the Judaical church, and partly from the new revelation of the gospel, which those to whom he wrote did as yet admit of and avow. Such were these, That there was a Messiah promised from the foundation of the world, to be a spiritual Redeemer of mankind. That this Messiah was come, and had performed and accomplished the work assigned unto him for the end of their redemption. That Jesus of Nazareth was this Messiah. There is not one line in the whole Epistle, but is in an especial manner resolved into these principles, and deduced from them. These therefore I found it necessary to examine and confirm, to unfold, vindicate, and declare, that their influence upon the apostle's discourse might be manifest, and his arguing from them be understood.

It is true I have so handled them, as all along to represent the opinions of the incredulous apostate Jews about them, and to vindicate them from the exceptions of their greatest masters, of old and of late. But he that shall look on these considerations and discourses as a matter only of controversy with the Jews, will but evidence his own weakness and ignorance in things of this nature. Who knows not that they are the very fundamental principles of our Christian profession, which, because of that opposition that is made unto them, ought to be frequently inculcated and strongly confirmed. Learned men find it in this day necessary for them to dispute in support of the very principles of natural theology; to prove and to vindicate the being and attributes of God; though these truths have left indelible characters of themselves upon the minds of all the children of men. How much more necessary then must it needs be, to endeavour to confirm and establish these grand principles of supernatural revelation, which have no contribution of evidence from the inbred inextinguishable light of nature, and yet
are no less indispensably necessary unto the future welfare of the souls of men, than those others are. I am not therefore without hope, that the handling of them as it was necessary unto my design, so it will not be unacceptable to the candid reader. I also hope that what is mixed in our discourses concerning Judaical customs, opinions, practices, expositions, interpretations of promises, traditions, and the like, will not give distaste unto any, unless it be to such as being unacquainted with them, will choose to continue ignorant, rather than to be instructed by them, whom they would by no means have supposed to be in any thing more knowing than themselves. I doubt not therefore, but our endeavours on that subject will be able to secure their own station, as to their usefulness, both by the importance of the matter treated of in them, as also from the necessity of laying them as a sure foundation unto the ensuing exposition of the Epistle itself.

Besides these general principles, there are also sundry other things belonging to the Mosaical order and frame of divine worship, which the apostle either directly treateth of, or one way or the other uses, to serve his own peculiar design. This also he doth sometimes directly and intentionally, and sometimes in transitu he reflects on them, and as it were only calls them to mind; leaving the Hebrews to the consideration of what they had been formerly instructed in concerning them. Such is the whole matter of the priesthood and sacrifices of the law, of the tabernacle, and utensils of it, of the old covenant, of the giving of the law, and of the commands, precepts, and sanctions of it in its promises and threatenings, rewards and punishments. He also brings to their remembrance the call of Abraham, with the state and condition of the people from that time unto the giving of the law, with sundry things of the like nature. Without a competent comprehension of, and acquaintance with these things, and their relation to the will and worship of God; it is altogether in vain for any one to imagine, that he may arrive at any clear understanding of the mind of the Holy Ghost in this portion of Scripture.

Now, as I had observed, that the consideration and explanation of these things had been too much neglected by the generality of expositors, so I quickly found that to insist at large upon them, and according as their weight doth deserve, in the particular places, wherein the mention of them doth occur, would too often, and too much divert me from the pursuit of the especial design of the apostle in those places, and would hinder the reader from carrying on the tendency of the whole in the perusal of it. To prevent both which inconveniences, I resolved to handle them all severally and apart, in previous Exercitations.

In these Exercitations I must acknowledge that I have not been able to accomplish the whole of what I designed. For it was my purpose to have pursued the tradition, and given an account of sacrifices with priests for their offering, as also of the occasions, rise, and discharge of the office of the priesthood among the principal nations of the world during their state of Gentilism and apostasy from God therein. Moreover, what doth concern the person and priesthood of Melchizedec, I had designed as a part of this work and undertaking. And I had also proposed an historical account of the succession and actings of the high priests among the Jews, from the institution of their office unto its dissolution; all which belong unto the illustration of that office, which, as vested in Jesus Christ, is the subject of these discourses. From these things, with others of the like nature, I have been forced to abstain. In my near approach to the grave, continued infirmities have rendered me insufficient for the labour, especially considering what
other duties have been, and yet are incumbent upon me. However, my choice also was compliant with this necessity. For I found that a full examination of these subjects would have been vastly too voluminous. But as I have not considered these subjects in the Exercitations, the reader will find them handled more largely than they would otherwise have been, in the exposition of the places where they occur in the epistle. And although they do all, as was said, belong unto the illustration of the priestly office and its administration, yet the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ is complete without them. Let not therefore the reader suppose that on this occasion our Exercitations concerning the priesthood of Christ are imperfect or defective as to the subject-matter of them, as though any thing materially belonging thereunto were left undiscussed. But other imperfections and defects, it is most probable, they may be justly charged with. I shall only farther say concerning them, that as it is wholly without the compass of my knowledge, if the reader can find any other work, in which the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ hath been so handled in its proper order and method, as to its original, causes, nature, and effects; so for the truth that is taught concerning it, and for the discharge of the office to the benefit and salvation of the church; I shall, God assisting, be accountable for it unto any by whom it shall be called into question.

The greatest opposition that ever was made among Christians unto the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, or rather unto the office itself, is that which at this day is managed by the Socinians. It is therefore manifest, and as I suppose will be confessed by all who inquire into these things, that I could not answer my design of the full declaration of it unto the edification of the present church, without an accurate discussion of their sentiments about it, and opposition unto it. This therefore was so necessary as things now stand, that my undertaking an express examination and refutation of their principles in this matter, is no way liable unto any just exception. Only it may seem inconvenient unto some, that in a discourse of this nature, the discussion of the writings of particular men, as Enedius, Socinus, Smalcius, Crellius, and others, should be so much insisted on. And I must acknowledge that at first it seemed unto myself not altogether suited unto the nature of my design. But second thoughts inclined me to this course. For it is known unto them who are any way exercised in these things, with how many artifices this sort of men do palliate their opinions, endeavouring to insinuate contrary and adverse principles under and by those words, phrases of speech, and expressions, whereby the truth is declared. Wherefore if any one shall charge them with what is indeed their mind and judgment in these things, he may sometimes be thought unduly to impose upon them what they do not own, yea, what their words seem expressly to free them from. For instance; suppose that it should be reflected as a crime on them, that they deny the priestly office of Christ itself, that they deny that he was ever a priest on earth, or yet is so in heaven, that they deny that he offered himself a perfect expiatory sacrifice unto God, or that he maketh intercession for us; those who are less wary and circumspect, or less exercised in these controversies, might possibly on the consideration of their words and profession, suspect that this charge must needs be very severe, if not highly injurious. For nothing occurs more frequently in their writings, than a fair mention of the sacerdotal office of Christ, and of his expiatory sacrifice.

What way therefore remained to state a right judgment in this controversy, but a particular discussion of what their principal authors and leaders,
with great agreement among themselves, do teach in this matter. And if from thence it do appear, that what they call the sacerdotal office of Christ is indeed no such office, nor any thing that holds the least analogy with what is properly so called, and that what they term his expiatory sacrifice and his intercession, is neither sacrifice nor intercession, nor hath the least resemblance to what is so indeed, the principal difficulty which lieth in our contest with them is removed out of our way. And herein, that none might suspect that advantages have been sought against them, by undue collections of passages out of their writings, or by a misrepresentation of their sense and intentions, it was necessary that they should be heard to speak for themselves, and that their own words at large, without alteration or diminution, should be represented unto the reader. And this is done so fully out of their principal authors, as that I dare say with some confidence, there is nothing in the writings of the whole party of any importance in this cause, which is not strictly examined. And the reader is desired to observe, that if the truth which we profess concerning this office of Christ, and his discharge thereof, be sufficiently confirmed and vindicated, all the other notions of these men, concerning a metaphorical redemption, a metaphorical sacrifice, and the like, do vanish and disappear. So that although, if I live, and if God will, I intend to write a full declaration of the true nature of the sacrifice of Christ, and a vindication of the doctrine of the church of God concerning it; yet I must take it for granted, that whilst what we have asserted and confirmed concerning his priesthood remains unshaken, the whole truth relating thereunto, will not only easily but necessarily follow. And what in these discourses is effected towards that end, is left to the judgment of the learned and candid reader. Besides, I thought it not unmeet to give a specimen of the way and manner whereby this sort of men do manage their opposition to the principal truths and mysteries of the gospel, that such as are less conversant and exercised in their writings, may be cautioned against those sophistical artifices whereby they endeavour to inveigle and infect the minds and imaginations of men. For this is their peculiar excellency, (or call it what you will) that under an appearance and pretence of perspicuity, clearness, and reason, they couch senses, the most uncouth and most alien from the common reason of mankind, that can possibly fall under the imagination of persons pretending to the least sobriety. Instances hereof, and those undeniable, the reader will find in the ensuing discourses plenteously produced and discovered.

Having given this general account of my design and purpose in the ensuing discourses; some few requests unto the reader shall absolve him from farther attendance in this entrance. First. I must beg his candid interpretation of my conduct in relating some of those Jewish fables and traditions which he will meet with in some of the Exercitations. I could plead necessity and use; and those such as will, evince themselves in the several places and passages of the discourses where they are reported. For they are none of them produced, merely to satisfy the curiosity of any: but either the investigation of some truth hidden under them, and involved in them, or the discovery of their rise and occasion, or the laying open of the folly of the pretences of the present Jews in their unbelief, doth still accompany their recital. However, I will not rigidly justify the production of all and every of them, but put it amongst those things wherein the candour of the reader may have an opportunity to exercise itself. I must beg also of the learned reader a consideration of the state and condition,
wherein through the good providence of God I have been, during the greatest part of the time wherein these Exercitations were written and printed. And I shall pray, in requital of his kindness, that he may never know by experience, what uncertainties, failings, mistakes, and several defects in exactness, straits, and exclusion from the use of books, will occasion in endeavours of this kind. And whatever defects they may meet with or complain of in these discourses, my design was, through the blessing of God, that they should have no cause to complain of want of diligence and industry in me. But yet I am sensible in the issue, that many things may seem to indicate that carelessness of mind, or precipitancy in writing, which is altogether unmeet to be imposed on men in this knowing age. But whatever other reflections I may be obnoxious unto, for the want of ability and judgment, which in me are very small in reference to so great an undertaking, I must crave of the reader, to believe, that I would not willingly be guilty of so much importunate confidence, as to impose upon him things trite, crude, and undigested, which either ordinary prudence might have concealed, or ordinary diligence might have amended. Whatever therefore of that kind may appear unto him, I would crave, that it may be laid to the account of my circumstances, which I have intimated before.

For the Exposition of the Epistle itself, I confess, as was said before, that I have had thoughts for many years to attempt something in it, and in the whole course of my studies have not been without some regard thereunto. But yet I must now say, that after all my searching and reading, prayer, and assiduous meditation on the text, have been my only reserve, and far most useful means of light and assistance. By these have my thoughts been freed from many and many an entanglement, which the writings of others on the same subject, had either cast me into, or could not deliver me from. Careful I have been, as of my life and soul, to bring no prejudicate sense unto the words, to impose no meaning of my own, or other men's upon them, nor to be imposed upon by the reasonings, pretences, or curiosities of any; but always went nakedly to the word itself, to learn humbly the mind of God in it, and to express it as he should enable me. To this end, I always in the first place considered the sense, meaning, and importance of the words of the text, and the consideration of their original derivation, use in other authors, especially in the LXX. of the Old Testament, in the books of the New, particularly the writings of the same author, was constantly made use of to that purpose. Oft-times the words expressed out of the Hebrew, or the things alluded unto amongst that people, I found to give much light into the words of the apostle themselves. Unto the general rule of attending unto the design and scope of the place, subject treated of, mediums fixed on for arguments, methods of ratiocination, I still kept in my eye the time and season of writing this Epistle, the state and condition of them to whom it was written, their persuasions, prejudices, customs, light and traditions; I kept also in my view the covenant and worship of the church of old, the translation of covenant privileges and worship to the Gentiles upon a new account, the course of providential dispensations that the Jews were under, the near expiration of their church and state, the speedy approach of their utter abolition and destruction, with the temptations that befell them on all these various accounts; without which it is impossible for any one justly to follow the apostle, so as to keep close to his design, or fully to understand his mind and meaning.

If any shall think that I have referred too many things unto the customs and usages of the Jews, and looked too much after some guidance in sun-
dry expressions and discourses of the apostle from them; I only answer, that as when I am convinced by particular instances of mistakes therein, I shall willingly acknowledge them; so for the present I am satisfied, that other expositors have had far too little regard thereunto. The exposition of the text is attended with an improvement of practical observations, answering the great end for which the Epistle was committed over to all generations for the use of the church.

If in some of these I shall seem to any to have been too prolix, I must only answer, that having no other way to serve the edification of the generality of Christians, I thought not so. Moreover, I have sundry things to offer towards his satisfaction: as,

1. The method of the whole is so disposed, as that any one, by the sole guidance of his eye, without further trouble than in turning the leaves of the book, may carry on or continue his reading of any one part of the whole without interruption, or mixing any other discourses therewith. Thus he may in the first place, go over our consideration of the original text, with the examination of ancient and modern translations, and the grammatical construction and signification of the words, without diverting unto any thing else that is discoursed on the text. In like manner, if any desire to peruse the exposition of the text and context, with the declaration and vindication of the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost in them, without the least intermixture of any practical discourses deduced from them, he may under the same guidance, and with the same labour confine himself to this, from the beginning unto the end of the work. And whereas the practical observations, with their improvement, do virtually contain in them the sense and exposition of the words, and give light unto the intendment of the apostle in his whole design, for aught I know, some may be desirous to exercise themselves principally in those discourses; which they may do by following the series and distinct continuation of them from first to last. Wherefore from the constant observation of the same method, as to the principal distinct parts of the whole exposition, every one is at liberty to use that order in the perusal of it, which he judgeth most for his own advantage.

2. There will be relief found against that discouragement which the apparent length of these discourses may give the reader, from the variety of their subject matter, or the things that are contained in them. For there are few of them on any single head, that extend themselves beyond a page or a leaf at the most. Wherefore, although all of them together may make an appearance of some tediousness unto the reader, yet he will find it not easy to fix this charge on any one in particular, unless he judge it wholly impertinent. And for those few of them which must exceed the bounds mentioned, their importance will plead an excuse for their taking up so much room in the work itself. In illustration of this, we may refer to the third chapter, in which our attention is called to the authority of Christ as the Son of God over the church; to the nature of faith; as also of unbelief, and to the danger of eternal ruin wherewith it is attended; to the deceitfulness of sin, with the ways and means by which it hardens the hearts of men; to the limitation of a day or season of grace, with the use of Old Testament types and examples. These subjects, which are therein treated of by the apostle, are things which in their own nature deserve a diligent enquiry into them, and declaration of them. And however others who have had only some particular design and aim in the exposition of this Epistle, or of any other book of the Scripture, may satisfy themselves in opening the words of the text so far as it suits their design; yet he who
professedly undertakes a full and plenary exposition, cannot discharge his duty and undertaking, without the interpretation and improvement of the things themselves treated of, according to the intention and mind of the Spirit of God. And I could heartily wish that the temptations and sins of the days wherein we live, did not render the diligent consideration of the things mentioned, more than ordinarily necessary unto all sorts of professors.

3. The reader may observe, respecting most of those discourses, that they either consist in the exposition of other places of Scripture suggested by their analogy unto that under consideration, or that they have such expositions, with a suitable application of them every where intermixed with them. Unto them to whom these things are not satisfactory, with respect unto the length of these discourses, I have no more to offer, but that if they think meet on this, or on any other consideration, to spare their charge in buying, or their labour in reading the book itself, they will have no reason to complain of any thing contained in it, or of the manner in which it is handled.

There is one thing also respecting the exposition of the fourth chapter, with which the reader must be made acquainted. I have already published Exercitations respecting the Sabbatical day of divine worship. Two editions of these Exercitations are now in the hands of the public. I am unwilling to reprint what I have there advanced. I therefore only request the reader to observe, that in the exposition of that discourse of the apostle about the several rests mentioned in the Scripture, I will not absolutely stand to his censure and judgment upon the perusal of the Exposition alone, (though I will maintain it to be true, and hope it to be clear and perspicuous) without regard to those Exercitations, wherein the truth of the exposition itself is largely discussed and vindicated.

I have no more to add concerning the ensuing Exposition. For to give the reader a particular account either of my travail therein, or of the means used in carrying it on, I judge not convenient; as unwilling to give the least appearance of any satisfaction, much less glorifying in any thing of my own but in my infirmities. This I neither do, nor desire, nor dare to do. Only duty binds me to declare, That as I have used the utmost sincerity whereof I am capable, in the investigation and declaration of the mind of the Spirit of God in the text, without the least respect unto any parties of men, opinions, ways of worship, or other differences that are amongst us in and about the affairs of religion, because I feared God; so in the issue and fruit of my endeavours, the reader will find nothing savouring of an itch after novelty or curiosity, that will divert him from that sound doctrine and form of wholesome words, wherein the professors of this nation have been educated and instructed.
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EXERCITATION I.


§ 1. The canonical authority of the Epistle unto the Hebrews having been called in question, we must in our entrance declare what it is which we intend by canonical authority, and also prove the clear interest of this Epistle therein. For this is the foundation of all those ensuing discourses from it, and of that exposition of it, which we intend.

§ 2. The Greek word κανον, which gives rise unto the term Canonical, seems to be derived from the Hebrew וּנְפֶל Kāneh; which sometimes denotes, an aromaticall cane that contained spices in it, used in the worship of God, as Isa. xliii. 24. וֹנֶפֶל וֹנֶפֶל אֲלֵה, 'thou hast bought me no sweet cane with silver,' (for this בְּרוֹאָה מְנֹּפֶל, 'precious cane,' growing not in their own country, was brought from afar off, Jer. vi. 20.) But in general it signifies any reed whatever, 1 Kings xiv. 15; Isa. xliii. 3, whence a multitude of fierce and wicked men, compared to the devouring crocodile, whose lurking place is in the canes or reeds, are termed וֹנֶפֶל וֹנֶפֶל, 'the beast of the reed,' Psal. lxviii. 30. It is used to signify a reed made into an instrument, wherewith they measured their buildings, containing six cubits in length, Ezek. xl. 7, chap. xlii. 16. And hence indefinitely it is taken for a rule or measure. Besides it signifies the jugum, or scapus, or beam with the tongue of a balance, keeping the poise of the scales equal, and discovering the rectitude or declensions thereof, Isa. xlivi. 6. וֹנֶפֶל וֹנֶפֶל, 'they weighed silver on the cane;' that is, saith the Targum, נוּנָה נוּנָה, 'in the balance;' the supporter and director of the scales, being put for the whole. The Rabbins call it וֹנֶפֶל, the 'reed of the scales;' that which tries, and weighs, and gives every thing its just moment.

VOL. I.
§ 3. And this also is the first and proper signification of the Greek word, κανων, canon. So the Scholiast on these words of Aristophanes, 

Καὶ κανονάς ἐξουσιοῦσι, καὶ παχεὶς επων. a
tells us, that κανων ἵσκεται τὸ ἐπάνῳ τῆς τριστάνης οὐ καὶ εἰς ισοτήτα ταυτήν αγών; 'properly that which is over the scales bringing them (and the things weighed in them) to equality.' The very same with the Hebrew תִּתֵּנ, from which it is derived. So Varinus tells us that it is properly the tongue in the balance, and in use μετρον αἰδαμένωσον. And Aristotle says, τῷ εὐθέτι καὶ αὐτοκαὶ καμπυλῶν γινωσκομεν, κριτῆς γαρ ἁμρόιν ὁ κανων, b 'by that which is right, we know its self, and that which is crooked, for the canon is judge of both: where he useth the word for any kind of rule or measure, answering unto the other signification of קאוב in the Hebrew. Rectum and Canon, that which is right, and the rule, are one and the same; the one expression denoting the perfect nature of any thing, the other its use and application.

§ 4. From this original and proper import of the word, is its metaphorical use deduced, which is most common; and therein it signifies a moral rule, or a measure, for direction, trial, and judgment. Hence the philosopher calls the law κανών τῆς πολιτείας, 'the rule of the administration, or government of the commonwealth; that whereby all the parts of it are disposed into their proper places, whereby they are regulated, and all things done in it are tried and judged. And in this sense it is applied by St. Paul unto divine revelation, Gal. vi. 16. ὅσοι τῷ κανών τούτῳ στοιχειούσιν, 'as many as proceed orderly,' that is, in a direct way, (for so στοιχεῖον denotes,) 'according to this rule or canon.' And to the same purpose he useth again the same expression, Phil. iii. 16. For as the words of the Scripture are in themselves παντὶ ῥήμα, 'words of truth,' so the writing itself is ἴση ῥήμα, a 'right writing;' or as the LXX. γεγραμμένον εὐθυτήτος, 'that which is written in uprightness,' to be a rule and judgment unto all. Εὐθυτήτος is genitivus adjuncti, not materice, declaring the property of the writing, not the subject matter, that is, it is canonical; for τῷ εὐθέτι κανων, that which is right, and a rule, we have shown to be the same. And from hence it is, that the Scripture, or written word of God, being in itself every way absolutely right and perfect, and appointed by him to be the rule or canon of the church's faith and obedience, requiring, trying, regulating, judging wholly and absolutely of these, hath obtained κατ' εὐθυτήτιν, by way of eminence the name of canonical, or regular; as the book wherein it is contained is called the Bible, though in itself that be the common name of all books.

§ 5. And this appellation is of ancient use in the church. The Synod of Laodicea, supposed to have preceded the council of Nice, makes mention of it as a thing generally admitted; for the fathers of it decree, ὅτι οὐ δει ἐπισκοπους φαλάσας λεγεται εν τῷ ἐκκλησία, οὐδὲ ἀκανονικα Βιβλία, ἀλλα μόνα τα κανονικα τῆς κανης καὶ παλαιας διάζηκες. d 'That no private Psalms ought to be said or read in the church, nor any uncanonical books, but only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament,' whose names they subjoin in their order. And somewhat before, the bishops who joined with the church of Antioch in the deposition of Paulus Samosatenus charge him as ὁ ἀποτητος των κανωνος, e one that in the introduction of his heresy, departed

a Aristoph. in Ran. Ac. 3. Sc. 1.  

b Aristot. de Anim. lib. 1. cap. ult.  
c Aristot. pol. lib. 2. cap. 8.  
from the canon or rule of the Scripture. Before them also, it was called by
Irenæus, κανών τῆς αληθείας ακλήνης; And Chrysostom calls it τῶν δεων
νομῶν αποφασιν, the 'sentence of the divine laws;' ακριβης ζυγον ἀπαντων κα
γνωσει και κανωνα, 'the exact balance, square, or rule and canon of all
truths and duties;' wherein he hath evidently respect unto the original use,
and import of the word as before explained; and thereupon he calls on his
hearers, that omitting the consideration of what this or that man says or
thinks, they should seek and require τινα τινα παρά των γραφων, 'all
these things of or from the Scriptures,' which are the canon of our faith and
obedience. And Austin, 'demonstrant ecclesiam suam non in rumoribus
Africorum, sed in prescripto legis, in Prophetarum praedictis, in Psalmorum
cantibus, hoc est in omnibus canonicis Sanctorum librorum autoritatis,b
'Let them demonstrate their church, not by the rumours of the Africans,
but by the prescription of the law, the predictions of the prophets, the
songs of the Psalms, that is by the canonical authority of the holy books of
the Scriptures.' And he pursues the metaphor of a scale and a measure in
many words elsewhere. And thus Aquinas 1 himself confesseth the Scrip-
ture is called canonical, because it is the rule of our understanding in the
things of God. And such a rule it is, as hath authority over the con-
sciences of men, to bind them unto faith and obedience, because of its being
given of God by inspiration for that purpose.

§ 6. Moreover, as the Scripture upon the accounts mentioned, is by way
of eminence said to be canonical, so there is also a canon or rule deter-
mining what books in particular do belong to the holy Scripture, and are
on that account canonical. So Athanasius tells us that by the holy Scrip-
ture he intends, 'Libros certo canone comprehensos,'—the 'books contained
in the assured canon of it.' And Ruffinus having reckoned up those books,
concludes, 'hi sunt quos patres intra canonem concluserunt;'—'These are
they which the fathers have concluded to be in the canon;' that is, to be-
long unto the canonical books of Scripture. And Austin to the same pur-
pose: 'Non sine causa, tam salubri vigilantia canon ecclesiasticus consti-
tutus est, ad quem certi prophetarum et apostolorum libri pertinent;' 1—
'not without good reason is the ecclesiastical canon determined by whole-
some diligence, unto which, certain books of the prophets and apostles
should belong.' About the assignation of this canon of the Scripture, or
what books belonged unto the canonical Scripture, there have been some
differences in the church, since the time of the synod of Carthage, con-
formed by that in Trulla at Constantinople; the first church having agreed
well enough about them, except some few persons, who hesitated in refe-
rence unto one or two of the books of the New Testament.

§ 7. From this rise and use of the word, it is evident what is intended
by the canonical authority of the Scripture, or of any particular book there-
unto belonging. Two things are included in that expression. First, the
spring and original of any book, which gives it authority; and secondly,
the design and end of it, which renders it canonical. For the first, it is
required that it be ἀποκαθευνιος, 'given by immediate inspiration from God;
without this, no book or writing can by any means, any acceptation, or
approbation of the church, any usefulness, any similitude of style, or manner
of writing to the books that are so, any conformity in matter or doctrine to

1 Iren. lib. 4. cap. 69.  g Chrysost. in 2 ad Cor. cap. 6. ad finem.  h August
de unitat. Ecleas. cap. 16. i Lib. 2 de Bap. ad. Donat. cap. 6. Aquin. in 1 Tim.
1 August. ad Crescon. lib. 2. cap. 31.
them, have an interest in that authority that should lay a foundation for its reception into the canon. It is the impress of the authority of God himself on any writing, or its proceeding immediately from him, that is sufficient for this purpose. Neither yet will this alone suffice to render any revelation or writing absolutely canonical in the sense explained. There may be an especial revelation from God, or a writing by his inspiration, like that sent by Elijah unto Jehoram, the king of Judah, 2 Chron. xxi. 12, which being referred only unto some particular occasion, and having thence authority for some especial end and purpose, yet being not designed for a rule of faith and obedience unto the church, may not belong unto the canon of the Scripture. But when unto the original of divine inspiration, this end also is added, that it is designed by the Holy Ghost for the catholic standing use and instruction of the church, then any writing or book becomes absolutely and completely canonical.

§ 8. The Jews of latter ages, m assign some difference among the books of the Old Testament, as to their spring and original, or manner of revelation, though they make none as to their being all canonical. The book of the law, they assign unto a peculiar manner of revelation, which they call מִסְכִנָה or מִסְכִּנָה, 'mouth to mouth,' or 'face to face,' which they gather from Num. xii. 8, whereof afterwards. Others of them they affirm to proceed from רָאוּבֵן, or the 'gift of prophecy.' Of this gift of prophecy they make many kinds or degrees, taken from the different means used by God in the application of himself unto them, belonging to the πολυτροπία of divine revelation mentioned by the apostle, Heb. i. 1. And they divide those books into two parts, namely the הִדְנַיָאתֵלֵין or 'former prophets,' containing most of the historical books after the end of the law; and הִדְנַיָאתֵי לֹא דָרוֹר, the 'latter prophets,' wherein they comprise the most of them peculiarly so called. The original of the remainder of them they ascribe unto שִׁירֵי־דָרוֹר, or 'inspiration by the Holy Ghost,' calling them peculiarly שִׁירֵי־דָרוֹר, or 'written, by that inspiration; as though the whole canon and system of the books were not רָאוּבֵן, the Scripture or writing, and שִׁירֵי־דָרוֹר or divine inspiration, the only means of their writing. But they do herein as in many other things.

The distribution of the books of the Old Testament, into the law, psalms, and prophets, was very ancient in their church. We have mention of it, Luke xxiv. 44, γα γεγραμμένα εν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως, καὶ προφητικος, καὶ ψαλμοι, 'that are written in, in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms,' that is, in the whole canonical Scripture. And it is evident that this distribution is taken from the subject-matter of those principal parts of it. This distribution they have by tradition, but not knowing, or neglecting the reason of it, they have feigned the rise of it in a different manner of revelation, and cast the particular books arbitrarily under what heads they pleased. This is evident from sundry of them which they reckon unto the סְתֵרֵי, Cethubim, or Hagiographa, which are with them of least esteem. But we have a more sure rule, both overthrowing that feigned distinction, and perfectly equalizing all parts of divine Scripture as to their spring and original. St. Peter calls the whole λόγον προφητικον, 2 Pet. i. 19, 'the word of prophecy;' and προφητικα, ver. 20, 'prophecy,' and therefore it belongs not unto any peculiar part of it, to be given out by prophecy; which is a property of the whole. And St. Paul also terms the whole Scripture γραφα προφητικα, Rom. xvi. 26, 'prophetical Scriptures,' or writings of the pro-

phets. And when he demanded of Agrippa whether he believed the Scriptures, he doth it in the same manner, πιστεύεις τοις προφηταῖς, Acts xxvi. 27, 'believest thou the prophets?' that is, the Scriptures, written by the spirit of prophecy, or by the inspiration τοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεύματος Χριστοῦ, 1 Pet. i. 11, 'of the Spirit of Christ that was in them.' God of old spake, εν τοις προφηταις, Heb. i. 1, in his revelation of himself unto them and in them, and equally spake, δια στομάτων τῶν ἄγιων τῶν αὖτις αἰωνίων προφητῶν, Luke i. 70, unto them, 'by the mouth of his holy prophets from the beginning.' And thus, not this, or that part, but πᾶσα γραφή Ἑιστευνσια, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 'all Scripture was given by inspiration.' And herein all the parts, or books of it are absolutely equal, 'And in the giving out of the whole, ὦ τὸ πνεῦματος ἄγιον ελάλησαν ἄγιοι ἰδίων αὐτῶν, 2 Pet. i. 21, 'holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' So that whatever different means God at any time might make use of, in the communication of his mind and will unto any of the prophets or penmen of the Scripture, it was this Ἑιστευνσια, and being acted by the Holy Ghost, both as to things and words, that rendered them infallible revealers of him unto the church. And thus the foundation of the canonical authority of the books of the Scripture, is absolutely the same in and unto them all, without the least variety, either from any difference in kind or degree.

§ 9. The same is their condition as to their being canonical: they are all so equally. Some of the ancients used that term ambiguously, and therefore sometimes call books canonical, that absolutely are not so, as not being written by divine inspiration, nor given by the Holy Ghost to be any part of the rule of the church's faith and obedience. Thus the Constantinopolitan Council in Trulla confirms the canons both of the synod of Laodicea, and the third of Carthage, which agree not in the catalogues they give us of books canonical; which, without a supposition of the ambiguity of the word, could not be done, unless they would give an assent unto a plain and open contradiction. And the council of Carthage makes evident its sense in their appendix annexed to the one and fortieth canon, wherein they reckon up the books of the Holy Scripture. 'Hoc etiam,' say they, 'fratrem et consacrodotis nostro Bonifacioc, vel alius earum partium Episcopos, pro confirmando isto canon, innontescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus legenda; licet etiam legi passiones martyrum cum anniversarii dies celebrantur.' They speak dubiously concerning their own determination, and intimate that they called the books they enumerated canonical, only as they might be read in the church; which privilege they grant also to the stories of the sufferings of the martyrs, which yet none thought to be properly canonical. The same Epiphanius testifies of the epistles of Clemens. But as the books which that synod added to the canon of Laodicea, are rejected by Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilarius, Gregorius Nazianzen, Cyrilus Hierosolimitanus, Epiphanius, Rufinus, Hierome, Gregorius Magnus, and others; so their reading and citation is generally declared by them to have been only for direction of manners, and not for the confirmation of the faith. Thus St. Paul cited an Iambic out of Menander, or rather Euripides, 1 Cor. xv. 33, an Hemistichium out of Aratus, Acts xvii. 28, and a whole Hexameter out of Epimenides, Titus i. 12. 'Non sunt

canonici, sed leguntur Catechumenis, saith Athanasius.—‘They are not canonical, but are only read to the Catechumeni.’ And Hierome, the church reads them ‘ad aedificationem plebis, non ad autoritatem ecclesiasticorum dognatum confirmandam’—‘for the edification of the people, but not for the confirmation of any points of faith.’ But although some books truly canonical were of old amongst some ev αφιέρων, as Epiphanius speaks, doubted of; and some were commonly read that are certainly αποκριφα, apocryphal, yet neither the mistake of the former nor latter practice, can give any countenance to an apprehension of a second, or various sort of books properly canonical. For the interest of any book or writing in the canon of Scripture accrues unto it, as hath been shown, merely from its divine inspiration, and from being given by the Holy Ghost for a rule, measure, and standard of faith and obedience unto the church. Therefore, whatever advantage or worth to commend it any writing may have, yet, if it have not the properties mentioned of divine inspiration and confirmation, it differs in the whole kind, and not in degrees only, from all those that have them. It cannot then be any part regulæ regulantis, but regulatur at the best, not having autopsiían, or a self-credibility on its own account, or αυτεντιαν, a self-sufficing authority, but is truth only materially by virtue of its analogy unto that which is absolutely, universally, and perfectly so. And this was well observed by Lindanus. ‘Impio,’ saith he, ‘sacrilégio se contaminant, qui in Scripturarum christianarum corpore, quosdam quasi gradus conantur locare, quod unam eandemque Spiritus Sancti vocem, impio humanæ stultitiae discerniculo audent in varias impares discerpere et disturbare autoritatis classes.’—‘They defile themselves with the impiety of sacrilege, who endeavour to bring in, as it were, divers degrees into the whole body of the Scriptures; for by the impious discretion of human folly, they would cast the one voice of the Holy Ghost into various forms of unequal authority.’ As then whatever difference there may be as to the subject matter, manner of writing, and present usefulness, between any of the books, which being written by divine inspiration, are given out for the church’s rule; they are all equal as to their canonical authority, being equally interested in that which is the formal reason of it; so whatever usefulness or respect in the church any other writing may have, it can in no way receive an interest in that, whose formal reason it is not concerned in.

§ 10. In the sense explained, we affirm the Epistle to the Hebrews to be canonical, that is, properly and strictly so, and of the number of the books which the ancients called, γρηγορος, ευδαιμονια, καθολικα, αναμφιλεγοντα, and ὑμιλογονυμια, every way genuine and catholic. In confirmation whereof, we shall first declare by whom it hath been opposed or questioned; and then what reasons they pretend for their so doing; which, being removed out of our way, the arguments whereby the truth of our assertion is evinced, shall be insisted on.

§ 11. We need not much insist on their madness, who of old, with a sacrilegious licentiousness, rejected what portion of Scripture they pleased. The Ebionites not only rejected all the epistles of Paul, but also reviled his person as a Greek and an apostate, as Irenæus and Epiphanius inform us. Their folly and blasphemy was also imitated and followed by the Hescheitæ in Eusebius. Marcion rejected in particular this Epistle to the Hebrews,
and those also to Timothy and Titus, as Epiphanius\textsuperscript{d} and Hierome\textsuperscript{e} assure us, who adds unto him Basilides. And Theodoret\textsuperscript{f}, as to the Epistle unto the Hebrews, joins unto them some of the Arians also. Now, though the folly of those sacrilegious persons be easy to be repelled, as it is done by Petrus Cluniensis,\textsuperscript{g} yet Hierome hath given us a sufficient reason why we should not spend time therein. ‘Si quidem,’ saith he, ‘redderent causas cur eas apostoli non putant, tentaremus aliquid respondere, et forsitan satisfacere lectori; nunc vero cum hæretica autoritate promptuent et diciunt, illa Epistola Pauli est, hæc non est, ea autoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescent falsa simulare.’ They did not so much as plead, or pretend any cause or reason for the rejection of these Epistles, but did it upon their own head and authority, so they deserve neither answer nor consideration.

§ 12. It is of more importance that this Epistle was a long time, though not rejected by, yet not received in the church of Rome. Eusebius\textsuperscript{h} informs us, that Caius, a presbyter of that church, whom he much commends for his learning and piety, admitted but of thirteen epistles of St. Paul, rejecting that unto the Hebrews, as Photius\textsuperscript{i} also affirms. And the same Photius acquaints us with the same judgment of Hippolitus, another eminent member of that church: Λέγει (saith he) ἐν αλλὰ τὰ τίνα τῆς ἀκριβείας λειτουργεία, καὶ ὅτι ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους επιστολὴ οὐκ ἑστὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου. Among other things not exactly answering the truth, he saith also, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not Paul’s. And Eusebius adds unto his information of the judgment of Caius, that it was not generally received in the church of Rome in his time. Neither is it any way acknowledged as St. Paul’s, by either Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, or Arnobius. Yea, the same Eusebius\textsuperscript{j} affirms, that some excepted against it upon this account, because it was opposed, as none of St. Paul’s, in the Roman church. Hierome grants that, ‘Latinorum consuetudo non recepit Epistolam ad Hebraeos inter canonicas Scripturas.’—‘The custom of the Latins (that is the Roman church) did not receive this Epistle among the canonical Scriptures.’ And speaking elsewhere of it, he adds the same words, ‘Licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.’ And elsewhere also he confirms the same assertion. It cannot then be denied but that it was four hundred years at least after the writing of this Epistle, before it was publicly received and avowed as canonical by the Roman church. Nor will the quotation of it by Hilary and Ambrose prove any general admission of it as such, it being their custom not to restrain the testimonies they made use of, unto books absolutely canonical.

§ 13. Baronius\textsuperscript{k} ad An. 160, labours to take off this failure of the Latin church. The testimony of Eusebius he rejects, because, as he says, he was ‘Arianorum gregalis’ of the Arian faction, and willing to call the authority of this Epistle into question in compliance with them, who, some of them, as we observed before, refused it: n. 42. The judgment of Caius he resolves into the testimony of Eusebius, which because of his partiality, as he pleads, is not to be admitted. And lastly opposeth the witness of Hierome, as a person who had suffered himself to be imposed on by Eusebius, whose
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words in his reports of Caius, he makes use of. n. 50. Concluding upon the whole matter, that it was a mere false calumny of Eusebius, against the church of Rome, which Hierome by too much facility gave credit unto. But I must acknowledge, that these answers of his, which indeed are nothing but a rejection of as good witnesses in matters of fact, as any we have upon the roll of antiquity, are not unto me satisfactory. Neither am I satisfied with the testimony of its acceptance which he produceth in the epistle of Innocentius to Exuperius, which is justly suspected to be supposititious; as is that of the council at Rome against Appolinaris, under Damasus, wherein no such thing appears. Though I will not deny, but that about that time it came to be publicly owned by that church, and was reckoned unto the canon of the Scripture by Rufinus.  

§ 14. But wherein doth it in the least appear that Eusebius reports the judgment of Caius, or the Roman church, in compliance with the Arians; he himself evidently admits the Epistle to be canonical, and confirms it by the testimonies of Clemens, Origen, and others. What would it advantage him, or the cause which some pretend he favoured, to report the opposition of others to a part of divine writ which himself accepted? Besides they were not the Arians of the first rank or edition, (for an inclination unto whom Eusebius is suspected,) but some of their offspring who fell into such sacrilegious opinions and practices as the first leaders of them owned not, that are accused in this matter; much less can he be thought to design the reproach of the Roman church. Nay, these answers are inconsistent, as any one may perceive. He could not at the same time design the rejecting of the Epistle in compliance with the Arians, and the calumniating of them by whom it was rejected, and on whose authority his intentions must be founded. But, indeed, his words plainly manifest that he gives us a naked account of matter of fact, without either prejudice or design. It is yet more incredible, that Hierome in this matter should suffer himself to be imposed on by Eusebius. That he was the most eminently learned and knowing person of the Roman or Latin church in those days, will, I suppose, not be greatly questioned. Now to suppose that he knew not the customs, opinions, and practice of that church, but would suffer himself to be imposed on by a stranger, destitute of those advantages which he had to come unto an unquestionable certainty in it, is a very fond thing. Besides he doth not any where speak as one that reported the words and judgment of another, but in three or four places expressly affirms it as of his own knowledge; when at the same time in opposition thereunto, he contends that it was received by all other churches in the world, and all writers from the days of the apostles.

§ 15. Neither yet doth it appear from any thing delivered by Caius, Hippolitus, Eusebius, or Hierome, that the Latin church did ever reject this Epistle. Yea, we shall find that many amongst them, even in those days, reckoned it unto the canon of the Scripture, and owned St. Paul as the penman of it. Eusebius himself acknowledges that Clemens useth sundry testimonies out of it, in his Epistle to Corinthians. And others also there were concurring with his judgment therein. But these two things I allow, on the testimonies insisted on. (1.) That sundry particular persons of note and esteem in the Roman church owned not the canonical authority of this Epistle, as not esteeming it written by St. Paul. (2.) The church itself had not before the days of Hierome made any public judgment about
the author or authority of this Epistle, nor given any testimony unto them. For it seems utterly impossible, that if any such judgment had passed, or testimony been given, that Hierome, living in the midst of that church, should know nothing of it, but so often affirm the contrary without hesitation. And this undeniably evinceth the injustice of some men's pretensions, that the Roman church is the only proposer of canonical Scripture, and that upon the authority of her proposal alone it is to be received. Four hundred years were passed, before she herself publicly received this Epistle, or read it in her assemblies; so far was she from having proposed it unto others. And yet all this while was it admitted and received by all other churches in the world, as Hierome testifies, and that from the days of the apostles, whose judgment the Roman church itself at length submitted unto.

§ 16. No impeachment, then, of the authority of this Epistle can be taken from this defect and inadvertency of the Roman church, it being proved to be a defect by the concurrent suffrage and testimony of all other churches in the world, from the days of the apostle, as we shall afterwards more fully declare. Neither are the occasions of this hesitation of the western church obscure: the Epistle was written, it may be, in Rome, at least it was in some part of Italy, chap. xiii. 24. There is no doubt it was seen, and, it may be, copied out before it was sent, by some who used to accompany the apostle, as Clemens, who, as we have showed, not long after mentioned divers things contained in it. The original was, without question, speedily sent into Judea, unto the Hebrews, to whom it was written and directed, as were all others of the Epistles of the same apostle unto those churches that were immediately intended and concerned in them. That copies of it were by them also communicated unto their brethren in the east, equally concerned in it with themselves, cannot be doubted, unless we will suppose them grossly negligent in their duty towards God and man, which we have no reason to do. But the churches of the Hebrews living at that time, and, for some while after, if not in a separation, yet in a distinction, by reason of some peculiar observances, from the churches of the Gentiles, especially those of the west, they were not, it may be, very forward in communicating this Epistle unto them, being written, as they supposed, about an especial concernment of their own. By this means, this Epistle seems to have been kept much within the compass of the churches of the Jews, until after the destruction of the temple; when by their dispersion and coalescence with other churches in the east, it came to be generally received amongst them; and 'non solm ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiis et Graeci sermonis Scriptoribus,' as Hierome speaks. But the Latin church having lost that advantage of receiving it when first written, it may be also from the consideration of the removal of its peculiar argument, upon the final destruction of the whole Judaical church and worship, was somewhat slow in their inquiry after it. Those that succeeded in that church, it is not unlikely, had their scruples increased, because they found it not in common use amongst their predecessors, like to the rest of St. Paul's epistles, not considering the occasion thereof. Add hereunto, that by the time it had gradually made its progress in its return into the west, where it was first written, and attended with the suffrage of all the eastern churches, began to evince its own authority, sundry persons who were wrangling about peculiar opinions and practices of their own, began to seek advantages from some expressions in it. So
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did in particular the Novatians and the Donatists. This might possibly in-
crease the scruple amongst the orthodox, and make them wary in their
admission of that authority which they found pleaded against them. And
well was it for them, that their opinions about which they disagreed with
their adversaries, were according unto truth, seeing it may justly be feared,
that some then would have made them their rule and standard in their re-
ception or rejection of this Epistle; for it was no new thing for the orthodox
themselves to make bold sometimes with Scripture, if they supposed it to
run cross unto their conceptions. So Epiphanius informs us in Ancorat.
αλλα καὶ εκλαυσε, κεκατε εν τω κατα Δουκαν ενγεγειλο εν τους αδιαφρωτους
αντιγραφους, και εκεχηται τη μαρτυρια δ άγιος Εφραινιος εν τω κατα αφεσεων,
προς τους δοκησε τον Χριστον πεφηγεναι λεγωντας, ορθοδοξου δε αφελωντο το
ρήτον, φαβηδεντες, και μη νοσαντες αυτω το τελος, και το ιαχυροτατον. 'And
also he wept; for so it is read in the uncorrected copies of the gospel
according to Luke: and St. Irenæus useth this testimony in his book against
heresies, for their confutation who affirmed that Christ took flesh only in
appearance; but the Orthodox (or Catholics) being afraid (of the im-
portance of that expression,) took away that word out of the copies,
not understanding its use and sense.' So also Sextus Sinensis, after he hath
informed us, out of Hilary, that many orthodox persons denied the story of
our Saviour's agony and bloody sweat, adds of his own, 'Suscipor a Catho-
licis sublatam esse, pio sed simplici zelo, quod favere videbatur Arianis.'—'I
suspect that the story was taken out of the copies, by some Catholics, out of
a godly but simple zeal, because it seemed to favour the Arians.' So great
is the power of prejudice, and so little occasions have men taken, whom
others have esteemed orthodox and pious, to make bold with that word,
whereby both we and all our opinions must be judged. But it being
manifest at length, that no colour was given unto the unjust severities of the
Novatians by any thing in this Epistle, it was generally embraced;
and by the conquest of this opposition, established its authority for the
future.

§ 17. Bellarminè chargeth Luther, Brentius, Chemnitus, and the Cen-
turiators, with the rejection of this Epistle. But because I know that some
of them are falsely accused by him, I am apt to suspect the same of the
rest, whom I have not the opportunity to consult; and so I shall not reckon
them amongst the opposers of this Epistle. The matter is more certain con-
cerning Cajetan and Erasmus: the former in his Preface unto, the other in
his last Annotation on this Epistle, denying it to be St. Paul's, and question-
ing, yea indeed rejecting its canonical authority. To them we may add
Enicedinus, proceeding upon the same principles, and making use of their
arguments to the same purpose. These are the chief, if not absolutely all,
who have at any time made any scruple about the authority of this Epistle.
The reasons they make use of to justify themselves in their conjectures, are
amassed together by Erasmus in his note on the 24th verse of the last
chapter of it; but because he mixeth together the arguments that he insists
on to prove St. Paul not to have been the penman of it, and the exceptions
he puts in unto its canonical authority, which are things of a diverse consi-
deration, I shall separate them, and first take out those that seem absolutely
to impeach its authority, leaving those that oppose its penman to our
ensuing discourse on that question in particular.

§ 18. The first thing generally pleaded, is the uncertainty of its author
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or penman. 'Sola omnium Pauli nomen non praefert,' saith Erasmus. How unjust and groundless this pretence is, we shall afterwards fully manifest. At present I shall only show, that it is in general of no importance in this cause. The author of a writing being certainly known, may indeed give some light unto the nature and authority of it. But when it is confessed, that the penman of any book was ἰδον νευστος, or 'divinely inspired,' and that by him it was written for the use of the church, there can be no question of its authority. But this last, viz. that he, by the direction of the Holy Ghost, designed it for the use of the church, must be no less known than the former. For a man may write one book by inspiration, and others by a fallible human judgment, as Solomon seems to have done his philosophical discourses that are lost. Again, when the penman of any writing pretending unto Divine authority is not esteemed, nor doth manifest himself in any thing to have been, ὑπο πνευματος ἠγιου φερομενος, 'immediately acted upon by the Holy Ghost,' the writing itself must needs be liable unto just exception. Wherefore it is confessed, that when the author of any writing is certainly known, much light into its authority and relation unto the canon of the Scripture may be thence received. But when this is doubtful, nothing satisfactory on either side can thence be concluded. And therefore it hath pleased the Holy Ghost to keep the names of the penmen of many parts of the Scripture in everlasting obscurity; for he borrows no countenance or authority unto any thing that proceeds by inspiration from himself, from the names of men. There is not then the least strength in this exception; for be it granted that we are altogether uncertain who was the penman of this Epistle, yet no impeachment of its authority can thence be taken, unless it can be proved that he was not divinely inspired. But yet, to show the insufficiency every way of this objection, we shall abundantly evince, that indeed the very ground and foundation of it is feeble and false: the penman of this Epistle being as well and certainly known, as those of any portions of Scripture whatever that are ανεπιγραφα, some whereof were never doubted nor called into question. And at least we shall so far evince St. Paul to have been the author of it, as, although we shall not from thence take any argument to prove its canonical authority, because it hath itself, been called into question, yet as to render an objection from the uncertainty of its author altogether unreasonable.

§ 19. The remaining objections are more particular, and direct to their purpose, by whom they are pleaded. As, first, that the author of this Epistle cites sundry things out of the Old Testament which are not therein contained. Such are many of the stories related in the 11th chapter, and that in particular in chap. xii. ver. 21, where he affirms, that Moses, upon the terror of the sight that appeared unto him, said, 'I exceedingly quake and tremble.' This place Erasmus supposeth Hierome to have intended, when he says that some things are mentioned in this Epistle that are not recorded in the Old Testament. And Aquinas perplexeth himself in seeking for a solution unto this difficulty. For, first, he would refer the place to Moses' sight of the angel in the bush, and not to the giving of the law, contrary to the express discourse of the context. And then he adds, 'dixit saltem facto:' though he said not so, yet he did so. And lastly, worst of all 'vel forte apostolus alia utitur litera quam nos non habemus:'—'or it may be the apostle used another text that we have not.' But there is no need of any of these evasions. The author quotes no book, nor testimony of the Old Testament, but only relates a matter of fact, and one circumstance of it, which doubtless he had by divine revelation, whereof there is no express
mention in the place where the whole matter is originally recorded. Thus
in the beginning of the Chronicles, sundry particular stories, (as that about
the children of Ephraim, chap. vii. 21,) no where before written, are
reported from the same infallible direction by which others of the same time
were written, when they were omitted. And it is an uncouth way of
proving an author not to write by divine inspiration, because he writeth
truths with which he could no otherwise be acquainted. Neither is it
unmeet for him that writes by divine inspiration, to mention things recorded
in other stories, whose truth is unquestionable, as is the case with those
which are related in chap. xi.

§ 20. It seems to be of more importance, that, if the objectors may be
believed, the writer of this Epistle citeth testimonies out of the Old Testa-
ment that are no ways to his purpose, nor at all prove the matter that
he produceth them for; discovering, at least, that he wrote with a fallible
spirit, if not also that he dealt scarcely bona fide, in handling the cause which
he undertook. Cajetan insists on that of the first chapter, ver. 5, 'I will be
unto him a Father, and he shall be unto me a Son,' taken from 2 Sam. vii.
14, or 1 Chron xvii. 14, which words, as he supposeth, no way belong unto
that, in confirmation of which they are produced by the author of this
Epistle. Erasmus insists upon his testimony in chap. ii. produced out of
Psa. viii. 4, 5, which, as he saith, is urged directly contrary to the intention
of the Psalmist, and scope of the words. Eniedinus insists on the same
places and others.

Now two things must be supposed to give countenance unto this
objection. First, That those who make it do better understand the mean-
ing and the importance of the testimonies, so produced out of the Old
Testament, than he did by whom they are here alleged. This is the
foundation of this exception, which, if once admitted, it may be easily
imagined how able some men will quickly think themselves to question
other allegations in the New Testament, and thereby render the authority of
the whole dubious. They must, I say, take upon themselves to know the
true meaning of them, and that in the uttermost extent of signification and
intention, as given out by the Holy Ghost, before they can charge their mis-
application on this author. How vain, unjust, arrogant, and presumptuous
this supposition is, needs little labour to demonstrate. The understandings
of men are a very sorry measure of the truth, and of the whole sense and
intention of the Holy Ghost in every place of Scripture. Nay, it may much
more rationally be supposed, that though we all know enough of the mind
and will of God in the whole Scripture, to guide and regulate our faith and
obedience; yet that we are rather ignorant of his utmost intention in every
place, than that we know it in all. There is a depth and breadth in every
world of God, because his, which we are not able to fathom and compass to
the utmost: it being enough for us, that we may infallibly apprehend so
much of his mind and will, as is indispensably necessary for us to the
obedience that he requires at our hands. An humble reverential considera-
tion of all, indeed almost any, of the testimonies alleged in the New
Testament out of the Old, is sufficient to evince the truth of this con-
sideration. We know but in part, and we prophesy in part, 1 Cor. xiii. 9.
Quantum est quod nescimus!—'How much is it that we know not!' or as
Job speaks, הכל תומך fons—'How small is the word that we understand of
God!' chap. xxxvi. 14. One says well, 'Est Sacra Scriptura veluti fons
quidam, in bono terrae loco scaturiens, quem quo altius foderis, eo magis
exuberantem invenies; ita quo diligentius Sacram Scripturam interpretaris,
eo abundantiores aquae vivae venas reperies.' Brent. Hom. 36, in 1 Sam. xi. That objection then must needs be very weak, whose fundamental strength consists in so vain a presumption.

Again, they must take it for granted, that they are aforehand fully acquainted with the particular intention of the author, in the assertion which he produceth these testimonies in the confirmation of; and with all the ways of arguing and pressing principles of faith, used by men writing by divine inspiration. Neither is this supposition less rash or presumptuous than the former. Men, who bring their own hypotheses and preconceived senses unto the Scripture, with a desire to have them confirmed, are apt to make such conclusions. Those that come with humility and reverence of his Majesty with whom they have to do, to learn from him his mind and will therein, whatever he shall thereby reveal so to be, will have other thoughts and apprehensions. Let men but suffer the testimonies and assertions, whose unsuitableness is pretended to explain one another, and the agreement will quickly appear. And the worst that will ensue, will be only the emergence of a sense from them which perhaps they understood not in either of them singly, or separately considered. Thus infirm on all accounts is this objection. For the instances themselves, some light will be given unto them, from what we shall afterwards discourse of the author's ways and principles, that he proceeds upon in his citations and testimonies out of the Old Testament. And in particular in our exposition of the places themselves, we shall manifest, that his application of them is every way suitable to the very letter of the text, and manifest intention of the Holy Ghost.—So false and unjust, as well as rash and presumptuous, is this objection.

§ 21. Neither is there any more real weight in that which Erasmus in the next place objects; namely, that some things in it seem to give countenance unto some exploded opinions of ancient heretics, whereof he gives us a double instance. First, 'Quod velum separans sanctum sanctorum interpretatur celum:'—that he interprets the veil separating the most holy place to be heaven: which he neither doth, (but only affirms that the most holy place in the tabernacle was a type or figure of heaven itself,) nor if he should have so done, had he given the least countenance unto the fondness of the Manichees, whom I suppose he intendeth: his whole discourse perfectly exploding their abominations. His other instance is in that vexed place, chap. vi. 6, favouring as he pretends the Novatians, denying recovery by repentance unto them who had fallen into sin after baptism. But the incompetency of this objection, arising merely from the objector's ignorance of the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the end for which it was used, hath been demonstrated by many of old and late. And the Lord assisting in our exposition of that place, we shall show, that it is so far from giving countenance unto any error or mistake which any man might fall into, contrary to the gospel, that a more plain, familiar and wholesome commination, is hardly to be found in the whole book of God. And this is the sum of what I can meet with, that is objected to the canonical authority of this Epistle; and how little this amounts unto, beyond an evidence of men's willingness to lay hold on slight occasions to vent their curiosities and conceptions, the reader that is godly and wise will quickly perceive.

§ 22. Having removed these objections out of our way, we shall now proceed to demonstrate the canonical authority of this Epistle, in the strict and proper sense, at large before declared. Now the sum of what we shall
plead in this cause amounts to this, that whereas there are many τεκμηρία, or infallible evidences, of any writings being given by divine inspiration, and sundry arguments, whereby books or writings ungroundedly pretending to that original may be disproved; that of the former, there is no one that is not applicable unto this Epistle; nor is it obnoxious unto any one of the latter sort. Of what nature in general that evidence is, which is given unto the divine original of the Scripture by the characters thereof implanted in it, or other testimony given unto it; or what is the assurance of mind concerning it which thereupon we are furnished withal; belongs not to our present inquiry. That which we undertake, is only to show that the evidence of the inspiration of this Epistle, and its immunity from rational exceptions, is equal unto, and no less conspicuous, than that of any other portion of holy writ whatever; so that it stands upon the same basis with the whole, which we suppose firm and immovable.

Eusebius, who after Melito, Caius, Clemens, and Origen, made a very accurate inquiry after the books unquestionably canonical, gives us three notes of distinction between them that are so, and others; namely, φρασεως χαρακτηρ, the character or manner of phrase or speech: 2. γνωμη, the sentence or subject-matter treated of; and 3, προσαρμοση, the purpose and design of the writer; and they are all of great importance, and to be considered by us in this matter. But because others of like moment may be added unto them, and are used by others of the ancients to the same end, we shall insist upon them all in that order which seems most natural unto them; yet so, as that they may be all referred unto those general heads by him proposed.

§ 23. Two things there are that belong to the γνωμη or sentence of this epistle: first, its general argument; and, secondly, the particular subject-matter treated of in it. These seem to be designed by γνωμη. Now the general argument of this epistle, is the same with that of the whole Scriptures besides. That is, a revelation of the will of God as to the faith and obedience of the church, and this holy, heavenly, and divine, answering the wisdom, truth, and sovereignty of him from whom it doth proceed. Hence they are called, λογια του Θεου, 'the oracles of God,' Rom. iii. 2. or the infallible revelation of his will; and δηματα της ζωης αιωνων, John vi. 63, 'the words of eternal life for that, in the name of God, they treat about. And St. Paul tells us, that the argument of the gospel is wisdom; but not the wisdom of this world, nor the princes of it who are destroyed, done away, and made useless by it; that is, the chief leaders of human wisdom and science, 1 Cor. ii. 6, but it is σοφια Θεου εν μυστηριο, η αποκερυκμενη, &c. 'the mysterious wisdom of God that was hidden from them,' ver. 7. Things of his own mere revelation, from his sovereign will and pleasure, with a stamp and impress of his goodness and wisdom upon them, of a different nature from any thing that the choicest wisdom of the princes of this world can reach or attain unto. And such is the argument of this epistle: it treats of things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor have they by any natural means ever entered into the heart of man; and that in absolute harmony with all other unquestionable revelations of the will of God. Now, if the immediate original hereof be not from God, that is, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; then it must be either the invention of some man spinning the whole web and frame of it out of his own imagination, or from his diligence in framing and composing of it

from a system of principles collected out of other writings of divine revelation. The first will not be pretended.

Two things absolutely free it from suffering under any such suspicion. First, The nature of its argument, treating, as was said of such things as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have they entered into the heart of man. The deity, offices, sacrifice, mediation, and grace of Jesus Christ, are not things that can have any foundation in the invention and imagination of man. Yea, being revealed by God, they lie in a direct contradiction unto all that naturally is esteemed wise or perfect, 1 Cor. i. 18—23. They exceed the sphere of natural comprehension, and are destructive of the principles which it frameth unto itself for the compassing of those ends whereunto they are designed. Nor is it liable to be esteemed of the other extract, or the diligence and wisdom of man in collecting it from other books of divine revelation, which alone with any colour of reason can be pretended. Human diligence, regulated by what is elsewhere revealed of God, is human still; and can never free itself from those inseparable attendances which will manifest it so to be. For suppose a man may compose a writing, wherein every proposition in itself shall be true, and the whole of its contexture materially every way answerable unto the truth, (which yet must be accidental as to the principle of his wisdom, understanding, ability, and diligence, by whom it is composed, they being no way able to give that effect certainly and infallibly unto it,) yet there will never be wanting that in it, whereby it may be discerned from an immediate effect and product of divine wisdom and understanding. Take but the writings of any wise man, who from his own ability and invention hath declared any science in them, and allow his discovery to be the absolute complete rule of that science; so that nothing beyond, or besides what he hath written about it is true or certain, nor any thing else, but as it hath conformity to, or coincidence with what he hath written; and it will be very difficult, if not impossible for any man so to treat of that subject from his writings, as not to leave sufficient characters upon his own, to difference them from his original and pattern. For suppose him to have in all things attained the perfect sense of his guide, which yet, it may be, until all words are freed from their ambiguity, will be impossible for any one to do; yet still there will remain such an impression of the genius and fancy by which its rules were first framed, as the follower cannot express. And how much more will there be so in that which both for matter and words also, proceeds from the sovereign will and wisdom of God! Can it be supposed, that any man should be able to collect and arrange, by his own industry and diligence, a writing out of that which is given by God, that it should absolutely express those infinite perfections of his nature, which shine forth in that which is immediately from himself? For that any writing should be pretended to be undiscoverable from them given by divine inspiration, it is not enough that the matter of it be universally true, and that truth no other than what is contained in other parts of Scripture: but it must also have those other 

τεκμηρια, and characters of a divine original, which we shall in our progress discover in this Epistle, as in other books of the Holy Scripture; for it is not behind the very choicest of them.

And the truth of this consideration is demonstrated, in the instances of every one of those writings, which may probably be concluded to have the nearest affinity and similitude unto those of divine inspiration, from the greatness and urgency of the plea to be admitted unto that series and
order. These are the books commonly called Apocrypha. Not one of them is there wherein human diligence doth not discover itself to be its fountain and spring. Did this Epistle proceed from the same root and principle, whence comes it to pass, that it no where puts itself forth unto a discovery and conviction? for that it doth not so, we shall afterwards fully declare. Besides, to close this consideration, the design of the writer of this Epistle manifests that he sought the glory of God in Christ, according unto his will. With this aim and purpose, an endeavour to impose that on the church, as an immediate revelation from God, which was the product of his own pains and diligence, is utterly inconsistent. For by no means could he more dishonour God, whose glory in sincerity he appears to have sought; nor wrong the church whose good he desired to promote; than by thus ascribing to God, that whereof he was not the author, so adding unto his words, and making himself subject to reproof as a liar, Prov. xxx. 6, and proposing that unto the church as a firm and stable rule and object of faith, which he knew not to be so, leading thereby into error, uncertainty, and falsehood. For this whole Epistle is delivered as the will and word of God, as coming by revelation from him, without the least intimation of the intervention of the will, wisdom or diligence of man, any other than is constantly ascribed to those that declare the will of God by inspiration. And if it were not so, the evils mentioned cannot be avoided. But how groundless this imputation would be, our following discourses will manifest. And I doubt not but this whole consideration is, and will be, of weight and moment with them, who have their senses exercised in the Scriptures, and are enabled by the Spirit breathing in them, to discern between good and evil, wheat and chaff, Jer. xxiii. 28.

§ 24. Unto the general argument, we may add the particular subject-matter of this Epistle, as belonging unto the γνώμη of it, further confirming its divine original. This, for the most part, consists in things of pure revelation, and which have no other foundation in rerum natura. Some books, even of the Scripture itself, are but the narrations of actions done amongst men, which for the substance of them might be also recorded by human diligence. But the things treated of in this Epistle, are purely divine, spiritual, and no ways to be known but by revelation. And not only so, but amongst those things, there are these four most eminent in the subject-matter of this Epistle. First, that the principal things treated of in it, are matters of the greatest importance in Christian religion, and such as concern the very foundation of faith. Such are the doctrines about the person, offices, and sacrifice of Christ, of the nature of gospel worship, our privilege therein, and communion with God thereby. In these things consist the very vitals of our profession; and they are all opened and declared in a most excellent and heavenly manner in this Epistle; and that, as we shall manifest, in an absolute consonancy unto what is taught concerning them in other places of Scripture. Secondly, in that some things of great moment unto the faith, obedience, and consolation of the church, that are but obscurely or sparingly taught in any other places of holy writ, are here plainly, fully, and excellently taught and improved. Such in particular is the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, with the nature and excellency of his sacrifice, and the execution of the remaining parts and duty of that office in heaven: and how the whole of it was typically represented under the Old Testament. He that understands aright the importance of these things, their use in the faith and consolation of the church, their influence upon our whole course of obedience, the spiritual
privileges that faith by them interests a believing soul in, the strength and supportment that they afford under temptations and trials, will be ready to conclude, that the world may as well want the sun in the firmament, as the church this Epistle. And this persuasion we hope through God's assistance, to further in our exposition of it. Thirdly, God's way in teaching the church of the Old Testament with the use and end of all the laborious discipline of Moses, manifesting it to be full of wisdom, grace, and love, is here fully revealed; and the whole Aaronical priesthood, with all the duties and offices of it, is made instructive to believers under the gospel. How dark Mosaical institutions were in themselves, is evident from the whole state of the church in the days of Christ and his apostles, when they could not see unto the end of the things that were to be done away. In their nature they were carnal; in their number, many; as to their reason, hidden; in their observance, heavy and burdensome; in their outward show, pompous and glorious; by all which, they so possessed the minds of the church, that very few saw clearly into the use, intention, and end of them. But in this Epistle, the veil is taken off from Moses, the mystery of his institutions laid open, a perfect guide given unto believers to pass safely through all the turnings and windings of them, unto rest and truth in Jesus Christ. Those hidden things of the Old Testament appear now unto us full of light and instruction; but we are beholden for all our insight into them, and benefit we receive thereby, unto the exposition and application of them made by the Holy Ghost in this Epistle. And how great a portion of gospel wisdom and knowledge consists herein all men know, who have any acquaintance with these things. Fourthly. The grounds, reasons, causes, and manner of that great alteration which God wrought and caused in his worship, by taking down the ancient glorious fabric of it, which had been set up by his own appointment, are here laid open and manifested, and the greatest controversy that ever the church of God was exercised with, is here fully determined.

There was nothing in the first propagation of the gospel and plantation of Christian churches, that did so divide and perplex the professors of the truth, and retard the work of promulgating the knowledge of Christ, and the worship of God in him, as the difference that was about the continuation and observation of Mosaical rites and ceremonies. To such an height was this difference raised, so zealously were the parties at variance engaged in the pursuit of their various apprehensions of the mind of God in this matter, that the apostles themselves thought meet for a season, rather to umpire and compose the controversy, by leaving the Jews free to observe these rites, and bringing the Gentiles unto a condescension in things of the greatest exasperation, than absolutely and precisely to determine the whole matter between them. And, indeed, this being a difference, wherein the will, authority, and command of God were pleaded on the mistaken side; these being all clear and full in support of what the Jews pleaded for: nothing but an immediate declaration of the mind of God himself, as to his removing and taking off the obligation of his own law, could put such an end unto it, as that the spirits of men might acquiesce therein. Now the will of God to this purpose before the writing of this Epistle, could only be collected from the nature and state of things in the church, upon the coming of the Messiah, and conclusions from thence, which the believing Jews were very slow to admit. Add hereunto, that many prophecies and promises of the Old Testament, setting forth the glory and beauty of gospel-worship, under the names and condition of the worship then in use, as of priests,
Levites, sacrifices, offerings, feasts of tabernacles, and the like, lay directly, in the letter, against that cessation of Mosaical rites, which the Jews opposed.

Now who was fit, who was able to determine upon these different and various institutions of God, but God himself? To declare positively, that all obligation from his former commands was now ceased, that his institutions were no more to be observed, that the time allotted unto the church's obedience unto him in their observance was expired, this was no otherwise to be effected but by an immediate revelation from himself. And this is done in this Epistle, and that in this only as to the Jews; whereby it became the main instrument and means of pulling up their old church state, and translating it anew into the appointments of our Lord Jesus Christ. Neither is this done by a bare declaration of God's authoritative interposition, but in a way of excellent and singular wisdom and condescension. God's love and care of his church, are manifested in the institutions that were now to be removed; and his wisdom appears in their gradual instruction as they were able to bear; and the whole nature and design of these institutions is evidenced to be such, as that having received their full end and accomplishment, they did of themselves naturally expire and disappear. And hereby, in that great alteration which God then wrought in the outward worship of his church, there is discovered an oneness and unchangeableness in his love and care; and a suitableness, harmony, and consonancy, in the effects of his will. Infinite Wisdom is also seen, so arranging these alterations in a subserviency one to another, that they should no where in any thing cross or interfere, and all of them be to his own glory in the promotion and furtherance of the light, faith, and obedience of his church, as sufficiently manifests the original and fountain whence it doth proceed. For my part, I can truly say, that I know not any portion of holy writ, that will more effectually raise up the heart of an understanding reader, to an holy admiration of the goodness, love, and wisdom of God, than this Epistle doth. Such, I say, is the subject-matter of this Epistle, so divine, so excellent, so singular. And in the handling hereof, we have not the least occasional mixture, of any matter, words, sentences, stories, arguments or doctrines so unsuited to the whole, as to argue the interposures of a fallible spirit.

Thus we know it hath fallen out in all the writings of the Christians of the first ages, after the sealing of the canon of the Scriptures. Many things in them appear to proceed from an holy and heavenly Spirit breathing in their authors; and most of what they contain to be consonant unto the mind of God: yet have they all of them evident footsteps that the authors were subject unto errors and mistakes, even in and about the things written by them. And the continuance of these failings in their writings, capable of an easy conviction, is no small fruit of the holy wise providence of God, and his care over his church, that it might not in after ages be imposed upon with the great and weighty pretence of antiquity, to admit them into a competition with those, which himself gave out to be its infallible, and therefore only rule. That nothing of this nature, nothing humanitas, merely after the manner of men, befel the writer of this Epistle in his work, we hope through the assistance of its principal Author, to manifest in our Exposition of the several parts of it. And this subject-matter of this Epistle, thus handled, further secures us of its original.

§ 25. The design, aim, and end of the Epistle, with the purpose and intention of its writer, which belongs to the προαίρεσις, which the ancients
made a characterism of writings given by divine inspiration, are consonant unto the general argument, and peculiar subject-matter of it. That the whole Scripture hath an especial end, which is peculiar unto it, and wherein no other writing hath any share, but only so far as it is taken from thence, and composed in obedience thereunto, is evident unto all that do seriously consider it.

This end supremely and absolutely, is the glory of that God who is the Author of it. This is the centre where all the lines of it do meet, the scope and mark towards which all things in it are directed. It is the revelation of himself that is intended, of his mind and will, that he may be glorified; wherein also, because he is the principal fountain, and last end of all, consists the order and perfection of all other things. Particularly the demonstration of this glory of God, in and by Jesus Christ is aimed at. The works of God's power and providence do all of them declare his glory; the glory of his eternal perfections and excellencies, absolutely and in themselves. But the end of the Scripture, is the glory of God in Christ, as he hath revealed himself, and gathered all things to an head in him, unto the manifestation of his glory. "For this is life eternal, that we know him the only true God, and whom he hath sent, Jesus Christ." The means whereby God is thus glorified in Christ, is by the salvation of them that do believe, which is therefore also an immediate end of the Scripture: "These things are written, that we may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that believing, we may have life through his name," John xx. 31; 1 Tim. iv. 16. Moreover, whereas this eternal life unto the glory of God, cannot be obtained without faith and obedience according to his will, the Scripture is given for this purpose also, that it may instruct us in the mind of God, and make us wise unto salvation, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Rom. i. 16; 2 Peter i. 3. These, in their mutual subserviency and dependence, complete the characteristic end of the Scripture. I confess Plato, in his Timæus, makes it the end of philosophy, that we may thereby be made like unto God. But that philosophy of his, having its rise and spring in inbred notions of nature, and the contemplation of the works of God's providence, could have no other end but conformity unto him, as his perfections were revealed absolutely; whereunto the Scripture adds this revelation in Christ Jesus, John i. 18, which gives them as I said, their special and peculiar end. It makes God known as all in all, and man to be nothing as to goodness or blessedness, but what God is pleased to do for him, and communicate unto him; and Jesus Christ to be the great and only way and means whereby he will communicate of himself, and bring us unto himself. The more clearly any portion of Scripture discovers and makes conspicuous this end, the more parts of the series and order of things, whereby the last and utmost end of the glory of God is produced, in their mutual connexion, dependence and subserviency, it manifesteth, the more fully doth it express this general end of the whole, and thereby evince its own interest therein.

Now herein doth this Epistle come behind no other portion of Scripture whatever. For as the exaltation of the glory of God, as he is the first cause and last end of all things, is expressly proposed in it, so the relation of the glory of God, and of our obedience and blessedness, whereby and wherein it is declared unto the person, offices, and mediation of Jesus Christ, is in an eminent manner insisted on and unfolded in it. And whereas some parts of Scripture do exhibit unto us most clearly some one part of this general end of the whole, and other portions or books of it
some other parts, this expresseth the whole, and all the parts of it distinctly, from the very foundation of calling men to the knowledge of God and obedience, unto the utmost end of his glorifying himself in their salvation by Jesus Christ. Neither is there herewith the least alloy or mixture of any bye, particular, or personal end of the writer; nothing of his honour, reputation, advantage, self-pleasing in any thing; but all runs evenly and smoothly to the general end before proposed. And this also hath deservedly a place among the τεκμηρία of writings by divine inspiration.

§ 26. The style also of the sacred Scripture, or φρασεως καρακτηρο, as it is termed by Eusebius in this argument, is of deserved consideration. By the style of any writing, we understand both the propriety of the words, with their grammatical construction, and that composition of the whole which renders it fit, decorous, elegant, and every way meet to be used in the matter about which it is used, and for the effecting of the end which is proposed in it. I know some bold atheistical spirits have despised the style of the Holy writers as simple and barbarous. Among these, Angelus Politianus is generally and deservedly censured by all learned men, who was imitated in his profane contempt of it by Domitianus Calderinus. And of the like temper was Petrus Bembus, who would scarce touch the Scripture; though his own epistles are not one of them free from solemnisms in grammar. Austin also confesseth that, whilst he was yet a Manichee, he had the same thoughts of it: 'Visa est mihi indigna quam Tullianae dignitati comparat.' The Scripture seemed to be unworthy to be compared with the excellency of Cicero. But it must be acknowledged that these spake of the common translations of it, though they used that pretence to reject the study of the books themselves.

I do confess that, though some translations may, and do render the words of the original more properly, and better represent and insinuate the native genius, beauty, life, and power of the sacred style than some others do; yet none of them can, or do express the whole excellency, elegance, and marvellous efficacy of it for the conveyance of its senses to the understandings and minds of men. Neither is this any reflection upon the translators, or on their abilities, diligence, or faithfulness, but that which the nature of the thing itself produceth. There is in the sacred Scripture, in the words wherein, by the Holy Ghost, it was given out, a proper peculiar virtue, and secret efficacy, inflaming the minds of the readers and hearers, which no diligence or wisdom of man can fully and absolutely transfer into, and impress upon any other language. And those who have designed to do it, by substituting the wordy elegancies of another tongue, to express their quickening and affecting idioms, (which was the design of Castalio,) have of all others most failed in their intentions.

Neither doth this defect in translations arise from hence, that the original tongues may be more copious and emphatical than those of the translations, which possibly may be the condition of the Greek and Latin, as Hierome often complains. But it is from the causes before named, and therefore is most evident in the translations of the Old Testament, when yet no man can imagine the Hebrew to be more copious, (though it be more comprehensive,) than the languages whereinto it hath been translated. But it is of the originals themselves, and the style of the sacred penmen therein, concerning which we discourse. And herein the boldness of Hierome cannot
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be excusea, though he be followed by some others of great name in latter ages, who more than once chargeth St. Paul with solecisms and barbarisms in expression, and often urgeth (upon a mistake as we shall see) that he was imperitus sermone, 'unskilful in speech.' But as neither he, nor any else, are able to give any cogent instance to make good their charge, so it is certain that there is nothing expressed in the whole Scripture, but in the manner and way, and by the words wherewith it ought to be expressed, unto the ends for which it is used and designed. This might easily be manifested, both from the intent of the Holy Ghost himself in suggesting those words unto his penmen, and in the care of God over the very iota and tittles of the words themselves. And wherever there appears unto us an irregularity from the arbitrary directions or usages of other men in those languages, it doth much more become us to suspect our own apprehensions and judgment; yea, or to refuse to those directions and usages the sovereignty of an absolute rule; than to impute the least failure or mistake to them who wrote nothing but by divine inspiration. The censure of Hensius in this matter is severe, but true. Prolegom. Aristarch Sac. 'Vellicare aliquid in illis, aut desiderare, non est eruditi sed blasphemi hominis, ac male feriati, qui nunquam intelligent quae humana sit conditio, aut quanta debeatur reverentia ac cultus cuncta dispensanti Deo, qui non Judicem, sed supplicem deposcit.'

Neither hath their success been much better, who have exercised their critical ability in judging of the style of the particular writers of the Scripture, preferring one before, and above another; whereas the style of every one of them is best suited to the subject-matter whereof he treats, and the end aimed at, and the persons with whom he had to do. And herein Hierome hath led the way to others, and drawn many into a common mistake. The style of Isaiah, he says, is proper, urbane, high, and excellent; but that of Hosea, and especially of Amos, low, plain, improper, favouring of the country, and his profession, who was a shepherd. But those that understand their style and language, will not easily give consent unto him, though the report has been admitted by the most. It is true there appeareth in Isaiah an excellent παθος in his exhortations, expostulations, and cominations; attended with efficacious apostrophes, prosopopeias, metaphors, and allusions; a compacted fulness in his prophecies and predictions, a sweet evangelical spiritualness in his expression of promises, with frequent paronomasias, and ellipses, which have a special elegance in that language, whence he is usually instanced by learned men as an example of the elocution of the divine writings, and his διανοης preferred unto that of Ἀeschines, Demosthenes, or Cicero. But the reader must take heed that he look not for the peculiar excellencies of that prophet, absolutely in the words used by him, but rather in the things that it pleased the Holy Ghost, to use him as his instrument in the revelation of. But the other part of Hierome's censure is utterly devoid of any good foundation. The style of Amos, considering the subject-matter that he treateth of, and the persons with whom he had to do, in suiting of words and speech, wherein all true solid eloquence consisteth, is every way as proper, as elegant as that of Isaiah. Neither will the knowing reader find
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him wanting in any of the celebrated styles of writing, where occasion unto them is administered. Thus some affirm that St. Paul used sundry expressions, (and they instance in 1 Cor. iv. 3; Col. ii. 18,) that were proper to the Cilicians his countrymen, and not so proper as to the purity of that language wherein he wrote; but as the first of the expressions they instance in, is an Hebraism, and the latter purely Greek; so, indeed, they will discover a Tarsian defect in St. Paul, together with the Patavinity in Livy that Pollio noted in him.

§ 28. Eloquence and propriety of speech for the proper ends of them, are the gift of God, Exod. iv. 10, 11. And therefore unless pregnant instances may be given to the contrary, it may well be thought and expected that they should not be wanting in books written by his own inspiration. Nor indeed are they; only we are not able to give a right measure of what doth truly and absolutely belong unto them. He that shall look for a flourish of painted words, artificial meretricious ornaments of speech, discourse suited to entice, inveigle, and work upon weak and carnal affections; or sophistical captious ways of reasoning to deceive; or that suada, or πιθανολογία, that smooth and harmonious structure of periods wherein the great Roman orator gloried, the λεοντινία verborum, the ψος, and grandiloquentia of some of the heathens, in the Scripture, will be mistaken in his aim. Such things become not the authority, majesty, greatness, and holiness of Him who speaks therein. An earthly monarch that should make use of them in his edicts, laws, or proclamations, would but prostitute his authority to contempt, and invite his subjects to disobedience by so doing. How much less would they become the declaration of his mind and will, given unto poor worms, who is the great Possessor of heaven and earth.

Besides, these things belong not indeed unto real eloquence and propriety of speech, but are arbitrarily invented crutches, for the relief of our lameness and infirmity. Men despairing to affect the minds of others, with the things themselves which they had to propose unto them; and acquainted with the baits that are meet to take hold of their brutish affections; with the ways of prepossessing their minds with prejudice, or casting a mist before their understandings, that they may not discern the nature, worth, and excellency of truth; have invented such dispositions of words, as might compass the ends they aimed at. And great effects by this means were produced; as by him whom men admired,

'——— pleni moderantem frōna Theatri.'

And therefore the apostle tells us, that the rejecting of this kind of oratory in his preaching and writing, was of indispensable necessity, that it might appear that the effects of them were not any way influenced thereby, but were the genuine productions of the things themselves which he delivered, 1 Cor. ii. 5, 6, 7. This kind of eloquence, then, the Scripture maketh no use of, but rather condemnh the employment of it, in the great and holy things whereof it treateth, as unbecoming their excellency and majesty. So Origen to this purpose, ψος γαρ ει καλλος και περιζηλην φρασεως, ως τα παρ' Ἐλλην θαυμαζομενα, ετειν η γραφη, υπενοιησεν αν τις υπ' ην αληθειαν εκπαθη- κεινα των ανθρωπων, αλλα την ερμαινομενην ακολουθιαν και το της φρασεως καλλος εψυχαγωγηκειν τον ακρομενον, και ητατηκος αυτως προσεληφεναι, Tom 4. in Johan.—'If the Holy Scripture had used that elegance and choice of speech which are admired among the Greeks, one might have sus-
pected that it was not truth itself that conquered men, but that they had been circumvented and deceived by appearing or fallacious consequences, and the splendour or elegance of speech."

§ 29. That the proper excellency of speech, or style, consisteth in the to πρεπεῖ, or meet accommodation of words unto things, with consideration of the person that useth them, and the end whereunto they are applied, all men that have any acquaintance with these things will confess. Βούλεται ἡ φύσις τοὺς νοηματιν ἐπέσται την λείν, ου τη λείει τα νοηματα, saith Dionysius Halicarnasseus: u 'Nature requireth that words should follow, or be made to serve sentences or things, and not things be subservient to words; whence the too curious observation of words, hath been censured as an argument of an infirm and abject mind;' however it may be pardoned in them who placed all their excellency in πειθανολογία, and disposing persuasive alluring words; as Isocrates spent ten years in his Panegyrics; and Plato ceased not unto the eightieth year of his age to adorn his discourses; as Dionysius testifies of them both. The style of the Holy Scriptures is every way answerable unto what may rationally be expected from it. For,

First, It becometh the majesty, authority, and holiness of Him, in whose name it speaketh. And hence it is, that by its simplicity without corruption, gravity without affectation, plainness without alluring ornaments, it doth not so much entice, move, or persuade, as constrain, press, and pierce into the mind and affections, transforming them into a likeness of the things which it delivers unto us. w And, therefore, though St. Paul says that he dealt not with the Corinthians, καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λογον η σοφίας, in 'an excellency or sublimity of speech, or wisdom,' like that of the orators before described; yet he did en αποδείξει τινες παρακατος και ἑνωμέως, in such an evidence of spiritual power, as was far more effectual and prevalent. The whole of the sacred style is ξειπρεπείς, if truth, gravity, authority, and majesty can render it so; nor can any instance be given to the contrary.

And, Secondly, it every-where becometh the subject which it treateth of, and because this is various, it is impossible that the style wherein it is expressed should be uniform: when yet, notwithstanding all its variety, it every-where keeps its own property, to be in gravity and authority still like unto itself, and unlike to, or distinct from all other writings whatsoever. Whence Austin rightly of the holy penmen; 'Audeo dicere omnes qui recte intelligent quod ʻiλlί loquuntur, simul intelligere non eos aliter loqui debuisse.' x—'I dare say, that whoever understands what they speak, will also understand that they ought not to have spoken otherwise.' And Origen, speaking of the writings of St. Paul, saith, 'If any one give himself to the diligent reading of his Epistles,' εν αὐτῷ ἡ θαυμασία τῶν νουν τῶν αὐτῶν εν ἡσυχίᾳ λέξι μεγάλα περινομυντος, ἡ μηθαυμάζαν, αὐτῷ καταγελασεός φανερα, 'I know full well, that either he will admire his great conceptions and sentences under a plain and vulgar style, or he will show himself very ridiculous.' The things treated of in the Scripture are, for the most part, heavenly, spiritual, supernatural, divine; and nothing can be more fond than to look for such things to be expressed in a flourish of words, and with various ornaments of speech, fit to lead away the minds of men from that which they are designed wholly to be gathered unto the admiration and
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contemplation of. Bodies that have a native beauty and harmony in
the composition of their parts, are advantaged more by being clothed with
fit garments, than by the ornaments of gay attire. And the spiritual native
beauty of heavenly truths, is better conveyed unto the minds of men,
by words and expressions fitted unto it, plainly and simply, than by any
ornaments of enticing speech whatever; and therefore we say with Austin,
that there is not any thing delivered in the Scripture, but just as it ought to
be, and as the matter requires.

Thirdly, the style of the holy penmen is, in gracious condescension, suited
unto them, and to their capacity, who constitute the greatest part of them
with whom they had to do. This Origen at large insists upon in the
beginning of his Fifth Book against Celsus. The philosophy and oratory of
the heathen, was suited principally, if not solely, to the capacity of the
learned; this the authors and professors of it aimed at; namely, that they
might approve their skill and ability unto those who were able to judge of
them. The Scripture was written for the good of mankind in general, and
without the least design of any accommodation of itself, to the learning and
wisdom of men. And this συγκαταβασις, or condescension unto the common
reason, sense, usage, and experience of mankind in general, is very admirable
in the holy penmen, and absolutely peculiar to them. In this universal
suitableness unto all the concerns of it, consists that excellent simplicity
of the Scripture style, whereby it plainly and openly, without fraudulent or-
naments, in common and usual speech, declares things divine, spiritual and
heavenly, with an holy accommodation of them to the understanding and
capacities of men, in such occasional variety as yet never diverts from
those properties and characters wherein the uniformity of the whole doth
consist.

§ 30. Besides all these excellencies of the style of holy writ, with others
that may be added unto them, there is in it a secret energy and efficacy for
the subjecting of the minds of men unto its intention in all things. Whether
this proceed only, and be imparted unto it, from the matters treated of,
which are holy and heavenly; or whether it be communicated unto it im-
mediately, by an impression of his authority upon it, by whom it is given
out; or whether it arise from both of them, all that are conversant in it
with faith and reverence do find the truth of our assertion by experience.
And Origen, amongst others, speaks excellently to this purpose: φησι δ' ὁ
τειός λόγος, οὐκ αυταρκες εστι καὶ λογομονος (κατ' αυτο αληθες καὶ πιστικω-
τοις) προς τα καθεκεσθαι ανθρωπινης ψυχης, εαυτ' μη καὶ δυναμις τις θεοθεν δοθη
tω λεγοντι, και χαρις επανθηση τοις λεγομενοις, και αυτη ουκ αξιω εγγυνεινη
τοις ανυπακοι λεγουναι. 'The holy Scripture teacheth us, that what is spoken,
though in itself it be true and fit to persuade, is not able to conquer the
minds of men, unless power from God be communicated to the speaker, and
grace (from him) do flourish in the things spoken themselves, and it is not
without divine influence, that they speak with efficacy.' Hence ariseth the
spiritual peculiar δεινοτης of the divine writers, termed by St. Paul αποθεοις
πνευματος και δυναμεως, 'the demonstration of the Spirit and of power.'
And herein, as on other accounts, the 'Word of God is quick and powerful,
and sharper than any two-edged sword,' Heb. iv. 12, by which living
energy and authority it exposed and brought to nought all the wisdom of
this world; that is, all philosophical conceptions, with all the ornaments of
elocution and oratory. The excellent discourse of Austin on this subject,
§ 31. Whatever hath been thus spoken concerning the style of the sacred Scripture in general, it is as applicable unto this Epistle unto the Hebrews, as to any one portion of holy writ whatever. That simplicity, gravity, unaffectedness, suitableness to its author, matter, and end, which commends the whole unto us, are eminent in this part of it; that authority, efficacy, and energy, which are implanted on the whole, by him who supplied both sense and words unto the penmen of it, exert themselves in this Epistle also.

No defect in any of these can be charged on it, that should argue it of any other extract than the whole. Nothing is to be found in the whole Epistle so far singular, as to be inconsistent with that harmony as to style and manner, which in all their variety still prevails among the books of the holy Scripture. If any where, as in the beginning of the first chapter, the style seems to swell in its current above the ordinary banks of the writings of the New Testament, it is from the greatness and sublimity of the matter treated on, which was not capable of any other kind of expression. Doth the penman of it, any where use words or phrases, not commonly, or rarely, or perhaps nowhere else used in the sense and way wherein they are by him applied? it is because his matter is peculiar, and not elsewhere handled; at least not on the same principles, nor to the same purpose as by him. Doth he oftentimes speak in an Old Testament dialect, pressing words and expressions to the service and sense they were employed in under the tabernacle and temple after they had been manumitted as it were, and made free from their typical importance in the service and spiritual sense of the gospel; it is from the consideration of the condition of those, with whom in an especial manner he had to do; and this in perfect harmony with the wisdom of the Holy Ghost in other portions of Scripture. So that on this account also its station in the holy canon is secured.

§ 32. Moreover, besides the peculiar excellency which is found in the style of the holy Scripture, either evidencing its divine original, or at least manifesting that there is nothing in it unworthy of such an extract, the authority of its principal author exerts itself in the whole of it, upon the consciences of men. And, herein, is this epistle an especial sharer also. Now this authority as it respects the minds of men, arises in part from the holy matter contained in it, and the heavenly manner wherein it is declared. They have in their conjunction, a peculiar character, distinguishing these writings from all writings of a human original, and manifesting them to be of God. Neither can it otherwise be, but that things of divine revelation, expressed in words of divine suggestion and determination, will appear to be of a divine original. And partly it arises from an ineffable emanation of divine excellency, communicating unto God's own word a distinguishing property because of its relation unto him. We speak not now of the work of the Holy Ghost in our hearts by his grace, enabling us to believe; but of his work in the word, rendering it credible and meet to be believed. Not of the seal and testimony that he gives unto the hearts of individual persons of the truth of the Scripture, or rather of the things contained in it; but of the seal and testimony, which in the Scripture he gives unto it, showing it to be his own work and word. Such a character have the works of other agents, whereby they are known and discerned to be theirs. By such properties are the works of
men discerned, and oftentimes of individuals amongst them. They bear the likeness of their authors, and are thereby known to be theirs. Neither is it possible that there should be any work of God, proceeding so immediately from him, as do writings by divine inspiration, but there will be such a communication of his Spirit and likeness unto it, such an impression of his greatness, holiness, goodness, truth, and majesty upon it, as will manifest it to be from him. The false prophets of old pretended that their dreams, visions, predictions, and revelations were from him. They prefixed ὄν, he saith, unto all the declarations of them, Jer. xxxii. 31, and therefore, doubtless, framed them to as great a likeness unto those that were by inspiration from him as they were able. And yet the Lord declares that all their imaginations were as discernible from his word, as chaff from wheat; and this by that authority and power wherewith his word is accompanied, whereof they were utterly destitute, ver. 28, 29. And this authority do all they who have their senses exercised in it, find and acknowledge in this Epistle, and in it their minds and consciences do acquiesce. They hear and understand the voice of God in it, and by that Spirit which is promised unto them, discern it from the voice of a stranger. And when their minds are prepared and fortified against objections, by the former considerations, into this they ultimately resolve their persuasion of its divine authority. For,

§ 33. From this authority, they find a divine efficacy proceeding; a powerful operation upon their souls and consciences, unto all the ends of the Scripture. A reverence and awe of God, from his authority shining forth and exerting itself in it, being wrought in them, they find their minds effectually brought into captivity unto the obedience taught therein.

This efficacy and power is in the whole word of God. 'Is not my word as a fire, saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rocks in pieces,' Jer. xxiii. 29, that is, living and powerful, and 'sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart,' Heb. iv. 12. As it hath an ἐξουσία, or authority over men, Matt. vii. 29, so it hath a δύναμις, or powerful efficacy in and towards them, Acts xx. 32; James i. 21. Yea, it is the power of God himself, for its proper end, Rom. i. 16, and therefore said to be accompanied with the demonstration of the Spirit and power, 1 Cor. ii. 4, a demonstration υπὲρ τὰς λογικὰς μεθοδοὺς τὴν ἐντὸς εἰς συγκαταβάσεις ἔλκοψα, as Basil, drawing the soul to consent beyond the efficacy of rational or logical arguments, or geometrical demonstrations, as he adds in the same place. And this divine power and efficacy of the word, as to all the ends of it, proceeding from the authority of God in it, with his designation of it unto those ends, (which is that which giveth energy unto all things, enabling them to produce their proper effects, and setting limits and bounds to their operation,) is testified unto in innumerable places of the Scripture itself. And it doth sufficiently manifest and evidence itself, both in the fruits and effects of it on the souls of particular persons, and in that work which it hath wrought, and doth yet carry on invisibly in the world, in defiance of all the opposition that is made unto it by the power of hell, in conjunction with the unbelief, darkness, and lusts of the minds of men, as may elsewhere be more at large declared.

z Basil, in Psal. 115.
A learned man a said well; 'Non moment, non persuadent Sacre literae, sed cogunt, agitant, vim invenunt; Legis rudia verba et agrestia, sed viva, sed animata, flammae, aculeata, ad inum, spiritum penetrantia, hominem totum potestate mirabili transformatia: expressing the sum of what we maintain. From hence is all that supernatural light and knowledge, that conviction and restraint, that conversion, faith, consolation and obedience, that are found amongst any of the sons of men.

πασα γραφη, saith Basil, b θεοπνευστος και φελιμος, δια τουτο συγγραφεια παρα του πνευματος ιν' ωσπερ εν κοινω των ψυχων ατρεψω, παντες αναρωτοι το ιαμα του οικου παιδου εκαστος εκλεγομενα.—The whole Scripture is divinely inspired and profitable; being written by the Holy Ghost for this purpose, that in it, as a common healing office for souls, all men may choose the medicine suited to cure their own distempers. Such is the nature, power, and efficacy of this Epistle towards them that do believe. It searches their hearts, discovers their thoughts, fixes principles in their consciences, judges their acts inward and outward, supports their spirits, comforts their souls, enlightens their minds, guides them in their hope, confidence, and love to God, directs them in all their communion with him, and obedience unto him, and leads them to an enjoyment of him. And this work of the Holy Ghost in it, and by it, seals its divine authority unto them, so that they find rest, spiritual satisfaction, and great assurance therein. When once they have obtained this experience of its divine power, it is in vain for men or demons to oppose its canonical authority with their frivolous cavils and objections. Neither is this experience merely satisfactory to themselves alone, as it is by some pretended. It is a thing pleasurable, and that not only in their own defence to strengthen their faith against temptations, but to others also; though not to atheistical scoffers, yet to humble inquirers; and humility ought to be the frame of all men in the investigation of sacred truths.

§ 34. Unto what hath been spoken, we may add, that the canonical authority of this Epistle is confirmed unto us by catholic tradition. By this tradition I intend not the testimony only of the present church that is in the world, nor fancy a trust of a power to declare what is so in any church whatever; but a general uninterrupted fame conveyed and confirmed by particular instances, records, and testimonies, in all ages. In any other sense, traditions are of very little value, as we may learn from the instance of him who first began to magnify them. This was Papias, a contemporary of Polycarp, in the very next age after the apostles. Tradition of what was done, or said by Christ, or the apostles, and what expositions they gave, he professed to set a very high value upon, equal to, if not above the Scripture. And two things are considerable in his search after these traditions.

First, c That he did not think that there was any church appointed to be the preserver and declarer of apostolical traditions, but made his inquiry of all the individual ancient men that he could meet with, who had conversed with any of the apostles.

Secondly, That by all his pains, he gathered together a rhapsody of incredible stories, fables, errors, and useless curiosities. Such issue will the endeavours of men have, who forsake the stable word of prophecy, to follow rumours and reports, under the specious name of traditions. But this catholic fame whereof we speak, confirmed by particular records in all

ages, testifying unto a matter of fact, is of great importance. And how clearly this may be pleaded in our present case, shall be manifested in our investigation of the penman of this Epistle.

And thus I hope, we have made it evident, that this Epistle is not destitute of any one of those πεπεμπα, or infallible proofs and arguments, whereby any particular book of the Scripture evinceth itself unto the consciences of men to be written by inspiration from God. It remaineth now to show, that it is not liable unto any of those exceptions, or arguments, whereby any book, or writing pretending a claim to a divine original, and to canonical authority thereupon, may be convicted, and manifested to be of another extract; whereby its just privilege will be on both sides secured.

§ 35. The first consideration of this nature is taken from the author or penman of any such writing. The books of the Old Testament were all of them written by prophets or holy men inspired of God. Hence St. Peter calls the whole of it, προφητεα prophecy, 2 Pet. i. 21; prophecy delivered by men, acted or moved therein by the Holy Ghost. And though there be a distribution made of the several books of it from the subject-matter, into the law, prophets and Psalms, Luke xxiv. 44, and often into the law and prophets on the same account, as Acts xxiv. 14, xxvi. 22, yet their penmen being all equally prophets, the whole in general is ascribed unto them, and called prophecy, Rom. i. 2, xvi. 26; Luke xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. i. 19. So were the books of the New Testament written by apostles, or men endowed with an apostolical spirit, and in their work equally inspired by the Holy Ghost; whence the church is said to be "built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone," Eph. ii. 20. If then the author of any writing acknowledgeth himself, or may otherwise be proved to have been neither prophet nor apostle, nor endowed with the same infallible spirit with them, his work, how excellent soever otherwise it may appear, must needs be esteemed a mere fruit of his own skill, diligence, and wisdom, and not any way to belong unto the canon of the Scripture. This is the condition, for instance, of the second book of Maccabees. In the close of it, the author being doubtful what acceptance his endeavours and manner of writing would find amongst his readers, makes his excuse; and affirms, that he did his utmost to please them in the style and composition of his words. So he tells us before, chap. ii. 24, that he did but epitomize the history of Jason the Cyrenean, wherein he took great pains and labour. In the course of his work the author commends Judas Maccabæus for offering sacrifices for the dead, (which indeed Judas did not, but for the living,) no where appointed in the law; and affirms that Jeremiah hid the holy fire, ark, tabernacle, and altar of incense in a cave. He affirms that Antiochus was killed at Nanea in Persia, chap. i. 16, and that the same person died in the mountains of torments in his bowels, as he was coming to Judea, chap. 9. while the first book affirms that he died of sorrow at Babylon, chap. vi. 16. He affirms, that Judas wrote letters to Aristobulus in the one hundred and eighty eighth year of the Seleucian empire, (who was slain in the hundred fifty second year of it, lib. i. chap. i. 3,) that is, thirty six years after his death; with many other such mistakes and falsehoods. This author then had no great need to inform us, that he had no special divine assistance in his writing, but leaned unto his own understanding. But yet this he doth, as we showed, and that openly; for the Holy Ghost will not be an epitomater of a profane writing, as he professeth himself to
have been; nor make excuses for his weakness, nor declare his pains and
and sweat in his work as he doth. And yet to that pass are things brought
in the world by custom, prejudice, love of reputation, and scorn to be
esteemed mistaken in any thing, that many earnestly contend, that this
book was written by divine inspiration, when the author of it himself openly
professeth it to have been of another extract. For although this book be
not only rejected out of the canon, by the council of Laodicea, d Hierome, e
and others of the ancients, but by Gregory f the great bishop of Rome him-
self; yet the church of Rome would now by force thrust it thereinto.
But were the author himself alive again, I am so well persuaded of his
ingenuity and honesty, from the conclusion of his story, that they would
never be able to make him say, that he wrote by divine inspiration; and
little reason then have we to believe it. Now this Epistle is free from this
exception. The penman of it doth no where intimate, directly or indirectly,
that he wrote in his own strength, or by his own ability; which yet if he
had done, in an argument of that nature which he insisted on, it had been
incumbent on him to have declared it, that he might not lead the church
into a pernicious error, in embracing that, as given by inspiration from God,
which was but a fruit of his diligence and fallible endeavours. But on the
contrary, he speaks as in the name of God, referring unto him, all that he
delivers; nor can he in any minute instance, be convicted to have wanted
his assistance.

§ 36. Circumstances of the general argument of a book, may also
prove it to be of human or fallible original. This they do for instance, in the
book of Judith. For such a Nebuchadonosor, as should reign in Nineve,
chap. i. 1, and make war with Arphaxad king of Eebatane, ver. 13, whose
captains and officers should know nothing at all of the nation of the Jews,
chap. vi. 3, that waged war against them in the days of Joakim, or as other
copies, Eliakim the high priest, chap. iv. 5, after whose defeat, the Jews
should have peace for eighty years at the least, chap. xvi. 28, 30, is an
imagination of that which never had subsistence in rerum natura; but is a
representation of what נוֹרָא a Jewish woman ought, as the author of it
conceived, to undertake for the good of her country. Setting aside the
consideration of all other discoveries of the infallibility of the whole dis-
course, this alone is sufficient to impeach its reputation.

Our Epistle is no way obnoxious unto any exception of this nature.
Yea, the state of things in the churches of God, and among the Hebrews
in particular, did at that time administer so just and full occasion unto a
writing of this kind, as gives countenance unto its ascription unto the wis-
dom and care of the Holy Ghost. For if the eruption of the poisonous
brood of heretics, questioning the deity of the Son of God in Cerinthus,
gave occasion to the writing of the gospel by St. John; and if the dissen-
sions in the church of Corinth, deserved two epistles for their composition;
and if the lesser differences between believers of the Jews and Gen-
tiles, in and about the things treated of in this Epistle had a remedy
provided for them in the epistles of St. Paul unto the Gentiles; is it not
at least probable, that the same Spirit who moved the penmen of
those books to write, and directed them in their so doing, did also provide
for the removal of the prejudices, and healing of the distempers of the
Hebrews, which were so great, and of so great importance unto all the
churches of God. And that there is weight in this consideration, when

f Gregor. Mor. lib. 19, cap. 16.
we come, to declare the time when this Epistle was written, will evidently appear.

§ 37. The most manifest eviction of any writing pretending unto the privilege of divine inspiration, may be taken from the subject-matter of it, or the things taught and declared therein. God himself being the first and only essential truth, nothing can proceed from him but what is absolutely so; and truth being but one, every way uniform and consonant unto itself; there can be no discrepancy in the branches of it, nor contrariety in the streams that flow from that one fountain. God is also holy, glorious in holiness, and nothing proceeds immediately from him, but it bears a stamp of his holines, as also of his greatness and wisdom. If then any thing in the subject-matter of any writing, be untrue, impious, light, or any way contradictory to the ascertained writings of divine inspiration, all pleas and pretences unto that privilege must cease for ever. We then need no other proof, testimony or argument to evince its original, than what itself tenders unto us. And by this means also do the books commonly called Apocryphal, unto which the Romanists ascribe canonical authority, destroy their own pretensions. They have all of them, on this account, long since been cast out of the limits of any tolerable defence. Now, that no one portion of Scripture, is less obnoxious to any exception of this kind, from the subject-matter treated of, and doctrines delivered in it, than this Epistle, we shall by God’s assistance manifest in our exposition of the whole, and each particular passage of it. Neither is it needful, that we should here prolong our discourse, by anticipating any thing that must necessarily afterwards in its proper place be insisted on. The place startled at by some, chap. vi. about the impossibility of the recovery of the apostates, was touched on before, and shall afterwards be fully cleared. Nor do I know any other use to be made of observing the scruple of some of old, about the countenance given to the Novatians by that place, but only to make a discovery how partially men in all ages have been addicted unto their own apprehensions in things wherein they differed from others. For whereas if the opinion of the Novatians had been confirmed in that place, as it is not, it had been their duty to have relinquished their own hypothesis, and gone over unto them; but instead of this, some of them discovered a mind rather to have broken in upon the authority of God himself declared in his word, than so to have done. And it is greatly to be feared that the same spirit still working in others, is as effectual in them to reject the plain sense of the Scripture in sundry places, as it was ready to have been in those of old, to reject the words of it in this.

§ 38. The style and method of a writing may be such, as to lay a just prejudice against its claim to canonical authority. For although the subject-matter of a writing may be good and honest in the main of it, and generally suited unto the analogy of faith; yet there may be in the manner of its composition and writing, such an ostentation of wit, fancy, learning, or eloquence; such an affectation of words, phrases and expressions; such rhetorical paintings of things small and inconsiderable; as may sufficiently demonstrate human ambition, ignorance, pride, or desire of applause, to have been mixed in the forming and producing of it. Much of this Hierome observes, in particular, concerning the book entitled the Wisdom of Solomon, written, as it is supposed, by Philo, an eloquent and learned man: redolete Graecam eloquentiam. This considera-

g Hieron. Pra, in Prov. Solo.
tion is of deserved moment in the judgment we are to make of the spring or fountain from whence any book doth proceed. For whereas great variety of style, and manner of writing, may be observed in the penmen of canonical Scripture; yet in no one of them do the least footsteps of the failings and sinful infirmities of corrupted nature before mentioned appear. When therefore they manifest themselves, they cast out the writings wherein they are from that harmony and consent, which in general appears amongst all the books of divine inspiration. Of the style of this epistle we have spoken before. Its gravity, simplicity, majesty, and absolute suitableness unto the high, holy, and heavenly mysteries treated of in it, are, as far as I can find, not only very evident, but also by all acknowledged, who are able to judge of them.

§ 39. Want of catholic tradition in all ages of the church, from the first giving forth of any writing testifying unto its divine original, is another impeachment of its pretense unto canonical authority. And this argument ariseth fatally against the apocryphal books before mentioned. Some of them are expressly excluded from the canon by many of the ancient churches, nor are any of them competently testified unto.

The suffrage of this kind given unto our Epistle, we have mentioned before. The doubts and scruples of some about it, have likewise been acknowledged. That they are of no weight to be laid in the balance against the testimony given unto it, might easily be demonstrated. But because they were levelled all, of them principally against its author, and but by consequence against its authority, I shall consider them in a disquisition about him, wherein we shall give a further confirmation of the divine original of the Epistle, by proving it undeniably to have been written by the apostle St. Paul, that eminent penman of the Holy Ghost.

§ 40. Thus the canonical authority of this Epistle stands clear. It is destitute of no evidence needful for the manifestation of it, nor is it obnoxious unto any just exception against its claim of that privilege. And hence it is come to pass, that whatever have been the fears, doubts, and scruples of some; the rash temerarious objections, conjectures, and censures of others; the care and providence of God over it, as a part of his most holy word, working with the prevailing evidence of its original implanted in it, and its spiritual efficacy unto all the ends of holy Scripture; hath obtained an absolute conquest over the hearts and minds of all that believe, and settled it in a full possession of canonical authority, in all the churches of Christ throughout the world.
EXERCITATION II.

OF THE PENMAN OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.


§ 1. The divine authority of the Epistle being vindicated, it is of no great moment to inquire scrupulously after its penman. Writings that proceed from Divine inspiration, receive no addition of authority from the reputation or esteem of them by whom they were written. And this the Holy Ghost hath sufficiently manifested, by shutting up the names of many of them from the knowledge of the church in all ages. The close of the Pentateuch hath an uncertain penman, unless we shall suppose, with some of the Jews, that it was written by Moses after his death. Divers of the Psalms have their penmen concealed, as also have the whole books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ruth, Esther, Job, and the Chronicles are but guessed at. Had any prejudice unto their authority ensued, this had not been. For those books whose authors are known, were not esteemed to be given by prophecy, because they were prophets; but they were known to be prophets by the words which they delivered. For if the word delivered or written by any of the prophets, was to be esteemed sacred or
divine, because delivered or written by such persons as were known to be prophets, then it must be because they were some other way known so to be, and divinely inspired, as by working of miracles, or that they were in their days received, and testified unto as such by the church. But neither of these can be asserted. For as it is not known that any one penman of the Old Testament, Moses only excepted, ever wrought any miracles, so it is certain that the most and chief of them (as the prophets) were rejected and condemned by the church of the days wherein they lived. The only way, therefore, whereby they were proved to be prophets, was by the word itself which they delivered and wrote; and thereon depended the evidence and certainty of their being divinely inspired. See Amos vii. 14—17; Jer. xxiii. 25—31. And setting aside that actual inspiration by the Holy Ghost, which they had for the declaration and writing of that word of God which came unto them in particular, even the prophets themselves were subject to mistakes. So was Samuel, when he thought Eliab should have been the Lord's anointed, 1 Sam. xvi. 6, and Nathan when he approved the purpose of David to build the temple, 1 Chron. xvii. 2, and the great Elijah, when he supposed none left in Israel that worshipped God aright but himself, 1 Kings xix. 14, 18. It was then, as we said, the word of prophecy that gave the writers of it the reputation and authority of prophets; and their being prophets gave not authority to the word they declared or wrote as a word of prophecy. Hence an anxious inquiry after the penman of any part of the Scripture is not necessary.

But whereas there want not evidences sufficient to discover who was the writer of this Epistle, whereby also the exceptions made unto its divine original may be finally obviated, they also shall be taken into consideration. A subject this is, wherein many learned men of old, and of late, have exercised themselves, until this single argument is grown up into entire and large treatises; and I shall only take care that the truth, which hath been already strenuously asserted and vindicated, may not again, by this review, be rendered dubious and questionable.

§ 2. St. Paul it is by whom we affirm this Epistle to be written. It is acknowledged that this was so highly questioned of old, that Origen, after the examination of it, concludes, το μην ἀληθεῖς θεος οὐδείς.—'What is the very truth in this matter, God only knows.' However, he acknowledgeth that οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, the ancients, owned it to be written by Paul, and that he says not without good reason; whereas the ascription of it unto any other, he assigns unto a bare report. It may not then be expected, that now, after so long a season, the truth of our assertion should be so manifestly evinced, as to give absolute satisfaction unto all, which is a vain thing for any man to aim at in a subject wherein men suppose that they have a liberty of thinking what they please; yet I doubt not but that it will appear not only highly probable, but so full of evidence, in comparison of any other opinion that is, or hath been promoted in competition with it, as that some kind of blameable pertinaciousness may be made to appear in its refusal. Now the whole of what I shall offer in the proof of it may be reduced unto these six heads. 1. The manifest failure of all them who have endeavoured to assign it unto any other penman. 2. The insufficiency of the arguments insisted on to disprove our assertion. 3. Testimony given unto it in other Scriptures. 4. Considerations taken from the writing itself, compared with

other acknowledged writings of the same author. 5. The general suffrage of antiquity, or ecclesiastical tradition. 6. Reasons taken from sundry circumstances relating unto the Epistle itself. Now, as all these evidences are not of the same nature, nor of equal force, so some of them will be found very cogent, and all of them together very sufficient to free our assertion from just question or exception.

§ 3. First, The uncertainty of those who question whether Paul were the writer of this Epistle, and their want of probable grounds in assigning it unto any other, hath some inducement in it to leave it unto him whose of old it was esteemed to be. For when once men began to take to themselves a liberty of conjecture in this matter, they could neither make an end themselves, nor fix any bounds unto the imagination of others. Having once lost its true author, no other could be asserted with any such evidence, or indeed probability, but that instantly twenty more, with as good grounds and reasons, might be entitled unto it. Accordingly sundry persons have been named, all upon the same account that some thought good to name them; and why should not one man’s authority in this matter be as good as another’s?

§ 4. Origen in Eusebius1 affirms, that some supposed Luke to have been the author of this Epistle. But neither doth he approve their opinion, nor mention what reasons they pretend for it. He adds also,2 that some esteemed it to be written by Clemens of Rome. Clemens of Alexandria allows St. Paul to be the author of it; but supposeth it might be translated by Luke, because, as he saith, the style of it is not unlike that of Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. Grotius of late contends for Luke to be the author of it on the same account;3 but the instances which he gives, rather argue a coincidence of some words and phrases, than a similitude of style, which things are very different. Hierome4 also tells us, that juxta quodam videtur esse Lucae Evangelistae—‘by some it was thought to be written by Luke the evangelist,’ which he took from Clemens, Origen, and Eusebius: only he mentions nothing of the similitude of style with that of St. Luke, but afterwards informs us, that in his judgment there is a great conformity in style, between this Epistle and that of Clemens Romanus. None of them acquaint us who were the authors or approvers of this conjecture, nor do they give any credit themselves unto it. Neither is there any reason of this opinion reported by them, but only that intimated by Clemens,5 of the agreement of the style with that of the Acts of the Apostles, which yet is not allowed by Hierome. Accordingly he doth not ascribe the writing, but only the translation of it unto Luke. Grotius alone contends for him to be the author of it, and that with this only argument, that sundry words are used in the same sense by St. Luke and the writer of this Epistle. But that this observation is of no moment shall afterwards be declared.

This opinion, then, may be well rejected as a groundless guess of an obscure unknown original, and not tolerably confirmed either by testimony or circumstances of things. If we will forego a persuasion established on so many important considerations, as we shall manifest this of St. Paul’s being the author of this Epistle to be, and confirmed by so many testimonies, upon every arbitrary ungrounded conjecture, we may be sure never to find rest in any thing that we are rightly persuaded of. But I shall add one consideration that will cast this opinion of Grotius quite out of the limits of

---
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probability. By general consent, this Epistle was written whilst James was yet alive, and presided in the church of the Hebrews at Jerusalem; and I shall afterwards prove it so to have been. What was his authority as an apostle, what his reputation in that church, is both known in general from the nature of his office, and in particular is intimated in the Scripture, Acts xv. 13; Gal. ii. 9. These were the Hebrews, whose instruction in this Epistle is principally intended, and by their means that of their brethren in the eastern dispersion of them. Now, is it reasonable to imagine, that any one who was not an apostle, but only a scholar and follower of them, should be used to write unto that church, wherein so great an apostle, a pillar among them, had his especial residence, and did actually preside; and that in an argument of such huge importance, with reasons against a practice wherein they were all engaged, yea, that apostle himself, as appears, Gal. ii. 12. Were any one then alive, of more esteem and reputation in the church than others, certainly he was the fittest to be used in this employment; and how well all things of this nature agree unto St. Paul, we shall see afterwards.

§ 5. Some have assigned the writing of this Epistle unto Barnabas. Clemens, Origen, Eusebius, make no mention of him. Tertullian was the author of this opinion; and it is reported as his by Hierome. Philastrius also remembers the report of it. And it is of late defended by Camero, as the former concerning Luke by Grotius, whose reasons for his conjecture are confuted with some sharpness by Spanheimius, mindful as it seems of his father's controversy with some of his scholars. The authority of Tertullian is the sole foundation of this opinion; but as the book wherein he mentions it was written in his paroxysm, when he uttered not that only unadvisedly, so he seems not to lay much weight on the Epistle itself, only preferring it unto the apocryphal Hermes: Receptor, saith he, apud Ecclesias Epistola Barnabae itlo Apocrypho pastore Machorum. And we have showed that the Latin church was for a time somewhat unacquainted with this Epistle, so that it is no marvel if one of them should mistake its author. Grotius would disprove this opinion from the dissimilitude of its style, and that which goes under the name of Barnabas, which is corrupt and barbarous. But there is little weight in that observation, that epistle being certainly spurious, no way favouring the wisdom or spirit of him, on whom it hath been vulgarly imposed. But yet that it was that Epistle which is cited by some of the ancients under the name of Barnabas, and not this unto the Hebrews, is well proved by Baronius from the names that Hierome mentions out of that epistle, which are no where to be found in this to the Hebrews. But that epistle of Barnabas is an open fruit of that vanity which prevailed in many about the third and fourth ages of the church, of personating in their writings some apostolical persons, wherein they seldom or never kept any good decorum, as might easily be manifested in this particular instance. As to our present case, the reason before mentioned, is of the same validity against this, as the other opinion concerning Luke, whereunto others of an equal evidence may be added. Barnabas was not an apostle, properly and strictly so called, nor had apostolical mission or authority, but rather seems to have been one of the seventy disciples, as

Epiphanius' affirms. And Eusebius, a person less credulous than he, acknowledging that a just and true catalogue of them could not be given, yet placeth Barnabas as the first of them concerning whom all agreed. Much weight, indeed, I shall not lay hereon, seeing it is evident that the catalogues given us by the ancients of those disciples, are nothing but a rude collection of such names as they found in the books of the New Testament, applied without reason or testimony; but apostle he was none.

Many circumstances also concur to the removal of this conjecture. The epistle was written in Italy, ch. xiii. 24, where it doth not appear that Barnabas ever was. The fabulous author, I confess, of the rhapsody called the Recognitions of Clemens, tells us that Barnabas went to Rome, taking along Clemens with him, and returning to Judea, found St. Peter at Cesarea. But St. Luke in the Acts gives us another account, both where Barnabas was, and how he was employed, at the time intimated by him who knew nothing of those things. For while St. Peter was at Cesarea, Acts x. 1, Barnabas was at Hierusalem, Acts ix. 27, being a little while after sent to Antioch by the apostles, ch. xi. 22. Again, Timothy was the companion of the writer of this Epistle, ch. xiii. 23, a person, as far as appears, unknown unto Barnabas, being taking into St. Paul's society after their difference and separation, Acts xv. 39, ch. xvi. 1. He had also been in bonds or imprisonment, ch. x. 34, whereof we cannot at that time learn any thing concerning Barnabas, those of St. Paul being known unto all. And lastly, not long before the writing of this Epistle, Barnabas was so far from that light into, and apprehension of the nature, use and expiration of judaical rites herein expressed, that he was easily misled into a practical miscarriage in the observation of them, Gal. ii. 13. And although some (after Hierome's fancy, that the difference between St. Peter and St. Paul was only in pretence) have laboured to free St. Peter and his companions on other grounds from any sinful failing, as it should seem in a direct opposition unto the testimony of St. Paul, affirming that κατεγνωσμένος νῦν in that particular he was to be blamed and condemned, ver. 11, not unlike him who hath written a justification of Aaron in his making the golden calf; yet that Barnabas was not come up unto any constancy in his practice about Mosaical institutions, is evident from the text. And shall we suppose that he, who but a little before, upon the coming of some few brethren of the church of Jerusalem from St. James, durst not avouch and abide by his own personal liberty, but deserted the use of it not without some blameable dissimulation, Gal. ii. 13, should now, with so much authority, write an epistle unto that church with St. James, and all the Hebrews in the world concurring with them in judgment and practice, about that very thing, wherein himself, out of respect unto them, had particularly miscarried? This certainly was rather the work of St. Paul, whose light and constancy in the doctrine delivered in this Epistle, with his engagements in the defence of it now unto all the rest of the apostles, is known from the story of the Acts and his own other writings.

§ 6. Apollos hath been thought by some to be the penman of this Epistle; and that because it answers the character given of him. For it is said, that he was an eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures, fervent in


spirit, and one that mightily convinced the Jews out of the Scripture itself, Acts xviii. 24, 26, all which things appear throughout this whole discourse. But this conjecture hath no countenance from antiquity, no mention being made of any epistle written by Apollos, or any thing else, so that he is not reckoned by Hierome amongst the ecclesiastical writers, nor by those who interpolated that work with some fragments out of Sophronius. Nor is he reported by Clemens, Origen, or Eusebius, to have been by any esteemed the author of this Epistle. However, I confess somewhat of moment might have been apprehended in the observation mentioned, if the excellencies ascribed unto Apollos had been peculiar unto him; yea, had they not all of them been found in St. Paul, and that in a manner and degree more eminent than the other. But this being so, the ground of this conjecture is taken from under it.

§ 7. Origen, Eusebius, and Hierome, in the places forecited, mention a report concerning some who ascribed this Epistle unto Clemens Romanus. None of them give any countenance unto it, or intimate any grounds of that supposition; only Hierome affirms that there is some similitude between the style of this Epistle and that of Clemens, which occasioned the suspicion of his translating of it, whereof afterwards. Erasmus b hath since taken up that report, and seems to give credit unto it, but hath not contributed any thing of reason or testimony unto its confirmation. This Clemens was a worthy holy man, no doubt, and bishop of the church at Rome. But none of the ancients of any learning or judgment, ever laid weight on this conjecture. For what had he, who was a convert from among the Gentiles, to do with the churches of the Hebrews, what authority had he to interpose himself in that which was their peculiar concernment? Whence may it appear, that he had that skill in the nature, use, and end of Mosaical rites and institutions, which the writer of this Epistle discovers in himself? Neither doth that epistle of his to the church of Corinth, which is yet extant, though excellent in its kind, permit us to think that he wrote by divine inspiration. Besides, the author of this Epistle had a desire and purpose to go to the Hebrews, ch. xiii. 22. Yea, he desires to be restored unto them as one that had been with them before. But as it doth not appear that this Clemens was ever in Palestine, so what reason should he have to leave his own charge now to go thither, no man can imagine. And to end this needless debate, in that Epistle which was truly his own, he makes use of the words and authority of this, as Eusebius long since observed.

§ 8. Sixtus Sinensis affirms, c that the work whose author we inquire after, was by some assigned unto Tertullian. A fond and impious imagination, and such as no man of judgment or sobriety could ever fall into. This Epistle was famous in the churches before Tertullian was born; is ascribed d by himself unto Barnabas, and some passages in it are said by him to be corrupted by one Theodotus long before his time.

From the uncertainty of these conjectures, with the evidence of reason and circumstances whereby they are disproved, two things we seem to have obtained. First, That no objection on their account can rise against our assertion. And, secondly, that if St. Paul be not acknowledged to be the writer of this Epistle, the whole church of God is, and ever was, at a total loss whom to ascribe it unto. And it may reasonably be expected, that the
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weakness of these conjectures, should, if not add unto, yet set off the credibility of the reasons and testimonies which shall be produced in the assignment of it unto him.

§ 9. The objections that are laid by some against the ascribing of this Epistle unto St. Paul, according unto the order proposed, are next to be considered. These I shall consider with what briefness I can, so as not to be wanting in the defence designed.

Dissimilitude of style, and manner of writing from that used by St. Paul in his other epistles, is pressed in the first place, and principally insisted on. And indeed it is the whole of what, with any colour of reason, is made use of in this cause. This the ancients admitted. The elegance, propriety of speech, and sometimes loftiness, that occur in this Epistle, distinguish it, as they say, from those of St. Paul’s writing. Δοκεῖ μεν οὖν εἴναι Παύλου διὰ τον χαρακτῆρα, says Cæcumenius: — It seems not to be St. Paul’s, because of the style or character of speech.’ For this cause, Clemens of Alexandria supposed that it was written in Hebrew, and translated into Greek by St. Luke the evangelist; the style of it, as he says, being like unto that which is used in the Acts of the Apostles; and yet that is acknowledged by all to be purely Greek, whereas this is accused of being full of Hebraisms: so little weight is to be laid on these critical censures, wherein learned men perpetually contradict one another.

Origen also confessed: that it hath not in its character, τὸ εἰδωτικὸν εν λαγε, the idiom or peculiarity of the language of St. Paul, who acknowledged himself to be εἰδωτὸς τῷ λαγῷ, 2 Cor. xi. 6, rude in speech; and this Epistle is, saith he, εν συνθετεὶ τῆς λεξίνως ἐλληνικωτέρα, ‘in the composition of its speech elegant Greek,’ in comparison of St. Paul’s, which, if we may believe him, any one will discern who can judge between the differences of style. And Hierome, Scripsert autem ad Hebraeos Hebrew, id est suo eloquio disertissime; ut ea quæ eloquenter scripta fuerant in Hebrew aliquatenus verterentur in Graecum; et hanc causam esse quod a ceteris Pauli Epistolis discrepare videatur. It seems to differ from the rest of St. Paul’s epistles, because of its translation out of Hebrew, wherein he speaks not with his wonted confidence. And elsewhere he says, that the style of this epistle seems to be like that of Clemens. Erasmus presseth this objection: Restat, saith he, jam argumentum illud quo non aliud certius: stylus ipse et orationis character, qui nihil habet affinitatis cum phrasi Paulinæ; — ‘The style and character of speech have no affinity with the phrase of St. Paul.’ This consideration also drew Calvin into the same opinion; and it is insisted on by Camero and Grotius to the same purpose. The sum of this objection is, that St. Paul was rude in speech, which is manifest in his other epistles, but the style of this is pure, elegant, florid, such as hath no affinity with his, so that he cannot be esteemed the penman of it.

§ 10. As this objection was taken notice of by them of old, and the matter of it admitted as true, so because they constantly ascribed the epistle to Paul, they gave sundry answers unto it. Origen gives us his judgment, that the sense or subject-matter of this Epistle was from St. Paul, which are excellent, and no way inferior to those of the same apostle in any other epistle, as every one exercised in the reading of his

---

e Cæcumen. Praef. in Ep. ad Heb.
g Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 6, cap. 24.  
h Hieronym. Catal. Scri. in Pau.  
f Clemens in Hypotyp.
epistles will grant; but the structure and phrase of it he supposed to have been the work of some other, who, taking the dictates of his master, from thence composed this Epistle. But this answer can by no means be admitted, nor used with respect to any writing given by divine inspiration. For not only the matter, but the very words of their writings, were suggested unto his penmen by the Holy Ghost, that the whole might have no influence from human frailty or fallibility, which alone renders the authority of their writings sacred and divine. But this intimation would resolve the truth in this Epistle into the care and diligence of him that took the sense of St. Paul, and thence composed it; wherein he was liable unto mistakes, unless we shall vainly suppose that he also was inspired. Wherefore generally they who admitted of this objection, gave the answer unto it before intimated; namely, that the epistle was originally written in Hebrew by St. Paul, and translated by some other into the Greek language. So Oecumenius: του μεν ουν ἡλλαχώς τον χαρακτηρα της επιστολης φανερα ἢ αιτιαπρος γαρ Εβραιον τη σφων ειδελεκτη γραφεια υστερον μεθερμηνευθηναι λειτεται, \^\textsuperscript{1}— 'The cause of the alteration or difference of style in this Epistle is manifest; for it is said to be written unto the Hebrews in their own language, and to be afterwards translated.' Hierome and Clemens also incline to this opinion and answer. And Theophylact, though following Theodoret, he egregiously confutes them who deny St. Paul to be the author of this Epistle, from the excellency, efficacy, and irrefragable power and authority wherewith it is accompanied, yet admits of this objection, and answers with others, that it was translated by St. Luke or Clemens. Only Chrysostome, \^\textsuperscript{k} who indeed is πολλων ανταξιως αλλων, without taking notice of the pretended dissimilitude of style, ascribes it directly to St. Paul. But to this answer incline generally the divines of the Roman church, as Catharinus, \^\textsuperscript{l} Bellarminus, \^\textsuperscript{m} Baronius, \^\textsuperscript{n} Cornelius à Lapide, \^\textsuperscript{o} Canus, \^\textsuperscript{p} Matheus Gale- nus, \^\textsuperscript{q} Ludovicus Tena, \^\textsuperscript{r} and others without number; though it be rejected by Estius, \^\textsuperscript{s} and some others among themselves. What is to be thought of it, we shall afterwards consider in a dissertation designed unto that purpose. For the present we affirm that is no way needful as an answer unto the objection insisted on, as we shall now farther particularly manifest.

\^\section{11.} The foundation of this objection lies in St. Paul's acknowledgment that he was ειτωτης τω λογω, 'rude in speech,' 2 Cor. xi. 6. This Origen presseth, and Hierome takes occasion hence to censure his skill in his mother tongue; for so was the Greek unto them that were born at Tarsus, in Cilicia; and this the place of St. Paul's nativity. Though the same Hierome, from I know not what tradition, affirms that he was born at Ghiscalis, a town of Galilee, from whence he went afterwards with his parents to Tarsus, contrary to his own express testimony, Acts xxii. 23, 'I verily was born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia.'

But this seems an infirm foundation of the objection insisted on. Paul in that place is dealing with the Corinthians about the false teachers, who seduced them from the simplicity of the gospel. The course which they took to ensnare them, was vain affected eloquence, and strains of rhetoric unbecoming the work they pretended to be engaged in. Puffed up with

\^\textsuperscript{j} Theodor. Argu. in Epist. ad Heb.\^\textsuperscript{l} Cathar. de Auth. Epist. ad Heb. diss.\^\textsuperscript{n} Baron. An. Eccles. A. C. 51, N. 55.\^\textsuperscript{p} Can. loc. com. lib. 2, cap. 11.\^\textsuperscript{q} Galenus Pref. in Epist. ad Heb.\^\textsuperscript{r} Ten. Prælud. 4.\^\textsuperscript{s} Estius Prolegom.\^\textsuperscript{k} Chrysost. Praef. in Epist. ad Heb.\^\textsuperscript{m} Bellar. de Verb. Dei. l. 1. c. 17.\^\textsuperscript{o} à Lapid. Praef. in Epist.
this singularity, they contemned St. Paul as a rude unskilful person, no way able to to match them in their fine declamations. In answer hereunto, he first tells them that it became not him to use σοφίαν λόγου, 1 Cor. i. 17, "that wisdom of words or speech, with which orators flourished;" or εὐδικτος ανδρωποτης σοφιας λογους, 1 Cor. ii. 13, "the words that man's wisdom teacheth, or an artificial composition of words to entice thereby," which he calls, ὑπεροχυν λόγου, ch. ii. 1. And many reasons he gives why it became him not to make use of those things, soasto make them his design, as seducers and false apostles did. Again, he answers by concession in this place, ει δε και εινοτης τω λόγω, "suppose I be, or were rude or unskilful in speech, doth this matter depend thereon? Is it not manifest unto you that I am not so in the knowledge of the mystery of the gospel?" He doth not confess that he is so, saith Austin, but grants it for their conviction. And in this sense concur Cæcumenius, Aquinas, Lyra, Catharinus, Clarius, and Capellus, with many others on the place. If then by λόγος here, that seducing enticing rhetoric, wherewith the false teachers entangled the affections of their unskilful hearers, be intended, as we grant that St. Paul, it may be, was unskilful in it, and are sure that he would make no use of it, so it is denied that any footsteps of it appear in this Epistle. But if any thing solid, convincing, unpainted eloquence, be intended in it, it is evident that St. Paul neither did, nor justly could confess himself unacquainted with it. Only he made a concession of the objection raised against him by the false teachers, to manifest how they could obtain no manner of advantage thereby.

§ 12. Neither are the other epistles of St. Paul written in so low and homely a style as is pretended. Chrysostome, speaking of him, tells us, ὑπερ των ἓλιων ελαμψεν ἡ τουτον γλωσσα; 1 and that for his eloquence he was esteemed a Mercury by the Gentiles. Somewhat hath been spoken hereunto before, to which I shall only add the words of a person who was no incompetent judge in things of this nature. Quum, saith he, orationis ipsius, totam indolem et χαρακτηρα propius considero, nullam ego in ipso Platone grandiloquentiam, quotes illi libuit Dei mysteria detonare, nullam in Demosthenem parem δεινοτητα, comperisse me fatoer, quoties animos vel metu Divini judicii perturbare, vel commonefacere, vel ad contemplandum Dei bonitatem attrahere, vel ad pietatis et misericordiae officia constitutum adhortari, nullam demiq vel in ipso Aristotele et Galeno praestantium aliquin artificibus, magis exactam docendi methodum invenio. 2—4 When I well consider the genius and character of the speech and style of this apostle, I confess I never found that grandeur in Plato himself, as in him, when he thundereth out the mysteries of God; nor that gravity and vehemency in Demosthenes as in him, when he intends to terrify the minds of men with a dread of the judgments of God, or would warn them, or draw them to the contemplation of his goodness, or the performance of the duties of piety and mercy; nor do I find a more exact method of teaching in those great and excellent masters, Aristotle and Galen, than in him. 5 So it is plainly, so the Greek fathers almost with one consent do testify, so domost of the Latins also, so the best learned of the later critics, and this may be defended against any opposition. And Hierome himself, who takes most liberty to censure his style, doth sometimes so far forget his own temerity therein, as to cry out against those who dreamed, as he speaks, that St. Paul was not thoroughly acquainted with
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all propriety of speech. And he who was the first who ever spake a word about any defect of this kind, though as able to judge as any one whatever who hath since passed his censure unto the same purpose, was in an evident mistake in the very instance which he pitched on to confirm his observation. This was Irenæus, one of the first and most learned of the Greek fathers; for affirming that there were many hyperbata in the style of this apostle, which render it uneven and difficult, he confirms his assertion with an instance in 2 Cor. iv. 4. ‘In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not.’ for, saith he, the words should naturally have been thus placed, ‘In whom God hath blinded the minds of them that in this world believe not.’ So to obviate a foolish sophism in the Valentinians, an hyperbaton must be supposed in the apostle’s style, when indeed there is not the least colour of it. Upon the whole then, I shall confidently assert, that there is no manner of defect in any of his writings; and that every thing (considering the matter and nature of it, the person in whose name he spake, and those to whom he wrote) is expressed as it ought to be for the end proposed, and not otherwise. And hence it is, that because of the variety of the subject-matter treated of, and difference among the persons to whom he wrote, that there is also variety in his way and manner of expressing himself in sundry of his epistles; and in many of these, there is such a discovery and manifestation of solid eloquence, and pure elegance of speech, that the observation of these in any writing, is far from having any weight to prove it none of his.

§ 13. It may then be granted, though it be not proved, that there is some dissimilitude of style between this and the rest of the epistles of St. Paul: and the reasons of it are sufficiently manifest. The argument treated of in this Epistle, is diverse from that of most of the other; many circumstances in those to whom he wrote singular, the spring of his reasonings, and way of his arguing, peculiarly suited unto his subject-matter, and the condition of those unto whom he wrote. Besides, in the writing of this Epistle, there was in him an especial frame and incitation of spirit, occasioned by many occurrences relating unto it. His intense love, and near relation in the flesh unto them to whom he wrote, affectionately remembered by himself, and expressed in a manner inimitable, Rom. ix. 1—3, did doubtless exert itself in his treating about their greatest and nearest concerns. The prejudices and enmity of some of them against him, recorded in several places of the Acts, and remembered by himself in some other of his epistles, lay also under his consideration. Much of the subject that he treated about was matter of controversy, which was to be debated from the Scripture, and wherein those with whom he dealt, thought they might dissent from him, without any prejudice to their faith or obedience. Their condition also must have greatly affected him. They were now not only under present troubles, dangers, and fears, but positi inter sacrum et saxum, at the very door of ruin, if not delivered from the snare of obstinate adherence unto Mosaical institutions. Now, they who know not what alterations in style and manner of writing these things will produce, in those who have an ability to express the conceptions of their minds, and the affections wherewith they are attended, know nothing of this matter. And other differences from the rest of Paul’s epistles, but such as may evidently be seen to arise from these and the like causes, none have yet discovered, nor can discover. And notwithstanding the elegance of the style pretended, that it is as full of Hebraisms as any other epistle of the same author, we shall show in our passage through it, which certainly a person of that
ability in the Greek tongue as the writer of this epistle discovers himself to be, might have avoided, if he had thought meet so to do.

§ 14. Neither is it to be omitted, that there is such a coincidence in many phrases, use of words and expressions between this Epistle, and the rest of St. Paul’s, as will not allow us to grant such a discrepancy in style as some imagine. They have many of them been gathered by others; and therefore I shall only point unto the places from which they are taken.—See ch. i. 1. compared with 2 Cor. xiii. 3. Ch. ii. 14. with Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12. Ch. ii. 2. with Eph. v. 26. Ch. iii. 1. with Phil. iii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 9. Ch. iii. 6. with Rom. v. 2. Ch. v. 14. with 1 Cor. xi. 6; Phil. iii. 15; Eph. iv. 13. Ch. v. 13. with 1 Cor. iii. 2. Ch. vi. 2. with Col. ii. 2; 1 Thess. i. 5. Ch. vii. 18. with Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9. Ch. viii. 6. 9. with Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5. Ch. x. 1. with Col. ii. 17. Ch. x. 22. with 2 Cor. vii. 1. Ch. x. 23. a phrase peculiar to St. Paul, and common with him. Ch. x. 33. with 1 Cor. iv. 9. Ch. x. 36. with Gal. iii. 22. Ch. x. 39. with 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14. Ch. xii. 1. with 1 Cor. ix. 24. Ch. xiii. 10. with Eph. iv. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Cor. x. 18. Ch. iii. 15, 16. with Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18. Ch. xiii. 20. with Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 2; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23. Many of which places, having before been observed by others, they are all of them collected in this order by Spanheimius; and many more of the like nature might be added unto them, but that these are sufficient to outbalance the contrary instances of some words and expressions, no where else used by St. Paul, which perhaps may be observed of every other epistle in like manner. And upon all these considerations it appears how little force there is in this objection.

§ 15. Secondly, it is excepted, that the epistle is αὐτογράφος, the name of Paul being not prefixed unto it, as it is, say some, unto all the Epistles written by him. And this indeed is the womb wherein all other objections have been conceived. For this being once taken notice of, and admitted as an objection, the rest were but fruits of men’s needless diligence to give countenance unto it. And this exception is ancient, and that which alone some of old took any notice of; for it is considered by Clemens, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Ecumenius, and generally all that have spoken any thing about the writer of this Epistle. Nor doth the strength that it hath lie merely in this, that it is without inscription; for so is the epistle of St. John, concerning which, it was never doubted but that he was the author of it. But in the constant usage of Paul, prefixing his name unto all his other epistles, so that, unless a just reason can be given why he should depart from that custom in the writing of this, it may be well supposed to be none of his.

Now, by the title which is wanting, either the mere titular superscription, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews, is intended; or the inscription of his name, with an apostolical salutation conjoined in the epistle itself. For the first, it is uncertain of what antiquity the titular superscriptions of any of the epistles are; but most certain, that they did not originally belong unto them, and are therefore destitute of all authority. They are things with which the transcribers, it may be, have at pleasure made bold, as with the subscription also of some of them, as to the place from whence they were sent, and the persons by whom. Though this therefore should be wanting unto this Epistle, as there is some variety both in ancient copies of the original, and translations about it, the most owning and retaining of it; yet it would be of no moment, seeing we know
not whence or from whom any of them are. The objection, then, is taken
from the want of the wonted apostolical salutation, which should be in, and
a part of the epistle. And this is the substance of what on this account is
excepted against our assertion.

§ 16. Various answers have been given to this objection, some of them
of no more validity than itself. Hierome replies, It hath no man's name
prefixed: therefore we may by as good reason say, it was written by no
man, as not by Paul; which instance, though it be approved by Beza, with
other learned men, and not sufficiently answered by Erasmus with a con-
trary instance, yet indeed it is of no value; for being written, it must be
written by somebody, though not perhaps by St. Paul. Some have thought
that it may be the inscription inquired after was at first prefixed, but
by some means or other hath been lost. But as there are very many argu-
ments and evidences to evince the weakness of this imagination, so the
beginning and entrance of the epistle is such, as is incapable of any con-
texture with such a salutation, as that used in other epistles, as is also that
of St. John, so that this conjecture can here have no place.

§ 17. Some of the ancients, and principally Theodoret, insist upon the
peculiar allotment of his work unto him among the Gentiles. Paul was the
apostle of the Gentiles in an especial manner; and if in writing unto the
Hebrews he had prefixed his name unto his epistle, he might have seemed
to transgress the line of his allotment. And if it be not certain that the
apostles, by common consent, cast their work into distinct portions, which
they peculiarly attended unto, as the ancients generally concur that they
did, and there was not reason wanting why they should do so,) yet it is
certain that there was a special convention and agreement between James,
Peter, and John, on the one side, and Paul and Barnabas on the other, that
those should attend the ministry of the circumcision, and these of the Gen-
tiles. Hence Paul finding it necessary for him to write unto the Hebrews,
would not prefix his name with an apostolical salutation unto his epistle,
that he might not seem to have invaded the province of others, or trans-
gressed the line of his allotment. But I must acknowledge that, notwith-
standing the weight laid upon it by Theodoret and some others, this reason
seems not unto me cogent unto the end for which it is produced. For, 1st,
The commission given by the Lord Christ unto his apostles, was catholic,
and had no bounds but that of the whole creation of God capable of
instruction, Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15, and that commission which was
given unto them all in general, was given unto every one in particular: and
made him in solidum possessor of all the right and authority conveyed by
it. Neither could any following arbitrary agreement pitched on for conve-
nience, and the facilitating of their work, abridge any of them from exerting
their authority, and exercising their duty towards any of the sons of men, as
occasion did require.

And hence it is, that notwithstanding the agreement mentioned, we find
St. Peter teaching of the Gentiles, and St. Paul labouring for the conversion
of the Jews. 2ndly, In writing this Epistle, on this supposition, St. Paul
did indeed that which is pretended was not meet for him to do; namely, he
entered on that which was the charge of another man, only he conceals his
name, that he might not appear to do a thing unwARRANTABLE and un-
justifiable. And whether it be meet to ascribe this unto the apostle,
is easy to determine. As then it is certain that St. Paul, in the
writing of this Epistle, did nothing but what in duty he ought to do, and
what the authority given him by Christ extended itself unto; so the conceal-
ing of his name, lest he should be thought to have done any thing irregularly, is a thing that without much temerity may not be imputed unto him.

§ 18. There is another answer to this objection, which seemeth to be solid and satisfactory, which most of the ancients rest in. And it is, that St. Paul had weighty reasons not to declare his name at the entrance of this Epistle to the Hebrews, taken from the prejudices that many of them had against him. This is insisted on by Clemens in Eusebius; 'He did wisely,' saith he, 'conceal his name, because of the prejudice opinion that they had against him;' and this is at large insisted on by Chrysostome," who is followed therein by Theophylact, Æcumenius, and others without number. The persecuting party of the nation looked on him as an apostate, a deserter of the cause wherein he was once engaged, and one that taught apostasy from the law of Moses; yea, as they thought, one that set the whole world against them, and all that they gloried in, Acts xxi. 28, and what enmity is usually stirred up on such occasions, all men know, and his example is a sufficient instance of it. And there was added thereunto, which Chrysostome, and that justly, lays great weight upon, that he was no ordinary person, but a man of great and extraordinary abilities, which mightily increased the provocation. Those among them, who with the profession of the gospel had a mind to continue themselves in, and to impose upon others the observance of Mosaical institutions, looked on him as the only person that had frustrated their design, Acts xv. 2. And this also is usually no small cause of wrath and hatred. The spirit of these men afterwards possessing the Ebonites, they despised St. Paul as a Grecian and deserter of the law, as Epiphanius testifies. And even the best among them, who either in the use of their liberty, or upon an indulgence given them, continued in the temple-worship, had a jealous eye over him, lest he had not that esteem for Moses which they imagined became them to retain, Acts xxi. 21. How great a prejudice against his doctrine and reasonings these thoughts and jealousies might have created, had he at the entrance of his dealing with them prefixed his name and usual salutation, is not hard to conjecture. This being the state and condition of things in reference unto St. Paul, and not any other known penman of the Holy Ghost, or eminent disciple of Christ in those days, this defect of inscription, as Beza well observes, proves the epistle rather to be his than any other person's whatever. And though I know that there may be some reply made unto this answer, both from the discovery which he makes of himself in the end of the epistle, and from the high probability that there is that the Hebrews, upon the first receipt of it, would diligently examine by whom it was written, yet I judge it very sufficient to frustrate the exception insisted on, though perhaps not containing the true, at least the whole cause of the omission of an apostolical salutation in the entrance of it.

§ 19. If then we would know the true and just cause of the omission of the author's name, and mention of his apostolical authority in the entrance of this Epistle, we must consider what were the just reasons of prefixing them unto his other epistles. Chrysostome in his Proem unto the epistle to the Romans gives this as the only reason of the mentioning the name of the writer of any epistle, in the frontispiece of it, otherwise than was done by Moses and the Evangelists in their writings; namely, because these wrote unto them that were present, and so had no cause to make mention of their

own names, which were well enough known without the premising of them in their writings: whereas those who wrote epistles, dealing with them that were absent, were necessitated to prefix their names unto them, that they might know from whom they came. But yet this reason is not absolutely satisfactory: for they who prefixed not their names to their writings, wrote, not only for the use and benefit of those that were present and knew them, but of all succeeding ages, who knew them not. And many of them who did preach and write the word of the Lord unto those that lived with them and knew them, yet prefixed their names unto their writings, as did the prophets of old, and some who did write epistles to them who were absent, omitted so to do, as St. John, and the author of this Epistle. The real cause, then, of prefixing the names of any of the apostles unto their writings, was merely the introduction thereby of their titles, as apostles of Jesus Christ, and therein an intimation of that authority, by and with which they wrote. This, then, was the true and only reason why the apostle St. Paul prefixed his name unto his epistles; sometimes, indeed, this is omitted when he wrote unto some churches where he was well known, and his apostolical power was sufficiently owned, because he joined others with himself in his salutation who were not apostles, as the epistle to the Philippians, chap. i., and the second of the Thessalonians. Unto all others, he still prefixeth this title, declaring himself thereby to be one, so authorized to reveal the mysteries of the gospel, that they to whom he wrote, were to acquiesce in his authority, and to resolve their faith into the revelation of the will of God, made unto him, and by him, the church being to be built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles. And hence it was, that when something he had taught, was called in question, and opposed, writing in the vindication of it, and for their establishment in the truth, whom before he had instructet, he doth in the entrance of his writings, singularly and emphatically mention this his authority, Gal. i. 1, ‘Paul an apostle, neither of man, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father that raised him from the dead:’ so intimating the absolute obedience that was due unto the doctrine by him revealed. By this title, I say, he directs them to whom he wrote, to resolve their assent into the authority of Christ speaking in him, which he tenders unto them as the proof and foundation of the mysteries wherein they were instructet.

In his dealing with the Hebrews the case was far otherwise: they who believed amongst them never changed the old foundation, or church-state, grounded on the Scriptures, though they had a new addition of privileges by their faith in Christ Jesus, as the Messiah now exhibited. And therefore he deals not with them as with those whose faith was built absolutely on apostolical authority and revelation, but upon the common principles of the Old Testament, on which they still stood, and out of which evangelical faith was educet. Hence the beginning of the epistle, wherein he appeals to the Scripture as the foundation that he intended to build upon, and the authority which he would press them withal, supplies the room of that intimation of his apostolical authority which in other places he maketh use of. And it serves to the very same purpose. For, as in those epistles he proposeth his apostolical authority as the immediate reason of their assent and obedience, so in this he doth the Scriptures of the Old Testament. And this is the true and proper cause, that renders the prefixing of his apostolical authority, which his name must necessarily accompany, needless, because useless, it being that which he intended not to engage in this business. And for himself, he sufficiently declares in the close of his
epistle who he was; for though some may imagine that he is not so certain known unto us from what he there says of himself, yet none can be so fond to doubt whether he were not thereby known to them to whom he wrote; so that neither hath this objection in it any real weight or moment.

§ 20. We have spoken before unto the hesitation of the Latin church, which by some is objected, especially by Erasmus, and given the reasons of it, manifesting that it is of no force to weaken our assertion. Unto this I shall now only add, that after it was received amongst them as canonical, it was never questioned by any learned man or synod of old, whether St. Paul was the author of it or no, but they all with one consent ascribed it unto him, as hath been at large by others declared. The remaining exceptions, which by some are insisted on, are taken from some passages in the epistle itself; that principally of chap. ii. and iii., where the writer of it seems to reckon himself among the number, not of the apostles, but of their auditors. But whereas it is certain and evident, that the epistle was written before the destruction of the temple, yea, before the beginning of those wars that ended therein, or the death of James, whilst sundry of the apostles were yet alive, it cannot be that the penman of it should really place himself amongst the generation that succeeded them; so that the words must of necessity admit of another interpretation, as shall be manifested in its proper place. For as both this and other things of the same nature must be considered and spoken unto, in the places where they occur, I shall not here anticipate what of necessity must be insisted on in its due season; especially considering of how small importance the objections taken from them are. And this is the sum of what hath as yet by any been objected unto our ascribing of this epistle unto St. Paul; by the consideration whereof the reader will be directed into the judgment he is to make on the arguments and testimonies that we shall produce, in the confirmation of our assertion, and these we now proceed unto under the several heads proposed in the entrance of our discourse.

§ 21. Amongst the arguments usually insisted on to prove this Epistle to have been written by St. Paul, the testimony given unto it by St. Peter, deserves consideration in the first place, and is indeed of itself sufficient to determine the inquiry about it. His words to this purpose, Epist. 2. Chap. iii. 15, 16, are; 'And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation, even as our beloved brother Paul also, according unto the wisdom given him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.' To clear this testimony, some few things must be observed in it, and concerning it. As 1st, That St. Peter wrote this second epistle unto the same persons, that is, the same churches and people to whom he wrote his first. This (to omit other evidences of it) himself testifies, chap. iii. 1, 'This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you;' it was not only absolutely his second epistle, but the second which he wrote to the same persons: handling in both the same general arguments as himself in the next words affirms. 2d. That his first epistle was written unto the Jews or Hebrews in the Asian dispersion, εκλεκτον παρεπιστημονι διασπορας Ποντου, &c. to the elect strangers of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, chap. i. 1, that is the διατηρης φυλας εν τη διασπορα, as St. James styles the same persons, chap. i. 1, the twelve tribes, or Hebrews of the twelve tribes of Israel in their dispersion. These παρεπιστημονι διασπορας, or εν τη διασπορα, are those whom
the Jews of Jerusalem called the διασπορά του Ἑλληνων, John vii. 35, the
dispersion or those of their nation that were dispersed among the Gentiles,
those especially they intend in the Greek empire. These they called
ἡ διασπορά Ἰσραήλ, the ‘dispersion, or scattering of Israel,’ when they were sifted
amongst all nations, like the ‘sifting of a sieve,’ Amos ix. 9; Psal. cxlvii. 2,
they are called הדרדד, which the LXX. according to the phrase in
their days render τας διασπορὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, the ‘dispersions,’ or those scat-
tered abroad of Israel, as Isaiah calls them, הדרדד נב אשי וcriminal
and לודג וארטימי, chap. xxvii. 13. So that there is no question but
that these were they whom St. Peter calls the διασπορά of Pontus, Galatia,
&c. As St. James, extending his salutation to the same people in all
places, the διασπορά of the twelve tribes.

Besides, many things insisted on by St. Peter in these epistles, were pe-
culiar to the Hebrews, who also were his especial care. See 1 Epist. i.
10—12, ii. 9, 21, iii. 5, 6, iv. 7, 17; Eph. ii. 19—21, ii. 1, 11, &c.
iii. 10—14, and many other particular places of the same nature may be
observed in them. To sum up our evidence in this particular: Peter being
in an especial manner the apostle of the circumcision or Hebrews, Gal. ii. 7,
having by his first sermon converted many of these strangers of Cappadocia,
Pontus, and Asia, Acts ii. 9, 10, 41, ascribing that title unto them to whom
he wrote, which was the usual and proper appellation of them in all the
world, ἦ διασπορά του Ἰσραήλ, James i. 1; John vii. 35, treating with them
for the most part about things peculiar to them in a special manner, and
that with arguments and from principles peculiarly known unto them, as
the places above quoted will manifest, there remains no ground of question,
but it was those Hebrews unto whom he wrote. Nor are the exceptions
that are made to this evidence of any such importance as once to deserve a
remembrance by them, who design not a protracting of their discourses by
insisting on things unnecessary.

§ 22. Now it is plain in this testimony asserted, that St. Paul wrote a
peculiar epistle unto them, unto whom St. Peter wrote his, that is to the
Hebrews; ‘he hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles;’ that is,
in all his other Epistles. Besides his other epistles to other churches and
persons, he hath also written one unto you. So that, if St. Peter’s testi-
mony may be received, St. Paul undoubtedly wrote an Epistle unto the
Hebrews. But this may be, say some, another epistle, and not this we
treat on; particularly that to the Galatians, which treateth about Judaical
customs and worship. But this Epistle mentioned by St. Peter was writ-
ten particularly unto the Hebrews in distinction from the Gentiles. This
to the Galatians is written peculiarly to the Gentiles in opposition to the
Jews: so that a more unhappy instance could not possibly have been fixed
upon. Besides he treats not in it of the things here mentioned by St.
Peter, which are indeed the main subject of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But, say others, Paul indeed might write an Epistle to the Hebrews,
which may be lost, and this that we have might be written by some other:
But whence this answer should proceed but from a resolution ζευγν διασπο-
ραπας, against light and conviction, I know not. If we give place to such
rash and presumptuous conjectures, we shall quickly have nothing left
entire or stable. For, why may not another as well say, it is true Moses
wrote five books, but they are lost, and these that we have under his name
were written by another. It is not surely one jot less intolerable for any
one, without ground, proof, or testimony, to affirm that the church hath
lost an epistle written to the Hebrews by St. Paul, and taken up one in
the room thereof, written by no man knoweth whom. This is not to deal with that holy reverence in the things of God which becomes us.

§ 23. St. Peter declares that St. Paul in that epistle which he wrote unto the Hebrews, had declared the long-suffering of God, whereof he had minded them, to be salvation. We must see what was this long-suffering of God, how it was salvation, and how Paul had manifested it so to be. The long-suffering, patience, or forbearance of God, is either absolute toward man in general, or special in reference unto some sort of men; or some kind of sins or provocations that are amongst them. The first of these is not that which is here intended; nor was there any reason why St. Peter should direct the Jews to the epistles of St. Paul in particular, to learn the long-suffering of God in general, which is so plentifully revealed in the whole Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, and only occasionally, at any time mentioned by St. Paul.

There was therefore an especial long-suffering of God which at that time he exercised towards the Jews, waiting for the conversion, and the gathering of his elect unto him, before that total and final destruction which they had deserved, should come upon that church and state. This he compares to the long-suffering of God in the days of Noah, whilst he preached repentance unto the world, 1 Epist. iii. 20. For as those that were obedient unto his preaching, which was only his own family, were saved in the Ark, from the general destruction that came upon the world by water; so also they that became obedient upon the preaching of the gospel, during this new season of God's special long-suffering, were to be saved by baptism, or separation from the unbelieving Jews by the profession of the faith, from the destruction that was to come upon them by fire. This long-suffering of God the unbelieving Jews, not understanding to be particular, scoffed at, and them who threatened them with such an issue or event of it, 2 Epist. iii. 4, which causeth the apostle to declare the nature and end of this long-suffering which they were ignorant of, ver. 9.

And thus, Secondly, was this particular long-suffering of God towards the Jews, whilst the gospel was preached to them before their final desolation, salvation; in that God spared them and allowed them to abide for a while in the observation of their old worship and ceremonies, granting them in the mean time blessed means of light and instruction to bring them to salvation.

And Thirdly, This is declared by St. Paul in this Epistle; not that this is formally and in terms the main doctrine of the epistle, but that really and effectually he acquaints them with the intention of the Lord in his long-suffering towards them, and peculiarly subserves that long-suffering of Christ in his instruction of them. And therefore after he hath taught them the true nature, use, and end of all Mosaical institutions, which they were as yet permitted to use in the special patience of God intimated by St. Peter; and convinced them of the necessity of faith in Christ, and the profession of his gospel, he winds up all his reasonings, in minding them of the end which shortly was to be put unto that long-suffering of God which was then exercised towards them, chap. xii. 15—28. So that this note also is eminently characteristic of this Epistle.

§ 24. 5. In the writing of the epistle mentioned by St. Peter, he seems to ascribe unto Paul an eminency of wisdom; it was written according to the wisdom given unto him. As Paul in all other of his epistles did exercise that grace of wisdom, so also in that which he wrote unto the Hebrews. There is no doubt but he exerted and put forth his other graces of know-
ledge, zeal, and love also; but yet Peter here in a way of eminency marketh his wisdom in that epistle. It is not Paul's spiritual wisdom in general in the knowledge of the will of God, and mysteries of the gospel, which Peter here refers unto; but that special holy prudence which he exercised in the composure of this Epistle, and maintaining the truth which he dealt with the Hebrews about. And what an eminent character this also is of this Epistle, we shall endeavour, God assisting, to evince in our exposition of it. The writer of it displays a special understanding in all the mysteries of the Old Testament, in unfolding things hidden from the foundation of the world, and in his application of them, with various testimonies and arguments, that wrapped up the truth in great darkness and obscurity, until the mystery of God was manifested in the flesh. And his various intertextures of reasonings and exhortations throughout this Epistle, his condescension to the capacity, prejudices, and affections of them to whom he wrote, urging them constantly with their own principles and concessions, do among many other things manifest the singular wisdom which Peter signifies to have been used in this work.

6. It may also be observed, that Peter affirms that among the things about which Paul wrote, there were τινα ἐντυπωσια, 'some things hard to be understood.' And that Paul in a special manner confesseth that some of the things which he was to treat of in that epistle were ἐντυπωσιον, 'hard to be declared,' uttered, or unfolded; and therefore certainly hard to be understood, chap. v. 11, which in our progress we shall manifest to be spoken not without great and urgent cause, and that in many instances, especially in that referred to by himself concerning Melchisedec. So that this also gives another characteristic note of the epistle testified unto by Peter.

I have insisted the longer upon this testimony, because in my judgment it is sufficient of itself to determine this controversy; nothing of any importance being by any that I can meet with excepted unto it. But because we want not other confirmations of our assertion, and those also every one of them singly out-balancing the conjectures that are advanced against it, we shall subjoin them also in their order.

§ 25. The comparing of this Epistle with the others of the same apostle gives farther evidence unto our assertion. I suppose it will be confessed, that they only are competent judges of this argument who are well exercised and conversant in his writings. Unto their judgment therefore alone in it do we appeal. Now the similitude between this and other epistles of Paul is threefold. 1st, In words, phrases, and manner of expression. Of this sort many instances may be given, and such a coincidence of phrase manifested in them, as is not usually to be observed between writings that have various or divers authors.

But this I shall not particularly insist upon: partly because it hath already been done by others at large; and partly because they will all of them be observed in our exposition itself, nor doth it suit our present design to enter into a debate about particular words and expressions. Nor do I assign any more force unto this observation, but only that it is sufficient to manifest the weakness of the exceptions urged by some to prove it none of his, from the use of some few words not elsewhere used by him, or not in that sense in which here they are applied. For such instances are not in number comparable with the other; and to evidence the vanity of that part of their objection which concerns the peculiar use of some words in this Epistle, it is enough to observe, that one word, ἑποτασικ, being three times used in this one Epistle, it hath in each place a peculiar and
diverse signification. 2d, There is also a coincidence of matter, or doctrines delivered in this and other epistles of Paul. Neither shall I much press this consideration. For neither was he in any epistle restrained unto what he had elsewhere delivered, nor bound to avoid the mentioning of it, if occasion did require; nor were other penmen of the Holy Ghost limited not to treat of what he had taught, any more than the evangelists were from writing the same story. But yet neither is this observation destitute of all efficacy to contribute strength unto our assertion, considering that there were some doctrines which Paul did in a peculiar manner insist upon; a vein whereof a diligent observer may find running through this, and all his other epistles. But, 3dly, That which under this head I would press, is the consideration of the spirit, genius, παθητικός, and manner of writing proceeding from them, peculiar to this apostle in all his epistles. Many things are required to enable any one to judge aright of this intimation. He must, as Bernard speaks, drink of St. Paul's spirit, or be made partaker of the same spirit with him, in his measure, who would understand his writings. Without this spirit, and his saving light, they are all obscure, intricate, sapless, unsavoury; when unto them in whom it is, they are all sweet, gracious, in some measure open, plain, and powerful. A great and constant exercise unto an acquaintance with his frame of spirit in writing, is also necessary hereunto. Unless a man have contracted as it were a familiarity, by a constant conversation with him, no critical skill in words or phrases will render him a competent judge in this matter. This enabled Cæsar to determine aright concerning any writings of Cicero. And he that is so acquainted with this apostle, will be able to discern his spirit, as Austin says his mother Monica did divine revelations, 'nescio quo sapore,' by an inexpressible spiritual savour. Experience also of the power and efficacy of his writings is hereunto required. He whose heart is cast into the mould of the doctrine by him delivered, will receive quick impressions from his spirit exerting itself in any of his writings. He that is thus prepared, will find that heavienliness and perspicuity in unfolding the deepest evangelical mysteries; that peculiar exaltation of Jesus Christ in his person, office, and work; that spiritual persuasiveness; that transcendent manner of arguing and reasoning; that wise insinuation and pathetical pressing of well grounded exhortations; that love, tenderness, and affection to the souls of men; that zeal for God, and authority in teaching, which enliven and adorn all his other epistles, to shine in this in an eminent manner, from the beginning to the end of it. And this consideration, (whatever may be the apprehensions of others concerning it,) is that which gives me satisfaction, above all that are pleaded in this cause, in ascribing this Epistle to Paul.

§ 26. The testimony of the first churches, of whose testimony any record is yet remaining, with a successive suffrage of the most knowing persons of following ages, may also be pleaded in this cause. If we set aside that limitation of this testimony, which, with the grounds and occasions of it, as to some in the Latin church, we have already granted and declared, this witness will be acknowledged to be catholic as to all other churches in the world. A learned man of late hath reckoned up and reported the words of above thirty of the Greek fathers, and fifty of the Latin, reporting this primitive tradition. I shall not trouble the reader with a catalogue of their names, nor the repetition of their words, and that, because the whole of what in general we assert as to the eastern church is acknowledged. Amongst them was this Epistle first made public, as they had far more advantages of
discovering the truth in this matter of fact, than any in the Roman church, or than any who followed them in after ages could have. Neither had they any thing, but the conviction and evidence of truth itself, to induce them to embrace this persuasion. And he that shall consider the condition of the first churches under persecution, and what difficulties they met with in communicating those apostolical writings which were delivered unto any of them, with that special obstruction unto the spreading of this unto the Hebrews, of which we have already discoursed, cannot rationally otherwise conceive of it, but as an eminent fruit of the good providence of God, that it should so soon receive so public an attestation from the first churches, as it evidently appears to have done.

§ 27. The Epistle itself in several ways discovers its author. Some of them we shall briefly recount.

1. The general argument and scope of it declares it to be Paul's. Hereof there are two parts; 1st, The exaltation of the person, office, and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the excellency of the gospel and the worship therein commanded, revealed by him. 2dly, A discovery of the nature, use, and expiration of Mosaiical institutions, their present unprofitableness, and the ceasing of their obligation unto obedience. The first part we may grant to have been equally the design of all the apostles, though we find it in a peculiar way insisted on in the writings of Paul. The latter was his special work and business. This partly ex instituto, partly occasionally from the opposition of the Jews, was he engaged in the promotion of, all the world over. The apostles of the circumcision according to the wisdom given them, and suitably to the nature of their work, did more accommodate themselves to the prejudicate opinion of the Jewish professors; and the rest of the apostles had little occasion to deal with them, or others on this subject. Paul, in an eminent manner, in this work bare the burden of that day. Having well settled all other churches, who were troubled in this controversy by some of the Jews, he at last treats with themselves directly in this Epistle, giving an account of what he had elsewhere preached and taught to this purpose, and the grounds that he proceeded upon; and this not without great success, as the burying of the Judaical controversy not long after doth manifest.

2. The method of his procedure here is the same with that of his other epistles, which also was peculiar to him. Now this in most of them, yea in all of them not regulated by some particular occasions, is first, to lay down the doctrinal mysteries of the gospel, vindicating them from oppositions and exceptions, and then to descend to exhortations unto obedience deduced from them, with an enumeration of such special moral duties, as those unto whom he wrote, stood in need to be minded of. This is the general method of his epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and the most of the rest. And this also is observed in this Epistle. Only whereas he had a special respect unto the apostasy of some of the Hebrews, occasioned by the persecution which then began to grow high against them, whatever argument or testimony in his passage gave him advantage to press an exhortation unto constancy, and to deter them from backsliding, he lays hold upon it, and diverts into practical inferences unto that purpose, before he comes to his general exhortations towards the end of the epistle. Excepting this occasional difference, the method of this is the same with that used in the other epistles of Paul, and which was peculiarly his own.

3. His way of argument in this and his other epistles is the same.
Now this, as we shall see, is sublime and mystical, accommodated rather to the spiritual reason of believers, than the artificial rules of philosophers. That he should more abound with testimonies and quotations out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament in this, than in other epistles, as he doth, the matter whereof he treats, and the persons to whom he wrote, did necessarily require.

4. Many things in this Epistle evidently manifest that he who wrote it, was not only mighty in the Scripture, but also exceedingly well versed and skilful in the customs, practices, opinions, traditions, expositions, and applications of Scripture then received in the Judaical church, as we shall fully manifest in our progress. Now, who in those days, among the disciples of Christ, could this be but Paul? For as he was brought up under one of the best and most famous of their masters in those days, and profited in the knowledge of their then present religion above his equals; so for want of this kind of learning, the Jews esteemed the chief of the other apostles, Peter and John, to be idiots and unlearned.

5. Sundry particulars towards the close of the epistle, openly proclaim Paul to have been the writer of it. As, 1st, The mention that he makes of his bonds, and the compassion that the Hebrews showed towards him in his sufferings, and whilst he was a prisoner, chap. x. 34. Now, as the bonds of Paul were afterwards famous at Rome, Phil. i. 13, so there was not any thing of greater notoriety in reference to the church of God in those days, than those that he suffered in Judea; which he minds them of in this expression. With what earnest endeavours, what rage and tumult, the rulers and body of the people sought his destruction, how publicly and with what solemnity his cause was sundry times heard and debated, with the time of his imprisonment that ensued, are all declared in the Acts at large. Now, no man can imagine, but that whilst this great champion of their profession was so publicly pleading their cause, and exposed to so much danger and hazard thereby, but that all the believers of those parts were exceedingly solicitous about his condition, (as they had been about Peter's in the like case,) and gave him all the assistance and encouragement that they were able. This compassion of theirs, and his own bonds, as an evidence of his faith and their mutual love in the gospel, he now minds them of. Of no other person but Paul have we any ground to conjecture that this might be spoken; and the suffering and compassion here mentioned, seem not to have been things done in a corner: so that this one circumstance is able of itself to enervate all the exceptions that are made use of against his being esteemed the author of this Epistle. 2dly, The mention of Paul's dear and constant companion Timothy is of the same importance, chap. xiii. 23. That Timothy was at Rome with Paul in his bonds, is expressly asserted, Phil. i. 13, 14; and that he was also cast into prison with Paul is here intimated, his release being expressed. Now, surely it is scarcely credible, that any other should in Italy, where Paul then was, and newly released out of prison, write unto the churches of the Hebrews, and therein make mention of his own bonds, and the bonds of Timothy, a man unknown to them but by the means of Paul, and not once intimate any thing about his condition. The exceptions of some, as that Paul used to call Timothy his son, whereas, the writer of this Epistle calls him brother, (when indeed, he never terms him son, when he speaks of him, but only when he wrote unto him,) or that there might be another Timothy, (when he speaks expressly of him, who was so generally known to the churches of God, as one of the chiefest evangelists) deserve not to be insisted on.
And surely, it is altogether incredible that this Timothy, the son of Paul, as to his begetting of him in the faith, and continued paternal affection; his known constant associate in doing and suffering for the gospel; his minister in attending of him, and constantly employed by him in the service of Christ and the churches; known unto them by his means, honoured by him with two epistles written unto him, and the association of his name with his own in the inscription of sundry others, should now be so absent from him as to be joined unto another in his travail and ministry. 3dly, The constant sign and token of Paul's epistles which himself had publicly signified to be so, 2 Thess. iii. 17, is subjoined unto this, "Grace be with you all." That originally this was written with Paul's own hand, there is no ground to question, and it appears to be so, because it was written; and he affirms that it was his custom to subjoin that salutation with his own hand. Now, this writing of it with his own hand, was evidence unto them, unto whom the original of the epistle first came, unto those who had only transcribed copies of it, it could not be so; the salutation itself was their token, being peculiar to Paul, and amongst the rest, annexed to this Epistle. And all these circumstances will yet receive some further enforcement from the consideration of the time wherein this Epistle was written, whereof in the next place we shall treat.

---

**EXERCITATION III.**


§ 1. That was not amiss observed of old by Chrysostome, Pref. in Com. ad Epist. ad Rom. that a due observation of the time and season wherein the epistles of Paul were written, doth give great light unto the understanding of many passages in them. This, Baronius, ad A. C. 55. N. 42. well confirms, by an instance of their mistake, who suppose the shipwreck of Paul at Melita, Acts xxvii. to have been that mentioned by him, 2 Cor. xi., when he was a night and a day in the deep; that epistle being written some years before his sailing towards Rome. And we may apply this observation to this Epistle unto the Hebrews. A discovery of the time and season wherein it was written, will both free us from sundry mistakes, and also give us some light into the occasion and design of it. This, therefore, we shall now inquire into.

§ 2. Some general intimations we have in the epistle itself, leading us towards the discovery of this, and somewhat may be gathered from other places of Scripture, for antiquity will afford us little or no help herein.
After Paul's being brought a prisoner to Rome, Acts xxviii., two full years he continued in that condition, ver. 30, at least, so long he continued under restraint, though in his own hired house. This time was expired before the writing of this epistle; for he was not only absent from Rome, in some other part of Italy, when he wrote it, ch. xiii. 24, but also so far at liberty, and sui juris, as that he had entertained a resolution of going into the east, so soon as Timothy should come unto him, ch. xiii. 23. And it seems, likewise, to be written before the martyrdom of James at Jerusalem, in that he affirms that the church of the Hebrews had not yet resisted unto blood, ch. xii. 4. it being very probable that, together with him, many others were slain. Many great difficulties they had been exercised with, but as yet the matter was not come to blood, which shortly after it arrived unto. That is certain also, that it was not only written, but communicated unto, and well known by all the believing Jews, before the writing of the second epistle of Peter, who therein makes mention it, as we have declared. Much light, I confess, as to the precise time of its writing, is not hence to be obtained, because of the uncertainty of the time wherein Peter wrote that epistle; only, it appears from what he affirms concerning the approaching of the time of his suffering, ch. i. 13, that it was not long before his death. This, as is generally agreed, happened in the thirteenth year of Nero, when a great progress was made in that war, which ended in the fatal and final destruction of the city and temple.

§ 3. From these observations it appears that the best guide we have to find out the certain time of the writing of this Epistle, is Paul's being sent prisoner unto Rome. Now this was in the first year of the government of Festus, after he had been two years detained in prison at Cesarea by Felix, Acts xxiv. 27; xxv. 26, 27. This Felix was the brother of Pallas, who ruled all things under Claudius, and fell into some disgrace in the very first year of Nero, as Tacitus informs us; but yet, by the countenance of Agrippina, the mother of Nero, he continued in some regard, until the fifth or sixth year of his reign, when, together with his mother, he destroyed many of her friends and favourites. During this time of Pallas' declension in power, it is most probable that his brother Felix was displaced from the rule of his province, and Festus sent in his room. That it was before his utter ruin in the sixth year of Nero, is evident from hence, because he found means to keep his brother from punishment, when he was accused for extortion and oppression by the Jews. Most probably then Paul was sent unto Rome, about the fourth or fifth year of Nero, which was the fifty-ninth year from the nativity of the Lord Jesus Christ. There he abode, as we showed, at the least two years in custody, where the story of the Acts of the Apostles ends, in the seventh year of Nero, and sixty-first of our Lord, or the beginning of the year following. It is presumed that he obtained his liberty in that year. And this was about thirteen years after the synod at Jerusalem had determined the controversy respecting the obligation of the Gentiles to observe Mosaic institutions, Acts xv. Presently, upon his liberty, whilst he abode in some part of Italy, expecting the coming of Timothy, before he entered upon the journey he had promised unto the Philippians, ch. ii. 24, he wrote this Epistle. Here then, we must stay a little, to consider what was the general state and condition of the Hebrews in those days, which might give occasion to the writing of it.

§ 4. The time fixed on was about the death of Festus, who died in the province, and the beginning of the government of Albinus, who was sent to succeed him. What the state of the people at that time was, Josephus
declares at large in his second book of their wars. In brief, the governors themselves being great oppressors, and rather mighty robbers amongst them than rulers, the whole nation was filled with spoil and violence. What through the fury and outrage of the soldiers, in the pursuit of their insatiable avarice; what through the incursions of thieves and robbers in troops and companies, wherewith the whole land abounded; and what through the tumults of seditious persons, daily incited and provoked by the cruelty of the Romans; there was no peace or safety for any sober, honest men, either in the city of Jerusalem, or any where else throughout the whole province. That the church had a great share of suffering in the outrage and misery of those days, (as, in such dissolutions of government, and license for all wickedness, if commonly falls out,) no man can question. And this is that which the apostle mentions, ch. x. 31—34: 'Ye endured a great fight of afflictions, partly whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly whilst ye became companions of them that were so used, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods.' This was the lot and portion of all honest and sober-minded men in those days, as their historian at large declares. For as no doubt the Christians had a principal share in all those sufferings, so some others of the Jews also were their companions in them; it being not a special persecution, but a general calamity that the apostle speaks of.

§ 5. One Joseph, the son of Cæbias, was in the beginning of those days high priest. He had been put into that office by Agrippa, who not long before had put him out. On the death of Festus, he thrust him out again, and placed Ananus, or Ananias, his son, in his stead. This man, a young rash fellow, first began a direct persecution of the church. He was by sect and opinion a Sadducee, who of all others were the most violent in their hatred of the Christians, being especially engaged therein by the peculiar opinion of his sect and party, which was the denial of the resurrection. Before his advancement to the priesthood, their afflictions and calamities were for the most part common unto them, with other peaceable men. Only the rude and impious multitude, with other seditious persons, seem to have offered especial violence unto their assemblies and meetings, which some of the more unsteadfast and weak began to omit on that account, ch. x. 25. Judicial proceeding against them as to their lives, when this Epistle was written, there doth not appear to have been any; for the apostle tells them, as we before observed, that as yet they had not resisted unto blood, ch. xii. 4. But this Ananus, the Sadducee, presently after he had been placed in power by Agrippa, taking advantage of the death of Festus, and of the time that passed before Albinus, his successor, was settled in the province, summons James before himself and his associates. There, to make short work, he is condemned, and immediately stoned. And it is not unlikely but that other private persons suffered together with him.

§ 6. The story, by the way, of the martyrdom of this James, is at large reported by Eusebius out of Hegesippus, Hist. Eccles. lib. 2, cap. 23, in the relation whereof, he is followed by Hierome and sundry others. I shall say no more of the whole story, but that the consideration of it is very sufficient to persuade any man to use the liberty of his own reason and judgment, in the perusal of the writings of the ancients. For of the circumstances therein reported about this James, and his death, many of them (as his being of the line of the priests, his entering at his pleasure into the Sanctum Sanctorum, his being carried up and set by a great multi-
tude of people on a pinnacle of the temple) are so palpably false, that no
colour of probability can be given unto them, and most of the rest seem
altogether incredible. That in general this holy apostle of Jesus Christ,
his kinsman according to the flesh, was stoned by Ananus, during the
anarchy between the governments of Festus and Albinus, Josephus, who
then lived, testifies, and all ecclesiastical historians agree.
§ 7. The churches at this time in Jerusalem and Judea were very nume-
rous. The oppressors, robbers, and seditious of all sorts, being wholly
intent upon the pursuit of their own ends, filled the government of the
nation with tumults and disorders. The disciples of Christ, who knew
that the time of their preaching the gospel unto their countrymen was but
short, and even now expiring, followed their work with diligence and suc-
cess, being not greatly regarded in the confusion which was raised, while
the nation was rushing on to its fatal end.
§ 8. All these churches, and the multitudes that belonged unto them,
together with the profession of the gospel, were addicted zealously unto
the observation of the law of Moses. The synod indeed at Jerusalem had
determined, that the yoke of the law should not be put upon the necks of
the Gentile converts, Acts xv. But eight or nine years after, when Paul
came up to Jerusalem again, ch. xxi. 20—22, James informs him, that the
many thousands of the Jews who believed did all zealously observe the
law of Moses; and moreover judged that all those who were Jews by birth
ought to do so, and on that account were like enough to assemble in a dis-
orderly multitude, to inquire into the practice of Paul himself, who had
been ill reported of amongst them. On this account, they kept their
assemblies distinct from those of the Gentiles all the world over; as
amongst others Hierome informs us, in his notes on the first chapter of
the Galatians. All those Hebrews then to whom Paul wrote this Epistle, con-
tinued in the use of Mosaiical worship, as celebrated in the temple, and in
their synagogues, and in the practice of all other legal institutions what-
ever. Whether they did this out of an unacquaintedness with their liberty
in Christ, or out of a pertinacious adherence unto their own prejudicate
opinions, I shall not determine.
§ 9. From this time forward, the body of the people of the Jews saw
not a day of peace or quietness: tumults, seditions, outrages, robberies,
murders, increased all over the nation. And these things, by various de-
greses, made way for that fatal war, which, beginning about six or seven
years after the death of James, ended in the utter desolation of the people,
city, temple, and worship, foretold so long before by Daniel the prophet,
and intimated by our Saviour to lie at the door. This was that day of the
Lord, whose sudden approach the apostle declares unto them, ch. x. 36, 37:
'For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye
may receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come
will come, and will not tarry.' Μετρον ὦσον ὃσον a very little while, less
than you think of or imagine, the manner whereof he declares, ch. xii. 26
—28. And by this means he effectually diverted them from a pertinacious
adherence unto those things whose dissolution, from God himself, was so
nigh at hand; which argument was also afterwards pressed by Peter,
2 Epist. iii.
§ 10. Our blessed Saviour had long before warned his disciples of all
these things; particularly of the desolation that was to come upon the
whole people of the Jews, with the tumults, distresses, persecutions, and
wars which should precede it, directing them to the exercise of patience
in the discharge of their duty, until the approach of the final calamity, out of which he advised them to free themselves by a timely flight from Jerusalem and all Judea, Matt. xxiv. 15—21. This, and no other, was the oracle mentioned by Eusebius, whereby the Christians were warned to depart out of Jerusalem. It was given, as he says, τοις ὄρκοις, to approved men amongst them. For though the prophecy itself was written by the evangelists, yet the special meaning of it was not known and divulged amongst all. Their leaders kept this secret for a season, lest the people should have been exasperated, and the servants of Christ obstructed in the work which they had to do before its accomplishment. And this was the way of the apostles also as to other future events, which, being foretold by them, might provoke either Jews or Gentiles, if publicly divulged, 2 Thess. ii. 5, 6. But now when the work of the church among the Jews for that season was come to its close, the elect being gathered out of them, and the final desecration of the city and people appearing to be at hand, by a concurrence of all the signs foretold by our Saviour, those entrusted with the sense of that oracle warned their brethren to provide for that flight whereunto they were directed. That this flight and departure, probably with the loss of all their possessions, was grievous unto them, may easily be conceived.

But that which seems most especially to have perplexed them, was their relinquishment of that worship of God whereunto they had been so zealously addicted. That this would prove grievous unto them, our Saviour had before intimated, Matt. xxiv. 20. Hence were they so slow in their obedience unto that heavenly oracle, although excited with the remembrance of what befel Lot's wife in the like tergiversation. Nay, it is likely from this Epistle, that many of them who had made profession of the gospel, rather than they would now utterly forego their old way of worship, deserted the faith; and, cleaving to their unbelieving countrymen, perished in their apostasy. These our apostle, in an especial manner, forewarns of their inevitable and sore destruction, by that fire of God's indignation, which was shortly to devour the adversaries to whom they associated themselves, ch. x. 25—31.

§ 11. This was the time wherein this Epistle was written—this the condition of the Hebrews unto whom it was addressed, both in respect of their political and ecclesiastical estate. Paul, who had inexpressible zeal, and overflowing affection for his countrymen, being now in Italy, considering the present condition of their affairs; how pertinaciously they adhered to Mosaical institutions; how near the approach of their utter abolition was; how backward, during that frame of spirit, they would be to save themselves, by flying from the midst of that perishing generation; what danger they were in to forego the profession of the gospel, when it could not be retained without a relinquishment of their former divine service and ceremonies; writes this Epistle unto them, wherein he strikes at the very root of all their dangers and distresses. For whereas all the danger of their abode in Jerusalem and Judea, and so of falling in the destruction of the city and people, all the fears the apostle had of their apostasy into Judaism, all their own distresses in reference unto their flight and departure, arose from their adherence unto and zeal for the law of Moses: by declaring unto them the nature, use, end, and expiration of these ordinances and institutions, he utterly removes the ground and occasion of all the evils mentioned. This was the season wherein this Epistle was written, and these some of the principal occasions (though it had
other reasons also, as we shall see afterwards) of its being written. And
though particular events of those days are buried in oblivion, yet I no
way doubt but that through His grace who moved the apostle to write, and
who directed him in writing it, it was made signally effectual towards the
professing Hebrews, both to free them from that yoke of bondage wherein
they had been detained, and to prepare them with cheerfulness unto the
observation of evangelical worship, leaving their countrymen to perish in
their sin and unbelief.

EXERCITATION IV.

§ Of the language wherein this Epistle was originally written. Supposed to be the Hebrew.
Written in Greek. Arguments for the proof thereof. § 5. Of citations out of the LXX.

§ 1. Because this Epistle was written to the Hebrews, most of the an-
cients granted that it was written in Hebrew. Clemens Alexandrinus was
the first who asserted it: after whom, Origen gave it countenance, from
whom Eusebius received it, and from him Hierome, which is the most
ordinary progression of old reports. The main reason which induced them
to embrace this persuasion, was a desire to free the epistle from an argu-
ment against its being written by Paul, taken from the dissimilitude of the
style used in it unto that of his other epistles. This being once admitted,
though causelessly, they could think of no better answer, than that this
supposed difference of style arose from the translation of this Epistle, which
by the apostle himself was first written in Hebrew. Clemens Romanus is
the person generally fixed on as the author of this translation; though
some do faintly intimate that it must have been done by Luke the evan-
gelist. But this objection from the diversity of style, which alone begat
this persuasion, hath been already removed out of the way, so that it can-
not be allowed to be a foundation of any other supposition.

§ 2. That which alone is added to give countenance unto this opinion
is that which we mentioned at the entrance of this discourse; namely, that
the apostle, writing unto the Hebrews, wrote in their native language,
which being also his own, it is no wonder if he were more copious and
elegant in it than he was in the Greek, with which he was originally un-
acquainted, learning it, as Hierome supposeth, upon his conversion. But
a man may modestly say unto all this, οὐδὲν ἔγραψε. Every thing in this
pretended reason for that which indeed never was, is so far from certainty,
that indeed it is beneath all probability.

For, 1. If this Epistle was written originally in Hebrew, whence comes
it to pass that no copy of it in that language was ever read, seen, or heard
of by the most diligent collectors of all fragments of antiquity in the pri-
mitive times? Had ever any such thing been extant, whence came it in
particular, that Origen, that prodigy of industry and learning, should be
able to attain no knowledge or report of it? 2. If it were incumbent on
Paul, writing unto the Hebrews, to write in their own language, why did he not also write in Latin unto the Romans? That he did so indeed Gratian affirms, but without pretence of proof or witness, contrary to the testimony of all antiquity, the evidence of the thing itself, and the constant confession of the Roman church. And Erasmus says well on Rom. i. 7, 'Coarguendus vel ridendus magis error eorum, qui putant Paulum Romanis lingua Romana scripsisse.'—'The error of them is to be reproved, or rather laughed at, who suppose Paul to have written unto the Romans in the Latin tongue.' 3. The supposition, that the Hebrew tongue was then the vulgar language of the Jews, is most unfounded. The Hebrew was then known only to the learned amongst them, and a corrupt Syriac was the common dialect of the people even at Jerusalem. 4. It is averred with as little truth, that the Hebrew was the mother tongue of Paul himself, or that he was ignorant of the Greek, seeing he was born at Tarsus, in Cilicia, where he must have been brought up in the use of the Greek language. 5. The epistle was written for the use of all the Hebrews in their several dispersions, (especially for those in the east, as Peter witnesses,) they being all alike concerned in the matter of it, though not so immediately as those in Judea and Jerusalem. Now to those the Greek language, from the days of the Macedonian empire, had been in vulgar use, and continued so to be. 6. The Greek tongue was so well known, and so much used in Judea itself, that, as a learned man hath proved by sundry testimonies out of their most ancient writings, it was called the vulgar amongst them.

I know among the Rabbins there is mention of a prohibition of learning the Greek tongue; and in the Jerusalem Talmud itself, Tit. Peah. c. i. they add a reason to it: מלתה של תורה, it was because of traitors, lest they should betray their brethren, and none understand them. But as this is contrary unto what they teach about the knowledge of tongues, required in those who were to be chosen into the sanhedrin; so it is sufficiently disproved by the instances of the translators of the Bible, Jesus Syrachides, Philo, Josephus, and others among themselves. And though Josephus affirms, Antiq. lib. 20. cap. 9, that the study of the elegance of tongues was of no great reckoning amongst them, yet he grants that they were studied by all sorts of men. Nor doth this pretended decree of prohibition concern our times, it being made, as they say, Mishn. tit. Sota; in the last wars of Titus, בושלמהו של מצאש נגור שלמ אשת אר דא בא יחי, 'In the wars of Titus they decreed that no man should touch his Greek tongue.' For it must be distinguished from the decree of the Hasmoneans long before, prohibiting the study of the Grecian philosophy; so that this pretence is destitute of all colour, being made up of many vain and evidently false suppositions.

§ 3. Again, the epistle is said to be translated by Clemens, but where, or when, we are not informed. Was this done in Italy before it was sent unto the Hebrews? To what end, then, was it written in Hebrew, when it was not to be used but in Greek? Was it sent in Hebrew before the supposed translation? In what language was it communicated unto others by them who first received it? Clemens was never in the east to translate it. And if all the first copies of it were dispersed in Hebrew, how came they to be so utterly lost, as that no report or tradition of them, or any one of them, did ever remain? Besides, if it were translated by Clemens in the west, and that translation alone preserved, how came it to pass that it was so well known and generally received in the east, before the
western churches admitted of it? This tradition, therefore, is also every way groundless and improbable.

§ 4. Besides, there want not evidences in the epistle itself, proving it to be originally written in the language wherein it is yet extant. I shall only point at the heads of these, for this matter deserves no long discourse. 1. The style of it throughout manifests it to be no translation, at least, it is impossible it should be one exact and proper, as its own copiousness, propriety of phrase and expression, with freedom from favouring of the Hebraisms of an original in that language, do manifest. 2. It abounds with Greek elegancies and paronomasias, that have no countenance given unto them by any thing in the Hebrew tongue; such as that for instance, chap. v. 8, ἐμαθεν αφ' ὧν επαθεν. From similar expressions in the story of Susanna, ver. 55, 56, ὑπὸ σχινων, σχισεὶ σε μεσον, and ver. 59, ὑπὸ πρινων, προσεὶ σε μεσον, it is well proved that it was written originally in the Greek language. 3. The rendering of יָדו constantly by διαθηκη, of which more afterwards, is of the same importance. 4. The words concerning Melchisedec, king of Salem, ch. vii. 11, prove the same, προτον μεν ἐρμηνευμενος βασιλευς δικαιοσυνης επειτα δε και βασιλευς υρηνης. Had the epistle been written in Hebrew, what need this ερμηνεια. That דַּרְשָׁן דָּן being interpreted is יָדו דָּן, is a strange kind of interpretation; and so also is it, that מַלְכָּן מָלְכָּן is מָלְכָּן מַלְכָּן. When John reports the words of Mary ῥαββουνι, and adds of his own, ὁ λεγεται διασκαλε, 'that is to say, Master,' ch. xx. 16, doth any man doubt but that he wrote in Greek, and therefore, so rendered her Syriac expression? And is not the same evident concerning our apostle, from the interpretation that he gives of those Hebrew words? And it is in vain to reply, that these words were added by the translator, seeing the very argument of the author is founded in the interpretation of those words which he gives us. It appears then that the assertion that this Epistle was written in Hebrew, is altogether groundless, and that it arose from many false suppositions, which render it more incredible, than if it made use of no pretence at all. And there are not wanting evidences in this Epistle itself of its having been originally written in the language wherein it is still extant; and those such as few other books of the New Testament can afford, should the same question be made about them.

§ 5. Moreover, in confirmation of our persuasion, it is by some added, that the testimonies made use of in this Epistle, out of the Old Testament, are taken from the translation of the LXX., and that sometimes the stress of the argument rests on somewhat peculiar to that version, which could not have been done, had the epistle been written originally in Hebrew. But because this assertion contains other difficulties in it, and is built on a supposition which deserves a farther examination, we shall refer it unto its own place and season, which ensues.
EXERCITATION V.

§ 1. Testimonies cited by the apostle out of the Old Testament. § 2—13. Compared with the original and translations. § 14—24. Whence the agreement of some of them with that of the LXX.

§ There is not any thing in this Epistle that is attended with more difficulty than the citation of the testimonies out of the Old Testament, that are made use of in it. Hence, some from their unsuitableness as they have supposed, to the author's purpose, have made bold to call in question, if not to reject the authority of the whole. But the matter of them, and the wisdom of the apostle in their application, must be treated of in the respective places where they occur. We shall then manifest how vain and causeless are the exceptions which have been laid against them, and how singularly they are suited to the proof of those doctrines and assertions in confirmation whereof they are produced. But the consideration of the words also in which they are expressed, as these vary frequently from the original, is attended with some difficulty. And this concernment of the apostle's citations, to prevent further trouble in the exposition of the several places, may be previously considered. Not that we shall here explain and vindicate them from the exceptions mentioned, which must of necessity be done afterwards, as occasion offers; but we shall only discover in general, what respect the apostle's expressions have unto the original, and to the old translations thereof; and remove some false inferences that have been made on the consideration of them. To this end I shall briefly examine them all, and compare them with the places whence they are taken.

§ 2. Chap. i. 5, εἰς μου καὶ σέ, εἰς σήμερον γεγονέναι σέ. 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' from Psal. ii. 7. The words exactly answer the original, with the addition only of the verb substantive, whereof in the Hebrew there is almost a perpetual ellipsis, πνεῦνα. And the same are the words in the translation of the LXX. In the same verse, εἰς σήμερον νενεώμει αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νόον. 'I will be unto him a father, and he shall be unto me a son,' from 1 Chron. xxii. 10. The LXX. is different as to the order of the words: αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς νόον, καὶ εἰς σήμερον νενεώμει αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, which is also in the order of the sentences in the original, the apostle using his own liberty, and varying from them both; so that this quotation is not directly from that translation.

Ver. 6. καὶ προσκυνησαντος αὐτῷ παντες ἄγγελος θεου. 'And let all the angels of God worship him,' from Psal. xciii. 7, without change, only ἄγγελος, 'gods,' is rendered by the apostle, ἄγγελοι θεου, 'the angels of God;' of the reason whereof afterwards. The LXX. προσκυνησαντε αὐτῳ παντες αγγελοι αυτου. 'Worship him all ye his angels,' differing from the apostle both in form of speech and words. Hence, some not understanding whence this testimony was cited by the apostle, have inserted his words into the Greek Bible, Deut. xxxiii. 43, where there is no colour for their introduction, nor any thing in the original to answer unto them; whereas the Psalmist ex-
pressly treateth of the same subject with the apostle; to the reason of which insertion into the Greek version, we shall speak afterwards.

Ver. 7. ὁ ποιων τοὺς αγγέλους αὐτοῦ πυρεμάτα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλογὰ. 'Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire,' from Psal. civ. 4. The LXX. πυρ φλεγον, 'a flaming fire.' Heb. נִיר נִב, 'fire of flame.' Aquila, πυρ λαβρον, 'a vehement fire.' Symmachus, πυρινὴ φλογα, 'a fiery flame;' much variety, with little or no difference, as it often falls out amongst good translators rendering peculiar Hebraisms, such as this is. The apostle's expression is this own, not borrowed from the LXX.

Ver. 8, 9, ὁ ἑρωνὸς σου, ὁ θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰώνα τοῦ αἰωνός (τοῦ χιλίου). ῥαβδὸς εὐθυτητος ἢ ῥαβδός τῆς βασιλείας σου· ηγατήσας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ εμμαθας ανομίαν, διὰ τοῦτο εὑρισκεῖ σὺ ὁ θεὸς, ὁ θεὸς σου, ἐλαῖον αγαλλιασώς παρὰ τοὺς μετοχοὺς σου. 'Thy throne, O God, for ever and ever. (The verb substantive is left out by the apostle in answer unto the original, but rendered ὁ θεὸς, for θεός, which the apostrophe requires.) 'A sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: thou hast loved righteousness, and thou hast hated iniquity, wherefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' The words exactly answer the original, and they are the same in the translation of the LXX, and whence that coincidence was, we shall afterwards inquire. Aquila somewhat otherwise, ὁ ἑρωνὸς σου θεός εἰς αἰώνα καὶ εἰς τοῦτον καὶ την αὐτοῦ συν. Symmachus, αἰώνιος καὶ την αὐτοῦ. (Τοῦ came to be translated εἰς from likeness of sound), in thee, O God,' he expresseth the apostrophe, which is evident in the context. Σεπτρον εὐθυτητος, σκεπτρον βασιλείας σου· he renders by σκεπτρον, 'sceptrum,' a sceptre, properly, as we shall see afterwards, on Gen. xlix. 10, εμμαθας ανομίας, thou hast hated ungodliness, 'iniquity, ἐλαῖον αγαλλίαζον, 'with the oil of joy,' Symmachus, ἐλαιῳ αγαλλίαζον, another word of the same signification with that used by the apostle, from Psal. xlv. 6, 7.

Ver. 10, 11, 12, ἐν κατ' ἀρχαις, κυριε, την γην εὐμελιώσας, καὶ ἐργα τῶν χιλιῶν σου εἰς ὧν ὑπάρχουν αὐτοὶ απολύονται, σὺ ἐν εἰρήμενις, καὶ παντες ὡς ἵπποι παλαιωθησονται· ἐν και ὑπερ βεβαῖον εἰς την αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐλαγησηται· σὺ ἐν ὧν αὐτοῦ εἰς, καὶ τα ἤτη σου οὐκ εκλειψον. 'And thou, O Lord, in the beginning, hast founded the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail; from Psal. cii. 26—28. And these words of the apostle are now exactly in the Greek Bibles. Some little difference there is in them from the Hebrew, the reason whereof we shall afterwards give an account of. Symmachus for ἐλαῖος reads ἀλλαζεις, and so did the copies of the LXX. of old, the word being yet retained in some of them, and reckoned by all amongst the various readings of that translation. The word Κυριε, O Lord, inserted by the apostle, is also undoubtedly taken from hence into the Greek Bibles. For as the inserting of it was necessary unto the apostle to denote the person treated of, so it is not in the original, nor will the context of the psalm admit of it; so that it could no otherwise come into that place, but from this of the apostle. Nor is it probable that the LXX. would translate ἐλαῖος, ἐλαῖος, 'thou shalt roll up,' and immediately render ἀλλαζέσανται, 'they shall be changed;' but here also the words have been borrowed from the apostle, whose design was not exactly to translate, but faithfully to apply the sense of the place unto his own purpose.

Ver. 13, καθοῦ εἰς θεϊον μον, ἐως ἃν θω τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποτείον των ποιῶν.
Sit thou at my right hand, until I place thine enemies the footstool of thy feet; from Psal. ex. 1; וְיִרְבֶּץ் 'at my right hand,' ek ἐξείων, in the plural number, of the reason of which change and manner of expression, we shall treat in its proper place. And here there remains nothing of difference in any old translation.

§ 4. Chap. ii. 6—8. τι εστιν ανθρωπος ὁτι μιμηση αυτον, η νος απεικόπην ὅτι επιθετη οντον. ἡλατωσας αυτον βραχυ τι παρ αγγελους, δοξη και τιμη εστεφανωσας αυτον, και καταστησας αυτον επι τα ἐργα των χειρων σου παντα υπεταιξας ὑποκατω των σων αυτον. 'What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him? thou hast made him less for a little while than the angels, thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, and has set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast subjected all things under his feet,' from Psal. viii. 5—8. The words of the apostle are the same with those in the present copy of the LXX. Theodotion, βραχυν τι παρα θεουν, in the ambiguous signification of the word שֵׁלֶחֶם, about which great stirs have been raised, whereof in their proper place. Chrysostome, on this text mentions some different translations of the words of the Psalms, ἀλλος, saith he, τι ὁ κατ' ανέφρα ὅτι μνημονευως αυτον. Another book reads, 'What is he according to man that thou rememberest him? τι ὁ κατ' ανέφρα, is not ἡμεν ζωή, but τι ανθρωπος θυγατς, 'What is mortal man?' Again, ἀλλος, αντι του, επιθετη αυτον, επικεφαλις αυτον. Another, instead of 'thou visitest him,' that 'thou wilt visit him.' Again, ἡλατωσας αυτον βραχυ τι παρα αγγελους, ἑτερος, βραχυ τι παρα θεουν, αλλος, ολιγον παρα θεουν, instead of 'less,' or 'a little while than angels;' another, 'a little less than God;' and another, 'less than God.' And he adds, the Hebrew is ουκαπηθήναι ματ μη ελεομυ, So different was their pronounciation of the Hebrew from that in use amongst us. Again, he adds, ἑτερος, δοξη και τιμη στεψεις αυτον, 'thou shalt crown him with glory and honour;' and yet, αλλος, εξουσιαζεις επονησας αυτον, 'thou madest him to have power.' From all which variety, it is most evident that there were various readings of this context in the ancient copies of the LXX. For no footsteps of them appear in the remains of Aquila, Theodotion, or Symmachus, and that, therefore, the common reading which is now fixed in the Greek Bible, was translated thither from this place of the apostle.

§ 5. Ver. 12. ἀπαγγελω το ονομα σου τοις αδελφοις μου, εν μεσω εκκλησιας ομοιωσε σε—'I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation I will sing praise unto thee.' from Psal. xxii. 23. The LXX. διηγησομαι το ονομα; αὐξάνω.

Ver. 13. εγω εσομαι πεποιθως επ' αυτως—'I will put my trust in him.' from Psal. xviii. 3. LXX. ελπιω επ' αυτον, 'I will hope in him;' but ἀμώμτων is rightly rendered by the apostle, 'I will trust in him.' The LXX. have these words of the apostle, Isa. viii. 17, where the words of the original are לְרָחֵי, 'and I will wait for him;' so that their words seem to be taken from this place of the apostle, as apprehending his testimony to be cited from the prophet; which, that it is not, we shall prove evidently afterwards.

The same verse, εδων εγω και τα παιδια α μοι ειδωκεν ὁ Θεος—'Behold I and the children which God hath given me;' from Isa. viii. 17.

§ 6. Chap. iii. 7—11. σημερον εαυ της φωνης αυτου ακουσητε, μη σκληρυνητε τας καρδιας ὑμων, ὡς εν τω παραπτακρασι, κατα την ἡμεραν του πειρασμον εν τη ερημω, ου επειρασαν με οι πατερες ὑμων, ἐδοκιμαζαν με, και ειδον τα ἐργα
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µου τεσσαρακοντα ετη. εις προσωπιάς τη γενεα εκεινη, και ειπον· αει πλανωνται τη καινα, αυτοι εαυτων εγενοται τας άθοδος μου· ος ομοσα εν τη οργη μου· ει εισελευνονται εις την καταπασιν μου· 'To-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the day of provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness, when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years: wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, they do always err in heart, and they have not known my ways; so I sware in my wrath they shall not enter into my rest.' from Psal. xcv. 7—11. The translation of the LXX. agrees with the words of the apostle, both of them answering the original. Only the apostle, clearly to express the reason of God's judgments on that people in the wilderness, distinguishes the words somewhat otherwise than they are in the Hebrew text. For whereas that saith, 'When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works: forty years long was I grieved with that generation.' The apostle adds that season of forty years to the mention of their sins, and interposing δε, 'wherefore,' refers his words unto the words foregoing, as containing the cause of the ensuing wrath and judgment. And though our present copies of the Greek Bibles distinguish the words according to the Hebrew text, yet Theodoret informs us, that some copies made the distinction with the apostle, and added δε before προσωπιάς, which also is observed by Nolius: and this could arise from no other cause but from an attempt to insert the very words of the apostle into that text; as did the ειπον also, reckoned amongst its various readings, though ειπα remain in the vulgar editions.

§ 7. CHAP. iv. 4, και κατεπασαν· δο θεος εν τη ήμερα τη ένδομ απο παντων των εργων αυτων· 'And God rested on the seventh day from all his works,' from Gen. ii. 2. The apostle adds δο θεος to the text, to complete his assertion; and leaves πανω της αντι αποιησι, which he had made, as not to its purpose. The LXX. has ὤν αποιησι, and in other respects also differs from the apostle.

§ 8. CHAP. vi. 6. ου της εκατερας εις τον αιωνα κατα την ταξιν Μελχισεδεκ. 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,' from Psal. cx. 4. So also the LXX. ἡ ἐπικρασία λύπην, with ὁδος superfluous; κατα λογον, επειδή Mos. There is nothing of variety remaining in these words from any other translations.

Ver. 14. ευλογων ευλογησω σε, και πληθυνων πληθυνω σε. 'Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee,' from Gen. xxii. 17. The LXX. πληθυσω το σπέρμα σου, 'I will multiply thy seed.'

§ 9. CHAP. viii. 9—12, ειδον ήμερας, ερθονται λεγει Κυριος (LXX. φησιν ευριος), και συντελεων επε τον οικον Ισραηλ, και επε τον οικον Ιουυα διαηθην καινην (LXX. διαηθησαται το οικον Ισραηλ διαηθην καινην) ου κατα την διαηθηνην ην αποιησι τοις πατρασιν αυτων (LXX. ην ειθεμενην) εν ήμερα επιλαξιμοντον μου της χειρος αυτων, εξαγαγειν αυτως εκ γης Αιγυπτου, ότι αυτοι ουκ εναιμυναν εν τη διαηθηη καινην, και μελησαν αυτως λεγει Κυριος οτι αυτη ή διαηθη, ην διαηθησαται το οικον Ισραηλ μετα της ήμερας εκεινης, λεγει Κυριος, εδος ουμενος μου (LXX. δεδους διωσω) εις την εικαινιαν αυτων, και επι καιριαν αυτων επιτραπων αυτως: και συναι αυτως εις θεον και αυτου ερθονται μου εις λαον και ου μη διαδωσων εκαστον τον πλησιον αυτων, και εκαστον τον αδελφον αυτων, λεγειν Τιωθεν τον Κυριον· ότι παντες εισεσαυσαν με, απο μικροι αυτων εις μεγαλον αυτων, οτε ειδω οσοις αυτων των αδικαιας αυτων, και των άμαρτων αυτων και των ανομων αυτων ου μη μηνιων ετι.—Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with
their fathers, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws in their minds, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more.' From Jer.xxxi. 32—35. Instead of τον πλησιον, 'his neighbour,' ver. 11. the LXX. read τον πολιτην, his fellow citizen. But some copies of the LXX. read πλησιον, and some of this text πολιτην, which makes it evident that there hath been tampering to bring them to uniformity. But the greatest difficulty of this quotation ariseth from the agreement of the apostle's words, and the translation of the LXX. where both of them seem to depart from the original. For those words in the Hebrew text, ver. 33. προς όμοιον, which my covenant they made void, and I was an husband unto them, or ruled over them, are rendered by them, ουκ ενεμειναν εν τη διαθηκη μου, καγω ημελησα αυτον, and they 'continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not.' The reason of the apostle's translation of those words we shall manifest and vindicate in our exposition of the context. At present I only observe the coincidence of the apostle's words with those of the LXX. and that in a passage in which they both seem to differ from the original, and from all translations except the Syriac and the Arabic, which are made out of the LXX., though the Syriac follow it not in the confused transpositions that are made of Jeremiah's prophecies, from chap. 25. to chap. 40. as the Arabic doth. This coincidence shall be explained when we have recounted the remaining testimonies, whereof some are attended with the same difficulty. § 10. Chap. ix. 20. τοντο το αιμα διαθηκης, ἣς ενετειλατο προς ύμας ὁ Θεος. 'This is the blood of the covenant, which God hath enjoined unto you.' From Exod. xxiv. 8. The sense of the Hebrew text is alluded unto, not the words absolutely. The LXX. ιδων το αιμα της διαθηκης ἡς ειθετο Κυριος προς ύμας ; with much difference from the words of the apostle. § 11. Chap. x. 5. ἡν θελησας, ζωιαν και προσφοραν ουκ θηλησας, σωμα ἐκ κατηρισω μου. 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not have, a body thou hast prepared me.' From Ps. xl. 6. So also the LXX. both with great difference from the original. For κατηρισω, 'my ears hast thou digged,' or bored, is rendered, 'a body thou hast prepared me.' Of the reason of which difference and agreement, we shall treat afterwards. Ver. 6. όλοκαυνοματα και περι ἁμαρτιας ουκ ευθησας; 'in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.' Heb. τοις κατηρισο, 'thou hast not required,' the apostle expresseth exactly the sense of the Holy Ghost, but observes not the first exact signification of the word. The LXX. χησας and in some copies εχησας 'soughtest not.' Ver. 7. ιδων ήκω, εν κεβαλϊ δεικουν γεγραπται περι εμοι, τον πνησαι, ὁ Θεος, το θελημα σου. 'Behold I come: in the head or beginning of the Book it is written of me, to do thy will O God. That is, Gen. iii. 15. Heb. יִצְרָא לָכְכֶם לְכֵיכֶם in the roll of the book. Symmachus, εν τω τευχει των ὁμοσαν, 'In the volume of thy determination.' Aquila εν τω εἰλιματε, 'in the roll,' εν τομον, 'in the section. LXX. τον πνησαι το θελημα σου, ω Θεος μου, ἡμουρληθην, 'I was willing to do thy will, O my God.' Ver. 38. ὃ ἐν ἐκαίων ἐκ πιστεως (LXX. μου) γησαται, και εαν ύποστειληται VOL. I.
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ουκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ συνή μου ἐν αὐτῷ. ‘But if any draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him,’ from Habak. ii. 4. The words of the prophet are transposed, and the beginning of the last clause much altered. ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τριάδος βραβεύσεις ἡ βασιλεία καὶ τὸ βασιλεία τοῦ μέλλοντος, expressing either from the beginning of the clause Greek ὑπὸ τὸν ἔλεγχον διαφορία, and in some copies παραδείγματι, from this place of the clause. ‘Behold it is lifted up, his soul is not right in him.’ but the sense and intention of the Holy Ghost is preserved, as shall be manifested.

§ 12. Chap. xii. 5, 6. νεί μοι (μοι is not in the LXX. Heb. יָבֵב my Son) μή ἐλεγωρεῖ παῖδείς ἡμῶν, μήδε εκλιπεῖν υπό αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχομένως, ὅταν γαρ ἀγαπᾷ ἢ δεν εἰς παῖδεις (LXX. ἐλεγχεῖ, and in some copies παῖδεις, from this place of the apostle) καὶ μαστιγοῖς πάντας τινὸς ὑπὸ παραδείγματι. ‘My son despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth, from Prov. iii. 12. ἐναιδίον ἵκω ἡμᾶς ἁρπαζεῖ, and as a father the son whom he delighteth in.’ The sense is retained, but the words not exactly repeated. Aquila εἰρήνηθεν τιν ποταμός, ‘reject not,’ γυνὴν. Theodotion, μηδε εγκαθηγησε, ‘neither vex thyself.’

§ 13. Chap. xiii. 5. οῦ μη σε αὐτοκίνησον, οὐδέ οὐ μη σε εγκαθαλίσω, ‘I will not leave thee, neither will I forsake thee,’ from Josh. i. 5. The LXX. in different words; οὐκ εγκαθαλίσω σε, οὐδέ υπερφόροι σε. ‘I will not leave thee, neither will I despise thee.’ The apostle’s words exactly express the original.

Ver. 6. Is from Psalm cxviii. 6. without any difficulty attending it.

§ 14. And these are all the places that are cited εἰς τοῦ ῥήτορον, by the apostle in this Epistle out of the Old Testament. Very many others there are which he either alludes unto or expounds, that are not of our present consideration. Neither are these here proposed to be unfolded as to the sense of them, or as to the removal of the difficulties with which the application of them by him is attended. This is the proper work of the exposition of the epistle. All at present aimed at, is to present them in one view, with their agreement and differences from the original and translations, that we may the better judge of his manner of proceeding in the citing of them, and what rule he observed therein. And what in general may be concluded from the view which we have of them, I shall offer in the ensuing observations.

§ 15. First, It is evident that they are exceedingly mistaken who affirm that the apostle cites all his testimonies out of the translation of the LXX. as we intimated that it is by some pleaded, in the close of the preceding discourse. The words he useth in very few of them agree exactly with that Greek version of the Old Testament which is now extant; though apparently since the writing of this epistle it hath grown in its verbal conformity to the citations in the New. And in most of them he varieth from it, either in the use of his own liberty, or in a more exact rendering of the original text. This the first prospect of the places and words compared will evince. Should he have had any respect unto that translation, it were impossible to give any tolerable account, whence he should so much differ from it, almost in every quotation, as it is plain that he doth.

§ 16. It is also undeniably manifest from this view of his words, that the apostle did not scrupulously confine himself unto the precise words either of the original, or any translation whatever, if any other translation or Targum were then extant besides that of the LXX. Observing and expressing the sense of the testimonies which he thought meet to produce and make use of, he used great liberty, as did other holy writers of the New Testament, according to the guidance of the Holy Ghost by whose inspira-
tion he wrote, in expressing them by words of his own. And who shall blame him for so doing? Who should bind him to the rules of quotations, which sometimes necessity, sometimes curiosity, sometimes the cavils of other men, impose upon us in our writings? Herein the apostle used that liberty which the Holy Ghost gave to him, without the least prejudice unto truth, or the faith of the church.

§ 17. Whereas some of these testimonies, or a part of some of them, may appear at first view to be applied by him unsuitably unto their original import and intention, we shall manifest, not only the contrary to be true, against those who have made such exceptions, but also that he makes use of those which were most proper and cogent, with respect unto them with whom he had to do. For the apostle in this Epistle, as shall be fully evinced, disputes upon the acknowledged principles and concessions of the Hebrews. It was then incumbent on him to make use of such testimonies, as were granted in their church to belong unto the ends and purposes for which by him they were produced. And that these are such shall be evinced from their own ancient writings and traditions.

§ 18. The principal difficulty about these citations lies in those wherein the words of the apostle are the same with those now extant in the Greek Bibles, both evidently departing from the original. Three places of this kind are principally vexed by expositors and critics. The first is that of Ps. xl. 7, where the words of the Psalmist in the Hebrew, ליעז ע"ה, 'my ears hast thou bored, or digged,' are rendered by the apostle according to the translation of the LXX. γόμη αὐτοῖς μοι, 'but a body hast thou prepared me.' That the apostle doth rightly interpret the meaning of the Holy Ghost in the Psalm, and in his paraphrase apply the words unto that very end for which they were intended, shall be cleared afterwards. The present difficulty concerns the coincidence of his words with those of the LXX., where apparently they answer not the original. The next is that of the prophet, Jer. xxxxi. 32. א '&#100;עא תב ומכ, 'and I was an husband unto them,' or I was a Lord unto them, or ruled over them, as the vulgar Latin renders the words. The apostle with the LXX. καὶ ὤντος ἐγγέγυτος αὐτῶν, 'and I regarded them not,' or despised them. The third is that from Habak. ii. 4. δὲ γὰρ ἐπήλθεν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ θάνατος, 'behold, it is lifted up, his soul is not right in him; which words the apostle with the LXX. renders καὶ εὖ ὀποστελείσατι οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἐν ψυχῇ μου εν αὐτῷ. 'But if any draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.'

§ 19. Concerning these, and some other places, many confidently affirm, that the apostle waved the original, and reported the words from the translation of the LXX. Capellus with some others proceed farther, and assign the rise of this difference unto some other copies of the Hebrew text used by the LXX. varying from those which now remain. Thus in particular, in that place of Jeremiah before mentioned, he conjectures that for בִּלְעָדָה, 'I despised them,' as another doth that they read בִּלְעָדָה, to the same purpose; for of such conjectures there is no end. But as may well signify as the apostle expounds it, and in other places doth so, as we shall see afterwards, so this boldness in correcting the text, and fancying without proof, testimony, or probability, of other ancient copies of the Scripture of the Old Testament, differing in many things from them which alone remain, and which indeed were ever in the world, may quickly prove pernicious to the church of God. We must therefore look after another expedient for the removal of this difficulty.

§ 20. I say then, it is highly probable, that the apostle, according to his
wonted manner, which appears in almost all the citations used by him in this epistle, reporting the sense and import of the places, in words of his own, the Christian transcribers of the Greek Bible inserted his expressions into the text, either as judging them a more proper version of the original, (whereof they were ignorant) than that of the LXX., or out of a preposterous zeal to take away the appearance of a diversity between the text and the apostle’s citation of it. And thus in those testimonies where there is a real variation from the Hebrew original, the apostle took not his words from the translation of the LXX. but his words were afterwards inserted into that translation. And this, as we have partly made to appear already in sundry instances, so it shall now briefly be farther confirmed. For,

§ 21. First, Whereas the reasons of the apostle for his application of the testimonies used by him in his words and expressions are evident, as shall in particular be made to appear; so no reason can be assigned why the LXX. (if any such LXX. there were) who translated the Old Testament, or any other translators of it, should so render the words of the Hebrew text. Neither various lections, nor ambiguity of signification in the words of the original, can in most of them be pleaded. For instance, the apostle in applying those words of the Psalmist, Ps. xi. אתлицי רחרת לannel unto the human nature and body of Christ, wherein he did the will of God, did certainly express the design and intention of the Holy Ghost in them. But who can imagine what should move the LXX. to render מִי חָ לֵב a word of a known signification and univocal, by σωμα when they had translated it an hundred and fifty times, that is constantly elsewhere, by ονε and ωτον, an ear, which alone it signifies; or what should move them to render מַדְרָפִי, το prepare, when the word signifies to dig, or to bore, and is always so elsewhere rendered by themselves? Neither did any such thing come into their minds in the translation of those places whence this expression seems to be borrowed, Exod. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17. When any man then can give a tolerable conjecture, why the LXX. should be inclined thus to translate these words, I shall consider it. In the meantime I judge there is much more ground to suppose, that the apostle’s expressions which he had weighty cause to use, were by some person inserted into the Greek text of the Old Testament, than that the apostle would adopt a translation, whose authors forsake, without cause, what they knew to be the proper meaning of some obvious words.

§ 22. Secondly, It is certain that some words used by the apostle have been inserted into some copies of the Greek Bibles, which being single words, and of little importance, prevailed not in them all, as may be seen in sundry of the foregoing instances. And why may we not think that some whole sentences might on the same account be inserted in some of them, which being of more importance found a more general acceptance? And how by other means also, that translation was variously changed and corrupted of old, even before the days of Hierome, learned men do know and confess.

§ 23. It is further evident that one place (at least) in this Epistle, which is urged by the apostle, as a testimony out of the Old Testament, is inserted in another place of the text, than that from which the apostle took it, and that where there is not the least colour for its insertion. This is the testimony out of Psalm xcvi. 7, which the apostle cites chap. i. 6, in words much differing from those wherewith the original is rendered by the LXX. This some of the transcribers of the Bible not knowing well where to find have inserted in the very syllables of the apostle’s expression into Deut.
xxxii. 43, where it yet abides, though originally it had no place there, as we shall in the exposition of the words sufficiently manifest. The same and no other is the cause why הנה is rendered ραβδος, Gen. xlix. And may we not as well think, nay is it not more likely, that they would insert his words into the places from whence they knew his testimonies were taken, with a very little alteration of the ancient reading, than that they would wholly intrude them into the places from whence they were not taken by him, which yet undeniably hath been done, and that with success? Nay, we find that many things out of the New Testament are translated into the Apocryphal Books themselves. As for instance, Ecclesiasticus, xxiv. 3, we have these words in the Latin copies, 'Ex ore altissimi prodiit primogenita ante omnem Creaturam;' which are cited by Bellarmin and others in the confirmation of the deity of Christ, whereas they are taken from Col. i. 15, and are in no Greek copies of that book.

§ 24. Upon these reasons then, which may yet be rendered more cogent by many other instances, (but we confine ourselves to this Epistle,) I suppose I may conclude, that it is more probable at least, that the apostle's interpretations of the testimonies used by him, all agreeably unto the mind of the Holy Ghost, were by some of old inserted into the vulgar copies of the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and therein prevailed unto common acceptation; than that he himself followed in the citation of them a translation departing without reason from the original text, and diverting unto such senses, as its authors knew not to be contained in them, which must needs give offence unto them with whom he had to do. It appears, then, that from hence no light can be given unto our inquiry after the language wherein this Epistle was originally written, though it be clear enough from other considerations.

EXERCITATION VI.

§ 1. Oneness of the church. Mistake of the Jews about the nature of the promises. § 2. Promise of the Messiah the foundation of the church. But as including the covenant, § 3. The church confined unto the person and posterity of Abraham. His call and separation for a double end. § 4. Who properly the seed of Abraham. § 5. Mistakes of the Jews about the covenant. § 6. Abraham the father of the faithful and heir of the world, on what account. § 7, 8. The church still the same.

§ 1. The Jews at the time of writing the Epistle, (and their posterity in all succeeding generations, follow their example and tradition,) were not a little confirmed in their obstinacy and unbelief, by a misapprehension of the true sense and nature of the promises of the Old Testament. For whereas they found many glorious promises made to the church in the days of the Messiah, especially concerning the great access of the Gentiles unto it; they looked upon themselves, the posterity of Abraham according to the flesh, as the first, proper, and indeed only subject of these promises, unto whom in their accomplishment, others were to be proselyted and
joined, the substance and foundation of the church remaining still with
them. But the event answered not their expectation. Instead of inheri-
ting, merely upon their carnal interest and privilege, all the promises,
which they looked for then, and which they continue to look for unto this
day, they found that they must come in themselves on a new account, to
be sharers in them in common with others, or be rejected, whilst those
others enjoyed the inheritance. This filled them with wrath and envy,
which greatly added to the strengthening of their unbelief. They could
not bear with patience an intimation of letting out the vineyard to other
husbandmen. With this principle and prejudice of theirs the apostle dealt
directly in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. ix. x. xi.

On the same grounds he proceeds with them in this Epistle. And be-
cause his answer to their objection from the promises, lies at the founda-
tion of many of his reasonings with them, the nature of it must be here
previously explained. Not that I shall here enter into a consideration of
the argument of the Jews to prove that the Messiah is not yet come, be-
cause the promises in their sense of them, are not yet accomplished; which
shall be fully removed in the close of these discourses; but as I said, I
shall only in general open the nature of that answer, which our apostle re-
turns unto them, and on which he builds his reasonings with them.

§ 2. We shall have occasion afterwards at large to show, that after the
entrance of sin, God founded his church in the promise of the Messiah given
unto Adam. Now though that promise was the support and encourage-
ment of mankind to seek the Lord, and although as a promise absolutely
considered, it proceeded from mere grace and mercy; yet as it was the
foundation of the church, it included in it the nature of a covenant, vir-
tually requiring a re-stipulation unto obedience in them who by faith come
to have an interest in it. And this the nature of the thing itself required;
for the promise was given unto this end, that men might have a new
bottom and foundation of obedience, that of the first covenant being dis-
annulled. Hence in the following explications of the promise, this condi-
tion of obedience is expressly added. So upon its renewal unto Abraham,
God required that he should walk before him and be upright. This pro-
mise then, as it hath the nature of a covenant, including the grace that
God would show unto sinners in the Messiah, and the obedience that he
required from them, was from the first giving of it, the foundation of the
church, and of the whole worship of God therein.

Unto this church so founded and built on this covenant, and by the
means thereof to the redeeming mediatory seed promised therein, were all
the following promises, and the privileges exhibited in them, given and
annexed. Neither hath, or ever had any individual person, any spiritual
right unto, or interest in any of those promises or privileges, whatever
his outward condition was, but only by virtue of his membership in the
church built on the covenant, whereunto as we said, they do all appertain.
On this account the church before the days of Abraham, though scattered
up and down the world, and subject unto many changes in its worship, by
the addition of new revelations, was still but one and the same; because
founded in the same covenant, and interested thereby in all the benefits
or privileges that God had granted, or would at any time grant unto his
church.

§ 3. In process of time, God was pleased to confine this church, as unto
the ordinary visible dispensation of his grace, unto the person and posterity
of Abraham. Upon this restriction of the church, covenant, and promise,
the Jews of old founded a plea in their own justification against the doctrine of the Lord Christ and his apostles. We are the children, the seed of Abraham, was their continual cry; on which account, they presumed that all the promises belonged unto them, and indeed unto them alone. And this their persuasion hath cast them, as we shall see, into a woeful and fatal mistake. God granted two privileges unto Abraham, upon his separation to a special interest in the old promise and covenant.

First. That according to the flesh he should be the father of the Messiah, the promised seed, who was the very life of the covenant, the fountain and cause of all the blessings contained in it. That this privilege was temporary, having a limited season, time, and end, appointed unto it, the very nature of the thing itself doth demonstrate. For upon this actual exhibition in the flesh, it was of course to cease. In consequence of this promise, the posterity of Abraham was separated from the rest of the world, and preserved a peculiar people, that through them the promised seed might be brought forth in the fulness of time, and be of them according unto the flesh, Rom. ix. 5.

Secondly, Together with this, he had also another privilege granted unto him, namely that his faith, whereby he was personally interested in the covenant, should be the pattern of the faith of the church in all generations; and that none should ever come to be a member of the church, or a sharer in its blessings, but by the same faith that he had fixed on the seed that was promised, to be brought forth from him in the world. On account of this privilege, he became the father of all them that do believe. For they that are of the faith, the same are the children of Abraham, Gal. iii. 7; Rom. iv. 11. As also heirs of the world, Rom. iv. 13; in that all that should believe throughout the world, being thereby implanted into the covenant made with him, should become his spiritual children.

§ 4. Answerably unto this two-fold end of the separation of Abraham, there was a double seed allotted unto him. A seed according to the flesh, separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah, according unto the flesh: and a seed according to the promise, that is, such as by faith should have interest in the promise, or all the elect of God. Not that these two seeds were always subjectively different, so that the seed separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah in the flesh, should neither in whole or in part be also the seed according to the promise; or on the contrary, that the seed according to the promise should none of it be his seed after the flesh. Our apostle declares the contrary in the instances of Isaac and Jacob, with the remnant of Israel that shall be saved, Rom. ix. x. xi. But sometimes the same seed came under different considerations, being the seed of Abraham both according to the flesh, and according to the promise; and sometimes the seed itself was different, those according to the flesh not being of the promise, and so on the contrary. Thus Isaac and Jacob were the seed of Abraham according unto the flesh, separated unto the bringing forth of the Messiah after the flesh, because they were his carnal posterity; and they were also of the seed of the promise, because, by their own personal faith, they were interested in the covenant of Abraham their father. Multitudes afterwards were of the carnal seed of Abraham, and of the number of the people separated to bring forth the Messiah in the flesh; and yet were not of the seed according to the promise, nor interested in the spiritual blessings of the covenant, because they did not personally believe, as our apostle declares, chap. iv. of this Epistle. And many afterwards, who were not of the carnal seed of Abraham, nor interested in the privilege of bringing
forth the Messiah in the flesh, were yet designed to be made his spiritual seed by faith; that in them he might become heir of the world, and that all nations of the earth might be blessed in him. Now, it is evident that the church to whom the promises are made, doth consist of them who by faith are interested in the covenant of Abraham, whether they be of the carnal seed or not.

§ 5. And herein lay the great mistake of the Jews of old, in which they are followed by their posterity unto this day. They thought that no more was needful to interest them in the covenant of Abraham, but that they were his seed according to the flesh. And they constantly pleaded 'the latter privilege, as the ground and reason of the former. It is true, they were the children of Abraham according to the flesh; but on that account, they can have no other privilege than Abraham himself had in the flesh. And this was, as we have showed, that he should be set apart as a special channel, through whose loins God would bring the promised seed into the world. In like manner were they separated to be a peculiar people, as his posterity, from amongst whom he should be so brought forth.

That this separation and privilege was to cease, when the end of it was accomplished, and the Messiah exhibited, the very nature of the thing declares. For to what purpose should it be continued, when that was fully effected for which it was designed? But the Jews would extend this privilege, and mix it with the other; contending, that because they are the children of Abraham according to the flesh, therefore the whole blessing and covenant of Abraham belongs unto them. But as our Saviour proved that, in the latter sense, they were not the children of Abraham, because they did not the works of Abraham, so, our apostle plainly demonstrates, Rom. iv. ix. x. xi.; Gal. iii. iv., that those of them who had not the faith of Abraham, had no interest in his blessings and covenant. Seeing therefore that their other privilege had come to an end, with all the carnal ordinances that attended it, by the actual coming of the Messiah, to which they were subservient, if they did not by faith in the promised seed attain an interest in this of the spiritual blessing, it is evident that they could on no account be considered as actual sharers in the covenant of God.

§ 6. We have seen that Abraham, on the account of his faith, and not of his separation according to the flesh, was the father of all that believe, and heir of the world; that the church in all ages, is founded on the covenant made with Abraham, and on the work of redemption, to be performed according to that covenant: and that, in Abraham's interest in this covenant, we are chiefly to regard his privilege as being a believer, and the privilege of being the father of the Messiah according to the flesh as subordinate to this. Now wheresoever this covenant made with Abraham is, and with whomsoever it is established, with them is the church, unto whom all the promises and privileges of the church do belong. Hence it was, that at the coming of the Messiah, there was not one church taken away, and another set up in the room thereof; but the church continued the same, in those that were the children of Abraham according to the faith. The Christian church is not another church, but the very same that was before the coming of Christ, having the same faith with it, and interested in the same covenant.

It is true, the former carnal privilege of Abraham and his posterity, expiring on the grounds before mentioned, the ordinances of worship which were suited thereto, did necessarily cease also. And this cast the Jews
into great perplexities, and proved the last trial that God made of them. For whereas both these, namely the carnal and spiritual privileges of Abraham's covenant, had been carried on together in a mixed way for many generations, they were now to be separated, and a trial to be made (Mal. iii.) who of the Jews had interest in both, and who in one only. They who had only the carnal privilege of being children of Abraham according to the flesh, contended for a share on that single account in the other also, that is, in all the promises annexed unto the covenant; but the foundation of their plea was taken away, and the church unto which the promises belong, remained with them who were heirs of Abraham's faith only.

§ 7. It remains then that the church founded in the covenant, unto which all the promises did and do belong, abide at the coming of Christ, and doth abide ever since, in and among those who are the children of Abraham by faith. The old church was not taken away, and a new one set up, but the same church continued, only in those who by faith inherited the promises. Great alterations indeed were then made in the outward state and condition of the church. As, 1. The carnal privilege of the Jews, in their separation to bring forth the Messiah, then failed; and therewith their claim on that account to be the children of Abraham. 2. The ordinances of worship suited unto that privilege expired, and came to an end. 3. New ordinances of worship were appointed, suited unto the new light and grace granted then unto the church. 4. The Gentiles came in to the faith of Abraham, together with the Jews, to be fellow-heirs with them in his blessing. But none of these nor all of them together, made any such alteration in the church, but that it was still one and the same. The olive tree was the same, only some branches were broken off, and others grafted into it; the Jews fell, and the Gentiles came in their room.

§ 8. And this doth and must determine the difference between the Jews and Christians, about the promises of the Old Testament. They are all made unto the church. No individual person hath any interest in them, but by virtue of his membership with the church. This church is, and always was, one and the same. With whomsoever it remains, the promises are theirs; and that not by application or analogy, but directly and properly. They belong as immediately at this day, either to the Jews or Christians, as they did of old to any. The question is, with whom is this church founded on the promised seed in the covenant. This is Sion, Jerusalem, Israel, Jacob, the temple of God. The Jews plead that it is with them, because they are the children of Abraham according to the flesh. Christians tell them, that their privilege on this account, is of another nature, and ended with the coming of the Messiah. That the church unto whom all the promises belong, are only those who are heirs of Abraham's faith; believing as he did, and thereby interested in his covenant. Not as though the promise made to Abraham was of none effect; for as it was made good unto his carnal seed in the exhibition of the Messiah, so the spiritual privileges of it belonged only unto those of the Jews and Gentiles, in whom God had graciously purposed to effect the faith of Abraham. Thus was, and is the church, whereunto all the promises belong, still one and the same, namely, Abraham's children according to the faith; and among those promises this is one, that God will be a God unto them and to their seed for ever.
EXERCITATION VII.


§ 1. The apostle in dealing with the Hebrews about the revelation of the will of God made unto their fathers, assigns it in general unto his speaking unto them in the prophets, ch. i. 1. This speaking unto them, the present Jews affirm to consist of two parts. 1st, That which Moses and the following prophets was commanded to write for the public use of the church. 2dly, That which being delivered only by word of mouth unto Moses, and continued by oral tradition until after the last destruction of the temple, was afterwards committed unto writing. And because those who would read our exposition of this Epistle, or the epistle itself with profit, had need of some insight into the opinions and traditions of the Jews about these things, I shall, for the sake of them that want either skill or leisure to search after them elsewhere, give a brief account of their faith, concerning the two heads of revelation mentioned; and therein discover the principle, means, and nature of their present apostasy and infidelity.

§ 2. The Scripture of the Old Testament they call אֲמַכָּה, 'the reading,' and divide it into three parts: 1st, תַּהוֹרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, 'the law;' 2d, בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל, 'the prophets;' 3d, הֵרָבֵית, 'the writings,' by divine inspiration, which are usually called the 'Hagiographa,' or holy writings. And this distribution of the books of the Old Testament is in general intimated by our Saviour, Luke xxiv. 44, παντα τα γεγραμμενα εν τω νομω Μωσεως, και προφηταις, και ψαλμοις. 'All things written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and the psalms;' under which last head, all the poetical books of the Scripture are contained. Thus Rabbi Bechai in Cad Hackemach, דְּרֵי הַתּוֹרָה מִלְפָּשָׁה, הָלְכִיס יִשְׂרָאֵל נְכָאֵיס הָלְכִיס, 'the law,' (so sometimes they call the whole volume), 'is divided into three parts, the law, the prophets, and the holy writings.' All comprised generally under the name of the law; for so they say in 'Midrash Tehillim,' Ps. lxxviii. 1, מָמוּרֵים הַתּוֹרָה וּנְכָאֵיס הָלְכִיס, 'the psalms are the law, and the prophets are the law;' that is, the whole Scripture.

This distribution, so far as it is intimated in the words of our Saviour, doth evidently arise from the nature and subject-matter of the books themselves. And this was the received division of the books of the Old Testament, whilst the Judaical church continued. But the post-talmudical doctors overlooking or neglecting the true reason of this distribution, have fancied others taken from the different manners and degrees of revelation, by which these books were given out to the church. Amongst these they make the revelation of Moses the most excellent, and are very vain in counting the privileges and preeminences which it had above all others; these are elsewhere examined. In the next degree they placed those which proceeded from the spirit of prophecy, which they distinguish from
the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Yea, in the eleven degrees of divine revelation assigned by Maimonides Mor. Nebu. par. 2, that by inspiration is cast into the last and lowest place. But their distinctions are groundless. In all the prophets it was the inspiration of the Holy Ghost alone, that enabled them infallibly to declare the mind of God unto the church, 2 Pet. i. 21; but because God was pleased to use various ways of representing things to the minds of the prophets, therefore the Jews have fancied different degrees of revelation.

Now the books thus given by the spirit of prophecy they make of two sorts, 1st, הַבָּרוֹאֲתֵי הַפְּרָשָׁהָה, the former prophets, which are all the historical books of the Old Testament written before the captivity, as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; Ruth only excepted. 2d, הַבָּרוֹאֲתֵי הַמַּדְבַּבָּבָה, the latter prophets, which are all the prophetical books peculiarly so called, Daniel only excepted; that is, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets. Of the last sort, or הַדְּבַרְבְּרֵבָה, Cethubim, books written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are the poetical books of the Scripture; Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, Lamentations, with Ecclesiastes, whereunto they add Ruth, Daniel, and the historical books written after the captivity, as the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which make up the canon of the Old Testament. Why sundry of these books should be cast into the last division, as the story of Ruth, and the prophecy of Daniel, they can give no tolerable account. The other books also, written after the captivity, are plainly of the same nature with those which they call the former prophets. And for that of Daniel, it contains in it almost all the eminent kinds of revelation, whereby they themselves would distinguish the Spirit of prophecy from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Neither have they any reason for this distribution; but finding the general division before mentioned to have been received in the church of old, they have at their pleasure disposed of the particular books into these orders, casting Daniel, as is probable, into their last order, because so many of his visions and prophecies relate unto other nations besides their own.

The law or the books of Moses they call הַתִּנְךָ, or the 'Pentateuch,' from the number of the books; or, הַדְּבַרְבְּרֵבָה הַמֶּלֶךְ, the 'five, or the five parts of the law;' whereunto Hierome in his Epistle to Paulinus, wrests those words of the apostle, 1 Cor. xiv. 9, 'I had rather speak חמשים לֹאֵו, five words' in the church; as if he had respect to the law of Moses.

These five books they divide into Parashae, or sections, wherof they read one each Sabbath day in their synagogues. Genesis is divided into twelve sections, Exodus into eleven, Leviticus into ten, Numbers into ten, Deuteronomy into ten, which all make fifty three. By reading one each day, and two in one day, they read through the whole in the course of the of a year, beginning at the feast of tabernacles. And this they did of old, as James testifies, Acts xv. 21. 'For Moses of old time, hath in every city, them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.' Some of them make fifty four of these sections, dividing the last section of Genesis into two, beginning the latter at chap. xlvi. 28, constituting the following chapter a distinct section, though it have not the usual note of a section prefixed unto it, but only one single Samech; to note, as they say, that it is absolutely closed or shut up, on account of the prophecy of the coming of the Messiah, chap. xlix., whose season is unknown to them.

§ 3. They also divide the law into lesser sections; and those of two
sorts, open and close, which have their distinct marks in their bibles, and many superstitious observations they have about the beginning and ending of them. Of the first sort there are in Genesis 43, of the latter 48. In Exodus, of the first sort 69, of the latter 95. In Leviticus, of the first sort 52, of the latter 46. In Numbers, of the first sort 92, of the latter 66. Deuteronomy, of the first sort 34, of the latter 379, in all 669. Besides they observe the number of the verses at the end of every book; as also that 1 in Levit. xi. 42, is the middle letter of the law; ור, Lev. x. 16, the middle word; Levit. xiii. 33, the middle verse; and that the number of all the verses through the law is 23,206.

Moreover they divide the law, or five books of Moses, into 53, סדרים, or distinctions: whereof Genesis contains 42. Exodus, 29. Leviticus 23, Numbers 32, Deuteronomy. 27; which kind of distinctions they also observe throughout the Scripture, assigning unto Joshua 14, Judges 14, Samuel 34, Kings 35, Isaiah 26, Jeremiah 31, Ezekiel 29; the lesser prophets 21, Psalms 19, Job 8, Proverbs 8, Ecclesiastes 4, Canticles and Lamentations are not divided; Daniel 7, Esther, 7, Ezra and Nehemiah 10, Chronicles 25.

Besides, they distribute the prophets into sections called Ḥaprēters, that answer the sections which are read every sabbath day in their synagogues. And this division of the prophets they affirm to have been made in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, whom they call עוֹשֵׁה, 'that wicked one,' when the reading of the law was prohibited unto them. All which things are handled at large by others.

§ 4. Having for a long season lost the promise of the Spirit, and there-with all saving spiritual knowledge of the mind and will of God in the Scripture, the best of their employment about it, hath been in reference to the words and letters of it, and in this their diligence hath been of use, in the preservation of the copies of it entire and free from corruption. For after that the canon of the Old Testament was completed in the days of Ezra, and points or vowels added to the letters, to preserve the knowledge of the tongue, and to facilitate the right reading and learning of it, the industry, diligence, and curiosity which they have used about the letter of the whole Scripture is incredible. The collection of their pains and observations to this purpose is called Massora, or Massera, consisting in critical observation upon the words and letters of the Scripture; begun to be collected of old, even it may be from the days of Ezra, and continued until the time of composing the Talmud, with some additional observations annexed unto it since that time.

The writers, composers, and gatherers of this work, they call הרמסים, whose principal observations were gathered and published by Rabbi Jacob Chaiim, and annexed to the Venetian Bibles; whereas before the Massora was written in other books innumerable. In this their critical doctrine, they give us the numbers of the verses of the Scripture, as also how often every word is used in the whole, and with what variety as to letters and vowels; what is the whole number of all the letters in the Bible, and how often each letter is severally used, with innumerable other observations which have their use; the sum whereof is gathered by Buxtorf, in his excellent treatise on that subject. And here is the knowledge of their masters bounded; they go not beyond the letter, but are more blind than moles in the spiritual sense of it. And thus they continue an example of the righteous judgment of God, in giving them up to the counsels of their own hearts, and an evident instance that the letter of the Scripture is un-
able to impart the saving knowledge of the will of God, if men do not also enjoy the Spirit promised in the same covenant to the church of the elect, Isa. lxix. 21.

§ 5. Unto that ignorance of the mind of God in the Scripture, which is spread over their minds, they have added another prejudice against the truth, in a strange figment of an oral law, which they make equal unto, yea in many things superior to that which is written. The Scripture becoming a lifeless letter unto them, as the true understanding of the mind of God was utterly hid from them, it was impossible that they should rest therein, or content themselves with what is revealed in it. For as the word, whilst it is enjoyed and used according to the mind of God, and is accompanied with that Spirit which is promised to lead them that believe into all truth, is full of sweetness and life to the souls of men, is a perfect rule of walking before God, and is that which satisfies them with wisdom and knowledge; so when it is only enjoyed outwardly as such a writing, without any dispensation of suitable light and grace, it will yield men no satisfaction; accordingly they will constantly turn aside to other means and ways of knowing and serving God. This being so eminent in the Jews, and the Medium they have fixed on to supply that want, which they suppose to be in the Scripture, (but which indeed is in themselves,) proving to be the great engine of their hardening and obstinacy in their infidelity; I shall first declare what it is that they intend by the oral law, and then briefly show the absurdity and falseness of their pretensions about it. Though it must not be denied, that it is one of the most ancient fables that is credited amongst any of the sons of men at this day.

§ 6. This oral law they affirm to be an unwritten tradition and exposition of the written law of Moses, given unto him in mount Sinai, and committed by him to Joshua and the Sanhedrim, to be by them delivered over by oral tradition unto those who should succeed them in the government of that church. It doth not appear that in the days of Christ or his apostles, whilst the temple was standing, there was any stated opinion amongst them about this oral law, though it is evident that not long after, it began to be received by the body of the people. Nay it is evident that there was no such law then acknowledged; for the Sadducees who utterly reject all the main principles of it, were then not only tolerated, but also in chief rule, one of them being high priest.

That they had heaped together many superstitious observances under the name of traditions, is most clear in the gospel; and it doth not appear that then they knew to whom to assign their origin; they therefore indefinitely called them the traditions of the elders, or of those that lived of old before them. After the destruction of their temple, when they had lost the life and spirit of that worship, which the Scripture revealed, betaking themselves wholly unto their traditional figments, they began to bethink themselves how they might give countenance to their apostasy from the perfection and doctrine of the written law. For this end they began to fancy that these traditions were no less from God, than the written law itself. For when Moses was forty days and forty nights in the mountain, they say that in the day time he wrote the law from the mouth of God, and in the night, God instructed him in the oral law, or unwritten exposition of it, which they have received by tradition from him. For when he came down from the mount, after he had read unto them the written law, he repeated, as they say, to Aaron and Eleazer and the Sanhedrim, all that secret instruction which he had received in the night from God, which it was not lawful for
him to write. Afterwards he committed the whole in a special manner to Joshua. Joshua did the same to Eleazer, as he did to his son Phineas, after whom they give us a catalogue of several prophets that lived in the ensuing generations, all whom they employ in this service of conveying down the oral law to their successors. To the high priests also they assign a place in this work; of whom there were eighty-three from the first institution of that office, to the destruction of the temple; Joseph. lb. 20, cap. 18. From Aaron to the building of Solomon’s temple thirteen; from thence to the captivity eighteen; all the rest take up the troublesome time of the apostasy of their church, unto the final ruin of it; their rulers being many because of their wickedness, as they themselves observe.

The last person whom they would have to preserve the oral law absolutely pure, was that Simeon, whom they call סֵימֶהְנָא, the Just, mentioned by Jesus the son of Syrach, chap. 1. And it is very observable, that the latter Jews have left out Simeon, the son of Hillel, whom their ancient masters placed upon the roll of the preservers of this treasure, supposing he might be that Simeon who in his old age received our Saviour in his arms, when he was presented in the temple, Luke ii. 25. A crime sufficient among the Jews to brand him with a perpetual ignominy: neither are they alone in turning men’s glory into reproach and shame.

§ 7. After the destruction of the temple and city, when the evil husbandmen were slain, the vineyard of the Lord was left out to others, and the kingdom given to another nation, and therewith the covenant sanctified use of the Scripture, the remaining Jews having lost wholly the mind of God in the Old Testament, betook themselves to their traditions, and as I said before, began to fancy and contend that they came from God himself; whereas their predecessors durst not plead any thing for them, but that they came unto them from them of old, that is from some of the masters of preceding generations. Hereupon a while after, (as I have elsewhere showed at large) one of them whom they call Rabbi Juda Hannasi, and Hakkadosh, the prince and the holy, took upon him to gather their scattered traditions, and to cast them into form, order, and method, in writing, that they might be unto the Jews a rule of life and worship for ever. The story of his work and undertaking is given us by Maimonides in Jud Chazaka, the authors of Sedar Olam, Halicoth Olam, Tzemach David, and many others; and they all agree that this their great master lived about the times of Marcus Antoninus two hundred years, or thereabouts after the destruction of city and temple.

§ 8. This collection of his they call מִשְׁנָא, Mishne, or Mishnaioth, being as is pretended a repetition of the law, in an exposition of it; indeed it is a farrago of all sorts of traditions, true and false, with a monstrous mixture of lies, useless, foolish, and wicked. The things contained in it, are by themselves referred to five heads: 1st. The oral law received by Moses on mount Sinai, preserved by the means before declared: 2nd. Oral constitutions of Moses himself, after he came down from the mount: 3rd. Constitutions and orders drawn by various ways of arguing, (13, as Rambam tells us) out of the written law: 4th. The answers and decrees of the Sanhedrim, and other wise men in former ages: 5th. Immemorial customs, whose original being unknown, are supposed to be divine.

§ 9. The whole is divided into six parts: noted with the initial letter of the word, which signifies the chief things treated on in it. As the first by כ, that is חֵן, Zerain, Seeds, which is divided into eleven Massicktot, or treatises, containing in all seventy-five chapters. The second by ז, מ,
that is, מזון, Moad, or appointed feasts, which is distributed into twelve 
Massicktot, containing in them eighty-eight chapters. The third by נ, 
that is, שלש, of women, and is distributed into seven treatises, containing 
seventy-one chapters. The fourth by ו, that is, Nezikim, about 
loss and damage, and is divided into eight Massicktot, whereof the first is 
divided into three parts, called א, ב, ו, the first, middle, and last, port, or entrance, containing in them thirty chapters, 
whereunto forty-four are added in the following parts. The fifth by פ, 
that is, חידושין, Kodashim, of Sanctifications, and is divided into eleven 
books containing ninety chapters. The sixth with ט, that is, תורת 
תかるות, of Purifications, in twelve books, and one hundred and twenty-
six chapters.

§ 10. Unto this Mishne of R. Juda, they annex the תוספות, the Tosi-
phot, or additions of Rabbi Chaiah, his scholar, expounding many passages 
in his master's works; to them a more full explanation of the same doc-
trine of the Mishne, which they call Baracetot is subjoined, being the col-
collection of some Antitalmudical masters. About three hundred years after 
the destruction of the temple, R. Johanan composed the Jerusalem Talmud, 
consisting in expositions, comments, and disputes upon the whole Mishne, 
excepting the last part about purifications. An hundred years or there-
abouts after that, Rabbi Ase, composed the Babylonian Talmud, or Gemara; 
three-two years, they say, he spent in this work, yet leaving it unfinished, 
seventy-one years after, it was completed by his disciples. And the whole 
work of both these Talmuds may be referred unto five heads: for first, they 
expound the text of the Mishne; 2nd. Decide questions of right and fact; 
3rd. Report the disputations, traditions, and constitutions, of the doctors 
that lived between them and the writing of the Mishne; 4th. Give alle-
gorical monstrous expositions of the Scripture, which they call Midrashoth; 
and 5th. Report stories of the like nature.

§ 11. This at length is their oral law grown unto, and in the learning 
and practising of these things, consists the whole religion and worship of 
the Jews; there being not the most absurd saying of any of their doctors, 
in those huge heaps of folly and vanity, that they do not hold to be equal 
unto, nay, that they are not ready to prefer before the written word, 
that perfect and only guide of their church, whilst God was pleased 
with it.

In the dust of this confusion they dwell, loving this darkness more than 
light, because their deeds are evil. Having for many generations enter-
tained a prejudicate imagination; that these traditional figments, amongst 
which their crafty masters have inserted many filthy and blasphemous fa-
bles against our Lord Christ and his gospel, are of divine authority; and 
having utterly lost the spiritual sense of the written word, they are thus 
sealed up in blindness and obdurateness; and shall be so, until the veil be 
taken away, when the appointed time of their deliverance shall come. A 
brief discovery of the falseness of this fancy of their oral law, which is the 
foundation of all that huge building of lies and vanities that their Talmuds 
are composed of, shall put an end to this discourse.

§ 12. 1. The very story of the giving of the law at mount Sinai, suffi-
ciently discovers the folly of this imagination. This oral law, the Jews are 
ready, on all occasions, to prefer before that which is written; and do 
openly profess, that without it the other is of no use unto them. I desire 
them to know whence it is, that all the circumstances of the giving and 
teaching of the necessary, are so exactly recorded; but not one word is
spoken of this oral law, either of God's revealing it to Moses, or of Moses teaching of it to Joshua, or any others. Strange! that so much should be recorded of every circumstance of the less principal, lifeless law; and not one word of either substance or circumstance of that which is, if these men may be believed, the very life and soul of the other. Maimonides, in Jad Chazaka, tells us there is mention made of it in Exod. xxiv. 12. I will give you, saith the Lord, תַּרְשָׁיָהוּ, a law and commandment. מַעְלָם, saith he, is the written law; מַעְלָם, the oral: though the next words are, אשר ה́נִיב ה́לַמַּרְשָׁיָהוּ, which I have written, that thou mayest teach them; the written law, and no other, being on several accounts expressed by both those terms. How know they, that any such law was given to Moses as they pretend? What testimony, witness, or record of it, was had or made at the time of its giving, or in many generations, for two thousand years afterwards?

§ 13. 2. Did their forefathers, at any time before the captivity, transgress this oral law, or did they not? If they say they did not, but kept it, and observed it diligently, we may easily see of what importance it is, that the most strict observation of it would not preserve them from all manner of wickedness; and what an hedge it is to the written law, when notwithstanding the obedience yielded unto it, that was utterly despised and neglected. If they shall say that law also was broken by them, I desire to know whence it comes to pass, that whereas God by his prophets doth reprove them for all their other sins, and in particular for contempt of the written law, and of the statutes, ordinances, and institutions of it, he no where once mentioneth this their greater guilt, of despising the oral law, but there is as universal a silence concerning its transgression, as there is of its giving and institution. Can we have any greater evidence of its being fictitious than this? that whereas it is pretended that it is the main rule of their obedience to God, God did never reprove them for the transgression of it, though whilst he owned them as his church and people, he suffered none of their sins to pass unreproved, especially not any of that importance of which this is by them pretended to be.

3. Moses was commanded to write the whole law that he received from God, and did so accordingly, Exod. xxiv. 3, 4; xxxiv. 28; Deut. xxxi. 9—24. Where was this oral law, which they say was not to be written, when Moses was commanded to write the whole law that he had received of God, and did accordingly? This new law was not then coined, being indeed nothing but the product of their apostasy from the law which was written.

4. The sole ground and foundation of this oral law, lies in the imperfection of the written law. This is that which they plead for the necessity of it. The written law extends not to all necessary cases that occur in religion; many things are redundant, many wanting in it; and hereof they gather great heaps of instances, so that they will grant, that if the written law had been perfect, there had been no need of this traditional one. But whom in this matter shall we believe: a few ignorant Jews, or God himself bearing witness that his law is perfect, and that he requires no more in his worship but what is in that law prescribed? See Ps. xix. 3; Prov. xxx. 5, 6; Deut. iv. 1, 2. And this perfection of the written law, though it be entirely destructive to their traditions, not only the Karai among themselves do earnestly contend for, but also sundry of their Gemarists do acknowledge, especially when they forget their own concerns, out of a desire to oppose the gospel. And to this head belong all the arguments
that divines make use of to prove the perfection of the Scripture against the new Talmudists in Christianity.

5. God every-where sends his people to the written law of Moses, for the rule of their obedience, no where unto any Kabal, Deut. xi. 32, x. 12, 13, and xxviii. 1; Josh. i. 7, 8, xxiii. 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 18; Isa. viii. 20. If there be such an oral law, it is one that God would not have any man to observe; which he calls none to the obedience of, nor did ever reprove any man for its transgression

§ 14. And many more arguments of the like nature may be added, to prove the vanity of this pretence; and yet this figment is the foundation of the present Judaical religion and obstinacy. When the apostle wrote this Epistle, their apostasy was not yet arrived at this rock of offence; since their falling on it, they have increased their blindness, misery, and ruin. Then they were contented to try their cause, by what God spake to their fathers in the prophets, which kept open a door of hope, and gave some advantages for their conversion, which are now shut up and removed, until God shall take this veil away from their faces, that they may see to the end of the things that were to be done away.

§ 15. By this means, principally, have they for many generations both shut out the truth, and secured themselves from conviction. For they reject whatever is taught in the Scriptures concerning the person, office, and work of the Messiah, seeing they have that which they esteem a revelation of equal authority, teaching them a doctrine quite of another nature, and more suited unto their carnal principles and expectations; and will rather rest in any evasions, than give way to the testimony of Scripture. And whilst they have a firm persuasion, as they have, received by the tradition of many generations, that the written word is imperfect, and but a half revelation of the mind of God, in itself unintelligible, and not to be received or understood, but according to the sense of their oral law, now recorded in their Talmuds, what can the most plain and cogent testimonies of it avail to their conviction? And here it must be remarked, that the Christian and the Jewish church have trodden the same path to their grand apostasy. How far that of the Jews was overtaken with it in the days of our Lord's conversation on the earth, the gospel doth abundantly declare; and of the manner in which they have brought it unto its height, we have given now some brief account. The conduct of the Roman church hath been the very same, and hath at length arrived unto almost the same issue, by the same degrees. This, some of them perceiving, do not only defend the Pharisaical opinion among the Jews about the oral law, and the succession of their traditions, as consonant to the pretensions of their own church; but also openly avow, that a very great number of their several respective traditions are either the same, or that they nearly resemble one another; as doth expressly Josephus de Voysin, in his Proemium to the Pugio Fidei of Raimundus Martini. And because it is evident that the way and means whereby both the Judaical and Roman church have apostatized and departed from the truth, are the same, and that they maintain and defend themselves in their apostasy and refusal to return unto the truth by the same arguments, I shall, ως εν παραφη, manifest their consent and agreement in this principle, about their traditions, and the authority of them, which have been the ruin of them both.

§ 16. First, The Jews expressly contend that their oral law, their mass of traditions, was from God himself. They say that it was partly delivered unto Moses on Mount Sinai, and partly added by him from divine revela-
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tions, which he afterwards received. Hence, the authority of it, with them, is no less than that of the written word, (which hath all its authority from its divine original,) and the usefulness of it is much more. For although they cannot deny but that this and that particular tradition, that is practice, custom, or exposition of any place of Scripture, was first introduced, expressed, and declared, at such or such seasons, by such masters or schools amongst them; yet they will not grant that they were then first invented or found out, but only that they were then first declared out of the cabalistical abyss, wherein they were preserved from their first revelation; as all of them agree, who have written any thing about the nature, propagation, and continuance of their oral law.

And this is the persuasion of the Romanists about their cabal of traditions. They plead that they are all of a divine original, partly from Christ, and partly from his apostles. Whatever they have added unto the written word, yea, though it be never so contrary thereunto, still they pretend that it is part of the oral law, which they have received from them by living tradition. Let one convention of their doctors determine that images are to be adored; another, that transubstantiation is to be believed; a third, add a new creed, with an equal number of articles unto the old: let one doctor advance the opinion of purgatory; another, of justification by works; all is one, these things are not then first invented, but only declared out of that unsearchable treasure of traditions, which they have in their custody. Had they not fixed this persuasion in the minds of men, they know that their whole fabric would, of its own accord, have long since sunk into confusion. But they highly contend at this day, that they need no other argument to prove any thing to be of a divine original, but that they think so, and practise accordingly.

§ 17. Secondly, This oral law being thus given, the preservation of it, seeing Moses is dead long ago, must be inquired after. Now, the Jews assign a threefold depository of it. 1st, The whole congregation; 2dly, The sanhedrim; and 3dly, The high priest. To this end they affirm, that the part of it which Moses received on Sinai, was three times repeated upon his descent from the Mount, and that the additions which were afterwards made, had the same promulgation. 1st, It was repeated by himself unto Aaron; 2dly, By them both unto the elders; and 3dly, By the elders unto the whole congregation; or as Maimonides in Jad Chazaka, Moses delivered it unto Eleazar; Phineas and Joshua, after the death of Aaron; by whom the consistory was instructed therein, who taught the people as occasion did require. What the people knew of it is uncertain, but what they did know was quickly lost. The consistory, or great sanhedrim, בַּתָּר דִּי שִׁלֹתֵית רְאוֹזִית, as they call it, 'The House of Judgment, of Seventy and one,' was more faithful in its charge. Hence, Rab. Moses, in the same book, Tractat. מַכְּרַי, of rebels or transgressors, teacheth us, בֵּית דֶי מָנוֹרִית מְבָרוֹסְלט וַתְּעִקְר נַרְוָה מַעְבֶּדֶל פֶּרֶת הָדוֹר מְנוֹרוֹת מְהָדוֹר הָדוֹר מְנַוְת, 'The great consistory (or house of judgment) at Jerusalem, was the foundation of the oral law: these are the pillars of doctrine, from whom statutes and judgments went forth unto all Israel.' And he afterwards affirms, with what truth may be easily judged, מַשֵׂהָה בֵּית דֶי מָנוֹרִית קִיֵּמִים לַאֲבָדָת מַחֲבוֹקָת בִּירָאוֹל, 'whilst this great consistory continued, there was no dissension in Israel.' For not only the famous differences between Hillel and Shammai, with their disciples, which involved all the schools, scribes, and lawyers among them, arose, and were propagated whilst that consistory continued; but also the atheistical sect of
the Sadducees rose unto that height and interest, as to obtain the president-
ship in the sanhedrim itself. But the high priests are those whom they
fix upon as the principal conservators of this oral law. To this end they
give us catalogues of them from first to last, that by their uninterrupted
succession we may be assured of the incorrupt preservation of their
original traditions. Only it may here be added by the way, that they bind
not themselves precisely in all their religious observances unto this oral law,
to which they assign a divine origin; but ascribe an authority unto the
sanhedrim and the high priest, to constitute things of themselves in the
worship of God, besides and beyond the word. And whatever they pretend
of their oral law, when they come unto particular instances, they would
fain educe the constitutions of it from some word or letter, or manner of
interpretation of the Scripture itself. But those constitutions of the con-
sistency and wise men, they ascribe unto their own authority.

Some of these are recounted by Maimonides, in his preface unto Jad
Chazaka; as the reading of the book or roll of Esther with fasting, lights
on the feast of dedication, the fast on the seventh of Ab, or July, various
mixtures and washings of hands; things plainly of that nature which our
Lord Jesus condemned amongst them. And there is something observable
in the manner in which Maimonides frees them from transgressing that
precept, Deut. xii. 32. "Thou shalt not add unto this word," by this constitu-
tion. "Neither shalt thou add unto the word of God's commandments.
Some restrain left unto them, for they say not that the holy blessed God hath commanded these things, that there
should be such mixtures; that the book of Esther should be read with
fasting; for if they should say so they should add to the law. But thus
we speak, such and such a prophet, or the consistory, commanded and
appointed that the book of Esther should be read with fasting, to celebrate
the glory of the holy blessed God in our deliverance; and so of the rest.
It seems, then, they may add what they will of their own, if they prefix
not the name of God to their inventions; by which means they have set
themselves at liberty to multiply superstitious observations at their pleasure,
which they had actually done in the days of our Saviour, and thereby made
the law of God of none effect.

In all these things are they followed and imitated by the Romanists.
In the same manner do they lay up the stock of their traditions. In
general, they make the church the repository of them, although they do
not so distinctly explain the ways and means whereby they were committed
to it, as the Jews do. Unto the sanhedrim, councils are succeeded in the
same office. But their nature, work, authority, assistance, and use, are so
variously disputed amongst them, that nothing of certainty from them or
by them, singly considered, is to be obtained. It is the high priest or pope
that is the principal conservator of this sacred treasury of traditions; upon
their succession doth the certainty of them depend. And whilst there is a
pope at Rome, the knowledge of the new oral law will not fail, as the old
one did not whilst the Jews had a high priest; though, in the pursuit of it,
they crucified the Messiah, and continue to reject him unto this day.
Besides, like the Jews, they content not themselves with what they pretend
to be of ancient tradition, but assume a power of making new constitutions
in the things of God; by which they would have us to think that they do
not violate the prohibitions of adding, because they ascribe them not unto
the word of God, but to the authority of the present church. Thus far,
therefore, they are fully agreed.
§ 18. Thirdly, The Jews, in favour and to the honour of these traditions, affirm that the written word without them is imperfect, and not to be understood, but as it is interpreted by them: in this they are constant, and for this they earnestly contend. Aben Ezra, in his Preface to the Law, discourseth at large of five several ways of the interpretation of it, but concludes at last that the whole written law of Moses is founded on the oral. He saith,  אֱלֹהִים וַאֲבָא מִשְׁתַּקֵּם לְעֵינֵי רָוֶם בֵּעָלֶם אֲלֵיהֶם שָׁמַעְתָּם — 'And this is a sign unto us, that the law of Moses is founded on the oral law, which is the joy of our hearts: so apt are they to rejoice in a thing of nought. To the same purpose are the words of another famous master amongst them: Rabbi Beehai, in Cad. Hakkemach,

 הנר ליהרדה אָנוֹתְהוֹן אֲלֵיהֶם שָׁמַעְתָּם לְעֵינֵי רָוֶם בֵּעָלֶם אֲלֵיהֶם שָׁמַעְתָּם — 'The oral law is the foundation of the written, nor can the written law be expounded but by the oral.'

By this being the foundation of the written law, they intend, that the sense of it is so unwrapped and contained therein, that without the explications of the oral law, the written law cannot be understood. And to this end Manasse, one of their late masters, expressly disputes, that in many things it is defective, and in some things redundant, so that it is not able to give us a full and clear direction in the things of God, without their traditional explications. And in the confirmation of his opinion, he instanceth in sundry precepts and prohibitions, that he would prove so obscure, as that no obedience can be yielded unto them in a due manner, without the help of the Cabala; but as the greater part of his exceptions are childish cavils, and have been answered by others, they shall be here passed over. To this then they are arrived; this is the common persuasion of them all; and we shall hear what farther progress they have made. And in this they are imitated by their successors. Their oral law also is made by them the foundation of the written.

As those heretics of old, who had got some sophistical cavils about evil, wherever they met with any one not of their mind, presently fell upon him with their unde malum? whence had evil its original? so thinking to bring them to the acknowledgment of two supreme principles of things, a good one and a bad one. So, for the most part, the first question of a Romanist is, How do you know the Scriptures to be the word of God? and then the next word is, the Cabala, the הָנָּרֶר שְׁבָעֵל סְפָר, oral law, tradition: these are the foundation of it. And in their progress, they fail not to assert two principles, both borrowed from the Jews:—1st, That the Scripture is imperfect, and doth not give us a full and complete account of all things that are to be believed or practised, that God may be glorified, and our own souls saved.—2dly, That what was delivered in the Scriptures can in no way be rightly and truly understood, but by the help of those traditions which they have in their custody. But although these are good and useful inventions, and although they are men that want not ability to find out what is conducing to their own advantage, yet they cannot be allowed the credit of being their first authors, seeing they are expressly borrowed from the Jews.

§ 19. Fourthly, When these two laws, the law of God and and their own traditions, do come in competition, many of the Jews do expressly prefer that of their own invention before the other, and that both as to certainty and use. Hence, they make it the foundation of their church, and the only safe means to preserve the truth. So are we informed by Isaac Corbulensis, in שְׁבָעֵל הָנָּרֶר in the law. 'Do not think,' saith he, 'that the written law is the foundation, for the foundation is the oral law; for by that law was the
covenant made, as it is written, According to these words do I make a covenant with thee,' Exod. xxxiv. 27. He takes his argument from that expression, 'לע פי והברים אלו,' wresting it foolishly, as they do other Scriptures. His oral law he finds in those words, 'לע פי,' which signify nothing but 'according to,' nor are any other words intended, but those delivered to Moses and written by him. And of this oral law he goes on to say, 'These are the treasures of the holy blessed God; for he knew that Israel should be carried captive among other people, and that the nations would transcribe their books, and therefore he would not commit their secret law to writing.'

It seems, then, that these things were left them in secret tradition, because God was not willing that any besides themselves should know his mind and will. But they have at last shown themselves more full of benignity towards mankind than they would allow God to be, inasmuch as they have committed this secret law to writing. And to this purpose is their Confession in 'the Golden Altar,' 'א אמסר עלה 'לע מובע ההובק 'עיך הרתים וקריתית שurette חודה שבכתב BEGIN WITH 'י עיך וחרת ש튜יע שדיא פירושה —'It is impossible for us to stand or abide upon the foundation of our holy law, which is the written law, unless it be by the oral law, which is the exposition thereof.' Wherein, they not only declare their judgments concerning their traditions, but also express the reason of their obstinate adherence unto them; which is, that without it they cannot maintain themselves in their present Judaism. And so indeed is the case with them; for innumerable testimonies of the Scriptures rise up directly against their infidelity, and they can never keep their station, but by a horrible corruption of them through their traditions. On this account, it is a common thing with them, in the advice which they give unto their disciples, to advise them to prefer the study of the Talmud before the study of the Scripture, and the sayings of their wise men before the sayings of the prophets; thus, plainly expressing an utter disregard of the written word, any farther than as they suppose the sense of it explained in their oral law. Neither are they here forsaken by their associates. The principal design of all the books which have been lately published by the Romanists, and they have not been a few, hath been to prove the certainty and sufficiency of their traditions, in matters of their faith and worship, above that of the written word.

§ 20. Fifthly, There are some few remaining among the eastern Jews, who reject all this story concerning the oral law, and professedly adhere unto the written word only. These the masters of their present religion and persuasion do, by common consent brand as heretics, calling them Scripturists, or Scripturarians, or Biblists, the very name of reproach wherewith the Romanists stigmatize all those who reject their traditions. These are their רמראים, that is 'Biblists' or 'Scripturarians;' and everywhere they term them רמראים, 'heretics,' and endeavour to prove them guilty הַרְמַיִם of 'heresy' in the highest degree. Some would have them to be the offspring of the old Sadducees, to deny the resurrection and the world to come, as men usually care not much what they impute unto those whom they esteem heretics. But the falsity hereof is notorious, and so acknowledged by others, and confuted by the writings of the Karanians themselves. Yea, the author of Cosri affirms, that they are more studious in the law than the Rabbins; and that their reasons were more weighty than theirs, and lead more towards the naked sense of the Scripture. But this they charge upon them, namely, that rejecting the sure rule of their
traditions, they ran into singular expositions of the law, and so divided it, and made many laws of it, having no certain means of agreement among themselves. So saith Rabbi Jehuda Levita, the author of the fore-mentioned Cosri, 'The Karæans multiply laws according to their own opinion,' for which he inveighs against them after he had commended them, as is mentioned above. And the same is objected against them by Maimonides, on Pirke Aboth; as though it were not known that the greatest part of their Talmud, the sacred treasury of their oral law, is taken up with differences and disputes of their masters, with a multitude of various opinions and contradictory conceptions about their traditions. Thus deal the Romanists also with their adversaries: this they charge them with. They are heretics, Biblists, and, by adhering to the Scripture alone, have no certainty among themselves, but run into diversities of opinions, because they have deserted the unerring rule of their Cabala; though the world is filled with the noise of their own conflicts, notwithstanding the pretended relief which they have by means of their traditions.

It remains that we consider how these traditions come to be communicated unto others, out of the secret storehouse wherein originally they were deposited. This, as I have elsewhere, and partly before declared, was by their being committed unto writing by Rabbi Juda Hakadosh, whose collections, with their expositions in their Talmud, do give us a perfect account, if we may believe them, of that secret law which came down unto them by oral tradition from Moses. And something like this is pretended by the Romanists; many of their traditions, they say, are recorded in the rescripts of popes, decrees of councils, and constitutions of the canon law, and other such sacred means of declaring the oral instructions of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles.

But herein the Jews deal with us far more ingenuously than they. They tell us plainly that now their whole oral law is written, and that they have no reserve of authentic traditions, not yet declared; so that where Austin says of his adversaries, 'Nescit habere præter Scripturas legitimas et Propheticas, Judæos quasdam traditiones suas quas non Scriptas habent, sed memoriter tenent, et alter in alterum loquendo transfundit, quam deuterосin vocant.' Either he knew not of the Mishne that was then written, or this opinion of secret traditions was continued until the finishing and promulgation of the Babylonish Talmud, which was sundry years after his death. But here the Romanists fail us; for although they have given us heaps upon heaps of their traditions, by the means afore-mentioned, yet they plead that they have still an inexhaustible treasure of them laid up in their church stores, and in the breast of their holy father, to be drawn forth at all times, as occasion shall require.

And thus have we taken a brief prospect of the consent of both these apostate churches, in that principle which hath been the means of their apostasy, and is the great engine whereby they are rendered incurable therein.

EXERCITATION VIII.

THE FIRST DISSERTATION CONCERNING THE MESSIAH, PROVING HIM
TO BE PROMISED OF OLD.

§ 1. Principles presupposed in the Apostle's discourse in his Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 1. We proceed now to what we chiefly intend in all these discourses; which is the consideration and discussion of those great principles, as of all religion in general, so of the Christian in particular. These the apostle supposes as the foundation of his whole reasoning with the Hebrews, and they are the basis that he stands upon, in the management of his whole design. For in all discourses that are parænetical, as this Epistle for the most part is, there are always some principles taken for granted, which give life and efficacy unto the exhortations in them, and into which these are resolved. For as to attempt to persuade men to receive particular points of faith, opinion, or practice, without a previous conviction of general principles of truth, from which the persuasions used do naturally flow and arise, is a thing weak and ineffectacious; so to be employed in the demonstration of the principles themselves, when the especial end aimed at is to persuade, would bring confusion into all discourse.

Wherefore, although our apostle do assert and confirm those dogmata, and articles of truth, which he persuaded the Hebrews to embrace; yet he supposeth and takes for granted those more general κυριας δοξας or 'first maxims,' which are the foundation both of the doctrines and exhortations insisted on, as all skill in teaching doth require. These principles we shall now attempt to draw forth and consider. They are the following:

First. That there was a Messiah or Saviour of mankind from sin and
punishment, promised upon, and from the first entrance of sin into the world, in whom all acceptable worship of God was founded, and in whom all the religion of the sons of men was to centre.

Secondly. That this Messiah, long before promised, had been actually exhibited in the world, and had finished the work committed unto him when the apostle wrote this Epistle.

Thirdly. That Jesus of Nazareth was this Messiah, and that what he had done and suffered was the work and duty promised of old concerning him.

There is not a line in the epistle to the Hebrews, that doth not virtually begin and end in these principles; not an assertion, not a doctrine, not an exhortation, that is not built upon this triple foundation. They are also the great verities, της ὑμολογίας χριστιανῆς, of the Christian profession or religion. A sincere endeavour, therefore, to explain and vindicate them, may not be unacceptable, especially in these days, wherein, as on the one hand, there are various thoughts of heart about the present condition and expectation of the Jews; so, on the other, there are many who are ready with a presumptuous boldness ακινητα κίνεω, and to call in question the fundamentals of all religion. Now the first of these principles is at this day by several vain imaginations obscured by the Jews, to their utter loss of all benefit by it; and hath been so for many generations, although it was the life and soul of the religion of their forefathers, as shall be demonstrated. And the two latter are by them expressly denied, and maliciously contended against. Here then we shall fix and confirm these principles in the order wherein we have laid them down; declaring on every one of them the conceptions and persuasions of the Jews concerning the promised Messiah, and removing in the close their objections against the faith of Christians in this matter, in a peculiar exercitation to that purpose. And the confirmation and vindication of the first of these principles, is the object of our present discourse.

§ 2. Besides the testimony of God himself in his word, we have a concurrent suffrage from the whole creation, that man in the beginning was formed, as in the image, so in the favour of God, and unto his glory. And as he was not liable unto any evil, which is the effect of God's displeasure, nor defective in any good necessary to preserve him in the condition wherein he was made, so he was destitute of nothing that was any way requisite to carry him on to that further enjoyment of God for which he was designed, Gen. i. 26, 31; Eccles. vii. 29. For God being infinitely good, wise, righteous, and powerful, creating man to know, love, honour, and enjoy him; thereby to glorify those holy properties of his nature, which exerted themselves in his creation, (which that he did, the nature of those intellectual perfections wherewith he endowed him, doth undeniably evince,) it was utterly impossible that either he should not delight in the work of his own hands, the effect of his own wisdom and power, or not furnish him with those faculties and abilities by which he might answer the ends of his creation. To suppose a failure in any of these, is contrary to the prime dictates of reason. For infinite wisdom can do nothing in vain, nothing not perfectly suited unto the end whereunto it is designed: neither can infinite goodness allow any defect in ought that proceedeth from it, Gen. i. 13,

'God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.'

Hence many philosophers saw and granted, that the first cause in the production of all things did δεω βαδιζείν, proceed by such a certain reason and way, as that every thing might both in itself, with reference unto its
own especial end, and also in relation to the universe, have its proper rectitude and goodness sufficient unto its station and condition. This ὅς the Scripture calls βοώη τον ξελαματος του θεων, Eph. i. 11, 'the counsel of the will of God;' expressing the co-operation of absolute sovereignty and infinite wisdom. And these uncontrollable notions of nature or reason, cast men of old into their difficulties about the origin of evil. For this they plainly saw, that it must be accidental and occasional; but where to fix that occasion they knew not. Those who, to extricate themselves out of this difficulty, fancied two supreme principles or causes, the one author of all good, the other of all evil, were ever exploded as persons bidding defiance unto all principles of reason, whereby we are distinguished from the beasts that perish. This, I say, men generally discerned, that evil, as it now exists, could not have entered into the world, without a disturbance of that harmony, wherein all things at the beginning were constituted by infinite wisdom and goodness, and without some interruption of that dependence on God, from whom the world proceeded.

The very first apprehensions of the nature of God, and the condition of the universe, declare, that man was formed free from sin, which is his voluntary subduction of himself from under the government of his Maker; and free from trouble, which is the effect of God's displeasure, in consequence of man's subduction or deviation; in which two, the whole nature of evil consisteth, so that evil must have some other origin.

§ 3. Furthermore, In this first effort of immense power, did God glorify himself, both in the wisdom and goodness wherewith it was accompanied, and also in that righteousness whereby, as the supreme rector and governor of all, he allotted unto his rational creatures the law of their obedience, annexing a reward thereunto, in a mixture of justice and bounty. For that obedience should be rewarded, is of justice; but that such a reward should be proposed unto the temporary obedience of a creature, as is the eternal enjoyment of God, was of mere grace and bounty. And that things should have continued in the state and condition wherein they were created, I mean as unto mankind, supposing an accomplishment of the obedience prescribed unto them, is manifest from the very first notions we have of the nature of God; for we no sooner conceive that he is, than we assent that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6. This is essential unto him, and inseparable from his nature as the sovereign ruler of the works of his hands. And thus was the continuance of this blessed state of the creation of all things provided for, and laid in a tendency unto further glory; all distance between God and man being excluded, except that which is natural, necessary, and infinite, arising from their beings. There was no sin on the one side, nor displeasure on the other. And this secured the order of the universe. For what should cause any confusion there, whilst the law of its creation was observed, which could not be transgressed by brute and inanimate creatures?

§ 4. That this state of things hath been altered from time immemorial; that there is a corrupt spring of sin and disorder in the nature of man; that the whole world lieth in ignorance, darkness, evil, and confusion; that there is an alienation and displeasure between God and man, God revealing his wrath and judgments from heaven, whence at first nothing might be expected but fruits of goodness, and pledges of love, and man naturally dreading the presence of God, and trembling at the effects of that presence, which at first was his life, joy, and refreshment, reason itself,
with prudent observation, will discover: it hath done so unto many contemplative men of old. The whole creation groans out this complaint, as the apostle witnesseth, Rom. viii. 20, 21, and God makes it manifest in his judgments every day, ch. i. 18. That things were not made at first in this state and condition in which they now are, that they came not thus immediately from the hand of infinite wisdom and goodness, is easily discernible. God made not man to be at a perpetual quarrel with him, nor to fill the world with tokens of his displeasure because of sin. This men saw of old by the light of nature; but what it was that opened the flood-gates unto all that evil and sin which they saw and observed in the world, they could not tell. The springs of it indeed they searched after, but with more vanity and disappointment than they who sought for the sources of the Nile. The evils they saw were catholic and unlimited, and therefore not to be assigned unto particular causes; and of any general one, proportioned unto their production, they were utterly ignorant. And this ignorance filled all their wisdom and science with fatal mistakes, and rendered the best of their discoveries but uncertain conjectures. Yea, the poets who followed the confused rumours of old traditions, about things whose original was occasional and accidental, give us a better shadow of truth than the philosophers, who would reduce them unto general rules of reason, which they would no way answer.

Post ignem ætherea domo
Subductum, macies et nova febrium
Terris incubuit cohors;
Semotique prius tarda necessitas

is a better allusion to the origin of sin and punishment, than all the disputations of the philosophers will afford us.

§ 5. But that which they could not attain unto, (and because they could not attain to it, they wandered in all their apprehensions about God and themselves, without certainty or consistency,) has been clearly made known to us by divine revelation. The sum of it is briefly proposed by the apostle, Rom. v. 12, 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.' Sin and death are comprehensive of all that is evil in any kind in the world. All that is morally so, is sin; all that is penally so, is death. The entrance of both into the world, was by the sin of one man, that is Adam, the common father of us all. This the philosophers knew not, and therefore knew nothing clearly of the condition of mankind in relation unto God. But two things doth the Scripture teach us concerning this entrance of sin into the world.

First. The punishment that was threatened unto, and inflicted on the disobedience of Adam. Whatever there is of disorder, darkness, or confusion, in the nature of things here below; whatever is uncertain, irregular, horrid, unequal, or destructive in the universe; whatever is penal unto man, or may be so in this life, or in eternity; whatever the wrath of the holy righteous God, revealing itself from heaven, hath brought, or shall ever bring, on the works of his hands; are to be referred unto this head. Other origin of them can no man assign.

Secondly. The moral corruption of the nature of man, the spring of all sin, the other head of evil, proceeded hence also. For by this means, that
which before was good and upright, has become an inexhaustible fountain of sin. And this was the state of things in the world, immediately upon the fall and sin of Adam.

Now the work which we assign unto the Messiah, is the deliverance of mankind from this state and condition. On the facts of the fall of man, and on the misery consequent on this fall, as those are revealed in Scripture, is the whole doctrine of the office of the Messiah founded, as shall afterwards more largely be declared. We contend that, in the wisdom, grace, and righteousness of God, he was promised and exhibited as a relief against this sin and misery of mankind, as our apostle also expressly proveth, ch. ii. of this Epistle unto the Hebrews. This is denied by them, as that which would overthrow all their fond imaginations about his person and office. We must therefore consider what is their sense and apprehension about these things, with what may be thence educated for their own conviction, and then confirm the truth of our assertion from the testimony of those Scriptures which they themselves own and receive.

§ 6. The first effect and consequent of the sin of Adam, was the punishment wherewith it was attended. What is written here of πτώς in the Scripture, the Jews neither can nor do deny. Death was in the commination given to deter him from his transgression. רעהו רוח, Gen. ii. 17, 'Dying thou shalt die.' Neither can it be reasonably pretended, that it was death to his own person only, which is intended in that expression. The event sufficiently evinceth the contrary. Whatever is, or might be evil unto himself and to his whole posterity, with the residue of the creation, so far as he or they might be any way concerned therein, hath grown out of this commination. And this is sufficiently manifested in the execution of it, Gen. iii. 16—19. The malediction was but the execution of the commination. It was not consistent with the justice of God to increase the penalty, after the sin was committed. The threatening therefore was the rule and measure of the curse. But this is here extended by God himself, not only to all the miseries of man (Adam and his whole posterity) in this life, in labour, disappointment, sweat, and sorrow, with death under, and by virtue of, the curse; but to the whole earth also, and consequently to those superior regions and orbs of heaven, by whose influence the earth is as it were governed and disposed unto the use of man, Hos. ii. 21, 22. It may be yet further inquired what was to be the duration and continuance of this punishment to be inflicted in consequence of this commination and malediction. Now there is not any thing tending in the least degree to intimate, that it should have a term affixed unto it when it should expire; or that it should not be commensurate unto the existence or being of the sinner. God lays the curse on man, and there he leaves him, and that for ever. A miserable life he was to spend, and then to die under the curse of God, without hope of emerging into a better condition. About his existence after this life, we have no controversy with the Jews. They all acknowledge the immortality of the soul; for the sect of the Sadducees is long since extinct, neither are they followed by the Karaëans in their atheistical opinions, as hath been declared. Some of them indeed incline unto the Pythagorean metempsychosis, but all acknowledge the soul's perpetuity.

Supposing then Adam to die penally under the curse of God, as without extraordinary relief he must have done, the righteousness and truth of God being engaged for the execution of the threatening against him, I desire to know what would have been the state and condition of his soul? Doth either revelation or reason intimate, that he should not have continued
for ever under the same penalty and curse, in a state of death or separation from God? And if he should have done so, then was death eternal in the commination. This is that which with respect unto the present effects in this life, and the punishment due to sin, is termed by our apostle, ἡ ὀργὴ ἐκποιήσεως, I Thess. i 10, 'the wrath to come,' from whence the Messiah is the deliverer.

Nor will the Jews themselves contend, that the guilt of any sin respects only temporal punishment. The event of sin unto themselves they take to be only temporal, imagining their observation of the law of Moses, such as it is, to be a sufficient expiation of punishment eternal. But unto all strangers from the law, all that have not a relief provided, they make every sin mortal; and Adam, I suppose, had not the privilege of the present Jews, to observe the law of Moses. Wherefore they all agree, that by his repentence he delivered himself from death eternal, which, if it were not due unto his sin, he could not do; for no man can by any means escape that, whereof he is in no danger. And this repentence of his they affirm to have been attended with severe discipline and self-maceration, intimating the greatness of his sin, and the difficulty of his escape from the punishment due thereunto. So Rabbi Eliezer, in Pirke Aboth, c. 20, ἡ ἀνάξια τοῦ ἁγίου ἐναντίων, 'On the first day of the week, Adam entered into the waters of the upper Gihon, until the waters came unto his neck, and he afflicted himself seven weeks, until his body became like a sieve. And Adam said before the holy blessed God, Lord of the whole world, let my sins I pray thee be done away from me, and accept of my repentance, that all ages may know that there is repentance, and that thou wilt receive them that repent and turn unto thee.' Hence also they tell us, that upon the pardon of his sin, he sang a song of praise unto the Lord on the sabbath day, which is mentioned in the Targum on the Song of Solomon, ch. i. 1, as one of the songs in reference whereunto that of Solomon is called, שיר חדש ו_ajax, 'the Song of Songs;' or the most excellent of them. And although indeed that expression, ימים שלמה, 'dying thou shalt die,' denotes only the certainty and vehemency of the death threatened, to express which the Hebrew language useth reduplications; yet some of them have not been averse to apprehend a twofold death, namely, of the body and also of the soul, to be intimated in that expression, as Fagius on the place well observes. Body and soul, they say, both sinned; and therefore both were to be punished. אולכ הצעות תומא באל דוד וכס מרימ דת נמסוכ ירל דוד והסיג את עתא אולכ דוד שהלות ומכות באד - 'If the flesh sin without the spirit, why is the soul punished? Is it one thing that sins, and another that is punished? Or rather is it not thus, that both sin together?' and so both are justly punished together.

§ 7. Thus is the sin and punishment of our first parents themselves acknowledged by them. And the condition of their posterity is the same. What was threatened unto, and was inflicted upon those who first sinned, all are now liable and obnoxious unto. Are they not all as subject unto death as was Adam himself? Are the miseries of man in his labour, or the sorrows of woman in child-bearing, taken away? Is the earth itself freed from the effects of the curse? Do they not die who never sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression? The Jews themselves grant, that all death is penal: אלי מות הַבֵּין אמיט אָנָי יאָדוֹר הָלָּכָה וַעֲלֵיהֶם - 'There is no death without sin; no punishment or correction without iniquity.' It is the saying of R. Ame in the Talmud, Tractat. Sabbat. cited in Sepher Ikkarim, lib. 4, cap. 13. And this principle Maimonides carries so high,
as to deny all correction of love, affirming none to be of that mind, but some Gaonims deceived by the sect of Muatzali, More Nebuch. p. 3, cap. 17. And they who die penally under the curse, abide in no other estate than that mentioned. They acknowledge also the remainder of the curse on the earth itself on the same account.

The whole world,' says one of their masters, 'was not created but for man; and therefore after man sinned, it came short of its first perfection.' But these things being of some use for their conviction, as also to discover the perverse obstinacy of some of their later masters, we may a little more particularly take them along with us.

§ 8. First. They acknowledge that Adam was a common head unto all mankind. So saith Manasse Ben Israel from their principles: 'Cum itaque esset Adam futurus caput et principium humanae naturae, necesse erat illi a Deo conferri omnem perfectionem et scientiam: De Fragilitate, p. 34.—'Whereas Adam was to be the head and principle of human nature, it was necessary that God should endow him with all perfection and knowledge.' And this perfection of his knowledge, Aben Ezra, on Gen. ii. proves from God's bringing all creatures unto him, to give them names according to their nature. And the same author again, in his discourse De Termino Vitæ. 'Aben Ezra inquit nominibus propriis in Sacra Scriptura non praefigi He demonstrativum, quod tamen in voce Adam fit, Gen. iii. 22. ratio est, quia in Adamo notantur omnes ejus posteri, et universa species humanae designatur.'—'Aben Ezra says, that He Hājēdia is not prefixed unto proper names in the Scripture, only it is so unto the word Adam, Gen. iii. 22; and the reason is, because in Adam all his posterity, the whole race of mankind, is denoted and signified.' Now this could not be, but by virtue of some divine constitution. For naturally, Adam could have no other relation to his posterity, than every other man hath unto his own. And this was no other but that covenant which God made with all mankind in him; whose promises and threatenings, rewards and punishments, must therefore equally respect them with him.

Wherefore, secondly, they grant that on this account his sin was imputed unto all his posterity. That is, some of them do so, and those the most sober of them. So Rabbi Menahem Rakanatensis in sec. Bereshith, &c. אֵיבֶּה הַיָּדָּה עַל הַחַטֵּא אַוֶּד הַחַד הנִהוּה, 'It is no wonder why the sin of Adam and Eve was engraven and sealed with the signet of the King, to be propagated unto all following generations; for in the day that Adam was created, all things were finished, so that he was the perfection and complement of the whole workmanship of this world. Therefore when he sinned, the whole world sinned, whose sin we bear and suffer, which is not so in the sin of his posterity.' To be sealed with the signet of the King, is their expression of God's constitution.

And these words are very consonant to those of our apostle, Rom. v. 12. 'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that, or because in him all have sinned.' To the same purpose speaks the Targum on Eccles. vii. 29, in the copies followed by the Jayan and London bibles; (for so the words are not in those of Buxtorf, nor the Biblia Regia,) 'God made the first man upright and innocent before him, but the serpent and Eve seduced him, and gave cause why the day of death should come on him and all the inhabitants of the earth.' And we can have no more authentic testimony of the apprehensions of their ancient doctors, than
what their Targums afford us. And therefore Joseph Albo in Sepher Ikkarim expressly concludes, lib. i. chap. 11, ‘that all the punishments relating unto Adam and Eve for their first sin, belong unto all mankind.’ And whereas they fancy that some persons spent their days without actual sin, at least without any such as should deserve death, they charge their death on the guilt of the sin of Adam. So the Targum on the last chapter of Ruth: ‘And Hobed begat Jesse, who was called Nachash, and there was no iniquity or corruption in him for which he should be delivered into the hand of the angel of death to take his soul from him; and he lived many days, until the counsel that the serpent gave to Eve, abode before the Lord; and upon that counsel were all the inhabitants of the earth made guilty of death, and upon the account of that sin died Jesse the righteous.’ Lud. Capellus in his annotations on John iii. hath an observation on this passage in the Targum, not unworthy consideration. The Jews call Jesus שֶׂרֶף without י; which differs little from רָשָׁע; and so he may be here intended; for he may be called רָשָׁע both because he was prefigured by the brazen serpent, and because the names of שֶׂרֶף and רָשָׁע, are the same by Gematria, or in their numeral letters; a great occasion amongst them of changing the names of persons and things. And this they might have from some tradition which they understood not. The like testimony we have in Siphre: שֶׂרֶף נִלְאוֹלָל וּאֵלֶּה הָמוֹר. ‘Rabbi Jose the Galilean said, go forth and learn the merit of Messiah the king, and the reward of that righteous One above the first Adam, who had only negative precepts given unto him which he transgressed; behold how many deaths befel him and his generations, and the generations of his generations unto the end of all generations.’ Answerable unto that of the apostle, Rom. v. 18. ‘Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came unto all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, unto the justification of life.’

And this punishment of the sin of Adam and Eve, they grant to have been so terrible, that they say, that in the day they were cast out of Paradise God lamented over them. דָּם הַשָּׁם אֲשֶׁר יָפְלָה בּוֹ וָאֵלֶּה מַרְאֵי מַעֲשֵׂה דָּם הַשָּׁם—‘Even as Adam and Eve when they were judged and cast out of the garden of Eden, and the Lord of the world lamented over them.’ Targum on Lamenta. ch. i. 1. And to show also that the whole creation was made subject unto vanity upon the sin of our first parents, Moses Haddarshan in Bereschit Rabba on Gen. iii. 6, informs us, that Eve gave of the fruit of the tree which she took unto all the beasts of the field, and birds of the air, only (which they interpret the Phoenix) excepted. The truth indeed in these expressions is clouded with fables and trifles; but they who are offended at them may do well to direct us unto Judaic writers that are free from such follies; and yet on these things do innumerable poor souls venture their eternal condition, in an opposition to the blessed gospel of the glorious God.

The latter masters I acknowledge are in this whole matter lubricious and uncertain; and they have been so in a special manner, ever since they began to understand the plea of Christians, for the necessity of satisfaction to be made by the sufferings of the Messiah, from the doctrine of the fall and sin of man. Hence Abarbinel in his commentary on Isa. liii, expressly argues against those sufferings of the Messiah, from the non-necessity of them with reference unto the sin of Adam. Also some of them contend that it was not so sorely revenged as we assert it to have been. ‘Ask an heretic,’ (a Christian) saith Lipman in his Nizzachon, ‘how it can enter into their hearts to think that God should use so great severity against the sin
of Adam, that he should hold him bound for so small a matter, namely, for the eating of an apple, that he should destroy him in this world, and that to come, and not him only, but also all his posterity.

But the blind Pharisee disputes not so much against us as against God himself. Who was it that denounced death in case he so transgressed? Who was it that pronounced him miserable, and the world accused on the account thereof? Are we to blame, if the Jews are not pleased with the ways of God? Besides, although to eat an apple be but a small thing, yet to disobey the command of the great God, is no such small matter as the Jew supposes; especially that command which set boundaries to that excellent condition, wherein Adam in the right of all his posterity was placed. But these exceptions owe their origin unto a discovery of the tendency of that truth, which otherwise, as we have shown, they are convinced of; and which we have sufficiently cleared from the Scripture.

§ 10. The second consequence of the first sin of man, is the moral corruption of nature, the spring of all that evil of actual sin that is in the world. And herein we have a full consent from the Jews, delivered after their manner, both in the Targums, Talmuds, and private writings of their principal masters. For an evil concupiscence in the heart of man from his very conception they generally acknowledge.

The name they give to this evil concupiscence is מַעֲשֶׂה הָרוּתָּה לִבְּנֶיךָ, the evil figment of the heart: properly enough, from Gen. vi. 5. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth; מַעֲשֶׂה הָדוֹרָה לִבְּנֶיךָ, and that the whole figment of the thoughts [or computation] of his heart was only evil every day. Hence have they taken מַעֲשֶׂה הָרוּתָּה, a more proper name than that used by Christian divines of Originale Peccatum. And it is a ludicrous ignorance in some of the late Rabbins, to deny original sin, as doth the author of the Questions and Objections, published by Brenius, and others of them, and yet in the meantime grant this evil figment in all mankind, which was not in Adam in his innocency. And to this they oppose that מַעֲשֶׂה הָדוֹרָה לִבְּנֶיךָ, that ‘good concupiscence,’ which they fancy to come on every one at the age of thirteen years, when he becomes Filius Preacteri, or liable unto the commands of God. The Targumists term it in the Chaldee tongue, מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת לִבְּנֵךְ, to the same purpose.

And it is mentioned by them, Psa. xiii. 5, that מַעֲשֶׂה הָדוֹרָה לִבְּנֶיךָ, ‘the evil figment, say not I have ruled over him;’ instead of the enemy; for it is the chief enemy of men. Twice also it is mentioned in the Targum of Psalm 1. 14, מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת לִבְּנֵךְ, ‘restrain the evil figment, and it shall be accounted before God as a sacrifice.’ Doubtless, none more acceptable; and to the same purpose the words are also, ver. 23. And in Psalm xci. 12, that thy ‘foot stumble not at the evil figment which is like a stone.’ That is, that it seduce thee not, that it cause thee not to offend, to stumble and fall into sin. See James i. 14. And Psalm cxix. 70, they call it absolutely מַעֲשֶׂה לִבְּנֶיךָ, מַעֲשֶׂה, the figment, or evil fomes of the heart. מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת לִבְּנֵךְ, מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת, מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת, the figment of their heart is made thick or hard as with fatness; an expression not unusual in the Scripture to set out impenitency and security in sinning, Isa. vi. 10. And in Isa. lxii. 10, they mention מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת, the thought of lust or of the figment; which is that conceiving of it, mentioned by James, ch. i. 14. For מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת is the inward evil thoughts of the heart, or the first motion of sin. Moreover, they do not unfitly describe it by other property; as Eccles. ix. 14, מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְשֵׁת, ‘the evil figment or concupiscence which is like unto a great king;’ namely, because of its power; on which account in the New Testament it is said
basileus, to reign as a king, because of the subjection unto it, ev taiες ετυθυμαις, in the lusts or concupiscence of the heart, Rom. vi. 12, and κυριευειν, or to have dominion, ver. 14, which is to the same purpose with that of the Targumist; evil concupiscence is like a great king. And this testimony we have given unto this moral corruption of nature in the Targums, the most ancient records of the Judaical apprehensions about these things, that are now extant, or have been so for many ages.

§ 11. The Talmudists have expressed the same thoughts about this inbred and indwelling sin; and to set forth their conceptions about it, they have given it several names not unsuited unto those descriptions of it, which are given us by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament. As,

First. They call it רע, that is, malum, evil; a name, as they say, given by God himself, Gen. viii. 21. Hence is that observation of R. Moses Haddarshan, from R. Jose in Bereshit Rabba; 'Sad, or dark is that mass against which he that made it gives testimony that it is evil; and our masters affirm that naught is that plant, which he that planted it witnessedeth to be evil.' And to the same purpose it is termed in the New Testament, ή αμαρτία, that sin, that evil thing that dwelleth in us, Rom. vii.

Secondly. They say, that Moses calleth it, הָרָע, præputium, or uncircumcision, Deut. x. 16. And therefore in Tract. Sand., cap. 11, to the question, when an infant may be made partaker of the world to come, Ra. Nachman the son of Isaac, answereth, עֵשֶׁת מִנְשֵׁי כְּרֵיכֶל, presently after he is circumcised; circumcision being admitted of old as the sign of the taking away by grace of the natural evil figment of the heart. And thus also it is called by our apostle ακροβουστία, or uncircumcision; Col. ii. 13.

Thirdly. They say David calls it זְמָזָה an unclean thing. This they draw from Psalm li. 12, by the rule of contraries, a great guide in their expositions. Create in me a clean heart, O God; whence it appears that the heart of itself is unclean. And the apostle gives it us under the same name and notion, 1 Thes. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Fourthly. Solomon as they suppose, calls it מְאֹר, an enemy or hater, Prov. xxv. 21. With what degree of propriety they gather this name from that place, ipsis viderint; this I know that, to the same purpose, it is called in the New Testament, ευθρανία, enmity, or hatred, Rom. viii. 7, and all the effects of enmity, or actions of an enemy, as נירס, are ascribed unto it, I Pet. ii. 11.

Fifthly. Isaiah calls it בָּשִׁיט, the offence, or stumbling-block, Isa. lvii. 14. παραπτωμα, Rom. v. 18. See James i. 14, 15. The cause of our stumbling and falling.

Sixthly. Ezekiel calls it, תִּזְבָּה, a stone, ch. xxxvi. 26. The reason of this appellation is commonly known; neither doth any allusion better set out the nature of it, from its effects. καρδία σκληρα κατ' αμετανοητος, an hard and impenitent heart, Rom. ii. 5.

Seventhly. Joel calls it, as they say, מְכֹר, that hidden thing, ch. ii. 20, for so they interpret מְכֹר in that place; whereby they seem to intend that darkness and deceitfulness, which are often ascribed unto it in the New Testament. And on these names they largely comment. Now, though I shall not justify their deduction of them, from the places mentioned, some of which are, however, proper enough unto their purpose; yet, as was said, the names themselves seem not unsuitable unto that description of it which we have in the New Testament. Besides, they speak elsewhere to the same purpose. In Neve Shalom, lib. 10, cap. 9, they term it סַעְרָה חָרֶם, the de-
filement of the serpent: see 2 Cor. xi. 3; and מִלְתָּהּ אֶלֶף, from Eccles. iv. 13, 'An old and foolish king;' so is that place interpreted in Midrash Coheleth. And this, as we observed before, answers what we are taught in the New Testament, concerning the reign and dominion of sin; as also to the name given to it by the apostle, of παλαίως αὐθρωπός, 'the old man;' both being comprised in that expression, an old and foolish king; though the text be wrested by them in their usual manner. And they give a tolerable reason in the same place for this appellation of the old man; because, say they, it is joined unto a man in his infancy, and continues with him unto his old age; but the בְּרֵאשִׁית, that is, the 'new man,' or good concupiscence comes not on our nature until the age of thirteen years; so the Midrash, feeling in the dark after that supply of grace, which is so clearly revealed in the gospel. And in Tractat. Sandrim. fol. 91, they ask this question: רַעְתָהוּ בַּיָּמִים שֶׁלֹּא בָּאָרָם, 'from what time doth the evil concupiscence bear rule in a man; from the time of his birth, or from the time of his forming in the womb?' Rabbi answered, 'from the time of his conception and forming in the womb.' And this Kimchi, on Psalm li., illustrates by a similitude, not altogether impertinent. As, saith he, 'He that sows a bitter berry, that bitterness becomes natural unto the tree and fruit that grows thereon.' And this concupiscence which is in the heart of man from his conception, they acknowledge to have proceeded originally from the sin of our first parents, for if it were implanted in him at his creation, it must follow, that God himself is the principal efficient cause of all moral evil.

Unto this purpose speaks their late master in his preface to his book, de Fragilitate. 'Hic vitiositas,' saith he, 'ex primorum Parentum profecta crimen contagioque invasit utramque animæ rationalis facultatem, mentem qua apprehendimus, et voluntatem qua appetimus;—'This vitiosity and contagion, proceeding from the sin of our first parents, hath invaded both the faculties of our rational souls, both the understanding and the will.' And for the continuance of this evil, or its abode in us, they express it in Bereshith Rabba; כָּלָמִין שְׁמַעְתֵּרֵי תַּפעִים דֶּה הָסִּים צֹירֵי, 'so long as the righteous live they wage war with their concupiscence.' And they variously set forth the growth of it, where it is not corrected by grace. At first, they say, it is like a spider's thread, but at last like a cart-rope, from Isa. lix. 5, and chap. v. 18. And again, in the beginning it is like a stranger, then as a guest, but lastly as a master of the house; see James i. 14, 15. And, according to their wonted manner, on Gen. iv. 7, where רֵא בֶרֶךְ of the masculine gender is joined with מַעְיָם of the feminine, they observe, in Bereshith Rabba, sec. 22. בְּתוֹלֵדוֹת הַנְּאָה מַעְיָם אָבָה בֵּית אָבָה מַעְיָם כָּפָר, at first it is like a woman, but afterwards it waxeth strong like a man.

§ 12. More testimonies of this nature, from the writings that are of authority amongst them, might be produced, but that these are sufficient unto our purpose. What we aim at, is to evidence their conviction of that manifold misery which came upon mankind, on the entrance of sin into the world. And to two things we have produced their suffrage.

First. The change of the primitive condition of man, by his defection from the law of his creation. This made him obnoxious in his whole person and in all his concernments to the displeasure and curse of God, to all the evil which in this world he feels, or fears in another; to death temporal and eternal. And hence did all the disorder which is in the universe arise. To all this we have found them freely testifying. And this must be acknowledged by all men, who will not brutishly deny what their own con-
sciences dictate unto them, and what the condition of the whole lower world proclaims, or who will not irrationally ascribe such things unto God, as are utterly inconsistent with his wisdom, goodness, righteousness, and holiness. And.

Secondly. We have manifested their acknowledgment, that a principle of sin, or moral evil, hath invaded the nature of man; or that from the sin of our first parents, there is an evil concupiscence in the heart of every man, continually and incessantly inclining the soul unto operations suitable unto it; that is unto all moral evil whatever. From both these it unavoidably follows, on the first notions of the righteousness, holiness, veracity, and faithfulness of God, that mankind in this estate and condition, can justly expect nothing but a confluence of evil in this world, and at the close of their pilgrimage, to perish with a ruin commensurate unto their existence. For, as we have shown above, God as the sovereign Lord of his creatures, has given them a law, good, just, and equal, and has appointed the penalty of death and his everlasting displeasure therein, unto the transgressors of it, and has sufficiently promulgated both law and penalty. Now, from this it follows, that all this constitution of a law, and threatening of a penalty, was vain and ludicrous, (as Satan in the serpent pretended) or mankind is rendered absolutely miserable and cursed, and that for ever. Now which of these is to be concluded, divine revelation in the Scripture, reason, and the event of things, will readily determine.

§ 13. That God, without the least impeachment of his righteousness or goodness, might have left all mankind remediless in this condition, is manifest, both from what hath been discoursed concerning the means whereby they were brought into it, and from his dealings with angels on the like occasion. The condition wherein man was created, was morally good and upright; the state wherein he was placed outwardly happy and blessed; the law given unto him just and equal; the reward proposed unto him, glorious and sure, and his defection from this condition voluntary. What shall we say, then, is God unjust who inflicteth vengeance? God forbid. The execution of a righteous sentence, upon the voluntary transgression of a law just and equal, hath no unrighteousness in it. And this was the sum of what God did in this matter, as to the misery that came on mankind. And who should have judged him if he had left man for ever to eat of the fruit of his own ways, and to be filled with his own devices. As he had before expressed his power and wisdom, so he had satisfied his goodness and bounty in his creation, with the endowments and enjoyments which he bestowed according unto the law thereof; and what could man look for farther at his hands?

Hence Adam, when his eyes were opened to see the nature of evil, in that actual sense which he had in his conscience of the guilt that he had contracted, had not the least expectation of relief or mercy. And the folly of the course which he took in hiding himself, argues sufficiently both his present amazement, and that he knew of nothing better to betake himself unto. Therefore doth he give that account of the result of his thoughts, as unto the relation that was between God and him, and what only he now looked for from him, 'I heard thy voice and was afraid.' Neither would any revelation that God had then made of himself, either by the works of his power and wisdom, or by any inbred impressions on the souls of men concreated with them, give encouragement unto them that had sinned against him to expect relief. Besides, he had dealt thus with angels. Upon their first sin, he spared them not, but at once without hope
of recovery, cast them under the chains of darkness to be kept unto the final judgment of the great day. On this our apostle discourses to the Hebrews, chap. ii. Now God dealt not unsuitably unto any of the excellencies of his nature, when he left the apostatizing angels to perish without remedy unto eternity, and had he dealt thus with apostatizing mankind also, who were drawn into a conspiracy against him by the head of the defection, his ways had been holy and righteous.

§ 14. Yet this great instance of God’s dealing with angels, doth not absolutely conclude his leaving of mankind also remediless in their misery. He might justly do so, but thence it doth not follow that necessarily he must do so. And although the chief, and indeed the only reason of his extending grace and mercy unto men, and not unto angels, was his own sovereign will and pleasure, concerning which who can say unto him, What doest thou? yet there was such a difference between these two sorts of original transgressors, as may manifest a condecency or suitableness unto his righteousness and goodness, in the difference of his procedure towards them. For there are sundry things that put an aggravation on the rebellion of angels above that of man; and some that render their ruin less destructive unto the glory of the universe, than that of mankind would have been. For,

First. The angels were created in an estate and condition, much superior unto, and more excellent than that of man; and so likewise were their present or actual enjoyments far above his, though these also were admirable and blessed. The place of their first habitation which they left, Jude 6, was the highest heavens, the most glorious abode of created beings; in opposition whereunto they are said to be cast into the lowest hell, 2 Pet. ii. 4. Whereas man was placed on the earth, which, although then beautiful and excellently suited to his condition; yet was every way inferior unto the glory and lustre of the other, which God had so garnished by his Spirit, Job xxvi. 13, and which for its curious excellency is called the work of his fingers, Psa. viii. 3.

Secondly. Their several employments also did greatly differ. The work of angels was immediately to attend the throne of God, to minister before him, and to give glory unto him, and to execute the commands of his providence in the government of the works of his hands, Psa. lxviii. 17; Dan. vii. 10; Ezek. i. 5, 6, 7; Heb. i. 14; Rev. v. 11, the highest pitch of honour that a mere creature can be exalted unto. Man during his natural life was to be employed in tilling and dressing of the ground, Gen. ii. 16, a labour that would have been easy, useful, and suitable unto his condition, but yet in honour, advantage, and satisfaction, it was unspeakably beneath the duty of the others.

Thirdly. Their enjoyments also greatly differed. For the angels enjoyed the immediate glorious presence of God, without any external created resemblances of it; while man was kept at a greater distance, and not admitted unto such immediate communion with God, or enjoyment of his glorious presence. Now all these, and the like considerations, although they do not in the least extenuate or excuse the sin and crime of man in his apostasy, yet they greatly aggravate the wickedness, ingratitude, and pride of the angels.

Moreover, they differed in their intellectual perfections, whereby they were enabled to discern the excellencies, and to know the mind of God. For though man had all that light, knowledge, and wisdom concreted with him, and so natural unto him, which were any way needful to fit him for a
right and due performance of the obedience required of him, in the observance whereof he should have been brought unto the enjoyment of God; yet it came far short of that excellency of understanding, and that piercing wisdom which was in those spiritual beings. Now, as angels needed such endowments to fit them for that near contemplation of the glory of God whereunto they were admitted, and for that ready apprehension of his mind which they were to observe, so these were blessed means of preserving them in their obedience, and ought to have been improved by them to this end; but being despised and neglected, they were a great aggravation of the wickedness of their apostasy.

There was, likewise, Fifthly, a difference in the manner of their defection. Man was circumvented by the craft and policy of the angels, who were made before him, and who sinned before him. And although he was furnished with an ability and power to have rejected and overcome, yet this had such influence upon his sin and fall, that the Holy Ghost affirms that our first parents were seduced or deceived, 1 Tim. ii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 3, and therefore calls Satan their murderer, John viii. 34. But the angels had nothing without them to excite, provoke, or lay snares for them; but of their own voluntary choice, and mere motion of their own mind, in the exercise of that freedom of their wills which was bestowed on them for their own honour and advantage in their obedience, left their stations, and set up themselves in a way of opposition unto their Creator, who had exalted them above their companions, newly brought out of the same nothing with themselves, into a condition of the highest created glory imaginable.

Again, Sixthly, although the propagation of mankind from one common stock, made it necessary that our first parents should have a greater trust reposed in them, by reason of their representation of their whole posterity in that covenant wherein they stood before God, than any angel could have, seeing they stood every one, only in his own name, and for himself; yet they were but two persons that actually sinned at first, and those one after another, one seduced by another. Whereas the angels in multititudes inconceivable, by a joint conspiracy at the same instant, combined together against the authority and law of their Creator; and as it should seem appointed one among themselves for the head of their apostasy. Now, although, as was said, none of these things can, or do in the least extenuate the sin of man, which was the product of inconceivable infidelity and ingratitude, yet they contain such aggravations of the sin of angels, as may evidence a connedency unto divine wisdom and goodness, in leaving them in their sin and misery unto eternity, and yet giving relief unto mankind.

Lastly. We may add unto what hath been spoken, the concern of the glory of God in the universe. For if man had been left for ever without relief, the whole race or kind of creatures, partakers of human nature, had been utterly lost, nothing of that kind could ever have come unto the enjoyment of God, nor could God have ever been glorified by them in a way of thankfulness and praise, which yet was the end for which he made that sort of creatures. For the whole race of them as to the event, would have been objects of wrath and displeasure. But in the fall of angels it was only a certain number of individuals that sinned, the whole kind was not lost, as to the first end of their creation. Angelical nature was preserved in its orderly dependance on God, in those millions that kept their obedience, and so kept their primitive condition, which is continued unto them with a superaddition of glory and honour, as shall be elsewhere declared. God
then, having made for himself two families unto his praise, amongst whom he would dwell, that above of angels, and this below of man; had sinning man, which was the whole creation participating in human nature, been utterly cast off, one family had been lost for ever, though so great a remnant of the other was preserved. Wherefore, as we shall afterwards see, it seemed good unto his infinite wisdom to preserve that portion of his superior family which sinned not, and to recover a portion of that below, and to make them up into one family under one new head, namely his Son Jesus Christ, in whom he hath now actually gathered into one, all things that are in heaven and in earth unto his praise and glory, Ephes. i. 10. It appears, then, that no certain conclusion can hence be drawn, that man is left remediless in his sin and misery, because angels are so; seeing that, although the whole cause of the difference made is to be referred unto the sovereign will, wisdom, and pleasure of God, yet there is that appearing unto reason, which manifests a suitableness unto his excellencies in the distinction which he put between them.

§ 15. There is, then, no necessary reason inducing us to believe, that God hath left all mankind to perish in their sin and misery under the curse, without any provision of a remedy; yea, there are, on the other side, evidences many and certain, that there is a way provided for their recovery. For,

First. The glorious properties of the nature of God, the manifestation and exaltation of which he designs in all the works that are outward of him, do require that there should be salvation for sinners. Even this matter of the salvation of sinners conduceth, yea is necessary unto, the manifestation of some of those divine excellencies, wherein no small part of the glory of God doth consist. God had, in the creation of all things, glorified his greatness, power, wisdom, and goodness. His sovereignty, righteousness, and holiness, he had in like manner revealed in that holy law, which he had prescribed unto angels and men, for the rule of their obedience, and in the assignation of their reward. Upon the sin of angels and men, he had made known his severity and vindictive justice, in the curse and punishment inflicted on them. But there were yet remaining undiscovered, in the abyss of his eternal essence, grace, and pardoning mercy, which in none of his works had as yet exerted themselves, or manifested their glory. And in case no remedy be provided for mankind, under the evils mentioned, as they must have perished accordingly; so those glorious properties of the nature of God, all ways of exerting their proper and peculiar acts being excluded, all objects of them removed, could not have been equally glorified with his other holy attributes. The creatures know nothing in God, but as it is manifested in its effects. His essence in itself dwells in light inaccessible. Had never any stood in need of grace or mercy, or doing so had they never been made partakers of them, it could not have been known that there was that kind of goodness in his nature, in which however it is his design principally to glorify himself. The necessity, therefore, of the manifestation of these properties of God, namely, his goodness, grace, mercy, and readiness to forgive; which can only be exercised about sinners, and that in their relief and salvation from sin and misery; do require, that the deliverance inquired after be admitted and justly expected. And this expectation is so much the more just and firmly grounded, in that there is nothing in which the Lord more requireth our conformity unto himself, than in this condescension, goodness, grace,
and readiness to forgive, which manifests how dear the glory of them is unto him.

Secondly. To what end shall we conceive the providence and patience of God to be exercised towards the race of mankind, for so long a season in the earth? We see what is the general issue and event of the continuance of mankind in the world: God saw it, and complained of it long ago, Gen. vi. 5, 6. Shall we now think, that God hath no other design in his patience towards mankind for so many generations, but merely to suffer them all, and every one without exception, to sin against him, dishonour him, provoke him, that so he may at length everlastingly destroy them? That this indeed is the event with many, with the most, through their own perverse wickedness, blindness, and love of the pleasures of sin, cannot be denied. But to suppose that God hath no other design at all, but merely by his patience to bear with them awhile in their folly, and then to avenge himself upon them, is unsuitable unto his wisdom and goodness. It cannot be, then, but that he would long since have cut off the whole race, if there were no way for them to be delivered out of this perishing condition. And, although this way, whatever it be, is not effectual towards all, yet for their sakes towards whom, through the grace of God it is, and shall be effectual, is the patience of God exercised towards the whole race of mankind, and they are continued in this world. Other reason of this dispensation of divine wisdom and goodness, can none be assigned.

Thirdly. That there is a way of deliverance for mankind, the event hath manifested in two remarkable and undeniable instances.

First. In that sundry persons, who were as others by nature children of wrath, and under the curse, have obtained an undoubted and infallible interest in the love and favour of God, and this testimony that they pleased him. What their assurances of divine favour were, I shall not now debate. But I take it for granted, which may be farther confirmed as occasion shall require, that some persons in all generations have enjoyed the friendship, love, and favour of God; which they could never have done, unless there had been some way for their deliverance out of the state of sin and misery before described. For therein every man, upon a just account, will find himself in the state of Adam, who, when he heard the voice of God, was afraid.

Secondly. God hath been pleased to require from men a revenue of glory, by a way of worship prescribed unto them after the entrance of sin. This he hath not done unto the angels that sinned; nor could it have been done in a consistency with righteousness unto men, without a supposition of a possibility of deliverance from under his wrath. For in every prescription of duty, God proposeth himself as a rewarder, which he is only unto them that please him; and to please God, without the deliverance required after, is impossible. Besides, that God is actually glorified in the world, by the way of worship required on this supposition, shall be elsewhere declared; and arguments added in full measure to confirm our assertion. Deliverance, then, from this condition, may on just grounds be expected; and how it might be effected, is our next inquiry.

§ 16. The great relief inquired after must be brought about by men themselves, or by some other for them. What they can do themselves herein, we may be quickly satisfied about. The nature of the evils under which they suffer, and the event of things in the world, sufficiently discover the inability of men to be their own deliverers. Besides, who should contrive the way of it for them? One single person, or more than one, or all?
How easily the impossibility of it might be demonstrated on any of these suppositions, is too manifest to be insisted on. The evils suffered under are of two sorts, both universal and eternal. The first is that of punishment, inflicted from the righteousness of God.

There are but two ways possible (setting aside the consideration of what shall be afterwards fixed on) whereby mankind, or any individual person amongst them, may obtain deliverance from this evil. And the first is, that God, without any further consideration, should remit it, and exempt the creation from under it. But although this way may seem possible unto some, it is, indeed, utterly impossible. Did not the sentence of it proceed from his righteousness, and the essential rectitude of his nature? Did he not engage his truth and faithfulness, that it should be inflicted? An doth not his holiness and justice require that so it should be? What should become of his glory, what would he do unto his great name, if now, without any cause or reason, he should, contrary unto all these engagements of his holy perfections, wholly remit and take it off? Nay, this would plainly justify the serpent in his calumny, that whatever he pretended, yet indeed that no execution of his threatening would ever ensue. How, also, can it be supposed, that any of his future threatenings should have a just weight upon the souls of men, if that first, great, and fundamental one should be frustrated, and rendered of no effect? Or what authority would be left unto his law, when he himself should dissolve the sanction of it? Besides, if God should do thus, which reason, revelation, and the event of things, do manifest that he neither would nor could, (for he cannot deny himself,) this would have been his work, and not an acquisition of men themselves, which we are now inquiring after. So that this way of deliverance, as it is but imaginary, so it is here of no consideration.

There is no other way, then, for man, if he will not perish eternally under the punishment due unto his apostasy and rebellion, but, secondly, to find out some way of commutation, or making a recompence for the evil of sin unto the law and righteousness of God. But herein his utter insufficiency quickly manifests itself. Whatever he is, or hath, or can pretend any interest in, lies no less under the curse than he doth himself. And that which is under the curse, can contribute nothing unto its removal. That which is, in its whole being, obnoxious unto the greatest punishment, can have nothing wherewith to make commutation for it. For that must first be accepted in, and for itself, which can either make atonement, or be received for any other in exchange. And this is the condition of man, and of every individual of mankind, and will be so to eternity, unless relief arise from another place. It is farther, also, evident, that all the endeavours of men must needs be unspeakably disproportionate unto the effect and end aimed at, if we consider the interest which the other parts of the creation have in the curse against sin. What can man do to restore the universe unto its first glory and beauty? How can they reduce the creation unto its original harmony? Wherewith shall they recompense the great God, for the defacing of so great a portion of that impression of his glory and goodness that he had enstamped on it? In a word, they who from their first date unto their utmost period, are always under the punishment, can do nothing for the total removal of it. The experience, also, of five thousand years, hath sufficiently evinced how insufficient man is to be a Saviour unto himself. All the various and uncertain notions of Adam's posterity in religion, from the extremity of Atheism, unto that of sacrificing themselves and one another, have been destined in vain towards this end.
Neither can any of them to this day find out a better, or more likely way for them to thrive in, than those wherewith their progenitors deluded themselves. And in the issue of all we see, that as to what man hath been able of himself to do towards his own deliverance, both himself and the whole world are continued in the same state, wherein they were upon the first entrance of sin, loaded, as it were, with another world of confusion, disorder, mischief, and misery.

There is also another head of the misery of man, and that is the corrupt spring of moral evil that is in his nature. This also is universal and endless. It mixeth itself with all and every thing that man doth or can do, as a moral agent, and that always and for ever, Gen. vi. 5. It is then impossible that it should have an end, unless it do either destroy or spend itself. But seeing it will do neither of these, ever sinning, which man cannot but be, is not the way to disentangle himself from sin.

If, then, any deliverance be ever obtained for mankind, it must be by some other being not involved in the same misery with themselves. This must either be God himself, or good angels. Other rational agents there are none. If we look to the latter, we must suppose them to undertake this work, either by the appointment of God, or upon their own accord, without his previous command or direction. The latter cannot be supposed. They knew too much of the majesty, holiness, and terror of the great God, to venture on an interposition of themselves, upon his counsels and ways, uncommanded. To do so, would have been a sinful dissolution of the law of their creation. So much, also, they might discern of the work itself, as to stifle unto eternity every thought of engaging in it. Besides, they knew the will of God, by what they saw come to pass. They saw his justice and holiness glorified in the evils which he had brought upon the world. That he would not for ever satisfy himself in that glory, they knew not. And what was man unto them, that they should busy themselves to retrieve him from that condition wherein he had cast himself by sin, while God was glorified therein, in conformity unto whose will, their happiness and perfection doth consist? As remote as men are from thoughts of recovering fallen angels, so far were they from contriving the recovery of man.

But it may be said, that God himself might design them to work out the salvation and deliverance inquired after, as was before supposed. But this makes God, and not them, to be the Saviour, and them only the instruments in the accomplishment of his work. Neither yet hath he done so, nor were they meet so to be employed. Whatever is purely penal in the misery of man, is an effect of the righteous judgment of God. This, as we have manifested, could be no otherwise diverted from him, but by some person enduring it in his stead. And two things are required in him, or them, that should so endure it. Ist. That they were not themselves obnoxious unto it, either personally, or upon the first common account. If they are so, they must look to their own concerns in the first place. 2dly. That they were such as that the benefit of their enduring that penalty might, according to the rules of justice, redound unto them for whom, and in whose stead, they endured it, otherwise they would suffer in vain. Now, although the angels might answer the first of these, in their personal immunity from obnoxiousness unto the curse, yet the latter they were unsuited for. They had no relation unto mankind, but only that they were the workmanship of the same Creator. But this is not sufficient to warrant such a substitution. Had angels been to be delivered, their redemption must have been wrought in the angelical nature, as the apostle declares,
Heb. ii. 16. But what justice is it, that man should sin, and angels suffer? Or from whence should it arise, that from their suffering it should be righteous that man should go free? By what notions of God could we have been instructed in the wisdom and righteousness of such a proceeding? Add hereunto, that this God hath not done, and therefore we may safely conclude that it became him not so to do.

§ 18. But what need all this inquiry? The Jews, with whom we principally have to do in this matter, plead constantly that God hath appointed unto men, at least unto themselves, a way and means of deliverance out of this condition. And this is by the observation of Moses' law. By this they say they are justified in the sight of God, and have deliverance from all wrath due unto sin. This they trusted in of old, Rom. ix. 32: this they continue to make their refuge at this day. 'Spiritualis liberatio solummodo dependet ab observatione legis quam Deus in monte Sinai promulgavit.'—

'Spiritual deliverance dependeth solely on the observation of the law which God promul gated on Mount Sinai,' saith the author of the Answers unto certain Questions proposed to the Jews, quest. 5, published by Brenius, who in his reply hath betrayed unto them the most important doctrines of the Christian religion. But this is their persuasion:—the giving of this law unto them, they suppose to have freed them utterly from every thing in the fallen condition before described, so far as they will acknowledge it to concern any of the posterity of Adam. And whereas they cannot deny but that they sometimes sin against the moral precepts of this law, and so stand in need of help against their helper, they fix in this case upon a double relief. The first is of their own personal repentance, and the other the sacrifices that are appointed in the law.

But whereas they now are, and have been for many generations, deprived of the privilege, as they esteem it, of offering sacrifices according to the law, they hope that their own repentance, with their death, respecting which they pray that it may be expiatory, will be sufficient to obtain for them the forgiveness of sin. Only they say, that this might better and more easily be effected, if they might enjoy the benefit of sacrifices. So saith the fore-mentioned Jew, whose discourse is published by Brenius. 'Quamvis jam nulla sint sacrificia, qua media erant ad tanto facilius im petrandam remissionem peccatorum, eadem tamen per pœnitentiam et resi pisscentiam im petratur.' And again, 'Hodie victimas offerre non possimus, quibus media tamen per pœnitentiam et resissionem illa tanto facilior reddetur.'—Respon. ad Qwæst. Septim. If they cannot obtain the use of sacrifices, yet the matter may be effected by their repentance; only it were much easier to do it by sacrifices. And they seem to long for them principally on this account, that by them they may free themselves from somewhat of discipline and penance, which now their consciences enforce upon them. But this, as all other articles of their creed which are properly Judaical, is feigned by them to suit their present condition and interest. For where do they find that their sacrifices, especially that which they most trust in, namely that on the feast of expiation, Lev. xvi., was ever designed for this end, to enable them the more easily to obtain the remission of sins by another means which they use? For it is said directly, that the sacrifice on that day did expiate their sin, and make atonement for it, that they might not die; and not that it did help them in procuring pardon another way. But this is now taken from them, and what shall they do? Why, rather than they will look or come to him who was represented in that sacrifice, and on whose account alone it had all its efficacy,
they will find out a new way of doing that which their sacrifices were appointed unto; and this they must do, or openly acknowledge that they all perish eternally. I shall not insist long on the casting down of this imagination, all the foundations of it being long ago demolished by our apostle in his epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and to the Hebrews themselves. And this he hath not done merely by a new revelation of the mind and will of God, but upon the principles, and by the testimonies of the Old Testament itself, as will afterwards more fully appear. Only because it is here set up in competition with that blessed and all-sufficient remedy against sin and the curse which God indeed hath provided, I shall briefly remove it out of our way, and that by manifesting that it is neither in itself suited unto that end, nor was ever of God designed thereunto.

§ 19. That all mankind were cast into the condition which we have described, by and upon the sin of Adam, we have before sufficiently confirmed. Other just reason, or occasion of it, no man can assign. It hath been also evinced, that God would, and consequently did, prepare a remedy for them, or a way of deliverance to be proposed unto them. If this were only the law of Moses, and the observance thereof, as the Jews pretend, I desire to know what became of them, what was their estate and condition, who lived and died before the giving of that law? Not only the patriarchs before the flood, who some of them had this testimony, that they pleased God, and one of whom was taken alive into heaven, but Abraham also himself, who received the promises, must on this supposition be excluded from a participation in the deliverance inquired after. For they observed not the law of Moses. What they dream about the making of their law before the foundation of the world, and the study of God therein, and that night and day, by day in the written law, and by night in the oral cabal, is not to be mentioned where matters of importance unto the souls of men are under consideration.

But yet I may add by the way, that neither this, nor the like monstrous figments are invented or broached by them, without some especial design. In the eighth chapter of the Proverbs there is mention of the wisdom of God, and such a description given of it as allows not an essential property of his nature to be thereby intended. This is there said to be with God before the foundation of the world, his delight and companion. Whence it appears, that nothing but the eternal word, wisdom, and Son of God can possibly be intended thereby. To avoid this testimony given unto his eternal subsistence, the Jews first invented this fable, that the law was created before the world, and that the wisdom of it was that which God conversed with and delighted in. And I have often wondered at the remark of a learned Christian annotator upon this place: 'Haec,' saith he, 'de ca sapientia quae in lege apparat, exponunt Hebraei; et sane e'i, si non soli, at precipe hece attributa conveniunt,' contrary to the faith of the church in all ages. It is true, that in writing on v. 22, and those that follow, he affirms that they may be expounded by the words of Philo de Coloniiis, ὁ λογος ὁ πρεσβυτερος των γενεσιν ἐληφσων, οú καθαπερ οιακος ενειλημνος ὁ των ὀλων κυβερνητης πηδαλουηις τα συμπαιτα, και ὁτε εκοσμοπλαστε χρησαμενος οργανω τουτω προς την ανυπατιον των αποτελουμενων συστασιν. But whether this Platonical declaration of the nature and work of the word of God, employed by him as an instrument in the making and government of the world, would have been accepted in the primitive church, when this place was vexed by the Arians, and studiously vindicated by the orthodox fathers, I much question. But to return, if the law, and the observance of it, be the
only remedy provided of God against the sin and misery of man, the only means of reconciliation with him, all that died before the giving of it must perish, and that eternally. But the contrary appears from this very consideration, and is undeniably proved by our apostle in the instance of Abraham, Gal. iii. 17. For he received the promise, and was taken into covenant with God four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law. And that covenant conveyed unto him the love and favour of God, with deliverance from sin and the curse, as themselves will not deny.

There was therefore a remedy in this case provided long before the giving of the law on Mount Sinai; and therefore the law was not given unto that purpose, but for other ends at large declared by our apostle. Either then they must grant that all the patriarchs, and he among the rest of whom they boast, perished eternally; or else, that there was a means of deliverance provided before the giving of the law, and consequently that the law was not given for that end. The first they will not do, nor can, without an absolute renunciation of their own sacred writings, wherein none have obtained a larger testimony that they pleased God than they. The latter therefore followeth undeniably. If they shall say they had a way of deliverance, but God provided another afterwards, as this would be spoken without warrant or authority from the Scripture, so I desire to know both what that way was, and why it was rejected. Of God's appointment it was, and effectual it was unto them that embraced it; and why should it be laid aside, who can declare?

§ 20. Again, as was before observed, there are two parts of the law; the moral precepts of it, and the instituted worship appointed in it. Unto this latter part do the sacrifices of it belong. But neither of these are sufficient unto the end proposed, nor jointly can they attain it. Two things are evidently necessary from what hath been discoursed unto the deliverance inquired after. First, That man be reconciled unto God by the removal of the curse, and the wrath due unto him for his apostasy. Secondly, That his nature be freed from that principle of sin and enmity against God, the evil figment that it is tainted with, yea, with which it is possessed. And neither of these can be effected by the law, or either part of it. For, First, The moral precepts of it are the same with those that were written in the heart of man by nature, or the law of his creation, which he transgressed in his first rebellion. And he must be delivered from that guilt, before any new obedience can be accepted of him. His old debt must be satisfied for, before he can treat for a new reward, which inseparably follows all acceptable obedience. But this the precepts of the law take no notice of, nor do they direct unto any way for removing sin: only supposing the doing of it by some other means, it requires exact obedience in them that come to God thereby. Hence our apostle concludes, that it could not give life, but was weak and insufficient in itself unto any such purpose.

Besides, secondly, it could not absolutely preserve men in its own observation; for it required that obedience which never any sinner did or could in all things perform, as the Scriptures of the Old Testament abundantly manifest. For they tell us, 'there is no man that sinneth not,' 1 Kings viii. 46; 2 Chron. vi. 36. That, if the Lord 'should mark iniquity, no man could stand,' Psalm exxx. 3. And that, 'if he enter into judgment (according to the law,) no man living can be justified in his sight,' Psal. cxliii. 2. To this purpose, see the excellent discourse, and invincible reasons of our apostle, Rom. iii. iv. This the holy men of old confessed, to this the Scripture bears testimony, and this experience confirms, seeing
every sin and transgression of that law was put under a curse, Deut. xxvii. 26. Where then, there is no man that sinneth not, and every sin is put under the curse, the law, in the preceptive part of it, can be no means of delivery from the one or other, but is rather a certain means of increasing and aggravating of them both. Neither is there any testimony given concerning any one under the Old Testament, that he was any other way justified before God but by faith and the pardon of sins, which are not of the works of the law. See Gen. xv. 6; Psal. xxxi. 1, 2. Of Noah indeed it is said, that he was upright and perfect in his generation; that is, sincere in his obedience, and free from the open wickedness of the age in which he lived. But as this was before the giving of the law by Moses, so the ground of his freedom and deliverance is added to be the gracious love and favour of God. This the Jews themselves confess in Bereshith Rabba, Sect. 29. אַל־נָהּ שֶפֶל מִשְׁפָּטִים מְנוֹת אֵלֶּה דָּרָם אַל־אֲדֹנָי שִׁמְצָא חֹזֶן בְּעֵיניי. ‘Even Noah himself, who was left of them, was not every way as he should be, but that he found grace or favour in the eyes of the Lord.’ And to the same purpose they speak concerning Abraham himself elsewhere. Thou findest that Abraham our father inherited not this world and the world to come, any otherwise than by faith; as it is said he believed God. This part therefore of the law is plainly proved to be insufficient to deliver sinners from an antecedent guilt, and curse due thereunto.

§ 21. It remains then that the sacrifices of the law must yield the relief inquired after, or we are still at a loss in this matter. And these the Jews would willingly place their chief confidence in; they did so of old. Since indeed they have been driven from the observance of them, they have taken themselves unto other helps, that they might not appear to be utterly hopeless. But they sufficiently manifest, that their great defence against the accusation of their consciences is in them, by the ludicrous ways of representing, or rather counterfeiting of them that they have invented. רָאָב signifies a man, and among the rabbins a cock also. Hence Ben Uzziel renders עֵזִיָּן גֶּבֶר, Ezion Geber, the name of a city, Deut. ii. 8, רָאָב עֵזִיָּן גֶּבֶר the city of a cock. And Isa. xxii. 17, נַבֵּר נַבֵּר is rendered by Hierome, Gallus Gallinaceus. Granting therefore that the punishment of Geber is required unto atonement and reconciliation, and that some such thing was signified in their sacrifices, they do each one for himself torture, slay, and offer a cock on the day of expiation, to make atonement for his sins, and that unto the devil. The rites of that diabolical solemnity are declared at large by Buxtorf, in his Synagog. Judaic. cap. 20. But yet, as this folly manifests, that they can find no rest in their consciences, without their sacrifices, so it gives them not at all what they seek after. And therefore, being driven from all other hopes, they trust at length unto their own death, for in life they have no hope; making this one of their constant prayers, ‘Let my death be the expiation of all sins.’ But this is the curse, and so no means to avoid it. Omitting therefore these horrid follies of men under despair, an effect of that wrath which is come upon them unto the uttermost, the thing itself may be considered.

That the sacrifices of Moses’ law should of themselves be a means to deliver men from the guilt of sin, and to reconcile them unto God, is contrary to the light of nature, to their own proper use, and to express testimonies of the Old Testament. For, first, can any man think it reasonable, that the blood of bulls and goats should of itself make an expiation of the sin of the souls of men, reconcile them to God the Judge of all, and impart unto
them an everlasting righteousness? Our apostle declares the manifest impossibility hereof, Heb. x. 4. They must have very mean and low thoughts of God, of his holiness, justice, and truth; of the demerit of sin; of heaven and hell; who think them all to depend on the blood of a calf or a goat. The sacrifices of these did, indeed, by God's appointment, represent that to the minds of men which is effectual unto the whole end of appeasing God's justice, and of obtaining his favour; but that they should themselves effect it, is unsuitable unto all the apprehensions which are imbred in the heart of man, either concerning the nature of God, or the guilt of sin. Secondly, Their primitive and proper use doth manifest the same; for they were to be frequently repeated, and in all the repetitions of them there was still new mention made of sin. They could not therefore by themselves take it away; for if they could they would not have been reiterated. It is apparent therefore, that their use was to represent and bring to remembrance that which did perfectly take away sin. For a perfect work may be often remembered, but it need not, it cannot be often done. For being done for such an end, and that end being obtained, it cannot be done again. The sacrifices therefore were never appointed, never used to take away sin, which they did not; but to represent that which did so effectually.

Besides, there were some sins that men may be guilty of, whom God will not utterly reject, for which there was no sacrifice appointed in the law of Moses; as was the case with David, Psal. li. 16, which makes it undeniable that there was some other way of atonement, besides the legal sacrifices, as our apostle declares, Acts xiii. 38, 39. Thirdly, the Scripture expressly rejects all the sacrifices of the law, when they are trusted in for any such end and purpose, which sufficiently demonstrates, that they were never appointed thereunto. See Psal. xi. 6—8, l. 8—13; Isa. i. 11—13, lxvi. 3; Amos v. 21, 22; Micah vi. 6—8, and other places innumerable.

§ 22. Add unto what hath been spoken, that during the observation of the whole law of Moses, whilst it was in force by the appointment of God himself, he still directed those who sought for acceptance with him unto a new covenant of grace, whose benefits by faith they were then made partakers of, and whose nature was afterwards more fully to be declared. See Jer. xxxi. 31—34, with the inferences of our apostle thereon, Heb. viii. 12, 13. And this plainly subverts the whole foundation of the expectation entertained by the Jews, of being justified before God, on the account of the law of Moses given on Mount Sinai. For to what purpose should God call them from resting on that covenant, to look for mercy and grace in and by another, if that had been able to give them the help desired?

In brief then, the Jews fixing on the law of Moses as the only means of deliverance from sin and death, as they do thereby exclude all mankind, besides themselves, from any interest in the love, favour, or grace of God, which they greatly design and desire; so they cast themselves also into a miserable, restless, self-condemned condition in this world, by trusting to that which will not relieve them, and into endless misery hereafter, by refusing that which effectually would make them heirs of salvation. For whilst they perish in their sin, another, a better, more glorious, and sure remedy against all the evils that are come upon mankind, or are justly feared to be coming by any of them, is provided in the grace, wisdom, and love of God, as shall now farther be demonstrated.

§ 23. The first intimation that God gave of this work of his grace in redeeming mankind from sin and misery, is contained in the promise sub-
joined unto the curse denounced against our first parents, and their posterity in them, Gen. iii. 15. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, and the serpent shall bruise his heel." Two things there are contained in these words—a promise of relief from the misery brought on mankind by the temptation of Satan, and an intimation of the means or way whereby it should be brought about. That the first is included in these words, is evident; for,

First, If there be not a promise of deliverance expressed in these words, whence is it, that the execution of the sentence of death against sin is suspended? Unless we will allow an intervention satisfactory to the righteousness and truth of God to be expressed in these words, there would have been a truth in the suggestion of the serpent, namely, that whatever God had said, yet indeed they were not to die. The Jews, in the Midrash Tehillim, as Kimchi informs us on Psal. xcii., whose title is, 'a Psalm for the Sabbath Day,' which they generally assign unto Adam, say that Adam was cast out of the garden of Eden on the evening of the sixth day, after which God came to execute the sentence of death upon him; but the Sabbath being come on, the punishment was deferred, whereas Adam made that Psalm for the Sabbath day. Without an interposition of some external cause and reason, they acknowledge that death ought immediately to have been inflicted; and other cause besides what is mentioned in these words, there was none.

Secondly, The whole evil of sin, and curse under which mankind then did suffer, or was to suffer, proceeded from the friendship contracted between the woman and the serpent, and from her fixing faith in him. God here declares, that he will break that league, and put enmity between them. Being now both of them in the same condition of sin and curse, this could not be without a change of condition in one of them. Satan is not divided from himself, nor is at enmity with them that are left wholly in his estate. A change of condition therefore, on the part of the woman and her seed, is plainly promised; that is, by a deliverance from the state of sin and misery in which they were. Without this, the enmity mentioned could not have ensued.

Thirdly, In consequence of this enmity, the seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the serpent. The head is the seat of his power and craft. Without the destruction of the evil and pernicious effects, which by his counsel he had brought about, his head cannot be bruised. By his head, he had contrived the ruin of mankind; and without the destruction of his works, and a recovery from that ruin, he is not conquered, nor his head bruised. And as these things, though they may now seem somewhat obscurely expressed in these words, are yet made plain unto us in the gospel, so the importance of them was evident unto our first parents of old, being expounded by all the circumstances wherewith the matter of fact was attended.

Again, there is an intimation of the manner an which this work shall be performed. First, God takes it upon himself. I will do it: I will put enmity. It is an issue of his sovereign wisdom and grace. But, secondly, he will do it in and by the nature of man, the seed of the woman. And two things must concur to the effecting of it. First, That this seed of the woman must conquer Satan, bruise his head, destroy his works, and procure deliverance for mankind thereby. Secondly, That he must suffer from, and by means of Satan in his so doing: the serpent must bruise his heel. This is the remedy and relief that God hath provided for mankind. And
this is the Messiah, or God joining with the nature of man, to deliver mankind from sin and eternal misery.

§ 24. This promise of relief by the seed of the woman, is, as the first, so the only intimation that God gave unto our first parents, of a way of deliverance from that condition into which they, and the whole creation, were brought by the entrance of sin. It was likewise the first discovery that there was in him, mercy, compassion, pardon. Hereby he declared himself to be, הוהי, ירה אל, § 25. According unto our design, we may take along with us the thoughts of the Jews in this matter, expressed after their manner.

With regard to the serpent that tempted Eve, who is here threatened as the head of all the evil that ensued thereon, they confess that Satan accompanied him, and was principally intended in the curse denounced against him. So the Targum of Ben Uzziel, 'When the serpent came to tempt Eve, she saw Samael with intent to murder Adam, Samael, the angel of death, upon him.' And Maimonides gives a large account of the doctrine of their wise men in this matter. More Nebuch. pag. 2. cap. 20. 'At neque hoc praetereundum, quod in Midrash adducunt sapientes nostri, serpentem equitatum fuisset, quantitatem ejus instar Cameli, et sessorum ejus fuisset illum qui deceptit Evam, huncque sessorum fuisset Samaelem, quod nomen absolute usurpante Satana. Inveniens enim quod in multis locis dicunt Sathanam voluisse impedire Abrahamum, ne ligaret Isaacum, sic voluisse impedire Isaacum, ne obsequetur voluntati patris sui; aliis vero in hoc comed negotio dicunt, venit Samael ad Abrahamum; sic itaque apparat quod Samael sit ipse Satan.' To omit their fables, this is evident, that they acknowledge that it was Satan who deceived Eve. And in Bereshith Rabba, sect. 10, they give an account why God expostulated with Adam and Eve, before he pronounced sentence against them, but without any word or question proceeded immediately unto the doom of the serpent; for, say they, the holy blessed God said, ויהי הוא מונע בצל הרוחות אתה אⒶ יאמול כ coś שמי זוחל את הצר י.which, 'This serpent is wicked, and a cunning disputer, and if I speak unto him, he will straitway say, thou gavest them a commandment, and I gave them a commandment: Why did they leave thy commandment, and follow my commandment? and therefore he presently pronounced sentence against him.' And the same words are repeated in Midrash Vaitkra ad cap. 13. v. 2, which things can be understood of Satan only. I know some of the later masters have other thoughts of these things, because they discover what use may be made of the truth, and of the faith of their forefathers in this matter.
Aben Ezra, in his commentary on this place, disputes the opinions of their doctors; and although he acknowledges, that Rabbi Saadias Haggaon, and Rabbi Samuel Ben Hopnii, with others, (that is indeed their Targums, and Talmuds, and all their ancient writers,) affirm Satan to be intended, yet he contends for the serpent only, on these weak pretences, that Satan goeth not on his belly, nor eateth dust, which things in the letter are confessed to belong unto the instrument that he used. And hereon they would have it, that the serpent was deprived of voice and understanding, which before he had; so making that a rational subsistence, which is expressly reckoned amongst the beasts of the field.

The root of all evil also, they would have to lie in the matter whereof we were originally made; an impossible figment, invented to reflect the guilt of all sin on him that made us. Thus every thing seems right that will serve their present purpose, whilst they shut their eyes against the truth. But we have the consent of the most ancient of the best and wisest of them in this matter; as also with respect to the deliverance here promised. The two Targums of Uzzielides, and that called Jerusalem, both agree that these words contain a remedy of the effects of Satan’s temptation, and that to be wrought by the Messiah, or, as they speak, in his days. And hence they have a common saying, that in the last days, (which is the Old Testament periphrasis of the days for the Messiah) all things shall be healed, but the serpent and the Gibeonites, by whom they understand all hypocrites and unbelievers. Satan therefore is to be conquered by the bruising of his head; and conquered he is not, nor can be, unless his work be destroyed. In the destruction of his work consists the deliverance of mankind from the twofold evil mentioned. And this is to be effected by the seed of the woman, to be brought forth into the world for that end and purpose. For when the production of this seed, is restrained unto the family and posterity of Abraham, it is said expressly, that in, or by it, all the kindreds of the earth should be blessed, which they could not be, without a removal of the curse.

§ 26. We may now therefore take the sum of this discourse, and of the whole matter that we have insisted on, about the entrance of sin into the world, and the remedy provided in the grace and wisdom of God against it. It appears upon our inquiry, First, That the sin of our first parents was the occasion and cause of all that evil which is in the world, of all that is felt, or justly feared, by mankind. For as those who knew not, or received not the revelation of the truth, in these things made unto us in the Scripture, could never assign any other cause of it that might be satisfactory unto an ordinary rational inquirer, so the testimonies of the Scripture make this most evident, and especially that insisted on. Secondly, It hath been evinced, that mankind could not recover, or deliver themselves from under the power of their own innate corruption and disorder, nor from the effects of the curse and wrath of God that came upon them. Neither is there any ground of expecting relief from any other part of God’s creation. But yet, that God, for the praise of the glory of his grace, mercy, and goodness, would effect it. Thirdly, That this relief and deliverance is first intimated and declared, in those words of God unto the serpent: “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Which appears,

First, Because in and with the serpent, Satan, who was the head of all apostasy from God, and by whom our first parents were beguiled, is intended in these words. This we have made evident, from the confession of the
Jews, with whom in this matter we have principally to do. And to what hath been already observed unto that purpose, we may add the testimonies of some other of them to the same effect. Rabbi Bechai, he whom they call רביה, 'Bechai the Elder,' in his comment on the law upon these words, Gen. iii. 15. speaks to this purpose: 'We have no more enmity with the serpent, than with other creeping things. Wherefore the Scripture mysteriously signifies him who was hid in the serpent. For the body of the crafty serpent was a fit instrument for that force, or virtue, that joined itself therewith. That was it which made Eve to sin, whence death came on all her posterity. And this is the enmity between the serpent and the seed of the woman. And this is the mystery of the holy tongue, that the serpent is sometimes called שארף, according to the name of an angel, who is also called שארף. And now thou knowest that the serpent is Satan, and the evil figment, and the angel of death.' And Rabbi Judah, in וְיִהְיֶהוּ, 'Many interpreters say, that the evil figment hath all its force from the old serpent or Satan.' To the same purpose, the author of הָרָאָרָם, 'Caphtor Vaperach,' 'The devil and the serpent are called by one name.' And many other testimonies of the like import might be collected out of them.

We have also a surer word for our own satisfaction, in the application of this unto Satan, in the divine writings of the New Testament: as 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Rom. v. 11, 12, 13, 15; Heb. ii. 14, 15; 1 John iii. 8; Rev. xii. 9, and ch. xx. 2, 3; but we forbear to press them on the Jews.

Besides, it is most evident from the thing itself. For, 1. Who can be so sottish as to imagine, that this great alteration which ensued in the works of God, that which caused him to pronounce them accursed, and to inflict so sore a punishment on Adam and all his posterity, should arise from the actings of a brute creature? Where is the glory of this dispensation? How can we attribute it unto the wisdom and greatness of God? What is there in it suitable unto his righteousness and holiness? Whereas, supposing this to be the work of him, who was in himself the beginning of all apostasy, and who first brake the law of his creation, all things answer the excellency of the divine perfections. Moreover, is it imaginable that the nature of man, then flourishing in the vigour of all its intellectual abilities, reason, wisdom, knowledge, in that order and rectitude of them, which was his grace, should be surprised, seduced, and brought into subjection, unto the craft and machinations of an inferior creature, a beast of the field, and that unto the ruin of man, both in time and eternity? The whole nature of the inferior creatures, James tells us, is tamed by the nature of man, ch. iii. 7, and that now in his lessened and depraved condition; and shall we think that this excellent nature, in the blossom of its strength, and right unto rule over all, should be tamed, corrupted, subdued, by the nature of a beast or a serpent? And yet again, whereas in the whole action of the serpent, there is an open design against the glory and honour of God, and against the welfare and happiness of mankind, and that managed with craft, subtility, and forethought, how can we imagine that such a contrivance should be consistent with the condition of a brute worm, incapable of moral evil, and newly framed out of the dust by the power of its Creator? Hitherto it had continued under the law and order of its creation; and shall we think that now, in an instant, it should engage thus desperately against God and man? And further, the actings of the serpent were by reason and with speech. And if we suppose that it was endowed with reason and speech, does not this plainly exempt it from that order and kind of
creatures whereof it was, and place it among the number of intellectual and rational parts of the creation? And is not this contrary to the analogy of the Scripture, and to the open truth of the thing itself, it being cursed among the beasts of the field? To say, as Aben Ezra seems to do, that God gave it reason and speech for that occasion, is blasphemously to make God the sole author of that temptation which he so much abhorred. Lastly, Considering the punishment denounced against mankind, of death temporal and eternal, that which is threatened unto the serpent bears no proportion unto it, if it concern only the serpent itself. And what rule of justice will admit, that the accessory should be punished with greater sufferings than the principal? Neither doth this punishment, as to the principal part of it, the bruising of the head, befal all serpents, yea but few of them in comparison, doubtless not one of a million, whereas all mankind, none excepted, were liable unto the penalty denounced against them. Were no more men intended, than are bitten on the heel by serpents, the matter were otherwise; but death is passed upon all, inasmuch as all have sinned. Satan then it was, who was the principal in this seduction, the author of all apostasy from God, who using the serpent as his instrument, involved that also so far in the curse, as to render it of all creatures the most abhorred of mankind.

§ 27. Against this seducer it is denounced, that his head should be bruised. The head of Satan, is his craft and power. From these issued all that evil whereinto mankind had fallen. In the bruising therefore of his head, the defeat of his counsel, the destruction of his work, and the deliverance of mankind, is contained, as our apostle most excellently declares, Heb. ii. Death must be removed, and righteousness brought in, and acceptance with God procured, or the head of Satan is not bruised. This therefore is openly and plainly a promise of the deliverance inquired after.

Moreover, there is a declaration made, how this victory shall be obtained, and this deliverance wrought, and that is by the seed of the woman. This seed is twice repeated in the words: once expressly, and her seed; and secondly, it is included in the pronoun דָּבָר, it. And as by seed, in the first place, the posterity of the woman, some to be born of her race, partakers of human nature, may be intended as the subjects of the enmity mentioned; so in the latter, some single person, some one of her posterity or seed that should obtain the victory, is expressly denoted. For as all her seed in common, do never go about this work, the greatest part of them continuing in a willing subjection unto Satan; so if all of them should combine to attempt it, they would never be able to accomplish it, as we have before proved at large. Some one therefore to come of her, with whom God would be present, in an especial and extraordinary manner, is here expressly promised. And this is the Messiah.

§ 28. God having in infinite wisdom and grace provided this way of relief, and given this intimation of it, that revelation became the foundation and centre of all the religion that ensued in the world. For as those who received it by faith, and adhered unto it, continued in the worship of the true God, expressing their faith in the sacrifices that he had appointed, typically to represent and exemplify before their eyes that work which by the promised seed was to be accomplished; so also all that false worship into which the generality of mankind apostatized, was laid in a general persuasion, that there was a way for the recovery of the favour of God; but what that was they knew not, and therefore wandered in woeful uncertainties.

Some suppose, that our great mother Eve, in those words, Gen. iv. 1,
expressed an apprehension that she had born him who was Man-God, the Man the Lord, the promised seed. And they do not only contend for this meaning of the words, but also reproach them who are otherwise minded; as may be seen in the writings of Hunnius and Helvius, against Calvin, Junius, Paræus, and Piscator. That she together with Adam believed the promise, had the consolation, and served God in the faith of it, I no way doubt. But that she had an apprehension, that the promised seed should be soon exhibited, and knew that he should be the Lord, or Jehovah, and yet knew not that he was to be born of a virgin, and not after the ordinary way of mankind, I see no cogent reason to evince. Nor do the words mentioned necessarily prove any such apprehension in her. The whole weight of that supposition lies on the construction of the words, from the interposition of the particle הִנֶּה denoting, as they say, after verbs active, always an accusative case. But instances may be given to the contrary; whence our translation reads the words, *I have gotten a man from the Lord*, without the least intimation of any other sense in the original. And Drusius is bold to affirm, that it is want of solid skill in the sacred tongue that was the cause of that conception. Besides, if she had such thoughts, she was manifoldly mistaken; and to what end that mistake of hers should be here expressed, I know not. And yet notwithstanding all this, I will not deny but that the expression is unusual and extraordinary, if the sense of our translation be intended, and not that by some contended for, I have *gotten* or *obtained the Man the Lord*. And this, it is possible, caused Jonathan Ben Uzziel to give us that gloss on the words in his Targum: *וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוָּה אֱלֹהֵי אָדָם וַיִּקָּחֶּהוּ מִלֶּאכָּה וְאָמֲרָה לְיוֹיִדִּיוּ* 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who desired the angel: and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have obtained the man (or a man) the angel of the Lord.' That, is, him who was promised afterwards under the name of the angel of the Lord, or the angel of the covenant, which the Jews may do well to consider.

§ 29. But we have farther expositions of this first promise, and farther confirmations of this grace in the Scripture itself. For in process of time, it was renewed unto Abraham, and the accomplishment of it confined unto his family. For his gratuitous call from superstition and idolatry, with the separation of him and his posterity from all the families of the earth, was subservient only unto the fulfilling of the promise before treated of. The first mention of it, we have Gen. xii. 1—3. 'Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.' And this is again expressed, chap. xviii. 18, 'All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him.' And chap. xxii. 18. 'And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.' And when he doubted of the accomplishment of this promise, because he was childless, and said, 'Behold unto me thou hast given no seed,' as knowing that therein lay the promise, chap. xv. 3, God tells him, that he who should come forth out of his own bowels, should be his heir, ver. 4, which was afterwards restrained unto Isaac, chap. xvii. 21. Thus he is called and separated, as from his own family and kindred, so from all other nations, and a peculiar portion of the earth, assigned unto him and his, for their habitation. Now the especial end of this divine dispensation, of this
call and separation of Abraham, was to be a means of accomplishing the former promise, or the bringing forth of him, who was to be the deliverer of mankind from the curse that was come upon them for their sin. For,

First, It is said that Abraham hereupon should be a blessing. יִתְנֶה הָאָבְרָהָם, 'And thou shalt be a blessing: not only blessed thyself, which is expressed in the former words, I will bless thee; but the means of conveying blessings, the great blessing unto others; and how was this done in and by Abraham? In his own person he conversed but with few of them, unto some whereof through their own sins he was an occasion of punishment; as to the Egyptians, chap. xii. 17, and to the Philistines, chap. xx. 4, 7. Some he destroyed with the sword, chap. xiv. 15, and was not in any thing specially a blessing unto any of them. So his posterity extirpated sundry nations from the face of the earth, were a scourge unto others, and occasioned the ruin of many more. He must needs then be made a blessing unto the world on some other account. And this can be nothing, but that he was separated to be the peculiar channel, by which the promised blessed seed should be brought forth into the world.

Secondly, It is said, that all the families of the earth should be blessed in him, chap. xii. 3, that is, not in his person, but in his seed, as it is expounded, chap. xxii. 18, that is in the promised seed that should come of him, chap. xii. 3. יִתְנֶה הָאָבְרָהָם shall be blessed, in the passive conjugation of Niphal; referring solely unto the grace and favour of God in giving the seed. chap. xxii. 18. יֵתְנֶה הָאָבְרָהָם, in Hithpael, so blessed in the seed when exhibited, as that they shall come for the blessing by faith, and so in him obtaining it, bless themselves. And this is spoken of all nations, all families, the posterity of Adam in general. They were all cursed in Adam as hath been declared; and God here promiseth, that they shall be blessed in the seed of Abraham; and by him the seed of the woman. And this blessing must envelop in it all the good things whereof by the curse they were deprived, or it will be of no use or benefit unto them; a blessing indeed it will not be. He intended to leave mankind for a while to walk in their own ways; partly that he might show his severity against sin; partly that he might evidence the sovereignty and undeserved freeness of that grace wherein he had provided a deliverer; and partly, that they might try their own wisdom and strength in searching after a way of deliverance. But in this promise was the ore laid up, which after many generations was brought forth and stamped with the image of God.

Thirdly, The curse upon Satan is here again renewed, 'I will bless them that bless thee, and I will curse him that curseth thee.' The blessing is to many; but the curse respecteth one principally, that is Satan, as the Scripture generally expresseth the apostate power under that name. Neither is there any just cause of the variation of the number, unless we look on the word as an unfolding of the first promise, which was accompanied with a special malediction on Satan, who shows his enmity in all obloquy and cursing against the blessed seed, and those that are blessed therein. And this change of the number in these words is observed by Aben Ezra: מִרְכָּבָה לְבֵית מַקְלְפֵלָא מָאָב, 'they that bless thee, many; he that curseth, one;' as though many should bless, and few curse, the contrary whereof is true. And Baal Hatturim מִרְכָּבָה לְבֵית מַקְלְפֵלָא מָאָב, 'they that bless thee in the plural number; he that curseth thee in the singular;' and an interpretation is given of the last word, becoming those annotations which are immeasurably Judaical, that is, sottish and superstitious. מַקְלְפֵלָא אָמְא בָּנֵי מַתְמָרִיא.
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He that that curseth thee I will curse; that is, by Gematry, Balaam that cometh to curse thy sons; the numeral letters of each making up 422, of which fantastical work amongst some of them there is no end. But one single person, in which way Satan is usually spoken of, they saw to be intended; which is passed over, as far as I have observed, by Christian expositors.

§ 30. After the giving of this promise, the whole Old Testament beareth witness, that a person was to be born of the posterity of Abraham, in and by whom the nations of the earth should be saved, that is delivered from sin and curse, and made eternally happy. Abraham himself died without one foot of an inheritance in this world, nor did he concern himself personally in the nations of the earth beyond his own family. Another therefore is to be looked after in whom they may be blessed. And this we must further demonstrate, to evince the perverseness of the Jews, who exclude all others beside themselves from an interest in these promises made to Abraham, at least unless they will come into subjection unto them, and dependance upon them. So high conceits have they of themselves even in their low and miserable condition. The next time therefore that he is mentioned in the Scripture, it is said, to him shall be the gathering of the peoples. Gen. xlix. 10, concerning which place we must treat afterwards at large. The people of the world, distinct from Judah, shall gather themselves unto him; that is, for safety and deliverance, or to be made partakers of the promised blessing.

Hence Balaam among the Gentiles prophesied of him, Num. xxiv. 17, 19. And Job among the children of the east that were not of the posterity of Isaac, professed his faith in him, chap. xix. 25. And I know that my Redeemer liveth, (or is living,) and afterwards he shall stand on the earth, or rise on the dust. He believeth that there was a 1 ל ה ו י ל a Redeemer promised, one that should free him from sin and misery. Aben Ezra, by my Redeemer, understandeth a man that would assist him, or judge more favourably of his cause than his friends at that time did; and his comment on ר י א ו נ י and א ר מ י ע א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י א ר מ י is very fond; 'He is at present living, or he shall be born hereafter.' But is this ר י א ו נ י a living Redeemer? ר י א ו נ י, the living one, is a property of God; he is θεος ζων, the living God, 1 Tim. iv. 10, διανοον εκεννανθαναν, 1 Tim. vi. 16, who alone hath immortality. A mortal man is not rightly called a living Redeemer, one that hath life in his power. Besides, Job met with no such Redeemer out of his troubles; and therefore R. Levi Ben Gershom confesseth that it is God who is intended; ר י א ו נ י 'who is the living one and liveth to eternity.' Of this Redeemer, Job saith, he shall stand on the earth, or arise on the dust; if the words be taken in the former sense, (as they will bear either,) his incarnation and coming into the world, is intended; if in the latter his resurrection out of the dust, is intended. The former seems most probable, and the earth is expressed by ר י ע, the dust, to denote the infinite condescension of this Redeemer, in coming to converse on this dust on which we live. And this he shall do ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י ר י R. 'I am the first, and I am the last,' so chap. xlvi. 11. Whence Ralbag, before mentioned, interprets this expression, with respect to the works that God shall do in the earth in the latter days. And in this respect our Goel is said to be Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the ending. He that abides thus the same after all, shall stand on the earth. But the word also is often
joined with מֶשְׁלֶה, a generation, a time, a season, Ps. xlviii. 4, 6, 14. Ps. cii. 19, and denotes the futurition of it; that it is to come, and shall come. So also with גֵּרֵד, a day; as Isa. xxx. 8, pointing out some signal latter day. And here it is used absolutely for וַתִּהְיֶה מִיַּמִּים, in the latter days, which is the ordinary description and designation of the days of the Messiah in the Old Testament. This is that which Job expected, which he believed. Though he was among the Gentiles, yet he believed the promise, and expected his own personal redemption by the blessed seed. And thus although God confined the posterity of Abraham after the flesh to the land of Canaan, yet because in the promised seed he was to be heir of the world, he gives unto the Messiah the heathen to be his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession, Ps. ii. 8. And upon the accomplishment of the work assigned unto him, he promiseth that all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him, Ps. xxxii. 27, a plain declaration of the Gentiles coming in for their share and interest in the redemption wrought by him. See Ps. xlv. 16. For these rebellious ones was he to receive gifts that the Lord God might dwell among them, Ps. lxviii. 18. So that by him Egypt and Ethiopia were to stretch forth their hands unto God, ver. 31. Yea, all kings were to bow down to him, and all nations to serve him, Ps. lxxii. 11—17.

§ 31. These poor Gentiles were the little sister of the Judaical church, which were to be provided for in the love of her spouse, the Messiah, Cant. viii. 8, 9. For in the last days, the days of the Messiah, many people, yea, all nations, are to be brought into the house of the Lord, and to worship him acceptably, Isa. ii. 2, 3, 4. And expressly, chap. xi. 10. The root of Jesse, which the Jews grant to be the Messiah, is to stand for an ensign unto the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek; even for that salvation and deliverance which he had wrought; and they are preferred therein before Israel and Judah, ver. 12. Egypt and Assyria, that is, the other nations of the world, are to be brought into the same covenant of the Messiah with Israel, chap. xix. 25. For all flesh was to see the glory of God, and not the Jews only; ch. xl. 5. And the isles, or uttermost parts of the earth, were to wait for the law of the promised Messiah, chap. xlii. 4. And the whole of what we assert is summed up, chap. xlix. 6, where God speaks unto the promised seed, and says, 'It is 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 unto the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth;' where he is as fully promised unto the Gentiles to be their salvation, as ever he was unto Abraham or his posterity. See chap. li. 5, liii. 12. And on this account doth God call unto men in general to come into his covenant; promising unto them an interest in the mercies of David, and that because he hath given this seed as a witness unto them, as a leader and commander, or the captain of their salvation, ch. li 1—4. The effect of which call in the faith of the Gentiles, and their gathering unto the promised seed is expressed, ver. 5. The like prophecies and predictions of the Gentiles partaking in the redemption to be wrought, occur in all the prophets, especially Ezekiel, Micah, Zechariah, and Malachi, but the instances already produced are sufficient unto our purpose.

§ 32. Yet there seems to be somewhat inconsistent with what we have declared in the words of the apostle, Eph. iii. 5, 6. 'God by revelation made known unto me the mystery which in other ages was not made
known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel. The apostle seems to deny that this mystery of the participation of the Gentiles in the blessing by the promised seed was revealed or made known, before the time of its discovery in and by the gospel, and therefore could not be so declared by the prophets under the Old Testament, as we have evinced. But indeed he doth not absolutely deny what is asserted, only he prefers the excellency of the revelation then made, above all the discoveries that were before made of the same thing. The mystery of it was intimated in many prophecies and predictions, though before their accomplishment they were attended with great obscurity, which now is wholly taken away. In former ages, ὥσπερ ἐγνωρίσθη, it was not, saith he, fully, clearly, manifestly known, τῶν νόεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, גנים שב�能, to the sons of men, in common and promiscuously, though it was intimated unto the prophets, and by them obscurely represented unto the church; but it was not made known, ὡς νῦν, with that clearness, evidence, and perspicuity, as it is now by the apostles, and preached unto all. It is only then the degrees of the manifestation of this mystery, as to openness, plainness, and evidence, that are asserted by the apostle, above all of the same kind that went before, but the discovery of it is not absolutely denied. And this much was necessary in our passage to secure our own interest in the mercy treated about.

§ 33. We may now return a little again to the promise given unto Abraham. In consequence of this promise, his posterity was separated to be a peculiar people unto God. Their church-state, the whole constitution of their worship, their temple, and sacrifices, were all of them assigned and appointed for the confirmation of the promise, and to the explanation of the way whereby the blessed seed should be brought forth, and of the work that he should perform for the removal of sin and the curse, and for the bringing in of everlasting righteousness, as shall elsewhere be manifested. Moreover, unto this deliverer, and deliverance to be wrought by him, with the nature of it, and the means of its accomplishment, by what he was to do and suffer, do all the prophets bear witness. The full manifestation hereof, seeing it requires an explication of the whole doctrine of the Messiah, concerning his person, grace, and mediation, his offices, life, death, and intercession, the justification of sinners through his blood, and sanctification by his Spirit; with all other articles of our Christian faith, all which are taught and revealed, though obscurely in the Old Testament, would take up an entire volume, and be unsuitable unto our present design. But by three things in general the prophets give testimony unto him. First, by preferring the promised relief and remedy above all the present glory and worship of the church; directing it to look above all its enjoyments unto that which in all things was to have the preeminence. See Isra. ii. 2, iv. 2—5, vii. 13—15, ix. 6, 7, xi. 1—10, &c., xxxii. 1—4, xxxv. 1—10, xl. 1—5, 9, 10, 11, xlii. 1—4, xlix. 18, 19, li. 4—7, lxx. 20, 21, lx. lxii. 1, 2, 3, &c., lxxxv. 17, 18; Jer. xxxii. 5, 6, xxx. 9, xxxi. 31—34, xxxii. 40, 41, 42; Ezek. xl., &c.; Dan. vii. 27, ix. 24, xii. 1, 2; Hos. iii. 5; Joel iii. 18; Amos ix. 11—15; Obad. 21; Micah iv. 1—4, v. 1—4; Hab. ii. 14; Hag. ii. 6—9; Zech. ii. 8—12, iii. 8, 9, 10, vi. 12, 13, ix. 9, 10, 11, xiv. 3, 4, 20; Mal. i. 11, iii. 1, 2, 3, iv. 2. Which places, although but a few of those that occur in the prophets, are yet too many to be particularly insisted on. But this they all teach with
one consent, that there was in the promise which they assert and confirm, an excellency of blessings, far exceeding in glory and worth, and in advantage unto believers, all that which they outwardly enjoyed, in their peace, prosperity, kingdom, and temple worship. Now this can be nothing but the spiritual and eternal deliverance of their persons, from sin, curse, and misery, with the enjoyment of the favour of God in this life, and blessedness hereafter in his presence for evermore. And this in particular is expressed and declared in many of the promises directed unto, especially those which concern the making and establishing of the new covenant, which is that we are in the demonstration of.

Secondly. They do the same in the description which they give of the person that was to be this remedy or relief, and of the work that he was to accomplish for that end. For the former, they declare that he was to be the Son of God, God and man in one person, Ps. ii. 7, ex. 1; Isa. ix. 6, 7; Jer. xxxii. 5, 6; Zech. ii. 8, 9, 10; and in sundry other places is the same mystery intimated, whereby the church was farther instructed how God would join with the nature of man in the seed of the woman, for the conquest of the old serpent, and the destruction of his works. And for the latter, they declare his sufferings in an especial manner, even what and how he was to suffer in the bruising of his heel, or bearing the effect of sin, and punishment due to it, Ps. xxii; Isa. liii; Dan. ix. 24, 25. And his teaching, ruling, and governing of his people, in their obedience unto God, until they are saved unto the uttermost by him, as the great prophet and king of his church, is by them fully manifested, Ps. ii., xxii. 25, xlv. 2—17, lxviii. 17, 18, lxiii., lxxxix. 9—13, xvii., xviii., xcviii., xcix., ex.; Isa. xi. 1—5, ix. 6, 7, xxxii. 1, 2, xxv., xl. 11, 12, xlii. 1—4, xlv. 22—25, xlix. 1—12, l. 4, lx. 16, 17, lxi. 1, 2, 3, lxxiii. 1—6; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Micah iv. 2, 3, v. 1—4; Zech. ii. 8; Mal. iii. 1—4, as in sundry other places. Yea, herein all the prophets greatly abound, it being the principal work for which God raised them up, and inspired them by his Holy Spirit in their several generations, as Peter declared; 1 Epist. i. 10—12.

Thirdly. They did also bear testimony to Messiah by taking off the expectations of men from looking after relief and deliverance by any other way or means whatsoever, Psal. xl. 8, 9. Add hereunto that the whole fabric of the tabernacle and temple-worship, was contrived, appointed, and designed in infinite wisdom, unto no other end, but to instruct and direct the church unto this promised deliverer, and to the salvation to be wrought by him; as, God assisting, shall be abundantly manifested in our exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 34. Thus, do both the law and and prophets bear witness unto this promised deliverer, and to the deliverance to be wrought by him. And this is he whom the Jews and Christians call the Messiah. מashiach is from מashiach to ‘anoint’ with oil. Those who were peculiarly of old consecrated unto God in the great offices of kings, priests, and prophets, were by his appointment so to be anointed; at least, some of them on special occasions were so. Thence were they called מashiach ‘anointed ones.’ And because this anointing with oil was not appointed for its own sake, but for somewhat signified thereby; those who received the thing so signified, although not actually anointed with oil, are called anointed ones also, Ps. cxv. 15. Now, this promised seed, this Saviour or deliverer, being appointed of God to perform his work in the discharge of the triple office of King, Priest, and Prophet unto his sacred people, and being furnished with those gifts and endowments which were signified by the anointing oil, is by an antonomasia
called the Messiah. Or מֶשֶׁחַ 'Messiah the king,' Dan. ix. 25. מֶשֶׁחַ הָרָע, 'Messiah the prince, ruler, or leader;' and ver. 26, מֶשֶׁחַ, 'Messiah' absolutely. The Greeks render this name μουσιας, which twice occurs in the New Testament, where persons of the Jewish faith and church are introduced speaking of the Saviour for whom they looked, John i. 41, iv. 25. In all the other Scriptures the holy penmen constantly call the same person by another name of the same signification in the language wherein they wrote, with מֶשֶׁחַ in the Hebrew, namely χριστός, 'the anointed one,' Christ. The Greek μουσιας and the Latin Messiah, seem rather to be taken immediately from the Chaldee מֶשֶׁחַ Messiahh, than from the Hebrew מֶשֶׁחַ 'Messiah,' and to come nearer unto it in sound and pronunciation. It is true, that the name is sometimes applied unto profane and wicked men with respect unto the office or work to which they were of God designed; as to Saul, 1 Sam. xxiv. 7; and to Cyrus, Isa. xliv. 1. And the Jews call the priest who was to sound the trumpet when the people went forth to battle, Deut. xx. 8, מֶשֶׁחַ מַלְאךָ מֶשֶׁחַ, the 'anointed unto the war.' But as was said, it is applied by the way of eminency unto the promised seed, and unto others by way of allusion, and with respect unto their office and present work.

EXERCITATION IX.


§ 1. We have considered the first great promise concerning the Messiah, and evinced from thence the nature of his work and office, as also shown in general how testimony is given to him throughout the Old Testament,
and whence his name is derived. We shall now, moreover, inquire in par-
ticular into some of those places where he is expressly foretold, promised, or prophesied of, that we may thence gather what farther light concerning his person and natures, and his employment, was granted unto the church of old, which the present Jews wilfully reject. And herein, as I aim not to collect all the prophecies and promises which God gave concerning him, by the mouth of his holy prophets from the foundation of the world, but only to single out some of the most eminent that give us a direct description of his person or his grace, in conformity to, or in confirmation of what hath been already discoursed about them; so I shall have an especial re-
spect unto those prophecies which the Jews themselves do acknowledge to belong unto him. There is a book written by Abarbinel which he calls שם ישוע, wherein he undertakes to explain all those texts of Scripture or prophecies, which cannot be understood either spiritually, or of the second temple, but of their redemption by the Messiah. This at present, among others, I am forbidden the use of, which might have been of advantage in the present design. I shall, therefore, principally insist on those places which are applied unto him in the Targums, the most authentic writings amongst them, whereunto some others shall be added, which I have observed to be interpreted to the same purpose in the best of their commentators.

§ 2. The name Messiah is but twice or thrice at most used in the Old Testament, directly and immediately to denote the promised seed; namely, Dan. ix. 25, 26, whereunto Ps. ii. 2, may be added. But this name, for the reasons before given, prevailing in the Judaical church, it is frequently made use of, and inserted in the Targums, where he is treated of, although he be not expressly named in the original. Elias, in his Methurgeman, reckons up fifty of those places, whereunto one and twenty more are added by Buxtorfius. The principal of these deserve our consideration, considering that some of the most eminent of them are denied by the latter Jews, to belong unto him, especially those which give testimony unto that part of the faith of Christians concerning his person and office, which by them is opposed or denied. And this consent of the Targums is of great weight against them, as containing an evidence of what persuasion prevailed amongst themselves, before they suited all their expositions of Scripture, unto their own infidelity in opposition to the gospel and its doctrines. And unto these, as was said, such others shall be added, as their chief masters do yet acknowledge directly to belong unto him.

§ 3. The first of this sort that occurs, is the first promise before insisted on and vindicated, Gen. iii. 15. It (the seed of the woman) shall bruise thy head, the head of the serpent. Mention is made here expressly of the Messiah in the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; and this promise is applied unto him after their manner. The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, and they shall obtain, מイラש איינקנס בירם 'healing, or a plaster for the heel,' (the hurt received by the serpent) 'in the days of Messiah the king;' so Jonathan; and Targ. Hierusal. useth words to the same purpose. Both of them expressly refer the promise to the days of the Messiah; that is, to himself, or the work that he was to do, whence they insert his name into the text. And this is per-
fectly destructive unto the present pretensions of the Jews. The work here assigned unto him, of recovering the evil of sin and misery brought on the world through the temptation of the serpent, is that wherewith they would have him to have nothing to do.

Besides, his suffering is intimated in the foregoing expression, that the
serpent should bruise his heel, from which they much desire to free their Messiah. But that which principally lies against them in this testimony is, that whereas they appropriate the promise of the Messiah unto themselves, and make the doctrine concerning him to belong unto the law of Moses, whereof say some, (those that follow Maimonides) it is one of the fundamentals, others (as Josephus Albo) that it is a branch of the fundamental concerning rewards and punishments, it is here given out by the testimony of their Targums, unto the posterity of Adam indefinitely, two thousand years before the call and separation of Abraham, from whom they pretend to derive their privilege, and much longer before the giving of their law, whereof they would have it to be a part; which is diligently to be heeded against them.

§ 4. Concerning the promises made unto Abraham we have spoken before; the next mention of the Messiah in the Targum, is on Gen. xxxv. 21, where occasion is taken to bring him into the text. For unto those words, and 'Israel journeyed and spread his tent, unto, or 'beyond the tower of Edar,' Jonathan adds, 'which is the place from whence the king Messiah shall be revealed in the end of the days.' And this tradition is taken from Micah iv. 8. And thou tower of Edar,' or of the flock, unto thee shall it come, the first dominion.' Now, this tower of Edar was a place in, or near to Bethlehem, as is manifest from the place in Genesis. For, whereas Jacob is said to stay at Ephrah, that is, Bethlehem, where he set up a pillar on the grave of Rachel, ver. 19, 20; upon his next removal, he spread his tent beyond the tower of Edar, which must therefore needs be a place near unto Bethlehem. And the prophet assigning the rise of the kingdom of the Messiah unto that place, because he was to be born at Bethlehem; the paraphrast took occasion to make mention of him here, where that place is first spoken of, declaring their expectation of his being born there, which accordingly had long before come to pass.

§ 5. Gen. xl. 1. 'And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you what shall befal you, in the latter days, or the last days, or end of the days. Jonathan paraphraseth thus on these words; 'after that, or although the glory of the divine majesty was revealed unto him, the time, (that is the express time,) wherein the king Messias was to come, was hid from him, and therefore he said, come and I will declare unto you what shall befal you in the end of the days.' This expression of the end or last of the days, is an usual periphrasis for the days of the Messiah in the Old Testament. To that purpose it is used, Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30; Isa. ii. 2; Hos. iii. 5; Micah iv. 1, and our apostle expressly refers unto it, Heb. i. 1. Now this expression denotes no certain season of time, but only indefinitely directs to the last days of the posterity of Jacob, continuing a distinct church and people, for those ends for which they were originally separated from all others. And this being the first place wherein it is used, and which all the rest refer unto, the paraphrast here took occasion both to mention the Messiah of whose time of coming this was to be the constant description, as also to intimate the reason of the frequent use of this expression; which was because the precise time of his coming was hidden even from the best of the prophets, unto whom the glory of the divine Majesty was in other things revealed. Besides the ensuing predictions in the chapter do sufficiently secure the application of the days mentioned, unto the time of the Messiah.
§ 6. Gen. xlix. 10. "Until Shiloh come. All the three Targums agree in the application of these words unto the Messiah. Onkelos; Ἰουλίου, until Messiah comes. Jonathan and Jerusalem use the same words; Ἱουλίου, until the time wherein the king Messiah shall come." An illustrious prophecy this is concerning him; the first that limits the time of his coming, with an express circumstance, and which must therefore afterwards be at large insisted on. At present it may suffice to remark the suffrage of these Targums against the perverseness of their later masters, who contend by all artifices imaginable, to pervert this text unto other purposes; who are therefore to be pressed with the authority of the Targumists, which with none of their cavilling exceptions they can evade. The following words, also, ver. 11, 12, are applied by Jonathan unto the Messiah in the pursuit of the former prediction, and that not unfitly, as hath been shown by others already. See Ainsworth on the place.

§ 7. Exod. xii. 42. "It is a night much to be observed." Hierusal. Targ. "This is the fourth night, (it had mentioned three before,) when the end of this present world shall be accomplished to be dissolved, and the cords of impiety shall be wasted, and the iron yoke shall be broken;" that is, the people of God shall be delivered; whereunto is added, מֵךְ וּמְכָּרנָה מִלְּכֵם מֵשֶׁה מִשְׁכָּב מַזְמֶר, "Moses shall come forth from the midst of the wilderness, and the king Messiah from the midst of Rome." That of the Messiah coming out of Rome is Talmudical, depending on a fable which we shall afterwards give an account of. And we may here once for all observe, that although they believe that their Messiah is to be a mere man, born after the manner of all other men, yet they never speak of his birth or nativity as a thing that they looked for; only they speak of his coming, but most commonly of his being revealed, and their great expectation is, when he shall be discovered and revealed. And this proceeds from a secret conviction, that he was born long since, even at the time promised and appointed; only that he is hidden from them, as indeed he is, though not in the sense by them imagined. But what makes the application of the night of the passover to be the coming of the Messiah? They cannot imagine that he shall come unto them whilst they are celebrating that ordinance; for that is not lawful for them, unless they were at Jerusalem, whither they believe they shall never return until he come and go before them. It is then some tradition amongst them, that their deliverance out of Egypt was a type of the deliverance by the Messiah, whose sacrifice and suffering was represented in the Paschal Lamb, which gave occasion unto this gloss.

§ 8. Exod. xl. 9. Targum of Jonathan; Ἰουλίου, Thou shalt sanctify it for the crown of the kingdom of the house of Judah; Ἰουλίου, and the king Messiah who shall deliver Israel in the end of the days. The end of the unction there mentioned in the text, is that the things anointed might be קדוש, holiness of holinesses, unto the Lord. Now it was the Messiah alone who truly and really was this most holy one, Dan. ix. 24. holiness נבכ Nhôkhe, to anoint, or to make Messiah, of the holiness of holinesses, the Most Holy One, as he is called in the New Testament, ὁ ἀγγελικός, the Holy One, κατ' εἰρήνην, Acts iii. 14, iv. 30; 1 John ii. 20; Rev. iii. 7. And hence, as it should seem, is this place applied unto him by the Targumist; and an intimation given, that in all their holy things, their tabernacle, sanctuary, and altar, he was represented; for as he was the most holy, and his body the temple wherein
the fulness of the Godhead dwelt, Col. ii. 9; so ἐκκυσάεσθαι εἰς ημῖν, he tabernacled amongst us; John i. 14, and is our altar, Heb. xiii. 10.

§ 9. Numb. xi. 26. 'But there remained two of the men in the camp, the name of the one was Eldad, and the name of the other was Medad, and the Spirit rested upon them (and they were of the men that were written, but went not out unto the tabernacle) and they prophesied in the camp.' Here seemeth not to be any thing immediately relating unto the Messiah, yet two of the Targums have brought him into this place, but attended with such a story, as I should not mention, were it not to give a signal instance how they raise their traditions. Eldad and Medad prophesied in the camp, as the text assures us. What they prophesied about is not declared. This the Targumists pretend to acquaint us with. Eldad they say prophesied of the death of Moses, the succession of Joshua, and their entrance into Canaan under his conduct. This caused one to run and inform Moses, which gave occasion to those words of lis, ver. 29. 'Enviest thou for my sake; for what if he do prophesy that I shall die? and thereon he would not rebuke them. Medad prophesied of the coming of the quails to feed them. But both of them prophesied and said, בָּשָׁלָם מָנוֹם וְנִפְרַדוּ בְּיוֹם מִשָּׁרָה, רִיתָם מִלְּרָפָסְלָה יְדוּרֵי מְדַלָּא מֶשֶׁה אֲנָא מְפֶלַן. 'In the latter days Gog and Magog shall ascend with their host against Jerusalem, and they shall fall by the hand of the Messiah; whereon in Jonathan there followeth a story of the delicious fare and dainties, which they fancy unto themselves in those days. But what is the reason that Eldad and Medad must be thought to prophesy thus concerning Gog? Ezek. xxxviii. 17, we have these words; 'Thus saith the Lord God, unto Gog art thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days and years, that I would bring thee against them?' Not finding any express prophecy in the Scripture, as they suppose, concerning Gog, because that name is not elsewhere used, they could not fasten these words any where better than on Eldad and Medad, concerning whom it is said that they prophesied, but nothing is recorded of what is spoken by them, therefore they think that they may assign unto them what they please; although there is not the least reason to suppose that their prophesying consisted in predictions of things to come. Speaking of the things of God, and praising him in an extraordinary manner, is called prophesying in the Scripture. So those words of the children of the prophets who came down from the high place with psalteries and harps, דָּנַהוּ יְהֹוָה מָשָּׁרָה, 1 Sam. x. 5, 'and they are prophesying,' is rendered in the Targum, מַשָּׁרָה אֲנָא מְשָׁרָה, and they are praising, or singing praises unto God; which both their company and their instruments declare to have been their employment. But such occasions as these, do they lay hold of, for the raising of their figments which in process of time grow to be traditions.

§ 10. Numb. xxiii. 21, chap. xxiv, 7, 17, 20, 24. All the Targums agree, that the Messiah is intended in these prophecies of Balaam. Especially on those words, chap. xxiv, 17, 'There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre out of Israel.' 'A King,' say they jointly, 'shall arise out of Jacob, מַשָּׁרָה אֲנָא מְשָׁרָה, and the Messiah shall be anointed.' And an illustrious prophecy it is, no doubt, concerning his coming and dominion, who is the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star. Rashi interprets the place of David, who smote the corners of Moab, as he was in many things a type of Christ. Aben Ezra confessesthat many interpret the words concerning the Messiah; and Maimonides distributes
the prophecy between David and the Messiah, assigning some things unto one, some to another: Tractat. de Regib. in בֵּין וַעֲלֵיהֶם also, they grant it to be the prophecy of the Messiah. And there is no doubt of the sense of their ancient masters, from the story of Bar Coziba, whom, after they had accepted of for their Messiah, from this place they called Bar Coheba; Akiba applying this prediction of בכור, or the star unto him. And Fagius on the Targum in this place, observes, that in the name בכור, chockab, applied unto the Messiah, the Cabalists observe two things: First, That the two first letters signify the same number with the letters of יהוה the name of God, that is twenty-six; and the two latter twenty-two, the number of the letters of the law. The observation is sufficiently Talmudical; but the intention of it, that the Messiah hath in him the name of God, and shall fulfil the whole law, is a blessed truth. This Fagius, and Munster before him, observed out of צַדִּיק יְהֹוָה, a bundle of myrrh, a Cabalistical comment on the Pentateuch, by R. Abraham. But they all contend against the application of this prediction unto our Lord Jesus Christ; for when, say they, did he smite the corners of Moab? when did he destroy all the children of Seth? and how were those words, ver. 18, כַּהַנָּה יְהֹוָה אֲבוֹת, in which they interpret, 'and Israel shall gather wealth or substance,' fulfilled? But we have sufficiently proved the Messiah to be a spiritual Redeemer; and therefore, however his kingdom may be expressed, in words signifying literally outward and temporal things, yet things spiritual and eternal are to be understood as figuratively set out by the other. Neither can these words be absolutely understood according to the letter. For whereas Seth was the son given unto Adam, in the room of Abel, and all the posterity of Cain was cut off at the flood, if the Messiah destroy literally all the children of Seth, he must not leave any one man alive in the world, which certainly is not the work he was promised for.

Besides, the Lord Christ hath partly already, and in due time will utterly destroy, all the stubborn enemies of his kingdom. Neither can the Jews press the instance of Moab literally, seeing by Edom they constantly understand Rome, or the Roman empire.

§ 11. Deut. xviii. 15—19. This place is an eminent prophecy concerning the Messiah, and concerning his prophetical office, which had not till now been mentioned. But the law being now given, which was to continue inviolably unto his coming, Mal. iv. 4, when it was to be changed, and taken away; this part of his work, that he was to make the last, full, perfect declaration of the will of God, is now declared. The Targums are here silent respecting him, for they principally attend unto those places which make mention of his kingdom. Rashi refers the words unto the series of prophets, which were afterwards raised up; Aben Ezra to Joshua; others to Jeremiah, upon the rejection of whose warnings the people were carried into captivity, which they collect from ver. 19. Whatever now they pretend, of old they looked for some one signal prophet from this place, which should immediately come before the Messiah himself. Thence was that question in their examination of John Baptist, 'Art thou that prophet?' John i. 21, namely, whom they looked for from this prediction of Moses. But it is the Messiah himself, and none other, that is intended. For, first, none other ever arose like unto Moses. This is twice repeated: in the words of Moses unto the people, ver. 15, 'God will raise thee up a prophet (כָּלָמִי) like unto me'; and in the words of God to Moses, ver. 18, 'I will raise them up a prophet (כָּלָמִי) like unto
Lipman, a blasphemous Jew, in his Nizzachon, contends that Jesus cannot be intended, because he was not like Moses; for Moses was a man only, Jesus declared himself to be God; Moses had father and mother, Jesus had not as we say. But the comparison intended, both not at all respect their persons or their natures, but their office. It was in the prophetic office, that the prophet foretold was to be like unto Moses. It is a lawgiver, one that should institute new ordinances of worship by the authority of God for the use and observance of the whole church, as Moses did; one that should reveal the whole will of God, as Moses did, as to that season wherein God employed him. That this could not be Joshua, nor any of the prophets that ensued, is evident from that testimony of the Holy Ghost, Deut. xxxiv. 10. ‘There arose not since a prophet in Israel like unto Moses.’ This must therefore be referred unto some singular prophet, who was then to come, or there is an express contradiction in the text. And this is none other but the Messiah, concerning whom they acknowledge that he shall be a prophet above Moses. Secondly, The extermination threatened unto the people, upon their disobedience unto this prophet, here promised, ver. 19, never befell them, until they had rejected the Lord Jesus, the true and only Messiah. Wherefore this place is rightly applied unto him in the New Testament, Acts iii. 22, 23, vii. 37. And we have hence a farther discovery of the nature of the Deliverer, and deliverance promised of old, and therein of the faith of the ancient church. He was to be a blessed prophet to reveal the mind and will of God; which also he hath done unto the utmost. And from this place it is that the Jews themselves, in Midrash Coheleth, cap. 1, say, ‘The latter Redeemer is to be like the former.’

§ 12. Deut. xxv. 19. ‘Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven, thou shalt not forget it.’ Jonathan Targum, אֲשֶׁר לְיִהְיוּ מָלְאָֽךְ מַהְדָּא לֶא תַּהֲנִי, And also in the days of the Messiah, the king, thou shalt not forget it.’ But as this savours too much of those revengeful thoughts with which they frequently discover themselves to be filled; so all these apprehensions proceed from the old tradition, that by the Messiah we should be delivered from the hands of all our enemies, which they being carnal and earthly, do wrest to give countenance unto their own desires and imaginations.

§ 13. Deut. xxx. 4. “If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee.” Jonathan Targum, מַהְמַּה יִנָּשֶׁךָ חַגְוֹ נְאֹרָה, וְיָדֶֽךָ מַאֲשָׁר לֶא תַּהֲנֵי מַהֲדָא מַאֲשָׁר, ‘from thence will the word of the Lord gather thee by the hand of Elijah the great priest, and from thence will he bring thee by the hand of Messiah the king.’ The place is not amiss applied unto the deliverance which they shall one day have by the Messiah; for it is to happen after the whole curse of the law is come upon them for their disobedience, and after that they shall turn again unto the Lord by repentance, ver. 1, 2. And whereas the words are doubled, they suppose them to imitate a double work of deliverance; one whereof they have committed to Elias from Mal. iv. 5, who was to be, and who was the forerunner of the Messiah.

And these are places in the books of Moses, wherein they acknowledge that mention is made of the Messiah; for as to that way whereby the church of old was principally instructed in his work and office, namely in the sacrifices and ceremonies of the law, they know nothing of it; nor shall
it here be insisted on, seeing it must have so large a place in the exposition of the Epistle itself.

§ 14. 1 Sam. ii. 10. ‘He shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed.’ Targ. רבד ומלŎגו וmah lih.f ירהומ אגלוים, and he shall exalt the kingdom of his Messiah.’ In Midrash Tillim also, on Ps. lxxv., they ascribe this place unto the Messiah, and reckon his horn as the tenth horn of strength granted unto Israel. R. Levi Ben Gershom understands by the king, in the first place, (He shall give strength unto his king,) Saul, and by Messiah in the close of the words, David, who was to be anointed by Samuel, the son of Hannah, whose words these are. Kimchi applies the words to the Messiah, whom, as he says, she intended by the spirit of prophecy, or spoke of from tradition. And indeed the words seem directly to intend him. For by him alone doth the Lord judge the ends of the earth, and he was the Anointed, whose power he would signally exalt. And I mention this place only as an instance of the faith of the church of old, who, in all their mercies, still had a regard unto the great promise of the Messiah, which was the fountain of them all. And therefore Hannah here closeth her prophetical eulogy with her acknowledgment thereof, and faith therein.

§ 15. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, ילאו שייאו רעיה וייה אגלוים, ‘He that ruleth in man, just, ruler, (in or of,) the fear of the Lord:’ Targ. בות ירחניא מָלֵא, ‘He said he would appoint unto me a king, which is the Messiah, who shall arise and rule in the fear of the Lord.’ And it refers this whole last prophecy of David, or his last words that he spake by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, unto the days of the Messiah: whence it gives this preface unto them: ‘These are the words of the prophecy of David, which he prophesied concerning the end of the world, (or for the end of the world, כְּהַלָּה יִירְחַני) and the days of consolation that were to come.’ Rab. Isaiah, and Rashi, interpret the words of David himself; and Kimchi also, but he mentions the application of it unto the Messiah, who was to come of David, whom God would raise up unto him, which he approveth of. Christian expositors who follow the Jews, interpret those words, יֵל יָרֵד בְּרֹאשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, ‘the Rock of Israel spake to me,’ by יֵל יָרֵד בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹרים, ‘spake concerning me;’ that is by Samuel, who anointed me to be King. Some, he spake to me by Nathan.

Our translators keep to the letter, ‘he spake unto me.’ And that alone answers unto the words of the verse foregoing, ‘The Spirit of the Lord, יֵל יָרֵד בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, spake in me, or to me,’ so are the revelations of God expressed, see Zech. iv. 1, 4, and it expresseth the communication of the mind of God unto the prophet, בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, and not his speaking by him unto others. And from these very words, יֵל יָרֵד בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, ‘the Spirit of the Lord spake in me,’ do the Jews take occasion to cast the writings of David amongst those which they assign unto that kind of revelation which they call תּוֹורים, אֲמִרִים, or רוח рассיב, ‘books written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost.’ The other words also, יֵל יָרֵד בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, ‘his word was in my tongue,’ manifest that it is David himself that is spoken unto, and not of, in the third verse; and therefore it is some other who is prophesied of by him, namely the Messiah.

And this the words whereby he is described do also manifest: רuling in man; that is, saith Jarchi, מָלָא אֲמִרִים, רדַּבְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, ‘over Israel, who is called man; as it is said, and ye the flock of my pasture are men: בְּרֹאשׁ תּוֹורים, you are man, Ezek. xxxiv. 1. But where the word Adam is used with this prefix ב, as here, it no where signifies Israel, but is expressly used in a contradistinction from them; as Jer. xxxii. 20, ‘which
hast set signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, even unto this day; ‘אבתו ותאבד, ‘and in Israel and in Adam, that is, as we render it, amongst other men that are not Israel.’ So that, if any special sort of men are intended in this expression, it is not Israel, but other men. And, indeed, this word is commonly used to denote mankind in general; as Gen. vi. 3, ix. 6; Exod. viii. 18, ix. 10, xiii. 2, and universally, wherever it is used, it signifies either all mankind, or human nature. So that is he who is the ruler over all mankind, which is the Messiah alone. Unless we shall interpret this expression by that of Ps. lxviii. 19, ‘Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, ἀκεπίστη δόνα ἐν ἀναρχίᾳ, and thou hast received gifts in man,’ that is, in the human nature exalted, whereof the Psalmist treats in that place. For whereas the apostle, Eph. iv. 8, renders these words, εὐθύς ἰδαία εἰς ἄνθρωπος, ‘he gave gifts unto men,’ it is manifest that he expresseth the end and effect of that which is spoken in the Psalm; for the Lord Christ received gifts in his own human nature, that he might give and bestow them on others, as Peter declareth, Acts ii. 33. The remainder also of the words contain a description of the Messiah. He is κυριός, δ ἐκκλησίας, ‘the just and righteous One,’ Acts iii. 14; and He alone is ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν τῆς ἀδελφίας, ‘he that rules in the things that concern the fear and worship of God,’ Isa. xi. 2, 3. So that this place doth indeed belong unto the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah.

§ 16. 1 Kings iv. 33. Instead of those words concerning Solomon, “He spake of trees from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;” the Targum reads, ‘הארהון עלה על בת הוד, ‘And he prophesied of the kings of the house of David in this world, (the duration of time and state of things under the Old Testament,) and of the Messiah in the world to come;’ so they call the days of the Messiah. I know of none who have considered what occasion the Targumists could take from the words of the text, to mention this matter in this place. I will not say, that he doth not intend the Book of Canticles, wherein, under an allegory of trees, herbs, and spices, Solomon prophesieoth of, and sets forth the grace and love of Christ towards his church, and wherein many things are by the latter Targumist applied unto the Messiah also, as we shall see.

§ 17. There is mention likewise made of the Messiah in the Targum, by an addition unto the text, Ruth iii. 15. ‘It was said in the prophecy, that six righteous persons should come of Ruth, David, and Daniel, with his companions, and the king Messiah.’ The general end of the writing of this Book of Ruth, was to declare the providence of God about the genealogy of the Messiah. And this seems to have been kept in tradition amongst them. And for this cause doth Matthew expressly mention her name in his rehearsal of the genealogy of Christ, Matt. i. 5. For it being a tradition amongst the Jews, that this was the end of the writing of her story, whereon they add that consideration unto the text in their Targum, it was remembered by the evangelist in a compliance therewith.

§ 18. The place of Job, wherein he expresseth his faith in him, and expectation of redemption by him, hath been already explicated and vindicated, so that we shall not need here to insist upon it again. The Psalms next occur. In David, the light and faith of the church began to be greatly enlarged. The renovation of the promise unto him, the confirmation of it by an oath, the confinement of the promised seed unto his posterity, the
establishment of his throne and kingdom as a type of the dominion and rule of the Messiah, with the especial revelations made unto him, as one that signally longed for his coming, and rejoiced in the prospect which he had of it in the spirit of prophecy, did greatly further the faith and knowledge of the whole church. Henceforward, therefore, the mention of him is multiplied, so that it would be impossible to insist on all the particular instances of it. I shall, therefore, notice only some of the most eminent, with an especial respect unto the concurrence of the persuasion and expectation of the Jews.

§ 19. Ps. ii. 2, 'The rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed:' his Messiah, as the word should be left uninterpreted. Targum, ויהי ברא אלהים בן ישר אלוהים, 'against his Messiah.' The Talmudists, in several places, acknowledge this Psalm to be a prophecy of the Messiah, and apply sundry passages thereof unto him. And those words, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," are not amiss expounded by them in Tract. Succah. c. 5, ‘I will this day reveal unto men that thou art my Son;’ for so are they applied by our apostle dealing with the Jews, Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5, namely, unto his resurrection from the dead, whereby he was declared to be the Son of God with power, Rom. i. 4. All the principal expositors amongst them, as Rashi, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, Bartenora, or Rab. Obodia, acknowledge, that their ancient doctors and masters expounded this Psalm concerning the Messiah. Of their more modern teachers, some of them apply it unto David, and say it was composed by some of the singers concerning him, when he was anointed king, of which the Philistines hearing, prepared to fight against him, 2 Sam. v. 17. This is the conceit of Rashi, who therein is followed by sundry Christian expositors, with no advantage to the faith. And I presume they observed not the reason he gives for his exposition, ‘Our masters,’ saith he, ‘of blessed memory, interpret this Psalm of the King Messiah; ויהי ברא אלהים, but as the words sound, and to answer the heretics, it is meet or right to expound it of David.’ Those words, ויהי ברא אלהים, ‘and that we may answer the heretics, or Christians,’ are left out in the Venice and Basil editions of his comments, but were in the old copies of them. And this is the plain reason why they would apply this Psalm to David, of whom not one verse of it can be truly and rightly expounded, as shall be manifest elsewhere. And it is a wise answer which they give in Midrash Tehillim, unto that testimony of ver. 7, where God calls the Messiah his Son, to prove him to be the natural son of God.

‘םיקרה מהתהוב תלמידי חכמים אומרים ית ככ לם בה אמת מראות יד יכ לא ראה ית אלהים פק 되ים; א"ד א"כ לא ראיה יית אלהים; ‘And hence we may have an answer for the heretics, who say that the holy blessed God hath a Son. But do thou answer, He says not thou art a Son to me; but thou art my Son.’ As though ראה, ‘thou art my Son,’ did not more directly express the filiation of the person spoken of, than יכ לא ראיה יית אלהים. יככו, my Son, is more emphatically expressive of a natural relation, than יככי, a Son to me; see Gen. xxvii. 21. And in this Psalm, we have a good part of the creed of the ancient church concerning the Messiah, as may be learned from the exposition of it.

§ 20. Ps. xviii. 32. Targum, ‘Because of the miracles and redemption which thou shalt work for thy Messiah.’ I mention this place only, that it may appear that the Jews had a tradition amongst them, that David in this Psalm bare the person of the Messiah, and was considered as his type. And
hence our apostle applies those words, ver. 3. רַבּוּ הָאָדָם, ‘I will put my trust in him,’ unto the Lord Jesus Christ, Heb. ii. 13. See also Ps. xx. 7.

§ 21. Ps. xxi. 1, “The King shall joy in thy strength, O Lord.” Targum, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘the King Messiah shall rejoice.’ Ver. 7, “For the King trusteth in the Lord.” Targum, ‘Messiah the King.’ And in Midrash Tehillim, those words of ver. 3, ‘Thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head,’ are also applied unto him. There is no mention of him in the Targum on Ps. xxi., nor in the Midrash; but we shall afterwards prove at large that whole Psalm to belong unto him, and to have been so acknowledged by some of their ancient masters, against the oppositions and cavils of their later seducers.

§ 22. Ps. xlv. The Targum hath given an especial title unto this Psalm, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘a Psalm of praise for the elders (assessors) of the sanhedrim of Moses:’ intimating, that something eminent is contained in it. And those words, ver. 2, “Thou art fairer than the children of men:” are rendered in it, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is more excellent than that of the sons of men.’ And grace, in the next words, is interpreted by Midrash, the spirit of prophecy, not amiss. And those words, ver. 7, ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,’ are retained with little alteration: יִכְרֹשׁ כְּזֶה יְנַפְּךָ, ‘The seat of thy glory, O God, remaineth for ever and ever:’ applying it unto the Messiah, which illustrious testimony given unto his deity, shall be vindicated in our exposition of the words, as cited by our apostle, Heb. viii. Kimchi expounds this Psalm of the Messiah. Aben Ezra says, it is spoken of David, עַל מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, or concerning Messiah his Son, who is likewise called David; as, דָּרְשֵׁי מִשְׁמָר, shall be their Prince for ever,’ Ezek. xxxvii. 25.

§ 23. Psalms cxlviii. and cxlix. are illustrious prophecies of the Messiah, though the Jews take little notice of them, and that because they treat of two things which they will not acknowledge concerning him: the former expresseth him to be God, ver. 17, 18, and the other his sufferings from God and men, ver. 26, both which they deny and oppose. But in Shemot Rabba, sect. 35, they say of the prophecies, ver. 32, ‘The princes that shall come out of Egypt, shall be called the princes of the Messiah. And in Midrash, דָּרְשֵׁי מִשְׁמָר, all nations shall bring gifts to the King Messiah,’ referring the Psalm to his days and work. The same exposition is given of the place in Midrash Esther i. 1, and by R. Obodiah Haggao on the place.

§ 24. Psalms cxlix. 1, “Give the King thy judgments, O God.” Targum, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘Give the sentence of thy judgment unto the King Messiah.’ And herein they generally agree. Midrash on the title, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘This is the King Messiah, as it is said, A rod shall come forth from the stem of Jesse,’ Isa. xi. 1. And Aben Ezra on the same title, מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, ‘A prophecy of David, or one of the singers, concerning Solomon, or concerning the Messiah.’ And Kimchi acknowledges that this Psalm is expounded by many of them concerning the Messiah. Rashi applies it unto Solomon, as a prayer of David for him; whereof he gives this as the occasion: מַלָּכָה מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ מַלְאֵךְ, he prayed this prayer for his son Solomon, ‘because he saw by the Holy Ghost that he would ask of God an heart to understand, and keep or do judgment.’ And although he endeavours vainly to apply ver. 5 unto his days, “They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure;” and ver.
7. "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace, until there be no moon;" yet when he cometh unto those words, ver. 16, "There shall be an handful of corn in the earth," he adds, 'Our masters interpret this of the cates, or dainties, in the days of the Messiah, and expound the whole Psalm concerning Messiah the King.' And this he was forced unto, lest he should appear too openly to contradict the Talmudists, who frequently apply this Psalm unto him, and have long discourses about some passages in it, especially this ἀναθήματα, ver. 16, and εὐαγγέλια, ver. 17, which are much insisted on by Martinus Raymundus, Petrus Galatinus, and others.

The vulgar Latin for ἀναθήματα, reads, erit firmamentum in terra, which I should suppose to be corrupted from frumentum; but that the LXX. who are followed also by other translations, as the Arabic and Ethiopic, read στυγμα, firmamentum. And this some think to be corrupted from στραγμα, 'a handful of corn,' which is very probable. Neither is the word ἀναθήματα any where else used in the Scripture, and may as well have something foreign in it, as come from στραγμα. So also, ver. 17, ἀναθήματα is nowhere else used for sobolescit, or filiabit, as it is here rendered, from ảo, a son, which is but thrice used in that signification. In Gen. xxii. 23, by Abimelech, who was a Philistine, and in Job xviii. 19, by Bildad the Shuhiite, an Arabian; and in Isa. xiv. 22, it is used concerning a son among the Chaldeans. These passages would argue it to be a foreign word: it is, therefore, properly used in a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, as this is. So, on the same subject, it is said, chasmannim shall come to the Messiah, Ps. lxviii. 32, which we render præces, and it may be such were intended; but the word seems to be Egyptian, for Hebrew it is not, though afterwards it was used among the Jews; whence the family of Mattathias were called Hasmoneans. But, to return, it is evident that in this Psalm, much light was communicated unto the church of old, respecting the office, work, grace, compassion, and rule of the Messiah, with the calling and glorious access of the Gentiles unto him.

§ 25. There is mention, likewise, made of him in the Targum on Psal. lxxx. 16, "The vineyard which thy right hand hath planted, upon the branch thou hast made strong for thyself;" so our translation. But all old translations, as the LXX. vulgar Latin, Syriac, interpret ןב not in analogy unto the preceding allegory of the vine, but from גרש, ver 18, and render it, εν πνεω ανθρωπον, super filium hominis, and upon the Son of man, whom thou madest strong for thyself.' Targum, אַדָּוַי מִשְׁמָאֵש וּמַעְלָה, and for the King Messiah whom thou hast strengthened, or fortified, for thyself.' And we know how signally in the gospel he calls himself the Son of man; and among other names ascribed unto him, the Talmudists say, he is called jinnon, from יונ, a son. And ver. 18, he is expressly called אָדֹם מִשְׁמָאֵש, the Son of man, whom thou madest strong for thyself. And hereunto doth Aben Ezra refer the ןב in the foregoing verse. And for that expression, יהי יד עלי רחמים ימי, 'let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand,' he observes, יהי יד עלי רחמים ויקרא יהוה 'ב=this is the hand of God, hath Beth following it, it is for reproach or punishment unto them whom it respects; as Exod. ix. 3. "Behold the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle," that is, for their destruction. And if Beth follow not, it is for praise or help; as Psal. cxix. 173. יִדְּךָ יּהוָה יִיפְגַּם, 'let thine hand help me,' or be for my help. So that the words are a prayer for the Son of man; and as our Lord Christ was the Son of man, so he was the true vine, whereof the
Father is the husbandman, and his disciples the branches, John xv. 1—5. And he himself also was called out of Egypt, Matt. ii. 15, as was the vine spoken of in this Psalm; so that he who is afflicted in all the afflictions of his people, is principally intended in this prophetical Psalm. Aben Ezra would have the Son of man to be Israel; but not seeing how it can be well accommodated unto them, he adds, ‘The words may respect Messiah Ben Ephraim, an idol of their own setting up. But the Targum acknowledgeth the true Messiah here; for whose sake the church is blessed, and by whom it is delivered.

§ 26. The exth Psalm is a signal prophecy of him, describing his person, kingdom, priesthood, and the work of redemption wrought by him. But whereas sundry things in this Psalm are interpreted and applied unto the Lord Christ by our apostle in this Epistle unto the Hebrews, where they fall directly under our consideration, I shall here only briefly reflect on some of their own confessions; although it be a signal declaration of the faith of the church of old scarcely to be paralleled in any other place. Their more modern masters, indeed, observing how directly and openly this Psalm is applied unto the Lord Christ in the New Testament, and how plainly all the passages of it are accommodated unto the faith of Christians, concerning the office and work of Messiah, do endeavour their utmost to wrest it unto any other, as shall elsewhere be manifested. Yea, the Targum itself is here silent respecting the Messiah, for the very same reason, and perverts the whole Psalm to apply it unto David; and yet it is forced on ver. 4, to refer the things spoken of unto the world to come, or days of the Messiah. And the most of their masters, when they mention this Psalm occasionally, and mind not the controversy they have about it with Christians, do apply it unto him. So doth the Midrash Tehillim on Psa. ii. 7, and also on this Psalm, ver. 1, though they do endeavour there foolishly to wrest it unto Abraham. Ra. Saadias Gaon, on Dan. vii. 13, whose words are reported by Solomon Jarchi on Gen. xxxv. 8.—Ra. Arama on Gen. xv. as he is at large cited by Munster on this Psalm—Moses Haddarshan on Gen. xviii. 1.—Ra. Obadiah on the place—all whose words it would be tedious here to report. It is sufficiently manifest, that they have an open conviction that this Psalm contains a prophecy concerning the Messiah; and what excellent things are revealed therein concerning his person and offices, we shall have occasion to declare in the exposition of the epistle itself, in which the most material passages of it are applied unto our Lord Jesus Christ.

§ 27. In the Targum on the Canticles also, there is frequent mention of the Messiah; as ch. i. 8; iv. 5; vii. 14; viii. 1—4. But because the Jews are utterly ignorant of the true spiritual sense of that divine Song, and the Targum of it is a confused miscellany of things sufficiently heterogeneous, being a much later compilation than the most of those on the other books, I shall not particularly insist on the places cited, but content myself with directing the reader unto them. The like also may be said of Eccles. i. 11; vii. 25, where, without any occasion from the text, the mention of Messiah is improtunately introduced by the Targumists.

§ 28. We are now entering on the prophets, of some of whom it was the principal work, to testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that was to follow, 1 Pet. i. 11. I do not at all design to collect all that is foretold, promised, declared, and taught concerning him in them. Such a work would require more peace, leisure, and ability, than what in any kind I enjoy. My intention is only to report some of the most eminent places,
concerning which we have the common suffrage of the Jews, in their general application unto the Messiah. Among these, that of Isaiah, ch. ii. 2—4, occurreth in the first place. 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted in the top of the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it: and many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares.'

The same prophecy is given out by Micah, in the same words, ch. iv. 1—3. And by the common consent of the Jews, the Messiah is here intended, although he be not mentioned in the Targum. The Talmudical fable also, of the lifting up of Jerusalem three leagues high, and of the setting of Mount Moriah, on the top of Sinai, Carmel, and Tabor, which shall be brought together for that purpose, (mentioned in Midrash Tehillim, and in Baba Bathra; distinct. Hammocher,) is wrested from these words. But those also of them, who pretend to more sobriety, do generally apply them to the promised Messiah. Kimchi gives it for a rule, that that expression, נגיזה ומדון, 'in the latter days, doth always denote the times of the Messiah, which I suppose, is not liable unto any exception. And as he giveth a tolerable exposition of the establishing of the mountain of the Lord on the top of the mountains, understanding by it that the glory of the worship of God should be exalted above all the false and idolatrous worship of the Gentiles, which they observed on mountains and high places; so concerning those words, ver. 4. נגיזה ומדון, 'He shall judge among the nations,' he saith, נגיזה ומדון, 'This Judge, or he that judgeth, is the King Messiah.' The like also saith Aben Ezra on the same place, and Jarchi on the same words in the prophecy of Micah. And as this is true, so whereas Jehovah alone is mentioned in the foregoing verses, unto whom, and to no other, this expression can relate, how it is possible for them to deny that Messiah is the Lord the God of Jacob also; for undeniably it is he, concerning whom it is said, 'that he shall judge among the nations;' and by their confession, that it is the Messiah who is the Prophet the Judge here intended, they are plainly convicted out of their own mouths, and their infidelity is condemned by themselves.

Abarbinel seems to have been aware of this entanglement, and therefore as he wrests the prophecy (by his own confession contrary to the sense of all other expositors) unto the times of the building of the second temple; so because he could not but see that one is spoken of who should judge among the nations, he makes it to be the house itself, wherein, as he says, 'Thrones for judgment were to be erected;' the vanity of which figment secures it from any further confutation. We have then evidently in these words, three articles of the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah; as, first, That as to his person, he should be God and man; the God of Jacob, who should in a bodily presence judge the people, and send forth the law among the nations, ver. 4. Secondly, That the Gentiles should be called unto faith in him, and to the obedience of his law, ver. 3. Thirdly, That the worship of the Lord in the days of the Messiah, should be far more glorious than at any time while the first temple was standing, for so it is foretold, ver. 2, and so our apostle proves it to be in his Epistle to the Hebrews. And this whole prophecy is not a little perverted by them,
who apply it to the defeat of Resin and Pekah, when they came against Jerusalem; and who, in their annotations on the Scripture, whereby they have won to themselves a great reputation in the world, seldom depart from the sense of the Jews, unless it be where the Jews are in the right.

§ 29. Isa. iv. 2. "In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beauty and glory." Targ. בְּרָאשִׁית הָיוּ חָמְשׁי דְּרוֹפֶּה דיֲלָדָה, ‘at that time shall the Messiah of the Lord be for joy and honour.’ And this prophecy also is, by the most learned of the rabbins, applied unto the Messiah. Kimchi interprets הֵבָכָה, the branch, by that of Jer. xxiii. 5. “I will raise up unto David a righteous branch, a king shall reign and prosper.” Aben Ezra inclines unto them who would have Hezekiah to be intended; a Christian expositor refers the words to Ezra and Nehemiah upon the return from the captivity, on what grounds he doth not declare. Abarbinel having, as is his manner, always repeated the various expositions and opinions of others, adds at last, מְלַקְדַּרְתֶּנָּה מֵאָוָה עִלָּמָה עִזֶּה בּוֹדַרְתֶּנָּה הָלְדֵל, ‘others expound the words of the Messiah our righteousness: let him be speedily revealed.’ But they may also do well to consider, that the person here promised to be the beauty and glory of the church, by whom the remnant of Israel which are written in the book of life shall be saved, is the branch of the Lord, and the fruit of the earth; which better expresseth his two natures in one person, than that he should be for a while a barren branch, and afterwards bear fruit in the destruction of Gog and Magog, which is their gloss on the words.

The illustrious prophecy concerning the name of the Messiah, Immanuel, and his being born of a virgin, ch. vii. & viii. must be handled apart afterwards, and vindicated from the exceptions of the Jews, and are therefore here omitted.

§ 30. Isaiah ix. 6. “And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace.” Targ. וַאֲמֹדָה מִבָּנָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוֹה כְּרֻקָם. And his name is called of old, מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם; Micah v. 2. Targ. מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם; that is, as in the next words, from everlasting, from the days of eternity. For although מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם may be frequently used for מְטָמֵא מָלָא, from before the face or sight, as these words of the Targumist are vulgarly translated, yet it is also used absolutely with reference unto time, and so there is no need that the following words should be regulated thereby. So is it twice used, as Prov. viii. 22. and before his works, that were wrought; that is, from eternity. And ver. 23, מִלְאַךְ הָאָדָם, and before the world. And in that sense is מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם always used; as Isa. xxiii. 7. Psal. lxxxviii. 2. Isa. xlv. 10. And thus the words will yield a better sense than a facie admirabilis Consilii Deus; or that which they are cast into by Seb. Munster, mirificantis consilium Deo fortissimo qui manet in secula. For there is no need, as we have seen, that the words should be cast into the Genitive case, by מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם. And although the Targumist rendereth מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם the participle, counselor, by the substantive מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם, counsel, yet this hinders not but that it may express one of his names, ‘Wonderful, Counsel, God; or, mirificans consilium Deus; or, ‘the God of wonderful counsel.’ One, from some of the Jews, takes another way to pervert these words. ‘Consilarius, Deus fortis, imo,’ saith he, ‘Consultator Dei fortis; i.e. Qui a See the translation in the Polyglot Bibles, where these words are rendered, A facie admirabilis Consilii Deus, which is blamed by Cartwright in his Melfliscium, for not putting Deus in the Genitive case, as well as admirabilis, which indeed were rational, if מַלְאַךְ הָאָדָם were necessarily a facie.
in omnibus negotiis consilia a Deo poscet, per prophetas scilicet; whereby this clear and honourable testimony given unto the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is weakened and impaired.

Again, the Targumist renders נלועם, be called, by נלועם, in a passive sense, which obviates the principal exception of the modern Jews, who interpret it actively, that it may be referred to God, the wonderful Counsellor, who shall call him the Prince of Peace. But as this is contrary to the Targum, so also to the use of the word in like cases. For this declaration of the name of the child promised, answers the proclamation made of the name of God, Exod. xxxiv. 6, where נלועם is well rendered by ours and proclaimed, or, and there was proclaimed; the name following was sounded in his ears. Where the vulgar Latin translates the word actively, and applies it unto Moses: 'Stetit Moses cum eo invocans nomen Domini, quo transeunte coram eo atit, Dominator Domine Deus.' 'Moses stood with him calling on the name of the Lord, who passing by, he said, O mighty Ruler, Lord God.' This translation both corrupts the proper sense of the words, and gives us that which is directly untrue; for it was not Moses, but God himself, who proclaimed that name, as it is said expressly that he would do, ch. xxxiii. 19, and as Moses himself afterwards pleaded that he had done, Numb. xiv. 17, 18. But this by the way, to obviate the Judaical sophism, that would make all the names in the text, unless it be the Prince of Peace, to precede the verb, and the verb to be actively understood.

§ 31. It follows in the Targum, מודא ותרי נלועם אמויהו אָלֶּוֶּם וְּלֵאָלֶּוֶּם, the words are variously rendered. Some refer נלועם to לאד, that goes before; so expressing them by Deus fortis, or fortissimus, 'the mighty God.' Others, as the translation in the Biblia Regia, and London, refer it to the words following, נלועם נלועם, and render it by vir, 'the man:' vir permanens in aeternum, 'the man abiding for ever,' but it doth not seem that this sense will hold, for although נלועם do signify a man, so that the same with the Hebrew נלועם, גזר נלועם, yet נלועם is not so used, but only for fortis or fortissimus. גזר נלועם, the word used in the original, is applied to God and men; but here it seems to be joined with ל, and to signify, as by us translated, the mighty God, which the Targumist endeavoured also to express; and so by נלועם נלועם, permanens in secula, abiding for ever, he rendereth נלועם נלועם, 'the Father of eternity,' significantly enough. Also מודא נלועם is joined by some with נלועם נלועם, and rendered Messia Pacis, for מודא נלועם נלועם, 'the Prince of Peace,' but this connexion of the words, those that follow will not well bear; wherefore, they place the name Messiah absolutely, and render the following words, 'whose peace shall be multiplied unto us in his days.'

§ 32. And with this testimony of their Targum, the present Jews ought to be pressed; for there are not many with which they find themselves more perplexed. And it would at the same time move compassion at their blindness, and indignation against their obstinacy, for any one seriously to consider how woefully they wrest the words, to make a tolerable application of them unto Hezekiah, to whom they would apply this prophecy. And on the occasion given us by the Targum, I shall take a little view of their sentiments on this place of the prophet. That of old they esteemed it a prophecy of the Messiah, not only the Targum, as we have seen, but the Talmud also doth acknowledge. Besides also, they manifest the same conviction in their futile traditions. In Tractat. Saned. Distinct. Chelek, they have a tradition, that God thought to have made Hezekiah to be the Messiah, and Sennacherib to have been Gog and Magog; but
promises of the Messiah vindicated.

The property of judgment, interposed, and asked why David rather was not made the Messiah, who had made so many songs to the praise of God? And Rabbi Hillel, as we shall see afterwards, contended that Israel was not any more to look for a Messiah, seeing they enjoyed him in Hezekiah. Now these vain traditions arose merely from the concessions of their old masters, granting the Messiah to be here spoken of, and from the craft of their later ones, wresting the words unto Hezekiah, thus casting them into such confusion, that they knew not what to say, nor believe; but let us see how they acquit themselves at last in this matter.

§ 33. Four things are here promised concerning this child, or son that should be given unto the church. 1. That the government should be on his shoulder. 2. That his name should be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. 3. That of the increase of his government there should be no end. 4. That he should sit on the throne of David to order it for ever. And we may see how well they accommodate these things unto Hezekiah, their endeavours being evidently against the faith of the ancient church, the traditions of their fathers, and, it may be feared, their own light and conviction.

First, The government shall be on his shoulder, saith Sol. Jarchi, because the rule and yoke of God shall be upon him in the study of the law. This pleaseth not Kimchi, as it is indeed ridiculous; and therefore he observeth, that mention is not made of the shoulder, but with reference unto burden and weight: whereas he gives this interpretation of the words, "he shall bear my burden, and carry it to his shoulder, and shall cleave unto my countenances;" because Ahaz served the king of Assyria, and his burden was on his shoulder, he says of this child, he shall not be a servant with his shoulder, but the government shall be on him. And this, it seems, is all that is here promised, and this is all the concern of the church in this promise—Hezekiah shall not serve the king of Assyria. Neither is it true, that Ahaz served the king of Assyria under tribute; and it may seem rather that Hezekiah did so for a season, seeing it is expressly said, that he rebelled against him, and served him no more, 2 Chron. xviii. 7. Yea, he plainly did so, and paid him by way of tribute, three hundred talents of silver, and thirty talents of gold, 2 Kings xviii. 14. Aben Ezra passeth over this expression, without taking notice of it.

§ 34. Secondly, As to the name ascribed unto him, they are for the most part agreed, and unless that one evasion which they have fixed on will relieve them, they are utterly silent. Now this is, as was before declared, that the words are to be read, 'the Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, shall call his name the Prince of Peace;' so that the Prince of Peace only is the name of the promised child, all the rest are the name of God. But, 1. If words may be so transposed and shuffled together, as these are, in order to produce this sense, there will nothing be left certain in the Scripture; nor can they give any one instance of such a disposal of words as they fancy in this place. 2. The very reading of the words rejects this gloss, "He shall call his name Wonderful." 3. It is the name of the child, and not of God giving it to him, which is expressed for the comfort of the church. 4. What tolerable reason can be given for such an accumulation of names unto God in this place? 5. There is nothing in the least, not, any distinctive accent, to separate between the Prince of Peace, and the expressions foregoing, but the same person is intended by
them all; so that it was not Hezekiah, but the mighty God himself, who in the Person of the Son was to be incarnate, that is here spoken of.

§ 35. Besides, on what account should Hezekiah so eminently be called the Prince of Peace? ישו. A prince is never used in the Scripture, but he that is so called hath chief power and authority over that whereof he is the רoi, prince, chief, or captain; as אֲחֹן רoi, is the general, or chief commander of the army, under whose command, and at whose disposal it is. By the Greeks it is rendered, αρχων and αρχηγος; as the apostle calls our Lord Jesus Christ, αρχηγον της ζωης; Acts xiii. 13, the Prince of Life; and αρχηγον της σωτηριας, Heb. ii. 10, 'the Prince or Captain of salvation.' Nor is the word once in the Old Testament applied unto any, but to one that had power and authority over that of which he was the רoi, or prince, to give, grant, or dispose of it, as he thought meet. In what sense then can Hezekiah be called the Prince of Peace? Had he the power of peace of any sort in his hand? Was he the Lord of it? Was it at his disposal? The most of his reign was spent in war, first with his neighbours the Philistines, 2 Kings xviii. 8, and afterwards with the king of Assyria, who took all the cities of Judah, one or two only excepted, 2 Kings xviii. 13. And in what sense shall he be called the Prince of Peace? The Rabbins, after their wonted manner of fetching any thing out of a word, whether it be ought to their purpose or no, answer, that it was because of that saying, Isa. xxxix. 8. "For there shall be peace and truth in my days." But this being spoken with respect unto the concluding part of his reign, and that only with reference unto the Babylonian captivity which was afterwards to ensue, is a sorry foundation to entitle him unto this illustrious name, the Captain, Prince, or Lord of Peace; which bespeaks one that had all peace in his power, and at his disposal. And peace, in the Scripture language, is all that is good or prosperous, both temporal and spiritual, in reference unto God and man. And yet this is the utmost that any of them pretend to give countenance unto this appellation.

§ 36. Abarninel, who heaps together the interpretations, conjectures and traditions of most that went before him, seems to agree with Kimchi in that of the government being upon his shoulder, because his father Ahaz sent מִלְחָד, a present unto the king of Assyria, but he did not; whereas, it is expressly said, that Hezekiah paid him tribute of three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold, for the raising whereof he emptied his own treasures, and the treasures of the house of God, yea, and cut off the gold from the doors and pillars of the temple, 2 Kings xviii. 15, 16. He mentions also that other fancy of Rashi about the study of the law, and so leaves it. But in this of the name ascribed unto him, he would take another course; for finding Hezekiah in their Talmud. Tract. Saned. Perek Chelek, called by his masters, הַלֵּא נְמָהָה מִמְכָה, he who had eight names, as Sennacherib is also childishly there said to have had, he would in the first place ascribe all these names unto Hezekiah, giving withall such reasons of them, as I dare not be so importunate on the reader's patience as to transcribe; and then after he had ascribed this opinion to Jonathan the Targumist, and Rashi, he embraceth the other of Kimchi, before confuted. And yet he knows not how to abide by that either.

§ 37. Thirdly, How can it be said of Hezekiah, that of the increase of his government there should be no end; seeing he lived but four and fifty years, and reigned but twenty-five. And his own son Manasseh, who succeeded him, was carried captive into Babylon? But as unto this ques-
tion, and that which follows, about his sitting upon the throne of David for ever, after they have puzzled themselves with the great mystery of Mem Clausum in הב ר י ס, they would have us to suppose that these words respect only the duration of the life of Hezekiah, though it be not possible that any other word should be used more significantly expressive of perpetuity.

Of the increase of his government, וֹיְלָמָא no end, it shall be endless; and he shall rule מָעָה וַיְרָד יָוָלִית, from hence, or now, and, unto for ever, for evermore.

And thus by the vindication of this place from the Rabbinical exceptions, we have not only obtained our principal intention, about the promise of a deliverer, but also showed who, and what manner of person he was to be, even a child that was to be born, who should also be the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, whose rule and dominion was to endure for ever.

§ 38. Isaiah x. 27, 'The yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing.' Targum, וֹיְלָמָא עָמָא מִלְּוֹדָמָא מִשְׁבָּה, 'and the people shall be broken before the Messiah.' And it may be some respect may be had in these words unto the promised seed, upon whose account the yoke of the oppressors of the church shall be broken; but the words are variously interpreted, and I shall not contend.

§ 39. Isaiah xi. 1. 'And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.' Targum, מַסֵּק מֵאָמָא, 'And a king shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and Messiah shall be anointed from the sons of his sons;' or from his posterity.

Ver. 6. 'The wolf shall dwell with the Lamb.' Targum, מַסֵּק מֵאָמָא, 'In the days of the Messiah of Israel, peace shall be multiplied in the earth,—and the wolf shall dwell with the lamb.' That this chapter contains a prophecy of the Messiah and his kingdom, and that immediately and directly, all the Jews confess; hence is that part of their usual song in the evening of the Sabbath.

They call him the son of Jesse from this place; which makes it somewhat observable, that some Christians, as Grotius, should apply it unto Hezekiah, Judaizing in their interpretations beyond the Jews themselves. Only the Jews are not well agreed in what sense those words, 'the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid,' &c., are to be understood. Some would have it, that the nature of the brute beasts shall be changed in the days of the Messiah; but this is rejected by the wisest of them, as Maimonides, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, and others; and these interpret the words בֵּית מָשָּׁל, allegorically, applying them unto that universal peace which shall be in the world in the days of the Messiah. But the peace they fancy, is far from answering the words of the prophecy, which express a change in the nature of the
worst of men, by virtue of the rule and grace of the Messiah. I cannot but add, that Abarbinel, writing his commentaries about the time that the European Christian nations were fighting with the Saracens for the land of Palestine, or the Holy Land, he interprets the latter end of the tenth chapter, to the destruction of both sides by God, whereon their Messiah should be revealed, as is here promised. This he expresseth in the close of his exposition of the first verse of chap. xi., thus: ומסיח הנבון ימצה בב נבון ומשיח הנה נבון לחיו : 'And there shall prevail great war between the nations of the world, one against another, on, or for the Holy Land, and strong nations shall fall in it by the sword of one another, and therefore it is said, Behold the Lord, the Lord of hosts shall lop,' ch. x. 33. And a little after, he adds, ומשיח הנה נבון לחיו ; 'In the midst of that war shall Messiah the king be revealed.' For those nations he would have had to be Gog and Magog; and in many places doth he express his hopes of the ruin of the Christians by that war; but the issue hath disappointed his hopes and desires.

§ 40. Isa. xvi. 1. 'Send ye the Lamb to the ruler of the land.' Targum, רוזו מסטכ מטביוGOOD אֹיֵב אָזְרָאלאָל; 'They shall bring their tribute unto the Messiah of Israel.' Observing, as it should seem, that the Moabites unto whom these words are spoken, were never after this time tributary to Judah; and also considering the prophecy of ver. 5, which he applies (and that properly) unto the Messiah, the Targumist conceived him to be the מלך шמשי, or Ruler here mentioned, unto whom the Moabites are invited to yield obedience; and I conceive it will not be very easy to fix upon a more genuine sense of the words. So also ver. 5, 'Then shall the throne of the Messiah of Israel be prepared in goodness.' Doubtless with more truth than those Christians make use of, who wrest these words also to Hezekiah.

§ 41. Isa. xxviii. 5. 'In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory.' Targum, כָּלַת נבון דר נצבאעָא, 'The Messiah of the Lord of hosts: the Lord of hosts, in and with the Messiah, who is the crown of glory, and diadem of beauty in his kingly office and rule unto the remnant of his people that shall be saved by him.

§ 42. Isa. xlii. 1. 'Behold my servant whom I uphold: my elect.' Targum, מָשִׁיח אֵבֵרי מֶשֶׁה, 'Behold my servant the Messiah.' How much better than the translation of the LXX. 1ακωβ β ταις μων, αντάλφομαι αυτου, Ἰσραηλ β εκλεκτον μου; applying the words to the whole people of Israel, whereas they are expressly referred to the Lord Christ, Matt. xii. 17, 18. And Kimchi on this place, הבָּא מִלְךַ מַלְכַו, 'behold my servant, that is Messiah the king.' And Abarbinel confutes both R. Saadius, and Aben Ezra with sharpness, who were otherwise minded. How much better than he of late, who interprets these words of Isaiah himself, to whom not one letter of the prophecy can receive any tolerable accommodation. It is the Messiah then, by their own confession, who is intended in this prophecy: who is described not on horseback in his harness as a great warrior, such as they expect him, but one filled with the Spirit of the Lord, endowed with meekness, suffering opposition and persecution, bringing forth righteousness and truth unto the Gentiles, who shall wait for his law, and receive it, when it is rejected by the Jews, as the event hath manifested, Isa. xliii. 10. 'My servant whom I have chosen.' Targum, 'My servant Messiah in whom I rest.'

§ 43. Isaiah lii. 13. 'Behold my servant shall prosper.' Targum, יִשְׁלָל אֵבֵרי מִשְׁמָה, 'Behold my servant the Messiah shall prosper.'
In these words that prophecy begins which takes up the remainder of this chapter, and that whole chapter that follows; in the tenth verse whereof there is mention made again of the Messiah. And this is an evidence to me, that the Jews, however bold and desperate in corrupting the sense of the Scripture, to countenance their infidelity, yet have not dared to intermeddle with the letter itself, no not in the Targums, which are not so sacred with them as the text. For whereas the application of this prophecy unto the Messiah is perfectly destructive to their whole present persuasion and religion, with all the hopes which they have in this world, or in another, yet they have never dared to attempt to corrupt the Targum where this prophecy is so plainly applied to Messiah. Though for many generations they had the Targums entirely in their own power, scarce any notice being taken of them by any Christians in the world. But concerning this place we must deal with them afterwards at large.

§ 44. Jer. xxiii. 5. ‘And I will raise unto David a righteous branch.’ Targum, אָנֹקְשׁ וְרָדְרַשׁ אָבְרָיִרְךָ; ‘And I will raise up unto David Messiah the righteous.’ This is he who in the next verse is called וַיָּהָוָה וְרָדְרַשׁ אָבְרָיִרְךָ; Jehovah our righteousness.’ The Jews generally agree that it is the Messiah who is here intended; and whereas a late Christian expositor would have Zerubbabel to be designed in these words, Abarbinel himself gives many reasons why it cannot be applied unto any one under the second temple. For saith he, during that space, no one reigned as king of the house of David, nor did Judah and Israel dwell then in safety and security, they being continually oppressed, first by the Persians, then by the Grecians, and lastly by the Romans. So he, and truly; and I see no reason why one should pervert the promises concerning the Messiah, when they cannot tolerably accommodate them unto any other.

For the preservation of the name of this righteous branch, מַהְיָה יְהֹוָה, Jehovah our righteousness, we may bless God for the original; for the old translations are either mistaken or corrupt, or perverted in this place. The vulgar Latin is the best of them, which reads, Dominus justus noster, ‘our righteous Lord;’ which yet corrupts the sense, and gives us an expression that may be assigned unto any righteous king.

The LXX. far worse; και τοῦτο το ονόμα αυτον, δο καλεσι αυτον Κυριος Ιωσεδεκ, ‘and this is the name that the Lord shall call him Josedec.’ A corrupt word, formed out of the two Hebrew words in the original, signifying nothing, but perverted, as it were on purpose, to despoil the Messiah of his glorious name, the evidence of his eternal deity. Symmachus κυριε δικαιωσον ημας; Lord justify us; he seems, as one observes, to have read ישוע in Pithel; but yet this also obscures the text.

The Chaldee, according to its usual manner, when any thing occurs which its author understood not, gives us a gloss of its own, sufficiently perverting the sense of the place. הִשְׂמָע אֶל לֵבַךְ וְקָרַת מִן כְּדוֹמִי, ‘let righteousness come forth to us from before the Lord in his days.’ Let them consider this instance, which is but one of many that may be given, who are ready to despise the original text, to prefer translations before it, and to cherish suspicions of its being corrupted by the Jews, or of their arbitrary inventions of its points or vowels, whereby the sense of the words is fixed and limited. Can there be any clearer acquittance of them in this matter, than this certain observation, that every place almost which bears testimony unto any thing concerning the Messiah which is denied by them, is far more clear in the original, than in any old translation whatever. And of this we have an eminent instance in this place, where this name, deno-
ting undeniably the divine nature of the Messiah, is preserved entire only in the original, and that as it is pointed, as some fancy, by some Jewish Masorites who lived they know not where, nor when. And those amongst ourselves, who are ready to give countenance unto such opinions, or to admire the promoters of them, may do well to consider what reflection they cast thereby on that translation which is of use among us, by the command of authority, than which there is no one extant in the world, that is more religiously observant of the Hebrew Text, and that as pointed in the Hebrew; nor hath it any regard unto any, or to all translations, where these differ from the original, as may be seen with especial respect unto that of the LXX, the stream that feeds most of the rest, in above a thousand places. But this by the way.

One of late hath applied this name unto the people of Israel; and interprets the words, Deus nobis bene fecit; 'God hath done well unto us.' But we have had too much of such bold and groundless conjectures about the fundamentals of our faith and worship. The Jews seek to evade this testimony, by instances of the applications of this name to other things; as to the altar built by Moses, to the ark, and to the city of Jerusalem. But it is one thing to have the name of God called on a place or thing, to bring the occasion of it unto remembrance; and another to say that this is the name of such a person, Jehovah our righteousness. And whereas the Holy Ghost says expressly that this is his name, the Jews must give us leave to call him so, and to believe him to be so; which is all we contend for. Of the same importance with this prophecy is that of Ezek. xxxvii. 24.

§ 45. Jer. xxx. 21. 'Their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them.' Targum, 'Their king shall be anointed from amongst them, and their Messiah shall be revealed unto them.' And upon his account it is, that God enters into a new coven-ant with his people, ver 22.

Jer. xxxiii. 13, 15. 'For those words, 'Flocks shall pass again under the hand of him that telleth them.' The Targum reads, כדי יהיה על ידיה, 'and the people shall be yet gathered by the Messiah;' and a prophecy of him it no doubt is, as the 15th verse makes it evident; where all the Jews acknowledge him to be intended by the branch of righteousness which shall spring up unto David, who also is promised in the sixth verse, as the abundance or crown of truth and peace; yet one of late hath wrested this place also to Zerubbabel.

§ 46. Hos. iii. 5. 'Seek the Lord their God, and David their king.' Targ. ירחמצתונך שלשאיה רבא רוד מלךך, 'And shall obey the Messiah the Son of David their king.' The rabbins are divided about this place, some of them acknowledging the Messiah to be intended, others referring the prophecy unto the temple, or house of the sanctuary built by the Son of David. But the words themselves, with the denotation of the time for the accomplishment of this prophecy in the end of the verse, will allow of no application unto any other, and plainly discovers his mistake who would wrest this text also to Zerubbabel.

Hos. xiv. 8. Targum, 'They shall sit under the shadow of Messiah;' see Cant. ii. 3.

§ 47. Micah iv. 8. 'And thou Tower of the flock;' &c. והיה עם הuencia מרכז דומם וינא חיות ושהות ברכו על צדקה ומלאכתך ליעד מלחמה. 'And thou Messiah of Israel, who art hid because of the sins of the congregation of Sion, to thee the kingdom shall come.' This gloss, I confess, breathes the spirit of Talmudical rabbinism; for they fancy, that their Messiah was long
since born, even at the appointed time, but is kept hid, they know not where, because of the sins of Israel.

§ 48. Micah v. 2. 'But thou Bethlehem Ephrata, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me the ruler over Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.' Targ. 'Out of thee shall the Messiah come forth before me, to exercise rule over Israel.' This prophecy was famous among the Jews of old, as designing the place where the Messiah was to be born, which alone is done here. And its signal accomplishment is recorded, Matt. ii. 1, 5, 6; Luke ii. 6, 7. And unto this day, they generally acknowledge that it is the Messiah alone who is here intended. And yet this consent of all the Jews, ancient and modern, with the application of it unto the true Messiah in the gospel, manifesting the catholic consent of both churches, Judaical and Christian about the sense of this place, hinders not one from interpreting this place of Zerubbabel, whose goings forth, as he supposeth, are said to be of old, from everlasting, because he came of the ancient kingly house of David; whereas, not one word of the prophecy ever had any tolerable appearance of accomplishment in him. For neither was he born at Bethlehem, nor was he the ruler over the Israel of God; much less had he the least share or interest in those eternal goings forth, which are expressed in the close of the verse. The words are an express description of the person of the Messiah, who, though he was to be born in the fulness of time at Bethlehem, yet the existence of his divine nature was from of old, from everlasting. And the Jews know not how to evade this testimony. Rashi adds in the interpretation of the words, only that of Ps. lxxii. 17. מָלֵא מְשֶׁר יָנֵי שֵׁם, which we have rendered, 'his name shall be continued as long as the sun,' not reaching the sense of the place. מָסֶר מְשֶׁר is rendered by the Targum אֲדָמָה מַגְוָה שֵׁם, 'and before the sun was,' an expression of eternity, as Prov. viii. 23. Kimchi and Aben Ezra would have the words respect that long season that was to be between David and the Messiah. Bethlehem, saith Kimchi, that is David, who was born there, and יֵשׁ וֹכֶר רֹב דּוֹד וּרְבִּי מַלֶּךָ שֵׁם, 'there is a long time between David and the Messiah'; but this gloss is forced, and hath nothing in the words to give countenance unto it. It is the Messiah that is said to be born at Bethlehem, and not David, as shall afterwards be evinced; and מַגְוָה שֵׁם denotes some acts, or actions of him that is spoken of, and not his relation unto another, not spoken of at all. Neither do those words מָסֶר מְשֶׁר מִכי יֶלֶשׁ denote a long time, but directly that which is before all times; see Prov. viii. 22. He yet proceeds to answer them who say the Messiah is God, from this place, because of this description of him. And first rejects the Lord Christ from being here intended, as supposing an objection to be made with reference unto him, though he express it not; for saith he, יִשָּׂרֵאֵל מִכֶּם הָיָה מְשָׁל בִּשְׁרָאֵל אַלּוֹ וְדַי מְשָׁל אֲבָל יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֶן, He ruled not over Israel, but they ruled over him.' Where it is evident, that some sentence written by him is left out of the copies printed among Christians. But, poor, blind, blasphemous wretch! this boast hath cost him, and his associates in infidelity, full dear. It is true, their progenitors did unto him whatever the counsel of God had determined. But notwithstanding all their rage, he was exalted by the right hand of God, and being a prince and Saviour, hath ruled ever since over the whole Israel of God, by his word and Spirit, and over them, his stubborn enemies, with a rod of iron. He adds, that it is false that these
words are applicable unto the eternity of God; for, saith he, מַעֲדוֹת וּלְיָבוֹם, 'God was before the days of everlasting:' as though in the same sense God were not expressly said to be מַעֲדוֹת as here; see Hab. i. 11; and to be from everlasting. And this place is well expounded by Prov. viii. 21—23, as some of the rabbins acknowledge; so that we have in it an eminent testimony given unto the person of the Messiah, as well as unto the place of his nativity. Of which we shall treat afterwards.

§ 49. Zechar. iii. 8. 'For behold I will bring forth my servant the Branch.' Targum, מַעֲדוֹת וְלָהֶם, 'Behold I bring forth my servant the Messiah, who shall be revealed.' This revelation of the Messiah relates unto their apprehension that he was born long since, but is hid because of their sins, as was before intimated. And in like manner is he three times more mentioned by the Targumist in this prophecy, chap. iv. 7, vi. 12, x. 4, in all which places he is certainly designed by the Holy Ghost. There are also many of them who acknowledge him to be intended, chap. ix. 9, xi. 12, 13, xii. 10, where he is not mentioned in the Targum. I have not insisted on these places, as though they were all the testimonies which might be collected to this purpose, out of the prophets, seeing they are a very small portion of the predictions, concerning the person, grace, and kingdom of the Messiah, and are not all those which are most eminent in that kind; but because, in the application of these to Messiah, we either have the consent of all the Jews, from whence some advantage may be taken for their conviction, or we have the suffrage of the more ancient and authentic masters, to reprove the perverseness of the modern rabbins.

§ 50. And this is He whom we inquired after—One who was promised from the foundation of the world, to relieve mankind from that state of sin and misery whereinto they were cast by their apostasy from God. This is He, who from the first promise of him, or intimation of relief by him, was the hope, desire, comfort, and expectation of all who aimed at reconciliation and peace with God—upon whom all their religion, faith, and worship was founded, and in whom it centered. He, for whose sake, or for the bringing of whom into the world, Abraham and the Hebrews his posterity, were separated to be a peculiar people, distinct from all the nations of the earth; in the faith of whom the whole church in the days of Adam, and in the period which followed, and in an especial manner the Jewish church, celebrated its mystical worship, endured persecution and martyrdom, waiting and praying continually for his appearance—He of whom all the prophets taught, preached, promised, and whom they raised the hearts of believers to a desire and expectation of, by describing beforehand his sufferings, with the glory that was to ensue—He of whose coming a catholic tradition was spread over the world, which the old serpent, with all his subtilty, was never able to obliterate.
EXERCITATION X.


§ 1. We have seen how plentifully God instructed the church of old by his prophets, in the knowledge of the person, office, and work of the Messiah. And this he did partly, that nothing might be wanting unto the faith and consolation of believers, which was suitable and proportioned to that condition of light and grace, in which it was his good pleasure to keep them before his actual coming; and partly, that his righteous judgments, in the rejection and ruin of those who obstinately refused him, might from the means of their conviction be justified and rendered glorious. But these promises and predictions were not the only means whereby God chose to manifest and reveal him unto their faith.

There are two things concerning the Messiah, which are the pillars and foundation of the church. The one is, his divine nature; and the other is, his work of mediation in the atonement for sin, which he made by his suffering, or by the sacrifice of himself. For the declaration of these unto them, who, according to the promise, looked for his coming, there were, under the Old Testament, two especial means graciously designed of God. The latter of these ways was that worship which he instituted, and the various sacrifices which he appointed to be observed in the church, as types and representations of that one perfect oblation which he was to offer in the fulness of time. The unfolding and particular application of this way of instruction, is the principal design and scope of the apostle in his Epistle unto the Hebrews. But as that must be insisted on at large in our exposition of that Epistle, I shall not anticipate what is to be spoken concerning it in these previous discourses, which are all intended in a subserviency thereunto. The other way, which concerns his divine Person, was by those visions and appearances of the Son of God, as the Head of
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the church, which were granted unto the fathers under the Old Testament. And these, as they are directly suited unto our purpose, in our inquiry after the prognostics of the advent of the Messiah, so are they eminently useful for the conviction of the Jews. For in them we shall manifest, that a revelation was made of a distinct person in the Deity, who in a peculiar manner did manage all the concerns of the church after the entrance of sin. And here also, according unto our proposed method, we shall inquire what light concerning this truth hath been received by any of the Jewish masters; as also manifest to what confusions they are driven, when they seek to evade the evidence that is in the testimonies to this purpose.

§ 2. There is frequent mention in the Targumist of וְדָאֵרוֹת מִשְׁמָרָה, 'the word of the Lord.' And it first occurs in them, on the first appearance of a divine Person, after the sin and fall of Adam, Gen. iii. 8. The words of the original text are, יִשְׁמַעַת אֲחֹזֵת רְוָי אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק, 'and they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden.' The participle לְחַזֵּק, 'walking,' may be as well referred unto לְבִלֵּק, 'the voice,' as unto רְוָי אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק, 'the Lord God: voice, Domini Dei ambulantem. And although לְבִלֵּק most commonly signify λογον προφορικον, or verbum prolatum, the outward voice, and sound thereof, yet when applied unto God it frequently denotes, λογον ενδιάθετον, 'his Almighty power,' whereby he effecteth whatever he pleaseth. So Psal. xxxix. 3—9; those things are ascribed לְבִלֵּק, to this 'voice of the Lord,' which elsewhere are assigned, τῷ λόγῳ τῆς οὐναμοσι αὐτοῦ, Heb. i. 3, 'to the word of his power,' which the Syriac renders by 'the power of his word,' intending the same thing. Now, all these mighty works of creation or providence, which are assigned לְבִלֵּק, to this 'voice of the Lord,' or τῷ λόγῳ τῆς οὐναμοσίως, to the 'word of his power,' or to his powerful word, are immediately wrought per λογον ουσιωδὴν ή εννυποστατον, by the 'essential word' of God, John i. 3; Col. i. 16; who was with God in the beginning, or at the creation of all things, John i. 1, 2, as his eternal wisdom, Prov. viii. 22—25, and power. This expression, therefore, of לְבִלֵּק, may also denote τον λόγον του θεου, κατ' εξοχην, 'the word of God,' that is God, the essential word of God, the Person of the Son. For here our first parents heard this Word walking in the garden, before they heard the outward sound of any voice or words whatever. For God spake not unto them until after this, ver. 9. 'The Lord God called unto Adam and said unto him. And this change of the appearance of God, some of the Jews take notice of; so the author of Tseror Hammor, Sect. Bereshith,_SAFE2100_אֲרֹא דָּוִד הַמֶּרֶד מֵעַמָּה הַפְּרָט אוֹתוֹ מַשְׁמַע אַל אֱלֹהִים אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק מִזֹּאת קָרָּא וַיַּאֲרָּא מֵעַמָּה הַפְּרָט אוֹתוֹ מַשְׁמַע אַל אֱלֹהִים אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק מִזֹּאת קָרָּא מַרְאֵה מִשְׁמָרָה וַיַּחְדִּשֵּׁהוּ נַגְּדָה אָרוֹם בָּרוֹנֲק וַיַּחְדִּשֵּׁהוּ נַגְּדָה אָרוֹם בָּרוֹנֲק. 'Before they sinned, they saw the glory of the blessed God speaking with them, but after their sin they only heard his voice walking.' God dealt now otherwise with them than he did before. And the Chaldee paraphrast observing that some especial presence of God is expressed in the words, renders them, עַדָּה יִרְוָי אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק מַשְׁמַע אַל אֱלֹהִים אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק, 'And they heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden.' So all the Targums, and that of Jerusalem, begins the next verse accordingly, יִרְוָי אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק מַשְׁמַע אַל אֱלֹהִים אֲנָחָנוּ לְחַזֵּק, 'And the word of the Lord God called unto Adam.' And this expression they afterwards make use of in places innumerable, and that in such a way as plainly to denote a distinct Person in the Deity. That this also was their intention in it, is manifest, because about the time of the writing of the first of those Targums, which gave normam loquendi, the rule of speaking unto them that followed, it was usual
amongst them to express their conceptions of the Son of God, by the name of ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, or 'the word of God,' the same with ὁ ἀρχόν.

So doth Philo express their sense, de Confusione Linguarum, καὶ μηδεὶς μνεία τυγχάνῃ τις αἰσιορέως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχόν προσαγορευόμενου, σπουδαίᾳ κοσμιεύεται κατὰ τὸν πρῶτον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν αἰγέλον πρεσβύτατον ὡς αρχαγέλον πολιωνυμίον ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ γαρ ἀρχη, καὶ ὁνόμα Θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος, καὶ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ανθρώπος, καὶ ὑψόν Ἰσραήλ προσαγορευότατοι. 'If any be not yet worthy to be called the Son of God, yet endeavour thou to be conformed unto his first-begotten Word, the most ancient angel, the archangel with many names; for he is called the Beginning, the name of God, and the Word, the man according to the image of God, the Seer of Israel.' How suitably these things are spoken unto the mysteries revealed in the gospel, shall elsewhere be declared. Here I only observe how he calls that angel which appeared unto the fathers, and that sometimes in human shape, the Word, the first-begotten Word. And he expresseth himself again to the same purpose, καὶ γαρ ἐι μηδεὶς ἀναφέρει τοῦ πατεὶς νομίζῃς και γεγονόμενι ἀλλα τοι τῆς αἰώνος εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, λόγον τοῦ ἱερωτατοῦ, Θεοῦ γαρ εἰκών λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος. 'For if we are not yet meet to be called the Sons of God, let us be so of his eternal image, the most sacred word, for that most ancient word is the image of God.' How these things answer the discourses of our apostle about Jesus Christ, Col. i. 15—18; Heb. i. 3, is easily discerned. And this conception of theirs, was so far approved by the Holy Ghost, as suitable unto the mind of God, that John, in the beginning of his gospel, declaring the eternal Deity of Christ, doth it under this name of ὁ λόγος, 'the Word, that is, ὁ ὑψιμός, 'the Word of God': the 'Word that was with God, and that was God,' John i. 1. For he there alludeth to the story of the first creation, in which God is described as making all things by his word; for he said of every thing, 'Let it be,' and it was made. And in a similar way the Psalmist expresseth it, 'He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast,' Psal. xxxiii. 9. On the same subject David speaks, yet more fully, in the 6th verse of the same Psalm, declaring that 'by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth;' in answer whereunto, John teacheth, that all things were made by this Word of God whose he speaks, ch. i. 3. And Peter also expresseth the same sentiment, 2 Peter. iii. 5. In the Chaldee, creation is also assigned unto this Word, where mention is not made of it in the original; as Isa. xlv. 12, and xlviii. 13.

In the words cited above, John might also have respect unto that ascription of the work of the redemption of the church to this Word of the Lord, which was admitted in the church of the Jews. That place, amongst others, is express to this purpose, Hos. i. 7, where the words of the prophet, 'I will save them by the Lord their God,' are rendered by the Targumist, יִדְרִית בְּמוֹדְרַךְ מִלְּא יִדְרְשׁוֹן, 'I will save (or redeem) them by the Word of the Lord their God,'—the Word, the Redeemer. And it is not unworthy of consideration, that the wisest and most contemplative of the philosophers of old, had many notions about the ὁ λόγος αἰώνος, 'the eternal Word,' which was unto them ἐνυπαρχεῖ τῆς ὥλης κτίσεως πνευματική, 'the formative or creative power of the universe;' to which purpose many sayings have been observed, and might be reported out of Plato, with his followers, Amelius, Chalcedius, Proclus, Plotinus, and others, whose expressions are imitated by our own writers, as Justin Martyr, Clemens, Athenagoras, Tatianus, and many more. And among the Mahometans themselves, this is the name that in their Alcoran they give unto Jesus, יָשׁוֹנָה מַלְאָךְ, 'the Word of God.' So pre-
valent this notion of the Son of God been in the world. And as those
words, Ezek. i. 24. 'I heard the voice of their wings, ידוע, as the voice
of the Almighty,' are rendered by the Targumist, ידוע על ידוע, 'as the
voice from the face of the Almighty,' what this is shall be afterwards
shown. Some copies of the LXX. render them by φωνην του λογου, 'the
voice of the Word,' that is of God, who was represented in that vision,
as shall be manifested.

Some would put another sense on that expression of the Targumists, as
though it intended nothing but God himself; and instances of the use of
it in that sense have been observed. As Eccles. viii. 17. 'If a wise man
say (דמל מבר) in his word,' that is, say in himself, Gen. vi. 6. 'It repented
the Lord (דמל זכר) in his word,' Also Ruth iii. 8, is urged to give coun-
tenance unto this suspicion; as did Paltiel, the son of Laish, who placed
his sword יבר ומכח ובכל הב שפעול, between his word and Michal, the
daughter of Saul, the wife of David.' But, 1. The former places use not
the word דמל, which is peculiar unto the sense contended for. 2. The
Targums on the Hagiographa, are a late post-talmudical endeavour, made
in imitation of those of Onkelos and Ben Uzziel, when the Jews had lost
both all sense of their old traditions, and the use of the Chaldee language,
any farther than what they learned from those former paraphrases. Nothing
therefore, can hence be concluded as to the intention of the Targumists
in these words. And they can have no other sense in that of Psalm ex. 1,
יאמר, 'The Lord said in (or to) his word,' for 'to my Lord,' as
in the original.

§ 3. The Jews discern that התייה, 'walking,' relates in this place imme-
diately to לו, 'the voice,' and not unto אתא ללחיו, 'the Lord God,' and
therefore, endeavour to render a reason of that kind of expression. So
Aben Ezra on the place giveth instances, where a voice or sound in its pro-
gress is said to walk. As Exod. xix. 19, לו ה.runners ה runes, 'The voice
of the trumpet went and waxed strong;' and Jer. xlii. 22, לו ה. הולק, 'The
voice thereof shall go like a serpent.' But these examples correspond
not with that under consideration. For although לו may express some-
times the progression or increase of a voice, yet it doth not so, but where
it is intimated to be begun before; but here was nothing spoken by God,
until after that Adam had heard this word of God 'walking.' And, there-
fore, R. Jona, cited by Aben Ezra, would apply התייה, 'walking,' unto
Adam, 'He heard the voice of God, as he was himself walking in the
garden,' the absurdity of which fiction the words of the text and context
sufficiently evince. For not התייה הנם, but התייה הנם would answer unto
עומד in the beginning of the verse. It is, therefore, most probable, that
in the great alteration which was now coming upon the whole creation of
God, mankind being to be cast out of covenant, the serpent and the earth
being to be cursed, and a way of recovery for the elect of God to be re-
vealed, that He, by whom all things were made, and by whom all were to
be renewed who were to be brought again unto God, did in an especial and
glorious manner appear unto our first parents, as he in whom this whole
dispensation centred, and unto whom it was committed. And as after the
promise given, he appeared, εν μορφη ανθρωπου, 'in a human shape,' to
instruct the church in the mystery of his future incarnation, and under the
name of angel, to shadow out his office as sent unto it, and employed in it
by the Father, so here before the promise, he discovered his distinct glorious
person, as the eternal Voice or Word of the Father.

§ 4. Gen. xviii. 1—3. 'And the Lord appeared unto him (Abraham) in
the plains of Mamre, and he sat in the tent-door, in the heat of the day: and he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he came to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground; and said, My Lord, if I have now found favour in thy sight, &c. The Jews in Bereshith Ketanna say, that this appearance of God unto Abraham was three days after his circumcision, from the sore whereof, being not recovered, he sat in the door of his tent, and that God came to visit him in his sickness. But the reason of his sitting in the door of the tent is given in the text, namely, because it was the heat of the day, as in, or about, the heat of the day, as the day grew hot; in an opposition unto the time of God's appearance unto Adam, which was in the cool air of the day. For as when God comes to curse, nothing shall refresh the creature, though in its own nature suited thereunto—it shall wither in the cool of the day; so when he comes to bless, nothing shall hinder the influence of his blessing upon his creatures, however any thing in itself may, like the heat of the day, be troublesome or perplexing.

§ 5. He lift up his eyes and looked, and 'behold three men stood by him.' The title is, הר אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהִים, 'the Lord appeared unto him;' and the narrative is, 'lo, three men stood by him:' the Lord therefore was amongst them. And it seems to be a sudden appearance that was made to him: he saw them on a sudden standing by him: he looked up and saw them, and this satisfied him that it was a heavenly apparition.

§ 6. The business of God with Abraham at this time was to renew unto him the promise of the seed who was to be a blessing, and to confine it unto his posterity by Sarah, now when he was utterly hopeless of this, and began to desire that Ishmael might be heir of the promise. Unto this signal work of mercy was adjoined the intimation of an eminent effect of vindictive justice, wherein God would set forth an example of this attribute unto all ensuing generations, in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. And both these were the proper works of the Son of God. Unto him was committed the care of the church, as its blessedness depended on the promise of his coming: and to him was given the government of the world, that he may act as its present Ruler and its future Judge. And hence, in the overthrow of those cities, he is said to set forth an 'ensample of his future dealing with ungodly men,' 2 Peter ii. 6.

§ 7. Aben Ezra reflects with scorn on the Christians, who from this place, because three men are said to appear unto Abraham, and he calls them, my Lord, would prove the tri-personality of the Deity. דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲרֻבֶּהְיָא, 'Because of the appearance of three men, God is three, and he is one, and they are not separated or divided.' How then doth he answer what they say? דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲרֻבֶּהְיָא, 'Behold, they forget that there came two angels unto Sodom.' That is, that two of those who appeared were angels, and no more. But if any Christians have taken these three persons to have been the three Persons of the Trinity, it were an easy thing to out-balance their mistake with instances of his own and of his companions' pernicious curiosities and errors. It is true, a Trinity of persons in the Deity cannot be proved from this place, seeing one of them is expressly called Jehovah, and the other two, in distinction from him, are said to be angels, ch. xix. 1. But yet a distinction of persons in the Deity, although not the precise number of them, is hence demonstrable. For it is evident, that he of the three that spake unto Abraham, and to whom he made his supplication for the sparing of Sodom, was Jehovah the Judge of all the world, ver. 22, 25. And yet all the three were sent upon the work, that One being the Prince
and Head of the embassy; as he who is Jehovah is said to be sent by Jehovah, Zech. ii. 8, 9. Neither is there any ground for the late exposition of this and the like places, namely, that a created angel, representing the person of God, doth both speak and act in his name, and is called Jehovah; an invention to evade the appearances of the Son of God under the Old Testament, contrary to the sense of all antiquity; nor is any reason or instance produced to make it good. The Jews indeed say, that there were three angels, because of the threefold work they were employed in; for they say, no more than one angel is at any time sent about the same work. So one of these was to renew the promise unto Abraham, another to deliver Lot, and the third to destroy Sodom. But besides that this is a rule of their own making; and evidently false, as may be seen, Gen. xxxii. 1, 2; 2 Kings vi. 17, so in the story itself, it is manifest that they were all employed in the same work, one as Lord and Prince, the other two as his ministering servants.

And this is further cleared in that expression of Moses, ch. xix. 24, 'The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord in heaven.' Targum, '🐌ך יגוז יד, 'from before the Lord,' or the face of the Lord. Aben Ezra answers, מַשָּׁשׂ זִבְּרָה וְגֹמְרָר מַמָּא, that this is the elegance of the tongue, and that the sense of it is, from himself; and this gloss some of our late critics embrace. And there are instances collected by Solomon Jarchi to confirm this sense. Namely, the words of Lamech, Gen. iv. 23, 'Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech,' not, my wives. And of David, 1 Kings i. 33, 'Take with you the servants of your lord,' not, my servants. And of Ahasuerus unto Mordecai, Esther iv. 8, 'Write you for the Jews in the king's name,' not, in my name. But the difference of these from the words under consideration is wide and evident. In all these places, the persons are introduced speaking of themselves, and describe themselves either by their names, or offices suitably unto the occasion and subject spoken of. But in this place, it is Moses that speaketh of the Lord, and had no occasion to repeat בָּאָרָה יִהוָה, were it not to intimate the distinct persons unto whom that name, denoting the nature and self-existence of God, was proper; one whereof then appeared on the earth, the other manifesting his glorious presence in heaven. Wherefore Rashi, observing somewhat more in this expression, contents not himself with his supposed parallel places, but adds, that the בָּאָרָה יִהוָה is to be understood; and gives this as a rule, בָּאָרָה יִהוָה וּבְיִשֹּׁר וּבְיִשֹּׁר דִּוְנֵי, 'Every place where it is said, יִהוָה וּבָּאָרָה, and the Lord, He and his house of judgment are intended;' as if God had a sanhedrin in heaven, a fancy which they have invented to avoid the expressions which testify unto a plurality of persons in the Deity. There is therefore in this place an appearance of God in a human shape, and that of one distinct Person in the Godhead; who now represented himself unto Abraham, in the form and shape wherein he would dwell amongst men, when of his seed he would be made flesh. This was one signal means whereby Abraham saw his day and rejoiced, which he himself ascribes to his existence before his incarnation, and not to the promise of his coming, John viii. 56, 58. A solemn prelude it was to his taking of flesh, a revelation of his divine nature and person, and a pledge of his coming in human nature to converse with men.

§ 8. Gen. xxxii. 24. 'And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the ascending of the morning. 26. And he said, Let me go, for the day ascendeth; and he said, I will not let thee go except thou bless me. 27. And he said unto him, What is thy name? and he said, Jacob. 28. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob,
but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and men, and hast prevailed. 29. And Jacob asked him and said, Tell me I pray thee thy name; and he said, Wherefore dost thou ask after my name? and he blessed him there. 30. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.' This story is twice referred upon in the Scripture afterwards: once by Jacob himself, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. 'And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads:' And once by the prophet Hosea, ch. xii. 3, 4: 'By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him, he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us, 5. Even the Lord God of hosts, the Lord is his memorial.' In the first place, he is called a man; there appeared a man, ver. 24. In the second, Jacob calls him an angel; the angel that redeemed me, ver. 16. And in the third, he is expressly said to be God, the Lord of hosts, ver. 3, 5.

§ 9. Jacob was now passing with his whole family into the land of Canaan to take seizure of it, by virtue of the promise on the behalf of his posterity. At the very entrance of it, he is met by his greatest adversary, with whom he had a severe contest, about the promise and the inheritance itself. This was his brother Esau, who coming against him with a power which he was no way able to withstand, he feared that both his person and his posterity would be utterly destroyed, ver. 11. In the promise about which their contest was, the blessed seed, with the whole church-state and worship of the Old Testament, was included; so that it was the greatest controversy, and had the greatest weight depending on it, of any that ever was amongst the sons of men. Wherefore to settle Jacob's right, to preserve him with his title and interest, He who was principally concerned in the whole matter, doth here appear unto him; some especial particulars of which manifestation of himself may be remarked.

§ 10. First, He appeared in the form of a man, a técnico עלנו, 'a man wrestled with him.' A man he is called from his shape and his actions; he wrestled, עזב נו that is saith R. Menachem in Rashi, 'he dusted;' this, saith he, is the sense of פֶּלַשׁ וּסְפָּר, for פֶּלַשׁ וּסְפָּר, 'they stirred up the dust with their feet;' as men do in earnest wrestling; or as he would rather understand it, in allusion to another word, to signify the closing with their arms to cast one another down, as is the manner of wrestlers. A great contention is denoted, and an appearance in the form of a man, further manifested by his touching the hollow of Jacob's thigh.

§ 11. Secondly, He is called an angel by Jacob himself, Gen. xlviii. 16, 'The angel that delivered me.' This was the greatest danger that Jacob ever was in, and this he remembers in his blessing of Joseph's children, praying that they may have the presence of this angel with them, who preserved him all his life, and delivered him from that imminent danger from his brother Esau. And he calls him, בְּנֵיה הָאָנָשִּׁים, 'The angel the Redeemer,' which is the name of the promised Messiah, as the Jews grant, Isa. lxx. 20, בְּנֵיה הָאָנָשִּׁים; 'And the Goel, the Redeemer shall come to Zion.' And he is expressly called the angel, Hos. xii. 14.

§ 12. Thirdly, This man in appearance, this angel in office, was in name and nature God over all blessed for ever. For in the first place, Jacob prays solemnly unto him for his blessing, Gen. xxxii. 26, and refuseth to let him go, or to cease his supplications until he had blessed him. 2. He
doth so: he blesseth him, and giveth him a double pledge or token of it in the touching of his thigh, and in the change of his name; giving him a name to denote his prevalence with God, that is with himself. 3. From hence Jacob concludes that he had seen God, and calls the name of the place, the Face of God. In the second place, in Gen. xlviii. 16, he prays to this angel for his presence with, and blessing on the children of Joseph, which cannot regard any but God himself, without gross idolatry. And it is evident that the angel who redeemed him, ver. 16, is the same with the God who fed him, that is the God of his fathers.

And this is yet more evident in the prophet. For with regard unto this story of his power over the angel, he says he had power with God; and proves it, because he had power over the angel and prevailed. And he shows, whereby he thus prevailed, it was by weeping and making supplications unto him, which he neither did, nor lawfully might do, unto a created angel; and therefore some of the Jews apply those words, he wept and made supplications, unto the angel's desiring Jacob to let him go; foolishly enough; and yet are they therein followed by some late critics, who too often please themselves with their curiosities. Again, this angel was he whom he found, or who found him in Bethel, an account whereof we have Gen. xxviii. 20—22; and ch. xxxv. 1. Now this was no other but he to whom Jacob made his vow, and with whom he entered into solemn covenant that he should be his God. And therefore the prophet adds expressly in the last place, ver. 5, that it was the Lord God of hosts, whom he intended.

§ 13. From what hath been spoken, it is evident, that he who appeared unto Jacob, with whom he earnestly wrestled by tears and supplications, was God, and because he was sent as the angel of God, it must be some distinct person in the deity, condescending unto that office; even the second person, who appearing in the form of a man, represented his future assumption of our human nature. And by all this did God instruct the church in the mystery of the person of the Messiah, that they might know for whom they were to look in the blessing of the promised seed.

§ 14. Exod. iii. 2—6. 'And Moses came to the mountain of God to Horeb. And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and beheld the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said Moses, Moses, and he said, Here am I. And he said, Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest, is holy ground. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; and Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.' And herein also have we expressed another glorious appearance of the Son of God. He who is here revealed, is called Jehovah, ver. 4. And he affirms of himself that he is the God of Abraham, ver. 6. He also describes himself by the glorious name of I AM that I AM, ver. 14. In his name and authority Moses was to deal with Pharaoh in the deliverance of the people, and him they were to serve on that mountain upon their coming out of Egypt. And for his יִנְאָר, or merciful good-will, Moses prays, Deut. xxxiii. 16. And yet he is expressly called an angel, ver. 2, namely the angel of the covenant, the great angel of the presence of
God, in whom was the name and nature of God; and he thus appeared that the church might know and consider who it was, that was to work out their spiritual and eternal salvation, whereof that deliverance which then he would affect was a type and pledge. Aben Ezra would have the angel mentioned ver. 2, to be another from him who is called the Lord God, ver. 6. But the text will not give countenance unto any such distinction, but speaks of one and the same person throughout, without any alteration; and this was no other than the Son of God.

§ 15. Exodus xix. 18—20. ‘And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke; because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount.’ The Jews well interpret those words concerning the descent of God, to be by way of the manifestation of his glory, not in the way of change of place. And hence Aben Ezra interprets that expression, chap. xx. 22, ‘Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven;’ God was still in heaven, when his glory was on the Mount. Yet those words do rather refer to his descent before described, than denote the place where he spake. For in giving the law God spake on earth, Heb. xii. 25. That God in this glorious manifestation of his presence on mount Sinai, made use of the ministry of angels, both the nature of the thing declares, and the Scripture testifies, Ps. lxxviii. 17. The voices, fire, trembling of the mountain, smoke and noise of the trumpet, were all effectuated by them. And so also was the forming of the words of the law conveyed to the ears of Moses and the people. Hence the law is not only said to be received by them, ες διασαγας ηγελον, (Acts vii. 53) by the disposition, or orderly ministration of the angels, and to be disposed by them into the hand of Moses, (Gal. iii. 19,) but is also called, σε σηνεις αληθεις λογος, Heb. ii. 2, the word spoken or pronounced by angels, that is, outwardly and audibly. As to him who presided and ruled the whole action, some Christians think that it was a created angel, representing God, and speaking in his name. But if this be so, we have no certainty of any thing that is affirmed in the Scripture, there is nothing which with assurance we can refer directly and immediately unto God; but we may when we please substitute a delegated angel in his room. For in no place, not even in that concerning the creation of the world, is God himself more expressly spoken of. Besides, the Psalmist in the place mentioned, affirms, that when those chariots of God were on mount Sinai, Jehovah himself was in the midst of them. And this presence of God, the Hebrews call כרכך וספינא, whereby they now understand a majestic and sanctifying presence; indeed it intends him who is the ‘brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person,’ who was delegated unto this work, as the great angel of the covenant, giving the law in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God.

§ 16. Exodus xxxiii. 20—22. ‘Behold I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place that I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak, then will I be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.’ The angel here promised, is he that went in the midst of the people in the wilderness, whose glory
appeared and was manifested among them. And moreover, another angel is promised unto them, ver. 23, 'For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee unto the Amorites, and I will cut them off.' This refers to a ministering angel, to execute the judgments and vengeance of God upon the enemies of his people. And that this angel of ver. 23, is another from that of ver. 20, appears from ch. xxxiii. 2, 3, compared with ver. 13—16, of the same chapter, ver. 2, 'I will send an angel before thee, and I will drive out the Canaanite and the Amorite,' which is the promise; and the angel of ch. xxxiii. 23. But saith he, ver. 3, 'I will not go up in the midst of thee; which he had promised to do in and by the angel of ver. 20, 21, in whom his name was. This the people esteemed evil tidings, and mourned because of it, ver. 4. Now God had not promised to go in the midst of them, any otherwise than by the angel mentioned; with which both Moses and the people were abundantly satisfied. But while he here renewes his promise of the ministry, and assistance of the angel of ver. 23, yet he denies them his own presence, in the angel of ver. 20. For which Moses reneweth his request, ver. 13, whereunto God replies, 'My presence shall go with thee,' ver. 14, concerning which presence or face of God, or which angel of his presence, we must a little more particularly inquire.

§ 17. First, It is said to the people concerning him מַהֲרֵךְ 무ַהֲרֵךְ, be- ware of him, or rather take heed to thyself before him: before his face, in his presence, ver. 21. מָסַר masar, in Niphal, is sibi cavit; cæce tibi. And this is the caution that is usually given the people, requiring that reverence and awe, which is due unto the holiness of the presence of God. 2. viz. מִשְׁמַע בַּקָּול mismaubakol, and obey his voice. This is the great precept which is solemnly given, and so often reiterated in the law with reference unto God himself. 3. לִקְשׁוּר likshur, provoke him not; or rebel not against him. This is the usual word whereby God expresseth the transgression of his covenant; a rebellion that can be committed against God alone. 4. Of these precepts a twofold reason is given, the first of which is taken from the sovereign authority of this angel; for he will not pardon your transgressions; that is, as Joshua afterwards tells the same people, 'he is a holy God, he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins,' Josh. xxiv. 19; namely, sins of rebellion, that break and disannul his covenant. And who can forgive sins but God? To suppose here a created angel, is to open a door unto idolatry; for he in whose power it is absolutely to pardon and to punish sin, may certainly be worshipped with religious adoration. The second reason is taken from his name, for my name is in him. A more excellent name than any of the angels do enjoy, Heb. i. 4. He is God Jehovah, that is his name, and his nature answereth thereto. Hence ver. 22, it is added, 'if indeed thou obey his voice, and do all that I speak.' His voice is the voice of God; in his speaking doth God speak; and upon the people's obedience thereto, depends the accomplishment of the promise. Moreover, ch. xxxiii. 14, 15, God says concerning this angel מַהֲרֵךְ, my presence, my face shall go with thee; which presence Moses calls his glory, ver. 18, his essential glory. This was manifested unto him, chap. xxxiv. 6, though the manifestation was but obscure when compared with what they enjoyed, who in his human nature, (wherein dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. ii. 9,) beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, John i. 14. For this face of God is he, who could truly say, 'he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father,' John xiv. 9, because he is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, Heb. i.
3. This is he who accompanied the people in the wilderness, 1 Cor. x. 4, and whose merciful good pleasure towards them, Moses prayed for, Deut. xxxiii. 16. He is the 'Father of lights, from whom descendeth every good and perfect gift,' James i. 17. These things evidently express God and none other; and yet he is said to be an angel sent by God in his name, and unto his work. So that he can be no other but a certain person of the deity, who accepted of this delegation, and was therein revealed unto the church, as he who was to take upon him the seed of Abraham, and to be their eternal Redeemer.

§ 18. Josh. v. 13—15. 'And it came to pass whilst Joshua was by Jericho, that he lift up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him, with his sword drawn in his hand, and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? and he said, Nay; but as Prince of the host of the Lord, am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant. And the prince of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy.' The appearance here is of a man, ver. 13, a man of war, as God is called, Exod. xv. 3, armed with his sword drawn in his hand, as a token of the business about which he came. At first sight Joshua apprehends him to be a man only, which occasioned his inquiry, art thou for us or for our adversaries? which discovers his courage and undaunted magnanimity, for doubtless the appearance was august and glorious. But he answers unto his whole question, §§, I am not; that is, a man either of your party, or of the enemy's, but quite another person, מנהיג הגלות, the Prince of the host of the Lord. And this was another illustrious manifestation of the Son of God unto the church of old, accompanied with many instructive circumstances. As, 1st. From the form in which he appeared, namely of a man, as a pledge of his future incarnation. 2nd. The title that he assumes to himself, the Captain of the Lord's host, to whom was committed the guidance and conducting of them unto rest, not only temporal, but eternal rest; whence the apostle, in allusion unto this place and title, calls him the captain of our salvation, Heb. ii. 10. And 3rd. The person unto whom he spake when he gave himself this title, was the captain of the people at that time, teaching both him and them that there was another supreme captain of their eternal deliverance. 4th. From the time and place of his appearance, which was upon the first entrance of the people into Canaan, and on the first opposition which occurred to them there; his people were taught to regard him as engaging his presence with his church, in all things which oppose them in their way unto eternal rest. 5th. From the adoration and worship which Joshua gave unto him, and which he accepted of, contrary to the duty and practice of created angels, Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9. 6th. From the prescription of the ceremonies expressive of religious reverence, Put off thy shoes, with the reason annexed, For the place whereon thou standest מנהיג פה, it is holiness, made so by the presence of God; the like precept whereunto was given to Moses, by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Exod. iii. 5. By all these things was the church instructed in the person, nature, and office of the Son of God: even in the mystery of his eternal distinct subsistence in the Deity, his future incarnation and condensation unto the office of being the Head and Saviour of his church.

§ 19. These manifestations of the Son of God unto the church of old, as the angel or messenger of the Father, subsisting in his own divine per-
son, are all of them revelations of the promised seed, the great and only Saviour and deliverer of the church; all of them intimate his eternal existence before his incarnation, and are pledges of his afterwards taking upon him the human nature, for the accomplishment of the whole work committed unto him. And many other instances of the like nature may be added out of the former and latter prophets, which, because in most important circumstances they are coincident with these, need not here particularly be insisted on.

§ 20. Some of late would apply all these appearances unto a created delegated angel; which conceit, as it is irreconcileable unto the sacred text, as we have manifested, so is it contrary unto the sense of the ancient writers of the Christian church. A large collection of testimonies from them, is not suited unto our present design and purpose: I shall therefore only mention two of the most ancient of them; one of the Latin, the other of the Greek church. The first is Tertullian, who tells us, ‘Christus semper egit in Dei Patris nomine; ipse ab initio conversatus est et congressus cum Patriarchis et Prophetis.’ Adv. Marc. lib. 2. ‘Christ always dealt (with men) in the name of God the Father; and so himself from the beginning conversed with the Patriarchs and prophets.’ And again, ‘Christus ad colloquia humana semper descendit, ab Adam usque ad Patriarchas et Prophetas, in visione, in somno, in speculo, in ænigmathe, ordinem suum præstruens semper ab initio; et Deus, in terris cum hominibus conversatus est, non alius, quam sermo qui caro erat futurus. Adv. Praxeam. ‘It was Christ who descended to commune with men, from Adam unto the patriarchs and prophets, in visions, dreams, and appearances, or representations of himself, instructing them in his future condition from the beginning; and God who conversed with men on earth, was no other but the word who was to be made flesh.’ The other is Justin Martyr, whose words need not be produced, seeing it is known how he contends for this very thing, in his dialogue with Trypho.

§ 21. That which is more direct unto our purpose, is to inquire into the apprehensions of the Jewish masters, concerning these divine appearances, granted unto the patriarchs and church of old, with what may thence be collected for their conviction concerning the person of the Messiah. The most part of their expositors do, I confess, pass over the difficulties of the places mentioned, (I mean those which are difficult to them because of their present infidelity) without taking the least notice of them. Some would have the angel mentioned to be Michael, to whom they assign a prerogative, above the other angels, who preside over other countries. But who that Michael is, and wherein that prerogative doth consist, they know not. Some say that Michael is the high priest of heaven, who offers up the prayers of the righteous: so R. Menachem. The priest above, that offereth, or presenteth the souls of the righteous, saith another, more agreeably unto the truth than they are aware of. One signal instance only, of the evidence of the truth insisted on, in the words of Moses Nechmanides Gerundensis, on Exod. xxi., which hath been taken notice of by many, shall at present suffice. His words are; ‘Iste Angelus, si rem ipsam dicamus, est Angelus Redemptor, de quo scriptum est Quoniam nomen meum in ipso est. Ille inquam Angelus, qui ad Jacob dicerat, Gen. xxxi. 13. Ego Deus Bethel. Ille de quo dictum est, Exod. iii. 4. Et vocabat Moses Deus de rubo. Vocatur autem Angelus quia mundum gubernat. Scriptum est enim, Deut. vi. 21, Eduxit vos Jehovah ex Ægypto; et alibi Numb. xx. 6; Misit Angelum suum et eduxit vos ex Ægypto. Praeterea
scriptum est Isa. Ixiii. 9, Et Angelus faciei ejus salvos fecit ipsos. Nimirum ille Angelus qui est Dei facies; de quo dictum est, Exod. xxxiii. 14, Facies mea praebit, et efficiam ut quiescas. Denique ille Angelus est de quo vates, Mal. iii. 1, Et subito veniet ad templum suum dominus quem vos quæritis, et Angelus fœderis quem cupitis.' And again to the same purpose. 'Animadverte attente quid ista sibi velint, Facies mea ipraebit. Moses enim et Israelites semper optaverunt Angelum primum, cæterum quis ille esset vere intelligere non potuerunt. Neque enim ab aliis percipiebant, neque prophetica notione satis assequabantur; Atqui Facies Dei, ipsum Deum significat, quod apud omnes interpretes est in confesso. Verum ne per summum quidem ista intelligere quisquam possit, nisi sit in mysteriis legis eruditus.' And again, 'Facies mea preceedet, h. e. Angelus fœderis quem vos cupitis in quo videbitur facies mea: de quo dictum est, tempore accepto exaudiam te; nomen meum in eo est. Faciamque ut quiescas; sive efficiam ut ipse tibi sit lenis et benignus: neque te ducat per rigidum, sed placide et clementer.' This angel, if we speak exactly, is the angel the Redeemer, concerning whom it is written, My name is in him, Exod. xxxiii. 21, that angel who said unto Jacob, I am the God of Bethel, Gen. xxxi. 13. He of whom it is said, And God called unto Moses out of the bush, Exod. iii. 4. And he is called an angel because he governeth the world. For it is written, Deut. vi. 21, The Lord our God brought us out of Egypt; and elsewhere, Numb. xx. 6. He sent his angel and brought us out of Egypt. Moreover it is written, Isa. lxiii. 9, And the angel of his face (presence) saved them. Namely, that angel who is the face of God; of whom it is said, Exod. xxxiii. 14. My face shall go before thee, and I will cause thee to rest. Lastly, it is that angel of whom the prophet speaks, Mal. iii. 1, And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come unto his temple, the angel of the covenant whom ye delight in.' His following words are to the same purpose. 'Mark diligently what is the meaning of those words, My face shall go before thee. For Moses and the Israelites always desired the highest angel, but who that was they could not truly understand. For neither could they learn it of any others, nor obtain it by prophecy. But the face of God signifieth God himself, as all interpreters acknowledge. But no man can have the least knowledge hereof, unless he be skilled in the mysteries of the law.' He adds moreover; 'My face shall go before thee, that is the angel of the covenant whom ye desire; in whom my face shall be seen; of whom it is said, in an acceptable time have I heard thee; my name is in him; I will cause thee to rest; or cause that he shall be gentle or kind unto thee, nor shall lead thee with rigour, but quietly and mercifully.'

§ 22. This Ra. Moses bar Nachman, wrote about the year of our Lord, 1220, in Spain, and died at Jerusalem, An. 1260, and is one of the chief masters of the Jews. And there are many things occurring in his writings, beyond the common rate of their present apprehensions. As in the places cited, he doth plainly overt one of the principal foundations of their present infidelity. For he not only grants, but contends and proves, that the angel spoken of was God, and being sent of God as his angel, he must be a distinct person in the deity, as we have proved. The reason indeed on which he fixeth why he is called an angel, namely, because he governeth the world, although the thing itself be true, is not so proper. For he is so called, because of his eternal designation, and actual delegation by the Father, unto the work of saving the church in all conditions from first to last. And as he acknowledgeth that his being called the face of God, proves him
to be God, so it doth no less evidently evince his personal distinction from him whose face he is; that is, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. And what he adds of the mercy and benignity which by the appointment of God he exerciseth towards his people, is signally suitable unto the tenderness and mercy which the great captain of our salvation exerciseth by God's appointment, towards all those whom he leads and conducts unto glory.

§ 23. It will also be not unsuitable to consider what some of them write in Tanhumah, an ancient comment on the five books of Moses. Speaking of the angel that went before them from Exod. xxxii. 20. 'God,' say they, 'said unto Moses, Behold I send my angel before thy face. But Moses answered, I will not have an angel, but I will have thyself. But when Joshua the son of Nun first saw the angel, he said, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? then the angel answered, I am the captain of the Lord's host, and now I come; as if he had said, I am come a second time, that I may lead the Israelites into their possession. I came when Moses thy master was the ruler, but when he saw me, he would not have me to go with him, but refused me. As soon as Joshua heard this, he fell on his face and worshiped, saying, What speaketh my Lord unto his servant?'

Answerable hereunto in the Talmud. Tractat. Saned. cap. 4. Echad dine Mamonoth, they have a gloss on those words, Exod. xxiii. 21, &c. He will not pardon your transgressions: לא אש.tellit us that He will not pardon. In the Talmud it is adduced, that the words signify a blot in the soul. He cannot spare or pardon your transgressions: what then doth he do, or could he do; wherefore he said unto him, (to God,) we believe that he cannot pardon our transgressions, and therefore we refuse him, and will not accept of him; so not for a leader to go in and out before us. They greatly mistake in supposing that the angel whom alone Moses refused, was he that afterwards appeared unto Joshua; for he was the same with him in whom was the name of God, and who was promised unto them under the name of the face or presence of God. But in this they were right enough; that, not Moses, but their church under the law, refused that Angel of God's presence, who was to conduct them that obey him into everlasting rest. And the church of believers under Joshua, which was a type of the church of the New Testament, adhering unto him, found rest unto their souls.

§ 24. And this angel of whom we have spoken, was he whom the Talmudists call Metatron, מטטרון. Ben Uziel in his Targum on Gen. v. ascribes this name unto Enoch. He ascended, saith he, into heaven by the word of the Lord, קדש שמה מטטרון ועמד על ראה, and his name was called Metatron the great scribe. But this opinion is rejected and confuted in the Talmud. There they tell us that Metatron is the hip prince of the world; or, as Elias calls him in Tishbi, הרפרים, the prince of God's presence. The mention of this name is in Talm. Tract. Saned. cap. 4. where they plainly intimate that they intend an uncreated angel thereby. For they assign such things unto him as are incompetent unto any other. And as Reuchlin informeth us from the Cabbalists, they say Metatron was the master or teacher of Moses himself. He it is, saith Elias, who is the angel always appearing in the presence of God, of whom it is said, my name is in him. And the Talmudists add, that he hath power to blot out the sins of Israel, whence they call him the chancellor of heaven. And Bechai a famous master among them affirms, on Exod. xxiii. that his name signifies both a Lord, a messenger, and a keeper. And, because he ruleth
all; a messenger, because he standeth always before God to do his will: and a keeper, because he keepeth Israel. The etymology of that name which he gives unto this purpose, is, I confess, weak and foolish. Nor is that of Elias one jot better, who tells us that Metatron is מֵאֲתָרִין, in the Greek tongue, One sent. But yet the person who is intended by these obscure intimations, which are the corrupted relics of ancient traditions, is evident, namely the uncreated Prince of glory, who being Lord of all appeared of old unto the patriarchs, as the angel or messenger of the Father. And as for the word itself, it is either a corrupt expression of the Latin Mediator, such as is usual amongst them, or a mere gematrical fiction to answer unto מֵאֲתָרִין, the Almighty, there being a coincidence in the numerical signification of their letters.

And this was another way, whereby God instructed the church of old in the mystery of the person of the Messiah who was promised unto them.

---

**EXERCITATION XI.**


§ 1. We have proved that there was a promise of a person to be born, and anointed unto the work of relieving mankind from sin and misery, and to bring them back unto God. And what kind of person he was to be we have also shown. It remains that we consider what was the faith of the ancient church of the Jews concerning him; as also what are, and have been for many generations, the apprehensions and expectations of the same people, about the same object of faith, with the occasions and reasons of their present infidelity and obstinacy.

§ 2. For the faith of the ancient church, it hath been already sufficiently discoursed. What God revealed, that they believed. They of old saw not indeed clearly and fully into the sense of the promises, as to the way and manner whereby God would work out and accomplish the mercy and grace, which they lived and died in the faith and hope of. But this they knew,
that God would in his appointed time, in and by the nature of man, in one to 
be born of the seed of Abraham and house of David, cause atonement to be 
made for sin, bring in everlasting righteousness, and work out the salvation 
of his elect. This was abundantly revealed, this they steadfastly believed, 
and in the faith thereof obtained a good report, or testimony from God him-
self, that they pleased him, they inherited the promises and were made par-
takers of life eternal. And farther we need not at present inquire into 
their light and apprehensions, seeing they must be considered in our ex-
position of the Epistle itself, to which we are now advancing.

§ 3. It may be interesting to consider the state of the Jews, since by their 
unbelief they were deprived of the privileges of their forefathers. Their 
condition during this period may be best seen by attending, First, to their 
history from the time of the actual exhibition of the promised seed, or of 
the Messiah, to the time of the composition of their Mishnæ, and Talmuds, 
that ensued thereon. Secondly, from thence unto this present day; and 
in both these seasons we may consider the prevailing opinions amongst them 
concerning the promised Messiah, concerning his coming, and the work he 
hath to do. That towards the close of prophecy in the church of old, the 
hearts and spirits of men were intently fixed in a desire and expectation of 
the coming of the Messiah, the last of the prophets clearly testifies, Mal. 
iii. 1. “The Lord whom ye are seeking, the angel of the covenant whom 
you are desiring, shall come suddenly.” As the time of his coming drew 
nigh, this expectation was increased and heightened, so that they continual-
ly looked out after him, as if he were to appear amongst them every moment. 
No sooner did any one make an appearance of something extraordinary, 
but instantly they were ready to say, Is not this the Messiah? This gave 
advantage to various seditious impostors, as Theudas, and Judas of Galilee, 
who deceived many of them to their ruin. John the Baptist also they in-
quired about, John i. 19, 20. Yea, and they had divulged such a report of 
their expectations, with the predictions and prophecies on which these ex-
pectations were built, that the whole world took notice of it; as hath been 
elsewhere manifested out of the best Roman historians. This was the state 
of the Jewish church not long before the destruction of the second temple. 
And so fixed were they in their expectations, that he was to come about 
that season, that during the last desolating siege of the city, they looked 
every day when he would come and save them.

§ 4. But though they retained the earnest desire and expectation, they 
had utterly lost the light and faith of their forefathers, about the nature 
work, and office, of the promised Messiah. For having grown carnal, and 
minding only things earthly and present, they utterly overlooked the spiritual 
genealogy of the seed of the woman from the first promise, and wrested all 
prophecies and predictions, to their ambitious, covetous, corrupt inclina-
tions and interests. Thus, regardless of sin and the curse, and deliverance 
from these, they fancied him unto themselves as one that was to deliver 
them from all outward trouble, and to satisfy them with the glory and de-
sirable things of this world. And hence the Sadducees, who denied the 
immorality of the soul, and consequently all rewards and punishments in 
another world, yet no less desired and expected the coming of the Messiah, 
than the Pharisees and their disciples. And the truth is, they had brought 
their principles unto a better consistency than the others had done. For if 
the promised Messiah was only to procure them the good things of this 
world, and that whilst they lived in it; it was in vain to look for the world 
to come, and the blessings thereof. To look for eternal life, and yet to con-
fine the promise of the seed to the things of this life only, was to form
expectations without ground or reason. So that the Pharisees laid down
the principle, and the Sadducees drew the natural conclusion from it.
Some in the meantime among them, God's secret ones, as Simeon, Anna,
Joseph, Zacharias, and Elizabeth, but especially the blessed Virgin, with
many more, retained no doubt the ancient faith of their forefathers. But
the body of the people, with their leaders, being either flagitiously wicked,
or superstitiously proud, fancied a Messiah suited unto their own lusts and
desires, such an one as we shall afterwards describe. And this their head-

§ 5. That this was the ground on which they rejected the promised Mes-

siah, is evident from the story of the gospel, and we shall farther prove it
in our ensuing discourses. How they acted to the Messiah, and the issue
of their conduct, is well known. But after they had done this, and mur-
dered the Prince of Life, to justify themselves in their wickedness and un-
belief, they still with all earnestness looked after such a Messiah as they had
framed in their own imagination. And in this they grew more earnest and
furious than ever. They had now not only their own false pre-conceived
opinion, strengthened by their carnal interests and desires of earthly things,
to actuate and provoke them; but also a regard to their reputation, and their
pretensions to the love and favour of God, tended to heighten their pre-
sumptions. For if they should admit, that they continued to reject the true
Messiah, because in his way and work he answered not their expectation,
then they knew full well, that in consequence of this rejection of him, they
could have no enjoyment of the favour of God. But pride and carnal wis-
dom engage men to pursue those miscarriages with violence, into which
they have been wickedly led, and to lay hold on any pretence that may seem
to justify them in what they have done. And on this account, they exposed
themselves as a prey unto every seducer who made the least appearance of
being such a Messiah as they thought meet for them to receive. This at
last involved them in a second shipwreck, in the business of Barchocheba,
who pretending that he was their Messiah, sent to deliver them from the Ro-

§ 6. Now, because in the business of this Barchocheba, they met with a
sore disappointment, that turned the stream of their imaginations and ex-

pectations for a long season, it may not be amiss to give in our passage a
brief account concerning him, and the things which befell them in those
days. Some of the Jews affirm, that there were two of that name, both
heads of sedition amongst them. One of these they place under Domitian,
and the other, who was his grandchild, under the reign of Trajan and Ha-
drian. So do the authors of Schalsehelet Hakabala, and of Tzemach David.
But the stories of those times, with the condition of the Jews under Domi-
tian, will allow no other place to the former but in their own imaginations.
The latter was well known in the world, and hath left himself a name, such
as it is, in the writings of Christians, and the histories of the Romans. For
Hadrian the emperor, provoked by a seditious tumult and rebellion of the
Jews, in the second year of his reign, which he suppressed by Martius
Turbo, as Dio, Eusebius, and Orosius declare, drove them from Jerusalem,
and built a temple to Jupiter in the place where the old temple stood. This proved a great provocation to the Jews all the world over; yea, turned them into rage and madness. And they were in those days exceedingly prone unto tumults and uproars, as being poor and needy, not having as yet given themselves to scrape wealth together, the love of which hath been the great means of keeping them in quietness in succeeding ages.

When in their poor condition, Barcosba showed himself amongst them, pretending that he was their Messiah, as they confess in the Talm. Tract. Saned. Dist. Chelek. He reigned, they say, 'three years and a half,' a fatal period of time; 'and ( aloud, Ani M'sheh) he said to the Rabbins, I am the Messiah.' Immediately one of their famous masters, whose memory they yet much reverence, Rabbi Akiha, became his armour-bearer; and so far his trumpeter also, as to proclaim him to be their king Messiah. For this is their way; when they get a false Messiah, they have also a false prophet to usher him in, or to set him off unto the people. And this Akiha, as Maimonides informs us, ' was a great wise man, and one of the wise men of the Mishne,' as his sayings in it manifest; so that all the wise men of that generation followed him, and took this Barcosba, for their king and Messiah. He first applied unto him the prophecy of Balaam, Numb. xxiv. 17, concerning the star that should arise out of Jacob, whereon they changed his name, and called him Barchocheba, or the son of the Star; or, as some say, that was his name at first, whence the blind Rabbin took occasion to apply that prediction unto him. Concerning him also, they interpreted the prophecy of the Shiloh; and also that in Haggai, about the shaking of the heavens and the earth, as they acknowledge in the Talmud in the place forecited. To this man therefore, a magician and a bloody murderer, by the common advice and counsel of their doctors and wise men, they gathered in multitudes, and him they embraced as their deliverer. As soon as he had got strength and power, he set himself to the work which they expected from their Messiah, namely, to conquer the Romans, and to extirpate the Christians; which last, as Justin Martyr, who lived near those days, informs us, he attempted to accomplish with all cruelty. In the pursuit of this design, he continued for three years and a half, obstinately managing a bloody war against the Romans, until the impostor himself was slain, their great Rabbi taken, and tortured to death with iron cards, and such a devastation was made of the whole nation, as that to this day they could never again gather together in great numbers in any place of the world.

Maimonides tells us of this Barcosba, whom they all received for their Messiah, ' that the wise men required of him neither sign nor wonder; that is, no miracle; but others of them report, that he caused fire to come out of his mouth, with other diabolical delusions, fit to deceive a poor blinded credulous multitude. This opinion of Maimonides, that they look for no miracles from the Messiah, seems to be be invented on purpose to obviate the plea of the Christians from the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus; and is contrary unto the constant persuasion of most of their masters, and to his own judgment declared in other places. And the Targum itself in Hab. iii. 18, hath these words,—because of the miraculous signs and redemption that thou shalt work for (or by) thy Messiah.' So they call the miracles wrought at their coming out of Egypt, or א敉ב, see Hos. ii. 15. Targum. And on this ground do they studiously and wickedly endeavour to stain by any means the glory of the miracles of the Lord Jesus.
But the end of this impostor, who probably was intended in those words of our Saviour, John v. 43, 'If another come in his own name, him will ye receive,' hath proved the shame and reproach of their hopes and expectations, unto all generations.

§ 7. From this time forward, the remaining Jews, with their posterity, utterly rejected the faith of their father Abraham, and the rest of their progenitors, who thereby obtained a good report, and this testimony that they pleased God. A Messiah that was promised unto Adam, the common father of us all; one that should be a spiritual Redeemer from sin and misery; a Goel, or Redeemer from death and wrath; a Peace-maker between God and man; one that should work out everlasting salvation; the great blessing, wherein all the nations of the earth were to have an interest; a spiritual and eternal Prophet, Priest, and King; God and man in one person; such a Messiah they neither looked for any more, nor desired. A temporal king and deliverer, promised unto themselves alone, to give them ease, dominion, wealth, and power, they would now have, or none at all. They would not think it thank-worthy towards God himself, to send a Messiah to deliver them from sin. And in their expectations of such a one, after they had been well wearied with many frustrations, they were, as was said, in their adherence unto Barcosba, almost extirpated from the face of the earth; but God in his providence, who hath yet another work to accomplish towards them, hath preserved them a remnant unto his glory.

§ 8. In this condition, some of them began to deny that there was any Messiah to be expected or looked for. This opinion is ascribed in the Talmud unto Rabbi Hillel. lib. Sand. Cap. Chelek. This was not that Hillel whom they call הילל, the Elder, the famous master of traditions, who with Shammai lived under the second temple, but another, of whom some say that he was the son of Gamaliel, others more probably that he lived a long time after those days. But whenever he lived, they say of him, ויהיה י FileOutputStream , 'Rabbi Hillel said, a Messiah shall not be given unto Israel, for they enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.' This was a consequence of their applying that prophecy of Isaiah, ch. ix. 5, 6, unto Hezekiah; for if he was intended therein, he was unquestionably the only Messiah. But it doth not appear that this opinion was much followed; for a great dispute arose amongst them whether Hillel were not to be esteemed an apostate, and to have lost his interest in the world to come by this opinion. Those who, following Maimonides, make the article of the coming of the Messiah one of the fundamentals of the law, are greatly offended at him; but he is more gently treated by Joseph Albo, Sepher Ikkarim. Orat. 1, on the account that this article is not fundamental, but only one branch of the great root of rewards and punishments. Abardinel, in another way attempts to excuse him, but generally they all condemn his opinion. In this persuasion then, that a Messiah is promised and shall come, they all continue. But whereas, as was before observed, they have utterly rejected the faith and light of the church of old, they have in their Talmuds, and in the ages which followed the composition of the Talmuds, coined so many foolish imaginations concerning him, concerning his person, work, office, kingdom, life, continuance, and succession, as are endless to recount. But yet it may be useful for the reader to consider the woeful condition of men rejected of God, cast out of his covenant, and bereaved of his Spirit, and to perceive of how little use the letter of the Old Testament is unto the vain minds of men, wholly destitute of divine illumination and grace. It may be also interesting to him to learn,
what is that present persuasion of the Jews which they prefer before the faith of their forefathers, and what they conceive of that Messiah, for whose sake they reject Him in whom alone there is salvation: I shall therefore give an account of the most important heads of their opinions and conjectures about him, as also of the principal occasions of their being hardened in their impenitency and unbelief.

§ 9. Our apostle tells us, 1 Tim. iii. 16, 'That without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.' All things which concern the Messiah, his person, office, and work, are exceedingly mysterious, as containing the principal effect of the eternal wisdom and goodness of God, and the sacred depths of the counsel of his will. Hence the things spoken of him in the Old Testament, are unto carnal reason full of seeming inconsistencies. As for instance, it is promised of him that he should be the seed of the woman, Gen. iii. 15, of the seed of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 18, and of the posterity of David; and yet that his name should be, 'the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' Isa. ix. 6, and of him it is said, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, Psal. xlv. 6. And again we are told, that he is the Lord our righteousness, Jer. xxiii. 6, that he is the Lord of hosts, Zech. ii. 8. Moreover it is declared, that he shall sit upon his throne for ever, and reign whilst his enemies are made his footstool, Isa. ix. 7, Psal. ii. 7—8; xlv. 6, 7. And yet we are as certainly informed that he shall be cut off, Dan. ix. 26, that he shall be pierced in his hands and feet, Ps. xii. 16, slain by the sword of God, Zech. xiii. 7, and that in his death he shall have his grace made among the wicked and with the rich, Isa. liii. 9. We are told, that he shall come with great glory, with the clouds of heaven, Dan. vii. 13, 14; but also that he shall come lovely, riding on an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass, Zech. ix. 9. We are assured that the soul of the Lord was well pleased with him, and always delighted in him, Isa. xiii. 1, and yet that it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to put him to grief, Isa. liii. 10, to forsake him, Ps. xxii. 1. That he was to be a King and a Priest upon his throne, Zech. vi. 13, and yet these things were inconsistent, the kingdom being annexed unto the family of David, and the priesthood to the posterity of Aaron by divine constitution. It was foretold, that he should be honoured and worshipped of all nations, Ps. xlv. 11, 12. Ps. lxxii. 10, 11, 15, and yet that he should be rejected and despised as one altogether undesirable, Isa. liii. 3. That he should 'stand and feed, or rule, in the name and majesty of God,' Micah v. 4, and yet he should complain, 'I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men, and despised of the people,' Ps. xxii. 6. All which, with other passages of the like nature concerning his office and work, are clearly reconciled in the New Testament, and their concurrence in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ openly and fully declared.

§ 10. At the time of his coming, the Jews were generally as ignorant of these things as Nicodemus was of regeneration; they knew not how they might be. And therefore, whenever our Saviour intimated unto them his divine nature, they were filled with rage and madness, John viii. 58, 59. They would stone him, because, being a man, he declared himself to be God, John x. 30—33. And yet, when he proved to them that the Messiah was to be God, seeing, though he was David's son, yet David in Spirit called him Lord, they were confounded, not being able to answer him a word, Matt. xxii. 42—46. When he told them, that the Son of man the
Messiah must be lifted up, that is in his death on the cross, they objected unto him out of the law, that Christ abideth for ever, John xii. 34, and they knew not how to reconcile these things. Hence some of his own disciples thought that he could not be the Messiah, when they saw that he died, Luke xxiv. 20, 21, and the best of them seemed to have expected an outward temporal kingdom. But of all these difficulties, as was said, and seeming inconsistencies, there is a blessed reconciliation revealed in the gospel, and an application made of them to the person of the Lord Jesus, to the office which he bare, and to the work that he accomplished. This the Jews refusing by unbelief, they have invented many fond and wicked imaginations to free themselves from these difficulties and entanglements. Some things they deny to be spoken concerning the Messiah; some things they wrest and pervert to their own apprehensions, and some of the things which were indeed promised, they allow and look for.

§ 11. First, To his person, and to the things spoken concerning it, they apply the principal engine which they have invented for their relief. For whereas the Scripture hath declared unto us such a Messiah, as should have the natures of God and man in one person, which person should in the nature of man suffer and die, and reign for spiritual ends and purposes, they have rejected the divine nature of this Person, and split that which remaineth into two persons; to the one whereof they assign one part of his work, as to sorrow, suffer, and die; to the other another part, namely, to conquer, rule, and reign, according unto their carnal apprehensions of these things. They have, I say, feigned two Messiahs, between whom they have distributed the whole work of him that is promised, according unto their understanding of it. And one of these is to come, as they say, before the other, to prepare his way for him.

This first they call Messiah Ben Joseph, because he is to be of the tribe of Ephraim; the other Messiah Ben David, of whom afterwards. Both of them are mentioned together in the Targum on Cant. iv. 5. "Thy two deliverers which shall deliver thee, Messiah the son of David, and Messiah the son of Ephraim, are like to Moses and Aaron." The same words are repeated again, chap. vii. 3. And in those places alone, in the whole series of Targums, is there any mention of this fictitious Messiah; the author of that paraphrase on the Canticles being Josephus Cæcus, who lived after the finishing of the Talmuds, whereof he maketh mention. In other parts of the Targum, this fictitious Messiah appeareth not. But in the Talmud, he is frequently brought on the stage. So Tractat. de Festo Tabernacul. Distinct. Hachalil Chamesha. "It is a tradition of our masters, that the holy blessed God shall say unto Messiah the Son of David who shall redeem us, (Let him do it suddenly in our days!) Ask somewhat of me, and I will give it thee; as Ps. ii. And when he shall hear that Messiah the Son of Joseph is slain, he shall say before the Lord, Lord of the world, I only ask life of thee; for it seems that he shall be much terrified with the death of Ben Joseph. Unto this Messiah, Ben Joseph, they assign all things that are dolorous, (and include suffering in them, which they call הבשלים) that are in the Scripture assigned to the Messiah; especially that prophecy, Zech. xii. 10. "They shall look upon me when they have pierced." And hereby they sufficiently discover the occasion of the whole figure to have been that before intimated, namely, a necessity of an evasion from those testimonies of Scripture and ancient traditions, which
assign sorrows and sufferings unto the Messiah, which they will not allow to belong unto the Son of David.

§ 12. A brief account may be given of what it is that they now ascribe unto this Messiah, and what it is that they expect from him. The whole of his story depends on that of one Armillus, against whom he shall fall in battle, whose legend we must therefore also touch upon. And this is given us at large in אבקת רוח in the seventh sign of the coming of the Messiah, and with some variation in שעם ורבך, or the Colloquy between Zerubbabel, and Michael the archangel. A fable it is of no small antiquity; for we have mention of Armillus, not only in the latter Targums on the Hagiographa, but in that of Jonathan also on the prophet, Isa. xi. 4, 'and by the word of his mouth he shall slay the wicked Armillus.' And yet this invention is not older than the Talmud, however it came into that Targum, which for the main of it was certainly written long before. The mother of this Armillus is, they say, to be a statue of stone at Rome, wrought into the similitude of a beautiful woman. This, saith the Dialogue of Zerubbabel, is the wife of Belial; and Armillus that is to be born of her is to be the head of all idolatry.

The author of Abkath Rochel, gives us somewhat another account of his nativity. The people of all nations, saith he, allured with the beauty of the image, shall come to Rome, and commit fornication with it, from whose uncleanness at length Armillus shall be born. The same author, after a description of his stature and bigness, (for he shall be twelve cubits high, and as broad as he is long,) with his hair, eyes, and whole complexion, gives us also an account of his actions and proceedings. First, therefore, he shall give himself out to theן הריטיס, (that is Christians,) to be their Messiah, who gave them their law, saying unto them, 'I am Messiah, I am your God; and they shall presently embrace him, and give him their תוכהות, or Prayer Books, acknowledging him to be the author of them. After this, by the help of the Edomites (Romans,) he shall conquer many nations, until coming unto the Jews, he shall require of them to receive him as their Messiah, and the author of their law. But these good Jews shall with one consent oppose him, under the conduct of Messiah Ben Joseph, and Nehemiah the son of Husiel says one, of Menachem the son of Ammiel says another. And in this war shall Messiah Ben Joseph be slain, as it is written, Zech. xii. 10.

§ 13. I shall stay a little by the way, to unriddle this enigmatical fable, it having not been by any attempted. The name Armillus some suppose to be formed of ἐρμολαος, 'a waster of the people,' for such they intend he shall be. But the truth is, as Broughton first observed, and sundry others have assent unto him, it is no other than Romulus, with the usual Chaldee formation by Aleph. For whereas he contends that it should be read Romulus, and not Armillus, or Armilus, there is no necessity for it. For the coiners of the fable might either ignorantly mistake the name, as is usual with these masters, or they might obscure it on purpose, that it might not at first view be known by the Christians, of whom they were afraid. And by Romulus, who was the first founder of the city and empire, they intend a prince of Rome, for such they declare this Armillus to be. And the whole story of him is derived from some prophetical passages.
and expressions in the Revelation of St. John, or is feigned by themselves from the event of things; mixing their own conceits with the opinions of some Christians concerning antichrist. For they plainly say, that this Armillus is called by the Christians, 'Antichristus.' Image-worship in the Revelation, as in the Old Testament, is expressed by the name of fornication; and Rome, because of her abounding therein is called the Mother of Harlots. Hence the image at Rome in the church, is become the mother of Armillus; and that by the people of all nations committing fornication with it, which is the rise assigned unto Antichristian power in the Revelation. This, then, is that which in their way they aim at: The worship of images in churches begun and promoted at Rome, furthered by the consent of the nations, shall bring forth that Roman power, which shall seek to destroy the Israel of God.

And I am the rather inclined unto this conjecture, because I find that some of them are not utter strangers unto the book of the Revelation; as those of them who are cabalistical have a great desire to be inquiring into things mystical which they understand not, which they wrest and corrupt unto their own imagination. Besides, it may be, they are pleased with that description that is in it of the New Jerusalem, which some Judaizing Christians of old wrested, so as to make it refer to a restoration of the earthly city of Jerusalem, and the renewed observation of the law of Moses. Thus, the author of the Questions and Answers published by Brennius, Quest. 26, inquires how 'Christians interpret those words of the Revelation, ch. xiii. 18. "Here is wisdom: let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man, and his number is 666,' to which he adds, 'I have heard of none who hath clearly interpreted this place, but I can give a good interpretation of it.' It is very likely that he had considered it, though possibly his interpretation, which he was not pleased to declare, was little worth. And the visions of Rabbi Joshua about the heavenly paradise, with the gates of it made of precious stones, wherein are mixed many fables, not unlike those about Mahomet's entrance into heaven, in the Alcoran, were originally taken from the allegorical description given us of the New Jerusalem, in the book of the Revelation, and abused to their superstitions. And from the same fountain it is, that they have got a tradition among them that they shall not be delivered until Rome be destroyed. For understanding Rome by Babylon in that prophecy, they apply unto themselves that which is foretold upon its destruction concerning the church of Christ. So Rabbi in קורא הדנה, or 'Bundle of Myrrh,' a commentary on the law, says more than once, בחרת הרמה מ用地 התיה שלורה, 'upon the destruction of Rome, our redemption shall ensue out of hand.' And it is by many observed, that an alteration is made in the later editions of the commentary of David Kimchi, on Obad. i. in those words, 'And watch the sword round about against the city, and against all that are in it.' which is interpreted by Rabbi Kimchi, that which the prophets speak concerning the destruction of Edom in the latter days, they spake it of Rome, as I have expounded it on that of Isaiah; Draw nigh ye nations to hear, (ch. xxxiv. 1.) for when Rome shall be destroyed, then shall be the redemption of Israel;' but the name of Rome is left out in the later editions, though it abide in that of Robert Stephens, which he published on the minor prophets. Sayings also unto the same purpose are cited out of Rabbi Bechay in Cad Hak kemach, Rabbi Solomon on Lev. vi. and sundry others.

§ 14. And this will yet farther appear, if we consider the account they give concerning the original and first building of Rome itself. Mention is
made of it in the Talmud, Tract. Saned. and more largely declared in Midrash Rabba Cantic. Cantico, cap. 1, 6, as it is from thence reported by Buxtorf in his Lexicon Talmud. Rad וַיִּשָּׁב. And their words are to this purpose. ‘Rabbi Levi said, that on the day that Solomon was married unto the daughter of Pharaoh, Michael the great Prince descended from heaven, and fixed a reed in the sea, so as that mud and dirt might on all sides be gathered unto it. And this place afterwards becoming a wood, was that place where Rome was afterwards built. For at the time that Jeroboam, the son of Nebat made the two golden calves, there were two small houses built at Rome, which presently fell down; and being again set up immediately fell down again. But there was then present an old man, whose name was "Abba Kolon, who said unto them, Unless you bring water hither out of the river of Euphrates and mix it with this clay, and build the houses therewith, they will never stand. They said therefore unto him, and who shall bring it unto us? He answered that he would. He went therefore, and took on him the habit of one that carries wine to sell, and so went from one city unto another, from one country unto another, until he came at length unto Euphrates. When he came thither, he took water out of the river; which when he had brought unto them, they mixed it with their clay, and therewith built up the houses which stood firm and stable. From that time it was a proverb amongst men. Every city or province where there is not an Abba Kolon, deserves not the name of a city or province, or of a metropolitan city; and they called that place Rome, Babylon.’ And the gloss adds, ‘This is the place where Rome that afflicted Israel was built.’ Cartwright, in his Mellificentum Hebraicum, lib. I, cap. 9, reporting this story out of Buxtorf, adds, ‘Haud dubitandum videtur, eos sub isto verborum involucro, Romam tanquam alteram Babylonem perstringere voluisse, quod nimimum quaes pries a Babylonius, cedam etque etiam graviora postea a Romanis passi fuerint. Quin et Romanam idololatriam in eo perstringi arbitrav, quod cedem die quo Jeroboamus filius Nebat vitulos aureos constituit, Romae (i.e. in loco ubi postea condita est Roma) duo tuguria ædificata esse dicunt.’ So he, who alone hath conjectured what the intention of this enigmatical story was, and that to good purpose, as I shall make it more fully to appear. Rome they have learned to call Babylon, out of the Revelation, as was declared; and thence conclude, that upon the destruction of Rome they shall be delivered. Two things were eminent in Babylon; first, that it was itself the beginning of all false worship and idolatry in the world, and therein the mother of harlots; the other, that God made use of it to punish the idolatries of the Jews. Hence, they say that Rome, this new Babylon, had its foundation when Solomon married Pharaoh’s daughter, and that it began to be built when Jeroboam set up his calves: which they look upon as the two first fatal instances of the declension of Israel into false worship and idolatry. And hereby they intimate, partly that Rome should set up idolatry, as Solomon and Jeroboam did, and partly that God had then provided a new Babylon to punish and destroy them. The Abba Kolon is a monster, the purport of whose name no man hath as yet attempted to explain. But it is no other but Capitolium, as they will easily grant, who know how usual it is with them strangely to metamorphose things and words; instances whereof I shall elsewhere give. Thence is the proverb they speak of: No Abba Kolon, no Capitol, or temple of idolatry, no city; the Capitol answering to the tower of Babel, which was a temple of Babel. Neither is that proverb any thing but an allusion to that in the Roman history: ‘Capitolium est, ubi quondam Capite humano invento, responsum
EST eo loco caput rerum, summamque imperii fore,' Tit. Liv. lib. 5. And the tempering of the clay of Rome with the water of Euphrates, by the help of Abba Kolon, is nothing but an expression of the succession of Rome in the stead of Babylon, which was built on that river, by the means of the Capitol, that great seat of idolatry. Nor do they at all distinguish between the present idolatry of Rome and that of old. So that although all things are confounded by them with monstrous fictions and expressions, which it may be they invented on purpose to obscure their intention, yet their aim in the whole is manifest.

But, to return, for the remaining part of the story concerning this Armillus, I know not whether they have borrowed it from those of the Roman church, or these from them; but it is evident that they strive to impose the odium of antichrist upon one another. The Papists say that antichrist shall be a Jew, of the tribe of Dan, and that he shall persuade the Jews that he is their Messiah; that by their help, and others joining with them, he shall conquer many nations, destroy Rome, slay Enoch and Elias, and afterwards be destroyed himself by fire from heaven, by the power of Christ. The Jews say that their Armillus shall be a Roman, born of idolatrous fornication, that he shall persuade the Roman Christians that he is the head of their religion, and author of their Prayer-books; that he shall conquer many nations, fight against Jerusalem, slay Messiah Ben Joseph, and afterwards be consumed with fire from heaven, through the power of Ben David. To which of the two the glory of this invention is to be assigned, I am uncertain; the story for the substance of it, is the same on both sides, only variously fitted unto their several interests.

§ 15. And this shall be the end of Messiah Ben Joseph, or Ephraim; Armillus having received a defeat by Nehemiah Ben Husiel, זכר ית, 'he shall gather the forces of all the nations of the world into the valley of decision,' יתקחש עם ינשהל, 'and shall fight with Israel;' יתורודioso יבضغו פונס ונוסס מיסוריאל פונס ירורית מישיה יד, 'And they shall slay of them (of the army of Armillus) heaps (or multitudes) on heaps, and they shall smite a few of Israel; and they shall slay the Messiah of the Lord.

בראך מלאאך מפור טורה מפור מגדים ראש עים אבות היילו, 'And the ministering angels shall come, and perfuming his body, shall lay it up with the ancient fathers;' where it is to be kept many days without putrefaction, as Hector's body was, (in Homer) after he was slain by Achilles. And it is not unlikely but that they may allude somewhat to the prophecy of the two witnesses, Rev. xi., who were to be slain, and afterwards called up to heaven. Thus do they, at their pleasure dispose of this creature of their own; for having framed him themselves, he is their own to do with him what they will, alive and dead. But that which is the poison and sting of this fable is, that the death of this fictitious Messiah, must amongst them bear all that is spoken in the Scripture, or continued by tradition, concerning the humiliation, suffering, and death of the true Messiah of the Lord.

§ 16. We need not stay long in the removal of this Mormon out of our way. Should they invent twenty other Messiahs, as they have done this, and which on the same grounds, and with as good authority they may, the case would still be the same. Who gave them power to substitute themselves in the place of God, to give new promises, to appoint new Saviours, and to invent new ways of deliverance? The Scripture is utterly silent of any such person, nor have they any antitalmudical tradition concerning him. And what their masters have invented in the Talmuds, is of no more
authority than what they coin every day themselves. The truth is, this whole story of Armillus and Ben Joseph is a Talmudical romance, the one the giant, the other the knight. But these fictions seria ducunt. Poor creatures are hardened by them unto their eternal destruction. But is the world bound to believe what every one whom they are pleased to call Rabbi can imagine, though never so contrary to the principles of that religion which they pretend to own and profess? So indeed some of them say, that if their masters teach the right hand to be the left, yea, heaven to be hell, yet their authority is not to be questioned; and, as I remember others say some such things of the pope. But God I hope of his goodness will not suffer poor men to be always so deluded. All the promises of God, all the prophecies from the foundation of the world, concern only one Messiah, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David. All the faith of the church of old, as we have proved, respected that one only. And who will lay any weight upon what is spoken, foretold, or promised concerning him, if the Jews have power to invent another at their pleasure?

§ 17. Again, their masters have not only dealt dishonestly and blasphemously, but foolishly also in this matter, in that they have not suited their own creature unto the ends for which they have made him. The end, as was shown before, why they advanced this imagination, was that it might correspond with what is spoken in the Scriptures, or retained by themselves in tradition, concerning the sufferings of the Messiah. And it is somewhat strange to me, that having raised up this Ben Joseph, they did not use him worse than they have done, but by a little foolish pity have spoiled the whole of their design. They have a tradition among themselves, that the Messiah must bear a third part of all the afflictions or persecutions that ever were, or shall be in the world. And what proportion doth a man's being slain in battle, where his army is victorious, which is all the hardship that this Ben Joseph is to meet with, bear unto the afflictions which befal the church in every age? And for the language of Scripture, it is mere lost labour to compare the death of this warrior with what is delivered there concerning the sufferings of the Messiah. Every one not judicially blinded, must needs see that there is no affinity between them.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is acknowledged by their Targum, and by several of the principal masters of their faith, to be a prophecy concerning Messiah; and this we shall afterwards undeniable prove. Now, the person there spoken of is one whom the Jews are to reject and to despise, whom God is to afflict and bruise, by causing the sins of the whole church to meet upon him. One, who by his sufferings is to fulfil the pleasure of the Lord, making his soul an offering for sin, justifying the elect, and conquering Satan by his death. This fictitious Messiah is to be honoured of all the Jews, to raise armies, to fight a battle, and therein, after the manner of other men, to be slain. So that a story was never worse told, nor to less purpose. No other use can be made of it that I know of, but only to consider it as a proof of the blindness of poor obstinate sinners, given up unto hardness of heart, and to a spirit of folly; for the rejection of him whom God sealed, anointed, and sent to be the Saviour of the world. Leaving them, therefore, to enjoy the poor satisfaction which this story can afford, we may now consider the other expected Messiah, whom they call Ben David, in whom principally they place their confidence.

§ 18. As the endless fables of the Jews about their Messiah have been in part discovered by others, so I design not here at large to recount them.
Concerning the Messiah.

Their chief masters in the Talmud, are full of disputes and contradictions about him, and those of after ages succeed them in their uncertainties. Such will the conceptions of all men be, when they take up fancies and opinions of their own in matters of divine revelation. But there are some things in which they all generally agree, and these relating to his person, work, and office, which it shall suffice to give an account of, as answering our present design. First, then, they contend that he shall be a mere man; and there is nothing that they strive to avoid more than the testimonies of Scripture, which show that the promised Messiah was to be God and man in one person, as hath been already evidenced. They contend also, that he shall be born after the manner of all men, not of a virgin, but of a married woman, and be begotten by her husband. About the place of his birth they are not fully agreed; for although they all acknowledge that the prophecy of Micah about Bethlehem relates to him, ch. v. 2, yet knowing that this town has now been desolate for many generations, and waste without in-habitant, which would seem to prove that he is come already, they contend that it is said that he shall be born at Bethlehem, because he is to spring of David who was born there; for of the tribe of Judah and family of David he must proceed, although they have neither distinction of tribes, nor succession of families, left in the world amongst them. To relieve themselves from that difficulty, they feign that he shall restore unto them all their genealogies.

About the time of his coming they are woefully perplexed, as we shall see afterwards. But many tokens they have of it when it doth come; for they heap up, out of some allegorical passages in the Scripture, such stupendous prodigies as never were, nor shall be in the world. One of the principal of them is the sounding of the great trumpet, which all Israel shall hear, and at which the world shall tremble, from Isa. xxvii. 13. The finding of the ark, and the sacred fire, which things were talked of in the late rumours about them, are indeed a part of their creed in this matter. His office, when he comes, is to be a king, to which he shall be anointed by them, when they are gathered together. And the work he is to do, is in war to fight with Armillus, Gog and Magog, to conquer the Edomites and Ishmaelites, that is the Romish Christians, and Turks or Saracens, and in so doing to erect a glorious kingdom at Jerusalem. In peace, he is to rule righteously, not only over Israel, but also all the nations of the world, if they have any difference amongst them, shall refer all unto his judgment and determination. In religion, he shall build the third temple mentioned by Ezekiel, restore the sacrifices, and cause the law of Moses to be most strictly observed. But that which is the head of all, he shall free the Jews from their captivity, restore them to their own land, make princes and lords of them all, giving them the wealth of all nations, either conquered by him, or brought voluntarily unto him, feast them on Behemoth, Zis, and the wine of paradise; so that they shall see want and poverty no more.

This is the substance of their persuasion, concerning his coming, person, office, and work. When he shall come, whether he shall live always, or die at an hundred years old; whether he shall have children, and if he have, whether they shall succeed him in his throne; whether all the Jews that are dead shall rise at his coming, and their Galgal, or rolling in the earth from all parts of the world into the land of Canaan, shall then happen or no; whether the general resurrection shall not succeed immediately upon his reign, or at least within forty years after; or how long it will be to the end of the world, they are not at all agreed. But this, as hath been
declared, is the substance of their persuasion and expectation, that he shall be a mere man, and that the deliverance which he shall effect, shall be by mighty wars, wherein the Jews shall be always victorious; and that in the dominion and rule which they shall have over all nations, the third temple shall be built, the law of Moses be observed by him and them, and the Noachical precepts be imposed on all others. As for any spiritual salvation from sin and the curse of the law; as to justification and righteousness by him, or the procurement of grace and glory, they utterly reject all thoughts about them.

§ 19. With these opinions, many of them have mixed prodigious fancies, rendering their state under their Messiah in this world, not much inferior to that which Mahomet hath promised unto his followers in another. And some of them on the other hand, endeavour to pare off what superfluities they can spare, and to render their folly as plausible as they are able. Wherefore that the utmost height may appear of their conceptions in this matter, and that in the language of the most contemplative persons amongst them, I shall subjoin a description of him and his kingdom in the words of Maimonides, one of the wisest and soberest persons that hath been amongst them since their last fatal dispersion. This man then in his exposition of the tenth chapter of Tractat. Saned., observing the fond and frivolous imaginations of their Talmudical masters about the Messiah, gives many rules and instructions about the right understanding of their sayings, to free them from open impieties and contradictions. And hereunto he subjoins, as he supposeth, the true notion of the Messiah and of his kingdom in the ensuing words. 'As to the days of the Messiah, they are the time when the kingdom shall be restored unto Israel, and they shall return unto Palestine. And this king shall be potent, the metropolis of whose kingdom shall be Sion; and his name shall be famous unto the uttermost parts of the earth. He shall be greater and richer than Solomon, and with him the nations shall make peace, and yield him obedience, because of his justice, and the miracles that he shall perform. If any one shall rise against him, God shall give him up into his hand to be destroyed. All the Scripture declares his happiness, and the happiness which we shall have by him. Howbeit, nothing in the nature of things shall be changed, only Israel shall have the kingdom; for so our wise men say expressly, there is no difference between these days and the days of the Messiah, but only the subduing of the nations under us. So indeed says Rab. Samuel, and others of them: 'אי בֶּן השכָל וחוז לאמר המסיחה אלְא דניבדו' He goes on, 'In those days, victuals shall be had at an easy rate, as if the earth brought forth cates and clothes.' And afterwards, 'The Messiah shall die, and his son, and his son's son, shall reign after him; but his kingdom shall endure long, and men shall live long in those days, so that some think his kingdom shall continue a thousand years. But the days of the Messiah are not so much to be desired that we may have store of corn and wealth, ride on horses, and drink wine with music; but for the society and conversation of good men, the knowledge and righteousness of the king, and that then, without wearisomeness, trouble, or constraint, the whole law of Moses shall be observed.'

§ 20. This is the sum of the creed of the most sober part of the Jews concerning the Messiah whom they look and long for, if any are so sober as to embrace it. For the same author tells us, that there were very few so minded, it may be scarce another in an age besides himself: generally they look after nothing but rule, dominion, wealth, and pleasure. But he,
and they, all own him as a temporal king, a mighty warrior, subduing the nations unto the Jews, a Furius Camillus, or an Alexander, or a Caesar. Of redemption from sin, death, and hell, of pardon of sin, justification, and righteousness, of eternal salvation by him, they know, they believe nothing. Maimonides thinks indeed, that his kingdom shall continue long, not like Manasseh of late, who supposed that it might not abide above forty years, and those immediately preceding the day of judgment.

§ 21. It is sufficiently evident that this opinion and persuasion of the Jews, which is catholic amongst them, and hath been so ever since they rejected the true Messiah, contains an absolute renunciation of the faith of the church of old, and an utter rejection of all the ends for which the Messiah was promised. I shall not therefore enter here upon a particular refutation of it, for it will occur in our ensuing discourses. Neither is this the person about whom we contend with them, nor have we any concern with him. When he comes, let them make the best of him: we have already received the Captain of our salvation. What also they plead for themselves, as the ground of their obstinacy in refusing the true Messiah, must afterwards be particularly discussed. At present, therefore, I shall only reflect on those depraved habits of their minds, which in concurrence with occasions and temptations suited unto them, have seduced them into these low, carnal, and earthly imaginations about the promised seed, about his person, office, and the work that he was to perform.

§ 22. In things therefore of this kind, ignorance of their miserable condition by nature, both as to sin and wrath, justly claims the first place. For although, as was by instances before manifested, the evidence of truth, and power of traditions amongst them, have prevailed with some to avow the notion of the sin of Adam, and the corruption of our nature thereby, yet indeed there is not any of them that have a true sense and conviction of their natural condition, and the misery that doth attend it. The Messiah as we have proved at large, was first promised to relieve mankind from that state whereunto they were cast by the apostasy of Adam, the common root and parent of them all. Such as are men's apprehensions of that condition, such also will be their thoughts concerning the Messiah, who was promised to be a deliverer from it. They who know that they are cast out of the favour of God by sin, and that they are made obnoxious unto his eternal displeasure, and are unable to do any thing that shall please him, as being cast into a state of universal enmity against him, must needs look on the Messiah promised in the grace, goodness, and wisdom of God, for a Saviour and Deliverer, to be One that must by suitable ways and means, free them from sin and wrath, procure for them the favour of God, enable them to serve him again acceptably, and so bring them at length unto their chief end, even to the everlasting enjoyment of God. As these things answer one another, and are on both sides fully revealed in the Scripture, so believers of old, who had a due apprehension of their own condition, looked for such a Messiah as God had promised. Ignorance therefore of this condition, is no small cause of the present Judaical unbelief. Whatever may be the state of other men, about which they do not much trouble themselves, for their parts they are children of Abraham, exempted from the common condition of mankind, by the privilege of their nativity; or at least they are relieved by their circumcision, by the pain of which, they make sufficient satisfaction for any ill they bring with them into this world. That they are dead in trespasses and sins, standing in need of being born again; that they are by nature children of wrath, ob-
noxious unto the curse of God; that the sin of our first parents is imputed unto them, or if it be, that it was of such demerit as Christians teach, they believe not. Indeed, they know no misery but what consists in poverty, captivity, and want of rule and dominion. And what should a spiritual Redeemer do unto these men? What beauty or comeliness can he have in him, for which by them he should be desired? Accordingly, they see no reason for understanding the promises concerning the Messiah in a spiritual sense; for by understanding them thus, they would exclude themselves from all advantage from him, seeing they have no wish for a spiritual redemption. And this blindness had in a great measure possessed their minds at the first promulgation of the gospel; see John viii. 33, 34; ch. ix. 40, 41. And therefore our apostle, in his Epistle unto the Romans, wherein he deals both with Jews and Gentiles, before he declares the propitiation that was made, with the justification that was to be obtained by the blood of Christ, proveth that they all are in a miserable lost condition, on the account of sin, original and actual, ch. i. ii. iii. Until therefore his pride, self-fulness, and ignorance of themselves, be taken from them, and rooted out of their hearts, all promises of a spiritual Redeemer must needs be unsavoury unto them. They stand in no need of him, and why should they desire him. An earthly king that would give them liberty, wealth, ease, and dominion, they would gladly embrace, and have long in vain looked for.

§ 23. Secondly, Ignorance of the righteousness of God, both as to what he requireth, in order that a man may be justified before him, and as to his judgment concerning the desert of sin, hath the same effect upon them, Rom. x. 3, 4. The great end for which the Messiah was promised, as we have in part declared, and shall afterwards farther evince, was to make atonement for sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. A righteousness was to be brought in, that might answer the justice of God, and abide its trial. Of what nature this righteousness must be, the Scripture declares in the revelation which it makes of the holiness of God, Ps. v. 4, 5; Joshua xxiv. 19; Hab. i. 13; of the purity and severity of his law, Deut. xxxiii. 2; ch. xxvii. 26; and of the absolute perfection of his justice in the execution of it, Ps. l. 21. An universal spotless innocence, with a constant unerring obedience in all things, and that in the highest degree of perfection, are required that a man may find acceptance with this holy and righteous God. Of the nature and necessity of this righteousness, the Jews are ignorant and regardless. They and their masters were so of old, Matt. v. 20. An external, partial, hypocritical observance of the law of Moses, they suppose will suffice; see Rom. ix. 31. And indeed there is not any thing that more openly discovers the miserable blindness of the present Jews, than the consideration of what they insist upon as their righteousness before God. The faith and obedience of their forefathers, the privilege of circumcision, some outward observances of Mosaical precepts, with anxious scrupulous abstinences, self-macerations in fasts, with prayers by tale and number, Sabbath-rests from outward labour, with the like bodily exercises, are the sum of what they plead for themselves. Now if these things, which are absolutely in their own power, will compose and make up a righteousness acceptable unto God, cover all the sins whereof they know themselves to be guilty, to what end should they look for a Redeemer to bring in everlasting righteousness, or to make atonement for sin? Why should they look out in this case for relief, seeing they have enough of their own to supply all their wants? Let them that are weary
and heavy laden seek after such a Deliverer, they have no need of him or his salvation. According therefore as this building of self-righteousness went on and prospered amongst them, faith in the Messiah as to the true ends for which he was promised, decayed every day more and more, until at length it was utterly lost. For as our apostle tells them, if righteousness were by the law, the promise of the Messiah was to no purpose; and if the law made things perfect, the bringing in of another priesthood and sacrifice was altogether needless.

§ 24. So is it also with them, as to their apprehension of the judgment of God concerning the desert of sin. With the natural notion hereof, the vilest hypocrites amongst them were sometimes perplexed; see Isa. xxxiii. 14, 15; Micah vi. 8. But the generality of them have long endeavoured, by prejudicate imaginations, to cast out the true and real sense of it. That God is angry at sin, that in some cases an atonement is needful, they will not deny. But so low and carnal are their thoughts of his severity, that they think any thing may serve to appease his wrath, or to satisfy his justice, especially towards them whom alone he loves. Their afflictions and persecutions, the death of their children, and their own death, especially if it be of a painful distemper, they suppose to make a sufficient propitiation for all their sins. Such mean and unworthy thoughts have they of the majesty, holiness, and terror of the Lord. Of late also, lest there should be a failure on any account, they have found out an invention to give their sins unto the devil by the sacrifice of a cock, the manner whereof is at large described by Buxtorf, in his Synagoga Judaica. And this also hath no small influence on their minds, to pervert them from the faith of their forefathers. Let the Messiah provide well for them in this world, and they will look well enough unto themselves, as to that which is to come.

§ 25. And hence ariseth also their ignorance of the whole nature, use, and end of the Mosaical law, which likewise contributes much to the producing of the same effect upon them. To what end the law was given, whereunto it served, what was the nature and proper use of its institutions, shall be declared as occasion is offered, in the exposition of the Epistle itself. For the present, it may suffice unto our purpose to consider their apprehensions of it, and what influence these have on their misbelief. In general, they look on the law, and on their observance of it, as the only means of obtaining righteousness, and making an atonement with God. So they did of old, Rom. ix. 32—34. In the observation of its precepts, they place all their righteousness before God, and by its sacrifices they look for atonement for all their sins. That the law was not given, that the sacrifices were not appointed for these ends, that the fathers of old never attended unto them absolutely with any such intention, shall be afterwards declared. In the meantime it is evident, that this persuasion corrupts their minds as to their thoughts about the Messiah. For if righteousness may be obtained, and atonement made without him, to what end serves the promise concerning him? But having thus taken from him the whole office and work, whereunto he was designed by God, that he might not be thought altogether useless, they have assigned to him the work and employment before mentioned. For looking on righteousness and atonement, with that which is the consequence of them, eternal salvation, as the proper effects of the law, they thought meet to leave unto their Messiah the work of procuring unto them liberty, wealth, and dominion, which they found by experience that the law was not able to do. But had their
eyes been indeed opened to the knowledge of God and of themselves, they
would have found the law no less insufficient to procure by itself a hea-
venly than an earthly kingdom for them. Against their obstinate preju-
dices in this matter, doth the apostle principally reason in this Epistle.
§ 26. But here by the way, some may possibly enquire how the Jews, if
they look for atonement and the remission of sins by the sacrifices of the
law, can now expect to have their sins pardoned, without which they can-
not be eternally saved, seeing they are confessedly destitute of all legal sa-
crifices whatever? Have they found out some other way, or do they utterly
give over seeking after salvation? This very question being put unto one
of them, he answers; that they now obtain the pardon of their sins, by re-
pentance and amendment of life, according to the promises made in the
prophets unto that purpose; as Ezek. xviii. 20. And concludes, 'Quamvis
jam nulla sint sacrificia, quae media erant ad tanto facilius impreandam
remissionem peccatorum, eadem tamen per peenitentiam ac resipiscantium,
declinando a viis malis impetratur.' 'Although there are now no sacrifices
which were a means the more easily to obtain the forgiveness of sins, yet it
may be obtained by repentance, and a departure from ways of evil.' This
is their hope, which, like that of the hypocrite, is as the giving up of the
ghost. For, 1st, It is true, that repentance and amendment of life, are re-
quired in them who seek after the forgiveness of their sins, and many pro-
mises are made unto them; but is this all that God required, that sin might
be forgiven? They are sufficient indeed in their own way and place, but
are they so absolutely also? Did not God moreover appoint and require,
that they should make use of sacrifices to atone for sins, without which they
should not be done away? See Levit. xvi. And, 2dly, What is the mean-
ing of that plea, that by sacrifices indeed remission of sins might more
easily be obtained, but obtained it may be without them? Doth this more
easily respect God or man? if they say it respects God; I desire to know,
if he can pardon sin without sacrifice, why he cannot do it as easily as
with them? or what is he eased of, by sacrifices? If it respect them-
selves, as indeed it doth, then it may be inquired what it is that they shall
be eased of, in the obtaining of the pardon of sins, by the use of sacrifices,
when that is again restored unto them? this can be of nothing but of
that which they are now forced to make use of, for that end and purpose,
and what is that? Why repentance and amendment of life. If then they
had their sacrifices, these might be spared, or at least much of them abated,
which at present is necessary. This then it seems was the end why God
instituted sacrifices, namely, that these Jews might obtain pardon of sin,
without either repentance or amendment. And this is that which they love
as their souls; namely, that they may live in their sins, and be acquitted of
all danger by sacrifices and outward services. 3dly, Atonement for sin is
expressly necessary, or all the institution of sacrifices for that end of old,
were vain and ludicrous. At the same time when sacrifices were in use,
repentance was also required, and therefore repentance could never be
designed to serve as a cause or means for the same end, in the same
kind with sacrifices. And therefore notwithstanding their pretence of
repentance, no Jew upon his own principles, can now in the total cessa-
tion of all sacrifices, obtain either pardon of sin here, or salvation hereafter.
But to proceed.
§ 27. Their corrupt carnal affections have moreover greatly contributed,
and yet do contribute, unto their obstinacy in their unbelief. Hence have
they coined their self-pleasing imaginations about the Messiah, and the
work that he hath to do. That he should be a king and reign gloriously, that his dominion should be over all the world, and endure throughout all generations, was promised concerning him from the beginning. They therefore dwell much on the thought of the advantage which this kingdom may afford unto them, comparing it in their minds with those other empires which they see in the world. Wealth, ease, liberty, dominion, or a share in power and rule, are the things that please their carnal minds, and evidently fill them with envy and wrath against those by whom these things are possessed. These they look after and hope for, as the only things that are desirable, as the only pledges indeed of the favour of God. No persons on the earth have their thoughts more fixed on them than they. As their oppressions increase, so do their desires after liberty and rule; and they have learned nothing by their poverty, but to grow in a greedy eagerness after riches. And when they would at any time set out the care of God towards their nation, they declare that such a one, in such a place, was worth so many thousand crowns; or drove such a trade, or was in such favour as that he rode in a coach or chariot; as may be seen in the address of Manasseh unto the English. This covetousness, and ambition, with revengeful thoughts against their oppressors, possessing their minds, makes them desire, hope, and believe, that the kingdom of their Messiah shall be of this world, and that therein their enjoyments shall be as large as their fancy can now reach unto. And so perfectly are they under the power of these lusts and earthly desires in this matter, that take away their hopes of satisfying themselves in the good things of this world, and they will on very easy terms bid adieu unto their Messiah, or grant that he is already come. But while they are obstinately fixed in the expectation of grandeur, to tell him of a spiritual and heavenly kingdom, wherein the poorest and most persecuted person on the earth may have as good an interest, and enjoy as much benefit by it, as the greatest monarch in the world, and you do but cast away your words to the wind.

§ 28. Secondly, Since the propagation of the gospel and its success in the world, Envy, (another corrupt lust,) against the Gentile believers, hath exceedingly perverted their minds, in their notions about the Messiah. And with this passion they are filled on a twofold account.

First, Upon account of the spiritual privileges which they saw claimed by the Gentiles. That the Gentiles, or nations of the earth distinct from Israel, should be fellow-heirs in the promise with the posterity of Abraham according unto the flesh, was declared by all the prophets of old. But yet, as we have shown, this was done by them in that obscure manner, in comparison of the revelation made of it in the gospel, that the grace and counsel of God therein is called a mystery hid from the ages that went before. Wherefore when this design of the love and wisdom of God was brought to light, it filled the Jews who had lost the faith of it with envy and wrath. See Acts xiii. 45—47, 50, ch. xxii. 21—23; 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16. The stories of all ages from thence unto this day testify the same, nor do they yet stick to express these corrupt affections, as occasion is offered. And this envy being greatly predominant in them, hardens them in their imagination of a Messiah, by whom the Gentiles may receive no benefit, but what may accrue unto them in becoming their servants. They cannot to this day endure to hear that the Gentiles should be equal sharers with themselves in the promise of the Messiah. They would have him unto themselves alone, or not at all. And this
keeps up their desires and expectations of such an one as they have fancied for their own ends and purposes.

§ 29. Again, their envy against the Gentiles is greatly increased and excited by the oppressions and sufferings inflicted on them by the Gentiles. This adds hatred and desire of revenge unto their envy, rendering it unrighteous and inhuman, and so undoubtedly a great occasion of hardening them in their obstinacy; but of their long continued oppressions under the power of the Gentiles in general. Having been greatly harassed and wasted by them in most ages, and having a deliverer promised unto them, they are strongly inclined to fancy such a deliverance as being peculiarly theirs, should enable them to avenge themselves on their old enemies and oppressors. And this they think must be done, not by a heavenly spiritual king, ruling in the things concerning religion and the worship of God, but by one, that having a mighty kingdom in this world, shall by force and power subdue their enemies under them. Such an one therefore they desire and look for; and how hard it is for them to extinguish these thoughts, unless they are freed by the grace of God from the carnal affections mentioned, it is not difficult to guess. And these are some of those especial occasions whereby the Jews through their own blindness are hardened in their unbelief and disobedience unto the gospel, whereunto others of the like kind may be added.

§ 30. Such then is the faith and expectation of the present Jews all the world over, concerning the Messiah in whom they place their confidence. A mere man he is to be; a king over the Jews at Jerusalem, who shall conquer many nations, and so give peace, prosperity, and plenty unto all the Israelites in their own land. But what great matter is in all this? Have not other men done as much or more for their citizens and people? Can they fancy that their Messiah should be more victorious or successful than Alexander? they dare not hope it. At a disputation before the Pope and Cardinals at Rome, which they have recorded in Shebat Jehuda, they openly confessed that they never expected so great glory by their Messiah, as that with which they saw them attended. And Manasseh confesseth that it is no great or extraordinary matter which they looked for by him. De Resur. lib. 2. cap. 21. Non est, saith he, 'tantum miraculum, si Messias veniat subjugatum regna sibi et imperia multa, cum non raro accidisse videamus, ut humiles aliqui abjectique ad regna et imperia pervenerint, terrarumque multarum Dominii fienter.' 'It is no such miracle that the Messiah should come and subdue many kingdoms and empires unto himself, seeing it often falls out that men of mean and abject condition, do come unto kingdoms and empires, and are made lords of many countries.' It is so indeed; they say nothing of him but what may be equalled in the stories of the nations of the world, especially considering the shortness of his reign, which they begin to think shall not be above forty years.

§ 31. But do these things answer the promises made concerning him from the foundation of the world? Is this the meaning of the promise given unto Adam? Was this the end of the call and separation of Abraham? this the intention of the promise made unto him, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed? Is this only the import of it, that towards the end of the world many of them shall be conquered? Was this the intent of the oath made unto David, and of the sure mercies confirmed to him, and his, thereby? Do all the promises in the prophets, ex-
pressed in words glorious and magnificent, end in a warrior, inferior it may be unto many of those whose destruction they prophesied of? Or is not this rather a way to expose the whole Old Testament unto scorn and reproach, as making the promises thereof not to extend to that degree of glory, which in other warriors the penmen of it despised; or at least making these promises to have a respect to things only of the same nature with the worldly success of these conquerors? Was this the expectation of the fathers of old? Is this that which they desired, prayed for, longed for, esteeming all the glory of their present enjoyments as nothing in comparison of it? Was it for this the Messiah was to be the hope and desire of all nations? Did God set him forth as the great effect of his love, grace, goodness, and faithfulness towards men, and then bring forth a military king, in whose exploits they were not all to be concerned? Was the church in travail for so many generations to bring forth this fighter? Had they no eye of old unto spiritual and eternal things in the promise of the Messiah? Of late indeed Josephus Albo tells us that the doctrine of the coming of the Messiah is not fundamental. And Hillel of old maintained that Hezekiah was the Messiah; he should have been so, saith another, had he composed a song unto God. Barcosá a seditious necromancer is the Messiah, says R. Akiba. He shall come, it may be, immediately before the resurrection, saith Manasseh. But do these thoughts suit the faith, hope, prayers, and expectations of the church of old? Do they answer any one promise of God concerning him? No man not utterly unacquainted with the Scripture can give the least countenance unto such imaginations.

§ 32. What all this while is become of the work every-where in the Scripture assigned unto the Messiah? To whom is that work abandoned? Who shall break the serpent’s head? Who shall take away the curse that entered on sin? Who shall be a blessing unto all nations? To whom shall the Gentiles be gathered to be saved by him? Who shall be a priest after the order of Melchizedek? Who shall have a body prepared for him to offer instead of the sacrifices of the law? Who shall have his hands and feet pierced in his suffering; and his vesture parted by lot? Who shall make his soul an offering for sin? Who shall be bruised, grieved, and afflicted by God himself, because he shall bear the iniquities of his people? Who shall make atonement for transgressors and bring in everlasting righteousness? Who shall for ever make intercession for transgressors? And who shall sit at the right hand of God in his rule over the whole world? All these things, and sundry others of the like kind, are openly and frequently promised concerning the true Messiah, not one of which is to be accomplished in or by him whom they look for. But these men indeed take a way to destroy all religion, and to turn the whole Bible into a story of earthly things, without either life, spirit, or heavenly mystery in it.

§ 33. It is acknowledged that there are many promises of mercy and glory unto the church in the days of the Messiah expressed in words, whose first literal sense represents things outward and temporal. And there is a threefold interpretation of them contended for. The first is that of the Jews, who would have them all understood according to their literal import, without the allowance of any figure or allegory in them. But nothing can be more vain than this imagination; nor do they make use of it, but where they suppose that it will serve their present design. For the wisest of them do grant, that in the days of the Messiah the nature of things shall not be changed, but only their use; yet many of these promises in their first literal sense, import a full and direct alteration in the heavens and earth and all
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things contained in them. So Isa. xi. 6, 7, 8. Lions, bears, leopards, cockatrices, asps, calves, and young children, are said all to live, feed, and play together. And ch. lx. 7. That the flocks of Kedar, and the rams of Nebaioth, should minister unto the church; ver. 16, that they should suck the milk of kings; and ver. 19. that the sun should no more give light by day; and yet ver. 20. that it should no more go down. Ch. lxv. 17. That new heavens and a new earth shall be created, and that the old shall be remembered no more; that trees and fields shall rejoice and clap their hands for gladness; with other things innumerable in the same kind. Now if they grant, as they must do, unless they intend to expose all sacred truth to the scorn and contempt of atheists, that these expressions are figurative and allegorical; they must do the same in all other promises of earthly things, as of peace, plenty, victory, long life, dominion, wealth, and the like, these being set out in the same kind of allegorical expressions. At least they cannot make them in the strict literal sense of the words the object of their faith and expectation, unless they can by some infallible rule declare, what is figuratively to be understood in them, and what properly, or which promises are expressed allegorically, and which not. And this they can never do. The event therefore is the only infallible interpreter of the meaning of such prophetical predictions; whatever precedes that, is but conjecture.

§ 34. Secondly, Some interpret all these promises and prophecies spiritually, without the least respect unto those outward terrene things, which in figurative expressions are used only to shadow out those spiritual, heavenly, and eternal things, which are intended in them. And, indeed, this way of interpretation which Calvin follows in all his commentaries, is attended with great probability of truth. For as the main ends and work for which the Messiah was promised, are, as we have proved, spiritual and eternal, and, as it is evident, that many promises of things relating unto him, and of the condition of them that believe in him, are allegorically expressed, (it being the constant way of the Old Testament to shadow out spiritual and heavenly things, by things earthly and carnal,) this way of interpreting the promises, seems to have great countenance given unto it, both from the nature of the things themselves, and from the constant tenor of the prophetical style. According unto this rule of interpretation, all that is foretold in the Psalms and Prophets, of the deliverance, rest, peace, glory, rule, and dominion of the church, of the subjection and subservicency of nations, kingdoms, rulers, kings, and queens to the church; intends only either the kingdom of grace, consisting in faith, love, holiness, righteousness, and peace in the Holy Ghost, with that spiritual beauty and glory which is in the worship of the gospel; or the kingdom of heaven itself, where lies our happiness and reward. And, indeed, this interpretation of the promises, as in respect of many of them it is evidently certain, true, and proper, they being so expounded in the gospel itself; so in respect of them all it is safe, and satisfactory to the souls of believers. For they who are really made partakers of the spiritual good things of the Messiah, and are subjects of his spiritual kingdom, do in this find and acknowledge such liberty, rest, peace, and glory, such durable riches, as they are abundantly content with, whatever their outward condition in this world may be. And to this exposition, as to the main and prime intention of the promises, the whole doctrine of the gospel gives countenance.

§ 35. Thirdly, Some acknowledging the kingdom of the Messiah to be heavenly and spiritual, and the promises generally to intend spiritual
and heavenly glory and riches, that is, grace and peace in Christ Jesus, do yet suppose, moreover, that there is in many of them an intimation given of a blessed, quiet, peaceable, flourishing state of the church even in this world, through the power of the Messiah. But this they do with these limitations. 1st, That these promises were not made unto the Jews as they were the seed of Abraham according unto the flesh, primarily and absolutely, but unto the church, that is the children of Abraham according unto the promise, heirs of his faith and blessing. That is, they are made unto all them who receive and believe in the promised Messiah, Jews and Gentiles with whom, as we have proved, the privilege of the church, and interest in the promises was to remain. 2d, That the accomplishment of these promises is reserved to an appointed time, when God shall have accomplished his work of severity on the apostate Jews, and of trial and patience towards the Gentiles who have been called. 3d, That upon the coming of that season, the Lord will by one means or other take off the veil from the eyes of the remnant of the Jews, and turn them from ungodliness unto the grace of the Messiah; after which, the Jews and Gentiles being made one fold under the great Shepherd of our souls, shall enjoy rest and peace in this world. This they think to be intimated in many of the promises of the Old Testament, which are brought over unto the use of the church as yet unaccomplished, in the book of the Revelation. And herein lies all the glory which the Jews can or may expect, and that only on such terms as they as yet will not admit of. But these things must all of them be spoken unto at large, when we come to answer the objections which they take from them, to our faith in Jesus Christ.

§ 36. That which above all things manifests the folly and irreligion of the imagination of the Jews about the person and work of the Messiah, is the event. The true Messiah is long since come, and hath accomplished the work assigned unto him. He hath thus made known the nature of the first promises, and of the promises consequent on these; he hath thus also made known the nature of the salvation which he was to effect. And in nothing has he answered the expectation of the Jews, who had departed from the faith of their forefathers, except in his genealogy according unto the flesh. And this fact, namely, that the Messiah is already come, is the second ground on which all the discourses and reasonings of the apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews is founded, and which being absolutely destructive of the Judaical infidelity, shall be fully confirmed in our ensuing dissertations.
EXERCITATION XII.


§ 1. The second great principle which the apostle supposes in all his discourses with the Hebrews in his Epistle to them, and which he lays as the foundation of all his arguments, is, that the Messiah whom we have proved to have been promised from the foundation of the world, had actually come, and had finished the work appointed for him, before the epistle was written. This the Jews pertinaciously deny unto this very day, and this denial is the centre in which all the lies of their unbelief do meet; and, in consequence of their unbelief, they continue in a deplorable condition, crying for and expecting his coming, who came long ago, and was rejected by them. Now this is the great difference between them and Christians, and that such a difference as hath a certain influence upon their eternal condition. As they have endeavoured to evade the force of the testimonies and arguments by which our faith and profession is confirmed, so are we to use diligence in the vindication and establishment of these, which we hope to do unto the satisfaction of the sober, and godly, and wise, in our ensuing discourse.

§ 2. The first great promise of the Messiah, at large insisted on before, declared only his coming, and the end of it in general. This promise was recorded רָגָעַת הַנְּאָבָא, Psa. xi. 8, or, as our apostle, Heb. x. 7, κεφαλὴ βοσκοὺ, in the beginning, head, or first roll of the book of God, namely, Gen. iii., as a stable foundation of all the rest that ensued. And it respected all the posterity of Adam, that they might have a refuge to which they might repair in all their distresses. When the world in unbelief rejected all care for, or respect to this promise, God left it to ways of its own choosing: ειςπαντιταἐνηπορευεταιταςόποιςαυτοις, Acts xiv. 16. But
in his sovereign grace and pleasure, he renewed the promise unto Abraham, with a restriction and limitation of it unto his family; as the family which was to be separated from the rest of mankind, and dedicated to the bringing forth of the Messiah in the appointed season, as we have declared. Upon the giving of that promise, with the call and separation of Abraham, by which the church became in a special manner visible, there was nothing wanting to confirm the faith, and fix the expectation of those that desired his coming, but only the determination of the time when he should actually come.

And this was necessary upon a double account: 1. That those who were to live before his advent, might not only by faith see his person afar off, and be refreshed, as Cant. ii. 8, but also behold his day, or the time limited and fixed for his coming, and rejoice therein; and that not only as Abraham, who knew that such a day should be, John viii. 56, but also as those who had a certain day so limited, as that by diligent inquiry, 1 Pet. i. 11, they might take some special prospect of it. 2. To guide them who were to live in the days of the accomplishment of the promise, to a more earnest expectation of him, and desire after him, as Daniel had for the return of the people from the captivity, when he understood by books, that the time limited for it was accomplished, Dan. ix. 2, 3. Accordingly, in consequence of the prophecies representing the time of his coming, we read that at that season when he was exhibited, all men were in expectation of him, and prepared thereby to inquire after him, Luke iii. 15.

§ 3. Now this determination of the time inquired after, was first made by Jacob, Gen. xlix. 8—10, accompanied with the name of that patriarch in his family, from whom the Messiah was to proceed. And after this, there was only one other restriction of the promise, as to the persons in whose line Messiah was to be born. By this additional restriction, that privilege, which originally rested in Abraham and his family, and which was afterwards restrained unto Judah and his posterity, was lastly confined unto David and his offspring, and was ever after left at large unto any branch of that family. And this I mention by the way, to prevent any difficulties about his genealogy. For as in the very first instance of the regal succession in the house of David, there was no respect had to primogeniture, 1 Kings ii. 22, so there was no necessity that the Messiah should spring from the royal family, although he did so; but only that he should be of the seed of David. For as after the promise given unto Abraham, the Messiah might have sprung from any family whatever of his posterity by Isaac, until the limitation made by Jacob unto the person of Judah; and as after that limitation, he might have sprung from any family of this tribe, until the limitation of that privilege to the person of David; so no restriction or limitation being afterwards added, his production by any person of David's posterity in an alliance nearer to, or farther from the reigning line, was all that was included in the promise. To return, the words of the place above quoted are, "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thine hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion which shall rouse him up, מבקש בראד הכהנים, מבקש עלי ויהי נביאים: The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver or Scribe from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him the gathering of people." These last words are the basis
of our argument; the former, therefore, we shall no otherwise consider, but as they give light and evidence to the interpretation of those which follow them.

§ 4. The great masters among the Jews are exceedingly perplexed with this testimony, and have therefore invented an endless variety of ways for enervating it, openly and loudly contradicting one another almost about every word in the text. Some would evade the sense of it, by interpreting שבס to be only a rod of correction, of support, say others; andiscopal, they would only have to be a Scribe, such as they fancy their present Rabbins to be. Some by רודו, understand the person of Judah, unto whom they ascribe I know not what preeminence, and not his family and tribe. Some would have ר to be separated from ר, that follows, because of the accent Jethib, and to signify for ever. Some by the Shiloh would have David intended, some Ahijah the prophet, some the city Shiloh, and most know not what. רוח, some would have to be destruction, some instruction and obedience. And on every one of these cavils do they build various interpretations, and provide various evasions for themselves, all which we shall either obviate or remove out of the way in the ensuing discourse.

§ 5. It were endless to consider all their several expositions; and it would be useless, because they are fully confuted by one another. But whatever seems of importance in any of their exceptions, will be fully answered in our exposition and vindication of the text and context. Only to give the reader a specimen of their sentiments, I shall briefly consider the sense and exposition of one of them; and he of such reputation, that he hath generally obtained the name of מָהָר, the wise; and this is R. A. B. Meir, Aben Ezra. And that we may the better see the perverseness of this man, and therein of his followers, I shall briefly give an account of the exposition of Rashi, his companion, in annotations on the Pentateuch, in their rabbinical Bibles. First, By מַכְבָּר, sceptre, he understands rule and government; as he doth scholars in the law by מַכְבָּר, from these words, מַכְבָּר רָבִּי, from between his feet; expressing, as he conceived, the posture of disciples. By Judah, he understands the house of David, the ruling family amongst them, the authority whereof was preserved in the תַּתִּים לְאֵוֶס, or heads of the captivity, while they were in Babel. And on these words, מַכְבָּר וּמַכְבָּר, waving all the former trivial exceptions, he adds expressly, מַכְבָּר שֶם מִדְבּרָה מַכְבָּר שֶם, מַכְבָּר שֶם מַכְבָּר שֶם. 'Until the Shiloh come, that is Messiah the King, to whom that kingdom belongs, as the words are interpreted by Onkelos in his Targum, and in Midrash Agadah.' And מַכְבָּר מַכְבָּר, he expounds אֲסַמְּחָה, the collection or gathering together of the people. Thus he agrees with the Targum, and with the truth, in the most material passages of the text.

§ 6. But Aben Ezra, as we observed, is otherwise minded; and in him, we have an example of the wilful blindness of the residue of them, who will not endure the light of that evidence which is tendered unto them in this testimony. First, By Shebet, he grants rule to be intended, or preeminence above others, being in this somewhat more modest than their later masters. 'This,' saith he, 'shall not depart from Judah, דִּק אָבַם דִּק דִּק, until David come; and why David? שֶם מִדְבּרָה מַכְבָּר שֶם מַכְבָּר שֶם, 'for he was the beginning of the kingdom of Judah.' So that it seems the meaning of the words is, that 'the sceptre shall not depart until the sceptre come;' that is, they should have rule until they had rule. For as he himself well observes, the kingdom of Judah began in David. But what sceptre had the
house of Judah before? Four hundred years the people were ruled under judges, of which but one was of that tribe. At length a kingdom was set up in the house of Benjamin; where was all this while the sceptre of Judah, if that was the space of time designed for its continuance? Two instances he gives hereof. First, 'The standard of Judah marched first in the wilderness;' and, 'Again, God said, Judah shall go up first.' But what was this to a sceptre and a lawgiver? The first belonged only unto the order of the tribes in the wilderness, while Moses was prince of the tribe of Levi, and afterwards Joshua of the tribe of Ephraim; nor was that privilege, if any it were, peculiar unto Judah, but common to the other tribes joined with him. The other was only an occasional expedition, in which Judah had a peculiar interest, which gave him no power nor sovereignty amongst his brethren. So that we have here no small instance, how the wisest of their masters do befool themselves, in seeking evasions from this testimony. Of the sense of the following words, abstracting from the design of the whole, he gives a tolerable account, "Nor a lawgiver from between his feet." 'Mechochock, a Scribe, who engrosseth any thing on a roll or books; and that expression of _from between his feet_, is taken from the common custom of such Scribes, to sit at, or between the feet of the prince;' namely, to record and enrol the laws of his kingdom, although the phrase seems to incline to another sense; but about this we will not differ with him.

§ 7. He next proceeds to the interpretation of the word Shiloh, which before he applied unto David; and to show the uncertainty and wanderings of all who reject the true and only intendment of the Holy Ghost in this expression, he gives us the various opinions of his masters, not knowing himself what to adhere to. 'Some, he says, 'there are, who interpret it from the Syriac,' as it were as much as נוע, unto him, or cujuς omnia. But this yields him no advantage. Sundry learned men suspect some such sense in the word, or derivation of it, נוע being put for נועו; and the translation of the LXX. reading ἁ πνεύματι, seems to have had respect thereunto. But then the Messiah is signally denoted, whose the kingdom was, whom the promises especially respected, and to whom the gathering of the people was to be. Some, he adds, derive it from נועו, which signifies 'the embryo in the womb;' and in allusion hereunto, many interpret the word his son, from נועו, which is as much as ב, from נועו, the after-birth, or certain membranes of the womb; and he adds afterwards, that נועו may be as much as נועו, נוע being put for נועו. But yet neither can he hence obtain any thing towards his design. Wherefore, he proceeds, some expound it of the city Shiloh; and then they interpret נועו, shall come, as that, the sun cometh; that is, sets, or goes down, Eccles. iv., that is נועו נועו נועו נועו נועו נועו נועו, 'until the end of Shiloh come;' for so it is written, 'He rejected the tabernacle at Shiloh, and chose David his servant.' But it is evident unto all who use the least attention unto these things, how forced, indeed foolish, this exposition is. Until Shiloh come; that is, until the city Shiloh be deserted, or forsaken, or destroyed; so that, until it comes, signifies, when it shall be no more. The application of that word to the setting of the sun, נועו נועו נועו, and the sun goeth down, is clearly from the nature of the thing itself; and the preceding words, נועו נועו נועו נועו נועו נועו, the sun riseth; but thence to draw it here to express the destruction of a city, in which sense it is never used, is a conceit purely rabbinical. Besides, we have shown already that the sceptre and lawgiver could
in no sense be said to abide with Judah until David came; for before his
days, that tribe had no special interest in the government at all. But this
catching at relief from a word no way suited to contribute the least assis-
tance in the case in hand, is a strong argument of a desperate sinking
cause, which rather than men will abandon, they will reach after help from
the shadow of the least twig that seems to be nigh unto them. I shall not
contend with him about what he next asserts, namely that this until doth
not prove the ceasing of rule and government when the Shiloh comes. It
is enough for us, that it was not to cease before Shiloh came, as shall fur-
ther be manifested in our ensuing explication and vindication of this pro-
phesy. I have only by the way more particularly considered the evasions
of this man, who is called amongst the masters of the present Judaical pro-
fession, the Wise, that the reader may know what thoughts to entertain con-
cerning the expositions and objections of others of them who have not at-
tained that reputation.

§ 8. The subject here spoken of, is Judah; and that not as merely de-
claring the person of the fourth son of Jacob, but the tribe and family
that sprung, and was to spring from him. So the whole tribes are every-
where called in Scripture by the name of him from whom they
sprang; and that principally from the prophecy and blessing in this chap-
ter, wherein the common stream of patriarchal blessing, hitherto running in
one channel, is divided into twelve branches; each son of Jacob being con-
stituted a distinct spring of benediction unto his posterity.

Now that this prediction relates not to the person of Judah, but to the
tribe of Judah, as from him the whole received its denomination, and as he
is included therein, is evident from various considerations. For, 1. The
things mentioned in this great patriarchal benediction, were such as should
befal the posterity of his children, to whom he spake, מְנַדֵּרָיִם וֹאַרְנָם; in
the latter days, or in the end of the days, as were all the blessings of them
that went before Jacob also. Now that expression in general signally de-
notes the times of Messiah, as we shall afterwards declare, and as hath in
part already been made manifest. And as it relates in particular unto any
of the tribes, it denotes the whole continuance of their times, until that sea-
son should be accomplished. So that it cannot be restrained unto the per-
sons of any of them. 2. Nothing that is spoken of any of the rest of the
sons of Jacob belonged unto them personally, no, though it had its founda-
tion in their persons, or in an allusion unto their personal acts. Thus
the dividing of Simeon and Levi in Jacob, and the scattering of them in
Israel, belonged not unto their persons, though the events of that nature
which befal their posterity, had a special relation to the misconduct of
these patriarchs, ver. 5—7. Neither was any thing here spoken of Judah
in any measure fulfilled in his person, who spent his days in Egypt, with-
out any preeminence among his brethren, and without any rule with con-
quest and terror, like a lion, over others. It is then the family, tribe, or
posterity of Judah, that by that name is here intended.

§ 9. Now this tribe of Judah may be considered either absolutely in
itself, as it was in its separate state and condition in the wilderness, with-
out the mixture of any not of his posterity, or with respect unto that ac-
cession, which was afterwards made unto it occasionally from the other
tribes. And this was fourfold: First, From the lot of Simeon falling
within its lot in the first inheritance of the land, Josh. xix. 1, whence that
tribe, though still keeping its distinct genealogy, was reckoned unto Judah,
and became one people with them. Secondly, By the cleaving of the tribe
of Benjamin, (whose lot lay next to that of Judah, and mixed with it in the very city of the kingdom,) to the reigning house of David, in the fatal division of the people, 1 Kings xii. 20, 21, 27, upon which both those tribes were after called by the name of Judah, ver. 20, and the people of both בּוֹרָד, Judei or Jews. Thirdly, By the tribe of Levi, with multitudes of other good men joining themselves to it out of all the tribes of Israel, upon the idolatries and persecution of Jeroboam, 2 Chron. xi. 13—17, by which means, that one tribe quickly became more numerous and potent than all the rest. Fourthly, By the mixture and addition of those great numbers, which out of all the tribes of Israel joined themselves unto them upon their return from Babylon, and the restitution of the worship of God amongst them in its proper place. Now it is Judah, with all these accessions, that is intended in this prophecy and benediction, yet so, as that in many things, as, namely, in the production of the Messiah, the natural genuine offspring of Judah was still to have the preeminence.

§ 10. That which is foretold concerning this Judah, is, that it should have מָלָע and קַשָּׁם, a sceptre, and lawgiver, or a writer of laws for the observation of others. That rule, power, and government are hereby intended, shall be afterwards evinced. What time this should come to pass, is not limited; only after it did so, it was not to cease until the Shiloh came. The foundation of the fulfilment then of this promise, in the erection of polity and government in that tribe, was not laid until about six hundred and twenty years after this time. So certain is that which we before observed, that these patriarchal benedictions concerned not the persons of his sons, and their then present condition, but that of their posterity in the latter days. And this was done when the kingdom was given to David of the tribe of Judah. Neither is the kind of government or rule, which should be erected in that tribe, expressed in the words; only a rule and polity is promised unto it; or that they should be a people having the principle of rule or government in and among themselves. While they continued such, the sceptre and scribe departed not from them; and thus did continue till the end of the time specified, though not without some intercisions of rule. And though there were many changes in the outward form of government, yet the law and polity amongst them were still the same. And where the law and polity are still the same, accidental alterations in the modes and manner of governing, make no essential change in the state of the people, or nature of the government. Thus the first constitution of rule in that tribe, was in a way of government absolutely monarchical: this being imprudently managed by Rehoboam, he lost the ten tribes who would never afterwards submit unto the regal family of Judah. The form of government after an intercision made of it in the Babylonish captivity, was ducal, or by an honorary president, with a mixture both of aristocracy, and of the power of the people. Upon the ceasing of these rulers extraordinarily called, the aristocracy in the Sanhedrim prevailed; whereunto succeeded a mixed monarchy in the Hasmonaëans; and their interest being ruined by intestine divisions, Herod by craft and external force intruded into their power and place.

Neither did his usurpation make any essential change in the rule or polity of the nation, although in his own person he was a foreigner. For even during the turbulent government of the Herodians, with the interposition of the Roman arms, the nation, with that which constitutes a people, its laws and polity, was still continued, though the administration of su-
perior rule was not always in the hands of Jews. In this state things con-
tinued amongst them until the destruction of the commonwealth by Ves-
Pasian, and of the city and temple by Titus; only as a presage of the de-
parture of sceptre and scribe, the power of judgment as to the lives of men,
was some years before taken from the Sanhedrim, John xviii. 31.

§ 11. By this general establishment of power in the tribe of Judah, we
are freed from any concern in the disputes of learned men, about the pre-
cise time of the departure foretold. And indeed if any thing more be in-
tended in this prediction, but only that the tribe of Judah should continue
in a national political state, with government in itself, it will be utterly
impossible to determine exactly and precisely upon the accomplishment of
this prophecy. Some would fix on the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey,
during the time of Hircanus, and Aristobulus the Hasmonaeans, as the pe-
riod when the prophecy was fulfilled. For not many years after this con-
quest Shiloh came; which small remnant of time, as they suppose, impeach-
eth not the truth of the prediction, for in that action of Pompey, Cicero
declares the nation conquered: Orat. pro Flacc. victa est, elocata, servata.
But if this might suffice for the departure of Sceptre and scribe, much more
might the former conquest by the Babylonians do so; which yet, by all
men’s consent, it did not. Besides, the nation was left free by Pompey to
use its own laws and policy, as were many other nations subdued by him,
των ελυμενον εθνων, τα μεν αυτονομα ηφεει, says Appian, ‘he left some of the
conquered nations free to their own rule and laws;’ among whom were
the Jews. Some fix the period in Herod an Idumæan, a stranger to
Judah, only a proselyte; on which subject we have many contests,
managed by Baronius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Bulinger, Montacue, Peri-
cus, A Lapide, Capellus, Scultetus, Rivetus, Spanhemius, and others in-
numerable.

But granting Herod to have been an Idumæan, as he undoubtedly was,
and granting that that nation was not incorporated into Judah upon the
conquest made of it by Hircanus, yet as he was in his own person a pro-
seyte, I do not see why it should be thought that the Sceptre departed from
Judah because of his reign, any more than it did in the days of the Has-
monaeans before him, who were of the tribe of Levi. The government and
polity of the nation was that of the Jews, whoever usurped and enjoyed
the place of supreme rule. As in the Roman Empire, the rule and govern-
ment was that of the Romans, though Philip an Arabian, Maximinus a
Thracian, and sundry other foreigners, were emperors amongst them. One
writer attempts to remove the difficulty arising from the authority of the
Hasmonaeans and Herodians, by affirming that the supreme power of the
nation in their days was in the Sanhedrim; the greatest number of the
persons of which it was constituted, being always of the tribe of Judah, as
the Talmudists constantly affirm. But neither are we concerned herein.
The government, as hath been manifested, was still in and of the tribe of
Judah, with the forementioned accesions denominated from it, until the
destruction of the country, city, and temple, by Vespasian and Titus, which
is all that in the prediction is intended. And that was the precise sea-
son aimed at, especially if we suppose, as rationally we may, that ἐκ τοῦ,
is to be repeated, εκ κοινοῦ, and to respect not only the former clause, but also
the last clause of the prediction, and to him the gathering of the nations;
which was accomplished signally before the final ruin of the church and
state of the Jews, according as Christ himself foretold, Matt. xxiv. 14.

§ 12. Now because some fix the departure of the sceptre and law-
giver unto the removal of the Sanhedrim, it may not be amiss to declare in our passage, what that Sanhedrim was, and what the power wherewith it was entrusted; and this briefly, because it is a subject which many learned men have carefully explained. The name νερόν or Ναυτηρον, Sanedrion or Sanhedrim, is taken from the Greek, Συνέδριον. Συνεδριον sometimes signifies the place where the senators meet, and is thus the same with βουλευτήριον; as in Herodian, Συνήλθον ουν ουκ εις το συνήζες Συνεδριον, αλλ' εις του Άδων του κατστρωλον. They assembled not in the accustomed council house, but in the temple of Jupiter. But most frequently it is taken for consensus Judicum, an assembly of Judges. A court made up of many assessors; whence the Areopagus, that is, the court of Judges at Athens, is so called in Eschines. Συνεδριον is an assessor in such a court; and Συνεδριον κυκλως, is such an assembly of magistrates or princes, as they call corona considentium, such as the Sanhedrim was. And this name of Sanhedrim, though it be plainly a Greek word, a little corrupted as is the manner of the Jews, in their use of them, is frequently used in the Targum of the Hagiographa, which places are collected by Elias in Tishbi. Some of the Jewish masters would have it to be a word of their own language, whence they invent strange etymologies of it, which are some of them mentioned by Buxtorf, Lex. Tal. Coll. 1513, in Arach they would have derived from ρωμιστα, haters of gifts; not knowing, doubtless, that doronoth was a Greek, and no Hebrew word.

§ 13. The first appointment of this court, or the origin of this consensus Judicum is recorded, Numb. xi. 16, where, by God's order, seventy elders are called and designed, to join with Moses in the rule of the people, and are furnished with gifts to fit them for that purpose. The continuance of this court, with the institution of others depending on it, is enjoined on the people, Deut. x. 16. Some say that the first seventy were of them who had been officers over the people in Egypt, and had suffered for them; 'whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them.' πρεσβυτεροι; and πρεσβυτεροι του λαον, in the New Testament, 'elders, and elders of the people.' Others think these had been elders and officers of the people before, in criminal and civil causes; but now were absolutely joined with Moses in all. These with him made up seventy-one, which was the constant number afterwards.

§ 14. The principal things recorded concerning this court of elders or judges, are, first, their orders, namely, that there was one that always presided amongst them, whom they called נבש, the prince, add נבש המ the excellent, who supplied the place of Moses. And on his right hand sat he whom they called נבש בּ, the father of the house of judgment, or consistory, who gathered the suffrages of the assessors. By whom stood two scribes, נבש, scribes of judgments, one on the right hand of the prince, the other on his left; one of whom wrote down the sentences of them who condemned, the other of them who absolved, the persons respecting whom judgment was to be pronounced. There belonged also to the court two criers; and two who received the alms that were given by them who were absolved. Before them at some distance sat these wise men, out of whom the number of the Sanhedrim when any died, or were removed, was to be supplied.

§ 15. Secondly, the place of their meeting, which usually and ordinarily was at Jerusalem, in a chamber of hewn stones, whence the judges are sometimes called by them תרנ ומכים, the wise men of the stone chamber. Although it may be, that no more is intended in that
expression, but that it was a magnificent stately place or building, such as usually are made of stones hewn and carved. And they tell us that this place was built nigh the temple, part of it being on the holy ground, and part on that which was profane and common. Whence also it had two doors, one on the sacred side, by which the prince and the assessors entered, the other on the profane, by which criminal persons were brought in before them by their officers. So Talmud in Joma. And this some take to be the place where our Lord Christ was judged, John xix. 13, ‘They sat down in the judgment seat, in the place that is called ληθαὸς ὀρχῆς:’ that is, הַשָכָה הַנִּרְיָה, the place built and raised up with hewn or squared stones. For that ληθαὸς ὀρχῆς doth not signify merely the pavement, as we translate it, or the floor of the place, the apostle manifests by adding, that it is called Gabbatha, סנֵבה, in the Hebrew; for although the word have a Syriac termination, according to the corrupt pronunciation of the Hebrew in those days among the people, yet the original of it is Hebrew; and the Syriac renders it here, סנֵבָּם, and reads not סנֵבה: now this signifies an high place, or a place built up on all sides and exalted, such as those in which the Roman βηματα, or judgment seats, were placed. But this might be a place like to the other; for I much question, whether the Roman governor sat in judgment, in the meeting place of the Sanhedrim.

§ 16. Thirdly, the Jews treat much of the qualifications of the persons, who were to be of the number of the assessors of this court. For first, they were to be of the priests, Levites, or nobles of Israel; that is, principal men in the commonwealth. Yet no one was admitted into the number of this court merely on the account of his dignity or offices; not even the king, nor the high priest, unless he was chosen because of his other qualifications. For they, secondly, were to be בִּין רֲאֹם men of stature, and בִּין מַלְאָכָּה, men of countenance, or good appearance, to keep up, as they say, a reverence for the office: and they were also to be בִּין חַּכָּם, men of wisdom, and בִּין יָמָּה, men of age, according to the first institution; and from this was derived the common appellation, elders of the people. They add in Dine Mamoneth, that they were to be בִּין נֶפֶשׁ, men skilled in the art of incantations and charms, to find out such practices; which the Talmudist thought good to add, to countenance themselves, many of whom were professed magicians. And lastly, they were to be בִּין עֵינָי, skilled in seventy tongues, that they might not need an interpreter; but fewer, I suppose, served their turn. They treat also in general, that they ought to be men fearing God, hating covetousness, stout and courageous, to oppose kings and tyrants if need were.

From this number they exclude expressly persons over old, deformed, and eunuchs, whom they conclude to be cruel and unmerciful, as Claudian doth,—

Adde quod eunuchus nulla pietate movetur
Nec generi nativis caveat, clementia eunetus
In similes, animosque ligant consortia damni.

Mercy from eunuchs is remov'd away,
No care of race or children doth them sway;
This only renders men compassionate,
When misery is known their common fate.

§ 17. The power of this court was great, yea, often supreme in all
things among the people; and at all times in most things of importance. All great persons, and weighty causes, were judged by them. When a whole tribe offended, or a high priest, or a king of the house of David, by these were their causes heard and determined. They had power also to determine about lawful war. They had two sorts of war._war permitted only; as war for security and enlargements of territories, which could not be engaged in at any time, but by consent, and upon the judgment of this court. The enlargement of the city of Jerusalem, the reparation of the temple, and the constitutions of courts of judicature in other cities, belonged also unto them. In a word, they were to judge in all hard cases, upon the law of God.

§ 18. This sentence extended to life and death; which last they had power to inflict four ways; four deaths, (four kinds of death) were committed to the house of judgment, to stone, to burn, to slay with the sword, and to strangulate. These were they, who in the days of the restoration of the church by Ezra, who by reason of the excellency of the persons, (many of them being prophets, and men divinely inspired,) are usually called ה' טורפים, the men of the great congregation. And the power of this court was continued, though not without some interruption and restraint, unto the last destruction of the city by Titus.

§ 19. Besides this greater court, they had also two lesser in other places; one of the twenty-three assessors, which might be erected in any city or town where there was a hundred and twenty families or more, but not less; and these also had power over all causes, criminal and civil, which happened within the precincts of their jurisdiction, and over all punishments unto death itself.

Hilary on the second Psalm tells us, that, 'Erat a Mose ante institutum in omni Synagoga LXX. esse doctores.' 'Moses had appointed that in every synagogue there should be seventy teachers.' He well calls them teachers, because that was part of their duty, to teach and make known the law of God in justice and judgment; and he adds, 'Cujus doctrina dominus in Evangeliiis meminit dicens.' 'Whose teaching our Lord mentions in the gospel, saying, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair.' So referring the direction there given by our Saviour, to the judicial determinations of these judges, and not to their ordinary teachings or sermons to the people. But herein his mistake is evident, that he supposeth the number of seventy, to have belonged to every synagogue, which was peculiar to the great court before described. For besides this judicature of twenty-three in the greater towns, there were also in the lesser towns appointed a court of three assessors, who might judge and determine in many cases, about money, debts, and contracts, but had nothing to do in transgressions that were capital.

§ 20. In this court, judging and determining according to the law of Moses, consisted the rule and polity of the nation; and it is evident that they were continued amongst them until the coming of the Shiloh. For they themselves constantly aver, that the power of judging capital, was taken from the Sanhedrim about forty years before the destruction of the second temple; though I suppose it will be found, that their power was rather
occasionally suspended by the Romans, than absolutely taken away until the final destruction of the city.

§ 21. But to return, upon the grant of the sceptre and law-writer unto Judah 21* and during the continuance of these, it is promised that the Shiloh should come; that is, the Messiah, and that unto him shall be the gathering of the people. So was the promise unto Abraham, namely, that in his seed, all people, or all nations of the earth should be blessed.  הָלַּשׁ, Shiloh is a word used only in this place; and it comes from  הָלַשׁ, Salahah, to prosper, or save. So that the most probable import of the word is a prosperer, a deliverer, a Saviour; as we shall afterwards more fully manifest. The promise of the continuance of a sceptre and law-writer is מָצְטָא וְשִׁלֹה, until this Shiloh should have come.

§ 22. The Jews, as was intimated before, state two objections to the sense and interpretation which we give of the particles מַעְלָה, until. First, That מַעְלָה signifies for ever: so that the meaning of the word is, that the sceptre and law-writer shall not depart from Judah for ever. The reason whereof is given in the next words, because the Shiloh shall come מַעְלָה being often casual. But though מַעְלָה may sometimes signify as much as for ever, (though generally it only means ad interim, yet, or, as yet;) yet it neither doth nor can mean forever, when it is joined as here, with מַעְלָה, which limits the duration intimated by the subject treated of; and by the sense of the ensuing words that they respect unto. They except again, that מַעְלָה is burdened with the accent Jethol, which distinguishes the sense, and puts a stop upon it. But this they can give no instance in the confirmation of, especially when it hath Athnas immediately preceding it, as in this place it hath. Besides מַעְלָה and קַפְּרָה, sceptre and law-writer, are long since actually departed from Judah, and in their judgment the Shiloh is not yet come; which perfectly destroys the verity of the prediction.

§ 23. Having taken this brief view of the words, we may draw our argument from them, which is this. The Messiah, according to this prediction, must come while the rule and government of Judah was continued, or before it was utterly taken away, but they are long since departed, and taken away. They have been so, at least ever since the destruction of the nation, city, and temple by Titus. And therefore the Messiah is long since come, which was proposed unto confirmation. To manifest the uncontrollable evidence of this testimony and our argument from it; there is no more necessary, but that we demonstrate; first, that by sceptre and law-writer, rule and government are intended. Secondly, that the promised Shiloh is the Messiah. Thirdly, that all rule and national polity, was long since utterly taken away from Judah, even in the destruction of the city and temple. Now the proof of the two former, we shall take first, from the text and context. Secondly, from the confession of the ancient Jews themselves. The last being matter of fact, must be evinced from history; and the state of things in the world since those days; so that there will be no rising up against this testimony, by any thing but by that pertinacious obstinacy, to which the Jews are judicially given up.

§ 24. The first thing proposed, namely, that by sceptre and lawgiver, rule and government are intended, is evident not only from the words themselves, which are plain and expressive, but from the context also; neither was it ever denied by any of the Jews, until they found themselves necessitated thereto, by their corrupt interest. The dying patriarch is foretelling the erection of a rule and government amongst his posterity: now it might have been expected, that of course it should have been fixed in Reuben,
his first born, according to the line of its descent from the foundation of the world, but he deprives him of it, ver. 4. Though he was in the ordinary course of nature, \( \text{שָׁלֹחַ} \) the excellency of his \text{dignity}, and the excellency of his strength, ver. 3, yet, saith he, \( \text{דְּרָכְתָּא} \), thou shalt not excel; not preserve that excellency in thy posterity; nor have the pre-eminence of rule, for the reason which he there expresseth. In like manner, he passeth by the next in order, Simeon and Levi, taking from them all expectation of that privilege, by foretelling that they should be divided in Jacob, and scattered in Israel, ver. 7. Coming to Judah, there he fixeth the state of rule, ver. 8. ‘Judah, thou art he, whom thy brethren shall praise,’ alluding unto his name, \( \text{דְּרָכְתָּא} \) \( \text{נְאֹמָה} \); thou shalt be exalted unto that rule amongst them, from the right to which the others fell by their transgression. And this rule, saith he, shall consist, as all prosperous dominion doth, in two things. First, in the regular obedience of those who \text{de jure} are subject unto it, ‘Thy father’s children shall bow down before thee,’ thou shalt have the authority among, and over the rest of my posterity. Secondly, in the conquest of the enemies and adversaries of the dominion itself; ‘Thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; as a lion’s whelp thou art gone up from the prey;’ to which the words insisted on are subjoined; the sceptre shall not depart; that is the sceptre of rule amongst thy brethren, and prevalency against thine enemies, however it may be weakened or interrupted, shall not utterly depart or be removed, until the Shiloh come. The context is clear and perspicuous: the Jews, as we shall see, cavil only at words and syllables; the reason of the Scripture, and the coherence of the context, they take no notice of.

§ 25. Secondly, the Targums have, with one consent, given us the same account of the sense and import of these words; and some of the Targums are said by the Jews in Shebet Jehuda to have been composed by divine inspiration or assistance of the \( \text{שַׁלֹּחַ} \), as they express it in their Talmuds. Thus \text{Onkelos}, the best of them, \( 
\text{לְעַרְיָה} \) \( 
	ext{עֶבֶר} \) \( 
	ext{שָׁלֹחַ} \), \( 
	ext{מְרִיבָא} \) \( 
	ext{מ} \text{דְּרָכְתָּא} \), the ruler, Lord, or prince, he that hath dominion, shall not be taken from the house of Judah. And Jonathan, \( \text{לְמָכָסְךָ} \) \( 
	ext{ל} \text{דְּרָכָא} \) \( 
	ext{ל} \text{שָׁלֹחַ} \) \( 
	ext{ל} \text{דְּרָכָא} \), \( 
	ext{ל} \text{דְּרָכָא} \) \( 
	ext{ל} \text{דְּרָכָא} \), ‘kings and rulers shall not cease from the house of Judah.’ The same words are used by that called the Jerusalem Targum. The authority of these paraphrases among the Jews is such, as that they dare not openly recede from them. And therefore Manasseh in his Conciliator, where he endeavours to enervate this testimony, passeth over these Targums in silence, as having nothing to oppose to their authority, which is a sufficient evidence that he saw the desperateness of the cause wherein he was engaged. Solomon and Bechai acknowledge rule and dominion to be intended in the words, but according to the latter, they are not to be erected until the coming of the Messiah, which is no less expressly contrary to the Targum, than to the text itself; affirming plainly, that then it was to end, and not begin. Add hereunto, further to manifest the consent of the ancient Jews unto this sense of the words, that in their Talmuds they affirm the lawgiver here mentioned to be the Sanhedrim, whose power continued in Judah until the Shiloh came, whereof we have spoken before.

§ 26. Unto these reasons and testimonies we may subjoin the use of the words themselves. \( \text{תָּלֹך} \) is originally and properly a rod, or staff; all other significations of it are metaphorical. Among these significations, the principal is that of Sceptre, an ensign of rule and government. Nor is it absolutely used in any other sense, and in this sense it is used very fre-
quently; Ps. xlv. 7, שבט מאשר ושבם מלמחץ, 'A sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom,' Num. xxiv. 17. און ושב י╘iae, 'A sceptre shall arise out of Israel,' that is, a prince or a ruler; Targum, 'Christ shall rule out of Israel.' And this sense of the words is made more evident, by its conjunction with חכם, a law-giver; he that pre-
scribes and writes laws with authority, to be observed, Deut. xxxiii. 2, in a portion, חכם במשה of the law-giver hidden, that is Moses; the great
scribe, saith the Targum: for as they suppose, the sepulchre of Moses was in the lot of Gad.Mechokek, saith Aben Ezra; that is, מבר והسجل, the
great president or ruler, Ps. cviii. 9, Judah חכם, my law-giver; with all-
fusion to this prediction of Jacob. The Lord is our judge, the Lord is
משה, our law-giver,' Isa. xxxiii. 22. These two words then in conjunc-
tion, do absolutely denote rule and dominion.
§ 27. The more modern masters of the Jews, to avoid the force of this
testimony, have coined a new signification for these words: Shebet they say
is only a rod of correction, and Mechokek means any scribe or teacher,
which they would refer to the Rabbins, whom they have had in every gene-
eration. Some of them by Shebet understand a staff of support, which they
were to enjoy in the midst of their troubles; so I remember Manasseh Ben
Israel, not long since, made it one of his reasons for their admission into
England, that therein this prophecy might receive somewhat of accomplis-
ment, by this countenance and encouragement in this land. But the most
of them adhere to the former sense of the words. So they call the story of
their calamities and sufferings, שבט ישבם, the rod of Judah. But this
evasion is plainly and fully obviated in the former opening of the words,
and confirmation of their genuine import: for, 1. it is openly contrary to
the whole context and scope of the place. 2. To the meaning and constant
use of the words themselves, especially as conjoined. 3. To the Targums,
and all old translations. 4. To the Talmud, and all their own ancient mas-
ters. 5. To the truth of the story; Judah having been long in a most
flourishing and prosperous condition, without any such signal calamity as
that which they would intimate to be intended in the words; namely, such
as for sixteen hundred years they have now undergone. 6. The support
which they have had hath not been national, nor afforded to Judah as a
tribe, or people, but hath consisted merely in the greatness and wealth of a
few individuals, scattered up and down the world, neither they, themselves,
nor any one else, knowing unto what tribe they did belong. And, 7. This
hath been in things no way relating to the worship of God, or their church-
state, or their spiritual good. 8. Their scribes were not formerly of the tribe
of Judah, and their later Rabbins are wholly of an uncertain extraction;
so that this pretence proves nothing, but the misery of their present state
and condition, wherein they seek a refuge for their infidelity, in vanity
and falsehood.

§ 28. Our second inquiry is concerning the subject of the promise under
consideration, which is the Shiloh; whereby we say the promised seed is
intended. About the derivation and precise significations of the word, we
have no need to contend. Most learned men look upon it as derived from
שלום, to be quiet, safe, happy, prosperous, whence also is השב, Ps. cxxii.
safety, peace, prosperity, abundance. Hence Shiloh, says Mercer, 'sonat
tranquillum, prosperum, pacatum, felicem, augustum, victorem, cui omnia
prospere succedunt;' signifies one, 'quiet, prosperous, peaceable, happy,
honourable, a conqueror, to whom all things succeed well and happily.' To
this etymology of the word, Galatinus, Fagius, Melanchthon, Pagninus,
Drusius, Schindler, Buxtorfius, Amama, and generally all the most learned in the Hebrew tongue assent. The vulgar Latin, rendering the words qui mittendus est, 'who is to be sent,' as if it were from משל, corrupts the sense, and gives advantage to the Jews to pervert the words, as both Raymundus and Galatinus observe. Neither is there any thing nearer the truth in the derivation of the word from משל, as though מ was put for מ and מ for מ, so making it as much as 'in respect of,' which to him; to which correspond the ψ ἀποκειμαντα, and the τα ἀποκειμενα αυτου of the Greeks, the first mentioned by Eusebius, and the latter in the present copies, and both of them by Justin Martyr.

Others suppose ליש, to signify a Son, from ליש, which denotes the afterbirth, or membrane wherein the child is wrapt in the womb. Thence ליש Shiloh should be the same with הנב, his Son; מ being put for מ, which is not unusual, saith Kimchi. But Galatinus supposeth מ, to be a feminine affix, denoting that the Messiah was to be the seed of the woman, or to be born of a virgin. Neither is his conjecture absolutely to be rejected; although Mercer pronounce it to be against the rule of grammar; for we know that these hold not always in things mysterious. He that would be farther satisfied about the import of the word, may consult Raymundus, Porcherus, and Galatinus, in their discourses against the Jews on this subject; Kimchi, Pagnin, Mercer, Schindler, Philip ab Aquino, and Buxtorf in their Lexicons; Munster, Fagius, Drusius, Gronius in their annotations on the Text; Helvicus, Rivetus, Episcopius, Boetius, Hornebecke, in their discourses upon it. The weight of our argument lies not in the precise signification of the word. The Messiah it is who is intended in that expression.

§ 29. For first, this is manifest from the context and words themselves. The promise of the Messiah was the foundation of that nation and people; the reason of the call of Abraham, and of the erection of a kingdom and a state in his posterity. This we have elsewhere demonstrated. This promise concerning him, and covenant in him, was always the chief matter and head of the patriarchal benedictions, when they blessed their children and posterity. Now, unless we grant him to be intended in this expression, there is no mention of him at all in this prophetical benediction of Jacob. Besides, his posterity being now to be distributed into twelve distinct tribes, and each of these having a peculiar blessing appropriated unto it, and it being certain and confessed by all the Jews, that this privilege of bringing forth the Messiah was henceforth limited to the tribe of Judah, this limitation must be stated in this place, or there is no footstep of it in the Scripture. And it would indeed be very strange if Jacob, in reckoning up the privileges and advantages of Judah above his brethren, should omit the chief of them, from whence all the rest did flow. But the very tenor of the words manifest his intention of bringing this privilege prominently forward; for fixing on this, which was the fountain and end of all blessing, he passes over his elder children, and declares to Judah that from him Messiah should descend, and that his tribe should have the continuance of rule until his coming.

§ 30. Secondly, That which in the text is affirmed concerning this Shiloh, makes it yet more evident who it is that is intended, לישו המלך, 'to him the gathering of the people,' רדוי; LXX. θρησκευ αθηνων, 'the expectation of the nations,' that is, רדוי from רוד, to expect or look for. So the Vulgar, 'Expectatio Gentium;' Onkelos א ההמה, 'and him shall the people obey,' or to him they shall hearken. Ben Uzziel; רביה, a יִמְשָׁקָל, 'because of him the people shall faint;' that is, cease
their opposition, and submit unto him. Targum Hierusal. א"ת ויתרי יולא, 'and to him shall all the kingdoms of the earth be subject.' all to the same purpose, המך in construction from המך is from דַּנְיָן to hear, attend, obey. The word is used only in one other passage of Scripture, Prov. xxx. 17, where it is rendered doctrine, or teaching given out with authority, and therefore to be obeyed. So that primarily it may seem to denote obedience unto doctrines; and because men gather themselves together to attend unto this, it signifies also gathering together; and so is rendered by Rashi, funkc the gathering together, collection or congregating. And by others also it is thus rendered, who seem to look on דַּנְיָן as its root, which signifies to gather and collect, as well as to hope, expect, and look after. That which in all these interpretations is aimed at, wherein they all agree, is one and the same thing, namely, that the Gentiles, people, heathen, should be called and gathered unto the Shiloh, should hear his doctrine, obey his law, and be made subject unto him.

Now as this was eminently contained in the great fundamental promise concerning the Messiah made to Abraham, namely, that in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed; so there is not any description of him in the following prophets more eminently than this, that unto him the gathering of the people should be, which in many places is made the characteristic note of his person and kingdom. Hence some of the Jews themselves interpret this place, as Rabbi Solomon by that of Isaiah xi. 10, אנל וייט יפלא Gobierno דרש כ, 'to him shall Gentiles seek;' and that of Chap. xlii. 4, יָאִים יתלד ידיל, 'the isles shall wait for his law.' The sense also of the words given by the LXX. and by the Vulgate,προσδέξασθαι εἴθων, expectatio Gentium, has good countenance given unto it, in other places of Scripture. For as he is called, Hag. ii. 7, חמודה לכהדדנירם, the desire of all nations, that which they desire and expect; so speaking of himself, Isa. lx. 9, he says, יי יאמ יגיט, ידיל מוהל, the isles, the same with יי יאמ, יגיט, 'the Gentiles shall wait for me, or expect me.' Now he to whom the Gentiles shall seek, whose doctrine they shall learn, whose law they shall obey, to whom they shall be subject, in whom they shall be blessed, and to whom they shall be gathered, for all these ends and purposes, is the true and only Messiah, and this is the Shiloh here mentioned.

§ 31. We have the concurring assent of all the Targums unto this application of the word Shiloh. Ben Uzziel, אבי יפת די ירח יlland מתיומא, 'Until the time wherein the King Messiah shall come.' The same are the words in that of Jerusalem; both of them, as we saw before, interpreting the next words also of the Messiah. And Onkelos to the same purpose, ינירית מתיומא דויד מהתומא, 'Until the Messiah shall come whose is the kingdom.' Now after the Scripture itself, there is no greater evidence of the persuasion of the old church of the Jews, than what is found in the consent of these Targums; and it is generally known of how little validity the exception of the modern Jews against their authority is.

§ 32. And we have also their Talmuds, and most learned masters, fully consenting in this cause. So in the Talmud. Hierusal. in Cheleke. 'The world,' say they, 'is created for the Messiah, ימוי מץ, and what is his name in the house of Rabbi Shiloh? They said, His name is Shiloh, as it is written, Until Shiloh come.' And in Bereshith Rabba, on this place of Genesis, 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come, ויב רבד מימיו הז: This is the Messiah the Son of David, who shall come to rule the kingdoms with a sceptre; as Psal. ii. And in Beresh. Kebanna, ייער ית ימאוה יסifa, 'Until the Shiloh come, יסifa ימאוה יסifa; for it shall come to pass,
that the nations of the world shall bring their gifts unto Messiah the Son of David." And Kimchi in "Shiloh is interpreted his Son, and it is a prophecy of the Messiah." And innumerable other testimonies from them to the same purpose may be produced. Yea, this sense is so common among them, and so known to have been the sense of the ancient church, that the wisest among them turn every stone to retain this interpretation of the words, and yet to avoid the force of the testimony insisted on from them.

§ 33. This passage of Scripture then plainly teaches, that the political rule and national government should not absolutely and irrecoverably be taken away from the tribe of Judah, until the promised Seed should be exhibited, until the Messiah should come. It remaineth, that we also evidence that all rule, government, and polity, is long since taken away from Judah, and that for many generations there hath been no such thing as a tribe of Judah, in any national or political condition or constitution in the world. And had we not here to do with men obstinate and impudent, very few words would be needed in this matter. But they must have that proved unto them, which all the world sees and knows, and takes care to make good, and which themselves, as occasion serves, confess and bewail. Is it not known to all the world, that for these last sixteen hundred years, they have been, sine Deo, sine homine rege, cast out of God's special care, and wandering up and down, without law, government, or authority of their own. They are scattered over the face of the earth, leading a precarious life under the power of kings, princes, and commonwealths, as their several lots in their dispersion have fallen. And this, as I said, themselves also confess, as they have occasion. To this purpose, see Kimchi on Hosea iii. 4, אלולת התיה ימי התחלת מלחמות בר יהים, 'And these are the days of captivity, wherein we are at this day, for we have neither king nor priest of Israel; but we are in the power of the Gentiles, and under the power of their kings and princes.' Doth this man think that sceptre and law-giver are departed from Judah or no? And the Targum of Jonathan on that place is considerable; for, saith he, 'The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king of the house of David, and without a ruler in Israel; afterwards the children of Israel shall repent, and seek the worship of the Lord their God, and shall obey the Messiah, the Son of David, the King.' So also are the words of Abarbinel on Isa. lii. He tells us that in their captivity and banishment, part of their misery is, ולא ידע במראת מלכתי ולא ידע במשה, 'that in Israel there is neither kingdom, nor rule, nor sceptre of judgment; that is plainly—sceptre and law-giver are departed. And therefore, if there be any truth in this prophecy, the Messiah is long since come. In like manner Maimonides: 'From the time that we have left our own land, we have no power of making laws.' And they jointly confess, in the Talmud. Tract. Saned. that some time before the destruction of the temple, all power of judging both as unto life and death, and as unto pecuniary punishments, was taken from them. So that if there be a certainty in any thing in this world, it is certain that sceptre and law-giver are long since departed from Judah.

§ 34. There are not many things wherein the present Jews do more betray the desperateness of their cause, than in their endeavour to obscure this open and known truth in a matter of fact. That which they principally insist upon, is a story out of the Itinerary of Benjamin Tudensis.

This Benjamin was a Jew, who about five hundred years ago travelled
from Europe to the eastern parts of the world, and in his Itinerary, after
the manner of common travellers, he gives us an account of the state and
condition of his countrymen. Among other things which he relates, fide
Rabbinica, he tells us of a Jew who then had a principality at Bagdad,
whom his countrymen called the Son of David, there being a thousand of
them living there all in subjection unto him. This honour was allowed
him by the caliph, who in those days ruled there; so that, when he passed
in the streets, they cried before him, Make way for the Son of David.
Fagius long since returned a proper answer to this story, in a proverb of
their own, רדוי רדוי, רדוי, 'He that hath a mind to lie, let him
place his witnesses at distance enough.' When Benjamin passed over those
eastern parts of the world, they were greatly unknown to Europeans, and
he had thence opportunity to feign what he pleased for the reputation of his
nation, which opportunity he did not neglect to use. Time hath now
brought truth to light. The people of Europe, especially the English and
Hollanders, have some while since discovered the state of things in those
parts, and can hear no tidings of Benjamin's principality, nor of his Son of
David; nor could the Jews ever since get any one to confirm his relation.
Besides, if all that he avers should be granted to be true, as in the main it
is undoubtedly false, what would it amount to as to the matter in hand?
Is this the sceptre and law-giver promised unto Judah, as the great privi-
lege above his brethren? It seems, that an obscure unknown person in
captivity at Bagdad, by the permission of a tyrant, whose slave and vassal
he is, hath a pre-eminence among a thousand Jews, all slaves to the
same tyrant.

And this is all that they pretend to in מבעה, in the forty-second
story, where they give us an account of this or为什么不, Prince or
Head of the Captivity, as they would have him esteemed. A rich Jew, as
they would make him to be, chosen unto a presidency by the heads or
rectors of the schools of Bagdad, Sora, and Pombeditha; and they confess,
that now for many ages they have chosen no such president, because the
Saracens killed the last that was so chosen. And is this, I say, the con-
tinuance of the tribe and sceptre of Judah? No: Judah must be a nation,
a people in a political sense and state, dwelling in his own land, and must
have rule and dominion exercised therein according to its own law, or
the sceptre and law-giver are departed from it. And this they evidently
are sixteen hundred years ago, and therefore the Shiloh, the promised Mes-
siah, is long since come; and this is the truth, which from this testimony
we intended to confirm.
EXERCITATION XIII.


§ 1. We shall now proceed to other proofs from the Old Testament, which afford the same evidence, and which are of similar importance with the foregoing. The end of calling and separating the Jews from the rest of the world, of forming them into a nation, and of setting up a political state and rule amongst them, was solely, as we have declared, to bring forth the promised Messiah by them, and to shadow out his spiritual kingdom. It was necessary, then, that he should come before their utter desolation and final rejection from their national state, which also he did according to the promise and prediction before insisted on and explained. The same was the end of their ecclesiastical or church-state, with all the religious worship that was instituted therein. While that also, therefore, continued, and was accepted of God in Jerusalem, the place of his own appointment, Messiah was to be brought forth, and to accomplish his work in the world. This is foretold in sundry other places of the Old Testament; one or two of the most eminent of these we shall consider, and manifest from them, that the true Messiah is long since come, and exhibited unto the world, according to the promise given of old to that purpose. The first we shall fix upon is that of Haggai, ch. ii. 3—9, unto which we shall add, Mal. iii. 1. The words of the former place are, 'Who is left among you, that saw this house in her first glory, and how do you see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: And I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts; and the glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of hosts: And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.' Those of the latter are, '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, behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts.' Both to the same purpose.

§ 2. The occasion of the former words must be inquired after, from the
story of those times in Ezra, and from the whole discourse of the prophet in that place. The people who had returned from their captivity with Zerubbabel, in the days of Cyrus, had laid the foundation of the temple; but having begun their work, they met with much discouragement, from the great opposition which was made to it. Thus, indeed, it will happen to all men who engage in the work of God in any generation. The kings of Persia who first encouraged them unto this work, and countenanced them in it, Ezra i. 7—9, being influenced by false reports and slanders, as is usual also in such cases, at first began to withdraw their assistance, as it should seem, in the days of Cyrus himself, Ezra iv. 5, and at length expressly forbade their proceedings, causing the whole work to cease by force and power, ver. 23. Besides this outward opposition, they were moreover greatly discouraged by their own poverty and inability for the carrying on their designed work in any measure, so as to answer the beauty and glory of their former house built by Solomon. Hence, the elders of the people who had seen the former house in its glory, wept with a loud voice when they saw the foundations of this laid, Ezra iv. 12, 13. They foresaw how much the splendour and beauty of their worship would be impaired; for as the dimensions assigned to the fabric itself by Cyrus, Ezra vi. 3, did no way answer Solomon's structure, so for the ornaments of it, wherein its magnificence did principally consist, they had no means or ability to make any suitable provision for these. Being, therefore, thus hindered and discouraged, the work ceased wholly from the end of the reign of Cyrus, unto the second year of Darius Hystaspis. For there is no reason to suppose that this interruption of the work continued unto the reign of Darius Nothus. Between the first year of the whole empire of Cyrus, to the second of Darius Nothus, there were no less than a hundred years, as we shall afterwards declare. Now, it is evident in Ezra, that Zerubbabel and Joshua, who began the work in the reign of Cyrus, were alive, and carried it on in the days of Darius. And it is scarcely credible that they who, it may be, were none of the youngest men when they first returned unto Jerusalem, should live there an hundred years, and then return unto the work again. Outward force and opposition, then, they were delivered from, in the second year of Darius Hystaspis. But their discouragements from their poverty and inability still continued. This the prophet intimates, ver. 4. 'Who is there left among you who saw this house in its first glory, and what do you now see it? Is it not as nothing in your eyes?' For there is no necessity of reading the words with a supposition, as Scaliger contends, 'If there were any amongst you who had seen.' For it is much more likely that some who had seen the former house of Solomon, and wept at the laying of the foundation of this in the days of Cyrus, should now see the carrying on of it on in the second year of Darius Hystaspis, that is, about ten or twelve years after, than that those who began the work in the reign of Cyrus, should live to perfect it in the second year of Darius Nothus, an hundred years after. However, it is evident that the old discouragement was still pressing upon them. The former house was glorious and magnificent, famous and renowned in the world, and full of comfort unto them, from the visible pledges of the presence of God that were therein. To remove this discouragement, and to support them under it, the Lord by this prophet makes them a promise, that whatever the straitness and poverty of the house might be which they undertook to build, however short it came of the glory of that of old, yet from what he himself would do, he would render that house far more glorious than the
former; namely, by doing that in it, for which, both it and the former were instituted and erected. Saith he, לֹ֔א יָ֖הַ֣ד לְכָּֽהִיּ֑וֹ בְּתֵֽבִַאֵֽי וּלְֽאַבְרֵֽהִיאֵֽו מַֽהָּ אָֽדָם, 'The glory of this latter house shall be great above that of the former.' To clear the argument which we intend to deduce from these words, we must consider, 1. What this latter house was which is spoken of in this passage: and 2. Wherein the glory of it did consist.

§ 3. First, We are to inquire what house it is whereof the prophet speaks. Now this is most evident in the context. This house, saith he, ver. 4, that your eyes look upon, and which you so much despise in comparison of the former. And ver. 8. I will fill, saith the Lord, יְֽהֹוָֽה יְרֵבְּהוּ, 'this house' which you are now finishing, with glory. And ver. 9, it is called יְֽהֹוָֽה יְרֵבְּהוּ, 'this latter house.' The prophet doth, as it were, point to it with his finger. This house that you and I are looking upon, this house which is so contemptible in your eyes, in comparison with that of Solomon, which you have either seen or read of, this house shall be filled with glory. It is true, this temple was three hundred years after re-edified by Herod in the eighteenth year of his reign, which yet hindered not, but that it was still the same temple. For this first structure was never destroyed, nor the materials of it at once taken down. And, notwithstanding the reparation of it by Herod, it still continued one and the same house, though much enlarged and beautified by him. And, therefore, the Jews, in the days of our Saviour, overlooked, as it were, the re-edification of the temple by Herod, and affirm that that house which then stood, was forty-six years in building, John ii. 20, as they supposed it to have been at the return from captivity; but the whole work and building of Herod was finished within the space of eight years. The Targum also of Jonathan, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi, and others, interpret the words of that house which was then building by Zerubbabel and Joshua, nor do any of the ancient Jews dissent from this opinion.

§ 4. Abarbinel, one of their great masters, and chief among them who invent pretences to serve their impenitence and unbelief, in his comment on this place, after he hath endeavoured his utmost against the interpretations of the Christians, and made use of the reasonings of former expositors, to apply the whole prophecy unto the second house, at least, as it was restored by Herod, at length refers all that is spoken of the house here unto a third temple, prophesied of, as he fancieth, by Ezekiel, and to be built in the days of the Messiah; because he saw, that if the second house was intended, it would be hard to avoid the evidence of the coming of the Messiah, whilst that house stood and continued. But we need not insist long in the removal of this fond imagination. For 1. It is contrary to express redoubled affirmations in the text before insisted on. 2. To the whole design of the context and prophecy, which is expressly to encourage the Jews unto the building of that house, which seemed so contemptible in the eyes of some of them. 3. To the repetition of this prophecy, Mal. iii. 1, where the second temple is evidently expressed. 4. To the prophecy of Ezekiel, wherein a spiritual and not a material temple is delineated, as we shall elsewhere demonstrate. 5. To the time assigned to the glorifying of the house spoken of; וְיָֽשָּֽב וְיָֽשָּֽׁב בִּֽי יִשְׂרָאֵֽל, 'yet a little while,' which in no sense can be applied unto a temple to be built longer afterwards than that nation had been a people. From the call of Abraham to the giving of this promise, there had passed about fourteen hundred and ten years; and it is now above two thousand years since this prophecy. Now, in what sense this can be called 'a little while,' it is hard to imagine. This then is the
sense that Abarbinel would put on these words, 'It is yet a little while, and I will fill this house with glory;' that is, 'a very great while hence,' longer hence than you have been a people in the world: I will cause another house to be built. 6. To the Targum, and all the ancient masters among the Jews themselves. 7. But lastly, this conceit of Abarbinel is inconsistent in its parts, for it is by his own confession promised, that the Messiah should come to the temple that is promised to be filled with glory; but the other third temple that he fancies, is, as he said, to be built by Messiah himself, so as he cannot be said to come unto it. So that this evasion will not yield the least relief to their obstinacy and unbelief. It is evidently the second temple built by Zerubbabel, whose glory is here foretold.

§ 5. The glory promised unto this house, is next to be considered. This is expressed absolutely, ver. 7. 'I will fill this house with glory;' and comparatively with reference unto the temple of Solomon, which some of them had seen, ver. 9. 'The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former.' To understand aright this promise, we must reflect a little upon the glory of the first house, which the glory of this second was to excel. It would not answer our present design to digress unto a particular description of Solomon's temple. It is also done by others with great judgment, diligence, and accuracy. I shall, therefore, only give a brief account of some of the heads of its excellency, which our present argument doth require.

§ 6. First then, it was very glorious from its principal architect, which was God himself. He contrived the whole fabric, and disposed of all the parts of it in their order. For when David delivered unto Solomon the pattern of the house, and the whole worship of it, he tells him, 'All these things the Lord made me understand in writing, by his hand upon me, even all the work of this pattern,' 1 Chron. xxv. 19. God gave him the whole in writing; that is, God divinely and immediately inspired him by his Holy Spirit, to write the frame of the house and of all that belonged to it, according to his own appointment and disposal. This rendered the house glorious, as answering the wisdom of him by whom it was contrived. And herein it had the advantage of all the fabrics that ever were on the earth; and in particular, of the second temple, whose builders had no such idea of their work given them by inspiration.

§ 7. Secondly, It was glorious in the greatness, state, and magnificence of the fabric itself. It was such a building, as was never equalled in the world, which sundry considerations will make evident unto us; as,

First, The design of Solomon in building it. Now, Solomon was the wisest and richest king that ever was in this world. When he undertook the work and sent to Hiram, king of Tyre, for his assistance, he tells him that 'the house which he was to build was to be great; because the God of Israel was great above all gods,' 2 Chron. ii. 5. Nay, saith he, 'The house which I am about to build shall be wonderful and great.' No doubt then, but he designed to raise a structure magnificent to the utmost extent of his wisdom and wealth. And what shall he do that comes after the king? What shall any of the sons of men think to contrive and erect, which shall surpass in glory that building, in forming which, Solomon laid out his utmost. There can doubtless be no greater fondness than to imagine, that it could in any measure be equalled by what was done afterwards by Zerubbabel or Herod.

§ 8. Secondly, The vast and unspeakable treasures which were expended in the building and adorning of it. I know that there is some difference
among learned men, about reducing the Hebrew signatures of money to our present account. But let the estimate be as low as by any can reasonably be imagined, setting aside what Solomon expended of his own revenue, the provision left by David towards the work, of an hundred thousand talents of gold, and a thousand thousand talents of silver; besides brass and iron without weight, with timber and stone, 1 Chron. xxii. 14, doth far exceed all the treasures that the greatest part, if not all the kings of the earth, are at this day possessed of. For on the ordinary computation and balance of coins, the gold amounted to £450,000,000, and the silver unto £375,000,000, besides what was dedicated by his princes, and out of his peculiar treasure. He that would be satisfied what immense sums of his own Solomon added to all this, may consult Villalpandus on this subject. And what the product of this expense, wisely managed, might be, it is not easy to conceive. It seems to me, that the whole revenue of Herod was scarcely able to find bread for Solomon's workmen; so unlikely is it that his fabric should be equal unto that other. It was surely, then, a glorious house that all this charge was expended about.

§ 9. Thirdly, It appears farther, from the number of workmen employed in the structure. We need not increase this number by conjectures with Villalpandus, who reckons above four hundred thousand, seeing there is evident mention in the Scripture of an hundred and fourscore, and three thousand and six hundred, (besides the Tyrians that were hired, who by their wages seem also to have been a great number, 2 Chron. ii. 10,) that is, there was an hundred and fifty-three thousand and six hundred strangers of the posterity of the Canaanites, 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18, and thirty thousand Israelites, 1 Kings v. 13. Neither was all this multitude engaged in this work for a few days or months, but full seven years, 1 Kings vii. 38. And therein, as Josephus observes, the speed of the work was almost as admirable as its magnificence. And what a glorious structure might be raised by such numbers of men, in such a space of time, when nothing was wanting unto them, which by the immense treasures before mentioned could be procured, may easily be conceived. It doth not appear that the whole number of the people, rich and poor, who were gathered together under Zerubbabel, after the return from captivity, did equal the number of Solomon's builders, so that they were not like to erect a fabric answerable unto what he effected; nor can it be imagined, that Herod employed so many in the whole work, as Solomon had to oversee his labourers.

§ 10. We may add hereunto what is recorded concerning the adorning of this house. Not to mention the pillars of brass, with their chapiters, whose magnificence was wonderful, and workmanship inimitable; the molten sea, with the oxen, and the like ornaments innumerable: if we do but consider that the whole house, upon the vaulting and ceiling with cedar, was overlaid with pure beaten gold, how glorious must it need be rendered to the thoughts of every man, who remembers the greatness of the structure! And those utensils of the sanctuary, the ark, oracle, mercy-seat, and cherubims that represented the presence of God, what tongue can represent their beauty and glory! In the second house there was little of all these; and for the things of most cost and charge, nothing at all. Nor did the riches of this house consist only in the solid parts of the fabric, but in those vast treasures of silver and gold, with other precious things, which being dedicated to the service of God, were laid up therein; for besides what was consecrated by himself and his princes, Solomon brought in all the things which David his father had dedicated, 2 Chron. v. 7, and put them among the treasures of
the house of God. And, although I do not think with some, that the whole sums of money before mentioned were herein included, because it was dedicated by David, for so also was his brass, and iron, and timber, all which were to be expended about, or used in the building of the house itself, yet I cannot but judge that those treasures were exceedingly great, and such as the poverty and confusion of the people, under the second temple, never allowed them to do any thing that was answerable unto it.

§ 11. Lastly, The glory of the worship of this temple consummated its beauty. Now, this was principally founded on the glorious entrance of God, or 'Divine presence' into it, upon its consecration by the prayer of Solomon. Hereof God gave a double pledge. First, The falling down of the fire from heaven to consume the first offerings, and to leave a fire to be kept alive perpetually upon the altar, a type of the effectual operation of the Holy Ghost, making all our sacrifices acceptable to God, 2 Chron. vii. 1. And this the Jews expressly confess to have been wanting in the second temple. Secondly, The glory of the Lord, as a cloud filling the whole house, and resting upon it, 2 Chron. vii. 2, 3. This foundation being laid, and attended with a sacrifice of many thousands of cattle, the whole worship was gloriously carried on, according to the institution revealed unto David by the Spirit of God. And the better to enable them to a right performance hereof, some of the chief ministers, as Heman, Ethan, and Jeduthan, were themselves inspired with the spirit of prophecy. So that, here there is evidently the utmost glory that a worldly sanctuary and carnal ordinances could ever possess.

§ 12. Having taken this brief view of the glory of Solomon's temple, we may now inquire what that glory was which was promised to this second house, concerning which the prophet affirms expressly that it shall excel all the glory which on any account belonged unto the former. And first, we shall consider the apprehensions of the Jews in this matter. First, Some of them plainly insinuate, that this whole promise was conditional, and depended upon the obedience of the people, wherein they failing, it is no wonder if the promise was never accomplished. Thus Abarbinel would have the prophet speak to them, 'אֲנָא יִמְיָר מַמְשָׁלֵיהֶם בְּמֵשְׂרֶה בְּמַרְדָּה יְהוָה, 'If your works be right in the observation of the law.' And to this end, Kimchi after Aben Ezra, giveth us a new connexion of the words; for that expression, ver. 4, 'Be strong all ye people of the land,' יִשְׂרָאֵל, and word, he carries on to the beginning of the next verse, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה, כְּעַדְּרֶבֶן, før a וְיַעֲשֶׂה אֶת הַדְּבָרָה, 'and work: it coheres in sense with the following verse, or this word, If you do the work that I covenanted with you, 'so my Spirit remaineth among you,' he interprets for a promise depending upon the same condition, 'If you do the work that I covenanted with you,' that is, 'observe the law; באֲלִיָּא אֲנָא, וְיִמְיָר מַמְשָׁלֵיהֶם בְּמֵשְׂרֶה בְּמַרְדָּה יְהוָה, 'But after they sinned, and observed not the law, the Holy Ghost and prophecy ceased from amongst them in the days of Zechariah and Malachi.' And to the same purpose Abarbinel, יְהוָה מֵמַעְשֶׁה מַמְשָׁלֵיהֶם, 'The glorious presence, prophecy, and the rest of the holy things that were then wanting, should return unto them, if their ways were right and good.' And in this fancy they all agree.

§ 13. But this wresting of the text is evident. There is no condition intimated in the words, but rather the contrary: God promising to be with
them, as he was in the days of their coming out of the land of Egypt, wherein the work that he wrought for them depended not on their obedience, but was a mere effect of his own faithfulness, as he often declares. And those words, 

and my Spirit standing, abiding, or remaining, in the midst of you, among you, is no promise of any thing that was future, but a declaration of the presence of God by his Spirit then amongst them, to carry them through all the difficulties and discouragements that they had met with. And this is evident from the inference that is made thereon, 

fear ye not. For as the presence of God with them by his Spirit and power was their great encouragement, so a promise of any thing that was future, was not suited unto that purpose. And hence the Targum of Jonathan, supposing the spirit of prophecy to be intended, referreth the words to the prophets that were then amongst them, who instructed them in the will of God. But by the Spirit, nothing is there intended, but the efficacious working of the providence of God in their protection, as it is explained, Zech. iv. 6, “Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.” And the transposition of the words invented by Kimchi, is a bold corruption of the text, and contrary to the whole design of the prophet’s message to the people. His business was, to encourage them to go on with the building of the temple. To this end, he bids them be strong, and do their work; ي šv יבך זבורי ויהי, saith Rabbi Levi, work on this building, carry on this fabric. יבריר, saith Jonathan, fall to your labour; and to this he adds the encouragement from the presence of God, who was powerfully with them by his Spirit, as in the days that he brought them out of the land of Egypt.

§ 14. This evasion being of no use, something more satisfactory must be inquired after, something wherein the glory of the latter house does excel that of the former. That they may not be utterly silent, the masters of the present Judaical infidelity fix upon two things, which they would persuade us this glory might consist in. First, They say the structure itself, either as built by Zerubbabel, or at least as restored by Herod, was higher, as more capacious, than that built by Solomon; and the glory of it was increased by the great riches of the nations, that were brought into it in the days of the Hasmonæans, and of Herod, when that was accomplished which was here foretold, “that the riches of the nations should come to that house.” So Kimchi, I will shake: this is an allegorical expression, saith he, of the great glory and good that God would bring to Israel in the days of the second temple; and when was this? It was in the days of the Hasmonæans, יא על ינפ דרורדס, or in the time of Herod,’ for which he refers us to the book of Joseph Ben Gorion, the plagiarist of the true Josephus. And this also is repeated by Jarchi and Abarbinel, for the glory of the house itself. The same man tells us, that his masters of blessed memory were divided; some referring it unto the time of the standing of the second house, of which afterwards; some to its greatness. And for its greatness he informs us, ‘The second house, יא על ינפ דרורדס, in the structure of it, was great; as it is written in the words of our Rabbins of blessed memory, and in the book of Joseph Ben Gorion, namely, that there was no building in the whole world to be compared with that structure which Herod built for beauty and excellency.’

But there are not many of this opinion, and those that pretend to be so, speak contrary to their own knowledge and conscience. They know well
enough, that the second temple was in nothing to be compared unto the former. And this Abarbinel acknowledgeth, in the entrance of his exposition of this prophecy, affirming that the people were troubled at the remembrance of the house built by Solomon, which was great and high, filled with multitudes of vessels of pure gold and precious stones; whereas that which they were building was small, according to the command of the king of Persia, and without treasure, because of the poverty of the people. And though this house was raised higher by Herod, yet it was not at all enlarged by him, but erected precisely on the old foundation. But not to enter at present into consideration of the dimensions of the former structure, let the latter temple be thought as wide and long as the former, and some cubits higher, doth this presently give it a greater glory than the other; a glory so much greater, as to be thus eminently promised and intimated to be brought in with the shaking of heaven and earth, sea, and dry land? Can any thing be more fondly imagined? It were endless to reckon up the particular instances wherein it came short of the glory of the first house. Let but the heads of the beauty and magnificence of the first temple, as above recounted, be run over, and this will quickly appear. In a word, notwithstanding this pretended greatness of the second temple, it had not the hundredth part of the glory of Solomon's house, which also these masters on all occasions acknowledge; for besides all the glorious golden vessels and ornaments of it, besides all the treasures deposited in it, besides sundry of the most magnificent parts of the building itself, they generally acknowledge that there were five things wanting in the last, wherein the principal glory of the first house consisted. These are diversely reckoned up by them, but in general they all agree about them; and they are given us by the author of Aruch in the root ארון סמוך ורזה נבוך in this order: the ark, propitiatory and cherubins, one; that is, the whole furniture of the sanctuary. The Divine Majesty or Presence, the second; this entered not into the second house in that glorious and solemn manner, that it did into the temple of Solomon, the Holy Ghost which is prophecy, the third; all prophecies ceasing under that house, from the days of Malachi unto John Baptist. The pillars of Hamozi and Thummim, the fourth thing. סא שן מז מזמי והמשי, fire from heaven, to kindle the everlasting fire on the altar, the fifth thing. They that acknowledge all these things to have been wanting in the second temple, as the Jews generally do, and as the Talmud in תם, ch. 5, expressly admits, cannot well compare the glory of it, with the glory of that temple wherein these were, and wherefo they were indeed the chief glory, as being the most eminent pledges of the presence of God therein.

§ 15. The pretence about the glory of this house, from the riches of the Hasmonaëns and of Herod, is no less vain. That which amongst the Hasmonaëns had the greatest appearance of glory, was their high priest (who also came irregularly unto that office) assuming the royal power and titles. But this, as themselves confess, was a sinful disorder, and their whole race was quickly extirpated before Herod the great. And though they are on this occasion reconciled unto Herod, yet elsewhere they execrate him as an usurper, cruel tyrant, and slave to the Romans, all which he was indeed. Little glory came to the temple by his rule and sovereignty. Besides, during his reign, and the rule of the remainder of his race, the high priests were thrust in and out, at the pleasure of brutish tyrants; no order in their succession, no beauty in their worship, being observed or sought after. Hence, comparing the number of high priests under the second temple, who are
more than three times as many as the high priests under the first temple, they use the words of Solomon, "Because of the wickedness of the people, the rulers are many." To seek for the glory mentioned among these things and persons, is assuredly vain.

§ 16. Wherefore others of these masters, waving these empty pretences, would have the glory of this second house to consist in its duration. So R. Jonathan in Bereishith Rabba, Jarchi on this place, and Kimchi, whose opinion is repeated by Abarbinel. Kimchi tells us, that their masters are divided in this matter; and Jarchi, that it was Raph and Samuel that were the authors of this different opinion. The one affirms, that the glory of this house consisted in its greatness, the other in its duration; and their dispute in this matter is in Perek Kama, of Baba Bathra, "The first house," saith he, 'continued four hundred and ten years, the second four hundred and twenty.' This is their account, though in truth it continued longer, as did the first house also. But is this the glory promised? What was the condition of that house in those last ten years, or for almost fifty years before? The whole nation, during this space of time, was shattered and wasted with oppressions, seditions, and miseries inexpressible, and the house itself made a den of thieves; and for the greatest part of the ten years they boasted, it was filled with cruel bloodshed and daily murders. And it is likely that for a mere duration in that season, when for the use made of the house, it was abhorred of God, and of all good men; is it likely that for this the second temple should be said to obtain more glory than the house of Solomon was ever made partaker of? There is, then, nothing more evident, than that these are evasions of men, who diligently endeavour to hide themselves from light and truth; for these inventions do not in the least answer either to the letter of the prophecy, or the intention of him that gave it.

§ 17. It remaineth, then, that we inquire from the text what is the true glory promised unto this house, wherein it was to have the pre-eminence above the former. Now this is expressly said to be, the coming unto it of the desire of all nations. "The desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory; and the glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former." This is directly affirmed to be the glory promised, and nothing else is in the least intimated wherein it should consist. And there are three circumstances of this glory expressed in the text. 1. The way whereby it should be brought in: "I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea and the dry land: and I will shake all nations." Secondly, The season wherein this was to be done: "Yet once it is a little while." Thirdly, The event of it, "And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts:" all which are severally to be considered, and the intention of the Holy Ghost in them vindicated from the objections of the Jews.

§ 18. The first thing we are to inquire after, is the glory itself that is promised in these words, והאמהמחליהםלאוהים, and the desire of all nations shall come. The Jews by these words generally understand the desirable things of the nations, their silver and gold, which above all things are unto them most desirable. These, they say, the nations being shaken, did bring unto the temple, and therein the glory of it did consist. Herein all their expositors on this place, Jarchi, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, and others of them whose judgments are repeated by Abarbinel, do agree. Aben Ezra briefly, 'The nations shall be shaken, ומאותלבית, and shall bring gifts unto my
house,ribvartiadhodbmessiah; ’And they shall bring the treasures of gold and silver, saith Jarchi, ‘as it is recorded in the Book of Joseph Ben Gorion.’ Kimchi to the same purpose somewhat largely, [אֶלֶף בְּרֵאשִׁית פָּרְשָׁא בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּתֵּל, mesheb, ‘As if it had been said. They shall bring in their hands all desirable things that are found in their lands, vessels of silver and of gold, garments and precious stones,’ and this, as I said, is their general sense.

But, first. It is directly contrary unto the context; for it is the plain design of the Holy Ghost to take off the thoughts of the people from that kind of glory, which consisted in abundance of ornaments of silver and gold. These being all of them always in his power, he could at that time have furnished them with these; but here he calls them to look for another glory. Secondly, It is perfectly false as to the event; for when was there such an outward shaking of all nations under the second temple, as that thereon they brought their silver and gold unto it, and that in such abundance, as to render it more rich and glorious than the house of Solomon? So to wrest the words, is plainly to aver that the promise was never fulfilled. For nothing can be more ridiculous, than to make a comparison between the riches and treasures of Solomon’s temple, and those which at any time were laid up in the second temple. Besides, the things which were thus laid up, were but gifts and oblations of the people of the Jews, which the nations sometimes took away, but never brought. And, therefore, they who use this evasion, dare not place the excelling glory of this house herein, though the text do plainly affirm, that it doth consist in what these words intend, but turn to other imaginations of largeness and duration.

Thirdly, Open force is offered unto the words themselves; for they are not ריבאיכלהנוםוהדרמשה, but באהיהנהמזר_Debug, the desire of all nations shall come. So woeful is the condition of men rebelling against light, that they care not into what perplexities they run themselves, if they avoid it. Abarbinel having repeated all these expositions, and seeing no doubt that they would not endure a tolerable examination, would have the desire of all nations to be Jerusalem; because they should all come up to war against it, with a desire to take it in the days of the third temple, which he fancieth to be here intended. There are scarce more words than monsters in this subterfuge. It may suffice for its removal, that we have already demonstrated, that his figment of a third temple is devoid of any pretence to cover it from open shame.

§ 19. We say then, that these words contain a prophecy of the Messiah, and of the real glory that should accrue unto the second temple, by his coming unto it, while it was yet standing. This is the import of the words. The LXX. give us a corrupt interpretation of the words, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκκλησταὶ παντῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν, and choice things of all nations shall come; in which error they are followed both by the Syriac and Arabic translators. Τα ἐκκληστα doth in nothing answer to תָּהוֹרְה, the word here used by the prophet, and retained by Jonathan in the Chaldee Targum; who indeed is not so unfaithful in places relating unto the Messiah, as to exclude him, although he pervert the true meaning of many of them. The vulgar Latin hath, as to the sense, rendered these words rightly, Et veniet desideratus cunctis gentibus; ’ And he shall come who is the desire of all nations. הדרמשה from דְּרָשָׁה, is properly desiderium, desire; but is no where used in the Scripture but for a thing, or person desired, or desirable, loved, valued, or valuable. As is דעון also, Dan. ix. 23; ch. x.
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\[ \text{desiderium thence} \]

\[ \text{construction, this unusual sense which their torium.} \]

\[ \text{agrees with the kind, of the number, and with the mighty, though it be apparently spoken of the bow. And likewise Hosea vi. 5, } \]

\[ \text{thy judgments shall go forth as the light: } \]

\[ \text{shall go forth, agrees in number with the light, though it respect thy judgments, in the plural number; and many other instances of the like kind, may be alleged to the same purpose. This construction, then, though anomalous, yet is in that language so frequent, as not to create any difficulty in the words; and yet possibly the words may not be} \]

\[ \text{VOL. I.} \]
without a further sense, intimating the coming of the nations to Christ
upon his coming into the temple.
§ 21. Though the words of the promise are thus clear in themselves,
we may yet see what further light is contributed unto our interpretation
from the circumstances before observed; as, first, the way of bringing in
this glory is there expressed by the prophet from the mouth of the Lord, 'I
will shake the heavens and the earth, the sea, and the dry land; and I will
shake all nations.' All the Jewish expositors agree, that these words are
to be interpreted המלך יְרוֹמָךְ; that is, metaphorically and figuratively.
Yet it cannot be denied, that a great concussion and shaking of the world,
and all the nations of it, is intended in them, otherwise nothing is signified
by them. And this must be with reference unto that house, and the wor-
ship thereof, and that in a tendency unto its glory. Now I desire to
know what work among the nations in the whole world it is, that was
wrought with respect unto the temple which is here intended. The na-
tions came indeed under Antiochus, and almost ruined it; under Crassus,
and robbed it; under Pompey, and profaned it; under Titus, and destroyed
it. But what tended all this to its glory? But refer these words unto the
coming of the Messiah, and all things contained in them were clearly ful-
filled. Take the words literally, and they suit the event. At his birth, a
new star appeared in the heavens; angels celebrated his nativity; wise
men came from the east, to inquire after him; Herod and all Jerusalem
was shaken at the tidings of him; and upon his undertaking of his work,
he wrought miracles in heaven, and earth, and sea, and dry land, and upon
the whole creation of God. Take them metaphorically, as they are rather
to be understood, for the mighty change which God would work in his
worship, and in the stirring up of the nations of the world to receive him
and his doctrine, and the event is yet more evident. All nations under
heaven were quickly shaken and moved by his coming. Some were stirred
up to inquire after him, some to oppose him, until the world, as to the
greatest and the most noble parts of it, was made subject to him. Evident
it is, that since the creation of all things, never was there such an al-
teration and concussion in the world, as that wherewith the Messiah and
his doctrine was brought into it, and which is therefore so expressed by the
prophet.
§ 22. Abarbinel affirms that the המלך יְרוֹמָךְ, Christian doctors,
would argue and prove from hence, that it is not the temple of the Jews,
but their own house of worship, that is intended in these words, and that
because there was no such confluence of the nations unto the Jews, either
under the first or second temple, as is here promised; but unto the church
and faith of Christians, all nations were converted. But he mistakes and
confounds things, as all of them constantly do, in their disputations against
Christians. We contend not that it is the Christian church that is here
intended by the house to which glory was to come. Only we say, that he
to whom the nations or Gentiles were to be gathered, whom they were
shaken and stirred up to receive, did actually come unto the temple at
Jerusalem, and thereby gave it a greater glory than what the temple of
Solomon ever received. This first circumstance then clears our intention
from this text.
§ 23. The season wherein the promised glory was to be brought in, is
next noted in the context. It is expressed, ver. 6. עִשָּׂרְאֵל מִלְשָׂנֶיךָ; 'The
Jews generally refer these words unto the rule or kingdom of the Hasmon-
eans, under whom the people were to enjoy their liberty, which is said to
be a little season, as continuing seventy or eighty years; for it is said to
be little, because they had but a small dominion in comparison of their
former kingdom and empire. But it is evident from the context, that the
prophet had no respect unto rule or dominion in these words. For what-
ever is intended in this expression, it hath a direct and immediate influence
to the bringing in of the desire of all nations, and the glory promised, which
the rule of the Hasmonaens reached not unto. Our apostle, Heb. xii. 27,
renders these words מְנַשֶּׁה, literally and properly וְיַעֲשֶׂה, 'yet more once,'
or 'yet once more.' God had before done some work, whereunto that which
he promised now to do is compared. Such a concurrence of all things had
been before; and this, as is evident from ver. 5, was the work that he
wrought at the giving of the law, and the erection of the Judaical church,
state and ordinances. In answer hereunto, he would bring in the ever-
lasting kingdom of the Messiah, and the spiritual worship to be celebrated
therein, the old church-state of the Jews being removed and taken away
in this shaking of all things.

And this is plainly evinced from the comparison that God makes
between the work here promised, and that which he wrought when he
covenanted with the people upon their coming up out of Egypt. Con-
cerning the work which God will thus do once more, it is said to be
םְיַעֲשֶׂה, a little while; that is, ere it be accomplished. It is not the na-
ture or quality of the work, but the season or time wherein it shall be
wrought, that is denoted in these words. In that sense is commonly used in
the Scripture, as we prove elsewhere. As the same work, Mal. iii. 1, is
promised to be done suddenly, speedily. It is then foretold, that it
should be but a little space of time before this work should be wrought.
And hence Abarbinel would prove, that it cannot respect the coming of
our Messiah, which was about four hundred years after. But this season
is not called a little while absolutely, but with respect unto the former
duration of the people, or church of the Jews, either from the calling of
Abraham, or the giving of the law by Moses. And this space of four
hundred years, is but little in comparison thereof; and is so termed to stir
up believers unto a continual expectation of it, and desire after it: it being
now nearer unto them than unto their forefathers, who beheld the time of
its performance a very great way off. And this also serves for the convic-
tion of the Jews; for whereas their forefathers of old did confess, and they
at present cannot with any modesty deny, but that the Messiah is here
intended, whom they suppose not yet to be come, how can this space of
time from the days of Hagga in any sense be called a little while, seeing
it far exceeds all the space of time that went before, from the call of Abra-
ham, which is the first epoch of their privileges and claim.

§ 24. The last circumstance contributing light unto our interpretation
of this place, is taken from the event, or the coming of the desire of all
nations, and the glory of the second house ensuing thereon, in these words,
בכְּפַרְקֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: 'and in this place I will give peace, saith the Lord of
hosts.' From these words Abarbinel seeks to overthrow our exposition;
by this place, saith he, is intended Jerusalem. Well, let that be granted,
what will thence ensue? Why, saith he, יָרָאָה מִתִּיַּשַּׁעַל מֵאָשָּׁתָה, אַלֹהִים.
שָׁלוֹם יִרְשָׁעֲל; 'Behold from the day that the Messiah was born, there
was no peace in Jerusalem, but wars, destruction, and desolation.' We say
then, that by peace, here, must be understood either outward, temporal,
worldly peace, or spiritual peace between God and man, between Jews and
Gentiles, in their joint communion in the same worship of God. If they
say the former was intended, I desire to know when this promise was accomplished under the second temple? before the days of the Hasmonæans, the whole people was in perfect bondage and slavery, first to the Persians, then to the Grecians; and bondage is not peace, especially in the Hebrew dialect, wherein that word denotes an affluence of all good things. The rule of the Hasmonæans was wholly spent in bloody wars, and intestine divisions. Their power issued in the dominion of the Romans, and their vassals the Herodians. What signal peace they had in those days, they may learn from their own Joseph Ben Gorion. To say, then, that this was the peace intended, is to say directly, that God promised what he never performed, which it is fit only for these men to do.

Besides, though God promised to give this peace at Jerusalem, that is amongst the Jews, yet he promised not to give it only to Jerusalem, or only to the Jews, but to all nations also, whom he would shake and stir up, to bring in this glory. Now what pretence of peace had the Jews under the second temple, in which all nations were concerned? I suppose they will not say they had any. Moreover, the peace promised, was that which was to be brought in by the Messiah. This Abarbinel grants; and thence seeks to strengthen his objection: for, saith he, 'Then we shall have peace, rule, and dominion, according to the manifold promises given us unto that purpose.' I answer, those promises were of two sorts. Some allegorically express spiritual things, by words literally signifying things outward, and they are all of them fulfilled in and unto them that do believe. Others of them, that really intend outward peace and glory, are indeed made concerning the Jews to be fulfilled, not when the Messiah came to them, but when they shall come to the Messiah. At his coming unto them, they rejected him and he rejected them; but when their blindness shall be taken away, and they shall return unto the Lord, all these promises shall have a blessed accomplishment amongst them. But we have sufficiently proved that the principal work of the Messiah was to make peace between God and man by taking away sin that was the cause of their separation, distance, and enmity. This then is the peace here promised. This God gave at Jerusalem, whilst the second temple was standing: 'For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances for to make in himself of twain, one new man, so making peace. And that he might reconcile both unto God, in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby, he came and preached peace to them that were afar off, and to them that were nigh.' Thus did God give peace at Jerusalem, both to the Jews and Gentiles, by him that was the desire of all nations; and so by this circumstance of the context also, is our interpretation fully confirmed.

§ 25. Although we have sufficiently confirmed our argument, and indicated it from the exceptions of the Jewish masters; yet as it is most certain, that the constant faith of their church of old was, that the Messiah should come whilst that second temple was standing, and as the modern Jews have apostatized from this faith, and countenance themselves in their infidelity, by the miserable evasions before mentioned: I shall yet add farther strength unto it from a parallel testimony, and from their own confessions. The parallel place intended, is that of Malachi iii. 1, 'Behold I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, even the angel or messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: Behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts.' The time future of his coming, is by Haggai said
to be understood, a little while; and Malachi answerably affirms, that he shall come in the sense before declared. He who by Haggai is called מלך ה véhicule לヘוגים, the desire of all nations, with respect unto the Gentiles, all desirable things being laid up in him, is by Malachi called מרגון אiores את מנשא, with respect unto the Jews, the Lord whom ye seek: whose coming they looked for so long, and prayed for so earnestly. And what Haggai expressed absolutely, shall come, afterwards intimating the respect his coming should have unto the temple, Malachi sets down fully, he shall come to his temple. Further to clear what it is, that in both these places is intended, he is called משלך הוא המלך, the angel of the covenant; God's messenger, who was to confirm and ratify the new covenant with them; that is, the Messiah. The Targum of Jonathan expresseth this on Jer. xxx. 21, closing the promise of the covenant with these words, ורהבט מלך יהוה מתה את מנוים את הכהנים מתים תחלה, and their king shall be anointed from among them, and their Messiah shall be revealed from amongst the midst of them; He who was the desire of all nations, the Lord whom the Jews sought, the messenger by whom the new covenant was to be ratified; that is, the Lord the Messiah was to come, and he did come to that temple.

§ 26. And here the Jews are at an end of all shifts and evasions. It cannot be said that the Messiah is not here intended; yet Rashi would fain evade it; the Lord whom ye seek, that is מלך יהוה, the God of Judgment: because they had said before, Ch. ii. 17, Where is the God of Judgment? Vain man! these words, Ch. ii. 17, which he himself had but just before interpreted, to be the atheistical expression of wicked men questioning the judgment of God, are now to serve his turn, interpreted as to be expressive of the same earnest desire of seeking after the Lord, which is evidently meant by the words, the Lord whom ye seek, the angel of the covenant whom ye delight in; for both these are the same, as Aben Ezra acknowledged, אברים ימים ומאדים ואלבנה הבירה כי י(mutex נצלי, 'The Lord he is the glory, and the angel of the covenant, the same things being intended under a double expression.' And the person to whom he refers is evident, from his interpreting the messenger to be sent before him, to be Messiah Ben Joseph, whom they make the forerunner of Messiah Ben David.

Kimchi interprets the angel to be sent before him, as the angel of God's presence from heaven, to lead the people out of their captivity, as of old he went before them in the wilderness when they came out of Egypt. But we are better taught who this messenger was, Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2. As for the Lord they sought, he speaks plainly, והא מלך המשיח הוא מלך הבדרה, This is the king the Messiah, and this the angel of the covenant.' He adds indeed the old story about Elijah, and his zeal for the covenant; whence he had the honour to preside at circumcision, to see the covenant observed, and may be thence called the angel of the covenant. But it is plain in the words, and confessed by Aben Ezra, that the Lord whom they sought, and the angel of the covenant, are the same. And as to these words, he shall come suddenly to his temple, he adds in their explication; לים שלמה חכמה ולא מתבצר בכריע ניאל אמור, Because the time of the end is not revealed nor unfolded in the book of Daniel. It is said he shall come suddenly, because there is no man that knows the day of his coming before he cometh.' We grant that the precise day of his coming was not known before he came; but that the time of it was foretold, limited and
unfolded in the book of Daniel, so far as the season would admit: and that all future expectation is there declared to be void, we shall immediately demonstrate. At present we have proved, and find that they cannot deny, but that he was to come unto the second temple, while it was yet standing.

§ 27. Once more, we may yet add the consent of others or their masters besides these expositors. Some testimonies out of their doctors are cited by others; I shall only name one or two of them in the Talmud itself; Tractat. Saned. cap. 11, the application of this place of Haggai unto the Messiah, is ascribed unto Rabbi Akiba; his words, as they report them, are, מָלַשׁ הַכֹּהֵן אִיתָלָה לְיֶשׁעָא הַלְוָיָא לְא אָרָד נָבְיָא וְאֶלְּמָה, 'A little glory will I give unto Israel, and then the Messiah shall come.' And this man is of so great repute among them, that Rabbi Eleazar affirms, that כל הכהנים Micha, 'all the wise men of Israel were like a little garlic in comparison of that bold Rabbi.' This then is their own avowed tradition, and the other place of Malachi, concerning the angel of the covenant, is expounded of the Messiah by Rambam in הלכות מלאכי, 'In the days,' saith he, 'of the Messiah, the children of Israel shall be restored unto their genealogies, by the Holy Ghost that shall rest upon him, as it is said, Behold, I send my messenger before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall come unto his temple.' We have then found out from the clear words of both these prophecies, and from the consent of the Jews themselves, who it is that is here promised in them, that he should come to his temple.

§ 28. This is the glory of the second house promised in Haggai. The end of the temple, and of all the glory of it, and all the worship performed in it, was to prefigure the promised seed, who was the true and only substantial glory of them all, and of the people to whom they were committed; for he was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel. Therefore in all the worship of the temple, those who believed, and in the use of the ordinances of it, saw unto the end of their institution, did continually exercise faith on his coming, and earnestly desire the accomplishment of the promise concerning it. The great glory then of this temple could consist in nothing but this coming of the Lord whom they sought, the desire of all nations, unto it. Now that he should come whilst the temple stood, is here confirmed by this double prophetic testimony; and the temple was utterly and irreparably destroyed above 1600 years ago. It must be acknowledged then that the Messiah is long since come, unless we we will say, that the word of God is vain, and his promise of none effect.

§ 29. The general objection of the Jews unto this argument, taken from the limitation of the time allotted unto the coming of the Messiah, we shall afterwards consider. In one word, that which they relieve themselves withal against the prediction of Haggai and Malachi, that he should come unto the temple then built amongst them, is so truly ridiculous, that I shall not need to detain the reader with the consideration of it. They say the Messiah was born at the time determined, before the destruction of the second temple, but that he is kept hid in the sea, or in Paradise, or dwells at the gates of Rome among the lepers, waiting for a call from heaven to go and deliver the Jews. With such follies do men please themselves in the great concerns of the glory of God and of their own eternal welfare, when they are left destitute of the Spirit of light and truth, and are sealed up under the efficacy of their own blindness and unbelief. But of this we shall treat further in the consideration of their general answers to the whole argument in hand.
§ 1. Daniel’s weeks, Ch. ix. 24—27, proposed unto consideration. § 2. Attempt of a learned man to prove the coming and suffering of the Messiah not to be intended, examined. § 3. First reason from the difficulties of the computation, and differences about it removed. § 4. Whether this place be used in the New Testament. § 5. Objection from the time of the beginning of this computation, answered. § 6. Distribution of the seventy weeks into seven, and sixty two and one. Reason of it. § 7. Objection thence answered. § 8. The cutting off the Messiah, and the destruction of the city, not joined in one week. § 9. Things mentioned, ver. 24, peculiar to the Messiah. § 10. The prophecy acknowledged by all Christians to respect the Messiah. § 11. The events mentioned in it, not to be accommodated unto any other. § 12. No types in the words, but a naked prediction, § 12—14. The prophecies of Daniel do not principally respect the churches of the latter days. § 15. Straights of time intimated when they fell out. § 16. Coincidence of phrases in this and other predictions considered. § 17. Removal of the daily offering, and causing the sacrifice and offering to cease, how they differ. § 18. The desolation foretold. § 19. Distribution of the seventy weeks accommodated unto the material Jerusalem. § 20. Objections removed. § 21. Distribution of things contained in this prophecy. § 22. Argument from the computation of time warranted. § 23. First neglected by the Jews, then cursed: yet used by them vainly. § 24. Concurrent expectation and fame of the coming of the Messiah upon the expiration of Daniel’s weeks. § 25. Mixture of things good and penal. Abarbinel’s fragment rejected. § 26. Four hundred and ninety years the time limited. Fancy of Origen, and Apollinaris. § 27. The true Messiah intended. Proved from the context. § 28. The names and titles given unto him. § 29. The work assigned unto him. § 30. That work particularly explained; the expressions vindicated. To make an end of transgression, what. § 31. To seal up sins. § 32. To reconcile iniquity. § 33. To bring in everlasting righteousness. § 34. To seal vision and prophet. § 35. Messiah how cut off. § 36. The covenant strengthened. § 37. Cessing of the daily sacrifice. § 38. Perplexity of the Jews about these things. § 39. Opinion of Abarbinel and Manasseh Ben Israel. Cyrus not intended. Not Herod Agrippa. § 40. Not Magistracy. Africanus, Clemens, and Eusebius noted. § 41. Messiah came before the cessing of the daily sacrifice. § 42. Chronological computation, not necessary.

§ 1. There remains yet one place more, giving evident testimony unto the truth under demonstration, to be considered and vindicated. And this is the illustrious prediction and specification of time granted unto Daniel by the angel Gabriel. Ch. ix. 24—27. “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks, the street shall be built again, and the wall in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off; but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war, desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined, shall be poured upon the desolate.” So our translation reads the words, how agreeably unto the original, we shall consider and examine particularly in our progress.

§ 2. As Christians in general are aware of the importance of this testi-
mony in our present argument, so the Jews are also in a great measure sensible of this; as we shall see in considering the manifold evasions which they have invented to avoid the efficacy of it. But before we engage in the consideration of this passage, we must remove out of our way a mistaken apprehension, which not only opposes our views, but which also is opposed to the whole design, intention, and subject-matter of the prophecy itself. A reverend and learned person in a late exposition of the visions and prophecies of Daniel, endeavours to refer them all to the state of the churches of Christ in these latter days of the world, with their sufferings under, and deliverance from the power of antichrist. And he contends expressly, that this prophecy, prediction, and computation, amongst the rest, doth not relate unto the coming and suffering of the Messiah, but only unto the state of the churches before mentioned. Hence he who published those discourses, declareth in the title of the book, that "A new way is pronounced in it, for the finding out of the determinate time signified unto Daniel in his seventy weeks, when it did begin, and when we are to expect the end thereof." And a new way it is indeed, not only diverse from, but upon the matter, contrary unto the catholic faith of the church of God, both Judaical and Christian, ever since the first giving out of the prophecy. And such a way it is, as is not only groundless, as we shall discover in the examination of it, but also dangerous unto the Christian faith if received. Yet because the author of it (if he be yet alive) is a person holy, modest, and learned, and proposeth his conjectures with submission unto the judgment of others, not peremptorily determining what he says, (page 51,) his discourse deserves our consideration, and it ought to be answered with a sobriety suited to that wherewith it is proposed. And herein we shall attend unto the method chosen by himself, which is first to give reasons and arguments to prove, that this prophecy cannot be applied unto the coming of the Messiah, and then those which countenance, as he supposes, the application of it unto these latter days, both which shall be examined in their order.

§ 3. That which in general he first insisteth on, as a reason why this prediction should be considered as not applicable to the times of the Messiah, is the difference that is among learned men about the chronological computation of the time here limited. The variety of opinions in this matter he terms monstrous, and the difficulties that attend the several calculations inextricable. But whether this reason suit his purpose, it is easy to determine; yea, it seems to have strength on the other side. For notwithstanding the difficulties of the exact computation pretended, not one of them whom he mentions, nor scarce any other person, ancient or modern, before himself, or a very few besides, did ever doubt, or call in question, whether the time designed, did concern the coming of the Messiah or not. And it seems to be a greater evidence of the truth thereof, that no difficulty in the computation did ever move them to question the principle itself.

Besides, this is indeed no tolerable argument, namely, that learned men cannot agree in the exact computation of any time appointed unto such an end, to prove that it was not designed unto that end, as is evident from other instances in the Scriptures to the same purpose. Thus God tells Abraham that his seed should sojourn in a strange land four hundred years, Gen. xv. 13, which Stephen repeats, Acts vii. 6. After this, Moses, with some difference in the years themselves, affirms that their sojourn in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years, Exod. xii. 40, which St. Paul repeats,
Gal. iii. 17. Now learned men greatly differ about the right stating of this account, as from what time precisely the computation is to be dated: and that on the very same reason which divides their judgments in the stating of these weeks in Daniel. For as in this place of Daniel, the angel fixes the beginning of the time limited unto the going forth of the decree to build Jerusalem, and there being several decrees at several seasons, made as it should seem to that purpose, they are not agreed from which of them precisely to begin the account. So Paul affirming, that the four hundred and thirty years began with the giving of the promise unto Abraham, it having been several times, and at several seasons solemnly given unto him, there is great question from which of them the computation is to take its date and beginning. And yet, as notwithstanding this difficulty, no man ever doubted, but that the years mentioned contained the time during which Abraham and his posterity were in Egypt; so, notwithstanding the difficulties and difference pleaded about the computation of these weeks of Daniel, no man ever doubted but that the time limited in them, was that allotted unto the Judaical church and state, until the coming of the Messiah. The like difference there is amongst learned men about the beginning and ending of the seventy years in Jeremiah, allotted unto the Babylonish captivity; and that because the people were carried captive at three different times by the Babylonians.

There is, therefore, indeed, no weight in this exception, which is taken merely from the weakness and imbecility of the minds of men, not able to make a perfect judgment concerning some particular points in this divine account. And as we shall afterwards manifest, it is of no great importance to the principal, yea, only end of the prediction itself, whether we can do so or no. But yet that this difficulty is not so inextricable as is pretended, but as capable of a fair solution, as any computation of time so far past and gone, we shall, I hope, sufficiently evidence in the account that shall be subjoined unto our exposition and vindication of the prophecy itself.

§ 4. From this general consideration, the learned author proceeds to give five particular reasons to prove his opinion, which we shall examine in their order. And the first is as followeth:—

'Because,' saith he, in no place of the New Testament is this prophecy used against the Jews to prove the Messiah already come.'

Answ. If this reason should be allowed to be cogent, it would disarm the Christian church of the principal testimonies from the Old Testament on which it hath always rested, as proofs that the Messiah is long since come, and that Jesus of Nazareth is he. For as evidences of that nature are sparingly recorded in the writings of the gospel, so of the most evident and illustrious unto that purpose, there is no mention at all therein. And it is most evident, that both in dealing with the Jews, and in the instruction of his own disciples, the Lord Jesus made use of innumerable other testimonies, besides those which are recorded in the books of the New Testament. So also did his apostles, and other primitive teachers of the gospel. Hence they are said to prove Jesus to be the Christ out of Moses and the prophets, and he is said to have instructed his disciples out of Moses and all the prophets in the things concerning himself; and yet the particular places whereby the one and the other was performed, are not recorded.

Besides, this reason laboureth under another unhappiness, which is, that it is grounded upon a mistake. For, indeed, this prophecy is expressly made use of in the New Testament, to denote the time by us allotted unto it; add that by our Lord Jesus Christ himself. For Matt. xxiv. 15,
speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, which, according unto this prediction was immediately to succeed upon his coming and suffering, he says unto his disciples, ‘When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand,) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.’ That which here is called βεστιγμα της ερημωσεως, or των ερημωσων, (as the words of the evangelist are inserted into the version of the LXX. in this place,) is, the ‘desolater’ or ‘waster over a wing of abominations;’ that is, as Luke interpreteth the words, an army compassing Jerusalem unto the desolation thereof, chap. xxi. 20. Wherefore, our Saviour expressly applying this prophecy of Daniel to the destruction of Jerusalem, which was the consequence of his passion, he plainly declares, that in his suffering, and the desolation that ensued on the Jews, this whole prediction and limitation of time is fulfilled, and ought not to be sought after in any other season of the church. And this is abundantly sufficient, not only to render the foregoing reason utterly useless, but also to supersede all the following considerations and arguments, as being arguments which contend directly against the interpretation of this prophecy, given us by the Lord Christ himself. But yet, having made this entrance, we shall examine also the ensuing reasons, in their order.

§ 5. It is added, therefore, Secondly, ‘If the restoration of the city, ver. 25, is of the material Jerusalem after Nebuchadnezzar’s captivity, it must begin in the first year of Cyrus, from which time seventy weeks of years will fully expire long before the birth of Christ.’

Answ. There are sundry learned men who despair not of making good the computation from the first year of Cyrus, whose arguments it will not be so easy to overthrow, as to make their failure in chronology to be the foundation of so great an inference as that here proposed, namely, that the coming of the Messiah is not intended in this prophecy. But we shall afterwards prove that there is not only no necessity that the decree mentioned for the restoration of Jerusalem, ver. 25, should be thought to be that made in the first year of Cyrus, but also that it is indeed impossible that any such decree should be intended, seeing no such was made by him, but only one about the re-building of the temple, to which there is here no respect. Another decree, therefore, express to what the angel here affirmeth, we shall discover, from which unto the sufferings of Christ, the seventy weeks are an exact measure of time.

§ 6. He adds, Thirdly, ‘the first division of the seventy weeks is seven weeks of years, ver. 25. The end whereof is expressly characterized by the setting up of a Messiah governor, which cannot be verified in the setting up of the first governor of the Jews after the captivity, much less of Christ. For Zerubbabel was set up in the beginning, and Christ long after the end of all. No other governor can be meant after the first; because the setting up of one pointeth at the first. Therefore, if the seven weeks end not in the setting up of Zerubbabel or Christ, as they cannot, then they cannot be verified in the material state of Jerusalem after the captivity of Babylon.’

Answ. This exception fixeth on one of the greatest difficulties in the text, which yet is not such as to bear the weight of the inference that is here made from it. For the argument from the division of the time in the text, is of this import; because it is said, ‘that from the going forth of the decree to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks the street shall be built again, and the wall in troublous times;’ therefore, if the seven weeks end not in the setting
up of Zerubbabel or Christ, they cannot be verified in the material state of Jerusalem after the captivity. Now, I see not the force of this argument; for the words may have another interpretation, and the separating of the seven weeks from the sixty-two, as all of them from the seventy before mentioned, excluding one out of the distribution, may be to another end than to denote either the setting up of Zerubbabel, which assuredly they did not, or the coming of Christ, which they extend not unto. In brief, they do not precisely assert that at the end of the seven weeks Messiah the Prince should be; for although they are distinguished from the other for some certain purpose not expressed, yet, as to the determination of the coming of the Messiah, they are to be joined with the sixty-two weeks, as is expressly affirmed in the following words. Now, not to prevent myself in what is more largely afterwards to be insisted on, in the exposition of the several passages of this prophecy, after a full consideration of what sundry learned men have offered for the solving of this difficulty, I shall here briefly propose my apprehension concerning it, which I hope the candid and judicious reader will find to answer the scope of the context, and the design of the place.

§ 7. First, I fix it here as unquestionable, that the whole space of seventy weeks doth precisely contain the time between the going forth of the decree, and the unction of the Most Holy, with his passion that ensued, some few years of the last week remaining, not reckoned on, to keep the computation entire by weeks of years. This is so expressly affirmed, ver. 24, that the interpretation of all that ensues is to be regulated thereby. And this, which we shall afterwards prove, we here take for granted, as the hypothesis on which the present difficulty is to be solved. There is, then, a distribution of these seventy weeks into seven, sixty-two, and one; upon the account of some remarkable events, happening at the distinct expiration of those several parcels of the whole season, ver. 25. We have two portions of this time expressed, namely, seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; and two events attending them, Messiah the Prince, and the building of the street and wall. 'From the going forth of the decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks the street shall be built again, and the wall in troublous times.' The two events here mentioned, did follow the two distinct parcels of time limited, but not in the order which the words at first view seem to represent, as is evident from the context. For as the Messiah did come at the expiration of the seven weeks, so the sixty-two weeks were not expired before the building of the city; nor is that mentioned as the event designed by the whole space of sixty-nine weeks, but as that which should fall out in some interval of it; for the prophecy issues not in the restoration, but in the desolation of the city.

The angel, therefore, expresseth the distinct divisions of time, and the principal distinct events of them, but not the order of their accomplishment. For the natural order of these things is, that in seven weeks the building of the city, wall, and street should be finished, and in sixty-two weeks after, the Messiah should be cut off. And this is evident from the text; for as the building of the city can no way be said to be after the sixty-two weeks, but in and after the seven, which was the season wherein the decree was executed; so the cutting off the Messiah is expressly said in the next verse, to be after those sixty-two weeks, which succeeded unto the seven weeks wherein the restoration of the city was finished. And to suppose the Messiah, in ver. 25, not to be the same with the Messiah, ver. 26, and the
Most Holy, ver. 24, is to confound the whole order of the words, and to leave no certain sense in them. For the single remaining week, the use of it shall be afterwards declared. This distinction, therefore, of the several portions of the whole time limited, doth rather confirm our application of this prophecy, than any way impeach the truth or evidence of it.

§ 8. It is added, fourthly, That 'the cutting off the Messiah here spoken of, is expressly joined with the destruction of the city in one week, to be accomplished the last seven years; whereas Christ suffered above thirty years before the destruction of the material Jerusalem,' ver. 26, 27.

Answ. There appears no such thing in the text. The destruction of the city and people, is only mentioned as a consequent of the cutting off and rejection of the Messiah, without any limitation of time wherein it should be performed; and de facto it succeeded immediately in the causes of it, and in the direct tendency of things thereunto.

§ 9. In the last place, he says, "Those phrases, ver. 24, 'to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to purge iniquity,' and 'to bring in everlasting righteousness,' are manifest characters of the time of the end, as shall be shown."

Answ. But why are not the other ends expressed in the prophecy, namely, 'to seal up vision and prophecy,' and 'to anoint the Most Holy,' here mentioned also? Why is that phrase, י臾 יָדֹבִּל, translated, 'to purge iniquity;' whereas, it rather signifies, 'to make atonement or reconciliation for iniquity?' Is it not because it would be very difficult to make any tolerable application of these things unto the season, which is called, 'the time of the end?' In brief, these things are so proper, so peculiar unto the Lord Christ, and the work of his mediation, that in the first, direct, and proper sense, they cannot be ascribed to any other things or persons, without some impiety. And there is no reason why we should here wrest them from their native and genuine signification; all which will be fully manifested in our ensuing exposition of the words themselves.

§ 10. I shall not here insist on those reasons and arguments whereby we prove the true and only Messiah to be intended in this prophecy. For as they are needless unto Christians, who are universally satisfied with the truth hereof, so we shall from the context and other evidences, immediately confirm them against the modern Jews and their masters. In the meantime, wholly to remove this unexpected objection out of our way, I shall show the inconclusiveness of those pretences, which the same learned author makes use of, to countenance his application of this whole angelical message unto the Christian churches of these latter days, which are these that follow:—

§ 11. First, saith he, 'Because the effects characterizing the end of those years, the consuming of transgression, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness, are effects to be accomplished in the Christian church at the fall of antichrist. Isa. i. 25—28, and xxvii. 19; Apoc. xxi. 27.'

Answ. These are but some of the effects mentioned, and one of them not rightly expressed; there are others in the prophecy, as 'the anointing of the Most Holy,' and 'cutting off the Messiah,' that can with no colour of probability be applied unto that season. 2. However, something analogous unto what is here spoken of as an effect and product of it, may be wrought at another time in the conformity of the church unto its head, yet properly and directly, as here intended, they are the immediate effects of the anointing, death, and sufferings of Jesus Christ. 3. The places quoted
out of Isaiah have no respect unto the churches of the latter days, other than all Scripture hath which is written for their instruction. 4. The things mentioned, Apoc. xxi. 27, are effects of this work of Christ in and towards his church, not the work itself here expressed, as the first view of the place will manifest.

§ 12. He adds, 'In the other prophets, the restoration of the Christian church from the Babylon of Antichrist, is in like types proportionably represented; Isa. x., xi., xiii., and xiv.; Jer. l., li.; Apoc. xiv. 6, 7, 8, xvi. 19, xv. 7, xviii. 2, 10, 21.'

Answ. I know not what is understood by 'represented in the like types.' There are no types in this prophecy, but a naked continuance of the Judaical church, until the coming of the Messiah, and of the work that he should accomplish at his coming, with the effects and consequences thereof. To allow types in these things, is to enervate all the prophecies which we have of him in the Old Testament. 2. The places directed unto in Isaiah and Jeremiah, intend not the deliverance of the Christian churches, unless it be κατά δευτερον σκοπον, and in those places the expressions are in no way coincident with, or suited unto this prophecy. 3. Where any thing is represented in a type, there must be an accomplishment of somewhat, answerable unto it in the type itself; and such was the deliverance of the Israelites from Babylon of old insisted on by those prophets. But here our author allows no such type, but refers the whole prophecy directly and only unto the Christian churches. 4. In the Revelation, indeed, the deliverance of the churches of Christ from antichristian persecution is foretold; but this cannot prove that the coming and suffering of the Messiah may not be immediately intended, as undoubtedly it is in this place.

§ 13. He says, thirdly, 'In all other prophecies of Daniel, the main subject of them is the history of antichrist, the Waldensian saints, and their successors, restored and reduced out of antichristian captivity. See chap. vii. 2, viii. 10—12.'

Answ. This is Petitio Principii, and hath no foundation but the arbitrary hypothesis of our author; and it seems strange that there should be so many prophecies of the churches of Christ, and none amongst them of Christ himself. But this is far from the genius and strain of the Old Testament, all the principal prophecies whereof directly respect him, and the church only as built on him. 2. Grant therefore (for we will not needlessly contend) that some of those prophecies may concern these latter times, it doth not at all follow that this also must so do, considering the great variety of Daniel's visions; and there are arguments unanswerable to prove that this prophecy does not relate to the latter times, as will afterwards appear.

§ 14. It is added, fourthly, That 'the parallel' proportion of phrase argueth the anointed Prince, ver. 25, to be the Prince of the covenant, ch. xi. 22, which there doth signify the princes of the Waldenses.'

Answ. 1. That expression, כְּהִיָּה יִשָּׁר, ver. 25, is not well rendered the anointed Prince. It is Messiah, the Prince, King, or Leader, as all translations whatever agree. And indeed this is, if not the only, yet far the most signal place in the whole Old Testament, wherein the promised Redeemer is directly called the Messiah, whence his usual appellation in both churches, Judaical and Christian, is taken. For there is not above one place more where he is immediately and directly so called, and not in his types: neither is that place without controversy. To interpret this expression, therefore, in this place otherwise, is to take away the foundation
of that name of our Redeemer, by which the Holy Ghost, in the New Testament, doth principally propose him unto our faith and obedience; which certainly would be in prejudicium fidei Christianoe. 2. The Prince of the covenant, ch. xi 22, in those wars of Antiochus Epiphanes, or persecutions of antichrist, (I determine not whether,) may be another from Messiah the Prince here promised.


Answ. They do more fitly agree to the times of the building of Jerusalem, and last destruction thereof, concerning which they are spoken. All streights and destructions have somewhat alike in them, wherein they may seem to agree; but it doth not thence follow, that one is intended in the prediction of another.

§ 16. It is further urged, "The effects of the last weeks are parallel with the antichristian persecution, described Apoc. xi. For as the Christian church is in both places signified by the holy city, Apoc. xi. 2, with Dan. ix. 26, and streights of time said in both places to go before the last afflictions, Apoc. xi. 5, iii. 7, with Dan. ix. 25, so the last afflictions are also proposed with marvellous agreement; those three years and a half of tyranny over the conquered saints, in the end of the persecution; here half a week of years, that is precisely three years and a half, cut out for the same end. The war immediately preceding the foresaid triumph, Apoc. xi. 7, here in like manner."

Answ. 1. The likeness of phrases and expressions in setting out different events which agree only in some general points, (especially in the predictions that concern Christ and his church, which is predestinated to be conformed unto him,) is so frequent in the prophecies of the Old Testament, that nothing unto the purpose of this learned author can be concluded from such an observation concerning these places. 2. The Christian church is not intended by the holy city, Dan. ix. 26, but expressly that city which was to be built by the decree of the king of Persia, whose condition was revealed unto Daniel upon his prayer for it, and about it. 3. It is no wonder that there should be streights before desolations, at all seasons of them whatever. 4. The half week cut off from the rest of the weeks, is not to be three years and a half of persecution, tyranny, and triumph; but on the contrary, it is designed for the confirmation of the covenant, by the preaching of the gospel; so that here is nothing of the parallelism pretended in the places compared.

§ 17. He proceeds: "From the beginning of the second half of the last week, or of the three years and a half, a prince is said to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, ver. 27, a phrase ascribed unto antichrist, ch. viii. 11; xi. 31."

Answ. I have shown before, that the similitude of phrases in different places, is no ground to conclude that the same things are intended. 2. The phrases are not the same, nor alike in the places compared. Concerning him who it is spoken of, ch. viii. 11, it is said, דודְוִרֵי הָאָדָם; and of them, ch. xi. 31. דודְוִרֵי הָאָדָם, they shall take or remove away the continual offering; that is, hinder the observation of it, and attendance unto it, when it ought to be observed. Of the Prince, ch. ix. 27, it is said, חָיָה, he shall cause to cease sacrifice and offering; so that de jure, they ought no more to be observed.

§ 18. "In the same time," saith he, "the said Prince is said, ver. 27,
for the overspreading of abominations to make desolate; a phrase attributed unto antichrist, ch. viii. 12, 13. xi. 31, there said to set up the abominations making desolate.'

Answ. As great desolations and destructions are treated of in all these places, it would not be strange if the same author should express the like events in the same terms; yet those which we are referred unto, are not the same in the original, nor of any considerable correspondency. And the like may be said of another instance, which he adds in the ninth place, between an expression, ch. ix. 27, and ch. xi. 36, wherein is no agreement at all, and the places treat directly of things different, yea contrary.

§ 19. It is added, in the last place, 'That as in the seventy weeks, the division of the seven from the sixty, and of both from the one week, are inapplicable to the material restoration out of real Babylon, so they will exactly and precisely agree to the restoration out of antichristian Babylon, as shall be shown.'

Answ. That the distribution of the seventy weeks mentioned in the text, is applicable unto the continuance of the Jewish church and state, with the coming of the Messiah, and the accomplishment of his work, hath been already shown, and shall be fully cleared in our ensuing exposition of the place. 2. Unto the exact answering of it unto the restoration of the church from antichristianism, I shall only say, that if men may be allowed to fix epochs arbitrarily at their pleasure, and to make application of what is spoken in any place of Scripture unto what things and persons they please, there is no doubt but that they may make their own imaginations adhere and agree well enough together.

§ 20. This brief view we have taken of the reasons of this reverend author; both of those whereby he endeavours to prove, that in this prophecy the coming of the Messiah is not intended, and those whereby he would induce a persuasion, that the whole of it is not only applicable unto, but also doth directly intend the state and condition of the church in these latter days. And now, whether he hath proved his assertion, and whether his arguments are sufficient to deprive us of the catholic faith of the church in all ages, concerning the import of this angelical message unto Daniel, is left unto the judgment of sober and learned men. For my part, I shall take it for granted that all his arguments are so far removed out of our way, as that we may proceed with our designed explication and vindication of this prophecy from the exceptions of the Jews, without any disturbance from them.

§ 21. There are three things that in this illustrious prophecy offer themselves unto our consideration.

First, The general testimony given unto the coming of the Messiah, and the limitation of time wherein he should so come.

Secondly, The especial sense of the words in the several passages of it, and the distinct prophecies contained in them.

Thirdly, The chronological computation of the time designed, in an exact account of the space of time limited from the beginning unto the end.

The first of these is that wherein principally we have to do with the Jews; namely, to prove from hence that there was a time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah, which is long since expired. And all things herein we shall find clear and evident. Both the space of time limited, and the several coincidences of its expiration, are sufficiently manifest. In the second, also, we have to deal with them, in order to the
confirmation of the former. In both these, their latter masters have studiously endeavoured to involve the words in difficulty and perplexity, which must be removed by the consideration of the use and genuine import of these words, as also by considering the scope of the prophecy, and by the help unto the understanding of it, which is contributed from other places of Scripture. The third is attended with sundry entanglements, which although they are not absolutely inextricable, yet are such in respect of some minute parts of calculation, as will not suffer us to hope, that we can adduce such demonstrative proof, as that all men should be compelled to acquiesce therein. This is sufficiently manifested in the different calculations of the most learned, both of the ancient and modern writers, who have laboured in this subject. In reference therefore hereunto, I shall do these two things: First, Manifest that our argument from this place is not at all concerned in the exact chronological computation of the times to which the accomplishment of this prophecy relates. And, secondly, Shall demonstrate that this difficulty may be removed, by giving a clear and satisfactory account of the time specified and limited, such as is not liable unto any material objection.

§ 22. First, It is evident in general, that, in this passage, the Holy Ghost reveals the time wherein the Messiah was to come, and to perform the work allotted unto him. And from this arises the argument which we now insist upon. No small part this was of the church’s treasure of old, and a blessed guide it would have been unto the faith and obedience of them concerned therein, had it been diligently attended unto. But having sinfully neglected it in its season, they have ever since wickedly opposed it. To Daniel, it was granted as a great favour, relief, and privilege, upon his deep humiliation, and fervent supplication, as himself records. ‘Whilest, saith he, ‘I was speaking and praying, (with fasting, sackcloth, and ashes, ver. 3,) and confessing my sins, and the sins of my people Israel, and presenting my supplications before the Lord my God, for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whilst I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation; and he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications, the commandment came forth, and I am now come to show thee, for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision: Seventy weeks,’ &c. ver. 20—23. This was the answer that God gave him upon his great and fervent prayer for the church, and that for his relief, comfort, and support; whence it is evident manifest, that the great blessing of the church was enwrapped in it. And the specification of time mentioned, was granted as a light to guide the Jews, that they might not make shipwreck of their souls at the appointed season. But when the time of its accomplishment drew nigh; they being generally unenlightened and carnal, and filled with prejudices against the proper work of the Messiah, wholly disregarded it. And since the misery that has come upon them for not discerning this time and judgment, most of them do cry out against all computations of time about the coming of the Messiah, although they are plainly called and directed thereunto by God himself. Neither can they conceal the vexation which from hence they receive, by finding the design of the prophecy so directly against them. Hence this place of Daniel, for the time of the coming of the Messiah, and the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, for his office and work, are justly esteemed the racks and tortures
of the Rabbins. It may not therefore be amiss, in our way, to take a little prospect of their perplexity in this matter.

§ 23. In the Talmud, Tractat. Sanedrin, they have laid down this general rule, Male percut qui temporum articulos suppetunt quibus venturus est Messiah. Or, as they express it, by a solemn curse in the name of Rabbi Jonathan, a great man among them, ‘let their bones rot who compute the times of the end.’ And in Shebet Jehuda, (wherein they follow Maimonides in Jad. Chazekah, Tractat. de Regib. cap. 12,) they give a particular account of that solemn maladiction against the computers of times. ‘It was invented,’ they say, ‘because upon the mistakes of their reckonings, or failings of their calculations, the people are apt to despond, and begin to suspect that he is already come.’ So openly do they own it to be an invention to defend their unbelief against their convictions. Yet this hath not hindered some of their chief doctors, when they hoped to make some advantage of it, (as when they saw their disciples under any distress inclining to Christianity,) to give out their conjectures, without any respect unto the Talmudical curse. So the author of Shalscheleth Hakakala assigns the year for the coming of the Messiah to be the 5335th from the creation, which, according to their computation, fell out about the year of the Lord, by our account, 1575. Another would have it to be in the year 5358, that is twenty-three years after, in the year 1598. Abarbinel, in his Comment on Isaiah, comes short of these, assigning it to the year 5263, or 5294 at the farthest; for he had great expectations from the issue of the wars between the Christians and Saracens that were in his days. Their utmost conjecture in Zohar is upon the year 5408, which, with their wonted success, fell out in the year of our Lord 1648, or thereabouts. All these calculations were invented to serve some present exigency.

But the Talmudical curse is pointed directly against them that would conclude any thing from the account of Gabriel given unto Daniel in this place. This they plainly acknowledge, in a disputation which they had with a converted Jew, before the bishop of Rome, recorded in their Shebet Jehuda. Only they would except Daniel himself, affirming that he was not חכמה נוכח, a computer of the time, but מרא, a seer; as though the question were about the way and means whereby we attain a just computation of the time, and not about the thing itself. Daniel received the knowledge of this time by revelation, as he did the time of the accomplishment of the captivity, though he made use of the computation of time limited in the prophecy of Jeremiah; but in both he gives us a perfect calculation of the time, and so cannot be exempted from the Talmudical malediction. I mention these things in the entrance of our considerations of this prophecy, to manifest how far the Jews despair of any tolerable defence of their cause, if the things recorded in it be duly weighed. This then we see in general, that the Holy Ghost directed the church to compute the time of its spiritual deliverance by the coming of the Messiah, no less evidently than he did that of their temporal deliverance from the Babylonish captivity. Neither are there more differences among Christians about the precise beginning and ending of Daniel’s seventy weeks, than were and are about the beginning and ending of the seventy years of Jeremiah amongst the Jews. This rule was given them by God himself, to direct and guide them, if they would have attended unto it, in that darkness, and under those prejudices, with which the coming of the Messiah was attended.

§ 24. And it is observable, that although it was not the will of God that they should exactly know the year and day of the accomplishment of
this promise, or although they could not attain unto it, or had lost the tradition of the true sense of it, yet about the end of the time pointed unto in this computation, they were all of them raised up to a great expectation of the coming of the Messiah. And this is not only evident from the gospel, wherein we find, that upon the first preaching of John Baptist, they sent unto him to know whether he were the Messiah or not, and were all of them in expectation and suspense about it, until he publicly disavowed any such character, and directed them to him who was so indeed; but also from sundry other testimonies, to which they can make no exception. Their own historian tells us, that what principally moved and instigated them to undertake an unequal war with the Romans, was the ‘ambiguity (as he thought) of the oracle, that about that time one of their nation should obtain the monarchy of the world.’ Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. 7, cap. 12, which he, to promote his own interest, wrested unto Vespasian, who was far enough from being one of their nation. Now they had no divine oracle about the coming of the Messiah at that season, but this of Daniel. And so renowned was this oracle in the world, that it is taken notice of by both the famous Roman historians, who wrote the occurrences of those days. 'Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis Sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore ut valesceret orientes, prefectique Judææ rerum potirentur,' saith Tacitus, Histor. lib. 5. 'Many had a persuasion, that there was a prophecy in the ancient sacred books, that at that time the east should prevail, and that the governors of Judea should have the empire of the world.' And Suetonius, in the life of Vespasian; 'Percreberat toto oriente vetus et constans opinio, ut eo tempore Judææ praefecti rerum potirentur.' An ancient and constant persuasion was famous all over the east, that at that time governors of Judea should have the empire; and this, as he adds, drew the Jews into their rebellion and war against the Romans.

Now this oracle was no other but this prophecy of Daniel, whose accomplishment at that time the Jews all over the east expected. And they acknowledge in their Talmud, that they were made prodigiously obstinate in the war they had undertaken against the Romans, by their continual expectation every day and moment, that their Messiah who was to come about that time, would appear for their relief; for because of some expressions in this prophecy, they always looked for his coming in some time of great distress. But this through their lusts and blindness was hid from them, that their distress indeed arose from their rejection of him, who was come, and had actually called them unto that repentance, which alone would have prevented it. And this persuasion, that the Messiah was to come about the end of Daniel's weeks, and that those weeks were now come to an end, was so fixed in their minds, that when they found that he came not as they thought according unto their expectation, they attempted to make a Messiah themselves, even the famous Barcosbi, which proved the means and cause of their utter extirpation out of the land of Canaan, as hath been declared. Thus was it with them of old, whose posterity, through obstinacy in their unbelief, do now curse all that compute the time of his coming, and confounding it with his second appearance at the end of the world, refer it to the last day, or to a small proportion of time immediately preceding it.

§ 25. The prophecy itself, that we may return to its consideration, contains a mixture of things good and desirable, with those that are terrible and dreadful. That there is a prediction of things penal, in destructions and desolations upon or after the close of the seventy weeks, is both plain
in the text, and acknowledged by the Jews. That there is any thing of mercy, love, and grace, contained in the words, some of them deny. This course takes Abarbinel in his הים וירעלת, 'springs or fountain of salvation.'

But this figment is directly contrary to the whole prophecy, the context, and the express words of the text. The vision itself was granted unto Daniel in answer unto his prayer. That the design of his solemn supplication was to obtain mercy and grace for Israel, is also plainly declared. The answer is given him in a way of mercy and love, and for his consolation in his great distress. And is it not strange, that the Spirit of God should direct him to pray solemnly for grace and mercy, and should give him a blessed answer, designed for his support and comfort, which should contain nothing at all of the mercy prayed for, but fitted only to distress him with wars, desolations and destructions? As such an apprehension hath nothing in the Scripture to warrant it, so it is altogether dissonant from reason. Besides, the things mentioned and summed up, ver. 24, contain the very substance of all the good things that ever were promised unto the church from the foundation of the world; and which it had for many ages been nourished with the expectation of. But these things will be more particularly evinced in our ensuing discourse.

§ 26. For the computation itself, the Jews universally acknowledge, that the Sevens here denote sevens of years; so that the whole duration of the seventy sevens, comprehend four hundred and ninety years. This is granted by R. Saadias Haggao, Jarchi, and Kimchi, on the place. Here we have no difference with them, nor others. For it were lost labour to divert unto the consideration of the fancy of Origen, who (Homil. 29, on Matthew) would have every seven to contain seventy years, ten years to each day, and the account to begin at the creation of the world, making the whole sum of years to be 4900, which expired, as he thought, at the coming of Christ. Apollinaris also indulged a more vain imagination, supposing the prophecy to give an account of the whole space of time, from the death of our Saviour unto the end of the world.

But these fancies are exploded by all. Both Jews and Christians are generally agreed, that the precise duration of the time determined, is four hundred and ninety years, and that it does not extend farther than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; whether it reach so far or no, shall afterwards be discussed. That which we have to prove and establish from this prophecy against the Jews, is first, That the true and only Messiah promised unto the fathers, is here spoken of; and the time of his coming limited. Secondly, That he was to come, and to discharge his work before the expiration of the seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years from their proper date; that is, before the sacrifice and oblation were caused to cease in the destruction of the city and temple. These things, if we clearly evince from the text, we have satisfied our argument, and confirmed that the Messiah is long since come. Neither are we, as to the import of the testimony itself, concerned in that chronological computation of the time limited, which we shall afterwards inquire into. The first thing incumbent on us, is to prove that it is the true and only Messiah, and his coming that is here spoken of. And this we shall do, 1. From the context and scope of the prophecy. 2. The name whereby he is called. 3. The work assigned unto him. 4. The general confession of the Jews of old. 5. The follies and open mistakes of the latter Jews in substituting any other thing or person in his stead.
§ 27. First, The context and scope of the place evidence him to be intended. This in general was before declared. It was about the greatest concern of that people, that Daniel had newly made his supplications. The answer given him is, as the angel declares, suited unto his desires and requests; and it contained an account of their state and condition, until the consummation of all things that concerned them. The end of that people, or that for the sake of which they were a church and people, was, as we have demonstrated, the bringing forth of Him, in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Until this was accomplished, it was impossible, from the decree and promise of God, that they should fall under an utter rejection, or final desolation. But this is plainly foretold, as that which should come to pass at the end of the time here determined, or instantly upon it. יטביה הוהמו וצל חכמ ש_coupon מושמשヴ י: נר, 'He shall cause the oblation and sacrifice to cease;' that is, utterly and everlastingly, putting thereby a period and final end unto their church state and worship. But what then shall become of the people? 'By a wing of abominations he shall make them desolate,' or cause them to be wasted and laid desolate by overspreading armies, either in themselves abominable, or abhorred by them. And in both these senses were the Roman armies, חכמ ש_coupon, 'a wing of abominations.' Neither was this to endure for a season only, but unto a consummation of the whole, ver. 27. Now it was inconsistent with all the promises of God, and the sole end of his wisdom in all that he had to do with that people, that this desolation should happen before the production of the Messiah. It being therefore expressly said in the text, that the Messiah should come before all this were accomplished, who can be intended thereby, but he who was promised unto the fathers from the foundation of the world?

Secondly, This whole revelation was granted unto Daniel for his relief in the prospect that he had of the ensuing calamities of the church; and recorded by him for the support thereof in those distresses, as were also those prophecies of Haggai and Malachi, before insisted on. Now, the only general promise, which God, for the consolation of his church of old, renewed unto them in all ages, was this concerning the Messiah, where-in all their blessedness was enwrapped. This we have already manifested from Moses, and all the prophets who ensued in their several generations. And he is therefore here no less intended.

Thirdly, Whatever benefit, privilege, or advantage the church had any ground or reason to expect from the promises of God at the coming of the Messiah, they are all here expressed, as we shall immediately declare. And we may truly say, that if the things mentioned, ver. 24, were to be wrought by any other than the Messiah, the church had much more reason to desire him, than the Messiah himself, as for any other work which remained for him to do.

Fourthly, Unless the Messiah and his blessed work be here intended, there is not one word of comfort or relief unto the church in this whole prophecy. For those who deny his coming here to be foretold, are forced violently to wrest the expressions in ver. 24, unto things utterly alien and foreign from the plain and only signification of the words. And how inconsistent this is with the design of this angelical message, we have before manifested. The context therefore evidently bespeaks the true Messiah to be here intended.

§ 28. Secondly. That the names and titles given unto the person spoken of, declare who he is that is designed. He is called הושע, Messiah,
and that κατ' εξοχήν, by way of eminence, and absolutely. Indeed, the very name of the Messiah, as appropriated unto the promised seed, is taken from this place alone; for it is no where else used of him absolutely. His Messiah, or the Messiah, of the Lord, that is his Anointed, is often used; but absolutely the Messiah here only. And is it not probable, that the name being used but once absolutely in the Scripture, any other should be intended, but he alone whose name absolutely alone it is? The name therefore sufficiently denotes the person.

The addition of κατ' εξοχήν, ver. 25, μεσίαν κατ' εξοχήν, 'Messiah the Prince,' makes it yet more evident. For as this word is often used to denote a supreme ruler, one that goeth in and out before the people in rule and government, as 2 Sam. vii. 8; 1 Kings i. 35; 1 Kings xiv. 7, and in sundry other places, so it is peculiarly assigned unto the Messiah, Isa. lv. 4. 'Behold I have given him a witness unto the people, a leader, or prince, and commander unto the people.' And those words are thus paraphrased by Jonathan, אָנוּכִּינוּ מֵהָרִים מֵהָרָה מִלְּקַל שְׁעֵלָתָנוּ, אֶל לְמָלַיְהָא, 'Behold, I have appointed him a Prince to the people, a King and Ruler over all kingdoms.' This is the same with מֵהָרִים, ṢEz, 'Messiah, the Prince, Leader, or Ruler over all.' And this is the same with מֵהָרִים, Mic. v. 1, 'the Ruler;' and רְאוּר, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 'the Shepherd;' and אֶשֶּׁר, 'the Prince, or Ruler, Mal. iii. 1, the Lord.' And to ascribe this name of מֵהָרִים, מֵהָרִים מֵהָרִים, 'Messiah the Prince,' absolutely unto any but the promised seed, is contrary to the whole tenor of the Old Testament.

Moreover, he is called, ver. 24, קָדוֹשׁ, 'the Holiest of the Holies, the Most Holy: Sanctitas Sanctitatum, in the abstract, the Holiness of Holinesses.' The most holy place in the tabernacle and temple was so called; but that cannot be here intended. The time is limited, לֵאמֶל קָדוֹשׁ, 'to anoint or to make a Messiah of the Most Holy.' But by the confession of the Jews, the holy place in the second temple was never anointed, because it was not lawful for them to make the holy oil. But suppose it was anointed, it must have been so long before the expiration of these weeks, which ended, as they suppose, in its final destruction; and in truth not long before. It must therefore be the person typified by the holy place, in whom the fulness of the Godhead was to dwell, that is here said to be anointed. Had there been any Targum on the Hebrew chapters of Daniel, we should have better known the sense of the ancient Jews in this matter than we now do. Some of them in after ages agree with us. Nachmanides tells us, קָדוֹשׁ כְּהֶן יְהוָה מַשִּׁיחַ, 'this Holy of Holies is the Messiah,' מַשִּׁיחַ כְּהֶן יְהוָה קָדוֹשׁ, 'who is sanctified from amongst the sons of David.' So he on the place.

§ 29. Thirdly. The work assigned to be done in the days of this Messiah here spoken of, and consequently by him, declares who it is that is intended. Sundry things there are in the text belonging unto this head; as, 1. 'Finishing of transgression.' 2. 'The making an end of sin.' 3. 'Making reconciliation for iniquity.' 4. 'The bringing in of everlasting righteousness.' 5. 'The sealing up of vision and prophecy.' 6. 'His being cut off, and not for himself.' 7. 'Confirming the covenant with many.' 8. 'Causmg the sacrifice and oblation to cease.' All these, especially as coincident, demonstrate the person of the Messiah. He that shall call to mind what hath been evinced concerning the nature of the first promise, the faith of the ancient Judaical church, the person, office, and work of the Messiah, will, upon the first consideration of these things conclude that this is he. For we have in these things a summary of the Old Testament, the substance of all temple
institutions, the centre of all promises, a brief delineation of the whole work of the promised seed. Wherefore, although it be not an exposition of the place that we have undertaken, but merely a demonstration of the interest of the Messiah therein; yet because the consideration of the particular expressions above mentioned will give light into the strength of the present argument, I shall in our passage briefly unfold them.

§ 30. The first thing designed is, נֶפֶשׁ דְָּם. The time determined for the coming of the Messiah is also limited, נֶפֶשׁ דְָּם, ‘ad cohibendam prævaricationem;’ to restrain, forbid, coerce, make an end of transgression. נֶפֶשׁ, is to shut, to shut up, to forbid, to coerce, to refrain, or restrain, Psal. exix. 101. נבָא, ‘I have refrained,’ or kept my feet from every evil way, Psal. xl. 12. ‘Thou Lord, נבָא נֶפֶשׁ, wilt not withhold, or restrain thy mercy from me.’ So also to shut up, or put a stop unto, as Jer. lii. 3; Haggai i. 10; 1 Sam. xxv. 33; Psal. lxxxviii. 9. Thence is נבָא, ‘carcer,’ a prison, wherein men are put under restraint. From the similitude of letters and sound in pronunciation, some suppose it to have an affinity in signification with נבָא, ‘to consummate, to end, to finish.’ But there is no satisfactory instance of this coincidence. For although נבָא do sometimes signify to restrain or shut up, as Psal. lxxiv. 11, yet נבָא no where signifies to consummate, finish, or complete. The first thing therefore promised with the Messiah, which he was to do at his coming, was to coerce and restrain transgression, to shut it up from overflowing the world so universally as it had done formerly. Transgression from the day of its first entrance into the world, had passed over the lower creation like a flood. God would now set bounds unto it, coerce and restrain it, that it should not for the future overflow mankind as it had done. This was the work of the Messiah. By his doctrine, by his Spirit, by his grace, and the power of his gospel, he set bounds to the rage of wickedness, rooted out the old idolatry of the world, and turned millions of the sons of Adam unto righteousness. And the Jews who deny his coming, can give no instance of any other restraint laid upon the prevalence of transgression within the time limited by the angel; and thus they directly deny the truth of the prophecy, because they will not apply it unto him unto whom alone it doth belong.

§ 31. The second thing to be done at the season determined, is מַשְּׁלָה, מַשְּׁלָה, ‘to seal up sins;’ γον σφραγίζεται, ‘to seal, or to seal up.’ The expression is metaphorical. To seal, is either to keep safe, or to hide, cover, and conceal. The former can have no place here, though the word seem once to be used in that sense, with reference unto sin, Job xiv. 14. But this sense hath a perfect inconsistency with what is spoken immediately before, and what follows directly after in the text. And the most proper sense of the word is to cover or conceal, and thence to seal, because thereby a thing is hidden, Cant. iv. 12. Now to hide sin or transgression in the Old Testament, is to pardon it, to forgive it. As then the former expression respecteth the stop that was put to the power and progress of sin by the grace of the gospel, as Titus ii. 11, 12, so doth this the pardon and removal of the guilt of it, by the mercy proclaimed and tendered in the gospel. And in this way of expression is God said to ‘cast our sins behind his back, to cover them, and to cast them into the bottom of the sea.’ That this was no way to be done but by the Messiah, we have before evinced. Neither can the Jews point out any other way in which this part of the prediction was accomplished within the time limited. For setting aside this one consideration of the pardon of sin procured by the mediation of the Messiah, and there was never any age wherein God did
more severely bring forth sin unto judgment, as themselves had large experience.

§ 32. Thirdly, This season is designed, יְנוּר רָצָבָל, to make reconciliation for iniquity. To reconcile iniquity; so our apostle, ρητω, renders this expression, Heb. ii. 17, ἰδικτεσσαὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, to reconcile iniquities. That is, ἰδικτεσσαὶ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, to make reconciliation with God for iniquity, to make atonement. The sense of the word רכזב, when applied unto sin, is known and granted. If it be spoken of God, it is to hide, to cover, to pardon sin, to be gracious unto sinners; if of men in the use of any of his institutions, it is to propitiate, appease, atone, make atonement or reconciliation, as I have elsewhere at large declared. How this was to be done by the Messiah, hath been already evinced. This was that work for which he was promised unto our first parents from the foundation of the world. That he was to do it, we are taught in the Old Testament; how he did it, we are taught by the gospel. To expect this atonement for sin from any other, or to look for its being wrought by any other ways or means, is fully to renounce the first promise, and the faith of the fathers from the foundation of the world.

§ 33. That which in the fourth place is mentioned, answers the former. To make reconciliation for iniquities, and בֵּית יְהוָה יִשָּׂא לְעַל מָאתָם, to bring in everlasting righteousness. There was a legal righteousness amongst the people before, consisting partly in their blameless observation of the institutions of the law, and partly in their ritual atonements for sin, made annually and occasionally. Neither of these could constitute their everlasting righteousness. Not the former, for 'by the deeds of the law can no flesh be justified;' that is, not absolutely, whatever they might be as to the possession of the promised land. Not the latter; for as our apostle observes, the annual repetition of legal sacrifices did sufficiently manifest that they could not make perfect them that came unto God by them.

In opposition to these, an everlasting righteousness, such as is absolute, perfect, and enduring for ever, is promised to be brought in by the Messiah; the righteousness which he wrought in his life and death, doing and suffering the whole will of God, being imputed unto them that believe. And this בֵּית יְהוָה יִשָּׂא לְעַל מָאתָם, 'everlasting righteousness,' procureth and endeth in the ἡσυχίαν ἔνα, 'everlasting salvation' mentioned, Isa. xlv. 17, both opposed unto the ritual righteousness, and temporal deliverance of the law. To declare the nature, and the way of bringing in this righteousness, is the design of the gospel, Rom. i. 16, 17. And I desire to know of the Jews, how it was brought in within the time limited. According unto their principles, the time here determined, was so far from being a season of bringing in everlasting righteousness, that by their own confession it brought in nothing but a deluge of wickedness in the sins of their nation, and oppressions of the Gentiles. This, therefore, is the proper work of the Messiah, foretold by the prophets, expected by all the fathers, and not denied by the Jews themselves at this day, though they would shamefully avoid the application of it unto him in this place. But he, whoever he be, that brings in everlasting righteousness, He, and no other, is the promised seed, the true and only Messiah.

§ 34. The fifth thing here foretold, is in those words, בֵּית יְהוָה יִשָּׂא לְעַל מָאתָם, 'to seal vision and prophet.' אֲלֵב for הָאָסָב, prophet for prophecy; the concrete for the abstract. The expression being metaphorical, is capable of a triple interpretation or application, every one of them proper unto the Messiah, to his work, and to the times wherein he came, and to no
other. 1. To seal, is to consummate, to establish, and confirm. Things are perfected, completed, established, and confirmed, by sealing; Jer. xxxiv. 44; Isa. viii. 16; John iii. 34; Rom. iv. 11. In this sense, vision and prophecy were sealed in the Messiah. They had all of them respect unto the coming of the just One, the promised seed. God had spoken of him by the mouths of his holy prophets, from the foundation of the world. In the bringing of him forth, he sealed the truth of their predictions by their actual accomplishment. The law and the prophets were until John, and then they were to be fulfilled. This was the season wherein all vision and prophecy centred, this the Person who was the principal subject and end of them: He, therefore, and his coming, is here foretold. 2. To seal, is to finish, conclude, and put an end unto any thing, Isa. xxix. 11. Thus also were vision and prophecy then sealed among the Jews. They were shut up and finished. The privilege, use, and benefit of them, were no more to be continued in their church. And this also fell out accordingly. By their own confession, from that day to this, they have not enjoyed either vision or prophet. That work, as unto them, came wholly to an end in the coming of the Messiah. 3. By sealing the confirmation of the doctrine concerning the Messiah, his person and office, by vision and prophecy, may be intended. The visions and prophecies that went before, by reason of their darkness and obscurity, left the people, in sundry particulars, at great uncertainty. Now all things were cleared and confirmed. The spirit of prophecy accompanying the Messiah, and by him given unto his disciples, foretold by Joel, ch. ii. 28, 29, was in his revelations express, clear, and evident, directing unto, and confirming every thing belonging unto his person and doctrine. Neither had these words any other accomplishment but what is contained in these things.

§ 35. Sixthly, It is affirmed that, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ, ‘Messiah shall be cut off:’ not occidetur, shall be slain, as the vulgar Latin renders the word, but excidetur, shall be cut off; that is, penally, as one punished for sin. For the word הָרָכָּח, when it includes death, constantly denotes a penal excision, or cutting off for sin; see Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 15; Numb. xv. 30. This the Jews themselves acknowledge to be the meaning of the word. So Rab. Saadias Gaon in Hæmunoth, cap. 8, יִרְכָּח, תַּחְתָּא כְּפַרְכוּ הַלֹּא יִרְכָּח קָרְבָּנָא כְּפֵרָיָא מַעַרְרָא, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ וּנְלָא עֲלֵי מִי שִׁפְדוּ הַמֶּשֶׁחַ בָּדִּירֵי, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ וּנְלָא עֲלֵי מִי שִׁפְדוּ הַמֶּשֶׁחַ בָּדִּירֵי, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ וּנְלָא עֲלֵי מִי שִׁפְדוּ הַמֶּשֶׁחַ בָּדִּירֵי, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ וּנְלָא עֲלֵי מִי שִׁפְדוּ הַמֶּשֶׁחַ בָּדִּירֵי, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ וּנְלָא עֲלֵי מִי שִׁפְדוּ הַמֶּשֶׁחַ בָּדִּירֵי, יִרְכָּח מֶשֶׁחַ dara and unmerited. It is not used for slaying, unless it be of him who is slain by the sentence of the Judge; or is judicially cut off, as it is said, Every one that eats of it shall be cut off,’ Lev. xvii. 14. It is then foretold, that the Messiah shall be cut off penally for sin; which he was, when he was made a curse for sin, all our iniquities meeting upon him.

And this also is intimated in the ensuing particles, יִרְכָּח, ‘and not to him.’ For an objection is prevented that might arise about the penal excision of the Messiah; for how could it be, seeing he was every way just and righteous. To this it is answered by way of concession, that it was not on his own account, not for himself, but for us, as is at large declared, Isa. li. Or, יִרְכָּח, ‘not to him,’ may be a farther declaration of his state and condition; namely, that notwithstanding those carnal apprehensions which the Jews would have of his outward splendour, glory, wealth, and riches, yet in truth he should have nothing in or of this world, none to stand up for him, not where to lay his head. And this is that part of the prophecy, for the sake whereof the Jews so pertinaciously contend, that the true Messiah is not here intended. For, say they, he shall not be penally cut off. But who told them so? Shall we believe the angel or them? Will
they not suffer God to send his Messiah in his own way, but they must tell him that it must not be so? To cast off prophecies when, and because they suit not men's carnal lusts, is to reject all authority of God and his word. This is that which hath proved their ruin, temporal and eternal: they will not receive a Messiah that shall suffer, and be cut off for sin, though God foretold them expressly that it must be so.

§ 36. It is added, seventhly, concerning the person here spoken of, and whose coming is foretold, 'he shall confirm,' or strengthen, 'the covenant unto many.' The covenant spoken of absolutely, can be none but that everlasting covenant which God made with his elect, in the promised seed; the great promise whereof was the foundation of the covenant with Abraham. And hence God says, that he will 'give him for a covenant unto the people,' Isa. xlii. 6; chap. xlix. 8. And the salvation which they looked for through him, God promiseth through the blood of the covenant, Zech. ix. 11. This covenant he strengthened unto many in the week wherein he suffered, even unto all that believed in him. This everlasting covenant was ratified in his blood, Heb. ix. 15, and after he had declared it in his own ministry, he caused it to be proclaimed in and by his gospel. At the time here determined, the especial covenant with Israel and Judah was broken, Zech. xi. 10, and they were thereon cast off from being a church or people. Nor was there at that season any other ratification of the covenant, but only what was made in the death of the Messiah.

§ 37. Then also, eighthly, did he cause to cease the sacrifice, and gift or offering. First, He caused it to cease, as unto force and efficacy, or any use in the worship of God, by his own accomplishment of all that was pre-figured by it, or intended in it. Hereby it became as a dead thing, useless, unprofitable, and made ready to disappear, Heb. viii. 13. And then shortly after, he caused it utterly to be taken away, by a perpetual desolation brought upon the place where alone sacrifices and offerings were acceptable unto God, according unto the law of Moses. And this is the third evidence that this prophecy affords unto our assertion; namely, that it is the true promised Messiah, and none other, whose coming and cutting off is here foretold. The great things here mentioned, were fulfilled in him alone; nor had they ever the least respect unto any other. And the Jews do not in any thing more evidently manifest the desperateness of their cause, than when they endeavour to wrest these words unto any other sense or purpose.

§ 38. Moreover, besides the confession of the ancient Jews, consenting unto the truth contended for, we have for our confirmation therein, the woeful perplexities of their later masters in their attempts to evade the force of this testimony. For some ages, they have abhorred nothing more than that the true Messiah should be thought to be here intended. For if that be once granted, they know that it brings an instant ruin on the pretences of their infidelity; and that not merely on account of the proof of his having come, against which they have invented a sorry relief, but also on account of what is here foretold respecting his being penalily cut off, which can no way be reconciled unto their presumptions and expectations. But if he be not here intended, it is incumbent on them to declare who is. For the utmost extent of the time limited in the prediction being long since expired, the prophecy hath certainly had accomplishment in some one or other; and it is known, or may be known who, or otherwise the whole angelical message never was, nor ever will be, of any use to the church of God.
But here our masters are by no means agreed amongst themselves; nor do they know what to answer unto this inquiry. And if they do guess at any one, it is not because they think it possible he should be designed, but because they think it impossible for them to keep life in their cause, and not to speak when the sword of truth lies at the heart of it. Some of them therefore, affirm the Messiah spoken of to be Cyrus, whom God calls רמיה, 'his anointed,' Isa. xlv. 1. But what the cutting off, or death of Cyrus should make in this prediction, they know not. Nor do they endeavour to show that any thing here mentioned, as connected with the cutting off the Messiah, hath the least relation unto Cyrus or his death. And if because Cyrus is once called the anointed of the Lord, he must be supposed to be intended in that place, where no one word or circumstance is applicable unto him, they may as well say, that it is Saul the first king of Israel who is spoken of, seeing he also is called רמיה, 'the anointed of the Lord,' 1 Sam. xxiv. 6, as was Zedekiah also, Lam. iv. 20. But it must needs be altogether incredible unto any, (unless they are Jews that can believe what they please that serves their ends,) that because the Lord calleth Cyrus his anointed, in reference unto the especial work of destroying the Babylonian empire, in which sense the term of anointing, namely for a designation unto any employment, is obvious and familiar in the Old Testament, should therefore be esteemed the promised Messiah of the people of God, who is here evidently described. But that which sinks this fancy beneath all consideration, is the time allotted to the cutting off of the Messiah.

Those among the Jews themselves, who begin the account of the weeks from the most early date imaginable, fix their epoch in the giving of the promise unto Jeremiah, concerning their return from captivity, which was in the days of Jehoiakim. Now from thence unto the death of Cyrus, no computation will allow above eighty years; which comes short somewhat above four hundred years of the season here allotted for the cutting off the Messiah. And the same is the case with Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, whom some of them would have to be designed. For neither were any of them penal cut off, nor did they cause in any sense the sacrifices to cease, but endeavoured to promote the observance of them in a due manner; nor did they live within some hundred years of the time determined, nor was any other thing which is here foretold, wrought or accomplished in their days.

§ 39. Abarbinel, and after him Manasseh Ben Israel, with some others of them, fix on Agrippa, the last king of the Jews, who, as they say, with his son Monabasius, was cut off or slain at Rome by Vespasian. A learned man in his Apparatus ad Origines Ecclesiasticas, mistakes this Agrippa for Herod Agrippa, who was σωζηκεφιοτης, Acts xii. But he who died long before the destruction of the city is not intended by them, but the younger Agrippa, the brother and husband of Berenice. Neither is there any colour of probability in this fancy. For that Agrippa was never properly king of the Jews, having only Galilee under his jurisdiction, nor was he ever anointed to be their king, nor designed of God unto any work on the account whereof he might be called his anointed, nor was he of the posterity of Israel, nor did by any thing deserve an illustrious mention in this prophecy. Besides, in the last fatal war, he was still of the Roman side and party; nor was he cut off or slain by Vespasian, but after the war lived at Rome in honour, and died in peace. Yea, he did not only outlive Vespasian, but Titus and Domitian, his sons, also; and continued unto the third year of Trajan, as Justus the Tiberian assures us in his History, whose words
are reported by Photius in his Bibliotheca. So that οὐδεν ὑπερε, there is nothing of truth, no colour of probability in this desperate figment.

§ 40. Their last evasion is, that by 'Messiah the Prince,' the office of magistracy and priesthood, and in these all anointed unto authority, are intended. These, they say, were to be cut off in the destruction of the city. And herein they have the consent of Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, among the ancients, who are also followed by some latter writers. But this evasion also is of the same nature with the former, yea more vain than these, if any thing may be allowed so to be. The angel twice mentioned the Messiah in his message. First, His coming and anointing, ver. 25, and then his cutting off, ver. 26. If the same person or thing be not intended in both places, the whole discourse is equivocal and unintelligible, no circumstance being added to mark a difference between them, who are called by the same name in the same place. And to suppose that the Holy Ghost, by one and the same name, within a few words, continuing his speech of the same matter without any note of difference or distinction, should signify things diverse from one another, is to leave no place for the understanding of anything that is spoken by him. The Messiah therefore who was to come, and to be anointed and cut off, is one and the same individual person. Now, it is expressly said that there shall be seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, that is four hundred and eighty-three years, from the going forth of the decree, unto Messiah the Prince. I desire, therefore, to know whether that space of time was passed before they had any such magistrates or priests, as they pretend afterwards were cut off. This is so far from truth, that before that time, the rule of the Hasmonæans, the last supreme magistrates of their own nation, was put to an end. This pretence, therefore, may pass with the former. And this perplexity of the modern Jews, in their attempts to apply this prophecy unto any other thing or person besides the true Messiah, confirms our exposition and application of it. There is no other person that they can imagine, unto whom any one thing here mentioned may seem to belong; much less can they think of any, in whom they should all centre and agree. It is then the promised Messiah, the hope and expectation of the fathers, whose coming and cutting off is here foretold.

§ 41. That which remains for the full confirmation of our argument from this place, is, that according unto this prophecy the promised Messiah was to come whilst the temple was standing, and the daily sacrifice continued, before the expiration of the seventy weeks of years limited by the angel. This is put beyond all question in the text itself; nor is it denied by the Jews, all whose exceptions lie against the person spoken of, whom we have proved to be the Messiah. Seventy weeks are assigned by the angel for the accomplishment of the whole prophecy, and all things contained in it. After seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, that is, in the beginning or middle of the last week, the Messiah was to be cut off. When this was past, and the covenant confirmed with many, upon the expiration of the whole time limited, the daily sacrifice was to cease, and an overflowing desolation was to come upon the city and temple. This, the Jews themselves acknowledge to be the destruction brought upon them by the Romans, nor do any of them extend the four hundred and ninety years any farther. It remains, therefore, that the Messiah came before that desolation, which is that we undertook to demonstrate from this place.

§ 42. There are yet some arguments to the same purpose with those foregoing that remain. But, before we proceed unto them, it will be neces-
sary to consider the computation of the times, which we are here directed unto by the angel. I have already manifested, that our argument from this place is not concerned in the exact chronological computation of the time here limited, as to its precise beginning and ending, with the commensuration of it unto the times, seasons, and accounts of the nations of the world. For, whenever the time mentioned began, all men agree that it is long since expired, namely at, or before, the desolation of the city and temple. Now, all that we undertook to prove, which also is sufficient unto our present purpose, is, that before that season the Messiah was to come, and to be cut off, which we have done, and cleared our argument from all further concernment in this account. But yet that it may appear that this testimony is not embarrased by the chronological difficulties which occur in the computation of time here determined, as also that there are no such difficulties therein, but what are fairly reconcilable unto all that is affirmed in the text, before we proceed to the consideration of our remaining arguments, these difficulties shall also be considered and stated in the ensuing exercitation.

EXERCITATION XV.


§ 1. That there is some difficulty in finding out the true and exact computation of the time here limited, all chronologers and expositors do confess. Neither is there any thing that belongs unto the account of the times mentioned in the Scripture, that hath been debated of old, or of late, with more difference of opinion, or diligence of endeavour. And the Holy Ghost himself, by the angel, seems to intimate this difficulty unto Daniel, in the double caution given him about it in the preface of the revelation made unto him, ver. 23, זָכַר בָּדַר בְּעָכוּר וְצָכַר נַחֲלָה and והשלמה כמו כַּדָּר כִּי וּכְתֻב declaring that not ordinary wisdom, diligence, consideration, and understanding, is to be used in the investigation of the time here determined. Nor is it necessary to suppose that Daniel himself exactly understood the beginning and ending of the time
or weeks mentioned. The hiding of the precise time intended, was indeed greatly subservient unto the providence of God, in the work which he had to do by the Messiah, and in what that people were to do unto him. The general notation of it sufficed for the direction of the godly, and the conviction of unbelievers, as it doth unto this day. And it may be, we shall not find any computation that will exactly answer in all particulars and fractions to a day, month, or year. And, that either because of the great darkness and confusion of some of the times falling under the account, or else because perhaps it was not the mind of God that ever the time should be so precisely calculated, or that any thing which he revealed for the strengthening of the faith of his church, should depend on chronological niceties. It shall suffice us then to propose and confirm such an account of these weeks, which infallibly comprising the substance of the prophecy, contains nothing in it contrary to the Scripture, and is not liable unto any reasonable exception. And herein I shall not examine all the accounts and computations that by learned men of old, or of late, have been given, (being eleven or twelve in number,) but only mention those which carry the fairest probability, and the names of whose authors or abettors call for our consideration.

§ 2. In the first place, we may wholly lay aside the consideration of them, who would date the weeks from any time whatever before the first year of the reign, and first decree of Cyrus. Among these are Lyra, Burgensis, Galatinus, and he from whom he borrowed his computation, Raymandus Martini. These fix the beginning of the weeks on the fourth year of Zedekiah, as they say, when Jeremiah gave out his prophecy about the Babylonish captivity, and the return from it at the end of seventy years; indeed, the fourth year of Jehoiakim, and not of Zedekiah, as is apparent, Jer. xxv. 1—11.

Of the like nature is the account of Solomon Jarchi, among the Jews, who dates the time limited from the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans. But both these accounts are expressly contrary to the words of the angel, fixing the beginning of the time designed, on the going forth of a decree for the building of Jerusalem. To these we may add, all that would extend these weeks beyond the destruction of the city and temple by Titus, as some of the Jews would do, to comprise the prophecy of their second fatal destruction by Hadrian, which is no way concerned in it.

§ 3. The seventy weeks then mentioned, we must seek for, between the first year of Cyrus, when the first decree was made for the re-edification of the temple, and the final destruction of it by the Romans. This space we are confined unto by the text; the seventy weeks are מוקָמָא דָּרֵךְ לְהַשְׁמיעָה, dari, from the going forth of the word to cause to return and build Jerusalem,' ver. 25. Now, the kingdom of Cyrus had a double first year. The one absolutely of his reign over Persia, the other of his rule over the Babylonian monarchy, which he had conquered after the death of Darius Medus. Now, it is the first year of this second date of the kingdom of Cyrus, which has relation unto the time here limited; for whilst he was king of Persia only, he could have nothing to do with the Jews, nor make any decree for the building of the temple, both the people and place being then under the dominion of another. Besides, in Ezra i. 11, where it is said, that he made his decree in the first year of his reign, himself plainly declares that he had obtained the eastern monarchy by the conquest of Babylon. The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; which words can in no sense be applied unto the kingdom of Persia,
supposing the monarchy of Babylon still to continue. The whole space of
time then, here limited, is seventy weeks, ver. 24. The beginning of these
seventy weeks is the going forth of the decree or word to restore or build
Jerusalem, ver. 25. The first decree or command that could have any relation
unto this matter, was that made by Cyrus in the first year of his
empire. We must, then, in the first place, find out the direct space of time
between the first year of Cyrus, and the destruction of the temple, and
then inquire whether the whole or what part of it, is denoted by these
seventy weeks.

§ 4. Some, I confess, there are, who contend that there is no considera-
tion to be had of that computation of time, which we find amongst the
heathen writers, nor of those stated epochs by which they limited and dis-
tinguished their computations. For whereas, say they, we have certainly the
term of this duration of time, its beginning and end fixed, namely, the first
of Cyrus, and the death of Messiah, it is thus positively determined, that
between them were seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, unto
which all other accounts are to be squared, and made proportionable. In-
deed, the conclusion were unquestionable, if the premises were certain. If
the terms be rightly fixed in the first of Cyrus, and the death of the
Messiah, there must be but 490 years between them: for whether we under-
stand the reason of it or not, all foreign accounts must be suited unto the
infallible truth which is stated in the Scripture.

But these things are much questioned; for some doubt whether the time
limited do absolutely expire in the death of the Messiah, and be not rather
to be extended unto the destruction of the city and temple, and there be
many more that do peremptorily deny that it is to take its date from the
first decree of Cyrus. And so must we also, unless it can be proved that
the times mentioned are justly commensurate from thence unto the death of
Messiah. For, seeing there were other decrees, as we shall find to the
same purpose, which might be respected as well as that; there is no
reason why we should offer violence unto other approved computations, to
force them to submit unto the Scripture account, when we first offer violence
unto that Scripture account, to make it serve our own opinion. I shall,
therefore, proceed in the way proposed, and first give a just computation of
the time from the first year of the empire of Cyrus, unto the destruction of
the city and temple, and then inquire whether the seventy weeks, or 490
years here determined, be commensurate unto the whole, or only unto
some part of it; and if to some part only, then to what part of it, and how
we are directed by the text to the beginning and end of the computation.

And herein, I shall not scrupulously bind myself unto days, or months,
or seasons of the year in any single account, but only consider the full and
and round number of years, which, in such computations, according to the
custom of holy writ, is to be observed. And indeed, partly through the
silence, and partly through the disagreement of ancient historians, it is
utterly impossible to state exactly, as to those lesser fractions, the times that
are passed of old. And we seek for no more certainty in these things, than
the condition of them will naturally bear.

§ 5. It is generally agreed by all historians and chronologers, that
Cyrus began his reign over Persia in the first year of the fifty-fifth Olympiad;
probably the same year that Nabonidus, or Darius Medus began his reign
over Babylon. And this was the year wherein Daniel set himself solemnly
to seek the Lord for the delivery of the people out of captivity, he being
now come to a kingdom who was so long before prophesied of to be their
deliverer, Dan. ix. 1. In the twenty-seventh year of his reign, or the first of the sixty-second Olympiad, having conquered the Babylonian empire, he began the first year of his monarchical reign, from whence Daniel reckons his third, which was his last chap. x. 1. And therein he proclaimed liberty unto the people of the Jews, to return to Jerusalem, and to build the temple, Ezra i. 1. The city and temple were destroyed by Titus, in the third year of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad; now from the first year of the sixty-second Olympiad, unto the third of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad inclusive, are five hundred ninety-nine years, and within that space of time are we to inquire after, and find the four hundred and ninety years here prophesied of, and forotold.

§ 6. Of this space of time, the Persian empire from the twenty-seventh of Cyrus, or first of the whole monarchy, and the first of the sixty-second Olympiad, continued two hundred and two years, as is generally acknowledged by all ancient historians, ending on, and including in it, the second year of the one hundred and twelfth Olympiad, which was the last of Darius Codomanus. For Cyrus reigned after this three years; Cambyses and Smerdes Magnus eight; Darius Hystaspis, thirty-four; Xerxes, with the months ensuing of Artabainus, twenty-one; Artaxerxes Longimanus, forty-one; Darius Nothus, nineteen; Artaxerxes Mnemon, forty-three; Ochus, twenty-three; Arses, three; Darius Codomanus, seven; in all two hundred and two years.

After his death Alexander, beginning his reign in the third year of the 112th Olympiad, reigned six years: from him there is a double account, by the two most famous branches of the Grecian empire. The first is by the Syrian or Αέra of the Seleucidae, which takes its date from the tenth year after the death of Alexander, when after some bloody contests, Seleucus settled his kingdom in Syria, and reigned thirty years. After him reigned Antiochus Soter twenty-one years, Antiochus Theos fifteen, Seleucus Callinicus twenty, Seleucus Ceraunus two, Antiochus Magnus thirty-seven, Seleucus Philopater twelve, Antiochus Epiphanes twelve, Eupator two, Demetrius Soter ten. In the second year of this Demetrius, which was the 153d of the account of the Seleucidae, was Judas Maccabæus slain, being the one hundred and sixty-ninth year after the death of Darius Codomanus, or end of the Persian empire, allowing six years to the reign of Alexander, and ten more to the beginning of the kingdom of the Seleucidae. Demetrius Soter in the tenth year of his reign was expelled out of his kingdom by Alexander Vales (Balas); in the second year of whose reign, ten years after the death of Judas, Jonathan his brother took upon him the supreme government of the people of the Jews, and began the reign of the Hasmonæans. So that the time of the Grecian empire in Syria from the death of Darius Codomanus, unto the liberty of the Jews and erection of a supreme government amongst them, was one hundred and seventy-nine years, which being added to two hundred and two years of the Persian empire, makes up three hundred and eighty-one years.

§ 7. To the same issue comes also the account by the other branch of the Grecian empire in Egypt. For Alexander reigned, as we said, after the death of Darius, six years, Ptolemaeus Lagus thirty-nine, Philadelphus thirty-eight, Euergetes twenty-four, Philopater nineteen, Epiphanes twenty-three, Philometor thirty, in whose thirtieth year began the rule of the Hasmonæans.

§ 8. The power of the Hasmonæans, with that of Herod the great, who obtained the kingdom by means of their divisions, continued until the birth of Christ one hundred and forty years. For Jonathan began his reign
in the second year of the one hundred and fifty-seventh Olympiad, as may be seen, by adding the Seleucian Æra to the one hundred and fourteenth Olympiad, wherein Alexander died; and our Lord Christ was born in the second year of the one hundred and ninety-fourth Olympiad, in the last year, or the last save one of Herod the great. This sum of one hundred and forty eight years, being added to the aforementioned, from the beginning of the empire of Cyrus, which is three hundred and eighty-one years, makes up in all five hundred and twenty-nine years. From the birth of our Lord Christ in the second year of the one hundred and ninety-fourth Olympiad, to the destruction of the city and temple, in the third year of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad, are seventy years; which makes up the whole sum before mentioned of five hundred and ninety-nine years, from the first of the empire of Cyrus, unto the destruction of Jerusalem. Petavius and our Montacute reckon from the first of Cyrus, unto the eighteenth of Tiberius, wherein our Lord Christ suffered, five hundred and ninety-four years, which differs very little from our account. For take from them twenty-seven years of the reign of Cyrus, before the first of his empire, and add unto them thirty-seven for the continuance of the city and temple after the death of Christ, and the sum remaining will exceed our account only four years, or five at the most.

But the computation we have fixed on, being every way consistent with itself, and the stated arcs of the nations, and abridging the time to the shortest duration that will endure the trial, we shall abide by it. Now the number of five hundred and ninety-nine years, exceeds the time limited in this prophecy of four hundred and ninety, the whole space of one hundred and nine years.

§ 9. Hence it evidently appears, that the seventy weeks of Gabriel, or the four hundred and ninety years, are not commensurate to the whole space of time between the first decree of Cyrus in the first year of his general empire, and the final desolation of the city and temple by Titus. One hundred and nine years must be taken from it, either at the beginning or at the ending, or partly at the one, partly at the other.

§ 10. We shall first consider the end of them, which being clear in the prophecy will regulate, fix, and state the beginning. Two things in general are insisted on in this prophecy. 1st. The coming of Messiah the Prince, his anointing unto the work which he had to do, and his cutting off, as we before declared. 2d. The ceasing of the daily sacrifice, with the destruction of the city and temple by war and a flood of desolations. Now these things happened not at the same time; for the city and sanctuary were destroyed thirty-seven years after the cutting off, or death of the Messiah. We are therefore to inquire to which of these it was that the time specified in the prophecy hath respect. Now it is the coming, anointing, and cutting off of the Messiah, that is the thing chiefly intended in this prophecy. This we have proved undeniably before; manifesting that the vision was granted unto Daniel, and given out by him for the consolation of himself and the church, as was the way of the Holy Ghost in all his dealings with the fathers of old. Hereunto the desolation and destruction of the city and temple was only a consequent, a thing that should follow and ensue on what was principally foretold and promised. And it is doubtless unreasonable to extend the duration of the time beyond the principal subject, on the account whereof alone the computation is granted, unto that which is only occasionally mentioned as the consequent of the accomplishment of the prophecy itself. Besides the computation itself is pointed directly by the angel to the
Messiah, and his cutting off. 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people; know therefore, that from the going forth of the commandment, unto the Messiah the Prince shall be, &c. And after sixty-two weeks shall Messiah be cut off.' But there is no guidance or direction of the time limited unto the desolation of the city and sanctuary, which is only said to ensue thereon.

Thirdly. It is expressly said, that the time limited extends itself only to the death of the Messiah, or a very few years farther. For he was to come after seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, which are the whole time limited within one week or seven years. Now this coming here intended, is not his incarnation, but the time of his anointing in his baptism, which fell out at the end of sixty-nine weeks. After these sixty-nine weeks, or seven, and sixty-two, he is to be cut off; that is, in the middle, or towards the end of the last week; when he had confirmed the covenant by preaching three years and a half of that seven years which remained. And if we shall say that his anunction being to be after the seven weeks, and sixty-two, we must grant it to be in the first or second year of the last week, whereunto add the three years and a half of his preaching, and the remaining fraction of one year or two can no way disturb the account, there being nothing more frequent, than the casting in of such parcels of time to complete an entire and round number. Here then must we fix the end of four hundred and ninety years, in the death of the Messiah, and so wholly lay aside the account of them, who would extend the time determined unto the desolation of the city and temple.

§ 11. We must therefore, in the first place, abate from the whole account of five hundred and ninety-nine years before stated, the sum of thirty-seven years, which ensued after the death of our Saviour, until the destruction of Jerusalem; and the remnant is five hundred and sixty-two years. Now five hundred and sixty-two years exceeds the number of four hundred and ninety, stated in Daniel’s vision, by seventy-two years. It appears then, that the beginning and ending of the seventy weeks cannot be the decree of Cyrus, and the death of our Saviour; there being seventy-two years between them, more than the weeks contain, or can be extended unto. The end we have already fixed from the text, and therefore it doth not appear that their date and rise can be taken from the decree of Cyrus. Sundry things are offered to disentangle us from this difficulty.

The most learned Reynolds, in his Prelections on the Apocryphal books, allows our account above mentioned, as to the substance of it, especially that which concerneth the Persian empire, about which alone there is any considerable difference. But he resolves at length, that the number of seventy weeks, which is a round complete number, is put for an uncertain number, thereabouts, more or less, over or under, not much varying from it. And on this supposition, he dates the beginning of the weeks in the decree of Cyrus. To confirm his opinion, he gives sundry instances of this kind of computation in the Scripture, and contends that the particular reason of limiting the whole time to seventy weeks, was to make it answer unto the seventy years captivity that immediately preceded it; the time to follow being declared to be just seven times as much.

§ 12. If this interpretation of the words might be admitted, it would, I confess, solve all difficulties, and entirely preserve the sacred and profane accounts from all appearances of interfering. But there are two reasons, on account of which I cannot assent unto it. The first is, because indeed there is no other instance in Scripture in which a number of years coming
so far short of the true and exact account, as this doth, is put for the whole; especially considering that this number is given out for this very purpose, that men might aright compute it, and so come to know the time of its expiration. To name 490, for 562, seems rather to be a conjecture than a prophecy. It may be supposed that some few odd years may be added to make a full round number, but that so considerable a part of the whole as 72 is, should be thus accounted for, there is no reason to imagine.

Secondly. The word used by the angel to express the limitation of this time עַשְׁׁרִים plainly proves that a precise duration of time, and number of years is signified. The vulgar Latin renders that word abbreviatae, shortened, or cut short. And a learned man of our own approves of that interpretation of it, in opposition unto our own translation, and to that of Junius. ¹De annis (saith he) porro loquitur signanter Propheta quod sint, non decisi, (as Junius) non determinati (as ours) apud Deum statuti, (quod tamen verum erat) sed quod erant abbreviati, quemadmodum transitul doctissimus interpres vetus. Mon. App. ad Orig. Eccl. And then he disputes at large, how the years are said to be shortened; and yet concludes, 'dicuntur autem abbreviatae hebdomadae, eo quod erant decise et determinatae;' as though shortened or abbreviated was the proper sense of the word, only it might be interpreted, determined; or that the days are said to be shortened, because they were determined.

But the truth is עַשְׁׁרִים doth not signify to abbreviate or make short; and all the reasons given to show why the times are here said to be shortened, are perfectly cast away. It is used only in this place of Scripture, and that in the singular number joined with a noun of the plural, to intimate that every week of the whole number was limited and determined, and cut out, as is usual in the Hebrews. Among the Rabbins, it is to cut off, and from it is a piece cut off, as עַשְׁׁרִים יָקְטִיב, 'a piece of flesh cut off,' and עַשְׁׁרִים, is a cutting, or incision. So that the word in its precise signification, is cut out, or cut off, that is set apart, limited, or determined. And here it means a portion of time cut out, limited, and apportioned for the accomplishment of the work foretold. Now there is nothing more contrary unto a precise determination of time, than that a certain number of years should be used to signify an uncertain, and that so exceedingly distinct from the exact account, as 490 years are from 562. So that here is no place for the conjecture of that most learned and renowned person.

§ 13. The Jews take another course to solve this difficulty, as also to give some countenance to their computation, in beginning the numeration of the weeks from the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and ending it in the desolation of the second house by the Romans. They will allow no more kings of Persia than are mentioned in the Scripture, and they will not admit that they reigned any longer than they are mentioned therein of the years of their reign. As though whether they did good or evil towards Jerusalem, it was fatal unto them; so that they must needs die immediately upon it. Thus they will not allow that there were above four or five kings of Persia at most, and thereby contract the duration of that empire from two hundred years and upwards, to fifty years at the most. But this supposition stands in open contradiction to all generally allowed computation of time in the world. And not only so, but it excludes all consideration of events as notorious to mankind, as that there ever was a Persian empire. Of this nature are the transactions and wars with other nations, especially the Grecians, which did not happen in the days of any of the kings mentioned in the Scripture; especially that famous expedition
of Xerxes, which the whole world looked on, waiting for its event. And yet I acknowledge that this imagination might deserve consideration, if it could be pretended that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah did intentionally give us an account of the Persian empire, and of the reigns of the kings thereof, as some books do of the kings of Israel and Judah. But it is evident, that the design of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah is quite different; and that they mention only occasionally some of the kings of Persia, and some years of their reign, as these related unto the state and actions of the people of the Jews. It is therefore as foolish to contend from thence, that there were no more kings of Persia, than are mentioned in them, and that they reigned no longer than is in them expressed; as it would be to say that there were never above three or four kings of the Assyrian empire, because there are no more mentioned in the Scripture, although the reigns of other Assyrian kings are ascertained from other authorities. But this anachronism is beneath all consideration.

§ 14. There are other learned and pious men, who, resolving to date these weeks from the first year of Cyrus, and to make 490 years the exact measure of the time from thence unto the death of Messiah, and not being able to disprove the computation from Alexander to that time, fall also upon the Persian empire, and cut it short above fifty years of the true account of its duration, to fit it to the place and measure provided for it. To this end, they reject the accounts of the Chaldeans, Grecians, and Romans, concerning the time of its continuance, as fabulous, and give us a new arbitrary account of the reign of those kings whom they will allow.

This plan is adopted by Beroaldus, Broughton, Genebrard, and Willet, with sundry others. And the truth is, were the supposition once cleared, that the decree or commandment mentioned by Gabriel, must needs be given out by Cyrus, there were some colour for offering this violence to the accounts of this period, although these were written by men prudent and sober in their own days. But this is so far from being a foundation sufficient to bear such a structure, that take it nakedly of itself, it is destitute of all probability. The word, decree, or commandment mentioned unto Daniel, is that for the building of Jerusalem; that is, the restoring it to a condition of rule and government, that is the building of a city, and not only the setting up of houses. Consequent upon this, their building of the walls also for the defence of the people is mentioned. Of this it is said, that it should fall out in a troublesome time, or a time of straits, as accordingly it did fall out in the days of Nehemiah. In the whole there is not the least mention of building the temple, which, had it been intended, could not I suppose have been omitted. But in the decree of Cyrus, the principal thing mentioned and aimed at, is the re-edification of the temple, the city and the walls thereof being not spoken of in it, as may be seen in the first of Ezra at large.

It seems then evident that there were two decrees; that the decree mentioned by Daniel for the building of the city and walls, not the temple, and that given out by Cyrus, for the building of the temple, and not the city and walls, were divers. Besides this decree of Cyrus, although foretold long before, and made famous because it was the introduction to the people's return and settlement, yet it took effect for so short a space of time, being obstructed within less than three years, and utterly frustrated within four or five, that it is not likely to be the date of this prophecy, which seems to take place from some good settlement of the people. That this decree of
Cyrus is the term from which the seventy years should be computed, is argued with some colour of probability, from the prediction recorded, Isa. xlv. 8. It is there prophesied of him, that he should say to Jerusalem, ‘thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid.’ But yet neither is it here foretold that Cyrus should make any decree for the building of Jerusalem; or that it should be done in his days, as indeed it was not until a hundred years after, as it is evident from the story in Nehemiah. The whole intention of this prophecy, is only that he should cause the people to be set at liberty from their captivity, and give them leave to return to Jerusalem, which he did accordingly, and thereupon both the building of the city and temple ensued, though not without the intervention of other decrees; of which afterwards.

§ 15. The only argument to prove that the Persian empire lasted not above a hundred and fifty years, is taken from the life and age of Nehemiah. In Ezra ii. 2, he is reckoned among them that came up with Zerubbabel unto Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus. It may reasonably be supposed that he was then at least twenty or twenty-five years of age. And it seems from the last chapter of Nehemiah, that he lived to the reign of Darius Codomans: for Sanballat the Horonite assisted Alexander in his wars. And Jaddua whom he mentions ch. xii. 11, was high priest, when Alexander came to Jerusalem, as appears from Josephus. Now if the Persian empire continued for the space of two hundred years, which we have allotted unto it, then he who went to Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus, and continued unto the reign of Codomanus, must needs live two hundred and twenty years at the least; now it is not credible that any one should live so long in those days. And therefore the space of time must needs be shorter than is pretended, at least by fifty or sixty years. But indeed there is no force in this exception. For, first, There is no necessity to conclude that Nehemiah wrote that genealogy, ch. xii., where mention is made of Jaddua, who was afterwards high priest, ver. 11, for he ends his story in the high priesthood of Eliashib, ch. xiii. 28, who was great grandfather unto Jaddua, as appears, ch. xii. 10, 11. Or, however, if he did, Jaddua might then be a child, and might not come to the high priesthood until fifty or sixty years after; after the death of Eliashib, Joiada, and Jonathan, his great grandfather, grandfather, and father. So that no evidence can be taken from hence, for the continuance of his life unto the end of the Persian monarchy. And for Sanballat mentioned by Josephus in the time of Alexander, it is not improbable, that he might name him as the head of the Samaritans, there being no name of any other after him left upon record.

2. There is no more reason to think that the Nehemiah, mentioned Ezra ii. 2, who came up with Zerubbabel, was that Nehemiah who was afterwards governor of Judah, and whose actions are recorded in the book of Nehemiah, written in all probability chiefly by himself, than there is to think that the Seraiah there mentioned, was the Seraiah that was slain at the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The Daniel mentioned, Ezra viii. 2, was not Daniel the prophet, nor Baruch, Nehem. x. 6, that Baruch who was the scribe of Jeremiah: nor that Jeremiah mentioned, Neh. xii. 11, Jeremiah the prophet. Besides, Ezra is said to come up with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 1, which must either not be that Ezra the great scribe, or he must be said to come up with Zerubbabel, because he followed him on the same errand and account. It cannot be denied that there were sundry men at the same time of the same name, as the same person had sundry names. much more mights everal men have the same name in suc-
cessive generations. Thus after Joshua was high priest, there was another Joshua chief of the Levites, Neh. xii. 7, 8. And that about this time there were two Zerubbabels, one of the house of Nathan, the other of the posterity of Solomon, we shall make appear in the consideration of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. 3. That this was not the Nehemiah that went up with Zerubbabel, the sacred story itself gives us sufficient evidence. For, 1st, he was ignorant of the state and condition of Jerusalem when he lived in the court of Persia, ch. i.: had he been there before and seen their condition, and been but newly returned to Shushan, he could not be so surprised as he was, ver. 4, upon the account then given him thereof. 2nd. ch. vii. 5, 6, he speaks of it as a great matter, that he should find a roll or register of them that came first up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel in the days of Cyrus, amongst whom that Nehemiah was one. Now if this had been himself, what reason had he to mention as a great discovery, a thing with which he could not but by his own knowledge be fully acquainted. There is no reason then to surmise, that he was among them who returned from captivity in the days of Cyrus, whatever may have been the length of his life.

§ 16. The account therefore before laid down being established, it is certain enough, that the decree mentioned by Gabriel, from the going forth whereof the seventy weeks are to be dated, was not that of the first of Cyrus for the return of the captivity and building of the temple. For from thence, the period would end long before the just time allotted unto it, yea, before the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great, where Eusebius would have them to expire. We must therefore search for some other word, decree or commandment, from whence to date the four hundred and ninety years enquired after.

§ 17. The second decree of the kings of Persia in reference to the Jews, was that of Darius made in his second year, when the work of the building of the temple was carried on through the prophecy of Haggai and Zechariah. This is the decree or commandment mentioned in Ezra vi. granted by Darius, upon appeal made unto him from the neighbouring governors; and it was a mere revival of the decree of Cyrus, the roll whereof was found in Achmetha in the province of the Medes, ver. 2. And this is that which Haggai and Zechariah relate to, dating their prophecies from the second year of Darius, Hag. i. 2—10; Zech. i. 1. In the roll of the kings of Persia we find three called by the name of Darius, or Darianes as the Jews term him. 1. Darius Hystaspis, who succeeded Cambyses, by the election of the princes of Persia, upon the killing of Smerdes Magus the usurper. 2. Darius Nothus, who succeeded Artaxerxes Longimanus. 3. Darius Codomanus, in whom the Persian empire had its period by Alexander the Great. That the last of these can be no way concerned in the decree, is notorious. The two others are disputed. Most learned men grant that it was Darius Hystaspis who was the author of this decree; and indeed that it was so, at least that it can be ascribed unto no other Darius, we shall afterwards undeniably prove. And it is not unlikely that he was inclined unto this favour and moderation towards the Jews, by his general design to relieve men from the oppressions which they suffered during the reign of Cambyses, and to renew the acts of Cyrus their first emperor, who was much renowned amongst them. Thus he might hope to ingratiate himself with mankind, and confirm himself in that kingdom to which he came not by succession. And it is not improbable that he was the husband of Esther; but if this was the case it was not till after this decree, made in the second year of his reign, the putting away of Vashti happening
in the third, Esth. i. 3. Now Cyrus reigned after his first decree three years; Cambyses with Smerdes eight, to whom succeeded this Darius, who issued this decree in the second year of his reign, that is at most thirteen years after the death of Cyrus; or if with some we should grant Cyrus to have reigned twenty years over the whole empire, it was but nineteen or twenty years at the most. Now the whole sum of the years from the first of Cyrus to the cutting off the Messiah, we have manifested to have been five hundred and sixty-two: deduct thirteen years from five hundred and sixty-two, and there yet remains five hundred and forty-nine years which exceeds the number of years inquired after by fifty-nine years. The addition of seven years to the reign of Cyrus, does not make any alteration in this general account. For on that supposition his first year must be taken seven years backwards, and the space of time from thence unto the end of the weeks will be five hundred and sixty-nine years, and the remnant from Darius, as we declared before, five hundred and forty-nine years. So that neither can this be the commandment intended there being from the going forth of it, unto the cutting off of the Messiah, not four hundred and ninety years, but as is declared five hundred and forty-nine. Besides indeed this decree of Darius was no new command, nor had any respect unto the restoration of Jerusalem, but was a mere renovation of the decree of Cyrus about the re-edifying of the temple, and so, doubtless, was not designed as the signal epoch of the time here determined. § 18. The great Scaliger, who would date the weeks from this decree of Darius, knowing that the time would not suit with the reign of Darius Hystaspis, contends that it was Darius Nothus who succeeded Longimanus that was the author of it, and extends the whole time or space of four hundred and ninety years, to the destruction of the city and temple, that space of time, according to his computation, being elapsed from the second year of Darius. But the truth is, as may be seen from our former account, from the second year of Darius Nothus to the destruction of the city, was but four hundred and eighty years, which is short of the whole sum. Besides, we have before proved from the text, that the time determined was to expire in the death of the Messiah. And there are sundry other circumstances which plainly evince the inconsistency of this computation; for from the first of Cyrus, when the first command went forth for the building of the temple, whereupon the work of it was begun, unto the second year of Nothus, are fully a hundred and eight years. And it is not credible, that the work of building of the temple should so long be hindered, and then come to perfection by them who first began it. For on this supposition, Zerubbabel and Joshua must live at Jerusalem after their return, above a hundred years, and then take in hand again the work which they had so long deserted. And this is yet more incredible upon his own opinion, that Xerxes was the husband of Esther, about fifty years before the reign of Nothus. For it is likely that the Jews would have attempted, and would have been able to effect the building of the temple, while Esther was queen.

Neither is it consistent with the prophecy of Jeremiah, that the temple should lie waste so long a space, that is about a hundred and seventy years. Again, Haggai plainly declares, that when the work of the temple was carrying on in the second year of Darius, many were yet alive who had seen the first temple, chap. ii. 3, as multitudes were upon the laying of its foundation in the days of Cyrus, Ezra iii. 12. Now, this was impossible had it been in the days of Nothus, a hundred and sixty, or a hundred and seventy years after it was destroyed. And Scaliger plainly wrests the words
of the text, when he would have them to be spoken by way of supposition: 'If any were then alive who saw the first house in its glory.' For Haggai evidently speaks with reference to the distress of the people, upon the laying of the foundation of the house, mentioned Ezra iii. 12, and the words themselves will bear no other sense: "מִי מַעְסֵס הַנַּעֲשֶׂה אֶשְׁתִּי וַאֲמָה הַנַּעֲשֶׂה אֶפְרַי אֲבֹתֶיךָ הַבָּשָׁלָם מִי מַעְסֵס הַנַּעֲשֶׂה אֶשְׁתִּי וַאֲמָה אֲבֹתֶיךָ הַבָּשָׁלָם. 'Who is among you that is left, that saw this house in her glory?' He speaks of them who were yet left and remaining, and spake to them to remove and take away their complaint and repinings. Moreover, Artaxerxes, in whose days Ezra and Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem, was Longimanus, who reigned before Nothus, and not Memor, who succeeded him, as will afterwards appear. Now, this Artaxerxes was long after that Darius, upon whose authority the building of the temple was finished, Ezra vii. 1, which certainly could not be Nothus, who was his successor.

§ 19. It appears, then, that Darius Nothus was not the author of the decree mentioned, as also, that the times of the weeks cannot be dated from the second year of Darius Hystaspis, who was the author of it.

§ 20. After this, there is mention made of two other commands or decrees relating to the temple and people, both granted by the same Artaxerxes, one in the seventh year of his reign, unto Ezra, chap. vii. 7; the other in the twentieth year of his reign, unto Nehemiah, chap. ii. 1. And from one of these must the account inquired after be dated. Now, supposing that one of these decrees must be intended, it is evident that it was Longimanus, and not Memor, who was the author of them. For, from the seventh year of Memor, which was the second of the ninety-fifth Olympiad, to the eighteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, when our Saviour suffered, being the third year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, are only four hundred and twenty-eight years, sixty-two years short of the whole, or four hundred and ninety. Now, these sixty-two years added to the beginning of the account from the seventh of Memor, terminate in the seventh of Longimanus. From the seventh of Longimanus, then, to the seventh of Memor, are sixty-two years, and from the seventh of Memor to the eighteenth of Tiberius, are four hundred and twenty-eight years, making together, four hundred and ninety years; which is the number inquired after.

§ 21. It was then, this decree of Longimanus that was intended by the angel Gabriel. For, from the seventh year of his reign, when he sent Ezra unto Jerusalem, to engage in that work which he afterwards commissioned Nehemiah to carry on and perfect, unto the cutting off of the Messiah, are exactly seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, as may appear from the accounts formerly insisted on. From the first of Cyrus, supposing him to reign but three years over the whole empire, unto the death of Christ, there was, as we have proved, five hundred and sixty-two years. From the first of the same Cyrus, unto the seventh of Longimanus, were seventy-two years, which being deducted from the whole of five hundred and sixty-two years, the remainder is four hundred and ninety years. How this period was apportioned between the Persian, Grecian, Hasmonaean, Herodian, and Roman governments, we have before declared.

§ 22. And there wants not reason to induce us to fix on this decree, rather than any other, being indeed, the most famous and most useful to the people of all the rest. By what means it was obtained, is not recorded. But it is evident that Ezra had great favour with the king, and that he had convinced him of the greatness and power of that God whom he served, chap. viii. 22. Besides, it was not a mere proclamation of liberty, like that
of Cyrus, which was renewed by Darius; but a decree, a law made by the
king and his seven counsellors, chap. vii. 14, the highest and most irrefra-
gible legislative power amongst the Medes and Persians. Moreover, with
the decree, Ezra had a formal commission, in which he is said not only to
have leave to go, but to be sent by the king and his council. Besides, the
former decrees barely respected the temple; and it seems, that in the exer-
cution of them, the people had done little more than built the bare fabric,
all things as to the true order of the worship of God remaining in great
confusion, and the civil state utterly neglected. But now, in this commission
of Ezra, he is not only directed to set the whole worship of God in order,
at the charge of the king, chap. vii. 16—23, but also to appoint and erect
a civil government and magistracy with supreme power over the lives, li-
berties, and estates of men, to be exercised as occasion required, ver. 25,
26, which alone, and no other, was the building of the city mentioned by
Gabriel; for it is not walls and houses, but policy, rule, and government,
that makes and constitutes a city.

§ 23. And here the impression made on the minds of the Persian rulers,
ought to be particularly observed. The king himself calls Ezra the scribe
of the law of the God of heaven; thus owning him for the true God: for
who is the God of heaven, is God alone; all others are but the dunghill
gods of the earth, ver. 12. Again, he declares that he was persuaded that if
this work was not done, there would be wrath from heaven upon himself,
his kingdom, and his sons, ver. 23. The seven counsellors they join in that
law, ver. 14; and the mighty princes of the kingdom assisted Ezra in his
work, ver. 28. So that no command that concerned that people before or
after, was accompanied with such solemnity, or gave such glory unto God
as this did. Besides, the whole work of the reformation of the church, the
restitution of the worship of God, the collecting and the recognition of the
sacred oracles, was begun, carried on, and finished by this Ezra, as we else-
where at large have declared. All which considerations falling in with the
account before insisted on, makes it manifest that it was this, and no other
decree that was intended by the angel Gabriel; and from thence unto the
death of the Messiah, was seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety
years; the just and true limitation of the time after which we have been
inquiring.

§ 24. I declared at the entrance of this discourse, that the force of our
argument against the Jews from this place of Daniel, does not depend on
this chronological computation of the time determined. All then, that I
aimed at in it, was to vindicate it in general from those perplexities by
which they pretend to render the whole place inconclusive. And this we
have not only done, but we have, moreover, so stated the account, as that
they are not able from any records of times past, to bring any one con-
siderable objection against it, or any objection which may not be easily solved.
We now proceed to what remains of our introductory dissertations.
EXERCITATION XVI.


§ 1. We may now add to the conclusive testimonies before insisted on, some other considerations taken from the circumstances and opinions of the Jews themselves. These will be found both suitable for their own conviction, and of use to strengthen the faith of them who do believe. And the first thing that offers itself unto us, is their miserable fluctuation and uncertainty in the whole doctrine about the Messiah, ever since the time of his coming, and of their rejection of him.

§ 2. That the promise of the coming of the Messiah was the foundation of their professed faith and worship, from the days of Abraham, we have before sufficiently proved. Until the time of his coming, they were unanimous in this profession, as also in their desires and expectations of his advent. Since that time, as they have utterly lost all faith in him, as to the great end for which he was promised, so they have lost all truth as to the doctrine concerning his person, office, and work, though these are abundantly revealed in the Old Testament.

In their Talmud. Tractat. Sanedr. they only wrangle, conjecture, and contend about him, and that under such notions and apprehensions of him, as the Scripture gives no countenance unto. When he shall come, and how, where he shall be born, and what he shall do, they wrangle much about, but are not able to determine any thing at all; at which uncertainty the Holy Ghost never left the church in things of so great importance. Hence, some of them adhered to Barcosba for the Messiah, a bloody rebel; and some of them in after ages to David el David, a wandering juggler; others, to Moses Cretensis; and by sundry other pretenders have they allowed themselves to be deluded. Thus, some have lately followed the foolish apostate Sabadia, with his false prophets, R. Levi and Nathan, who never made the least appearance of any one character of the true Messiah, as Maimonides confesseth and bewaileth. The disputes of their late masters have not any thing more of certainty or consistency, than those of their Talmudical progenitors. And this, at length, hath driven them to the pre-
sent miserable relief of their infidelity and despair, asserting that Messiah
shall not come until immediately before the resurrection of the dead; only
they take care that some small time may be left for them to enjoy wealth
and pleasure, with dominion over the Edomites and Ishmaelites, that is,
Christians and Turks, under whom they live, full of thoughts of revenge
and retaliation in the days of their Messiah. Now, to what can any
man ascribe this fluctuation and uncertainty, about that which was the
fundamental article of the faith of their forefathers, and their utter re-
nunciation of the true knowledge of the Messiah, but to this, that having
long ago renounced him, they exercise their thoughts and expectations
about a chimera of their own, which having no subsistence in itself,
nor foundation in any work or word of God, can afford them no certainty or
satisfaction in their contemplations about it?
§ 3. Again, the state and condition of this people for the space of above
sixteen hundred and thirty years, gives evidence to the truth contended for.
The whole time of the continuance of their church state and worship, from
the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, to the final destruction of the city
and temple by Titus, was not above sixteen hundred and thirty years, or
sixteen hundred and forty at the utmost, allowing all their former captivities
and intermissions of government into the reckoning. They have then,
continued in a state of dispersion and rejection from God, as long as ever
they were accepted for his church and people; what their condition hath
been in the world for these sixteen centuries, is known unto all, and what
may be thence concluded, we shall distinctly consider.
§ 4. When God took the Jews to be his people, he did it by a special
and solemn covenant. In this covenant, he gave them promises, which were
all made good to them until the expiration of this peculiar covenant in
the coming of the Messiah. These promises may be classed under three
heads. First. That they should possess the land of Canaan, and there
enjoy that worship which he had prescribed unto them; see Exod. vi. 4,
xxxiv. 10, 11; Levit. xxvi. 8, 9; Deut. xviii. 18, xxix. 13; Psal. cv. 10,
11. Secondly. That he would defend them from their adversaries, or if at
any time he gave them up to be punished and chastised for their sins, that
upon their repentance and supplications made unto him, he would deliver
them from their oppressors, Deut. xxx. 1—5; Neh. i. 9; Deut. xxxii.
35—37; 1 Kings viii. 34. Thirdly. That he would continue prophets
among them to instruct them in his will, and to reclaim them from their
transgressions, Deut. xviii. 18. The whole Pentateuch, and all their divine
writings, are full of promises about these things. And, as we said, till
the time limited for the expiration of that special covenant, they were all
made good unto them. That it was to expire, they are forced to acknow-
ledge, because of the express promise of a new or another covenant to be
made not like unto it, Jer. xxxii. The land given them by inheritance
and the place designed for the worship of God therein, were continued in
their possession, notwithstanding the mighty attempts made by the nations
of the world for their extirpation. And when at any time he gave them up
for a season unto the power of their adversaries, because of their sins
and provocations, as unto the Babylonians in the days of Nebuchad-
nezzar, and afterwards unto the Grecians or Syrians in the days of Antio-
chus Epiphanes; yet still he first foretold them of their condition, promised
them deliverance from it, and in a short time accomplished it, though it
could not be done without the ruin of other kingdoms and empires. The
oppression of the Babylonians continued but seventy years, and the persecu-
tion of Antiochus prevailed only for three years and a half. Prophets also
he raised up unto them in their several generations, yea, in the time of their
greatest distresses; as Jeremiah at the time of their desolation, Ezekiel
and Daniel at Babylon, Haggai and Zechariah in their poverty after their
return, which dispensation ceased not until these prophets had pointed out
to them the end of that covenant, and had told them that the Messiah
should come speedily and suddenly into his temple, Mal. iii. 1, 2.
§ 5. The present Jews, I hope, will not deny but that God is faithful,
still, and that he is as able now to accomplish his promises, as he was in the
days of old. Let us, then, inquire whether they enjoy any one thing prom-
ised them in the covenant, or any thing relating to it, or whether they
have done so since the days wherein, as we have proved, the Messiah was
to come. 1. For the country given unto them by covenant, and the place
of God's worship there, the whole world knows, and they continually com-
plain, that strangers possess it, they being utterly cast out of it. It is with
them all, as it was with Abraham before the grant of the inheritance was
accomplished, they have not possession of one foot in it, no not for a bury-
ing-place. Their temple is destroyed, and all their attempts for the restora-
tion of it, which God so blessed of old, have been frustrated, and have
ceased. Their daily sacrifice has ceased, and whatever they substitute in
the room of it, is an open abomination unto the Lord. We need not insist
on these things. The stories of the ruin and exile of their forefathers, and
of the vain attempts which they have made to recover their land, and of the
utter pollution of the places of their worship, are known to themselves, and
to all men that care to know ought of these things. Where is now the
co vent of the land of Canaan? Was it to be absolutely everlasting? Whence comes it to pass, that the great promise of it doth utterly fail?
Was it to expire? What period can be assigned unto its duration, but
only that of the coming of the Messiah, and the establishment of a new
covenant in him? Is not the denial hereof a ready way to make the men
of the world turn Atheists, and to look upon the Scriptures of the Old Tes-
tament as a mere fable, when they shall be taught that the promises con-
tained in it, were but conjectures, deceitful words, that came to nothing.
§ 6. Again, How are they delivered from their adversaries? How are
they defended from their oppressors? There is not a nation in the known
world, in which they do not live either openly or privately in exile and
banishment from their own land. About their oppressions, and against
their oppressors, they have cried out, and prayed after their manner, for
many generations. Where is the protection, the deliverance promised? If
the time be not yet expired for the coming of the Messiah, why are they
not delivered? What word is there in the law, or the prophets, that they
shall not be delivered out of temporal distresses in any other way but by the
Messiah? Hath it not been otherwise with them? Were they not deli-
ered from former oppressions and captivities by other means? Could not
God of old have dispossessed the Romans of the land of Canaan, and af-
terwards the Saracens? and can he not now dispossess the Turks as easily
as he did the Babylonians, Persians, and Grecians? If the covenant of
those promises be not expired in the coming of the Messiah, what account
can they give of these things?
§ 7. Further, where are the prophets promised unto them? Can they
name one since the days of John Baptist, whom they owned for a prophet?
Hath any one amongst them pretended to any such thing, whom the event,
and they on the event, have not discovered to be an impostor? Such was
Theudas, and Moses Cretensis, with some few others. Is it not strange, that they who never long wanted a prophet in their difficulties, and sometimes had many of them together, should now in their utmost misery, wanderings, and darkness, be left utterly destitute of any one for more than a thousand and six hundred years together? It is the general confession of all their masters, that they have lost the Holy Ghost, or spirit of prophecy. After the finishing of the second temple, they say, and they say truly, that prophecy ceased. יכ משכבהו וחרם ומנה לא כobar יעורו אימלוא וחליו, saith Saadias Haggao on Daniel ix. 'Israel had no prophet after the finishing of the second house, but those who enjoyed the Bath Kol.' But what is now become of that Bath Kol also for sixteen hundred years? Is not all pretension to revelations utterly departed? What then is become of that covenant, wherein it was promised unto them? Yea we know, that they have not only lost the Holy Ghost as a spirit of prophecy, but also as a spirit of grace and supplications; so that except a few superstitious forms, repeated by number and tale, there is no such thing as prayer amongst them, as some of their late masters have acknowledged.

§ 8. What reason now can be assigned for this state and condition of things, but only that the covenant wherein the good things mentioned were promised unto them, had a time limited unto it, when it was to give place to a new covenant of another nature. And this the Jews acknowledge is to take date from the coming of the Messiah. God is faithful and unchangeable, and able to make good his promises and his word to the utmost. The present Jews are no less Jews of the carnal seed of Abraham, than their forefathers were. Therefore the covenant made with them, to continue until the coming of the Messiah, must be long since expired; consequently the Messiah must be long since come.

§ 9. Two things in general the Jews reply unto these considerations; the one as they have occasion and advantage, the other openly and constantly. In the first place, to evade the force of the argument from their present abstract condition, they mention as they have occasion the prosperity of some of their nation in this or that country, with the honour and riches that some of them have obtained. To this purpose, they tell us stories of their number and wealth in the east, out of Benjamin Tudelensis and others, and of the riches of some of them in the western parts also of the world. But they know that not one of these things was promised unto them in the covenant that God made with them upon Mount Horeb. All the promises of it respected the land of Canaan, with their preservation there, or their return thither. What they acquire in countries which are under the power of other nations, they acquire in a way of common providence, as do some of the vilest wretches of the earth, and not in a way of any especial promise. And therefore when Daniel and Nehemiah, with others, were exalted unto glory and riches among the Babylonians and Persians, yet they rested not therein, but pleaded the covenant of God for their restoration to the land promised unto Abraham. And to suppose that the wealth of a few Jews in different regions, obtained by physic, or usury, or by farming of customs, is an accomplishment of the promises before insisted on, is openly to despise the promises, and the Author of them.

§ 10. But it is pleaded, secondly, by them, that it is for their sins that the coming of the Messiah is thus retarded. But it is not about the coming of the Messiah, directly and immediately, that they are pressed in these considerations; that about which we inquire, is their present state, and their long continuance in this state, with the reason of it. We
ask then what is the true cause of their present condition? They say it is because of their sins; and this also in general we grant. But we must yet further inquire what they intend by this answer. I ask therefore whether it be for the sins of their forefathers, who lived before the last final dispersion, or for their sins who have lived in the several generations since, that they are thus utterly forsaken? If they shall say it is for the sins of their forefathers, as Manasseh plainly doth, Quest. 43. in Gen. p. 65, and sundry others of them do the same, then I desire to know whether they think God to be changed from what he was of old, or whether he be not still every way the same as to all the promises of the covenant? If they shall answer that he is still the same, I desire to know whether he did not in former times, in the days of their Judges and Kings, especially in the Babylonian captivity, punish them for their sins, with that contemplation of justice and mercy, which was agreeable to the tenour of the covenant? This I suppose they will not deny, the Scripture speaking so fully to this effect, and the righteousness of God requiring it. I desire then to know what were the sins of their forefathers, before the destruction of the second temple, and their final dispersion, which so much, according to the rules of the covenant, exceeded the sins of them who lived before the desolation of the first temple, and the captivity that ensued? For we know that in the former instance they were punished only with a dispersion, of which some of them saw the beginning and the end; the duration of the whole of it not exceeding seventy years, after which they were restored again to their own land.

But the captivity and dispersion which hath befallen them upon the sins of those who lived before the destruction of the second temple, as they were in their manner and entrance much more terrible and tremendous than the former; so they have now continued above twenty times seventy years without any prospect of a restoration. As God is still the same that he was, if the old covenant with the Jews be still in force, then the difference between these dispensations must arise from the difference of the sins of the one sort of persons and the other. Now of all the sins of which, on the general account of the law of God, the sons of men can be guilty, idolatry is doubtless the greatest. The choosing of other Gods, is a complete renunciation of the true God. This sin then comprises in it all other sins whatever, as it casts off the yoke of God, and our dependence upon him as the first cause, and last end of all. Thus while other sins violate the different precepts of the moral law, idolatry tramples on the whole law, by rejecting the Lawgiver. Therefore the first commandment forbids this sin, thus intimating, that if the command to own the true God, and him alone, be not obeyed, it is to no purpose to apply ourselves to the precepts that follow. Now it is known to all, that this sin of idolatry abounded amongst them under the first temple, and that also for a long time, attended with violence, adulteries, persecution, and oppression; but that those under the second temple had contracted the guilt of this sin, the present Jews do not pretend; and we know that they hated all appearance of it. Nor are they able to assign any other sins whatever, in which they exceeded their progenitors under the first temple. What then is the cause of the difference in the event between them and their forefathers? It must be, that either they have contracted the guilt of some sin, wherewith God was more displeased than with the idolatry of their forefathers, or that the covenant made with them is expired, or that there hath been a coincidence of both these causes. This indeed is the condition of things with them,
The Messiah came, in whom the carnal covenant was to expire, and they rejected and slew him. Thus do they justly suffer a perpetual rejection from it, and disinherition.

§ 11. Sometimes they plead, that it is for their own sins, and the sins of the generations that succeeded the destruction of the second temple, that they are kept thus long in misery. But we know that they use this plea only as a covering for their obstinate blindness and infidelity. Take them from this dispute, and they are continually boasting of their righteousness and holiness; for they do not only assure us that they are better than all the world besides, but also much better than their forefathers, (as Manasseh plainly affirms in the place before cited;) and that on the day of expiation, that is once a-year, they are as holy as the angels in heaven. There are therefore one or two things which I would desire to know of them as to this pretence of their own sins, which on another account also must be afterwards considered.

First, then, Whereas it is a principle of their faith, that all Jews, excepting apostates, are so holy and righteous, that they shall all be saved, and all have a blessed portion in the world to come, whence is it that none of them are so righteous as to be restored to the land of Canaan? Is it not strange, that that righteousness which is able to bring them all to heaven, will not serve to bring any one of them to Jerusalem. Yet this latter mercy is more openly and frequently promised to them than the former. I know not how to solve this difficulty; ipsi viderint.

Again, Repentance from their sins is a thing wholly in their own power, or it is not. If they shall say it is in their own power, as generally they do, I desire to know why they defer it? The high imaginations which they have of the levelling of mountains, the dividing of rivers, the singing of woods, and the dancing of trees; of the coaches and chariots of kings to carry them, as also of their riding upon the shoulders of their rich neighbours into Jerusalem; of the conquest of the world, of the eating of Behemoth, and of drinking the wine of paradise; of the riches, and wives, and long life that they shall enjoy in the days of the Messiah; these do make them, as they pretend, patiently endure all their long exile and calamities. And can these all not prevail with them for a little repentance, which they may perform when they please, and so obtain them all in a trice? If they are so evidently blind, foolish, and mad, about that which they look upon as their only great concern in this world, have they not great cause to be jealous, lest they be also equally blind in other things, and particularly in that wherein we charge them with blindness. This, it seems, is the state of these things. Unless they repent, the Messiah will not come; unless he come, they cannot be delivered from their calamities, nor enjoy the promises. To repent is a thing in their own power, yet they choose rather to endure all miseries, and forego all the promises of God, than to repent of their sins. And what shall we say to such a perverse generation of men, who openly proclaim that they will live in their sins, though they should never have more to do with God unto eternity. If they shall say that repentance is the gift of God, and that without his pouring forth his Spirit upon them, they cannot attain unto it, then I desire to know whence it is that God doth not give them repentance, as he did to their forefathers, if the covenant continue established with them as in former days? From what hath been discoursed, it sufficiently appears, that the condition of the Jews hath been such in the world for these sixteen hundred years, as to manifest that their special covenant has long since come
to an end, and consequently that the Messiah, in whom it was to expire, has long since come.

§ 12. There is one of them, a nameless person, not unlearned, who hath written somewhat lately in the Portuguese language, which is translated into Latin by Brenius the Socinian, who gives so satisfactory an answer in his own conceit unto this argument, that he concludes, that every one who is not obstinate, or blinded with corrupt affections, must needs acquiesce in it. His confidence, if not his reasons, deserves our consideration, especially as he brings forward reasons which their former masters did not insist upon.

That then which he returns as an answer to the inquiry after the causes of their present long captivity and misery, is the sins of their forefathers under the first temple. The greatness of these sins, he saith, is expressed by the prophet Ezekiel, ch. xvi. 48. ‘As I live, saith the Lord God, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she nor her daughters, as thou hast done, thou and thy daughters.’ To which he adds, Isa. i. 9, where mention is made again of Sodom. So that this captivity is to them in the room of such a destruction, as that with which Sodom was overthrown.

But it may be said that these sins, whatever they were, were expiated in the Babylonish captivity, and pardoned unto them upon their return. So that now they must suffer on the account of their sins committed under the second temple, to which he replies that this exception is of no force. ‘Nam liberatioe Babylone nihil aliud fuit, quam exploratio, qua Deus experiri voluit, an cum restitutione regni et templo possint abbreviari, et expiari enormia ista, quae commisserant, adulterii, homicidii, et idololatria peccata; sed pro antecedentium debitorum solutione, quam praestare debuerunt, nova insuper debita accumulaverunt.’ ‘For the deliverance from Babylon was nothing but a trial, whereby God would make an experiment, whether with the restitution of their kingdom and temple, these enormous sins of adultery, murder, and idolatry, which they had committed, might have been cut off and expiated, but instead of a discharge of their former arrears, which they were obliged unto, they heaped up new debts by their sins.’ This he affirms. At their deliverance out of Babylon, the people had no discharge of their former sins by the pardon of them; but were only tried how they would refresh acquit themselves, with a resolution in God, that if they made not satisfaction then for those sins, to charge the guilt of them again upon them, and upon all their posterity, for all the generations that are passed, until this day. But, first, This is plainly a fiction of this man’s own devising. Let him produce any one word from the Scripture, where it treats of these things, in the least giving countenance thereto, or let him show how this procedure is suitable to the justice of God; either to the general notion that we have of it, or to any other instance recorded of it in the Scripture.

But if these men may feign what they please, there is no doubt but they will justify themselves, and maintain their own cause.

Secondly. Why did none of the latter prophets whom God granted unto the people, after their return from captivity, as Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, let the people know that this was the condition of their return into their land, but only require of them to walk in a manner answerable to the mercies which they had then received?

Thirdly. As the very nature of the dispensation did declare, that God having purged out the rebels of the people, and destroyed them with his sore judgments, had forgiven their sins, and had returned unto them in a
way of mercy and grace, never again to call over their past iniquities, so the prophets that treated concerning that dispensation of God, do in places innumerable assert the same, and plainly contradict this imagination.

Fourthly, God punisheth not the sins of the fathers upon their children, unless the children continue in the sins of their fathers. This he declareth at large, Ezek. xviii. Now, what were the sins of this people under the first temple before their captivity? Our author reckons adultery, murder, and idolatry. There is no doubt but many of them were adulterers, and that sin among others was charged on them by the prophets; but it is evident that their principal ruining sins were their idolatry, and persecution or killing of the prophets. And God by Ezekiel declares, that in and by their captivity, he would punish and take away all their idolatry, and adulteries of which they had been guilty, from the time of their leaving the land of Egypt, or from their beginning to be his people, ch. xxiii. 11—27. Now were the Jews, that is the body of the people, guilty of these sins under the second house? It is known that they preserved themselves from all idolatry, which was the sin that in an especial manner was their ruin before; and for killing the prophets, they acknowledge that after Malachi they had none, so that none could be persecuted by them, but those whom they will not own to be prophets. But,

Fifthly. Suppose that all those under the second house had continued in the sins of their forefathers, which yet is false, and is denied by themselves as occasion requires, yet what have the Jews done, for sixteen hundred years since the destruction of that house? They plead that they are holy, and in application of the prophecy, Isa. liii. unto themselves, proclaim themselves innocent and righteous; at least they would not have us to think that the generality of them are adulterers, murderers, and idolaters. Whence is it, then, that the punishment of their fathers' sins lies so long on them? What rule of justice is observed herein? What instance of the like dispensation can they produce? On Christian principles, it is indeed easy to account for their continued calamities, for we affirm, that they continue unto this day in the same sin for which their forefathers under the second house were rejected and destroyed, and so know the righteousness of God in their present captivities and miseries. Besides,

Sixthly. They say that they abhor the sins of their forefathers, repent of them, and do obtain remission of sins through their observation of the law of Moses. Where, then, is the faithfulness of God in his promises to them? Why are they not delivered out of captivity? Why not restored to their land according to express testimonies of the covenant made with them unto that purpose? There is no colour of truth or of reason therefore in this evasion, which they have invented to countenance themselves in their obstinate blindness and unbelief.

§ 13. But our author yet adds an instance, whereby he hopes to strengthen and confirm his former answer. Saith he, 'Deus per manus Salamanassani decem tribus in captivitatem passus est abduci in regiones nobis incognitas, sexcentis fere annis ante destructionem templi secundii, hoc est ante præsentem hanc nostram captivitatem, needum in hodiernam hanc diem in terram suam reverse aut dominio suo restituta sunt, quæ omnia speciali Dei providentia nobis ita evenerunt, ne quis causam hujus nostræ captivitatis speciali alicui peccato sub secunda domo commissis imputaret: Cum decem tribus qui tum abfuerunt captivitatem pati debent sexcentis annis longiorum.' 'God suffered the ten tribes to be carried captive by Salamanasser
into regions unknown to us, six hundred years before the destruction of the
second temple, and our present captivity; neither are they yet brought
back to their own land, or restored to their former rule, all which things
have happened unto us by the especial providence of God: that none might
impute the cause of the captivity unto any sin committed under the second
temple; seeing the ten tribes that were then absent must endure a captivity
six hundred years longer. But this instance will not yield them the least
relief. For, 1. It was before granted, that the sins under the second temple
were even greater than those under the first, whence the punishment of
these former sins was revived, which is here denied, manifesting that this is
an evasion invented to serve the present turn. 2. Whatever is pretended,
no impartial man who admits the special relation of that people unto God,
and his covenant with them, can refuse to grant that their present rejection
is for some outrageous sins which broke the covenant under the second
temple, and which are continued in by them unto this day. 3. The case
of the ten tribes, after they had publicly rejected all that worship of God,
and all that government of his peculiar people, which was appointed to
typify Messiah, and to continue until his coming, is different from that of
the other tribes, to whom the promises were appropriated in Judah, and in
the house of David; so that the rejection of the ten tribes implies no dis-
annulling of the covenant. 4. It must be remembered, that all of the two
tribes came not up to Jerusalem at the return from the captivity of Babylon,
and that very great numbers of the ten tribes appear so to have done. Now
these being added to the multitudes of them which before that had fallen
away to Judah, partly upon the account of the worship of God, partly upon
the account of outward peace, when their own land was wasted, makes the
condition of the body of the people to be one and the same. Now these
men, consisting partly of some of the ten tribes, and partly of some of the
two tribes, committed, and their posterity continue in the sins to which we
ascribe their present dispersion and captivity. 5. The remnant of that
people dispersed amongst strange nations, seems voluntarily to have em-
braced their manners and customs, and utterly to have forgotten their own
land; whereas those with whom we have to do, daily expect, desire, and
endeavour, a return thereunto; so that this evasion can yield no relief to
the present Jews. We may now return to the notions of their more ancient
masters.

For a close, then, of these considerations, I shall add some of the confes-
sions of the Jews themselves, which the evidence of the truth contended
for, hath at several seasons extorted from them. And this I shall not do, as
though they were of great importance in themselves, or unto us, but only
to discover their difficulties in contending against the light; for the present
masters of their unbelief, are more perplexed with the convictions of their
predecessors, than with the plainest testimonies of the Scripture: the
authority of their predecessors being equal with them unto, if not more
sacred than that of the word of God itself.

First, then, Being pressed with the testimonies before insisted on out of
Haggai, concerning the glory of the second temple, and the coming of the
desire of all nations thereunto, they have a tradition that the Messiah was
born on the same day that the second temple was destroyed. The story,
indeed, with which they make it up, is weak, fabulous, and ridiculous; but
he who is offended with the citation of such things out of their Talmudical
doctors, is desired only to exercise patience, until he shall be able himself
to report from them things more serious and of greater importance; and yet
from them we must learn the persuasions and convictions of the ancient Jews, or remain utterly ignorant of them. And let their stories be what they will, the powerful convincing evidence of truth, and the miserable shifts that the poor creatures are put to, to keep off the efficacy of it from their minds, do sufficiently appear in them.

§ 14. The tradition mentioned, they give us in Tractat. Bezaroth, distinct. Hajakor, in these words: "זא" "זדך ביבא ר" אהב היבש משלכדרניא שמש, 'Rabbi Joden, in the name of Rabbi Ibbo, said, the Messiah was born in the day that the house of the sanctuary was destroyed.' And the story they tell to this purpose is as followeth: It came to pass, that as a Jew was ploughing, his ox before him loved, and there passed by him ירעיב, 'an Arabian,' and he heard a voice saying, O Jew, the son of a Jew, loose thy oxen, for behold the house of the sanctuary is destroyed. The ox lowed the second time; and he said, O Jew, the son of a Jew, yoke thy oxen, for behold Messiah the King is born. He said unto him, What is his name? He answered, שמאמה, Menachem, that is, 'the Comforter.' And in Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxx., they have a long story to the same purpose. "זא vel. 'א תודיה אליהם למס בער 'Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said, As Elias of good memory was walking on the way, on that very day that the house of the sanctuary was destroyed, he heard 'ה קלח יב, 'the voice from heaven,' crying unto him, The house of our holy sanctuary is brought unto destruction. When Elias of good memory heard this, he thought the whole world should be destroyed. He went, therefore, and finding, הב נאדוה, 'men ploughing and sowing,' he said unto them, The holy blessed God is angry with the world, or all this generation, על הנעורים, and will destroy his house, and send his children into captivity among the nations of the world, and you are solicitous about this temporal life! הב קלח came forth again, and said unto him, Let them alone, for unto Israel is born a Saviour. He said unto the voice, Where is he? The voice said unto him, In Bethlehem Judah. He went and found a woman sitting in the door of her house, and her child lying in its own blood before her. He said unto her, My daughter, hast thou born a son? She said unto him, Yea. He said, And why doth it lie so long in its own blood? She said unto him, Because of the great evil; for on this day wherein he is born, the house of the sanctuary is destroyed. He said unto her, My daughter, be of good courage, and take care of the child, for great salvation shall be wrought by his hand; and she was straitway encouraged, and took care of him.'—In the sequel of this story, they tell us that this child was carried away by the four winds of heaven, and kept in the Great Sea four hundred years, of which afterwards. I doubt not but that this tale is derived from the account which is given in the second chapter of the gospel by Luke, of the appearance of the angels to the shepherds, and of their finding our Lord's mother in a stable. All the use that I intend to make of this story is, to urge the present Jews with a conviction and acknowledgment of their forefathers, that the Messiah was to be born under the second temple.

§ 15. Again, they have a tradition out of the school of one Elias, a famous master amongst them of the Tannarei or Antetalmudical doctors, which they have recorded in the Talmud Tractat. Saned. distinct. Chelezk. about the continuance of the world, which is as follows: 'זא רב' יאליהו שמת אלכסיר נ人性化 והדックין אלכסיר והדיך שמי אלכסיר והדיך והדיך אלכסיר מהי, 'It is a tradition of Elias, that the world shall continue six thousand years, two thousand void (which the gloss of Rabbi Solomon Jarchi reckons
from the creation of the world unto the call of Abraham,) two thousand to the law, (from thence to the destruction of the second temple,) and two thousand to the days of the Messiah.' It is incredible how the latter Rabbins are perplexed with this tradition of their masters, which is recorded in the Talmud as sacred. In the account they give in Shebet Jehuda, of a disputation they had with one Hierome, a converted Jew, before the bishop of Rome, they know not how to free themselves from the authority of it. The sum of their answer is, that the next words in the tradition are, that that time is elapsed because of their sins; but as others have already manifested that that gloss is no part of the tradition, but an addition of the Talmudists, so we shall immediately manifest the vanity of that pretence. Others of them say, that it sufficeth to maintain the truth and credit of the tradition, if the Messiah come at any time within the last two thousand years. But even these are now drawing towards their period, not a fifth part in their computation of that space of time remaining; moreover, such an interpretation as this is directly contrary to the very words of the tradition. For as two thousand years are assigned to the world before the law, and two thousand to the law, which they reckon from the call of Abraham to the ruin of the second temple, so the two thousand years allotted to the time of the Messiah must begin with his coming, as the other portions do one of them with the creation, the other with the call of Abraham; or else the space of time (above sixteen hundred years) between the expiration of the second two thousand years, and the third, must be left out of the computation. And the time limited for the duration of the world extended above sixteen hundred years, beyond what is allotted to it in their tradition.

§ 16. Many similar concessions and acknowledgments hath the evidence of truth wrested from sundry of them, which having been collected by others, we shall not trouble the reader with their recital: these that have been insisted on, may and do suffice to make good the argument in hand. And thus we have fully demonstrated the second thing proposed for confirmation; namely, that the true Messiah is long since come, and hath finished the work allotted unto him. Now as in the course of our reasoning we have vindicated the particular testimonies insisted on from the exceptions of the Jews; it remaineth that we consider in the conclusion of this dissertation, the general answer which they give unto the whole argument.

§ 17. That which they principally insist on is this, that the concession which they have made, must be taken in connection with an exception, which, as they suppose, renders the whole useless to our purpose. Thus they grant that the time fixed on, was determined for the coming of the Messiah; but they add withal, that it is prolonged beyond the limited season, because of their sins. That is, that the promise of his coming at that season was not absolute, but conditional, depending on the supposition that the Jews were righteous, holy, and worthy to receive him. Thus, to the tradition of Elias before mentioned, determining the coming of the Messiah to be at the end of the second two thousand years of the world's duration; they add in the Talmud, Tractat. Saned. distinct. Chelek. cap. 11, these words as an exception, 'because of our sins, those days have exceeded the time, all that is past.' And again they add in the same place; 'אמר פָּרָה בַּכְלָלם כלָו קָצָי נַעַם הָרָבָר תָּלְיוֹלֵי אַשָּׁר אֲנִי הַמַּעֲשָׁהָם מִכָּעֵיטָם וּבָהִים Rab. said, 'all times appointed are finished, and this matter is not suspended, but upon account of repentance and good
works.' And nothing is more common with them than this condition, if they deserve it, if they repent, the Messiah will come, the time is already past, but because of our sins he is not come. If all Israel could repent but one day, he would come. This is the sum of their answer. There was a time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah; this time is signified in general in the Scripture to be before the destruction of the second temple, and the utter departure of scribe and law-giver from Judah; but all this designation of the time was but conditional, and the accomplishment of it had respect unto their righteousness, repentance, good works, and merits; which they failing in, their Messiah is not yet come. To this issue is their infidelity at length arrived. But there are reasons innumerable, that make naked the vanity of this pretence. Some of them I shall briefly insist upon at present, and more fully afterwards.

§ 18. First, We have before proved, that not the Jews only, but the Gentiles also, even the whole world, was concerned in the coming of the Messiah. The first promise of him concerned mankind in general, without the least particular respect unto any one peculiar people, Gen. iii. 15. The next solemn renovation of this promise unto Abraham, extends the blessing with which it was to be attended unto all the kindreds of the earth, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18. All that there was of restriction in the promise to him and to his posterity, consisted only in the designation of them to be the means of bringing forth that Messiah, who was to be a blessing unto all nations. And when Jacob foretels that he should be born of the tribe of Judah, Gen. xlix. 10, he declares that together with his posterity, other nations should have an equal share in Messiah's blessings: 'To him,' saith he, 'shall be the gathering of the people.' The same course do all the succeeding prophets follow. They every where declare, that the Gentiles, the nations of the world, were equally concerned with the Jews in the promise of the coming of the Messiah, if not principally intended, because of their greatness and number. In mercy, love, compassion, and philanthropy, did God provide this blessed remedy for the recovery of mankind, both Jews and Gentiles, out of that misery in which they had involved themselves by sin and apostasy from him. The time of exhibiting this remedy unto them, he promised also, and limited, stirring them up unto an expectation of its accomplishment, as that wherein all their happiness did depend. Shall we now suppose, that all this love, grace, and mercy of God towards mankind, that his faithfulness in his promises were all suspended on the goodness, righteousness, merits, and repentance of the Jews? that God who so often testifies concerning them, that they were a people, wicked, obstinate, stubborn, and rebellious, should make them keepers of the everlasting happiness of the whole world? Shall we suppose that he hath given the fountain of his grace and love, which he intended and promised should overflow the whole earth, and make all the barren wildernesses of it fruitful unto him, to be closed and stopped by them at their pleasure? that it should be in their power to restrain all the promised effects of them from the world? As if he should say in his promises, I am resolved out of mine infinite goodness and compassion towards you, O ye poor miserable sons of Adam! to send you a Saviour and a Deliverer, who at such a time shall come and declare unto you the way of eternal life, shall open the door of heaven, and shall save you from the wrath that you have deserved; but I will do it only on this condition, that the Jews, an obstinate and rebellious people, be good, holy, righteous, and penitent; for unless they be so, the Saviour shall not come, nor is it possible that he should, until they be so:
this of themselves they will never be, nor do I intend to make them so. If they can persuade us, that God hath thus placed them on his throne, and given his grace and truth into their hands to make it effectual, or to frustrate it at their pleasure, and hath suspended his good-will towards the residue of mankind on their obedience, (of whom he testifieth that they have been always stubborn and disobedient,) they may also hope to prevail with us to believe, that they only are men, and that all others are beasts, as some of their Talmudical masters have affirmed. At present we find by blessed experience, that their wickedness hath not made the truth of God of no effect.

§ 19. Secondly, When God limited and foretold the time of the coming of the Messiah, he either foresaw what would be the state and condition of the Jews as to their repentance and good works, or he did not. If they say that he did not, then they both deny him to be God, by denying those essential attributes of his nature, which the very heathen acknowledged in their deities; and they also utterly overthrow all the prophecies and predictions of the Old Testament, for there is not any of them but depend on a supposition of the prescience of God; and this is nothing but to countenance their unbelief with perfect atheism. If they say that he did foresee, that their circumstances and manners would be such as they have in fact been, then he must also have known that it was impossible that the Messiah should come at the time limited and determined, seeing the Jews were to prove so wicked. I ask then to what purpose doth he so often, and at so great a distance of time, foretel and promise that he should come at such a season, seeing he knew perfectly that he should not come at that time, and that thus not one word of his predictions should be fulfilled? Why, I say, did he fix on a time and season, foretel it often, mark it out by infallible signs, give an exact computation of the years from the time of his predictions, and call all men unto an expectation of his coming accordingly, when by his foresight of the want of merit and repentance in the Jews, he knew that no such thing could possibly fall out? God who is αφεντος, doth not deal thus with the sons of men. This were not to promise and foretel in infinite veracity, but purposely to deceive. This pretended condition then cannot be annexed to the promise of the coming of the Messiah, without a direct denial of some, and by just consequence of all the essential properties of the nature of God.

§ 20. Thirdly, There is not in the whole Scripture, the least intimation of any such condition, as this which they pretend that the promise insisted on is clogged with. It is no where said, no where intimated, that if the Jews repented, and merited well, the Messiah should come at the time mentioned; no where threatened, that if they did not repent, his coming should be put off unto an uncertain day. We know not, nor are they able to inform us, whence they had this condition, unless they will acknowledge that they have forged it in their own brains, to give countenance to their infidelity. Before the time allotted was elapsed, and they had absolutely refused him who was sent, and who came according unto promise; there was not the least rumour of any such thing amongst them. Some of their predecessors invented it to palliate their impiety, and if they can succeed in this they are not solicitous about the reflection which it may cast upon the honour of God. Besides, as the Scripture is silent as to any thing that may give the least support to this pretence, so it teaches that which is contrary to it, and destructive of it; for it informs us, that the season of the coming of the Messiah shall be a time of great sin, darkness, and misery, which also their
own masters, in other places, and on other occasions acknowledge. See Isa. ch. lii. liii; Jer. xxxi. 32, 33; Dan. ix. 24; Zech. xiii. 1; Mal. iii. 4. He was to come to turn men from ungodliness, and not because they were thus turned before his coming. There can be no place then for this condition.

§ 21. Fourthly, The suggestion of this condition subverts the foundation of the promise, and the whole nature of the thing promised. We have before manifested, that the rise and spring of this promise, was mere love and sovereign grace. There was not any thing in man, Jew or Gentile, that should move the Lord to provide a remedy and relief for them who had destroyed themselves. Now to suspend the promise of this love and grace, on the righteousness and repentance of them unto whom it was made, is perfectly to destroy it, and to place the merit of it in man, whereas it arose purely from the grace of God. Again, it utterly takes away and destroys the nature of the thing promised. We have proved, that it is a relief, a recovery, a salvation from sin and misery that is the subject matter of this promise. To suppose then that this shall not be granted, unless men, as a condition of it, deliver themselves from their sins, is to assert a plain contradiction, and wholly to destroy the promise. He was not promised unto men, because they were penitent and just, but to make them so. And to make the righteousness of Jews or Gentiles the condition of his coming, is to take his work out of his hand, and to render both him and his coming useless. But this figment proceeds from the πρωτον ψευδων of the Jews; namely, that the Messiah is not promised to free them from their own sins, but to make them possessors of other men's goods; not to save their souls, but their bodies and estates; not to make men heirs of heaven, but lords of the earth; which folly hath been before discovered and disproved.

§ 22. Fifthly, The Jews on several accounts are αυτοκατακριτοι, or self-condemned, in the use of this pretence. Their great sins, they say, are the cause why the coming of the Messiah is retarded. But, 1st, what those sins are they cannot declare. We readily grant them to be wicked enough, but withal we know that their great wickedness consists in what they will not acknowledge, namely, in their refusing him when he came, not in their being unfit for his coming. They sometimes indeed mention their hatred one of another, their mutual animosities, and frequent adulteries, and want of observing the Sabbath, according to the rules of their present superstitious scrupulosity. But what is all this unto the abominations which God passed over formerly in their nation, when he also fulfilled his promises unto them, though really conditional. 2d. Take them from the rack of our arguments, and you hear no more of their confessions, no more of their sins and wickedness, but they are immediately all righteous and holy, all beloved of God, and better than their forefathers. Yea, 3d. On the day of expiation, they are all as holy, if we may believe them, as the angels in heaven. There is not one sin amongst them, so that it is strange the Messiah should not at one time or another come to them on that day. 4th. They have a tradition among themselves, that the coming of the Messiah may be hastened, but not retarded. So they speak in their gloss on Isa. lx. 22. “I the Lord will hasten it in its time.” Tractat. Saned. אֶלָּכֶסְדְּנָא רַבִּי רְבֵיתָא יִהְיֶה רַבִּי אָדָמָא רַבִּי יוֹשֵׁע, Rabbi Alexander said, and Rabbi Joshua the Son of Levi, 'it is written in his time, and it is written, I will hasten it, I will hasten it if they deserve it, and if they deserve it not, yet in its own time;' and this they apply to the coming of the Messiah.
5th. Many of them assert, that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah speaks of them, and of their being causelessly afflicted by the Gentiles; now he whom the prophet there speaks of, is one perfectly innocent and righteous, and so they must needs be in their own esteem, as they suppose themselves to be there intended. How inconsistent then is it in them to say, that the coming of the Messiah has been deferred because of their sins.

§ 23. Sixthly, This plea is directly opposed to the nature of the covenant which God promised to make at the coming of the Messiah, or to that which Messiah came to ratify and establish, and to the reason which God gives, for the making of that covenant, Jer. xxxi. 31—33. The foundation of the new covenant lies in this, that the people had disannulled and broken the former covenant made with them. Now surely they do not disannul that covenant, if they are righteous according to the tenor of it, and unless they are so, they say that the Messiah will not come, that is, the new covenant shall not be made, unless by them it be first made unnecessary. Again, the nature of the covenant consists in this, that God in it engages to make men righteous and holy, Ezek. xi. 19. So that righteousness and holiness cannot be the condition of making it, unless it be of making it useless. This then is the contest between God and the Jews, he takes it upon himself, to give men righteousness by the covenant of the Messiah; they take it upon themselves to be righteous, that so he may make that covenant with them.

§ 24. Lastly, If the coming of the Messiah depend on the righteousness and repentance of the Jews, it is not only possible, but very probable that he may never come. They conceive that the world shall not continue above six thousand years. Of this space, they do not suppose that there are more than five hundred years remaining; the time which is past since the expiration of the days determined for the coming of the Messiah, is at least sixteen hundred years: seeing that they have not repented all this while, what assurance have we, nay what hope may we entertain of their repentance, within the four or five hundred years that remain. Greater calls to repentance from God, greater motives from themselves and from others, they are not likely to meet with. And what ground have we to expect, that they who (by their own confessions) have withstood all these calls without any good fruit, will ever become any better. Upon this supposition then, it would be very probable, that the Messiah should never come. Nothing can be replied to all this reasoning, but that God will either at length effectually by his grace give them that repentance which they make necessary for his coming, or that he will send him at last, whether they repent or not. But if either of these are expected, then I would ask, what reason can be imagined, why God should so deal at a future season, concerning which he has made no promise that the Messiah should come therein, and not deal so at the time concerning which he had so often promised and foretold, that he should come therein.
EXERCITATION XVII.

PROVING JESUS OF NAZARETH TO BE THE ONLY TRUE AND PROMISED MESSIAH.

§ 1. Jesus whom Paul preached, the true Messiah. § 2, 3. First argument from the time of his coming. Foundation of this argument unquestionable. § 4. Coming of Jesus at the time appointed, proved by Scripture, record, and catholic tradition. § 5. By the testimonies of heathen writers. § 6. By the confession of the Talmudical Jews, Jesus Christ intended by them, in their story of Jesus the son of Pandira and Stada. § 7. No other came at that season, by them owned. § 8. Force of this argument. § 9. Characteristical notes of the Messiah given out in the Old Testament. § 10. His family, stock, or lineage, confined unto the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David. § 11. Our Lord Jesus of the posterity of Abraham, and tribe of Judah, also of the family of David. Testimonies of the Evangelists vindicated. § 12. Jewish exceptions in general answered. § 13. In particular, the genealogy not proved; answered. § 14. The genealogy of Matthew declared. § 15, 16, and of Luke. § 17. The place of the birth of the Messiah, Bethlehem, Micah, v. 2. § 18. Circumstances enforcing this consideration. § 19. The evangelist's citation of the words of the prophet vindicated. § 20. The Messiah to be born of a virgin, Isa. vii. 10, 11, and Matt. i. 21, 22. § 21. Jews convinced that Jesus was born of a virgin. § 22. Jewish exceptions to the application of this prophecy. Their weight. § 23. The answer of some to them, unsafe, needless. § 24, 25. True sense of the words. Exceptions answered. § 26—28. The signification and use of Ναζαρην. Greatness of the sign promised. § 29, 30. No other Virgin and Son designed but Jesus Christ and his mother. The prophecy cleared in this instance. § 31. In what sense the birth of the Messiah was a sign of present deliverance. § 32, 33. Remaining objections answered. § 34. Other characters of the Messiah. § 35. He was to be a prophet, Deut. xviii. 19, a prophet like unto Moses. Expected by the Jews. § 36. Jesus Christ a prophet. That prophet. § 37. The nature of the doctrine which he taught. Its perfection. § 38. The works of the Messiah revealed only in the gospel of Christ. § 39. Also the nature and end of Mosaic institutions. § 40. Threatenings unto the disobedient, fallen upon the Jews. 41. Sufferings are another character of the Messiah. § 42. His passion foretold, Psal. xxii. The true Messiah therein intended. Expositions of Kimchi and others confuted. § 43. Sufferings peculiar unto the Messiah. § 44. The Psalm exactly fulfilled in Jesus Christ. § 45. Objections of the Jews from the principles of Christians, answered. § 46. Isa. lxi. Prophecy of the suffering of the Messiah. § 47. Consent of the ancient Jews. Targum, Bereshith Rabba, Talmud, Ashech. § 48—53. Invalidity of exceptions of latter rabbins. Application to the Lord Jesus vindicated. § 54. Other testimonies concerning the sufferings of the Messiah. 55. Jewish traditions to the same purpose. § 56. Other arguments proving Jesus to be the true Messiah. § 57. Miracles. § 58. The nature of them. § 59. wrought by Christ, proved. § 60. Testimony of the gospel. § 61. Notoriety of tradition. § 62. Miracles of Christ compared with those of Moses. § 63. Excelling them in number; § 64. in manner of their being wrought; § 65. in their nature; § 66. in his giving power to others to effect them; § 67. in his resurrection from the dead; § 68. continuance of them in the world. § 69. Sum of the argument. § 70, 71. Conviction of the Jews evinced. § 72, 73. Causes of the miracles of Christ assigned by them. Magical art, retorted, removed. § 74. The name of God. § 75. Testimonies of his disciples. § 76. Success of the doctrine of Jesus. Last argument.

§ 1. The third branch of that great supposition and fundamental article of faith, on which the apostle builds his arguments and reasonings with the Hebrews, is, that Jesus, whom he preached, was the true and only promised Messiah, who came forth from God for the accomplishment of his
work, at the time which had been determined and foretold. The confirmation of this foundation of our faith and profession, is that which now in the third place we must engage in. This is a subject on which I could insist at large, with much satisfaction to myself; nor have I just cause to fear that the matter treated of would be irksome to any Christian reader. But we must have respect unto our present design; for it is not absolutely and of set purpose that we handle these things, but merely with reference to that further end of opening the springs of the apostle's divine reasonings in this Epistle, and therefore we must contract as much as may be the arguments that we have to plead in this case. And yet neither can this be so done, but that some continuance of discourse will be unavoidably necessary. And the course which we shall adopt is the same which we have followed in our foregoing demonstrations of the promise of the Messiah, and of his coming. Our arguments are first to be produced, and vindicated from the particular objections of the Jews, and then their opposition to our thesis in general is to be removed, referring an answer to their special objections unto another dissertation.

§ 2. That our present discourse may follow the foregoing in a natural order, our first argument shall be taken from that which is proved, and confirmed therein; namely, the time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah. Two ways there are, whereby the time fore-appointed of God for the coming of the Messiah is signified and made known. First, By certain τεκμηρία, or evident tokens, taken from the Judaical church, with the state and condition of the whole people of the Jews. This we have insisted on from Gen. xlix. 10; Hag. ii. 8; Mal. iii. 1, 2. Secondly, By a computation of the time itself as to its duration, from a certain fixed date unto its expiration. This way we have unfolded and vindicated at large from Dan. ix. 24—27. And although we have evidenced the truth and exactness of the computation insisted on by us, as far as any chronological accounts of times past are capable of being demonstrated, yet we have also manifested, that our argument depends not on the precise bounding of the time limited; but lying εν πασεί, is of equal force, however the computation be calculated, the whole time limited being undeniably expired before, or at the destruction of the city and temple. Hence is the foundation of our first argument. Before or at the expiration of that time the promised Messiah was to come. Before, or at that time, (as denoted and described by the general τεκμηρία, or evident tokens before mentioned, and limited by the computation insisted on,) Jesus came, and no other that the Jews can or do pretend to have been the Messiah; and therefore he was the true promised Messiah.

§ 3. The foundation of this argument, namely, that the Messiah was to come within the time limited and foretold, cannot be shaken, without calling in question the truth of all promises and predictions in the Old Testament, and consequently the faithfulness and power of God. The great design of the Old Testament is to reveal the Messiah, the Saviour of the world. This design is manifested from the first, and it is prosecuted through the whole record. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit that enlivens the whole doctrine and history of it. It is the bond of union, and it is the centre in which all the parts of it do meet, and without which they would be loose, scattered, and deformed heaps. Without an apprehension of this design, and faith therein, not a letter of it can be understood, nor can a rational man discover any important excellency in it. Him it promises, him it typifieth, him it teacheth, and prophesieth about; him it
calls men to desire and expect. When it hath done this in several places, it expressly limits, foretells, and declares the time wherein he shall be sent and exhibited. If there be a failure herein, (seeing it is done to give evidence to all other things that are spoken concerning him, by which they are to be tried, and to stand or fall, as they receive support or are discountenanced by it,) to what end should any man trouble himself about that which is cast, as a fancy and empty imagination, by its own verdict? If then the Messiah came not within the time limited, all expectation from the Scriptures of the Old Testament must come to nought; which those, with whom at present we contend, will not grant.

Nor can the Jews, on such a supposition, in any measure defend the truth of the Scriptures against an infidel. For unto his inquiry, where is the promised Messiah? if they shall plead their usual pretences, it is easy for him to reply, that these things being no where mentioned, nor intimated in the books themselves, they are only such subterfuges as any man may palliate the most open untruths withal. And indeed, the ridiculous figment of his being born at the time appointed, but kept hid to this day, they know not where, is not to be pleaded, when they deal with men not bereft of their senses, or judicially blinded by God. For besides, that the whole of it is a childish fiction, inconsistent with the nature and being of their Messiah, whom they make to be a mere man subject to mortality, in his whole person like all the other sons of Adam, it suits not at all unto the difficulty intended to be removed by it. For it is not his being born only, but also his accomplishment of his work and office at the time determined, which is foretold. Nor is there any one jot more of probability in their other pretence, about their own sins and unworthiness. For, as we have declared, this is nothing but in plain terms to assert, that God hath violated his faith and promise; and that in a matter, wherein the great concern of his own glory, and the welfare of all mankind, doth consist, on account of their miscarriages, which, as they either cannot or will not remedy, so he himself hath not, (though he might have so done,) provided any relief against them. This then stands upon equal evidence with the whole authority of the Old Testament, namely, that the promised Messiah was to come within the time prefixed for his coming, and foretold.

We ask them, then, If Jesus of Nazareth be not the Messiah, where is he? or who is he that came in answer to the prophecies insisted on? Two things, then, remain to be proved. First, That our Lord Jesus Christ came, lived, and died within the time limited for the coming of the Messiah. Secondly, That no other came within that season, that either pretended with any colour of probability unto that dignity, or was ever as such owned or esteemed by the Jews themselves.

§ 4. First, then, that Jesus came and lived in the time fixed for the coming of the Messiah, that is, some short time before the departure of sceptre and scribe from Judah, the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, and the final desolation of the second temple, we have all the evidence that a matter of fact which happened so long ago is capable of, evidence as good as that the world was of old created by God. The histories of the church are express in affirming that he was born during the reign of Augustus Caesar, and in the latter end of that of Herod over Judea, when Cyrenius was governor over Syria; that he lived unto the time when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea under Tiberius, about thirty-six or thirty-seven years before the destruction of the Jewish nation, city, and temple by Titus. This the histories written by divine inspiration, and committed unto the
care of the church, expressly affirm; neither have the Jews any thing to object against the truth of the relation, whatever may be their thoughts of his person, or of what he did. That he lived and died then and there is left on record beyond dispute. And if they should deny it, what is the bare negation of a few interested, blinded persons, without testimonies or evidence from any one circumstance of times, persons, or actions, when laid in the balance against the catholic tradition of all the world, whether believing in Jesus, or rejecting of him. For they all have always agreed in this, that he lived and died at the time mentioned in the sacred stories.

And this was still one part of the charge brought against his followers, in the very next age after, that they believed in a person whom they knew to have lived at such a season, and in a mean condition. Neither did the most malicious and fierce opposers of the religion taught by him, such as Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, ever once attempt to attack the truth of the story, as to his real existence, and as to the time of it. So that in this we have as concurrent a suffrage as the whole world in any case is able to afford.

§ 5. The best historians of the nations who lived near those times give their testimony unto what is recorded in our gospel. The words of one of them, a person of unquestionable credit in things that he could attain the knowledge of, and as it will appear by them, far enough from any compliance with the followers of Jesus, may suffice for an instance. This is Cornelius Tacitus, in the fifteenth of his Annals: 'Abolendo (saith he) rumori (he speaks of Nero and of his burning Rome) subdidit reos, et quasi-simis penis affectis, quos per flagitia invisus vulgus Christianos appellaret. Author ejus nominis Christus qui Tiberio imperante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat.' He expressly assigns the time of the death of Christ unto the reign of Tiberius, and government of Pilate. The same also is confirmed by Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian, in the fourth chapter of the eighteenth book of their antiquities; to which season also he assigns the death of John the Baptist, who was his contemporary, according to the evangelical story.

§ 6. Further, we have that testimony in this matter, which, though in itself it be of little or no moment, yet as to them with whom we have to do, is cogent above all others; and this is their own confession. They acknowledge in the Talmud that he lived before the desolation of the second temple, for they tell us, cap. Chelek, and 52, cap. 2, that he was the son of Pandira and Stada, and that he lived in the days of the Maccabees, Alexander, Hircanus, and Aristobulus, under whom he was crucified. I confess Galatinus, Reuchlinus, and of late the learned Schiklard, with some others, do contend that it is not Jesus Christ whom they intend, in the wicked story which they tell of that Jesus, the son of Pandira. But the reasons which they insist on are of no cogency to procure the assent of any one acquainted with their writings; no, though some of the more modern Jews (ashamed of the lies of their forefathers, and afraid to own their blasphemies, lest they should provoke the Christians against them) do faintly deny him to be the person intended. The names of their parents, say they, do not agree. The Lord Jesus was the reputed son of Joseph, the true son of Mary. This Jesus of the Talmud was the son of Pandira and Stada. I shall not reply that Damascenus, lib. 4, mentions one Panther and Barpanther, as in the genealogy of Christ, making the latter grandfather to the blessed virgin; seeing it is evident that he borrowed that part of the genealogy from some corrupt traditions of the Jews.
The reason why the Talmudists concealed the true names of the parents of Jesus is evident; for by this means they covered their malice more in one respect, and gave more blasphemous vent to it in another. They concealed it thus far, that every one might not perfectly understand whom they intended, unless he were a disciple of their own. And they gave it vent in the reflection which they cast upon the evangelical story, as though it had not given us the true names of the parents of Jesus. And moreover, they gave themselves liberty by this means to coin new lies at their pleasure, for they may say what they choose of their Pandira and Stada, though all the world knew it to be false as to Joseph and Mary. And Pandira, is a feigned name, insignificant, and invented by them for this only purpose. They sometimes write it with א in the midst, instead of א: אנה Pan-thira: so that Galatinus doth perfectly contradict himself in this matter. For whereas, lib. 1, cap. 7, he contends, that by Jesus, the son of Pandira, mentioned in the Talmud, the Lord Jesus is not intended, lib. 8, cap. 5, he asserts that Jesus, the son of Panthira, in whose name James the Just healed the sick and wrought miracles, was the Lord Jesus; as indeed it was he, whom they intend also in that story about James. But now Pandira and Panthira are the same; and so also was he whom they term his son. אנה Stada, is also a name framed to the same end; and as the learned Buxtorf supposeth from אנה, one that went aside, declined, or was an adulteress. And they feign her to have been a platter of women's hair, with other monstrous lies, at their pleasure; but yet in sundry places they expressly confess that her true name was Mary, and as I suppose, from the imputations mentioned, do wilfully confound her with Mary Magdalen, as Mahomet did with Miriam the sister of Moses. These stories must be searched for in the Talmud printed at Venice, for they are left out in that printed at Basil. The objection, namely, that these things can by no means be accommodated to Jesus of Nazareth, is of as little avail as the things themselves are: for such an objector reasons as though the Talmudical Rabbins had ever accustomed themselves to speak one true word concerning him, or as though they intended not him in all these blasphemies lies, wherewith they and their forefathers reproached him; which is all one as if we should say that it was another, and not the Lord Jesus, whom they accused of sedition, blasphemies, and seducing the people, because indeed he was most remote from all such things. But yet there are also sundry things which they ascribe to this Jesus, the son of Pandira and Stada, which make it very apparent who it was whom they intended; for first, they say that he learned magic in Egypt, upon his being carried thither in his infancy. Again, they say he was a seducer of the people; which we know was the accusation that they raised against the Lord Jesus. Again, They tell us a story concerning two men placed in a room near him, to overhear his seducing, that so they might accuse him. This they say was their course to entrap seducers, and therefore they give this instance. י"ע ונה זבוס טבוס הירא עב הדפס. 'So they did to the son of Stada, and they hanged him on the eve of the passover.' The witnesses they speak of are no others but the false witnesses mentioned Matt. xxxvi. 60, 61. The kind of his death, hanged on a tree, with the time of it, the eve of the passover, do also fully make naked their intentions. The age only, or the time of his life, remains, from whence any difficulty is pretended. This Jesus, the son of Pandira, they have affirmed to have lived in the days of Alexander, and to have been crucified in the days of Aristobulus, a hundred, or a hundred and ten years before the birth of Christ. But the
mystery of this fiction also is discovered by Abraham Levita, in his Cabala Historiae. He tells us that the 'Christians placed the death of their Christ under Pilate, that so they might show that the destruction of the city and temple fell out not long after his death; whereas, he says, it is apparent from the Mishna and Talmud that he was crucified in the days of the Maccabees, a hundred years before.' And here we have the true reason unawares laid open, why the Talmudists attempted to transfer the time of his death from the days of Herod the tetrarch to the rule of Aristobulus the Hasmonæan; namely, lest they should be compelled to acknowledge their utter ruin to have so suddenly ensued upon their rejection of him, as indeed it did. However, as to our present purpose, we have in general this confession of our adversaries themselves, that the Lord Jesus came before the destruction of the city and temple, which was what we undertook to confirm.

§ 7. Secondly. In the pursuit of our argument, we affirmed that no other person came at, or within the time limited, that could pretend to be the Messiah. This the Jews themselves confess, nor can they think otherwise, without destroying themselves. For if any such person came, seeing they received him not, nor do own him unto this day, their guilt would be the same, that we charge upon them for the refusing of our Lord Jesus. There is no need, then, that we should go over the tragical stories of Barchocheba, Moses Cretensis, David el David, and such other impostors. For whereas none of them came or lived within the time determined, so they are all disclaimed by themselves, as seducers and causers of great misery unto their people and nation. Herein, then, we have the consent of all parties concerned, which renders all further evidence unnecessary.

§ 8. From the preceding reasonings then, it follows, that either our Lord Jesus is the true Messiah, as coming from God in the season limited for that purpose, or that the whole promise concerning the Messiah is a mere figment, the whole Old Testament a fable, and so both the former and the present religion of the Jews a delusion. At that season the Messiah must come, or there is an end of all religion. If any came then, whom they had rather embrace for their Messiah than our Lord Jesus, let them do so, and own him, that we may know who he was, and what he hath done for them. If none such there were, that can be so esteemed, as in truth there was not, and as they universally acknowledge that there was not, their obstinacy and blindness in refusing the only promised Messiah is such, as no reasonable man can give an account of, who doth not call to mind the righteous judgment of God in giving them up to blindness and obstinacy, as a just punishment for their rejecting and murdering his only Son. And this argument is of such importance, as that with the consideration of the doctrine of Christ and his success in the world, it may well be allowed to stand alone in this contest.

§ 9. Our second argument is taken from those characteristic notes that are given in the Scripture of the Messiah. Now these were designed to enable the church to know him; and it was bound to receive him who was pointed out by these characteristic marks. All these we shall find to meet and centre in the person of our Lord Jesus. Some of the principal of them we shall therefore insist upon, and vindicate from the exceptions of the Jews. The stock whereof he came, the place and manner of his birth, the course of his life and death, what he taught and what he suffered, are the principal of those signs and notes by which God taught his people to discover the Messiah in his appointed time. And as they were very sufficient
for that purpose, so upon the matter they comprise all the signs and tokens whereby any person may be predesigned and signified.

§ 10. First, For the family, stock, or lineage, whereof he was to come. There was a threefold restriction of it, after the promise had for a long time run in general, that he should be of the seed of the woman, or take his nature from among mankind. The first restriction was to the seed of Abraham, Gen. xv. 17, and under that alone, there was no more required, but that he should spring from among his posterity, till God added that peculiar limitation unto it, In Isaac shall thy seed be called, Gen. xxi. 12. After this, in the family of Isaac, Jacob peculiarly inherited the promise; and his posterity being branched into twelve tribes or families, the rise or nativity of the Messiah was confined unto the tribe of Judah, Gen. xlix. 10. This made it further necessary that from him, by some one of the numerous families that sprang of him, Messiah should proceed. Out of that tribe God afterwards raised the royal family of David to be a type and representation of the kingdom of the Messiah; and hereupon he restrained the promise unto that family, though not unto any particular branch of it. To this, no other restriction was ever afterwards added.

It was not then at any time made necessary by promise, that the Messiah should proceed from the royal family of the house of David, but only that he should be born of some of his posterity. For by what family soever, poor or rich, in power or subjection, he derived his genealogy from him, his kingdom was to be quite of another nature than that of David or Solomon; nor did he derive his title in the least thereunto from the right of the Davidical house to the kingdom of Judah. Thus far then it pleased God to design the stock and family of the Messiah. He was to be of the posterity of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David. And although this evidence in its latitude will conclude only thus far, that no one can pretend to be the Messiah, whose genealogy is not so derived by David, and Judah from Abraham, yet by the addition of this circumstance in the providence of God, that no one since the destruction of the city and temple can demonstrate a lineal descent from David, and seeing this was given out for a note and sign to know him by, it proves undeniably that he whom we assert was the true Messiah. For to what end should this token of him be given forth to know him by, when all genealogies of the people being utterly lost, it is impossible it should be of any use in the discovery of him.

§ 11. First, then, For Abraham there is no question between us and the Jews, but that the Lord Jesus was of his offspring and posterity. Neither do they pretend any exceptions to his being of the tribe of Judah. The apostle in this Epistle asserts it as a thing notorious and unquestionable, ch. vii. 14, προέδρον γαρ, saith he, ὑπὲρ εἰς Ἰουδαία ανατελάκτεν ὁ Κυρίος ἤμων; 'it is every way, or altogether manifest, that our Lord sprang of Judah.' Προέδρον is used by the Greek authors to signify not only manifest, but openly and conspicuously manifest. Thus he is said, θανεν προέδρως, in Sophocles, who died openly and gloriously by all men's consent. Thus, among the Jews themselves, it was a manifest thing that our Saviour sprang from the tribe of Judah. The apostle declares that it was αὐτοτρίβητος, without any contradiction received amongst them, and acknowledged by them. Nor unto this day do they lay any exception unto this assertion. It remains, that we prove him to have been of the family of David by some one single branch of it. For as we said, there is nothing in the promise restraining his origin to the reigning family, or to the direct posterity
thereof. Now this is purposely declared by two of the evangelists, who being Jews, and living amongst the Jews, wrote the story of his life in the age wherein he lived, for the use of the Jews themselves, as well as for the residue of mankind. Matthew, who calls his record of it, Πεντετευχής, or תרי Tahoe, 'the roll of his genealogies,' shews in the front of it, that he wrote it on purpose to declare, that he was according to the promise of the posterity of Abraham and of the family of David. 'Of Jesus Christ, the son of David the son of Abraham;' that is, who was promised to Abraham and David, to spring from their loins. Luke also, who derives his genealogy from the first giving of the promise unto Adam, brings it down through the several restrictions mentioned by Abraham, Judah, and David. Other testimony or evidence in this matter of fact, it is utterly impossible for us to give, and it is un-reasonable for any man to demand any other. It was written and published unto all the world, by persons of unquestionable integrity, who had as much advantage to know the truth of the matter about which they wrote, as any man ever had, or can have in a matter of that nature. And this was done, not upon rumours, or traditions of former days, but in that very age wherein he lived, and that before them whose great interest it was to object to what they wrote, and who would undoubtedly have done so, had they not been overpowered with the conviction of the truth of it. If they had the least suspicion of the contrary, why did they not in some of their consultations, and in their rage against him and his doctrine, object this unto himself, or to his followers, that he was not of the family of David, and so could not be the person that he pretended to be? Besides, the persons who wrote his genealogy, sealed their testimony, not only with their lives, but with their hopes of a happy eternity: a higher proof of assurance of truth can no man give.

§ 12. The present Jews make two objections to this testimony. First, In general they deny the authority of our witnesses, and they deny the whole matter that they assert. Secondly, In particular they say, that these prove not the matter in question; namely, that Jesus of Nazareth was of the family of David. For the first, they neither have, nor do yield any other reasons, but their own wills and unbelief. They neither do, nor will believe what the evangelists have written. Record, testimony, tradition, or any circumstance contradicting their witness, they have none; only they will not believe them. Now whether it be meet that their mere obstinacy and unbelief, wherein, and for which, they perish temporally and eternally, should be of any weight with reasonable men, it is easy to determine. Besides, I desire to know of the Jews, whether they think it reasonable that any man, without reason, testimony, evidence, or record, to give him countenance, should call in question, disbelieve, and deny the things witnessed unto by Moses. It is known what they will answer unto this demand, and thereby they will stop their own mouths as to the refusal of our record in this matter. So that this exception, which amounts to no more but this, that the Jews believe not the gospel, and that because they will not believe it, needs no particular consideration, it being that which we plead with them about in all these our discourses. And as to our own faith, it is secured by all these evidences which we give of the sacred authority of the writings of the New Testament.

§ 13. But moreover they object in particular, that neither of the evangelists do either prove or assert that our Lord Jesus did spring from the family of David. For they thus reason, that as Christians believe that he was
born of the Virgin Mary, without conjunction of man, and that Joseph was only reputed to be his father, because his mother was legally espoused unto him, and as both genealogies belong unto Joseph alone, as is evident from the beginning of the one, and the end of the other; therefore the Lord Jesus being not related unto Joseph, but by the legal contract of his mother, he cannot be esteemed in his right to belong unto the family of David. This is pleaded by many of them; moreover, they take notice of the difficulties which have exercised many Christians in reconciling the several genealogies recorded by the two evangelists; to all which exceptions, we shall briefly reply, and take them out of our way.

§ 14. First, Suppose it granted, that the genealogy recorded by Matthew is properly the genealogy of Joseph, what madness is it to imagine, that the evangelist avowedly proposing to manifest Jesus Christ to have been of the family of David, and premising that design in the title of his genealogy, doth not prove and confirm what he had so designed, according to the laws of genealogies, and according to the legal and just way of asserting any one to be of such a tribe or family. No more is required for the accomplishment of the promise, but that the Lord Jesus should be of the family of David, in such a manner as was required by the laws of families and genealogies, that any person might belong unto it. Now this might be by the legal marriage of his mother unto him who was of that family; for after that contract of marriage, whatever tribe or family she was of before, she was legally accounted to be of that family, into which by her espousals she was engrafted. And of that family, and no other, was he to be reckoned, who was born of her, after those espousals. Now that the reckoning of families and relations among the Jews, by God's own appointment, did not always follow natural generation, but sometimes legal institutions, is manifest by the law respecting a man dying without issue. For when the next kinsman took the wife of the deceased, to raise up seed unto him, he that was born of his widow, was by law not reckoned to be his son by whom he was begotten, but the son of him, and of the family of him that was deceased, to bear his name, and inherit his estate, Numb. xxxvi. 6. And this legal cognition Luke seems to intimate, ch. i. 27, where he says, that 'the mother of Jesus was espoused unto a man whose name was Joseph, of the family of David;' there being no reason to mention his family, but that the genealogy of his wife's son was to relate thereto. And if this were the law of genealogies, and of legal relations unto tribes and families, as it evidently was, Matthew recording the genealogy of Joseph, to whom the blessed Virgin was espoused before the birth of Jesus Christ, doth record his, according to the mind of him who gave both law and promise. And upon this known rule of genealogies, and legal relations, may Matthew proceed in his recital of the pedigree of Joseph, and profess thereby to manifest how Jesus Christ was the son of David, the son of Abraham. Secondly, Although there was no indispensable necessity among the Jews, binding them to marry within their tribes, unless the women were heiresses, in which case provision was made, that inheritances might not be transferred from one tribe unto another, yet it is more than probable, that the blessed Virgin Mary was of the same family with Joseph, and that this was so notoriously known, that seeing genealogies were not reckoned by women, nor the genealogies of women directly recorded, there was no better, or more certain way of declaring his pedigree who was born of Mary, than by his unto whom she was so nearly related. So that on several accounts, the genealogy recorded by Matthew, proves Jesus Christ to have been of the family of David.

§ 15. Secondly, Luke directly, and of set purpose, gives us the genealogy
of the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus; for the line of his progenitors, which he derives from Nathan, is not at all the same with that of Joseph from Solomon, insisted on by Matthew. It is true, there are a Zerubbabel and Salathiel in both genealogies, but this proves not both the lines to be the same; for the lines of Solomon and Nathan might by marriage meet in these persons, and so leave it indifferent which line was followed up to David; and the lines of Joseph and Mary might be separated again in the posterity of Zerubbabel, Matthew following one of them, and Luke the other. This, I say, it possible, but the truth is, as is evident from the course of generations insisted on, that the Zerubbabel and Salathiel mentioned in Matthew, were not the same persons with those of the same names in Luke, those being of the house of Solomon, these of the house of Nathan. So that from David it is not the line of Joseph, but of the blessed Virgin, that is recited by Luke. And the words with which Luke prefaceth his genealogy, do in no way impeach this assertion, neither of the names John; for whereas these words, as was supposed, are usually placed and read in parenthesis, the parenthesis may be better extended unto the Heli, including Joseph; being (as was supposed, the son of Joseph) the son of Heli. Or Joseph may be said to be the son of Heli, because his daughter was espoused unto him, otherwise the true natural father of the blessed Virgin; so that both legally and naturally our Lord Jesus Christ was a descendant of the house and lineage of David, according to the promise. And as this was unquestionable among the Jews in the days of his conversation in the flesh, so the present Jews have nothing of moment to oppose unto these unquestionable records.

§ 16. This is the first characteristical note given of the Messiah, whereby he might be known, and it hath strength added unto it by the providence of God, in that all genealogies among the Jews are now so confounded, and have been so for so many generations, that it is utterly impossible that any one should rise amongst them, and manifest himself to be of this or that particular family. The burning of their genealogies by Herod, the extirpation of the family of David by Vespasian, and their one thousand and six hundred years dispersion, have put an utter end unto all probability about the genealogies among them. The Jews indeed pretend, that the family of the Messiah shall be revealed by the miracles that he should do; that is, by knowing him to be the Messiah, they shall know of what family he is. But this note of his family is given out to know him by; nor are we any where directed to learn his family from our knowledge of him.

§ 17. Another note or sign pointing out the Messiah in prophecy, was the place where he should be born; which added unto the time wherein, and the family whereof he should be brought forth, was intended evidently to mark out his person. The place of his nativity is foretold, Mic. v. 2. וַאֲנָהוּ בֵּית לְבָלֶם בָּאָרְמֶה אֵפְרַתָּה, מַעֲרֵי בֵּית לְבָלֶם וְאֵפְרַתָּה הַגָּאוֹן פָּרַשִּׁית שְׁלֹשָׁה הַמִּשְׁמֵי הָאָדָם, 'And thou Bethlehem Ephratah, is it (or it is) little for thee to be amongst the thousands of Judah; out of thee shall come forth unto me, he that shall be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from the days of eternity.' That old this prophecy was understood by the Jewish church, to denote the place of the birth of the Messiah, we have an illustrious testimony in the records of the Christian church, Matt. ii. 5, 6. Upon Herod's demanding where the Messiah should be born, the chief priests and scribes affirm with one consent, that he was
to be born at Bethlehem, confirming their judgment by this place of the prophet. And afterwards when they supposed that our Lord Jesus, had been born in Galilee, because he lived there, they made this an argument against him, because he was not born according to the Scripture in Bethlehem, the town where David was, John vii. 41, 42. And we have the concurrence of their own testimony in this matter. So the Chaldee paraphrase renders these words, מַכָּה יְאָא אֵלֶּה מָסוּל, *Out of thee shall come forth to me the ruler,* מַכָּה קרֵמִים נַפְנְפַרְנֵמִים עַבְרִי שָׁלֹמָה, *out of thee shall come forth to me the Messiah, who shall have the dominion*; taking it for granted, that he it is of whom this place is spoken. So also R. Solomon expounds the place: עָרָי מַלְוִיה יְאָא לָדוֹא דְרֵי, היְאָא לָדוֹא צַעַר, which seems to confirming that, thou deservest to be so, because of the profanation of Ruth the Moabites, who was in thee, out of thee shall come forth to me the Messiah, the Son of David; and so he saith, The stone which the builders refused.' And though Kimchi seems to deny that the Messiah shall be born in Bethlehem, yet he grants that it is he who is here promised of, *Out of thee shall come forth,* גֶּה צַא אֶפֶס אֱוָה מִשְׁמַה מַכָּה מַפּ מַכָּה לָא מַפּ מַכָּה הָאָרֵי, unto me the Messiah, for he shall be of the seed of David, who was of Bethlehem.' He grants, I say, that it is the Messiah that is here prophesied of, though, in opposition to Rashi, and to the Targum, and to the text, he would deny that he should be born in Bethlehem. *But his interpretation is fond and forced, to serve the present turn, because the Jews know that the Lord Jesus was born there. God speaks to Bethlehem, the city of David, and gives an account how greatly he will magnify it, beyond what it then seemed to deserve; and this he will do by raising (not only from David, who was born at that place, but also out of that place) the Messiah who was to rule his people Israel. This then was the place of old designed for the birth of the Messiah, and there was our Lord Jesus born, at the appointed time, of the tribe of Judah, and family of David, and there are sundry circumstances giving weight unto this consideration.*

§ 18. First. Whereas the parents of Jesus were outwardly of a mean condition, and living in Galilee, it may be supposed that they were very little known to be of the lineage of David; and it may be, in their low estate, they did not much desire to declare that which would be of no advantage, and perhaps of some hazard unto them. But now their coming to Bethlehem, and that whether they would or not, by the command of public authority, made their house and kindred known unto all the Jews, especially to those of the family of David, all of whom were then gathered together in that place. Secondly. No just reason appears, why the Roman Emperor decreed that description and enrolment of persons. It was a matter of great charge and trouble to the whole empire, which at that time enjoyed the greatest peace and tranquillity. The temple of Janus was then shut, and all things in quietness in all parts of the world. Neither was there afterwards any public use made of that enrolment, nor is it certain that it was accomplished in many other nations. But the infinite, holy, wise Governor of all the world, puts this into the emperor's mind, and incites him to a work which sets mankind in motion, that two persons of low condition might be brought out of Galilee into Bethlehem, in order that Jesus might, according unto this prophecy, be born there. Thirdly. It is not likely that Joseph and Mary had any thoughts at that time about the place where the Messiah should be born, and so probably had not the least
design of removing their habitation to Bethlehem; or, if they had, yet their doing of it on their own accord might have given advantage to the Jews to say, that the mother of Jesus did not any way belong unto Bethlehem, but only went thither to be delivered, that she might with more advantage report that her son was the Messiah. But by this admirable providence of God, all these, and sundry other difficulties of the like nature, are removed out of the way; their minds are determined, a journey they must take, (and that at a time very unseasonable for the holy Virgin, when she was so near the time of her delivery,) and they must be publicly enrolled of the family of David, upon the command of him who never knew aught of that business, which none but he could thus have accomplished. Fourthly. Not long after this, that town of Bethlehem was utterly destroyed; and for these sixteen hundred years, it has not been either great or small among the thousands of Judah. Now all these circumstances illustrate this characteristic presignation of the person of the Messiah from the place of his nativity.

§ 19. The exceptions of the Jews against the citation of the words of the prophet by the evangelist, concern not the testimony itself, nor are indeed of any great importance. For, first, the evangelist intended no more, but only to direct to that testimony which was given to the nativity of the Messiah at Bethlehem, reciting so much of the words, and these in such a manner, as to prove by them that which he intended. He did not intend to repeat every word as they were written by the prophet, which he might easily have done had he designed it, and that without the least disadvantage to what he aimed at, but only to declare how the assertion was proved, that the Messiah was to be born at Bethlehem.

Secondly. He useth the words to no other purpose than that for which, by the acknowledgment of the Jews, they were recorded by the prophet; neither in the alterations that are made in this recital, is there one letter taken from the prophet's words, or added to them, used by him to the advantage of his assertion; which is all that the most scrupulous can require in the recital of the words of another by way of testimony.

Thirdly. He seems not to repeat the words of the prophet himself immediately, but only to record the answer which from these words of the prophet was given unto Herod by the priests and scribes; so that the repetition of the words is theirs, and not hisproperly.

Fourthly. But to whomsoever the words belong, as there is nothing in them discrepant from, much less contrary to those of the prophet, and as they are not used to signify any thing but what the prophet plainly intended, so are all the particulars wherein a difference appears between them capable of a fair reconciliation. This we shall manifest by briefly reviewing them.

The first difference is in the first words: אם אתה כותב בילמחה אברומ, 'and thou Bethlehem Ephratah;' which are rendered in the evangelist, καὶ σὺ Βεθλεήμ γνω ουδεὶς, 'and thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah.' Bethlehem, which was of old called Ephratah, from its first builder, 1 Chron. iv. 4, that name being now disused, is here said to be, as it indeed was, in the land of Judah; to distinguish it from Bethlehem, that was in the lot or land of Zebulun, as both Rashi and Kimchi observe, Josh. xix. 13; and perhaps also, to denote the relation that the Messiah had to Judah. So that here there is no discrepancy. Bethlehem Ephratah, and Bethlehem in the land of Judah, are names of one and the same place. 2. In the ensuing words there is more variety, בֵּית לֵוַה בָּאֲלָמִים, 'little to be in the thousands of Judah.'
In the evangelist, οὐδὰμος ἐλαχίστης εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἴγκροσιν Ἰουδαί, 'art not the least among the leaders of Judah.' ἦν, parva, or little, in the positive, is rendered by the evangelist, ἐλαχίστης, in the superlative degree: the Hebrews have no superlative degree in their language, and therefore do often express the import of it by the positive with οὐ following, as is done in this place: οὐδὲν ἔχεις, 'little in the thousands of Judah, that is, the least of them, if the word should be expounded adjectively.

The only ἐναντιοφωνήσεως is in the mode of expression. The proposition in the prophet seems to be affirmative, thou art little; in the evangelist, it is expressly negative, thou art not the least. But, first, this difference concerneth not the testimony, as to that end for which it was produced: what way soever the words be interpreted, the import of the testimony is still the same. 2. The words in the prophet contain no perfect enunciation, nor do yield any complete sense, unless it be on one of these two suppositions. First, the word ἐξορούσιος is to be taken adverbially, and to signify not parva, but parvum, not a little one, but a little; and then they give us this sense, 'And thou Bethlehem Ephratah, it is but a little that thou shouldst be among the thousands of Judah.' And this hath no inconsistency with the words of the evangelist, 'thou art not the least;' for though it were eminent among the thousands of Judah, yet this was but a little or small matter in comparison of the honour that God would put upon it by the birth of the Messiah. And this is not unusual in the Hebrew language. Adjectives feminine are frequently taken in the neuter gender, which it hath not, and signify adverbially. And though ἐξορούσιος be of a masculine termination, yet being joined with ἔχεις τὸν νόμον τῆς Ἰς, 'the name of a town or city,' it is put for ἔχεις τίνος, of the feminine gender. Or, secondly, An interrogation must be supposed to be included in the words, 'art thou but little?'—Bethlehem, ἔχεις τίνος, art thou but little? which may well be rendered negatively, οὐδὰμος ἐλαχίστης, 'thou art not the least' among the thousands of Judah. The prophet then might have respect both to its present outward state, which was mean and contemptible in the eyes of men, and also to the regard that God had to it as to its future worth, which was to prefer it above all the thousands of Judah, to which principally the evangelist refers.

There is yet another solution of this difficulty given of late by a learned person, (Pocock, Miscelan. not. cap. 2,) who makes it probable at least, that the word ἐξορούσιος is of the number of those that are sometimes used in a sense directly contrary to their meaning. Thus ἱδρυν, 'to sanctify and profane;' ἱδρυσί, 'to bless and to curse;' ἵππος, 'a living soul and a dead carcase.' And
he proves by notable instances, that it signifies sometimes ἀληθιστος, least, and sometimes οὐάρμος ἀληθιστος, great, illustrious, and excellent.

The remaining differences are inconsiderable. The pronoun ἦν, to me, is omitted by the evangelist, and the reason of it is evident: for in the prophet God himself speaks in his own person; in the gospel the words are only historically recited. μεν, ruler in Israel, is paraphrased by the evangelist, ἡγουμενος, ὁστις ποιμανει των λαον μου των Ισραηλ, ‘the leader that shall feed my people Israel.’ When he asserts that Messiah should rule over his people, he adds the manner of his ruling: he shall rule by feeding them, according as it is declared in the next words of the prophet, Micah v. 4, ‘He shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord;’ which words the evangelist had respect unto. Of these things we have spoken by the way, to vindicate the recital of this testimony by the evangelist, and we have seen that the application of it in general to the matter in hand is every way unquestionable, and so yields us a second characteristic note of the person of the Messiah.

§ 20. The manner of the birth of the Messiah, namely, that he should be born of a virgin, is a third characteristic note given of him. The first promise doth sufficiently intimate that he was not to be brought into the world according to the ordinary course of mankind, by natural generation, seeing he was diakriktos, and in a peculiar manner designed to be the seed of the woman, that is, to be born of a woman without conjunction of man. To make this sign yet the more evident, God gives it forth directly in a word of promise, Isa. vii. 10—16: ‘Moreover, the Lord spake to Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God, ask it either in the depth, or in the height above; but Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. And he said, Hear ye now, ye house of David, is it a small thing for you to weary men, but ye will weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and call his name Immanuel: butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good; for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.’ This is the promise and prophecy, the accomplishment whereof in our Lord Jesus we have recorded, Matt. i. 22, 23, ‘All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Immanuel.’ Now this being a thing utterly above the course of nature, which never fell out from the foundation of the world to that day, nor ever shall again fall out, seeing the miraculous power of God shall be no more exerted in the same way, it is an infallible evidence and demonstrative note of the true Messiah. He, and he alone, was to be born of a virgin. Jesus of Nazareth is the only person who ever was born of a virgin, and therefore he alone is the true Messiah.

§ 21. The Jews being greatly pressed with this prophecy, and with the accomplishment of it, try all means to evade the force of it by breaking through one of these. And it might be expected, that they would principally oppose the story of the evangelist; but circumstances on that side are so cogent against them, that they are very faint in that endeavour. For if indeed Jesus was not born of a virgin, as is recorded, and as both he and his disciples professed, why did they not charge him with untruth herein in the days of his flesh? Why did they not call his mother to account, especially considering that she being espoused unto a husband, they might, upon conviction, have put her to a public and shameful death? Nothing of this
kind being done, or once undertaken, by their forefathers, (no less full of envy and malice against the person and doctrine of Jesus than themselves, and much better provided for such an undertaking, if any reason had been given for it, than they are,) they insist not much upon the denial of the truth of the record; but to relieve themselves, they by all means contend, that the words of the prophet are in no way applicable to the birth of our Lord Jesus, of which the evangelist considers them as a prophecy. And to this end they multiply exceptions against our interpretation of the prophecy.

§ 22. First. They deny that there is any thing said here of the conception or bearing of a son by a virgin. For the word here used, say they, הָנָּלָּל, signifieth any young woman, married, or unmarried; yea, sometimes an adulteress, as Prov. xxx. 18; so that the whole foundation of our interpretation is infirm. And the הָנָּלָּל here intended, was no other, say they, but either the wife of the prophet, or the wife of Ahaz the king, or some young woman in the court then newly married, or to be married to the king, or to some other person.

Secondly. They say that the birth of this child which the הָנָּלָּל, or young woman, mentioned, was to conceive, was immediately to ensue, so as to be a sign unto Ahaz, and to the house of David, of the deliverance promised unto them from the kings of Damascus and Samaria. Therefore, they say, that the child promised could not be Jesus of Nazareth, whose nativity happening seven hundred years after this, would be no pledge unto them of any thing that should shortly come to pass.

Thirdly. They insist that in ver. 16, it is promised, that before that child which should be so conceived and born, should come to the years of discretion, to know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the kings of Damascus and Samaria should be destroyed. Now this came to pass within a few years after, and therefore this passage can have no relation to the birth of Jesus of Nazareth.

Fourthly. They affirm, that in the following chapter the accomplishment of this prophecy is declared in the prophet's going in unto the prophetess, and in her conceiving a son, concerning whom it is said, that before he should have knowledge to say, My father, and My mother, the land should be forsaken of both her kings, in correspondence with what is spoken of the child of the virgin, ch. vii. 16, viii. 1.

Fifthly. That the name of this child was to be Immanuel, whereas he of whom we speak was called Jesus, Matt. i. 21.

Sixthly. That the child here mentioned was to be fed and nourished with butter and honey, which cannot be spoken, nor is written of Jesus of Nazareth.

§ 23. In answer unto these objections, some learned men have granted to the Jews, that these words of the prophet were literally fulfilled in some one then a virgin, and afterwards married in those days, and that they are only in a mystical sense applied by Matthew to the birth of the Lord Jesus as say they, are sundry other things that are spoken primarily of others in the Old Testament. But the truth is, this answer is neither safe in itself, nor needful as to the argument of the Jews, nor consistent with the sense of the place, nor with the truth of the words themselves.

First. It is not safe, as to the faith of Christians. For whereas the birth of the Messiah by a virgin, was so signal a miracle, and so eminent a characteristic note of his person, if it be not directly foretold and prophesied of in this place, there was no one prediction of it made unto the church of the
Jews. Now how this should seem reasonable, when things of far less concern are foretold, is not easily made to appear.

Secondly. Upon this interpretation of the words, there is no ground left for the application of their mystical sense, which they pretend to be made by Matthew. For if indeed the person primarily, directly, and literally spoken of, did not conceive a child while she was a virgin, if the passage only means that she who was then a virgin, did afterwards upon marriage conceive in the ordinary course of nature, there remains no ground for the application of what is spoken concerning her, unto one who in, and after her conception, and the birth of her child, continued a virgin. For though it be not required that there be an agreement in all things between the type and the antitype, yet if there be no agreement between them in that wherein the one is designed to signify the other, they cannot on any account stand in that relation. David as he was a king, was a type of Messiah the great King. There was not an absolute similitude in all things between David and him, nor was there any necessity that so there should be, that he might be his type. But yet if he had not been a king, he could not have been at all a type of him in his kingdom. No more can any person who may be supposed to be here spoken of, unless she did conceive and bring forth a son, continuing a virgin, be a type of her who was so to do. For how can the miraculous work of the conception of a virgin be signified or expressed by the ordinary conception of a woman in the state of wedlock? Besides this answer is wholly needless as to the objection of the Jews, and inconsistent with the sense of the place, as will be seen in the consideration of the words themselves.

§ 24. We have formerly evinced that the foundation and design of the Jewish church and state, and of the preservation of the Davidical family, was solely the bringing forth of the promised Messiah. And this the event hath fully demonstrated, they being utterly rejected after the accomplishment of that end. Add hence the promise of the Messiah was the foundation, cause, and reason of all their privileges, and of all other promises made unto them. For that for the sake of which they were made a people, must needs be the reason and cause of all good things, that as a people were bestowed upon them. Thus God often promiseth to do this or that unto them for Abraham's sake, and for David's sake, that is, upon the account of the promise of the Messiah signally made unto Abraham and David, when it was declared that he should be born in the line of their posterity. And hence also, in times of difficulty, when the people were pressed on every side, and laboured for deliverance, God oftentimes renewed unto them the promise of the Messiah, partly to support their spirits with expectation of his coming, and of his salvation, and partly to give them assurance that they should not utterly perish under the then present calamity, because the great work of God by them in bringing forth the Messiah was not yet accomplished. See to this purpose the fourth chapter of Isaiah's prophecy. On account of this temporal concern which that people had in the coming of the Messiah, the promise of him was often interwoven with the mention of other things that were of present use, to them; so that sometimes it, is not easy to distinguish the things that are spoken with peculiar reference unto him, from those other things which respected what was present, seeing things of both sorts are spoken of together, and that to the same end and purpose.

§ 25. Upon these principles, we may easily discover the true sense and import of this prediction. Upon the infidelity of Ahaz, and of the gene-
rality of the house of David, they refusing a sign of deliverance tendered unto them, God tells them by his prophet, that they had not only wearied his messengers by their unbelief and hypocrisy, but that they were ready to weary himself also, ver. 13. He was even almost wearied with their manifold provocations, during that typical state in which he preserved them. However, for the present he promised them deliverance; and though they had refused to ask a sign of him according unto his command, yet he declares that he would preserve them from their present fears and from utter ruin, and in due time would accomplish his great and wonderful design, and that in a miraculous manner, by causing a virgin to conceive and bring forth that Son, on whose account they were preserved. This is the ground of the promise of the Messiah in this place, even to give them assurance that they should be preserved from utter destruction, because they were to continue to enjoy their church and state until his coming; as also to comfort and support them during their distresses with the hopes and expectation of him. For with the thoughts of his coming do the Jews of this day relieve their spirits under their calamities, though they had no renewed promise of him for near two thousand years. But how may it appear that it was the Messiah who should be thus born of a virgin? Of this the prophet assures them, by telling them his name, and by this name he tells them what he shall be; 'He shall be called Immanuel,' or God with us. He shall be so both in respect of his person and office; for he shall be God and man, and he shall reconcile God and man, taking away the enmity and distance that was caused by sin. Now this was a description of the Messiah sufficiently express; for he had been known under the Old Testament, yea from the foundation of the world, as he who alone was to accomplish this work. And the prophet further assures them, that this Immanuel shall be born truly a man, and dwell amongst them, being brought up with the common food of the country, until he came, as other men, unto the years of discretion. Butter and honey shall he eat, until he know to choose the good and refuse the evil. And this was enough for the consolation of believer, as also to secure the people from the desolation feared. But yet because all this discourse was occasioned by the war raised against Judah by the kings of Israel and Damascus, to the promise of their deliverance, God is pleased to add a threatening of judgment and destruction to their adversaries. And because he would limit a certain season for the execution of this judgment, as he had declared the safety and preservation of Judah to depend on the birth of Immanuel by a virgin in the appointed season, so as to their enemies, he declares that they should be cut off and destroyed before the time that any child not yet born could come to the years of discretion, to choose the good or refuse the evil, ver. 16. Now, that this is the true meaning of the prophecy, will evidently appear in our vindication of it from the objections mentioned above, as made by the Jews against its application by Matthew unto the nativity of Jesus Christ.

§ 26. First. They object, that it is not a virgin here intended by נライ, which they say signifies any young woman, and sometimes an adulteress. This being the foundation of all their other objections, on the determination of which the whole controversy from this place dependeth, I shall fully clear the truth of what we assert. For the Jews themselves will not deny, but that if the conception of a virgin be intended, it must refer unto some other, and not to any in those days. נライ, the word here used, is from לライ, 'to hide,' or לライ in Niphal, 'hidden, kept close, reserved.' Hence is that name of virgins, partly in general from their being unknown by man,
and partly from the universal custom of the east, by which those virgins who were of any esteem, were kept hid and reserved from all public or common conversation. Hence by the Grecians also they are called κατακληστος, 'shut up,' or 'recluses;' and their first appearance in public they termed ανακαλυπτεια, the season of bringing them out from the retirements in which they had been hidden. The original signification of the word then denotes precisely a virgin, and cannot be wrested to a person living in the state of wedlock, much less unto a prostituted harlot, as the Jews pretend.

Secondly. The constant use of the words directs us to the same signification. It is seven times used in the Old Testament, and in every one of them doth still denote a virgin, or virgins, either in a proper or metaphorical sense. The first time it is used, is Gen. xxiv. 43, where Rebekkah is said to be הָלַע, 'a virgin,' ver. 16. She is said to be הָלַע אֵלְבָר, 'a maid,' and again הָלַע אֵלְבָר אַתִי אֵלֵ֯י הָלַע, 'a maid had not known her,' so that הָלַע אֵלְבָר, 'a maid that no man hath known,' that is, an unspotted virgin. And doubtless such a one, and no other, was intended by Abraham's servant for a wife unto Isaac, when he prayed that she הָלַע אֵלְבָר, which came forth to the water, might answer his token that he had fixed on. Again, it is used, Exod. ii. 8, where Moses' sister, who called her mother unto Pharaoh's daughter, is termed הָלַע אֵלְבָר; and she living in her mother's house, and being then probably not above nine or ten years old, it is sufficiently evident that she then was a virgin. It is used once in the Psalms in the plural number, Psal. lxviii. 20, הָלַע אֵלְבָר אֲמָרְתֵּהוֹ, 'in the midst, the virgins playing with timbrels;' where also none but virgins properly so called can be intended, for they were separately employed to celebrate the praises of God in the great assembly. Twice is the word used in the same number in a metaphorical sense in the Canticles; and in both places hath respect unto virgins, ch. i. 3. 'Therefore do the virgins, love thee;' that is the virgins, as they do a desirable person, from whence the allusion is taken. And, ch. vi. 7, the virgins are distinguished first from the queens, or the king's married wives; and then from the בִּלוֹא יִשָּׂרֶה, or concubines, those who were admitted, ad usum thori, 'to the marriage-bed,' though their children did not inherit with those of the married wives. And therefore none but those who were properly virgins, could be designed by that name; and by them are those denoted, who keep themselves chaste unto Christ, and undefiled in his worship. Hence are they in the Revelations, ch. xiv. 4, said to be παρθενοι, 'virgins,' or αἱ υἱοὶ ημῶν τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 17, 'persons unblamable before the throne of God;' they not being defiled with the spiritual fornications of the great whore. There remaineth only one place more where this word is used, and from the Jews try to draw some support to their objections. It is Prov. xxx. 19, הָלַע אֵלְבָר יְדֹר, 'and the way of a man with a maid.' And who is intended by הָלַע אֵלְבָר there, they say, the ensuing words declare, הָלַע אֵלְבָר אֲמָרְתֵּהוֹ, 'so is the way of an adulteress, or a woman an adulteress, a harlot;' so that הָלַע אֵלְבָר may, it seems, be such an one. But, 1. Suppose the word should in this place be used in a sense quite contrary to that in which it is used in all other places, is it reasonable that we should take the import of it from this single peculiar use of it, rather than from all the other places in which it is constantly used in another sense? Moreover we must add, that this place will by no means admit of that signification, as we shall immediately evince. Secondly, It is used here peculiarly with the prefix ב; הָלַע אֵלְבָר, whence it is rendered by the LXX. in the abstract, ἐν νεότητι, 'the way of a man in his youth;' which sense Hierome
follows, 'viam viri in adolescentia;' and it may thus seem to be differentiated from the same word in all other places. But, thirdly, Indeed the meaning of the wise man is evident: it is a virgin that he intended by the word, חיה, is the way that a man taketh to corrupt a virgin. This is secret, hidden, full of snares and evils, such as ought not to enter into the thoughts of a good man to conceive, much less to approve of. And, therefore, whereas he says of the residue of the quaternion joined with this, ver. 18, אשה, 'they are too wonderful for me,' he adds, on the mention of this evil, 'יידע אני,' 'I know it not.' Or, as Hierome, 'penitus ignoro,' which he could not say of the way of natural generation. And by this means, she who is called אשה a virgin, ver. 19, is made אשתאשה, a harlot, ver. 20, and has become impudent in sinning. A man having, by subtle wicked ways, prevailed against her chastity, and corrupted her virginity, she afterwards becomes a common prostitute. And this I take to be the genuine meaning of the place, though it be not altogether improbable, that the wise man in ver. 20, proceedeth to another especial instance of things secret and hidden in an adulterous woman, נב signifyings as much as so also, which it doth in sundry other places.

§ 27. And these are all the places, besides that of the prophet under consideration, where the word is used in the Old Testament. So that both its derivation, and also its constant use, will admit of no other signification, but only that of an unspotted virgin. Besides, the LXX. render it in this place παρθενος, a virgin, and the Targum אשה, by which word the other Targums express a virgin, Gen. xxiv. 24, 59; Esth. ii. 2, iv. 4: Ruth ii. 23; 1 Sam. xxv. 42. Neither is any other word in the Scripture so constantly and invariably used to express an incorrupt virgin as this is. אשה hath respect only to age, and signifies any one that is young, whether she be married, or unmarried, a virgin, or one deflowered. אשת also is used for one corrupted, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. As also for a widow, Joel i. 8. So that by the word אשה a virgin is precisely signified, or the Hebrews have no word denoting exactly that state and condition. And lastly, the prefixing of נ in this place אשה, makes the denotation of the word more signal. It is so prefixed only in other two places, Gen. xxiv. and Exod. ii. In both which places the Jews themselves will not deny but that unspotted virgins are intended.

§ 28. Further, There are other considerations offering themselves from the context, undeniably proving that it is the conception of a virgin which is here intended and foretold. For first, it is plainly some marvellous thing, above, and contrary to the ordinary course of nature that is here spoken of. It is called אשה a signal prodigy, and is given by God himself in room of, and as something greater, and more marvellous than any thing that Ahaz could have asked either in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, had he made his choice according to the tender made unto him. 'The Lord God himself shall give you a sign.' The emphasis used in giving the promise, denotes the marvellousness of the thing promised. Now, certainly it was no such great matter that the wife of Ahaz, who had before borne him a son, who was now eight years of age, or that the wife of the prophet, who was the mother of Shearjashub, then present with his father, or that any virgin then present immediately to be married, should bear a son. Surely, this could not have been called a prodigy, or an eminent sign of God's accomplishing what he undertook to perform, when within the same space of time hundreds of sons were born to other woman in the same country. And it is ridiculous for the Jews to pretend that the sign was
great in this, that the prophet should foretel that conception, as also that it should be a son that should be born, and not a daughter; for the work and sign intimated doth not consist at all in the truth of the prophet's prediction, but in the greatness of the thing itself that was foretold.

§ 29. The Jews cannot tell either who was the virgin or who was the son that is here intended. Some of them affirm that Alma was the wife of Ahaz, and that the son promised was Hezekiah; but this is rejected by Kimchi himself, he acknowledging that Hezekiah was now eight years old, being born four years before his father came to the kingdom, in the fourth year of whose reign this promise was given unto him. Others would have the Alma to be the wife of the prophet, and the son promised to be Maher-shalal-hashbaz, whose birth is mentioned in the next chapter. But neither has this any more colour of reason. For his wife is called חָנַנָּא הָנָּא, the 'prophetess,' and could on no account be termed מְלֶאךְ, a 'virgin,' as she had a son some years old at that time with his father. And that son of hers in the eighth chapter, is promised as a sign quite to another purpose, and could on no account be called מְלֶאךְ, 'Immanuel,' as this promised child is, to whom the land is said to belong, ch. viii. 8. And as to what they, lastly, add concerning some virgin then standing by, who was shortly after to be married, it is as fond as any other of their imaginations. For besides that the prophet says not הָנָא מְלֶאךְ, 'this virgin,' as he would have done, if his speech had respected any one then present; it is a mere arbitrary invention, no way countenanced by the text or context; and if men may be allowed thus to interpret Scripture, it is easy for them to pervert it at their pleasure. On all which considerations it appeareth, that no one can possibly be intended in this promise, but he whose birth was נָא מְלֶאךְ a miraculous sign, as being born מְלֶאךְ a virgin, and who being thus born was נָא מְלֶאךְ 'God with us,' both in respect of his person uniting the natures of God and man in one, and in respect of his office reconciling God and man, that God might dwell with us in a way of favour and grace. This is he to whom the land belongs in an everlasting kingdom.

§ 30. I have insisted the longer on this particular point, because in this is comprised all that the prophecy is cited for by the evangelist, and all that we are especially concerned to establish from it. And this being undeniably proved and confirmed, that it is the Messiah whose birth is here foretold, as also that he was to be born of a virgin, other things in the passage, whatever difficulty we may meet with in them, must be interpreted agreeably thereunto. And we have shown before, that because of the typical condition of that people, many of the promises of the Messiah were so mixed with things belonging to their temporal interests, that it is often a matter of some difficulty to distinguish between them. But it is enough for us, that we prove unquestionably, that those passages which are applied to him in the New Testament were spoken in the Old, with this intention that they should be applied to him. This we have proved with respect to the passage which foretels that he should be born of a virgin; and in those parts of the prophecy which belonged to the then state of the Jews, we are not particularly concerned. However, we shall manifest in answer to the remaining exceptions of the Jews, that there is nothing mentioned in the whole prophecy that hath any inconsistency with what we have declared, as to the sense of the principal point of it; nay, that the whole of it is excellently suited to the principal scope, as already shown and vindicated.

§ 31. That, then, which in the second place is objected by the Jews against our application of this prophecy to Jesus Christ, is that the birth
of the child here promised, was to be a sign to Ahaz, and to the house of David, of their deliverance from the two kings who then waged war against them. And this they say, the birth of the Messiah so many hundred years after, could give them no pledge or assurance of. And 1st. We do not say, that this was given them as a peculiar sign, or token of their present deliverance. Ahaz himself had before refused such a sign. But God only shows the reason in general why he would not utterly cast them off, although they wearied him, but would yet deliver them as at other times. And this was because of that great work which he had to accomplish among them, which was to be signal, marvellous, and miraculous. And this he calls מַשָּׁל, a sign in its absolute, not in its relative sense; as denoting a wonderful work, such as sometimes he wrought to evidence his great power. In this sense מַשָּׁל, 'signs,' are joined unto וַיִּשָּׁבוּ, 'prodigies,' Deut. xxvi. 22; Jer. xxxii. 20; Neh. iv. 10, where the works so called, were great and marvellous, but not formally signs of any thing, unless it were of the wonderful power of God by which they were wrought. So the miracles of our Saviour and the apostles in the New Testament are called σημεία, signs for the same, and for no other cause. And the word is thus absolutely used very often in the Old Testament.

Besides, that which is secondly alleged, that a thing that shall come to pass many ages after, cannot be made a sign of that which was to be done many ages before, is not universally true. The thing itself in its existence, it is true, cannot be so made a sign; but it may in the promise and prediction of it. And we have many instances of things promised for signs, which were not to exist in themselves, until after the accomplishment of the things whereof they were signs, as Exod. iii. 12; 1 Sam. xi. 34; Isa. xxxvii. 10; 1 Kings xxii. 25. God intending by them the confirmation of their faith, who should live in the time of their actual accomplishment.

Thirdly. This sign had the truth and force of a promise, although it was not immediately to be put in execution, and that is the reason that the words here used, are one of them מַשָּׁל, 'conceive,' in the preterperfect tense, the other מַשָּׁל, in 'benoni;' or participle of the present tense, to intimate the certainty of the events, as is usual in the prophetical dialect. Their assurance, then, from this sign, consisted herein, that God informs them, that as surely as he would accomplish the great promise of bringing forth the Messiah, and would in this put forth his marvellous power, that Messiah might be conceived and born of a virgin, so certainly should they be delivered from their present dangers.

§ 32. It is further insisted on by them, that the deliverance promised was to be wrought before the child spoken of should know to refuse the evil and choose the good; or should come to years of discretion, ver. 16, and how could this be said of him that was to be born some hundred years after? Answ. 1st. That the מַשָּׁל, ver. 16, is the same with the מַשָּׁל promised, ver. 14, doth not appear. The prophet, by the command of God, when he went unto the king with his message, took with him Shear-ja-shub his son, ver. 3. This certainly was for some special end, with reference to the message that he had to deliver. Now, the child being then but an infant, could be of no use in the matter, unless to be made an instance of something that was to be done. It is, therefore, probable that he was the מַשָּׁל, the young child mentioned, ver. 16, before whose growing up to discretion, those kings of Damascus and Samaria were to be destroyed. Or 2dly. The expression may denote the time of any child's being born and coming to the maturity of understanding, and so, consequently, it may respect the promised child.
In as short a space of time as this promised child, when he shall be born, shall come to know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, shall this deliverance be wrought.

§ 33. Their remaining cavils are of little importance. The child intended chap viii., was to be the son of the prophet and prophetess, and so not this child that was to be born of a virgin. Besides, he is plainly promised as a sign of other things than those treated of in this chapter, yea, of things quite contrary to them. Again, this child they tell us was to be called Immanuel, whereas the Son of Mary was called מוש, or, as they maliciously write it, מוש. But this name of Immanuel is given to signify what he should be and do, and not what he should be commonly called. He was to be God and man in one person, and he was to reconcile God and man; he was thus to be every way Immanuel. And this kind of expression, when a thing is said to be called that which it is, the name denoting the being, nature, and quality of it, is so frequent in the Scriptures that there is nothing peculiar in it as here used. See Isa. i. 20, viii. 3, ix. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6; Zech. viii. 2. The like also made be said to their last objection, namely, that they know not that Jesus of Nazareth was brought up with butter and honey, which is foretold concerning this child. For the expression signifies no more but that the child should be nourished with the common food of the country, or with such food as children in those places and times were nourished with; it being the special blessing of that land that it flowed with milk and honey. Thus, we have asserted and vindicated the third characteristic note of the true Messiah: he was to be born of a virgin, which no one but only our Lord Jesus ever was from the foundation of the world.

§ 34. There remain yet other descriptive notes of the Messiah, consisting in what he was to teach, and to do, and to suffer, all of them guiding the faith of the church unto our Lord Jesus, who in all things fully answered to them all. I shall consider them briefly, according to our design, beginning with what he was to teach. To this Moses directs us, when he gives that great predescription of him, which we have Deut. xviii. 18, 19, 'I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken to my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.' This is that signal testimony concerning the Messiah, which Philip urged out of Moses to Nathaniel, John i. 45; which Peter not only applies to him, but concerning it he declares that Messiah was solely intended in it, Acts iii. 22, 23, and Stephen seals that application with his blood, Acts vii. 37. Neither can or do the Jews deny that the Messiah was to be a prophet, or that he was promised unto the church in the wilderness in these words. But we shall consider the particulars of them.

§ 35. Sundry things are here asserted by Moses concerning the Messiah; as 1st. In general, that he should be a prophet; a teacher of the church, and not a king only. The Jews indeed, who greedily desire the things which outwardly attend kingly power and dominion in this world, do principally fix their thoughts and expectations on his kingdom. The revelation of the will of God which was made by him, they little desire or inquire after. But the common faith of their ancestors from this and other places, was, that the Messiah should be a prophet, and should reveal to the church the whole counsel of God, as we shall evince in our commentary on the first words of the epistle. 2dly. That this prophet should be raised up
to them from among their brethren, that is, should be of the posterity of Abraham, and of the tribe of Judah, as was promised of old; or be made of them according unto the flesh, Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. So that as to his original or extraction, he was to be born in the level of the people; from among his brethren was he to be raised up, unto this office of a prophet and teacher of the church. 3dly. That he must be like unto Moses. It is plainly taught in many places, that in the ordinary course of God's dealings with that church, there was none among the prophets like unto Moses, neither before nor after him. Hence, Maimonides with his followers, conclude that nothing can ever be altered in their law, because no prophet was ever to arise of equal authority with him who was their lawgiver. But the words of the text are plain. The prophet here foretold was to be like unto him, and in this he was peculiar and exempted from comparison with all other prophets, who were to build on the foundation laid by Moses, without adding anything to the rule of faith and worship which he had revealed, or changing any thing therein. But the prophet here promised is to be like unto Moses; that is, he is to be a lawgiver to the house of God, as our apostle proves and declares, chap. iii. 1—5. And we have the consent of the most sober among the Jews to the same purpose.

The words of the author of Sepher Ikkarim, lib. 3, cap. 10, are remarkable. 'And as Esaviour Elohim, which sent forth Jacob unto Egypt, which made all the land of Egypt a fruitful land, so shall the Messiah, the glorious one, set up his house among his brethren, and shall send forth his servants, the Prophets, and they shall make his name known; and no one shall come before him, or be like him, as to some particular quality or accident; or that in all the space of time wherein the prophets followed him, until prophecy ceased, none should be like unto Moses; but hereafter there shall be one like him, or rather greater than he.' This is what we affirmed before, that in the whole series of prophets that succeeded in that church building on Moses' foundation, there was none like unto him, but the prophet here promised was to be like to him, and in other regards, as appears from other testimonies far greater than he. This was of old their common faith, from this prediction of Moses. And wherein this likeness was to consist, our apostle declares at large in the third chapter of this Epistle. Moses was the great lawgiver, by whom God revealed his mind and will, as to his whole worship, while the church state instituted by him was to continue. Such a prophet was the Messiah to be, a lawgiver, so as to abolish the old, and to institute new rites of worship, as we shall afterwards more fully prove. 4th. This raising up of a prophet like unto Moses, declares that the whole will of God, as to his worship and the church's obedience, was not yet revealed. Had this been the case, there would have been no need of a prophet like unto Moses, to lay new foundations as he had done. Those whose who succeeded, building on what he had founded, and therefore, said not to be like unto him, would have sufficed. But there were new counsels of the will of God, as yet hid, to be finally and fully revealed by this prophet. And after his work is done, there is no intimation of any further revelation to ensue. 5th. The presence of God with this prophet in his work, is promised. 'He would put his word into his mouth,' or speak in him, as our apostle expresseth the same matter, ch. i. 1. And lastly, his ministry is further described from the event, with respect unto them
who would not submit unto his authority, nor receive the law of God at his mouth. God would require it at their hands; that is, as those words are interpreted by Peter, they should be cut off from among his people, or from being his people. And the accomplishment of this signal threatening, gives light to the whole prediction. Some of the Jews, from these words have fancied to themselves another great prophet, whom they expect as they did of old, before the coming of the Messiah. So in their dealing with John the Baptist, they asked him whether he were Elias, which he denied, because, though he was promised under that name, yet he was not that individual person whom they looked for, that is, the soul of Elias the Tishbite, as Kimchi tells us, with a body new created like unto the former. Then, they further demand whether he were ὁ προφήτης, 'the prophet promised by Moses,' which he also denies, because that prophet was no other than the Messiah, John i. 21. To the same purpose also, the Spirit of the Lord is promised 'to rest upon the Messiah, to make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, that he might not judge after the sight of his eyes,' &c., Isa. xi. 3—5; see also chap. xlii. 1, 2. And from this great prophet were the isles of the Gentiles to receive the law, chap. xlii. 1, 2. The sum of all is, the Messiah was to be a prophet, a prophet like unto Moses, that is, a lawgiver; one that should finally and perfectly reveal the whole will and counsel of God, with such authority, that whosoever refused to obey him should be exterminated, and cast out from the privilege of being reckoned among the people of God.

§ 36. We are then, in the next place, to consider the accomplishment of this promise in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Now, the history of his life, and the event, do abundantly testify that he was a prophet, and that he was so esteemed by the Jews themselves, until through the envy of the Scribes and Pharisees, and through their own unwillingness to receive his pure and holy doctrines, they were stirred up to oppose and persecute him, as they had done all other prophets, who in their several generations foretold his coming, see John i. 46, vi. 17; Acts iii. 22, 23. Their present obstinate denial hereof, is a mere contrivance to justify themselves in their rejection and murder of him. But this is not all; he was not only a prophet in general, but he was that prophet who was foretold by Moses, and by all the prophets who built on his foundation, who was to put the last hand to divine revelations, in a full declaration of the whole counsel of God. Now, this is the peculiar work of the Messiah, and in the ensuing consideration of the doctrines of Jesus Christ, with the success and event of them, we shall evince that he accomplished this work.

§ 37. First. The nature of the doctrine taught by this prophet gives testimony to our assertion. Whatever characters of that truth which is holy and heavenly, can be rationally conceived or apprehended, they are all eminently and incomparably imprinted on the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Whatever tends to the glory of God, as the first cause, and the last end of all things, as the only Sovereign Ruler, Judge, and Disposer of all, as the only infinitely holy, wise, righteous, good, gracious, merciful, powerful, faithful, independent Being, is clearly and evidently, and in a heavenly manner revealed therein. Whatever is useful or suitable to excite and improve any good that is in man, in the notions of his mind, or in the inclinations of his will, to discover his wants and defects, that he may not exalt himself in his own imagination above his real condition; whatever is needful to reveal to man his end, or his way, his happiness, or the means conducting thereunto, this, the doctrine of Jesus plainly teaches. Whatever may bring man into a due subjection to God, and subordination to his glory; whatever
may teach him to be useful in all those relations in which he may be placed, to the full extent of the moral principles of his nature, as a creature made for society; whatever it useful to deter him from evil, and to suppress in him every evil thing, even in the hidden seeds of it, which lie beneath the first instances that reason can discover, and that in absolute universality, without the least indulgence on any pretence; whatever can produce these effects, the doctrine of Jesus forcibly inculcates. Whatever can be conceived as fitted to excite man, to provoke him unto, and to direct him in the practice of all that is true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report; of all that is virtuous or praiseworthy; that may begin, bound, guide, limit, finish, and perfect the whole system of moral actions in him, in relation to God, to himself, and to others; all this is revealed, confirmed, and ratified in the doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It hath stood upon its trial above sixteen hundred years in the world, challenging the wit and malice of its adversaries, to discover any one thing, or any circumstance of any thing, that is untrue, false, evil, uncomely, not useful, or inconvenient in it. It also challenged men to find out anything that is morally good, virtuous, useful, praiseworthy, in habit or in exercise, in any instances of operations, in any degree of intention of mind, any duty that man owes to God, to others, or to himself, that is not taught, enjoined, encouraged, and commanded by it; or to discover any motives, encouragements, or reasons unto, and for the pursuit of that which is good, and for the avoiding of evil, that are true, real, solid, and rational, which it inculcates not on them that embrace it. This absolute perfection of the doctrine of this prophet, joined with those characters of divine authority which are enstamped upon it, sufficiently evidences that it contains the great, promised, full, final revelation of the will of God, which was to be given by the Messiah. Add hereunto, that since the revelation of this doctrine, the whole race of mankind hath not been able to find out any thing, that without the most palpable folly and madness might be added to it, much less stand in competition with it. Let these things be considered, and they will sufficiently demonstrate the author of this system.

§ 38. Secondly. We have declared in the entrance of this discourse, that the Messiah was the means promised for delivering mankind from that woeful estate of sin and misery into which they had cast themselves. This was declared unto all in general, and this was believed by them whom God graciously enabled thereunto. But how this deliverance should be wrought in particular by the Messiah, how the works of the devil should be destroyed, how God and man should be reconciled, how sinners might recover a title to their lost happiness, and be brought to an enjoyment of it; this was unknown not only unto all the sons of men, but also to all the angels in heaven themselves. Who, then, shall unfold this mystery which was hid in the counsel of God, from the foundation of the world? It was utterly beyond the reason and wisdom of man, to give any tolerable conjecture how these things should be effected. But all this is fully declared by this prophet himself. In his doctrine, this great and hidden mystery of the reconciliation and salvation of mankind, opens itself gloriously to the minds and understandings of them that believe, for their eyes the God of this world doth not now blind. For, although this promise of the Messiah was all that God revealed to Adam, and by him unto his posterity, to keep their hopes alive in their miserable condition; yet such was its obscurity, that the minds of men being full of darkness, and their hearts being set upon the pursuit of their lusts, it was as to the substance of it, utterly lost to the greatest part of mankind. Afterwards by new revelations and pro-
mises, it was again made known to some, but the manner of its accomplishment was still left hid in the depths of the bosom of the Almighty. But by the preaching of Jesus, both the thing itself, and the manner of it, are together brought to light, being made known and established beyond all the power of Satan to prevail against it. This was the work of the promised prophet; this was done by Jesus of Nazareth, who is, therefore, both Lord and Christ.

§ 39. Thirdly. We have also declared, how God in his wisdom and sovereignty restrained the promise to Abraham and his posterity, and how he shadowed out among them the accomplishment of it in Mosaic rites and institutions. These also received manifold explications by the succeeding prophets. And from the whole, a system of worship and doctrine arose, which turned wholly on this hinge of the promised Messiah, relating in all things to the salvation to be wrought by him. But yet the will and mind of God in this whole dispensation was wrappt up in types, was vailed and shadowed by carnal ordinances, and was obscured and hid in allegorical expressions; so that the bringing these truths forth to light, the removal of the clouds and shades that were spread over them, and the declaration of the nature, reason, and use of all those institutions, was a work no less glorious than the very first revelation of the promise itself. This was that which was reserved for the great prophet, the Messiah; for it is unreasonable to imagine that God would prescribe ordinances and institutions to his church, whose full nature, use, and end, should be for ever unknown unto them. Now this manifestation of the nature and design of these ordinances is given in the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ. From it we learn the spiritual end, use, and nature of all these sacrifices, and typical institutions, which to them who were conversant only with their outside, were servile performances, and an insupportable yoke of bondage. This they were to the Jews in the days of the apostles, and this they are to their children, for they are never able to satisfy themselves in their most scrupulous attendance to them. But these were all made evident and plain, and all that was taught by them was accomplished by the prophet like unto Moses. He fulfilled the end, and unveiled the mind of God in all these institutions. And he hath done it so fully, that whosoever looks upon them through his declaration of them, cannot but be amazed at the blindness and stupidity of the Jews, who rejecting the revelation of the counsel of God by him, adhere pertinaciously unto that whereof they understand not one tittle or syllable aright. For the meanest Christian who is instructed in the doctrine of the gospel, can give a better account of the nature, use, and end of Mosaic institutions, than all the profound Rabbins in the world either can, or ever could do; he that is least in the kingdom of God, being greater in this light and knowledge, than John Baptist himself, who yet was not behind any of the prophets that went before him. This, I say, is that which the promised prophet was to do; and moreover, he was to add institutions by his own immediate revelation, even as Moses had given them the law of ordinances of old. And in this institution of new ordinances of worship, thereby superseding those instituted by Moses, was he like unto him, as was foretold.

§ 40. Lastly, The event confirms the application of this character to the Lord Jesus. Whoever would not receive the word of this prophet, God threatens to require it of him, that is, as themselves confess, to exterminate them from among the number of his people, or to reject them from being so. Now this was exemplified in the case of the Jewish nation. They re-
ceived him not, they obeyed not his voice, and what was the end of this their disobedience? They who for their despising, persecuting, and killing the former prophets, were only corrected, chastened, afflicted, and again quickly recovered out of the worst and greatest of their troubles; upon their rejection of him, and disobedience to his voice, are cut off, destroyed, and exterminated from the place of their solemn worship, and utterly rejected from being the people of God. Whatever may be conceived to be contained in the commination against those who disobey the voice of the promised prophet, all of it in its whole extent, came upon the Jews, for their disobedience of the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth. Now this, added to the foregoing considerations, undeniably proves him to have been that prophet.

§ 41. There is yet another character given of the Messiah in the Old Testament; it is derived from what he was to suffer in the world, in the discharge of his work and office. This being the main foundation of the whole deliverance, and that which God knew would be most contrary to the apprehension and expectation of that carnal people, is of all other notes of him, most clearly and fully revealed. Without an understanding of the nature and effects of the sufferings of the Messiah, and how these were to be satisfactory to the justice of God, little or nothing of the promise, or of Mosaic institutions, can be rightly understood. But because we must treat of these matters in our explication of the epistle itself, we shall not here insist on them. It is sufficient to our present intention, that we prove that the Messiah was to suffer, and that as he was to endure many other miseries, so he was to suffer death itself; and that this his suffering is foretold as a character to know and discern him by. Now that Jesus of Nazareth, by so many other demonstrations, and evident tokens proved to be the Messiah, did also suffer the utmost that could be inflicted on a man, and in particular that he did submit to the things and evils which the Messiah was to undergo, we shall not need to prove; the Jews confess it, and even glory that their forefathers were the instrumental cause of his sufferings. Neither doth it at present concern us to declare what he suffered from God himself, what from man, and what from Satan, in his life and death, in his soul and body, and in all his concerns; it being abundantly sufficient to our present purpose, that he suffered all manner of miseries; and, lastly, death itself, and that not for himself, but for the sins of others.

§ 42. The first evident testimony given hereunto, is in Ps. xxii. from the beginning to ver. 22. That sufferings, and those very great and inexpressible, are treated of in this Psalm, the Jews themselves confess; indeed the matter is too evident to be denied. That dereliction by God, tortures and pains in body and soul, revilings, mockings, with cruel death, are sufferings, is certain, and they are all here foretold. Again, it is evident, that some individual person is designed as the subject of those sufferings. Most of the Jews would interpret this Psalm of the body of the people, to whom not one line in it can be properly applied. For besides, that the person intended, is spoken of individually throughout the whole prophecy, he is also plainly distinguished from all the people, of what sort soever; from the evil amongst them who reviled and persecuted him, ver. 7, 8, and from the residue, whom he calls his brethren, and the congregation of Israel, ver. 22. It cannot, then, be the congregation of Israel that is spoken of; for how can the congregation of Israel be said to declare the praises of God, before the congregation of Israel, which is the sum of Kimchi’s exposition. Some
of them from the title of the Psalm, הַיְרָעֹא; 'for the hound of the morning,' would have it to be a prophecy of Esther, who appeared as beautiful as the morning in the deliverance of Israel. But as the title is of another import, respecting the nature of the Psalm, not the person treated of in it, so they are not able to apply one verse or word in it to her. Others of them plead, that it is David himself who is intended; and this is not without some shadow of truth; for David might in some things propose his own afflictions and sufferings, as types of the sufferings of the Messiah. But there are many things in this Psalm that cannot be applied unto him absolutely. When did any open their lips, and shake their heads at him, using the words mentioned, ver. 7, 8? When was he, or his blood poured forth like water, and all his bones disjoined? ver. 14. When were his hands and feet pierced? ver. 16. When did any part his garments, and cast lots on his vesture? ver. 18. When was he brought to the dust of death, before his last and final dissolution? ver. 15. And yet all these things were to be accomplished in the person of him, who is principally treated of in this Psalm.

§ 43. This whole Psalm, then, is a prophecy of the Messiah, and absolutely of no other, as may further be evidenced from sundry passages in the Psalm itself. For first, It treats of one in whom the welfare of the whole church was concerned; they are, therefore, all of them invited to praise the Lord on his account, and for the event and success of his sufferings which they had the benefit of, ver. 22, 23. Secondly. It is he by whom the meek shall be satisfied, and obtain life eternal, ver. 26. Thirdly. Upon his sufferings, as the event and consequence of them, the Gentiles are to be gathered in unto God, ver. 27. 'All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.' And this by the confession of the Jews is the proper work of the Messiah, to be effected in his days and by him alone. Fourthly. The preaching of the truth and righteousness and faithfulness of God in his promise to all nations, that is the preaching of the gospel, ensues on the sufferings described, ver. 31, which they also acknowledge to belong to his days. So that it is the Messiah, and he alone, who is absolutely and ultimately intended in this Psalm.

§ 44. Now the whole of what is here prophesied was so exactly fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, in all the instances of it, that it appears to be spoken directly of him, and no other. The manner of his sufferings is scarcely more clearly expressed in the story of it by the evangelists, than it is here foretold by David in prophecy, and therefore many passages out of this Psalm are expressed by them in their records. He it was who, pressed with a sense of God's dereliction, cried out, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' He it was that was accounted a worm and no man, and reviled and reproached accordingly; at him did men shake their heads, and reproach him with his trust in God; his bones were drawn out of joint by the manner of his sufferings; his hands and feet were pierced, and upon his vesture lots were cast; upon his sufferings were the truth and promises of God declared and preached to all the world: so that it is his suffering alone which is beforehand described in this Psalm.

§ 45. But the Jews object to our application of this Psalm to the Lord Jesus, from our own principles (as they imagine) and greatly triumph in their supposed advantage; but, indeed, their triumph is only in their own blindness and ignorance. Jesus, they tell us, in the opinion of Christians, was God, and how can these things be spoken of God; how could God cry
out, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? how could men pierce the hands and feet of God?" And sundry of the like queries are made by Kimchi on the several passages of this Psalm. But we know of how slender importance these things are. He who suffered was God; but he suffered not as God, nor in that wherein he was God; for he was man also, and as man, and in that wherein he was man, did he suffer. But their ignorance of the union of the divine and human nature in the person of Christ, each nature preserving its distinct properties and operations, is what they would by no means part with, because it stands them, as they suppose, in great stead, as furnishing them with those weak and pitiful objections that they use to make against the gospel.

§ 46. We have yet another signal testimony to the same purpose, Isa. liii. As the outward manner of the sufferings of the Messiah, with the actions of them who were instrumental therein, is principally considered in Psalm xxii., so the inward nature, end, and effect of them, are declared in this prophecy. There are also various passages in it relating to the covenant between the Lord Christ and his Father, for the carrying on of the work of redemption by this way of suffering. The ancient Jews not understanding Messiah's personal subsistence before his incarnation, referred these unto his soul, which they imagine was created at the beginning of the world. Indeed, there is not any prophecy that fills the present Rabbins with more perplexities, or drives them to more absurdities and contradictions. It is not our present business to explicate the particular passages of the prophecy, or to make application of them to the Messiah. It hath been done already by sundry learned men, and we also have cast our mite into this sanctuary on another occasion. That on which we insist, is obvious to all; namely, that dreadful sufferings in soul and body, and that from the will and good pleasure of God, for ends expressed in it, are here foretold and declared. At present, our only inquiry is after the Person spoken of; for whoever he be, the Jews will not deny but that he was to suffer all sorts of calamities. That it is the Messiah, and none other, we have evidence from the text and context, from the nature of the subject-matter treated of, and from the utter impossibility of applying the thing spoken of unto any other person, without overthrowing the whole faith of the ancient church. Moreover, from the confession of the Jews themselves, we have all the advantage which can be expected, or need to be desired from adversaries. For,

§ 47. First. The most ancient and best records of their judgment, expressly affirm that the person spoken of is the Messiah. I refer to the Targum on the place, which they esteem of unquestionable, if not of divine authority. The spring and rise of the whole prophecy, as the series of the discourse manifests, is in ver. 13. of ch. lii., and there the words, ויהי כי עבר, 'Behold my servant shall prosper,' or deal wisely, are rendered by Jonathan, ויהי כי מעשרי אימר אליך, 'Behold my servant the Messiah shall prosper.' And among other verses, the 5th verse of ch. liii. is paraphrased by him, as that none of the Jews will pretend any other to be intended: ויהי כי בים יקדים את משולם ויקיים את ויסר נמצא ואת הנ亮相 אל, 'And he shall build the house of our sanctuary, which is profaned for our sins, and delivered for our iniquities, and in his doctrine shall peace be multiplied unto us: and when we obey his word, our sin shall be forgiven us.' Here, indeed, he greatly perverts the text, yet he gives us that sense which, by their own confession, is applicable only to the Messiah. And by this, as by other parts of his interpretation, he stopped the way to the present rabbinical
evasions. The translation of the LXX. they have formerly avouched as their own. And this also plainly refers the words to the Messiah and his sufferings, though somewhat more obscuringly than it is done in the original.

In the Talmud itself, lib. Saned. Tractat. Chelek., among other names they assign unto the Messiah, מַלְשָׁנֵה is one; because it is said in this place, סָמְכָה תְיוֹם נַה אֲמָא, 'truly he bore our infirmity.' We have their ancient Rabbins making the same acknowledgment. To this purpose they speak in Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxiv. 17. 'This is Messiah the King, who shall be in the generation of the wicked, and shall reject them, and choose the blessed God and his holy name, to serve him with his whole heart.'

ין תיוא מַלְשָׁנֵה. 'And he shall set his heart to seek mercy for Israel, to fast, and to humble himself for them,' as it is said, Isa. liii., 'He was wounded for our transgressions,' וּבשָׁמוּל הָאֵמוֹת הֲוָא מַכְּלָף הַדָּרוֹמִים ח' כְּחֵרֶב הָמָא כָּלָף. 'And when Israel sinneth, he seeketh mercy for them, as it is said again, And by his stripes are we healed.' So Tanchuma on ver. 13, ch. lii. מַלְשָׁנֵה מַלְשָׁנֵה, 'this is King Messiah.' And not to repeat more particular testimonies, we have their full confession in Alshech on the place, with which I shall close the consent. וְהָא יִרְדֶּשׁ מַלְשָׁנֵה קַיְמֶהוֹ קַמִּילֶּהוֹ עִם מַלְשָׁנֵה מַלְשָׁנֵה, 'Behold our masters, of blessed memory, with one consent determine according as they received by tradition, that it is concerning Messiah the King that these words are spoken.' And, therefore, Abarbinel himself, who of all his companions hath taken most pains to corrupt and pervert this prophecy, confesseth that all their ancient wise men were of the same opinion with Ben Uzziel in his Targum. So that we have as full a suffrage unto this character of the Messiah from the Jews themselves, as can be desired or expected.

§ 48. This testimony is also corroborated by the weakness of the opposition which at present they make to our application of this place unto the Messiah. It is rather to rage than to reason that they trust. Indeed they act as if they had adopted the maxim 'Pereant et amici, dummodo et immici perant.' Let Targum, Talmud, Cabal tradition, and former masters, be all esteemed liars, or deceived, if Christians may thus be disappointed. New expositions and applications of this prophecy they coin, wherein they openly contradict one another; yea, the same man (as Abarbinel) sometimes contradicts himself. And when they have done, they suggest such things as are utterly inconsistent with the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah, and indulge in innumerable follies, no way deserving our serious consideration. The chief things which they most confide in, we shall speedily remove out of our way.

First. Some of them say, that this prophecy indeed concerneth the Messiah, but not Messiah Ben David who shall be always victorious, but Messiah Ben Joseph, who shall be slain in battle against Gog and Magog. But 1. This figment wholly overthrows the faith of the true Messiah, and they may as well make twenty as two of them. 2. That Ben Joseph, who is the mere creature of their own imaginations, is to be a great warrior from his first appearance, and after many victories, is to be slain in a battle, or at least so it is to be thought. But this prophecy speaks of a man who is poor, destitute, despised, and afflicted all his life; who is bound, imprisoned, rejected, scorned, condemned, and slain under a pretence of judgment; not one thing of all this do they ascribe, or can they ascribe to their Ben Joseph.

2. Others feign that the true Messiah was born long ago, and that he
lived among the leprous people at the gates of Rome, being himself leprous and full of sores, which, as they say, is foretold in this prophecy. Such monstrous imaginations as these could not be repeated without some participation in the folly of their authors, were it not that poor souls are ruined by them, and that they evidence what a foolish thing man is when left to himself, or judicially given up to blindness and unbelief. We are ready to wonder at the senseless stupidity of their forefathers, who chose to worship Baal and Moloch, rather than the true God, who had so eminently revealed himself unto them, and the Jews of the present day themselves wonder at this; but it doth in no way exceed the stupidity of those who have lived since the rejection of the true Messiah, and we do not need any other instance than that before us to make good our observation. For this story of the leper is not only most absurd in itself, but moreover it does not in any thing answer the words of the prophecy, nor indeed hath it any countenance from one word therein; that single word on which they found their notion signifying any kind of infirmity or sorrow in general.

3. Some of them apply this prophecy to Jeremiah, concerning whom Abarbinel affirms, and that truly, that no one line or verse in the whole can with any colourable pretence be applied unto him; which also I have in particular manifested on another occasion. He applies it two ways: 1. To Josiah. 2. To the whole body of the people; contradicting himself in the exposition of every particular instance, and the truth in the whole. But it is to the whole people, in their last desolation, that they chiefly desire to wrest this prophecy. But this is, 1. Contrary to the testimony of their Targum and Talmud, to all their ancient masters, and to some of the wisest of their more modern doctors. 2. It is contrary to their own principles, profession, and belief; for they acknowledge that their present misery is continued on them for their sins, and that if they could but repent and live to God, their Messiah would undoubtedly come; but this place speaks of the perfect innocence and righteousness of him that suffers, he no way on his own account deserving, so to suffer; now, if they ascribe this innocence to themselves, and yet their Messiah is not come, they must for ever bid adieu to all their expectations of him. 3. It is contrary to the express words of the text, plainly describing one individual person. 4. It is contrary to the context, distinguishing the people of the Jews from him that was to suffer by them, among them, and for them, ver. 3—6. 5. It is contrary to every particular assertion and passage in the whole prophecy, no one of them being applicable to the body of the people. All these things are so manifest to every one who shall but read the place with attention, and without prejudice, that they need not any farther confirmation. Hence Johannes Isaac confesses, that the consideration of this place was the means of his conversion.

§ 49. Again, the whole work promised from the foundation of the world to be accomplished by the Messiah, is here ascribed to the person treated of, and to his sufferings. Peace with God is to be made by his chastisement, ver. 5, and healing of our wounds by sin, is from his stripes. He bears the iniquity of the church, ver. 6, that they may find acceptance with God. In his hand, the pleasure of the Lord for the redemption of his people was to prosper, ver. 10. And he is to justify them for whom he died, ver. 11. If these and the like things here mentioned may be performed by any other, the Messiah need not come, there is no work for him to do in this world. But if these are the things which God hath promised that he shall perform, then he, and none other, is here intended.

§ 50. Neither are the cavils of the Jews about the application of some
expressions unto the Lord Jesus, worth the least consideration. For all of them may be easily removed, the whole prophecy being exactly accomplished in him, and his passion being here set forth beyond any instance of a description of any thing future in the whole Scripture. Besides, our faith does not depend on the application of these disputed expressions. Let them but grant that the true and only Messiah was to converse among the people in a despised, contemned, reproached condition; that he was to be rejected by them, to be persecuted, to suffer, to bear our iniquities, and that from the hand of God; that he was to make his soul an offering for sin, and by that means spiritually to redeem and save his people; then, as they know well, there is an end of this controversy, for then the Lord Jesus must on all hands be acknowledged to be the true and only Messiah.

§ 51. But that we may not seem to avoid any of the pretences, or exceptions that they make use of, when they are pressed with this testimony, I shall briefly consider what their later masters object to our interpretation of this passage. These men think themselves wiser than the authors of their Targum and Talmud, and all their ancient doctors, who with one consent acknowledge the Messiah to be intended in this prophecy, and wrest it to the people of the Jews themselves, to whom not one line or word of it is applicable. First, then, They say, that it is not the prophet speaking by command from the Lord, nor in the persons of the people of the Jews, but that it is the kings of the earth who formerly had afflicted them, who are mentioned, ch. iii. 15, who utter and speak the words of this chapter, in an admiration of the blessed state to which the Jews shall at length attain.—Answ. Any man that shall but view the context, will easily the shameful folly of this evasion. For 1. Where is there any instance in the whole Scripture of such introduction of aliens and foreigners, and of the prophets personating them in what they say, and why should such a singular imagination here take place? 2. How could they say, ‘Who hath believed our report,’ or the doctrine that we had heard and taught concerning this person, or these persons? Had the kings and nations preached the misery and subsequent happiness of the people of the Jews, that they are forced to complain of the incredulity of men, that they would not believe them? And who would not believe them? The Jews? They believe it well enough? The nations and their kings? They are supposed to be the men complaining that they are not believed; so that the fondness of this imagination is beyond expression. 3. How do they say, ‘For the iniquity of my people he was stricken,’ ver. 8. Who are they for whom this was endured, when the people themselves are supposed to speak? In brief, let all the Jews in the world find out one expression in the whole prophecy tolerably suited unto this hypothesis of theirs, and I shall be contented that the whole of it be granted unto them, and be used according to their desires.

§ 52. Secondly. They add, that the subject of this prophecy is spoken of in the plural number, and so cannot intend any one person. This they endeavour to prove from those words of the Lord, ver. 8, מְסָמַע יִמְוָיְנָו לְמָן מָלָא, which they render, ‘a transgression populi mei plaga illa.’ ‘Lamo,’ is of the plural number, and so cannot, say they, respect any single person, but must denote the whole people. Answ. But what perverseness is this? Whoever is intended in this prophecy, he is spoken of twenty times as a single person; and such things are spoken of him, as can by no artifices be suited to any collective body of people. And shall one expression in the plural number outweigh all these in the singular number, and be used to
pervert the whole context, and to render it unintelligible? 2. But suppose the word to denote many, and not one single person, will it not unavoidably follow, that in the passage mention is occasionally made of some other persons, besides him who is the principal subject of the prophecy; and so the sense can be no other, but that the people of the prophet, that is the Jews, should assuredly be punished for the rejection of him, whose person and work he prophesied about. 3. The truth is, the word hath not necessarily a plural signification: מְלוֹן, 'lamo,' is most frequently put for לֶם, by the insertion of מ, whereof we have sundry instances in the Scriptures, Gen. ix. 26, 'Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant:' 'lamo' for 'lo.' Job xx. 23, 'God shall cast the fury of his wrath upon him, and it shall rain upon him whilst he is eating.' So again the same word is used, ch. xxii, 2; Ps. xi. 7. 'The righteous Lord loveth righteousness; יִמשְׂרֵא יִשָּׁר ה יי, his counseller doth behold the upright:' יָשָׁר ה יי for יִמשְׂרֵא יִשָּׁר ה. And in this prophet, ch. xliv. 15. 'He maketh it a graven image, יִמְגָּר עִיר קָנָן, and he falleth down to it:' יִמְגָּר עִיר קָנָן for יָשָׁר ה יי. And this is so known, that there is scarce any grammarian of their own who hath not taken notice of it; so that this exception also is evidently imperient.

§ 53. They yet urge further those words, ver. 10: 'He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days.' This, say they, 'cannot apply unto any, but to those who have children of their bodies begotten, in whom their days are prolonged.' Answ. 1. It was well if they would consider the words foregoing, of his making his soul an offering for sin, that is, dying for it, and then tell us how he that doth so can see his carnal seed afterwards, and in them prolong his days. 2. He that is here spoken of is directly distinguished from the seed, that is the people of God, so that they cannot be the subject of the prophecy. 3. It is not said that he shall prolong his days in his seed, but he himself shall prolong days after his death; that is upon his resurrection he shall live eternally, which is called length of days. 4. The seed here, are the seed spoken of, Psal. xxii. 30. 'A seed that shall serve the Lord,' and be all accounted unto him for a generation; that is, a spiritual seed, as the Gentiles are called the 'children of Zion brought forth upon her travelling,' Isa. lxvi. 8. Besides, how the Messiah shall obtain this seed is expressed in the next verse: 'By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many.' His seed are such as are converted to God by his doctrine, and justified by faith in him. And to call disciples the seed, the offspring, the children of their masters and instructors, is so common among the Jews, that no phrases or expressions are more in use. Thus speaks expressly this prophet, also, ch. viii. 18: 'Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me;' and who were their children, he declares, ver. 16: 'Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples;' these were the children whom the Lord had given him. And this is the sum of all that which with any appearance of reason is objected against our application of this place to the Messiah; and how weak and trivial it is, is obvious to every ordinary understanding.

§ 54. We may yet add some other testimonies to the same purpose, Daniel tells us, ch. ix. 26, זֵכֶר ה יי וּכַל יִשָּׁר, 'Messiah shall be cut off,' that is from the land of the living; and that not for himself. And Zech. ix. 9, is said, he shall be מָעַן, poor; and in his best condition, 'riding on an ass;' which place is interpreted by Solomon Jarchi, and others, of the Messiah. He was also to be נָפָל, the king, as the Targum, that was to be מָעַן, pierced. Zech. xii. 10, being the Shepherd, ch. xiii. 7, the מְלֹך, the king, as the Targum, that was to be מָעַן, smitten with the sword
of the Lord.' The Judge of Israel that was to be smitten with the rod on the cheek, Mic. iv. 1. All denoting his persecution and suffering.

§ 55. Agreeably to these testimonies, the Jews themselves have a tradition about the sufferings of the Messiah, which sometimes breaks forth amongst them. In Midrash Tehillim, on Psal. ii., 'Rabbi Hana, in the name of Rabbi Idi, says that the Messiah must bear the third part of the affliction that shall ever be in the world.' And R. Machir, in Abkath Rochel, affirms that 'God inquired of the soul of the Messiah, at the beginning of the creation, whether he would endure sufferings and afflictions for the purging away the sins of his people; to which he answered, that he would bear them with joy.' And that these sufferings of the Messiah are such, as that without the consideration of them no rational account can be given of any of their services or sacrifices, shall in our exposition be fully declared. Now upon these testimonies it is evident, that the great argument used by the Jews to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was not the true Messiah, namely, his meanness, poverty, persecutions, and sufferings in this world, doth strongly confirm the truth of our faith, that he only was so indeed.

§ 56. To these characters given of the Messiah, we might also subjoin other invincible arguments, proving our Lord Jesus Christ to be he that was promised. I shall add only some few of them, and that very briefly, because they have been in a special manner at large insisted on by others.

First, then, To the Jews he testified of himself that he was the Messiah, and that those who believed not that he was so should perish in their sins. And because, according to a general rule he granted, that though the testimony which he gave concerning himself, being the testimony of the Son of God, was true, yet that it might be justly liable to exception amongst them, he therefore appeals, for the confirmation of his assertion, to the works that he wrought; resting the decision of the question about his testimony on the nature of his works, and freeing them from the obligation to believe in him, if his works were not such as no other man ever wrought, or ever could work, but the Messiah only. 'The works,' saith he, 'that my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me,' John v. 36; that is, to be the Messiah. His own record he asserts to be true, and he appeals also to the testimony of John; but he shows it to be inferior to those other witnesses which he had, namely, the Scripture and his own works. And so also, ch. x. 37, he says, 'If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.'

§ 57. Many things might be insisted on for the confirmation of this argument. I shall only point at the heads of them; nor is there more necessary unto our present purpose.

First. All true and real miracles are effects of divine power. Many things prodigious, marvellous, or monstrous, differing from the common and ordinary productions of nature, may be brought forth by an extraordinary concurrence of causes. Many marvellous things may be wrought by the great, hidden, and to us unknown power of wicked spirits: many things may have an appearance of prodigy and wonder, by the force of some deceit, pretence, or delusion, which attends the exhibition of them. But real miracles are effects so above, beside, or contrary to the nature and efficacy of any or all natural causes, that by no application or disposition of them, though never so uncouth and unusual, can they be produced. Miracles, therefore, must of necessity be the effects of an almighty creating power, causing somewhat to exist in matter or manner out of nothing, or
out of that which is more adverse unto the being or manner of existence given unto it. Such are the works of raising the dead, opening the eyes of men born blind, &c. And this position the Jews will not deny, seeing they make it the foundation of their adherence to the law of Moses.

§ 58. Secondly. When God puts forth his miracle-working power, in the confirmation of any word or doctrine, he avows it to be of, and from himself; to be absolutely and infallibly true, setting the fullest and openest seal unto it which men, who cannot discern his essence or being, are capable of receiving or discerning. And therefore when a doctrine, in itself such as becometh the holiness and righteousness of God, is confirmed by the emanation of his divine power in the working of miracles, no greater evidence of the truth of it can be given, even by God himself.

§ 59. Thirdly, The Lord Jesus, in the days of his flesh, wrought many great, real miracles, in the confirmation of the testimony that he gave concerning himself, that he was the Christ, the Son of God: see John v. 20, vii. 31, x. 25, xii. 37. Greater confirmation it could not have. Now, that the Lord Jesus wrought the miracles recorded by the evangelists, with others innumerable that are not recorded, (see John xx. 30, xxi. 25,) we have in general all the testimony, evidence, and means of certainty, that any man can possibly have of things which he saw not done with his own eyes. And to suppose that a man can have no assurance of any thing but of what he sees or feels himself, as it overthrows all the foundations of knowledge, and of all human society, yea, of every thing that as men we either do, or know; so when this is granted, it will necessarily follow that we know not the things that we see, any longer than whilst we see them; and perhaps not even then, seeing the evidence we have of knowing any thing by our senses proceeds from principles and presumptions which we never saw, nor ever can see. These things, however, need not be insisted on, for in reasoning with the Jews, we have all the advantage for the confirmation of what we affirm, that we either need to desire, or that the subject can admit of.

§ 60. First, We plead our own records, that are written by the evangelists. And here we have but one request to make to the Jews, namely, that they would lay no exceptions against them, which they know to be of equal force against the writings of Moses and all the prophets. If they declare themselves to be such bedlamites, as to set their own houses on fire, for no other end but to endanger those of their neighbours; if they will destroy the principles of their own faith and religion, to cast the broken pieces of them at the heads of Christians; if they cry, 'pereant amici dummodo et pereant inimici,' they are not fit to be any longer contended with. I desire then to know what objection the Jews can make to this record, which mutatis mutandis may not be made to the Mosaic writings. And if they have always held all such objections to be invalid, when opposed to the evidences on which they believe those writings, why will they not give us leave to affirm the same of these objections, when urged against the New Testament Scriptures, which we receive and believe on no less certain testimonies and evidences? Unless, then, they can plead something against the credit of our writers, or disprove that which is written by them, from records of equal weight with them, (which they can never do, nor do they attempt it,) they have nothing reasonable to plead in this case. To tell us that they do not believe what is written by them, and that their forefathers did not believe it, is, as to themselves, no more than what we know, and as to their forefathers, is nothing but what those very writers testify.
concerning them. To expect, then, a proof of the consent of their fathers to that record, while the record itself witnesseth that they dissented from it, is to overthrow the record and all that is contained in it. The Jews, then, have nothing to oppose to this testimony, but only their own unbelief; which, for all the reasons that have been insisted on, cannot be admitted as any just objection. History or circumstance they have none to oppose to it.

§ 61. Secondly. We plead the notoriety of the miracles wrought by Christ, and the tradition delivering them down unto us. This also the Jews plead concerning the miracles of Moses. They were, say they, openly wrought in the sight of all Israel, and that they were so wrought, the testimony of Israel in succeeding ages is, next to the writings themselves, the best and only witness which they can produce. And wherein doth our testimony come short of theirs? Nay, both on account of their first notoriety, and also of succeeding tradition, our evidence far exceeds what they have to plead. For the miracles of Moses were indeed wrought openly, but the most of them were wrought only in the sight of that one people, whom he had under his own conduct, and in a wilderness remote from any converse with other nations; and that in the dark times of the world, when men were generally stupid and credulous, as having not been imposed on by the delusions by which the following ages were awakened. The Jews also lay no greater weight on any miracles, than on those which were wrought in the wilderness of Midian, which had no witness unto them but that of Moses himself. But the miracles of Jesus were all, or most of them, wrought before the eyes of multitudes, envying, hating, and persecuting him; and that in the most knowing days of the world, when reason and learning had improved the light of the minds of men to the utmost of their capacity. They were wrought upon multitudes for sundry years together, and were all of them sifted by his adversaries, to try if they could discover any thing of deceit in them. And although his personal ministry was confined to one nation, yet the miracles wrought by his disciples in his name and by his power, for the confirmation of his being the Messiah, were spread all the world over; so that all mankind were first filled with the report of them, and then satisfied with their truth: and lastly, the generality of them with faith in him, whom they directed unto. The notoriety, therefore, of his miracles far exceeds that of those of Moses. And for the means whereby the certainty of them is continued unto us, whether we respect the number of persons confirming it, or their quality, or their having no temptation from any carnal advantage, or their suffering for their testimony; it is notorious that the secluded circumstances of the Jews could not afford evidence which can in any way be compared with it. So that we may truly say, that no Jew can on any rational account give credit to the truth of the miracles wrought by Moses, and deny it to the record of those which were wrought by the Lord Jesus.

§ 62. But yet there seems somewhat further necessary in this case. Though there were miracles wrought by our Saviour, yet they might be every way inferior to those which were wrought by Moses, and so not sufficient to confirm a doctrine and authority removing and abolishing the laws and customs instituted by Moses. And to this the Jews of old seemed to have had respect, in their constant tumultuous calling after signs and miracles. And hence, though the Lord Christ sometimes pleaded with them the works that he wrought, leaving them to stand and fall according to their evidence, John xv. 24, x. 37; as did the apostles also, Acts ii. 22,
to the astonishment of all, and to the satisfaction of the less obdurate, John vii. 31, xii. 37; yet Jesus constantly refused to gratify their curiosity and unbelief, when they required any sign or miracle of him, Matt. xii. 38, 39, xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29. And the apostle Paul expressly condemns the requiring of a sign, as that which in the preaching of the gospel was not to be gratified, nor much attended unto, 1 Cor. i. 22. But yet there is not, on this account, any strength wanting to our argument. For although it be not at all necessary, that he who comes with an after revelation of the will of God, reversing any thing before established, should be attested to with more miracles, or with more signal miracles, than he or they were, who were the instruments of the first revelation of things to be repeated; seeing no more is required but that he be sufficiently evidenced to be sent of God, which may be done by one true real miracle, as well as by a thousand; yet the wisdom of God hath so ordered things, that the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus did on many accounts exceed those wrought by Moses, as by a comparison in some particular instances will appear.

§ 63. First. The number of them gives them the preeminence. The Jews contend that there were seventy-six miracles wrought by Moses; whereas those of all other prophets, as they observe, amount but to seventy-four; for so do they lay hold on every occasion to exalt him, who yet judgeth and condemneth them. To make up this number, they reckon up sundry things that happened about his birth and death, far enough from miracles wrought by him, or in the confirmation of his ministry. They add also every extraordinary work of God that fell out in his days, to the same purpose. Be it so then, that so many miracles were wrought by Moses, as we are far from wishing to diminish any thing of the glory of his ministry, yet what are these compared to the miracles wrought by Christ and by his apostles, in his name, and by his power and authority? Those that are recorded, as wrought by himself, are not easily reckoned up, and yet those that are written are far the least part of what he did perform, and that in the space of three or four years; whereas those of Moses were scattered over the whole course of his life, for a hundred and twenty years. Thus John assures us that he did many more signs besides those that are written, ch. xx. 30, 31; and that John's testimony is equal to that of Moses, we have proved before. He adds, that the world could not contain the books that might be written of his miracles, ch. xxi. 25; by which usual hyperbole a great multitude is designed.

Nor did the writers of the story of the gospel agree to give an account of all the miracles that were wrought by the author of it, but only to leave on record a sufficient number of instances of his divine power in the effecting of them. For this end they singled out works that were attended with some disputes or preachings, tending to the opening and confirmation of the doctrine of the gospel. Thus when the disciples of John came to him, it is said, Luke vii. 21, 'In that same hour he cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits, and unto many that were blind he gave sight.' No particular account of any of these cures is given, nor would that season have been at all remembered, had it not been for the sake of the persons who were then sent unto him; the works which they saw being made the ground of that answer which he returned to their master, ver. 22; 'Go tell John the things which ye have seen and heard, how that the blind see,' &c. Considering, therefore, what is elsewhere written, of all the regions about bringing in their sick, weak, and impotent,
and of the cures of persons by the touching of his garment, it is evident that his personal miracles amounted to thousands, which might well give occasion to the hyperbole used by John in recounting them. Hence some among the Jews were convinced that he was the Messiah, not only by the greatness, but also by the number of his works, John vii. 31: "Many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these, which this man doeth?" Now what are the seventy-six miracles of Moses unto those of Christ, as to number? and it is in the number of the miracles of Moses that the Jews in the first place glory. And if we may add those which were wrought by his power, by them that preached the gospel by commission from him, as they are all of the same efficacy to the end proposed, namely, the confirmation of his being the Messiah, they amount not unto thousands only, but probably unto millions. For of this sort were all the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost that were granted to the church all the world over. So that as to the number of miracles, he was by them sufficiently attested as the Messiah, the great Lawgiver of the people of the new covenant.

§ 64. Again, The Jews insist greatly on this, that all other prophets wrought miracles by the intervention of prayer, and that Moses alone, without prayer, wrought miracles at his own pleasure. The rod, they say, was committed unto him as a kingly sceptre, to denote that authority to which the whole nature of things submitted. It is true indeed it is not recorded that Moses prayed in words before every miracle that was wrought by him, or in reference to his ministry; but yet this is plain in the history, that he wrought no mighty work, but either upon his prayer, or some express command and direction from God in particular, which events the Judaical pretence of a power remaining with him, enabling him to work miracles when and how he would. But this which they falsely ascribe to Moses, was eminently true of the Lord Jesus. Those thousands of miraculous works which he wrought, were the arbitrary effects of a word or command, without any special direction for every new work; arguing the constant presence of an infinite power with him exerted according to his will. "Come forth of him—come out of the grave—I will—Be thou clean—Be ye opened," and the like expressions, he used as signs and pledges thereof. It was not thus with Moses, as the story manifests; yea, he himself greatly doubted of the greatest effect of the divine power put forth by him, when he smote the rock to bring forth water.

§ 65. The nature also of the miracles wrought by the one and the other may be compared; and we shall see from thence also on which side the preeminence will, be found. The miracles wrought by Moses, or by God himself, whilst he employed Moses in the giving the law, and in the deliverance of the people, were for the most part portentous prodigies, suited to fill men with wonder, astonishment, and fear. Such were all the signs of the presence of God on Mount Sinai. The effects also of most of them, were evil and destructive, proceeding from wrath and indignation against sin and sinners. Such were all the mighty works wrought in Egypt, such was also the swallowing up of Dathan and Abiram, in the wilderness. Those that tended to the good and relief of mankind, as the bringing of water from the rock, were typical and occasional. Miracles of an alarming nature were suited to the ministry of death and condemnation, which was committed to Moses. But on the other side, the mighty works of the Lord Jesus were evidently effects of goodness, as well as of power, consisting in things useful and helpful unto mankind. Healing the sick, opening the eyes of the
blind, and the ears of the deaf, and giving strength to the lame, casting out of devils, feeding hungry multitudes, and raising the dead, are things amiable and useful. And though terrible prodigies may more affect and astonish the minds of carnal men, such as the Jews in general were, yet works of grace and goodness do more allure those who attend to the dictates of right reason. These merciful works were evidences of a gracious ministry, tending to salvation and peace in every kind, such as that of the Messiah was promised to be. As miracles then were the tokens of their several ministries, and bespeak the nature of them, those of the Lord Christ were exceedingly more excellent than those of Moses.

§ 66. Furthermore, as Moses had not a power of working miracles constantly resident with him, which he might exert according to his own will, so he was very far from being able to communicate any such power unto others. God indeed took of the Spirit that was on him, and gave it unto the elders that were to be joined with him in the government of the people, Numb. xi. 25; but this Spirit conveyed only ability to government, and no power of working miracles went along with it. Moreover, the communication of this Spirit was not any act of Moses at all. But now our Lord Jesus, as he had the divine power mentioned always with him, so he could give authority and power unto whom he pleased, to effect all such miraculous works, as were any way necessary for the confirmation of their doctrine. Of this nature was the commission which he gave to the twelve when he sent them forth, Matt. x. 8. ‘Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils.’ As also that to the seventy, Luke x. 17—19. Yea, he promised them, which also came to pass, that by his power and presence with them, ‘they should do greater things than those which they had seen him to do,’ John xiv. 12; Mark xvi. 17. And this difference is so eminent, that nothing can be objected against it. This more evidently confirmed him to be the Messiah, than all the mighty works which he wrought in his own person on the earth.

67. Again, all the miracles of Moses ended with his life. The Jews indeed some of them tell us a number of foolish stories about his death, which, as their manner is, they would fix on those words, Deut. xxxiv. 5. ‘And Moses died, פִּתְהֵמְה לְעֹלַם, by the mouth or word of the Lord.’ Here they tell us how Moses contended with הָגִיהַר לַיְבָם, ‘the angel of death,’ and drove him away with his rod, so that he could not die, till God laid his mouth unto his, and so took out his soul from him. But these figments are shameful, and such as become none but themselves. However these things extended only unto his death: then ended his ministry and miracles. But now the greatest miracle of our Lord Jesus was wrought by him, after the violent and cruel death which he underwent for our sakes. For he took his life again, and raised himself from the dead, John x. 17, 18. This being performed by him, after the dissolution of his human nature, in the open visible separation of his body and soul, in which state it was utterly impossible that that nature should put forth any act for retrieving its former condition, manifested his existence in another superior nature, acting with power on the human nature in the same person. And this one miracle was a sufficient vindication of the truth which he had taught concerning himself, namely, that he was the Messiah the Son of God. And though any should question his being raised from the dead by his own power, yet the evidence is uncontrollable, that he was raised again by the power of God, without the application of the means and ministry of any other, whereby the holy and eternal God of truth confirmed all that he had
taught concerning his person and office while he was alive. And this leaves no room for hesitation in this matter; for if it is granted that he was raised by the power of God no man will deny that he was the Messiah, and on what principles we proceed for the proof of his resurrection, in reasoning with the Jews, hath been before declared.

§ 68. To what has been thus summarily recounted, we may lastly add, the continuance of the miracles wrought by his power, after his leaving of this world, and his ascension into heaven. For there is in this an additional evidence. For whereas the miraculous works that were wrought by himself, and by his disciples while he conversed with them in the flesh, were confined, as we observed before, to the land of Canaan; they who afterwards received power from above by his grant, continued to work the like miracles all the world over; so that within the space of a few years, there was scarcely a famous town or city in the world, in which some of his disciples had not received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. And this also distinctly proves him to be the promised Messiah; for whereas the isles of the Gentiles were to wait for, and receive his law, it was necessary that among them also it should receive this solemn kind of attestation from heaven.

§ 69. Now from what has been spoken, it appears that the miracles wrought by Jesus were not only sufficient to confirm the testimony which he gave concerning himself; namely, that he was the promised Messiah, the Son of God, but also that they were much more eminent than those where-with God was pleased to confirm the ministry of Moses in the giving of the law: so that the Jews have no reason to question his authority to abrogate any institutions of worship, to the observance of which they had formerly been bound.

§ 70. To close this argument, I shall now manifest that the Jews of old were convinced of the truth of the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus, and in doing this, I shall in some measure discover the vanity of those pretences by which they attempt to shield themselves from the natural consequences of that conviction.

1. The convictions of those who lived in his own days, appear from Matt. xxvii. 11—14; John vii. 31. ix. 16; Acts iv. 16; xix. 13. Neither did they at any time dispute his works, but only the power whereby they were wrought; of which afterwards.

2. The fame and reputation of his miracles was such amongst them, that they who made an art and trade of casting out devils, used the invocation of the name of Jesus over those who were possessed; for to this they were evidently induced, by the notoriety of his exerting his divine power in that kind of works. Thus we read, Acts xix. 13, that they adjured the spirits by the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached, because they observed the miracles that were wrought in that name. For being ignorant of the true way and means by which the apostle wrought his miraculous works, they, after the manner of magicians, used the name of him whom he preached, in their exorcisms. For it was ever the custom of that sort of men, to intermix their charms with the names of such persons as they knew to have excelled in mighty works. And that this was common among the Jews of those days, is evident from Luke ix. 49, which could proceed from nothing but from a general consent in the acknowledgment of the works wrought by him.

3. We have also hitherto the suffrage of the Talmudical rabbins themselves, the most malicious adversaries that ever the Lord Jesus had in this
world. They intend not indeed to bear witness to his miracles; but whilst they relate stories that were continued among them by tradition, and whilst they endeavour to shield their unbelief from the arguments taken from them, they tacitly acknowledge that they were indeed wrought by him. This I say they do, while they labour to show by what means those prodigies and wondrous works which are recorded of him, were wrought and effected. For they who say that that this or that was the way whereby such a thing was accomplished, do plainly acknowledge, that the thing was accomplished. Greater evidence of their conviction it is impossible for such men to give, and for our argument we need to desire no greater.

§ 71. First. In the Talmud itself they have traditional stories of miracles wrought by the disciples of Jesus, and by others in his name, and although these are like the rest of their narrations, foolish and insipid, yet they evidence the tradition that was amongst them from the forementioned conviction. Thus in Aboda Zara they have a story concerning James, who lived longest amongst them. It happened, they say, that Eleazer the son of Dama, was bitten by a serpent, and James of the village of Secham, that is Bethany, came to cure him in the name of Jesus, the son of Pandira; but R. Ishmael opposed him, and said, It is not lawful for thee thou son of Dama. So owning that miracles and cures were wrought by James in the name of Jesus. And in Sabbat. Hierusal. Distinct. Shemona Sheraticin, they tell us that the son of Rab. Jose the son of Levi had swallowed poison; a certain man came and communed with him in the name of Jesus the son of Pandira, and he was healed; but when he was gone out, one said unto him, How didst thou adjure him, he said, By such a word; the other replied, That it had been better for him to have died, than to have heard that word. I mention these things only to show that they were never able to stifle the tradition that passed among themselves, concerning the miracles wrought by Jesus and his disciples.

§ 72. But this conviction more evidently discovers itself in their endeavours to assign his mighty works to other causes, so that they may not from them be forced to acknowledge his divine power, and the presence of God with him. And there are two pretences which they make use of. The first is that of their forefathers, Matt.xii. 24. They would have the devil to be the author of them, and that he wrought them by magical incantations. This they pleaded of old; and to this some of them pretend to adhere to this day; the folly of which blasphemy both reflects upon themselves, and may be fully proved to have no application to him, whom to their eternal ruin they seek to reproach. For,

First. Do they not know, that Moses was generally esteemed by the wisest of the heathens, to have been skilled in magic? So Pliny and Apuleius testify, and Celsus contends at large, that it was by means of magic that he wrought wonders. And can the Jews fix on a course more likely to confirm such a suspicion in the minds of atheistical scoffers, than by their own taking up the same accusation against the author of more, and greater miracles wrought by Moses? What answer can they give to the reproaches of an infidel, while they themselves with more open impudence, bring the same accusation against the Lord Jesus? Besides, as is confessed, Egypt was the very source of magical incantations, the world's academy for that diabolical cunning, for there, and almost nowhere else, magic was had in honour. Now in the court of the king of Egypt, Moses had his education, and conversation for forty years. How much more just then, though still most unjust, would the supposition be, that Moses was skilled in that wis-
dom falsely so called, than that our Lord Jesus acquired this art of magic in Egypt, who was driven thither by persecution, and who returned from thence while yet in his infancy. So that in his whole vain pretence they do nothing but attempt to cast down their own foundations.

Secondly. Neither indeed do they account the skill in, and use of magi
cal incantations a crime, but an excellency. Josephus would have us be
lieve that the art of magic, and the invention of incantations, was part of the
wisdom of Solomon. And their Talmudical doctors do expressly approve
of that diabolical art. Nothing then but extreme malice and desperation,
could lead them to use this cloak for their insidelity, which not only opposes
the foundation of their own profession, but which also involves a contradic-
tion to those principles, which at other times they avouch. So that Rabbi
Achor was mistaken when he gave that out as a prophecy, which indeed is
a history, namely, that a generation of ungodly men among the Jews would
not believe the things that the Messiah should do, but should affirm that he
doth them by magical art.

§ 73. As for the blasphemy itself, no other answer needs to be given to
it, but what was returned by our Lord Jesus of old. If these things had
been done by magical incantations, and consequently by the assistance of
the Devil, it must proceed from a division of those wicked spirits among
themselves, and that with respect to the main design of their kingdom,
dominion and interest in this world. The open and avowed work of our
Lord Jesus in this world, was by all ways and means to overthrow the
kingdom of Satan and to destroy his works. This he privately taught,
this he publicly declared to be the main end of his coming into the world.
The works and miracles which he wrought were very many, innumerable of
them were exercised against devils themselves, to their shame and terror,
and to their expulsion from the habitation which they had invaded. During
this work, he declares to all the world that these spirits are evil, wicked,
malicious, unclean, and lying, reserved for everlasting destruction in hell,
under the wrath of the great God. For this cause, they on the other side
ceased not to oppose him, and to stir up all the world against him, until
they thought they had prevailed in his death. If then, men will imagine
that the works of Christ, which are against the interest and person of
Satan, and which put him to open shame; works which were wrought
to confirm a doctrine that teaches all the world to avoid Satan, to
abhor him, to fight and contend against him, that commends every thing
which he hates, and that gives promises of life eternal to them who for
sake him, and maintain his quarrel against him, and that threatens every
thing that Satan loves, and labours to promote in the world with eternal
vengeance; if men will imagine that these works confirming this doctrine
were wrought by Satan's assistance, they had more need to be sent to the
place where the maladies of those distracted of their wits are attended to,
than to have an answer given to their folly.

§ 74. They have yet another pretence by which they try to harden them-
selves against conviction. But it is so perfectly Judaical, that is, so full of
monstrous and ridiculous figments, that nothing but a design to discover
their present desperate folly, and to show with what unmanly inventions
they endeavour to resist their own convictions, can afford an excuse for the
repetition of it. Besides, the fable itself is vulgarly known; I shall,
therefore, only give a brief compendium of it, seeing it may not be wholly
avoided.

The story they tell us is this: there was a stone in the Sanctum Sanctorum,
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under the ark, on which was written Shem Hamphorash,—(so the Cabalists call the name Jehovah.) He that could learn this name, might by the virtue of it, do what miracles he pleased. Wherefore, the wise men fearing what might happen, made two brazen dogs, and set them on two pillars before the door of the sanctuary: and it was so, that when any one went in, and learned that name, as he came out, these dogs barked so horribly, that they frightened him, and made him forget the name that he had learned. But Jesus of Nazareth going in, wrote the name in parchment, and put it within the skin of his leg, and closed the skin upon it; so that, though he lost the remembrance of it at his coming out, by the barking of the brazen dogs, yet he recovered the knowledge of it again out of the parchment in his leg; and by virtue thereof, he wrought miracles, walked on the sea, cured the lame, raised the dead, and opened the eyes of the blind. From this story we mean only to infer that the most stubborn of the Jews must have been convinced of the miracles of our blessed Saviour. Had these not been openly performed and undeniably attested, no creatures that ever had the shape of men, or any thing more of modesty than the brazen dogs which they talk of, would have had recourse to such monstrous and foolish figures, to countenance their rejection of him and of his miracles. He that should contend that the sun did not shine all the last year, and should give this reason of his assertion, that a certain man of his acquaintance climbed up to heaven by a ladder, and put him in a box, and kept him close in his chamber all that while; that man would speak to the full, with as much probability and appearance of truth, as the grand Rabbins do in this tale. Every word in their story is a monster. The stone, the writing of the name of God on it, the virtue of the pronunciation of that name, the entrance of a private man into the Sanctum Sanctorum, the barking of the dogs, all are dreams becoming men under a penal infatuation and blindness, not much distant from those chains of darkness wherewith Satan himself is kept bound unto the judgment of the great day.

§ 75. Fourthly. We must not forget the testimony of his disciples who conversed with him, and were eye witnesses of his miracles, especially of his rising from the dead. These, with multitudes assured of the truth by their testimony, willingly suffered the loss of all temporal interests, and exposed themselves to innumerable dangers, in bearing witness to it in the world. And at last they sealed their testimony with their blood, which was shed by the most exquisite tortures that the malice of hell could invent. Now, all this they did in expectation of acceptance with him, and a reward from him, which depended on the truth of the miracles which they asserted him to have wrought. From all these considerations we may safely conclude, that it is utterly impossible that the nature of man should be more ascertained of any thing that ever was in the world, than we may be of the miracles wrought by our Lord Jesus. Now all these we have declared, were wrought by the power of God to confirm the truth of his being the promised Messiah. And if this were not so, it is impossible that God should ever require an assent unto any revelation of his mind or will, no revelation being capable of a more evident and full confirmation than this truth hath received, that Jesus is the Christ. The application of this consideration, particularly to his resurrection from the dead, hath been the special subject of so many writers, that I shall not farther insist upon it.

§ 76. One argument more, taken from the success that the doctrine of Jesus hath had in the world, shall close this discourse. How poor his out-
ward condition was in this world, we acknowledge, and in this the Jews triumph. His poverty, and the contempt and reproach that he was exposed to, was one of the chief pretences that they had, and have to this day, for their refusal of him. The time when he came, was the time, as has been shown, when the Jews were in daily expectation of their Messiah, and when the residue of mankind were in the full enjoyment of all that light, wisdom, and knowledge, which the principles of nature could afford. In this state of things, a poor man, living in an obscure village of Galilee, not taught by men so much as to read, begins to preach, and to declare himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. With this testimony he declares a doctrine destructive of the religion and sacred worship of every man then living in the world; of the Jews as to the manner of it, which they esteemed above its substance; and with respect to all other men, his doctrine was destructive of the very nature and being of their religion, and enjoined a course of obedience to God, decried by them all. To encourage men to believe him, and to accept of his testimony, he gives them promises of what he would do for them when this life should be ended. No sooner doth he undertake this work, but the Jews among whom he conversed, almost universally, at least, all the great, the wise, the learned, and they who were esteemed devout amongst them, set themselves to scorn, despise, reproach, and persecute him. And from this course they ceased not, until, conspiring with the power of the Gentiles, they removed him out of the world as a malefactor, by a bitter, shameful, and ignominious death. After this, he riseth again from the dead, and shows himself neither to Jews nor Gentiles in general, but only to some poor men chosen by himself to be his witnesses and apostles. These begin to teach both Jews and Gentiles the things before mentioned. The Jews more deeply engaged than formerly, by having slain their Master, immediately persecute the servants, and that unto death. The Gentiles at first deride and scorn them, but quickly change their conduct, and set all their wit and power at work to extirpate them and their followers out of the world. The Jews, on many accounts looked upon themselves as ruined for ever, if the testimony of these men were admitted. The Gentiles saw that on the same supposition they must abandon all their religion, and with it, every thing with which they pleased themselves in this world. Invisible infernal powers who ruled in the world by superstition and idolatry, were no less engaged against them. With them was neither human wisdom or counsel, nor external force; yea, the use of both in their work was by their master severely interdicted to them. Had not the truth and power of God been engaged in support of this undertaking, it is such madness to suppose that it could have been carried to that issue in the conquest of mankind, which it at length obtained, that no man not utterly forsaken of reason, or cursed with blindness of mind, or made senseless and stupid by the power of his lusts, can make himself guilty of it. Many are the branches of this argument, and many the considerations that concur in contributing evidence and strength unto it; but to examine and follow out these, is beyond our present design. The bare statement of the argument is sufficient to banish all Jewish exceptions from the minds of sober and reasonable men. With this argument, then, we finish the third part of our general thesis concerning the Messiah; and from it, in connexion with those which we formerly stated, we conclude that Jesus of Nazareth whom Paul preached, was He.
EXERCITATION XVIII.

§ 1. Objections of the Jews against the Doctrine of Christianity. § 2. Their principal argument to prove the Messiah not yet come. General answer. Principles leading to a right understanding of the promises concerning the Messiah. § 3. Redemption and salvation promised by him spiritually. Folly and self-contradiction of the Jews, that expect only temporal deliverance by him. § 4. Promises of temporal things, accessory and occasional. Thence conditional. The general condition of them all suited to the nature and duration of the kingdom of the Messiah. § 5. Spiritual things promised in words which first signify things temporal. Reasons thereof. Of peace with God, and in the world. § 6. Seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel, Sion, Jerusalem. Who and what intended thereby. § 7. All nations; the world; the Gentiles in the promise, who. § 8, 9. Promises suited unto the duration of the kingdom of the Messiah. § 10. The calling and flourishing state of the Jews thereon. § 11. Particular promises may not be understood, or understood amiss, without prejudice to the faith. § 12. Application of these principles. § 13, 14. Promise of universal peace in the days of the Messiah; Isa. ii. 2, 5, 4, 5, considered. § 15. Jewish objections from it, answered. Outward peace how intended. § 16. Promises of the diffusion of the knowledge of God. Of unity in his worship, Jer. xxxi. 34; Zeph. iii. 9; Zech. xiv. 9, fulfilled. § 17—19. Jewish objection answered. § 20. Promises concerning the restoration and glorious estate of Israel. § 21. Fulfilled to the spiritual Israel. To the Jews in the appointed season. Their calling, and peace ensuing thereon.

§ 1. That which remains for a conclusion to these dissertations, is the consideration of those reasons and arguments with which the present Jews do endeavour, as their forefathers for many generations have endeavoured, to defend their obstinacy and unbelief. And in this we shall engage with as much briefness as the nature of the matter treated of, will admit. Many are the books which they have written, mostly in the Hebrew tongue, and some in other languages, but in the Hebrew character, against Christians and their religion. To some of these they have given triumphant and insulting titles, as though they had undoubtedly obtained a perfect victory over their adversaries. But the books themselves in nothing answer their specious frontispieces. Take away wilful mistakes, gross paralogisms, false stories, and some few grammatical niceties, and they vanish into nothing. What is spoken by them or for them, which seems to have any weight, shall be produced and examined.

Sundry things they object to the doctrine of the gospel, concerning the person of the Messiah, or his being God and man, and concerning the rejection of the Mosaic ceremonies and law, which they deem eternal; and many exceptions they lay against particular passages and expressions, in the historical books of the New Testament. But all these things have been long since cleared and answered by others, and I have also myself spoken to the most important of them, partly, in the preceding discourses; and partly, in my defence of the Deity and satisfaction of Christ against the Socinians. For what concerns the law of Moses, and the abolition of the ceremonial worship therein instituted, it must be insisted on at large in that exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews to which these discourses are only intended as an introduction. I shall not, therefore, enter here upon a particular discussion of their opinions, arguments, and objections about
these things; indeed, they belong not immediately to the subject of our present discourse. It is only about the coming of the Messiah that we are now disputing; this we assert to be long since past; the Jews deny that he has yet come, and live in the expectation and hope of him, which at present is in them but as the giving up of the Ghost. The means whereby this dying, deceiving hope is supported in them, comes now under examination, and this alone is the subject of our ensuing discourse.

§ 2. To countenance themselves, then, in their denial of the coming of the Messiah, they all of them make use of one general argument, which they seek to confirm in and by several instances. Now, this is, that the promises which are recorded in Scripture to be accomplished at the coming of the Messiah, are not fulfilled, and therefore, that the Messiah is not yet come. This fills up their books of controversies; and is constantly made use of by their expositors, so often as any occasion seems to offer itself to them. The Messiah, say they, was promised of old. Together with him, and to be wrought by him, many other things were promised. These things they see not at all fulfilled; nay, not those which contain the only work and business that he was promised for; and therefore, they will not believe that he is come. This general argument, I say, they seek to confirm by reckoning up all the promises, which they suppose to be as yet unaccomplished, and so endeavour to establish their conclusion. These we shall afterwards cast under the several heads to which they belong, and return that answer which the word of truth itself, and which the event manifests to be the mind of God in them. For the present, to their general argument we say, that all the promises concerning the coming of the Messiah, are actually fulfilled; and that those which concern his grace and kingdom are partly already accomplished, and that the remainder shall be accomplished in the manner, time, and season appointed for them, in the purpose and counsel of God. So that from hence, nothing can be concluded in favour of their incredulity. To evidence the truth of this answer, I shall state and confirm certain unquestionable principles, that will guide us in the interpretation of the promises under consideration.

§ 3. The first principle is, that the promises concerning the Messiah do principally respect spiritual things, and that eternal salvation which he was to obtain for his church.—This we have proved at large before; and this, the very nature of the thing itself, and the words of the promises, do abundantly manifest. The Jews, I suppose, will not deny, that the promise concerning the Messiah, is the promise of the greatest good that ever God engaged to bestow upon them. I do not find that they any where deny it. And the Messiah, at present, is the sum of all their desires, prayers, and expectations, with the hopes of whom they comfort and support themselves in all their calamities. If they should deny it, it may easily be proved against them by innumerable testimonies of Scripture, many whereof have been already produced. Now there can be no reason of this, but only because he was to work and effect for them to whom he was promised, (whoevers they be) the greatest good that they can be made partakers of. And if it be only a good of an inferior nature that he was to effect, and other means was to be used for that which was greater and more excellent, that means is much to be preferred before him, and above him. Now what is this chief good of man? DOTH it consist in riches, honour, power, or pleasures? The blindest of the heathen were never blind enough to think so; nor can any man entertain any such imagination, without renouncing not only all right reason, but in an especial manner, the whole Scripture.
I think the Jews will not deny, but that this good consists in the favour of God in this world, and the eternal enjoyment of him hereafter. Now if the Messiah were promised only to procure those outward, temporary, perishing things; and these spiritual blessings are to be obtained by other means, namely, by the observance of the law of Moses; it is evident, that this is to be preferred infinitely before him. Now that this is not the case, is manifest from the whole Scripture, and confirmed by the traditional hope and expectation of the Jews. For if they enjoy that which is incomparably the chief good, to what end do they so miserably bemoan themselves in their present condition, and with so much impatience cry out for the coming of their Messiah? Are they such slaves in their affections to earthly perishing things, that, living in the enjoyment of all that is needful to procure them the love and favour, and the eternal enjoyment of God, they can have no rest or quiet, because they enjoy not the good things of this life? Doubtless this great expectation, had a greater rise and cause, than now they will own. I know that men are apt to complain under outward trouble, and to desire relief from it, but to place the main of their religion in this, when they have grace, the pardon of sin, and heaven on other accounts, this is only done by the Jews. But the truth is, though they continue in their desires of the coming of the Messiah, yet they have lost the knowledge of the true reason why they should do so; only this they find, that their forefathers from the days of Abraham placed all their happiness in his coming; and therefore they think that they also ought to do so, though why, they cannot tell, or will not understand. But we have proved that the object of the faith and expectation of their fathers of old was, the promise of the Messiah as a spiritual Redeemer, to save them from sin, Satan, death, and hell, to procure for them the favour of God, and to bring to them an enjoyment of him. Set this aside, and we need not contend with the Jews about a Messiah which shall come and make war for them, conquer their enemies, and make them rich. Much good may he do them when he comes. They say, indeed, that having the affluence of all things under him, they shall be the better enabled to keep the law of Moses, and so the way to heaven will be easier for them. But I fear that that which they manifest their hearts to be set upon as their chief end and aim, will scarcely much further them to any other end whatever; the last end will not be made the means to another. Nor was it otherwise with their forefathers; 'Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked.' According to their pasture they were filled, and forgot the Lord. Prosperity ruined them; nor did they ever reform, but under sore afflictions. The Messiah then, that we contend with them about, is a spiritual Redeemer; such an one he was promised to be, as we have abundantly proved. And all promises of that nature are perfectly accomplished. He is come, and hath saved his people from their sins. He hath made an end of sin, and made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness. There is not one promise concerning grace, mercy, pardon, the love of God, and eternal blessedness by the Messiah, (which contain the whole of his direct and principal work,) but they are all yea and amen in Christ Jesus, are all exactly made good and accomplished. And this is attested by millions of souls now in the unchangeable fruition of God, and by all that seriously believe in him, who are yet alive. Now this is a first principle to be kept in view in our inquiry after the accomplishment of the promises, concerning the coming, grace, and kingdom of the Messiah.

§ 4. A second principle hence follows, that all promises concerning tem-
poral things, at or by the coming of Messiah are but accessory and occasional, and do not directly appertain to the principal work and main design of his coming.—Certain it is, that the whole work for which God of old promised the Messiah, might have been effected and fully accomplished, though not one word had been spoken of any outward advantage to ensue thereon in this world. These promises then do not directly and immediately belong to the covenant of the Redeemer, but are only declarations of the sovereign will and wisdom of God, as to what he would do in the dispensation of his providence, at such and such a season. Hence two things will ensue.

First. That all these promises may be conditional. The promises which concerned the sending of the Messiah for the accomplishment of his principal work, were absolute, and depended not upon any thing, in all or in any of the sons of men. The whole of it was a mere effect of sovereign grace. He was therefore infallibly to come at his appointed season. But those that concern the dispensation of God's providence in temporal things, may all of them be conditional. And it is evident, that they have one condition annexed to the fulfilling of every one of them; and that is, that those who would partake of them, do submit themselves to the law and rule of the Messiah. For in the midst of the greatest collection of promises in the whole Old Testament, which at first view seem to express the glory of the kingdom of the Messiah in outward things, it is added, 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee, (that is the church,) shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted,' Isa. lx. 12. So that all the happiness here intimated depends on the condition of men's submitting themselves to the law of the Messiah, without which they are threatened with desolation and utter wasting. This condition belongs to them all; and what other particular considerations there may be, on which their accomplishments may be suspended, we know not.

Secondly. It follows from hence, that as to the times, seasons, and places of their accomplishment, they are left to the sovereign will, wisdom, and pleasure of God, as are those of all other works of his providence whatever. It is not necessary that they should all of them be accomplished at the same time, or in the same place, or after the same manner. God may, and God doth fulfil them when, where, how, and towards whom he pleaseth; so that in the issue they shall all have that accomplishment which he hath designed unto them, and which the church hath ground to expect. And thus hath God provided that these promises and declarations should be a ground of comfort and direction to the church in all ages, containing encouragements to obedience, and consolations in what his saints may expect to fall upon their persecuting adversaries. The Jews indeed, who cannot form even an idea of the kingdom of their Messiah under any other form, than that of the Roman commonwealth, imagine that his kingdom was like to prove, res unius aetatis, the business of one age, and would have all these temporal promises to be fulfilled at once, momento turbinis, all on a sudden. But the real kingdom of Christ being to continue through many generations, even from his coming to the end of the world, and that in such a variety of states and conditions, as God saw conducing to his own glory, and to the exercise of the faith and obedience of his people; the accomplishment of these promises in several ages, and at several seasons, according to the counsel of the will of God, is exceedingly suited to the nature, glory, and exaltation of it. This one observation may be easily used to
frustrate all the objections of the Jews, from the pretended non-accomplishment of these promises.

§ 5. Thirdly. Whereas spiritual things have the principal place and consideration in the work and kingdom of the Messiah, they are oftentimes promised in words, whose first signification denotes things temporal and corporeal.—And this came to pass, and was so ordered on several accounts. For, 1st. The very manner used by the prophets in expressing their visions and revelations, in which, after the way of the people of the east, they employed many metaphors and allegories, led them so to set forth spiritual things. That this was the custom of the prophets, as they expressly own it, and as it is manifest in their writings, so it is confessed by the Jews, who, in their expositions of them, do constantly tell us that this and that is to be interpreted בְּרֵאשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ, that is allegorically. Now when it is granted, that the subject treated of is principally spiritual, all these metaphors are plain and easily accommodated to the principal scope and end intended.

Again, as this was the manner of the prophets, so it is a manner exceedingly instructive, and suited to convey an apprehension and sense of the things treated of, to the minds and understandings of men. All men know the worth and usefulness of the precious things of the creation, gold, silver, precious stones; of the desirable things of natural life, health, strength, long life; and of the good things of civil society, wealth, riches, liberty, rule, dominion, and the like. Men know somewhat of the worth of these things, and commonly esteem them above their worth. Now what is more likely to make them attend, and to raise their affections to spiritual things, than to have them proposed to them under the names of these things, whose excellency they are so well acquainted with, and the enjoyment of which they so much desire. For nothing can be more evident than that [God, in thus condescending to their capacities, doth declare, that the things which he promises, are indeed the most excellent and desirable that they can be made partakers of.

3dly. The state and condition of the church of old, required such a way of instruction. For as they had then, in the covenant of the land of Canaan, many promises of earthly and carnal things, so they themselves were carnal, and received great encouragement to abide in their expectation of the coming of the Messiah, from that outward glory with which they apprehended that it would be attended. Besides, the time was not yet come, wherein the vail was to be removed, and believers were with open face to behold the glory of God. And therefore, though this way of instruction by similitudes, metaphors, and allegories, was suited, as we observed, to affect their minds, and to stir up their affections, yet it did not give them that clear and distinct apprehension of the things of the kingdom of the Messiah, which was afterwards afforded. God had other work to do among them, by them, and upon them, than openly and plainly to reveal his whole counsel in these things unto them. Hence the prophets themselves, who received from God the promises and revelations treated of, were anxious to inquire with all diligence into the nature of the office, work, sufferings, and glory of the Messiah, about which they prophesied unto the church, 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. And yet all their inquiry came short of the understanding of those mysteries, which he had, who only saw the Messiah come in the flesh, and died before he had accomplished his work. But in all these promises, there was provision made for compelling, as it were,
the most carnal mind to look principally after spiritual things, and to own
an allegory in the expressions of them. For many of these expressions
are such, that if they are not understood as allegorical, they have no tole-
rable sense, nor ever shall have accomplishmment. Can any man be so
stupid as to think, that in the days of the Messiah, ‘hills shall leap,’ and
trees ‘clap their hands,’ and ‘waste places sing,’ and ‘sheep of Kedar
and rams of Nabaioth be made ministers,’ and ‘Jews suck milk from the
breasts of kings,’ ‘little children play with cockatrices,’ literally and pro-
perly? And yet those things, with innumerable of the like kind, are pro-
mised. Do they not openly proclaim to every understanding, that all these
expressions are metaphorical, and that some other thing is to be sought for
in them. Some of the Jews, I confess, would have them all literally ful-
filled to a tittle. They would have a ‘trumpet to be blown,’ that all the
world should hear; ‘mountains to be levelled,’ ‘seas to be dried up,’ ‘wil-
dernesses to be filled with springs and roses,’ the Gentiles carrying Jews
upon their shoulders, and giving them all their gold and silver. But the
folly of these imaginations is unspeakable, and the blindness of their au-
thors deplorable. Neither to gratify them must we expose the word of God
to the contempt and scorn of atheistical scoffers, which such expositions and
applications of it would undoubtedly do. Now this rule which we in-
sist upon is especially to be heeded, where spiritual and temporal things,
though far distant in their natures, yet do usually come under the same
appellations. Thus is it with the peace that is promised in the days of the
Messiah. Peace is either spiritual and eternal with God, or outward and
external with men in this world. Now these things are not only distinct,
and such as may be distinguished the one from the other, but their special
nature is absolutely different; yet are they both peace, and so called.
The former is that which was chiefly intended in the coming of the
Messiah; but this being peace also, is often promised in words, which in
their first signification denote the other, or outward peace in this world
amongst men. And this is frequent in the prophets.

§ 6. Fourthly. By the seed of Abraham, by Jacob and Israel, in many
places of the prophets, not their carnal seed, at least not all their carnal
seed, is intended; but the children of the faith of Abraham, who are
the inheritors of the promise. — Here I acknowledge, the Jews universally
differ from us. They would have none but themselves intended in those
expressions; and whatever is spoken concerning the seed of Abraham, if
it be not accomplished in themselves, they suppose that it hath no effect on
any other in the world. And from this apprehension an objection was
raised of old against the doctrine of our apostle. For on supposition that
Jesus was the Messiah, and that the blessing was to be obtained by faith
in him, it would seem to follow, that the promise of God made to Abra-
ham was of none effect, (Rom. ix. 1.); for it was evident, that the far
greater part of the Jews did not believe in him. But the apostle answers,
that the promise did never belong to all the carnal seed of Abraham;
for whereas he had many sons, of whom Ishmael was his first born, yet
Isaac only inherited the promise. And whereas Isaac himself had two
sons, yet one only of them, and he the younger, enjoyed the privilege; and
all this proceeded from the special purpose of God, who takes into that
privilege whom he pleaseth. Similar was his dealing with the Jews at that
time; he called whom he pleased to a participation of the promise, and
passed by whom he would; whereby it came to pass at last, that all the
elect obtained, and the rest were hardened. Now the seed to whom the
promise is given, are only those who obtain it by faith, being chosen there-
to; and the residue are not intended in the appellation of Israel, Jacob, the sons and seed of Abraham. Moreover, as those only of the carnal seed of Abraham who embrace the promise, are received into the number of his seed in a spiritual sense, so all that follow the faith of Abraham, and believe unto righteousness as he did, are his sons and the seed of the promise, although carnally they are not his offspring. The same also is to be said concerning those names of Zion and Jerusalem, of both which such glorious things are spoken. I suppose that none can imagine, that it is the little hill so called, or the streets and buildings of the town, that God did so regard. But one of them having been for a season, in the days of David, the special place of his worship, and the other the principal habitation of church and people, God expresseth his love and good will to his church and worship under those names; and it is a fond thing to sup-
pose, that the divine regard should be attached to the places themselves, which now for a thousand years have lain waste and desolate. Those pro-
mises then which we find recorded concerning Zion, Jerusalem, the seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel, respect the elect of God called to the faith of Abraham, and worshipping God according to his appointment, of what peo-
ples or nation soever they may be. And this we have proved before, in our dissertation about the oneness of the church of the Old and New Testa-
ment.

§ 7. Fifthly. By all people, all nations, the Gentiles, all the Gentiles, not all absolutely, especially at any one time or season, are to be understood; but either the most eminent and most famous of them, or those in whom the church, by reason of their vicinity, is more especially concerned.—God oftentimes charged the Jews of old, that they had worshipped the gods of all the nations; whereby yet not all nations absolutely, but only those that were about them, with whom they had commerce and communication, were intended. Those expressions, then, of all nations, and all kingdoms, who are said to come into the church, and submit themselves to the kingdom of the Messiah at his coming, do not denote all absolutely in the world, espe-
cially at any one time, but only such as are either most eminent among them, or such as God would cause his light and truth to approach unto. And those which in a special manner seem to be designed in these prophetic expressions, are that collection of nations in which the Roman empire was constituted, which obtained the common appellation of the whole world, the most of them being of the posterity of Japhet, who were to be persuaded to dwell in the tents of Shem. The Jews would have all na-
tions absolutely to be intended; and Kimchi, with Aben Ezra, tells us (on Isa. ii. 4, in those words of the prophet, 'He shall judge among the na-
tions,' ) 'that all nations of the earth shall live at peace; for whatever con-
troversies they have among themselves, they shall come and refer the deter-
mination of them to the Messiah living at Jerusalem.' But how this should be done by all nations of the earth absolutely, they are not pleased to tell us. Certainly the heat of some of their differences will be much abated before they have made a full end of their journey.

§ 8. Sixthly. It must be observed, that whatever is to be done and effect ed by the Spirit, grace, or power of the Messiah during the continu-
ance of his kingdom in this world, it is mentioned in the promises as that which was to be accomplished at or by his coming.—But here, as we before observed, lies the mistake of the Jews; whatever is spoken about his work and kingdom, they expect to have fulfilled, as it were, in a day; which
neither the nature of the things themselves will bear, nor is it any way suited to the glory of God, or the duration of this kingdom in the world. The kingdom of the Messiah is prophesied of, as to be set up in the room of the other great kingdoms and monarchies that are in the world. If we take as an instance the last monarchy of Daniel; namely the Roman, it is spoken of as that which came forth, as it were, all at once into the world, and did all its work immediately; now, we know, that from its first rise to the end of the things there spoken of, there passed above the space of a thousand years. But yet all the things ascribed to it are mentioned as attending its rise and coming, and that because they were in process of time affected by its power. And in like manner, all the things that are foretold about the kingdom of the Messiah are referred to his coming, because they were not wrought before, and they are produced by his Spirit and grace, the foundation of them all being perfectly and unchangeably laid in what he did and effected upon his first coming and appearance. It is no wonder then that many particular promises seem as yet to be unfulfilled; for they were never designed to be accomplished in a day, a year, or an age, in one place or season, but in a long tract of time during the continuance of his kingdom, that is, from his coming to the end of the world. And as the Father has the care of accomplishing those promises, so the ordering of the time and season of their being effected depends on his counsel and will; for the Father has engaged to the Messiah, with respect to his children and servants, that he should see of the travail of his soul in all generations: and as to his adversaries hath said, 'Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'

§ 9. Seventhly. There are two ways whereby promises may be said to be accomplished by him who gives them.

The first is, when all is done in respect of outward means, helps, and advantages, that is needful for that end; and which, if men do not embrace and make use of, they are left inexcusable, having none to blame for their coming short of enjoying the full benefit of the promises but themselves alone. And in this sense all the promises contended about are long since accomplished towards all the world. As to outward means, there is plentiful provision made in the doings and doctrine of the Messiah, for the peace of all the nations in the world; for the ruin of all false worship; for the uniting of Jews and Gentiles in one body, in peace and unity; and the cause why these things are not actually effected lies in the blindness, unbelief, and obstinacy of the sons of men, who will rather perish in their sins than be saved through obedience to this Captain of salvation.

The second is, God doth sometimes accomplish his promises, by putting forth the efficacious power of his Spirit and grace, actually to fulfil them, by working the things promised in and upon them to whom they are promised. Thus all the promises of God that concern the Messiah, his work, his mediation, with the effects of them, his grace and Spirit, are at all times, and in all ages, absolutely fulfilled in and towards the elect, that seed of Abraham to whom all the promises do in a special manner belong. The election obtaineth the promise, although the rest are hardened. Now, if the Jews, or any other nation under heaven, shall at any time, or for a long season, continue to reject the terms of reconciliation with God, and of inheriting the promises which are proposed to them, 'shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect?' God forbid. The truth of God failed not when he brought only Caleb and Joshua into Canaan, the whole body or the people being consumed in the wilderness by reason of their unbelief.
God hath fulfilled, is now fulfilling, and always will effectually fulfil all his promises in his elect; and as for the residue of men, they come not short of the enjoyment of them, but because of their own sin, blindness, and unbelief.

§ 10. Eighthly. Moreover it is granted, that there shall be a time during the continuance of the kingdom of the Messiah in this world, when the generality of the Jews, all the world over, shall be called and effectually brought to the knowledge of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ; with which mercy they shall also receive deliverance from their captivity, restoration to their own land, with a blessed, flourishing, and happy condition therein. I shall not here enter into a confirmation of this concession, or assertion. The work would be long and great, because of the difference about the time, season, manner of their call, and their following condition; and so it is unmeet for us to undertake it, in the winding up of these discourses. I only assert the thing itself, and have no cause, as to the end aimed at, to inquire into the time and manner of its accomplishment. Besides, the event will be the only infallible expositor of these things, and in matters of such importance as those before us I shall not trouble the reader with conjectures. The thing itself is acknowledged, as far as I can understand, by all who have any acquaintance with these things. Christians generally do assert it, look for it, pray for it, and have done so in all ages from the days of the apostles. Mahometans are not without some thoughts of what shall befall the Jews before the end of the world. As to the Jews themselves, in their false notion of it, it is the life of their hopes and religion. What is it, then, that the Jews plead? what do they expect? what promises are given unto them? They say that they shall be delivered out of their captivity, restored to their own land, and enjoy peace and quietness, glory and honour there. We also say the same concerning them; but by whom shall these things be wrought for them? By their Messiah, they say, at his coming. But shall he do all these things for them, whether they believe in him or no; whether they obey him or reject him; whether they love him or curse him? Is there no more required to this deliverance but that he should come to them? Is it not also that they should come to him? Here then lies the only difference between us; we acknowledge that the promises mentioned are not yet all of them actually fulfilled towards them; this they also plead. The reason hereof, they say, is because the Messiah is not yet come; so casting the blame on God, who hath not made good his word according to the time limited expressly by himself. We say that the reason of it is, because they come not by faith and obedience to the Messiah, who long since came to them, and so cast the blame, where sure it is more likely to lie, even on them and their unbelief. They are in expectation that the Messiah will come to them; we, that they will come to the Messiah; and it may be this difference may ere long be reconciled, by his appearance to them, and so calling them to faith and obedience.

§ 11. Lastly. Suppose there should be any particular promise relating to the times and kingdom of the Messiah, either accomplished, or not yet accomplished, which we cannot clearly or freely understand; shall we therefore reject that faith and persuasion which is built on so many clear, certain, undoubted testimonies of the Scripture, and which is manifest in the event, as if it were written with the beams of the sun? As such a proceeding could arise from nothing but a foolish conceited pride, that we are able to find out God unto perfection, and to discover all the depths of wisdom that are in his word; so it would, if applied to other things, destroy all that
assurance and certainty which is necessary to a man to enable him to act with any satisfaction to himself or others. What then we understand of the mind of God we faithfully adhere unto, and what we cannot comprehend we humbly leave the knowledge and revelation of to his divine majesty.

§ 12. On these and the like principles, most of which are clear in the Scripture itself, and the rest of which are deduced immediately from the same fountain of truth, it is no hard matter to answer those particular instances which the Jews produce to make good their general argument, by which they would prove that the Messiah is not yet come from the non-accomplishment of the promises that relate to his coming and kingdom. It were an endless and useless work to consider every particular promise, which they wrest to their purpose. Our controversy is not about the words, but about the things promised. Now these, though expressed in a great variety of ways, and on occasions innumerable, may yet be referred to certain general heads to which they all belong. And, indeed, under these heads they are usually collected by the Jews themselves in all their disputes against Christians. These promises, then, we shall consider, and show their consistency with that truth which we have abundantly evinced from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which Scriptures are the common acknowledged principle between us.

§ 13. First, then, they insist upon that universal peace which they take to be promised in the days of the Messiah. To this purpose they urge the prophecy recorded Isa. ii. 2, 3, 4, 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it; and many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths. For out of Sion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' This prophecy is in the same words repeated, Micah iv. 1, 2, 3, 4; where there is added to the close of it, 'But they shall sit every man under his vine, and under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.' And the like things are spoken of in sundry other places of that prophecy.

§ 14. In this we agree with the Jews, that this is a prophecy of the time of the Messiah, of his kingdom in this world; and do willingly subscribe to that rule of Kimchi on the place, on those words, 'In the last or latter days,' קֵמֶקֶו מָשָׁאְר בָּאָה הַדְּרָמַי הָאָרָי מֵהוֹ דַּהַשְׁפִּי, 'In every place where there is mention of the last days, the days of the Messiah are intended,' which we have formerly made use of. We also agree with him, that the רָבַרְבָּר שלום, the teacher from Jerusalem who shall instruct us in the law and will of the Lord, is מָשָׁאְר הָהַמֵּשֶׁה, 'Messiah the King,' which manifests him to be a prophet no less than a king; and he also is the Judge that shall judge among the nations. Only we differ from them in the exposition of the 'mountain of the house of the Lord,' which they take to be mount Moriah, we the worship of God itself. Both of us are necessitated to depart from the letter, and to allow a metaphor in the words, for they will not contend, that the hill Moriah shall be plucked up by the roots, and taken and set on the tops of some other mountains, nor can they tell to what purpose any such thing would be. Now our interpretation of the words
requires only the most usual figurative expression, the place being taken for
the worship performed in that place, and it was only this worship which
made the place of any esteem. To understand the passage thus is far more
easy and natural than any meaning to which they can wrest the remainder
of the words, supposing mount Moriah to be literally understood. And in
this sense we affirm the first part of the prophecy to be long since really and
to the full accomplished. For the worship of God before the coming of
Christ was confined to the temple at Jerusalem, attended to by one poor,
small, enslaved nation, and that in such outward contempt and scorn, that
it was no way to be compared with the glory of the false worship of the
nations, and with the multitudes of people who observed this false worship;
thus, these mountains or places of false worship, were far more visible, con-
spicuous, and stately than that at Jerusalem. But when Christ came, and
gave out the law of God to the nations, the most of them, the greatest, and
the most glorious of them, agreed to accept it, and with one consent gave
themselves to the worship of the God of Jacob. Thus the worship of the
true God was not only exalted and made more conspicuous than the lofty
hills and high places of the world, where they had worshipped their idols;
but the most eminent mountains of the whole earth, as that of Diana at
Ephesus, and of the Capitol at Rome, were destroyed and deserted, and the
glory of the worship of God was lifted up above them. So that what the
Jews think to plead for themselves, doth indeed in a manifest and open
event wholly evert their unbelief. But avoiding the consideration hereof,
that which they principally insist upon is, the peace promised under the
kingdom of the Messiah; which, as it seems to them, is not accomplished.
"Yea," saith one of them, "men are so far from beating their swords into
ploughshares, that within a few hundreds of years, new instruments of war,
ever heard of in the world before have been invented among them who
pretend to believe in the Messiah." And this, as they think, makes it ap-
ppear, that really he is not as yet come into the world; the vanity of which
pretence may easily be discovered from our former rules, which we shall
briefly apply for the removal of it.

§ 15. For, first, the temporal outward peace of the world, if any such
ting be here intended, is not the principal part, matter, or subject of the
promise, but only an accessory to it; the chief part of it which concerns the
spiritual worship of God is evidently fulfilled. That which is temporal, for
the times and seasons of it, is left to the sovereign will and wisdom of God
for its accomplishment. Neither is it necessary that it should be fulfilled
among all nations at once, but only among them who at any time, or in any
place, effectually receive the laws of God from the Messiah. Whatever
then of outward peace is really intended in this promise, as it hath already,
as we shall show, received its accomplishment in part, so the whole shall be
fulfilled in the time and way of God's appointment. 2. That the words
are not to be understood absolutely, according to the strict import of the
letter, is evident from what is added to the prediction in Micah, 'Every one
shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree.' Now, there are many, not only
persons, but great nations in the world, that have neither the one nor the
other. 3. The Jews themselves do not expect such peace upon the coming
of their Messiah. They look for great and terrible war with Gog and
Magog, as the Scripture mentions, and to this they add from their own
fancy, war with Armillus: only, it may be, they would have nobody to
wage war with, but themselves. For they tell us, that all nations shall
come with their controversies to be ended by the Messiah at Jerusalem, and
by that means prevent war among them. But I suppose the nations will not do so till they are subdued, and those of them broken in pieces which will not serve them; now whatever expedition they fancy to themselves, this may take up at least half the reign of their Messiah, if he should live an hundred years, about which they differ. Indeed, great wars and desolation of the enemies of the children of God are plainly and openly foretold under the Messiah, Isa. lxiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. 4. I shall not much insist on that universal peace which God gave to all the known nations of the world, at the coming of Christ, in the reign of Augustus; though this looks more like an accomplishment of this prophecy than what the Jews imagine to be the meaning of it. But because this was, in the providence of God, only coincident with his coming, and not an effect of it, I shall pass it by, considering it only as a diagnostic of the season wherein the Prince of peace was to be born. But I say, 5. That Christ at his coming wrought perfect peace between God and man, slaying the enmity and difference which by reason of sin was between them. This alone, absolutely and properly, is peace; without this, all other outward quiet and prosperity is ruinous and destructive. And where this is, no wars nor tumults can hinder the persons enjoying it from being preserved in perfect peace; and of this, if the Jews did believe it, they would have experience. 6. He hath also wrought spiritual peace and love between all that sincerely believe in him, all his elect. And though this does not free them from outward troubles, persecutions, oppressions, and afflictions in the earth, and that from some also that may make profession of his name, (for Judah may be in the siege against Jerusalem, Zech. xii. 2,) yet they having peace with God, and among themselves, enjoy the promise to the full satisfaction of their souls. And this peace of the elect with God, and among themselves, is that which singly and principally is intended in this prediction, though set out under terms expressive of the things in which outward peace doth consist. 7. The Lord Christ by his doctrine has not only proclaimed and offered peace with God to all nations, but also has given precepts of peace, and self-denial, (were they attended to and received,) directing and guiding all the sons of men to live in peace among themselves; whereas the Jews of old had express command for war, and for destroying the nations among whom they were to dwell, which gives a great foundation to the promises of peace in the days of the Messiah. 8. Let it be supposed, that it is general outward peace, prosperity and tranquillity, that is here promised to the world; yet then, 1. The precise time of its accomplishment is not here limited nor determined. If it be effected during the kingdom and reign of the Messiah in the world, the world is established, and the prophecy verified. 2. Our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles have foretold, that after his law and doctrine should be received in the world, there would be a great defection and apostasy from the power and purity of it, which would be attended with great persecution, troubles, afflictions, wars, and tumults. Moreover, it is foretold, that after these are all removed, and all his adversaries subdued, he will give peace and rest unto his churches and people all the world over; and thus in that season, which now approaches, shall be accomplished all the promises concerning the glorious and peaceable state of the church in this world. Take, then, this prophecy in what sense soever it may be literally expounded, and there is nothing in it that gives the least countenance to the Judaical inference from the words.

§ 16. The next collection of promises which they insist upon as to their
purpose, is of those which intimate the destruction of idolatry and false worship in the world, with the abundance of the knowledge of the Lord, taking away all diversity in religion, that shall be in the days of the Messiah. Such is that of Jer. xxxi. 34, 'They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the greatest of them to the least of them, saith the Lord.' And Zeph. iii. 9, 'I will turn to the people a pure language, that they may call on the name of the Lord with one consent.' As likewise that of Zech. xiv. 9, 'And the Lord shall be king over all the earth. In that day shall there be one Lord, and his name shall be one.' There are also other predictions of the same import, all which are to be accomplished at the coming of the Messiah. But for the present, say they, we see the contrary prevailing in the world. Idolatry is still continued, and that among the Christians themselves; diversities of religion abound, so that now there are more sects and opinions in the world than formerly; nor can the Jews and Christians agree in this very matter about the Messiah: all which make it evident, that he is not yet come, who shall put an end to all this state of things.

§ 17. Answer. It will prove in the issue, that the mention of these, as well as of other promises, will turn to their disadvantage. Their accomplishment in the sense of the Scripture hath been so plain and manifest, that nothing but prejudice and obstinate blindness can once call it in question. For the further manifestation of this, we may observe, 1. That these things are not spoken absolutely but comparatively. It is not to be thought, that in the days of the Messiah, there shall be no means of instruction in the knowledge of the Lord used; as that parents shall not teach their children; or that the officers of the church and others shall not teach those that stand in need of teaching. Indeed, even the Jews do not imagine any such thing, nor can they do so, without the rejection of the precepts of the law of Moses, and the predictions recorded in the prophets, in which God promiseth, that in those days he will give the people pastors after his own heart, priests and Levites, to teach them his mind and will. But these expressions signify, that in those days there shall be such a plentiful effusion of the Spirit of wisdom and grace, as shall cause the true saving knowledge of God to be more easily obtained, and much more plentifully to abound, than it did in the time of the law; when the people, by a hard yoke, and insupportable burden of carnal ordinances, were darkly, meanly, and with difficulty instructed in some part of the knowledge of God. And that the words are thus to be interpreted, the many promises that are given, concerning the instruction of the church, in the days of the Messiah, and his own office as the great prophet of the church, which the Jews acknowledge, do undeniably evince. 2. That the terms of 'all people and nations,' are necessarily to be understood as before explained, for many nations, those especially in whom the church of Christ is concerned; neither can any place be produced, where an absolute universality of them is intended. 3. That the season of the accomplishment of these and the like predictions, is not limited to the day or year of the Messiah's coming, as the Jews amongst other impossible fictions, imagine; but extends to the whole duration of his kingdom, as hath been shown before. 4. That God sometimes is said to do that, for effecting which he provides the outward means, though as to some persons and times, they may be frustrated of their effect. This the Jews not only acknowledge, but also contend for, when they give
an account why the promises which concern themselves are not yet fulfilled; the reason of which they suppose, or at least they pretend, to lie in their sins and unworthiness.

§ 18. These things being supposed, we may quickly see what was the event, as to those promises, upon the coming of the true and only Messiah. For, 1. It is known to all, and not denied by those with whom we have to do, that at the coming of Jesus of Nazareth, if we except that knowledge and worship of God which was in Judea, (a little corner of the earth, and that also by their own confession then horribly defiled and profaned,) the whole world, with all the great and most potent and flourishing nations of it; in particular, that the whole Roman empire, which is chiefly concerned in these predictions, was utterly ignorant of the true God, and engaged in the worship of idols and devils; and that this ignorance and idolatry had prevailed from time immemorial. 2. It is well known, that although the Jews had taken great pains, and compassed sea and land to make proselytes, yet they were only very few, and those very obscure persons, whom they could at any time, or in any place, prevail upon to receive the knowledge, or to give themselves up to the worship of the God of Israel. Of converting people or nations to the obedience of God, they never entertained the least hope. 3. It is manifest to all the world, that not only at the time of the coming of Jesus, but also by virtue of his law and doctrine, all the old idolatry of the world was destroyed, and that whole fabric of superstition, which Satan had been so many ages erecting, was cast to the ground, and those gods of the earth which the nations worshipped utterly famished. Hence it has come to pass at this day, that no people or nation under heaven doth continue to worship those gods, which the old empires of the world adored as their deities, and in whose service they waged war against the God of Israel and his people. And all the knowledge that at this day is in the world of one true living God, and also the reception of the God of Israel as that true God, however abused, as it is by some, Mahometans and others, did all originally proceed from the doctrine of Jesus Christ, whom these ungrateful people hate and persecute. Had it not been for him and his gospel, the true God, the God of their forefathers, had been no more owned in the world at this day, than he was at his coming in the flesh; and yet these poor blinded creatures, can see no glory in him or in his ministry. 4. The Lord Jesus Christ by his Spirit and word, did not only destroy idolatry and false worship in the world, but also brought the greatest and most potent nations to the knowledge of God, so that, in comparison of what was past, this knowledge covered the earth, as the waters cover the seas. This the Jews saw and repined at in the flourishing times of the Roman empire, when the Lord was one, and his name was one, in the whole earth, as that expression is used in the Scripture. 5. The way whereby this knowledge and worship of the true God was dispersed over the face of the earth, and spread itself like an inundation of saving waters over the world, was by a secret energy of the Spirit of Christ accompanying his word and the ministration of it. So that it, wholly differed from that operose, burdensome, and for the most part ineffectual way of teaching, which was used by the Priests, Levites, and Scribes of old; much more of the efficacy of grace, than of the pains of the teachers, being seen in the effects which were produced, according to the words of the promise, Jer. xxxi. 34. 6. In this diffusion of the knowledge of God, there was way made for the union, agreement, and consent in worship, of those that should receive it. For the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles was removed,
and both people did actually coalesce into one body, worshipping God with one lip and shoulder; and also a holy and plain way of spiritual worship was prescribed to all who embraced the law of the Messiah. 7. Notwithstanding all that has been already accomplished, yet there is still room and time left for the further accomplishment of these predictions, so that before the close of the kingdom of the Messiah, not one tittle of them shall fall to the ground. And thus also, the event known to all the world, manifests the due and full accomplishment of these promises, making it unquestionable, that the Messiah is long since come, and has fulfilled the work to which he was designed of old.

§ 19. Neither are the objections of the Jews of any force to invalidate our application of these promises. Two things they object to us. First, the idolatry that is yet in the world; especially among Christians. Secondly, the differences in religion that every-where abound amongst men. For, 1. We have shown already, that these and the like predictions are to be gradually accomplished, and not all at once, in every place. It is sufficient that there is an everlasting foundation laid for the destruction of all false worship; and that it has been conspicuously and gloriously destroyed in the most eminent nations of the world. This is sufficient to answer the intention of the prophecy, and supports the hope, that in the appointed seasons the remainder of all superstition and apostasy from God shall be rooted out. 2. As to what concerns Christians themselves, it cannot be denied, but that many who are so called, have corrupted themselves, and contracted the guilt of that horrible iniquity, with which the Jews charge them. But this, which is the crime and guilt of certain persons, and not of all the professors of Christianity, ought not to be objected to them. And I desire to know by what means the Jews suppose that they and the nations of the world shall be kept from idolatry and false worship in the days of their Messiah. If it be, because their Messiah shall give such a perfect law, and such full instructions in the mind and will of God, that all men may clearly know their duty; we say that this is already done, in the highest degree of perfection that is conceivable. But what if, notwithstanding this, men will follow their own vain reasonings and imaginations, and fall from the rule of their obedience into will-worship and superstition, what remedy have they provided against such backsliding? if they have none, but only the pressing upon them their duty to the law, word, and institutions of God, we have the same, and do make use of it, to the same end and purpose. If they shall say that their Messiah will kill the idolaters, we confess that ours is not of that mind; and desire them to take heed, lest in the room of the holy, humble, merciful King promised to the church, they look for and desire a bloody tyrant, who shall exercise force over the minds of men, and execute their revenge and lusts on those whom they like not. 3. This apostasy of some professors of Christianity, to false worship, idolatry, and persecution, is foretold obscurely in the writings of the Old Testament itself; but very plainly in those of the New Testament, in the revelations made by the Lord Christ to his apostles concerning the state of the church to the end of the world; so that from this apostasy no impeachment can arise against our interpretation of the predictions insisted on, which have a perfect coincidence therewithal. 4. The same is the state of things in reference to what they object about the variety of religions that are in the world, and the multitude of sects which every-where spring up. For, 1. Although de facto there are at this time sundry false religions in the world, and amongst them that which is professed by the Jews, yet de iure they
ought not to be, there being one true religion sufficiently declared and promulgated to the children of men. And though the Jews and others do wilfully shut their eyes against the light and evidence of truth, the guilt and misery is their own; the Lord Christ having graciously provided, and tendered unto them, means of better instruction. And, 2. It is a mistake, that the different opinions and sects that are amongst Christians themselves, do constitute different religions. For as they all agree in the worship of the God of Israel by Jesus Christ the Messiah, which contains the sum of their religion; so their profession itself is not to be measured by the doctrines and conceptions of some amongst them, but by the Scripture which they all receive and acknowledge. This is the religion of them all, and it is one and the same, amongst all that receive Jesus Christ for their Saviour. That there are such pertinacious contests about men's different apprehensions of the mind of God in the word, that they labour to impose their private conceptions one upon another, is the fault of some men, which doth not prejudice the oneness of that religion which is taught in the gospel. Upon all which it appears, that the promises insisted on, have received a glorious and blessed accomplishment.

§ 20. Thirdly. They insist on the promises which concern themselves; and these of all others they regard most, and urge against their adversaries. Nothing they say is more certain and evident in the Scripture, than that the people of Israel shall be brought into a blessed and prosperous condition by the Messiah at his coming; and in particular, that by him they shall be brought home to their own land. And to this purpose, they plead, Isa. xi. 13, lii. liv. lx. lxi. lxii. lxiii. lxiv. ; Jer. xxx. xxxi. ; Ezek. xxxvi.—xlil. to which sundry other places of a like import may be added. But now, say they, instead hereof, that whole people is scattered over the face of the earth, and are generally under great misery and oppression, without the least interest in the country promised to them. And from hence they most obstinately conclude, that the Messiah is not yet come; for until they are rich, wealthy, and powerful, they will not believe that God is faithful.

§ 21. Answ. It would be too long a work, and not suitable to our present design, to go over all the promises in particular, which seem to have an aspect this way, or wherein mention is made of Abraham, the seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel, and the people of Israel and Judah. Besides, the exposition of them may be readily found in many learned commentaries on the prophecies of the Old Testament, extant in all languages. I shall therefore only give such general answers, as, being applied to the several particular instances, will manifest the insufficiency of the argument of the Jews from promises of this nature. 1. Then, In the consideration of these promises, we must carefully distinguish between those which had their full, or at least their principal accomplishment in the return of the people from the captivity of Babylon, and those which have a direct respect to the days of the Messiah. It is known that the prophets do very usually describe that merciful deliverance in metaphorical expressions, to manifest the greatness of the mercy. But the present Jews look for the accomplishment of all the most strained allegories in a literal sense. And supposing that the deliverance from Babylon, which their forefathers obtained, did not answer what is spoken of it, because of their ensuing poverty and trouble, they wrest all the promises to the times of the Messiah, when they hope they shall receive them in full measure. For they reckon of all things according to their outward gain and profit, and not according to the manifestation
of the love and glory of God in them. These promises, then, are in the first place to be set apart, as not concerned in our present business and difference. 2. We have manifested before, that there is mention of a double Israel in the Scripture; the spiritual Israel, that is, all the sons of the faith of Abraham, in all ages and places throughout the world; and an Israel according to the flesh, or the carnal posterity of Jacob, which the present Jews are. This distinction we have elsewhere confirmed. Now many of the promises pleaded belong to Israel in the first sense, that is, to the church and people of God, who by faith are admitted into the covenant of Abraham, and so made inheritors of the promises. Now these promises also, which are by far the greatest number, are to be set aside from our present consideration of them. 3. It hath been proved, that oftentimes spiritual things are expressed metaphorically in the prophets, by words which in their literal sense denote things outward and corporeal. This is sufficiently evident from the instances formerly given, in which things are promised, of which it is utterly impossible that they should be a literal accomplishment; and of the like sort there are others innumerable. And thus most of the predictions that concern peace and prosperity must necessarily respect spiritual peace with God; because, concerning the same seasons, wars and trials are in other places foretold. 4. Whatever is foretold and promised concerning the Jews themselves, in the days of the Messiah, doubtless they have no reason to expect the accomplishment of it, until they receive him, own him, and submit to him, which to this day they have not done. When of old Moses went forth to visit them in their distress, and slew the Egyptian that smote one of them, they refused him, and would not understand that it was he by whom God would deliver them, and endeavoured to betray him to death; and because of this their bondage was continued forty years longer, and yet at length by the same Moses were they delivered. And although they have refused and rejected him who was promised to be their Saviour, and so continue to this day in their captivity, spiritual and temporal, yet it is he by whom, in the time appointed, they shall be delivered from the one and the other. But this shall not be done until they own and receive him; and when God shall incline their hearts to receive him, they will quickly find the blessed consequences of it. For, 5. We grant that there are many promises on record in the Scripture concerning their gathering together, their return to God by the Messiah, and the great peace and glory that they shall then enjoy. If we except their opinion concerning the perpetuity of the ceremonial law, and their return in the observance of it to their carnal ordinances, (which opinion is founded on an apprehension, which the rest of the world has long ago renounced, namely, that God is pleased with the blood of bulls and goats for its own sake, and not for its signification of that which was infinitely more excellent and glorious;) and if we except their vain and foolish imaginations about sensual pleasures, Behemoth, the wine of Paradise, and the literal accomplishment of evident allegories, which the wisest among themselves begin to be ashamed of; with these exceptions, there is nothing in their own expectations which we do not acknowledge that they shall be made partakers of. They shall return to their own land; they shall enjoy it for a quiet and everlasting possession, their adversaries being destroyed; they shall also be filled with the light and knowledge of the will and worship of God, so as to be a guide and blessing to the residue of the Gentiles who seek after the Lord, and, perhaps, shall be entrusted with great empire and rule in the world. The most of these things are foretold concerning
them, not only in their own prophetical writings, but also by the divine writers of sundry books of the New Testament. But all this, we say, must come to pass when the veil shall be taken from their eyes, and when they shall look on him whom they have pierced; and when they joyfully receive him whom they have sinfully rejected for so many generations. Until this be done, they may wrestle as they can with their perplexities, and comfort themselves as well as they are able in their miseries; they may get money in their dispersions by all unlawful arts and ways imaginable; and may expose themselves to the delusions of impostors, false prophets, and pretended deliverers, which to their unspeakable misery and reproach they have now done ten times; yet deliverance, peace, tranquillity, acceptance with God and man, they shall not obtain. Here lies the crisis of their condition. When they shall receive, acknowledge, and believe in that Messiah who came to them so long time since, whom their fathers wickedly slew, and hanged on a tree, and whom they have since no less wickedly rejected; and when by his Spirit and grace they shall be turned from ungodliness, and shall have their eyes opened to see the mystery of the grace, wisdom, and love of God in the blood of his Son; then shall they obtain mercy from the God of their forefathers, and returning again to their own land, 'Jerusalem shall be inhabited again, even in Jerusalem.'

EXERCITATION XIX.

§ 1. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the apostle treats either directly or occasionedly of the worship of God under the Old Testament; of the state of the church in those periods; and of the whole, or at least of the most important parts of the Mosaic economy. Indeed, there is nothing material, from the call of Abraham, to the utmost issue of God's dispensations towards his posterity, that is omitted by him. And if we have not that previous acquaintance with these things, which he supposed in them to whom he wrote, much darkness and many mistakes must attend us in considering the subjects of which he treats, and the ends which he proposes to himself. Now it will not be expedient to insist upon these things, every time that they are mentioned or alluded to. I thought it meet, in the close of these Prolegomena, to present the reader with a brief scheme and delineation of the whole Mosaic economy, as also of those other previous concerns of the church, in the posterity of Abraham, to which the apostle in this Epistle directs us. And they are these that follow:—

1. The call and obedience of Abraham, ch. xi. 8—17.
2. The institution and observance of the passover, ch. xi. 28.
3. The giving of the law, ch. i. 1, ii. 1, xii. 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26.
4. The sanction of the law in promises and penalties, ch. ii. 2, 21, iii., iv., x. 28.
5. The building of the tabernacle in the wilderness, and afterwards of the temple in answer thereunto, ch. iii. 3, 4, ix. 1—5, x. 19—22, with its utensils.
6. The calling, succession, and office of the high priest, ch. vii. 16, 17, 21, 23; ch. viii. 3, 4, 5.
7. The sacrifices and services of them both, ch. viii. 3, 5, ix. 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, x. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, xiii. 11, 12.

It is evident, that under these heads are comprised all the principal concerns of the ancient church, with the worship and rule of God therein; and all of them are reflected on, and most of them explained and applied to the service of the gospel by our apostle. However, I shall not at present engage in the exposition of the particular places in the Epistle where they are treated of; this is to be done elsewhere; but I shall only represent them as they are described in their institution and use in the Old Testament, that we may understand them aright, as they are mentioned and made use of in the New Testament.

§ 2. Many of these things, I acknowledge, especially those concerning the fabric and worship of the temple, have been so largely discussed by others, that I should judge my endeavours in reviewing them altogether needless, if the nature of our present design would allow them to be omitted. For much has been formerly collected from the Scriptures, with excellent success, respecting the fabric of divine worship, and the ceremonies thereof, by Josephus, and more modern Jewish masters, by Abubensis, Arius Montanus, Villalpandus, Capellus, Ribera, Constantine Emperor, Broughton, Ainsworth, Weemse, Rivet, and by all learned expositors on the parts of holy writ where these things are recorded. And there are also
some of late amongst ourselves, who have treated this subject with much diligence in large discourses. They are persons worthily skilled in suitable learning, and industrious in improving their knowledge of all that learning which is needful to the due and accurate handling of this subject. But notwithstanding their labours, I shall proceed in the way which I have mentioned above, because a discourse on these subjects is necessary to my present design; and because most of the things which I am now to consider are such as fell not under the consideration of those learned persons; and because I design not an exact examination of the particular concerns of all these things, with a discussion of the reasons and arguments wherewith various apprehensions of them are supported, but only to represent such a scheme of them, as may enable the reader to judge aright of the references of the apostle to them, and of the use he makes of them in this Epistle.

§ 3. First, then, The call of Abraham, which was the foundation on which all the following administrations of God towards his posterity, and his whole worship amongst them, were built, is excellently and fully described by our apostle, ch. xi. 8—19: 'By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should afterwards receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and he went out, not knowing whither he went,' Gen. xi. 4. 'By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,' Gen. xii. 12, 14. 'Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised,' Gen. xvii. 19, xxi. 2. 'Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable,' 13, 16; Gen. xv. 5. 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth,' Gen. xxiii. 4, xlvii. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 15. 'For they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country; and truly if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned,' Gen. xxiv. 5, 7. 'But now they desire a better, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city. By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and (or even) he that received the promises, offered up his only begotten Son, of whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called,' (so that he was his only begotten with respect unto the promise, Gen. xxi. 12, xxii. 9,) 'accounting that God was able even to raise him up from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure.'

The design of the apostle in this discourse, is to set forth and commend the faith of Abraham from its fruits, in the whole course of his obedience; but he builds it upon, and resolves it into his call: 'By faith Abraham being called.' It is not my present purpose to open particularly the discourse of the apostle, which must be referred to its proper place; but as what we do now, is in a subserviency to the right understanding of the Epistle, I have cited the account here given of the call of Abraham, and of his faith and obedience, as the reason of our insisting on it, and as the ground on which this discourse rests. Neither shall I now at large declare the nature of this call of Abraham, with the several occurrences that accompanied it; partly because it is already touched on in a former excercitation, and
partly because I have elsewhere handled it more largely, and cleared it from the corrupt traditions and opinions of the Jews concerning it. But as this was the root from which the Jewish church did grow, the stock into which all the Mosaic institutions of worship were grafted, it is necessary that we give a brief historical account concerning it.

§ 4. Abraham was called by his parents אבamed, 'Abram,' that is, 'a high father;' not without a signal presaging providence of God. For as of old they gave significant names to their children, so in this they had respect to their present condition, or to some prospect of future things given them by the Spirit of God, in which they or theirs should be concerned. Thus we have the reasons given us for the names of Cain, Gen. iv. 5; of Seth, ver. 28; of Noah, v. 29; of Peleg, x. 25; and of sundry others. And if we may not suppose that the parents of Abraham were directed to give him this name of a high father, by the spirit of prophecy, yet if we consider its suitableness to what God had designed him for, and its readiness to yield to that change which God made afterwards in it, unto a great strengthening of his faith and significance in a way of instruction unto future generations, we must grant that it was done by the designing holy wise providence of God. For he was a high father indeed, as being the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh. In process of time, upon the solemn establishment of the covenant with him God changed this name of לאזרה, Gen. xvii. 5, 'Neither shall thine name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham.' On a similar account, God also changed the names of some other persons, or superadded new names to those whereby they were called before. Thus Jacob was called Israel, Gen. xxxiii. 28, upon his prevalence with God as a prince; Solomon was called Jedidiah, 2 Sam. xii. 25, because the Lord loved him; and many doubtless had new names given them by themselves or others, or had some letter or syllable in their names changed, so altering their significations upon emergent occasions. Hence in the Old Testament, we find in several places the same person spoken of by divers names. Now this change in the name of Abraham, was not, as the Jews fancy, to honour him with the addition of a letter out of the Tetragrammaton, but for the addition of a new prophetical significance to his name. God himself expressly declares this: 'Thy name shall be אבגד, Abraham, for a father of a multitude of nations have I made thee.' According as I said before, ver. 3, 'Thou shalt be a father of a multitude of nations, עשה in his name denoting עשה, a multitude,' that is of nations, God himself expounding his own design. And in this there is a solemn prefiguration of the implanting of believers of all nations into the covenant and faith of Abraham; for this name he received upon the solemn establishment of the covenant with him, as the apostle explains the place, Rom. iv. 11, 17. All then who believe, are taken into the covenant of Abraham. And as to the privileges of it, and the inheritance to be obtained by it, they are no less his children and heirs, than those who proceeded from his loins according to the flesh, as hath been manifested in our Exercitation concerning the oneness of the church. And in this also God manifested what was his design in this call, and separation of Abraham to himself, even to make and constitute him and his posterity the means of bringing forth the promised seed, wherein all nations were to be blessed.

§ 5. Abraham being of the tenth generation from Noah, exclusive, was the son of Terah, of whom it is said, Gen. xi. 26, that Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; not doubtless in the same year,
but then the eldest of them was born, whoever he was. If Abraham was
the eldest, as he is first expressed, he was born 292 years after the flood, in
the three hundred and ninety-second year of the life of Shem, who outlived
him thirty-five years. He was the sixth from Heber, and was born in the
two hundred and twenty-fifth year of his age, who continued the longest
of all the postdiluvian patriarchs, outlived Abraham about sixty-four years.
But there is a difficulty in this account. For if Abraham was born in the
seventieth year of the age of Terah, Terah living in all two hundred and
five years, Abraham at the death of Terah must needs be a hundred and
thirty-five years of age. But the Scripture saith expressly, that at his de-
parture out of Haran, upon the death of his father, he was no more than
seventy-five years old. And if he was seventy-five years old at the death
of his father, who lived two hundred and five years, he must, have been
born in the one hundred and thirtieth of his father's life, and not before ;
which brings forward his birth and death sixty years beyond the former ac-
count: so that he outlived Shem twenty-five years, and died only four years
before Heber. Although therefore he be mentioned before Haran, Gen. xi.
26, yet indeed Haran was, the eldest son of Terah, and born sixty years be-
fore Abraham. And it appears from the story, that Lot and Sarah who were
the children of Haran, (if Sarah was the Isciah mentioned, as most suppose
she was, Gen. xi. 29,) were not much younger than Abraham himself.
For when Abraham was a hundred years old, Sarah was ninety, Gen. xvii.
17, and Lot may well be supposed to be older than she; so that of neces-
sity Haran must be many years older than Abraham, even no less than sixty, as
we have declared.

§ 6. His nativity and education was in Ur of the Chaldees, Gen. xi.
28, 31. This place is said to be on the other side of the flood, 7717, or
'the river,' Josh. xxiv. 2, that is, from the land of Canaan, on the other
side of the great river Euphrates eastward. It was also on the other side
of the Tigris, on the east of Aram Naharaim, or Mesopotamia, properly
so called; which is not insisted on, because Abraham came over Tigris to
Haran with his father Terah. 'He came out,' saith Stephen, 'from the
land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Canaan,' Acts vii. 4. He says indeed
that before he came unto Canaan, he dwelt in Mesopotamia, ver. 2, where
the land of Haran lay. For the name of Mesopotamia was given of old to
all the adjacent regions, even to the Persian Sea. Thus Pliny evidently
uses the word, lib. vi. cap. 26, 'Mesopotamia tota Assyriorum fuit vicatim
dispersa, præter Babylona, et Ninum.' 'All Mesopotamia belonged unto
the Assyrians, and consisted of scattered villages, unless it were Babylonia,
and the country about Nineveh.' And again, 'Reliqua pars Mesopotamiae
Assyriæque, Babylonia appellata est.' So that he equals Mesopotamia with
Assyria; and how great a tract of those regions it comprehended, is mani-
fest from Ptolemy, Strabo, and others. Eupolemus in Eusebius, Praeparat.
Evang. lib. 9, placeth oequa, Ura, in Babylonia; and there also Pliny men-
tions Ura upon the banks of the Euphrates, lib. cap. 24, 'Fertur Euphrates
usque ad Uram.' But this seems not to be the Ur where Abraham dwelt;
nor was there any reason that in going to Canaan, he should remove from
any part of Babylonia upon Euphrates to Charan. It is more likely to be
the place mentioned by Ammianus, lib. 5, where he says that the Romans
in six days came from Corduena in Armenia, 'ad Ur nomine, Persicum
castellum,' 'to Ur a Persian castle.' And this he placeth between Nisibis
and Tigris, not far from the place where it is supposed with probability that
the ark rested after the flood. Thus it would seem, that the family of Heber
kept their first seat, not accompanying the ד耎ט וְב, or 'sons of men,' Gen. xi. 2—4, those apostates who went from the east to find a place to fix the seat of their rebellion against God. Broughton contends, that Ur was in the vale of the Chaldeans, that is, in Babylonia, a very little way, or some few miles from Charan; averring, that Stephen cannot otherwise be defended who affirms that he was in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Charan. But this defence of Stephen is needless, seeing, as we have manifested, Stephen took Mesopotamia in a large sense, as others did also, giving the same extent to it as to Assyria, the denomination arising from the most eminent and fruitful of these regions. Moreover, the removal of a little way, or a few miles, answers not the description which the Holy Ghost gives us of this journey, Gen. xi. 31. 'And Terah took Abraham his son, and Lot the son of Haran, and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan, and they came unto Haran and dwelt there.' Their design was to go to Canaan. Now, as the Ur which was in Babylonia, was situated on this side of Euphrates, as Pliny testifies, Abraham could not go from thence to Canaan by Haran, without twice passing with all his family over Euphrates; besides the expression of their journeying to Haran, will not suit with any imaginary Ur within a few miles of it. Nor is it of any weight, that it is called Ur of the Chaldees, whose proper seat was in Babylonia, and not extended much farther eastward; seeing if the Chaldees, as is most probable, were called Chasdim, as they are constantly from רכש כessed the son of Nachor, the brother of Abraham, there must of necessity be allowed an historical prolepsis in the words; thus that place is called Ur of the Chaldees, from whence the Chaldees were after-to-have their original, who in time possessed Babylonia and the parts adjacent.

§ 7. Whilst Abraham lived with his progenitors in Ur, he no doubt was infected, as they were, with much false worship and idolatry. For so Joshua affirms expressly, that they served בורא וה��½, ch. xxiv. 2, even those whose worship God afterwards prohibited in the first precept of the law, מַלְאָכַי יִתְנַסְי. 'There shall not be unto thee other gods;' those or such as those, whom they served beyond the flood. By other gods, are meant all false gods. I have elsewhere considered and exploded the Jewish story about Abraham's discovery of the true God; about his consequent renunciation of all idolatry, with the breaking of his father's images, and his being cast for that cause by Nimrod into the fire, all about the forty-fourth year of his age. All these figments, with that of Haran's being consumed by fire in the sight of his father, they derive from the supposed signification of the name רָאָש, which they would have to signify 'fire,' Gen. xi. 28. But as in the passages where it relates to the Chaldeans, (as Ur of the Chaldees) it is apparently the name of a place, a town or country; so it rather signifies a valley than fire. And those words, Isa. xxiv. 15, בְּהַר יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְנַסְי, which we translate in the text, 'Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires,' may be better read as in the margin, 'in the valleys,' for this corresponds better with the following words, 'and the name of the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the sea.' At what year of his age he left Ur with his father is not expressed. But it is apparent, that it was towards the latter end of the life of Terah, after the death of Haran his eldest son, and after Nahor and Abraham were married to Milcah and Iscah his daughters; and after Sarah had continued barren some remarkable space of time, Gen. xi. 28—32.

§ 8. From Ur, therefore, with his father and the rest of their family, he removed to Haran with the design of proceeding to Canaan, Gen. xi. 31.
Where this Haran was situated we before declared. Stephen calls it Χαρραν, Charran, and so do the Latin writers:

Assyrias Latio maculavit sanguine Charras,

says Lucan, speaking of the overthrow of the army of Crassus near that place. And it may be pronounced either way in the original, from the ambiguous force of the Hebrew Cheth; but it seems to be best expressed by Charran. How long he stayed here is uncertain, as was said before. That it was not very long, appears from his having been married so long before he came thither, that the barrenness of Sarah had been observed. And yet that they abode there some years is no less evident from ch. xii. 5: ‘Abraham took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother’s son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls or servants that they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan.’ It is not the work of a few days or months that is here described. This gathering of substance and the getting of souls was a business of some years, of how many it is uncertain. What was the design of Terah, in his attempt to go to the land of Canaan, is not absolutely certain. The special call of Abraham to that country could not be the reason of it; for it is most probable, yea, indeed undeniable, that Abraham did not receive this call until after the death of Terah. This journey, then, they undertook, as led by motives which are not revealed. But in the providence of God, it was made subservient to the future call of Abraham, that he might be in more readiness to yield obedience to it, than he could have been in the land of Ur. Whether Terah did merely seek a new habitation in a country less peopled than that of his nativity, which doubtless was then the most populous part of the world, as being near the place where mankind first settled after the flood; or whether he might be instructed in the ancient promise, that the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, who then possessed the country called after his name, should be servants unto the seed of Shem, from whom Terah was a principal descendant, I know not. But this journey could not be taken in answer to the call of Abraham, for he was called to leave his father’s house, ch. xii. 1, and not to bring his father, and his father’s household with him; and this call was given to Abraham in the seventy-fifth year of his age, when Terah was dead. But whatever was the occasion of it, the providence of God used it to serve its designs towards Abraham. And here in Haran, if I may be allowed to conjecture, it is probable that God taught him the evil of those superstitions in which he was educated, revealed himself to him as the only true God, and so prepared him for the tedious journeying and long peregrination to which he was afterwards called.

§ 9. After the death of his father Terah, when Abraham was seventy-five years old, ch. xii. 14, God called him to himself, and entered into covenant with him in the promise of the land of Canaan, ver. 7. And this call of his was the great foundation on which God afterwards built the whole structure of his worship under the Old Testament. For herein he both appropriated to him the promise of the Messiah, engaging that from him he should proceed according to the flesh, and also set both him and his posterity apart, to be visibly subservient to the great design of his grace, in the accomplishment of the promise of a deliverer made unto our first parents. This we have elsewhere at large declared, and shown how that, after his call, every thing was disposed so as to prefigure that which was to come, and was suited for continuing till that season, and no longer.
§ 10. When Abraham was ninety and nine years old, that is, after he had been twenty-four years in the land of Canaan, the Lord confirms his covenant with him and his seed, by the sign and token of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 8—12. This Paul calls the seal of the righteousness of faith, Rom. iv. 12, because God thereby confirmed and assured unto him an interest in the promised seed, who is the Lord our righteousness, Isa. xlv. 24, 25; Jer. xxiii. 6; and because he had accepted of the righteousness and salvation, which in and by him God had prepared for sinners, in believing the promise, Gen. xv. 6. And thus God manifested that he took his seed together with him into the covenant, as those who, no less than himself, were to be made partakers of the righteousness exhibited therein, as also to be used for the line in which the holy seed was to be carried on; until the Word was to take it and to be made flesh, John i. 14; Mark i. 1; Rom. ix. 5.

And by this ordinance of circumcision were his posterity separated from the rest of the world, and united among themselves. Ishmael, indeed, and Esau carried the outward sign of circumcision out of the limits of the church, and communicated it to the nations that sprang from them, who observe it to this day. It is also observed by the Turks and Persians, and by very many of the Indians, who, though descended from other families, yet have received the law of Mahomet, who was a descendant of persecuting Ishmael. But their observance of it was never under the law of God, nor accepted with him, but is rather accursed by him. But as it was continued in the posterity of Abraham according to the promise, it was the fundamental uniting principle of the church amongst them, though dispersed into innumerable particular families. For as there were as many churches before as there were families, ecclesiastical rule, and economical, or paternal rule, being the same; now the covenant being one, and the token of the covenant being one and the same, to all the families that sprang of Abraham, which in their several generations were as the sands of the sea shore, or as the stars for multitude, they were all incorporated into one body among themselves, and separated from the rest of the world. Not that this ordinance alone was sufficient to constitute the whole nation one ecclesiastical body or church, which was done by the following institutions of worship, but the foundation of this union was first laid herein. Neither without some such general initiation into union could it have been orderly accomplished. And as it was the glory of the people of old, whilst they walked in the steps of the faith of Abraham, so it was the carnal boast of their degenerate posterity. Hence the frequent mention of those who were uncircumcised, in the way of reproach and contempt. And when they renewed the administration of it among themselves, upon their first entrance into the land of Canaan, after its omission in the wilderness, it is said that they rolled away the reproach of Egypt, Josh. v. 9; because they were now no more as the Egyptians, uncircumcised. And it was their glory, both because God made it the token of his receiving them to be his peculiar people, out of all the nations of the earth, as also because it was the pledge of their obedience to God, which is the glory of any person or people. But their posterity being carnal, and departing from the faith and obedience of Abraham, have quite lost the grace betokened by it, which, as Moses often declares to them, was the circumcision of their hearts to hear and obey the voice of God. They, however, always boasted, and still do boast of it as a sign of their separation to God from other people; not considering that these things were mutual, answering one another, and that circumcision of the flesh is nothing, where the circumcision of the heart is not also attended to.
§ 11. These are the chief heads of what is noticed by our apostle in the
call of Abraham, which also we have been more brief in the explication of,
because the consideration of it hath elsewhere occurred to us. Now from
this call of Abraham, to the deliverance of the children of Israel out of
Egypt, was, as Moses assures us, four hundred and thirty years, Exod. xii.
40, 41; and so saith our apostle, Gal. iii. 17. But because the Lord tells
Abraham that his posterity should be afflicted in a strange land four hun-
dred years, Gen. xi. 13, which words are repeated by Stephen in his sermon
to the Jews, Acts vii. 6, the reason of this different account may be briefly
inquired after. Here is a double limitation of time, 1st. Of four hundred
and thirty years by Moses and Paul; 2nd. Of four hundred years, by God
himself unto Abraham, repeated by Stephen. The words of Moses are
recorded, Exod. xii. 40, 41: 'Now the sojourning of the children of Israel
in Egypt were four hundred and thirty years; and it came to pass, at the
end of four hundred and thirty years, even on the self-same day, it came
to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out of the land of Egypt.' It
is evident that there is an ambiguity in the words of Moses, for if בֵּית
יִצְרָאֵל, the sojourning, or dwelling, in the beginning of the verse, do relate unto
כְּבָשָׂר, dwell in Egypt, it can design no longer space of time than
they dwelt there after the descent of Jacob, which, by an evident compu-
tation of the times, does not exceed half the space of four hundred and
thirty years. If it refer only to the children of Israel, then it takes in all
the sojournings and peregrinations of that people who dwelt in Egypt, from
the first day of their being the people of God. Now this ambiguity is
perfectly removed by our apostle, Gal. iii. 16, 17: 'Now to Abraham and
his seed were the promises made; and the covenant that was confirmed
before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years
after cannot disannul.' The law was given, as we shall see, immediately
upon their coming out of Egypt; and saith he, the 430 years are to be
reckoned from the call of Abraham, when God first entered into covenant
with him, Gen. xii. 2, 3. From thence to the departure out of Egypt, and
the giving of the law that ensued, are 430 years. It is evident, then, that
by the sojourning of the children of Israel is not meant merely their abode
in Egypt, (which, after their going down, Gen. xlvi., was only 215 years,
or thereabouts,) but the whole course of the peregrinations of that people,
after they were in Abraham called from their own country, and a certain
habitation therein, until their leaving of Egypt, in order to take possession
of the land of Canaan, as a perpetual inheritance. By perpetual inheri-
tance we mean an inheritance commensurate with the duration of the special
covenant made with them. It remains, then, that we consider the other
space of time assigned by God in vision to Abraham, for the affliction of
his seed under persecution, namely, four hundred years, Gen. xi. 13. Now
here, either the round number of 400 is put for 430, or 30 years are to be
abated out of the latter number, for some special cause and reason. The
former seems not probable, because Moses so emphatically observes that it
was in the four hundred and thirtieth year, that very same day, or night,
and therefore 30 years must be taken off, either from the beginning or from
the end of the latter number. There is no reason for taking it from the end; indeed, the exact notation of that period by Moses will not allow us
so to do. It must therefore be taken from the beginning. Now this pre-
diction of God unto Abraham, about the affliction or persecution of his
seed for 400 years, was given to him before the birth of Isaac, who, being
of his seed according to the promise, was to have his share in this afflic-
tion; yea, it was to begin with him. He was born, as was proved, 25 years after the promise; so that the 30 years, taken from the 450, fall out in the fifth year of his life; which was the time when the persecution began in the mocking of Ishmael, Gen. xxii. 9. This the apostle expressly calls persecution, and that on account of Isaac’s being the heir of the promise, Gal. iv. 29. Then began the 400 years of their affliction, which ended with the 430 of their peregrination.

§ 12. The faith of Abraham appeared in his obedience to the call of God, in his resting on the promise of the blessing by Christ, and in the observance of this ordinance of circumcision. By following this faith and obedience, his children were separated to God, and united among themselves, and continued without the addition of any new ordinance of worship for the support of their faith, the enlargement of their light, or for the outward profession of their separation to God, till the expiration of 430 years. And this period of time proved afterwards fatal unto them, not exactly and absolutely, but in some kind of proportion. For from hence unto the building of the temple by Solomon was 480 years. The duration of that temple was 415 years. And that which was built in the room of this stood somewhat above 500 years. Some peculiar space being given them beyond their former trials, before their utter destruction.

§ 13. At the expiration of the period of time now under consideration, our apostle tells us, Heb. xi. 28, that ‘by faith Moses kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them.’ This was the second ordinance which God instituted among them, to be of common use to the church, and appropriated unto them. The story of its institution, and the manner of its celebration, are narrated at large, Exod. xii.

§ 14. The time of its institution, and of the annual celebration of it, is exactly noted in the Scripture. It was the night before the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt, which is thence called לֹא מֵאָרֶץ, Exod. xii. 42, ‘a night of observances’ unto the Lord, that is, wherein the institutions of this ordinance were to be observed with great care and diligence. And this night followed directly upon the expiration of the 430 years before limited, ver. 40, 41. For the time of the year, it was in the month בָּרָאן, Abib, as the Hebrews call the month of the spring, which in those eastern parts gave blades to the corn and other fruits of the earth, Exod. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18; Deut. xvi. 1. This month was afterwards by a Chaldee name called Nisan, Neh. ii. 1; Esth. iii. 7; and it answered partly to our March, partly to April, beginning before or at the vernal equinox, according to the distance of any year from the embolismal year. And from hence this month was appointed to be יְדֵי הָיָן, the head, chief, or principal of the months, Exod. xii. 2; and so consequently the beginning of the year unto them. For before this their year began and ended in September, upon the gathering in of the fruits of the earth, Exod. xxiii. 16; being the time, as most of the present Jews suppose, when the world was created. Neither yet was this change absolute to all ends and purposes, but only as to ecclesiastical observances, and feasts, that depended on their distance from this of the passover. For their civil year, as to contracts, debts, and liberties, continued still to begin in September, with their jubilees, Lev. xxv. 8, 9, 10. And from that beginning of the year, most probably, are the months to be reckoned that are mentioned in the continuance and ending of the flood, Gen. vii. 11. See Joseph. liber 1, ch. 4.

§ 15. The time of the day when the lamb was to be slain is declared to
be between the two evenings of the 14th day of the first month. Some of the Jews, as Kimchi, make these two evenings to be the first declining of the sun, which began the evening or afternoon, and the setting of the sun which closeth it, answering the ancient division of the day into morning and evening. So that by this rule the lamb might be slain in any time of the afternoon, though it always followed the evening sacrifice, at the ninth hour, or three of the clock. Others, as Aben Ezra, make the first evening to be the setting of the sun, the other the departure of all light. And the Jews have a distinction of the day, by which they call this space of it between the two evenings, between the two suns. So they express themselves in Talmud. Hieros. Berach. cap. 1: פֶּסַחּ פּוֹ שַׂ כּ וֹאָנָּא קִבּוּל הַקִּבּוּל. 'All the space of time wherein the face of the east is red, is called day; when it begins to wax pale, it is called between the suns, (the same with between the evenings,) and when it waxeth black, the upper firmament being like the lower, it is night.'

§ 16. The occasion of the institution of this ordinance, is so fully and plainly declared in Exodus and Deuteronomy, that we shall not need to enlarge upon it. In brief, God being about to accomplish his great work of delivering the people out of Egypt, he thought meet to conjoin together his greatest mercy towards them, and his greatest plague upon their enemies. For this end he commands the destroying angel to pass through the land, and to slay all the first-born therein, from the first-born of him who sat upon the throne, to the meanest person belonging to the body of the nation. And although he might have preserved the Israelites from this destruction by the least intimation of his will to the instruments whom he used therein, yet having respect to the furtherance of their faith and obedience, as also designing their instruction in the way and means of their eternal salvation, he chose to do it by this ordinance of the passover. The form of this service is given us Exod. xii. 27, it is called פֶּסַחּ פֶּסַחּ: and the reason of it is subjoined, for the Lord פֶּסַחּ פֶּסַחּ passed over the houses of Israel. פֶּסַחּ is to pass on by leaping, making as it were a halt in any place, and then leaping over that which is next. Whence he that goes halting is called פֶּסַחּ פֶּסַחּ; one that as it were leaps on, from one leg unto the other. Some of the ancients call it Phase; Cheth being only not pronounced. The Greeks retain the name, but corrupt it into Πασχα, and are followed by the Latins, who call it Pascha. Hence, after the apostle had applied this feast and sacrifice to the Lord Christ, 1 Cor. v. 7, and Christians began to celebrate the commemoration of the passion of Christ, at the time of the year when that was observed, many both of the Greeks and Latins began to think, that the word was derived from Πασχα, Patior, to suffer, as both Augustin, and Gregory Nazianzen, Serm. de Pasch. do declare, who both of them refute that imagination. The general nature of it was פֶּסַחּ a sacrifice, Exod. xii. 27, and פֶּסַחּ a feast, ver. 14, a sacrifice from the slaying and offering of the lamb, which was done afterwards for the people by the Levites; and a feast from the joy and remission of labour wherewith the annexed solemnities were to be observed. The matter of it was פֶּסַחּ Seh, ver. 3, that is, a young lamb or kid; for either might be used in this service, a male without blemish, ver. 5. The manner of the service was, 1st. In the preparation, the lamb or kid was to be taken into custody on the tenth day of the month, and kept up four days, ver. 6, which, as the Jews say, was partly that they might discern perfectly whether it had any blemish or no, partly that they might by the sight of the lamb be reminded of their duty,
and the mercy of their deliverance. Indeed it was, that it might prefigure the imprisonment of the Lamb of God, Isa. liii. 7, 8, who took away the sin of the world. This preparation, the Jews say, was temporary, and observed only at the first institution of the ordinance in Egypt, and that partly lest in their haste they should not otherwise have been able to prepare their lambs. So also was the sprinkling of the blood on the posts of the doors of their dwelling houses, ver. 7, with hyssop, which could not be afterwards observed, when by God's institution the whole congregation were to celebrate it in one place; and it had respect unto their present deliverance from the destroying angel, ver. 12, 13. In like manner was their eating it, with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staves in their hands, ver. 11, that they might be in readiness for their immediate departure, which was not afterwards observed by our Lord Jesus Christ, nor any of the church. For these signs ceased with the present occasions of them. 2d. This lamb was to be provided for each household, ver. 3, 4, which was the third distribution of that people, the first being into tribes, and the second into families, from the twelve patriarchs and their immediate sons, Josh. vii. 16—18. But because there was an allowance to make their company proportionable unto their provision of a lamb, joining or separating households, ver. 4, they ate it afterwards in societies or fraternities; as our Saviour had twelve with him at the eating of it. And the Jews require ten at least in society for the celebration of it. Whence the Targum expressly on this place, Exod. xii. 4, 'If the men of the house be fewer than the number of ten:' for this was a sacred number with them. They circumcise not, marry not, divorce not, unless ten be present. Thence is their saying in Pirke Aboth, 'where ten sit and learn the law, the divine presence resteth on them;' as Ps. lxxxii. 1. 3d. The lamb being provided was to be killed, and it was directed that the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel should kill it, ver. 6, that is, every one for himself and family. But after the giving of the law, and the erection of a priesthood in the church, this work, as it was a sacrifice, was left unto the priests, 2 Chron. xxxv. 1—5. 4th. The place where it was to be killed, was at first in their several houses, or wherever the assembly of the people was; but this was afterwards forbidden, and the sacrifice of the passover confined expressly to the place where the tabernacle and temple were to be, and not elsewhere, Deut. xvi. 6, 7. 5th. The preparation of the whole lamb for eating, was by roasting it, ver. 8, 9, and that was done with bread unleavened, and bitterness, or bitter herbs, ver. 9, and it was all to be eaten that night. What remained until the morning was to be burned in the fire, as a thing dedicated, and not to be polluted. The Jews have many traditions about the manner of eating and drinking at this supper, of the cups they drank and blessed, of the cakes they brake, of their washings, and the like. But as these have all been discussed by others at large, so I shall not engage in the consideration of them, being satisfied that the most, if not all of them, are inventions of the Rabbins since the destruction of the second temple, and that many of them are taken up from what they observed to be in use among Christians, to which they were perhaps led by such, as from the profession of Christianity apostatised unto them, and these were no small multitude.

§ 17. To the observance of the passover, was joined the feast of unleavened bread, which was to begin the next day after the eating of the lamb, that is, on the 15th day of the first month. For whereas the Paschal lamb was to be eaten with unleavened bread on the fourteenth day, this was a peculiar ceremony of that ordinance, and belonged not to the ensuing
feast, ver. 15, 16. And in this feast these things are to be considered: 1st. The total exclusion of all leaven out of their houses. 2d. The time of its continuance, which was seven days. 3d. The double extraordinary Sabbath wherewith it was begun and ended: for on the first day, and last day of the seven, there was to be a solemn and holy convocation unto the Lord, to be observed in a cessation from all labour, and in holy duties. And here also it were lost labour to reckon up the cautions, rules, and instructions which the Jewish doctors give about the nature, kinds, and sorts of leaven, and about the search that was to be made for it, and the like, most of them being vain imaginations of superstitious minds ignorant of the truth of God.

§ 18. This sacrifice, then, of the passover, with its attendant feast of unleavened bread, to be annually observed on the fourteenth day of the month Abib, unto the end of the twenty-second, was the second solemn ordinance of that people, as the people and church of God. And the Jews observe, that no other positive ordinances, but only circumcision and the passover, had that sanction of the הָרָא, Excision, or extermination annexed unto them. Concerning circumcision, the words are plain, Gen. xvii. 14, 'The uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, יהוה will cut it off from his people, he hath broken my covenant.' And with reference to the passover, Exod. xii. 15, 'Whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.' Whereas they observe, as Aben Ezra tells us on this place, that it is annexed to above twenty negative precepts; intimating that there is a greater provocation and sin in doing any thing in the worship of God against his commandment, than in omitting what he had commanded, though both of them be evil. The observation I acknowledge in general is true, but the application of it to the passover is not so. For although we should suppose that the words of Exod. xii. 15, do relate to the passover also, although they seem to respect only the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, yet they do not require the observance of the passover itself under that penalty; but upon a supposition of the observance of the passover, they were to eat the lamb with unleavened bread, which was a negative precept, namely, that they should have no leaven in their bread, and so was justly attended in its transgression with this cutting off. And this cutting off, the Jews generally interpret when it is spoken indefinitely, without a prescription of the manner how it should be done, or by whom, to respect יְאָשָׁר, the hand of heaven, or the vindictive justice of God, which in due time will find out the transgressor. But we know that God long bare with them, in the omission of this ordinance of the passover itself.

§ 19. What the observances of the modern Jews, in the imitation of their forefathers' observance of this ordinance of God are, the reader may see in Buxtorf's Synagoga Judaica, and in part in the Annotations of Ainsworth; and they need not here be repeated. This only I shall observe, that all of them in their expositions of this institution, do make the application of its several parts unto other acts of God in dealing with them; such as indeed the text of Moses plainly leads them to. And this perfectly overthrows their pretensions, as to their other ceremonies and sacrifices; namely, that they were instituted for their own sakes, and not as signs of things to come; the figurative nature of this their greatest ordinance being manifest, and acknowledged by themselves.

§ 20. On occasion of this great solemn ordinance, there was given to the vol. 1.
people two additional institutions; the first concerning the writing of the law on their foreheads and hands, the other of the dedication to God of all that opened the matrix. The first of these is prescribed, ch. xiii. 9, "And it shall be for a sign upon thine hand, and as a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth: ver. 16, and it shall be for a token upon thine hand, and as frontlets between thine eyes." To which may be added Deut. vi. 6—9, "And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gates." In the observance of sundry things, supposed to relate to these precepts, consists the principal part of the superstition of the present Jews. For they have mixed the observance of this duty, whatever be intended by it, with many foolish and noisome imaginations. It doth not indeed appear to me, that any more is intended by these expressions, a sign upon thy hand, and a memorial or frontlet between thine eyes, but a continual remembrance, and careful practice of the institution itself, and their calling thus to mind the mercy and goodness of God in their deliverance; which they were to celebrate when they were settled in their own land, by writing some passages of the law upon the doors and posts of their houses. But they are otherwise minded. That which is prescribed unto them is called ver. 9, םיר, a sign, as it was to be on their hand; and־דר, a memorial, as between their eyes; both which are very capable of our interpretation, but ver. 16, they are called ירושה, as also Deut. vi. 8. From this word, the meaning of which they do not know, they draw out all the mysteries of their present observances. The Chaldee renders it ידळ Theophilin; which word seems to be taken from the Hebrew דלום prayer or prayers, and to be so called from the prayers that they used in the consecration and wearing of those frontlets. But because they are rendered in the Greek φωκαρχα, Philacteria, some would derive it from לבלב, to conjoin, keep, and bind, which hath some allusion at least to the sense of the Greek word. And for this origin and import of the word the learned Fuller contends, Miscelan. i. 5. c. 7. The manner of their present observance hereof is to this purpose. They write four sections of the law on parchment. And why four? that they gather from the signification of the word תותפו Totaphoth; Tot saith Rabbi Solomon, in Pontus, somewhere by the Caspian sea, signifies two, and Poth signifies two in Egypt; both which make four undoubtedly. Or as they say in the Talmud, Tat in Caspe signifies two, and Pat in Africa. So that four sections must be written. Scaliger supposeth the word to be Egyptian, which is not unlikely: but that it should signify an amulet, or a charm, as Petitus supposes, is not so probable. For the reason assigned for this opinion, namely, that such amulets were in use among the heathen, with inscriptions either ridiculous or obscene, and that as God would not have his people to make use of these, that therefore he appoints them other things and inscriptions in their stead, this reason does indeed overthrow such an opinion. For it is abundantly evident, that God in his laws, doth directly on all occasions command the contrary to whatever was in practice of this sort among the nations. So that Maimonides well observes, that the reason of many of their institutions cannot be understood, without a due consideration of the superstition of the neighbouring nations.
These four sections must be these that follow. The first is, Deut. vi. 4—9. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and these words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart;' and so onward as before. The second is, Exod. xiii. 1—10. 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine. And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand, the Lord brought ye out from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten, this day came ye out in the month of Abib. And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee; a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month: seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast unto the Lord: unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days, and there shall be no leavened bread with thee; neither shall there be leaven seen within all thy quarters: and thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt; and it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth; for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt: thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in its season from year to year.' The third s from the tenth verse of that chapter to the end of the seventeenth: 'And it shall be, when the Lord shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, as he sware unto thee unto thy fathers, and shall give it thee, thou shalt set apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast, the male shall be the Lord's: and every firstling of an ass, thou shalt redeem with a lamb, and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck, and all the first-born of man amongst thy children shalt thou redeem: and it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage. And it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of beast: therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the matrix being males, but all the first-born of my children I redeem: and it shall be for a token upon thine hand, and as frontlets between thine eyes; for by strength of hand the Lord brought us forth from out of Egypt.' The last is, Deut. xi. 13—21. 'And it shall come to pass, if you shall hearken diligently unto my commandments which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart, and with all your soul; that I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat, and be full. Take heed to yourselves, that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and serve other gods, and worship them: and then the Lord's wrath be kindled against you, and he shut up the heaven that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit, and lest ye perish quickly from off the good land which the Lord giveth you. Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart, and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as
frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thine house, and upon thy gates; that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them, as the days of heaven upon the earth.'

§ 21. Because in all these places there is mention made of these frontlets or memorials, therefore they select these passages for this use. And these are to be written on parchment made of the skin of a clean beast, on the side next the flesh, prepared with a pronunciation of a form of words, both in the killing of the beast, and in delivering the skin to the dresser, and to the writer. When they are written, they are wrap up in small rolls, and so worn upon their foreheads and left arms, being so rolled and made up, that none of the writing might be seen. And so great art is required in the making of these Tephilim, that few among them attain to it. Hence Fagius tells us a story of a master among them in his days, who sold many thousands of these phylacteries to his countrymen, which had nothing in them but cards, which served their turn well enough. Their masters also are curious in describing to what part of the head they must be applied, namely, to the fore part from ear to ear; and the hand must be the left hand, by which, however, they will have the arm above the elbow to be understood; and when they must be worn, namely, by day, not by night, on the week days, not on the Sabbath, and the like worthy specifications. The benefit also they receive hereby is incredible; for by them are they defended from evil, as some by the sign of the cross, and others by the first words of the Gospel of John worn about them. By the use of these, they are sanctified in the law; and in a word the Targum on the Canticles, ch. viii. 3, tells us, that 'God chose them above all people, because they wore their phylacteries.' So just cause had our Lord Jesus Christ to reprove their hypocrisy, superstition, and self-justification in the use, abuse, and boasting of these things, Matt. xxiii. 5. 'All their works they do to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments.' This about the borders of their garments was an after institution; yet because it is of the same nature with this, we may notice it also in this place. To this purpose God gives his command, Numb. xv. 38—40. 'Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make their fringes in the borders of their garments throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a ribband of blue; and it shall be unto you as a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and do them; and that ye seek not after your own heart, and your own eyes, after which ye use to go a-whoring: that ye may remember and do all my commandments, and be holy unto your God;' which law is repeated again, Deut. xxii. 12. 'Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four quarters of thy vestures wherewith thou coverest thyself.' These ἤφακαι, 'locks, or fringes,' were made of thread fastened to the wings or skirts of their garments with a ribband, ἰσιν, of a blue colour, the making of which the Jews confess that they do not now understand, but suppose that it was made with the blood of a fish called Chalazon, mixed with vermilion. The use of these fringes had efficacy from the institution of God, who alone is able to bless and sanctify things, in themselves indifferent, to sacred use, for the keeping of their hearts in a due reverence of himself, and their eyes from wandering after false worship and
superstition; which being now removed and taken away, the things themselves are among the present Jews turned into the greatest superstition imaginable. Their principal vanities about these things having been represented by others out of the treatise of Maimonides on that subject, need not here be repeated.

§ 22. The last appointment of God occasioned by the mercy solemnly remembered in the passover, was the dedication of all the first-born males to himself. The law of this dedication is recorded, Exod. xiii. 12, 13, and the manner of its performance is farther stated, Numb. xviii. 15, 16, 17. 'Every thing that openeth the matrix, in all flesh which they bring unto the Lord, whether it be of men or beast, shall be thine; nevertheless the first born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem, and those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou redeem, according to thine estimation, for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs. But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem, they are holy, thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto the Lord.' The whole dedication of the first-born males is distributed into three parts. 1. Children, who were to be redeemed with five shekels, twenty gerahs to one shekel, that is about twelve shillings of our money. 2. Clean beasts, such as were appointed to be offered in sacrifice on other occasions, as the kine, the sheep, and the goats. These were to be offered to God, in a sacrifice of burnt-offering without redemption or commutation, after they had been kept a month with the dam. 3. Unclean beasts, whereof an instance is given in the ass, which were either to be redeemed with money by an agreement with the priest, or to have their necks broken at the choice of the owner. And all of this to call to remembrance the mercy of God in sparing them, and theirs, when the first-born of man and beast, clean and unclean in Egypt, were destroyed. For hence a peculiar right of special preservation arose unto God towards all their first-born, and this also not without a prospect towards the redemption of the church of the first-born by Jesus Christ, Heb. xii. 23.

§ 23. And this concluded the first dispensation of God towards the church in the posterity of Abraham, for the space of 430 years. With the provision and furniture of these ordinances of worship, they left Egypt, and passing through the Red-sea, came into the wilderness of Sinai, where they received the law, and were made perfect in the beauty of typical holiness and worship.

§ 24. To these ordinances succeeded the solemn νόμοθεσία, or giving of the law on mount Sinai, with the precepts and sanctions thereof, mentioned in several places by our apostle, as ch. ii. 2. 'For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward.' Chap. x. 28. 'He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses.' Chap. xii. 18, 19, 20, 21, 'For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire; nor unto blackness and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words, which they that heard treated that the word should not be spoken to them any more; for they could not endure that which was commanded; and if so much as a beast touched the mountain, it shall be stoned or thrust through with a dart. And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.'
Ver. 25. 'They escaped not who refused him that spake on earth.' And in other places.

§ 25. Three things must be explained in reference to this great and solemn foundation of the Jewish church state, of which our apostle treateth in this whole epistle. First, the preparations for it. Secondly, the manner of the giving of it. Thirdly, the law itself. For the preparations for it, they are either more remote, or immediately preceding it. The former were those temporary, occasional, instructive ordinances which God gave them at their entrance into the wilderness, before they came to receive the law on Sinai.

The first mentioned of this nature is Exod. xv. 23, 24, 25, 26. 'And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were bitter; therefore the name of it was called Marah. And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink? And he cried unto the Lord, and the Lord showed him a tree, which when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet. There he made a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of those diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians, for I am the Lord that healeth thee.' The whole course of God's proceedings with his people, whereof we have here the first pledge in the wilderness, was by a constant series of temporal providential straits, sinful murmurings, and typical mercies.

The waters being bitter, that they could not drink them, God showed to Moses a tree; that is, say some of the Jewish doctors, he showed him the virtue of a tree to cure and make wholesome bitter waters. And they say it was a tree, whose flowers and fruit were bitter; for no other reason, but because Elisha afterwards cured salt waters, by casting into them a crust of salt. The Targum of Jonathan, and that of Jerusalem say, God showed him מֶרֶדֶפֶּר אֲדַרְדֶפֶּר the bitter tree Ardiphne, which is nothing but Деоу Daphne, the Laurel. And on this tree the author of that fabulous paraphrase would have the glorious name of God to be written, according to the incantations in use among them in his days. But that which is designed in the whole is, that God preparing them for the bitter consuming law that was to be given them, and discovering to them their inability to drink of the waters of it for their refreshment, gave them an intimation of the cure of that curse and bitterness by him, who bearing our sins in his body upon the tree, (I Pet. ii. 24,) is the end of the law for righteousness unto them that do believe.

§ 26. Their second preparation for the receiving of the law, was the giving of manna unto them from heaven. In their progress between Elim and Sinai, they came to the wilderness of Sin, so called from a city in Egypt, to which it extended, in the midst of the second month after their departure from Egypt; the stores which they brought with them from thence being exhausted, the whole congregation murmured for food. For still their wants and murmurings lay at the bottom, and were the occasion of those reliefs, whereby the spiritual mercies of the church by Christ were typified. In this condition God sends them manna, Exod. xvi. 14, 15. 'In the morning the dew lay round about the host. And when the dew that lay was gone up, behold, upon the face of the wilderness there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar frost of the ground, and when the
children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna; for they wist not what it was. And Moses said unto them, This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat, ver. 31. And the house of Israel called the name thereof manna, and it was like coriander seed, white, and the taste of it like wafers made with honey.

When the children of Israel saw it, they said, אָדָם יָּהַנְא Man hu: and ver. 31, the children of Israel called the name of it ן מ Man. The reason of this name is very uncertain. The calling of it manna in the New Testament, gives countenance to the derivation of the word from הָמָּנָא Manah, to prepare and distribute. For what some have thought, that it should be an abbreviation of הָמָּנָא a gift, and spoken by them in their precipitate haste, is destitute of all probability. If it be from הָמָּנָא Manah, it signifies a prepared meat, or portion. So upon the sight of it, they said one to another, here is a portion prepared. But the truth is, the following words, wherein there is a reason given why they said upon the sight of it אָדָם יָּהַנְא Man hu, inclines strongly to another signification, אָדָם יָּהַנְא הבָּר Man, 'For they knew not, Ma hu, what it was.' They said one to another, Man hu, because they knew not Ma hu, that is, what it was. So that Man hu is as much as, What is it? and so the words are rendered by the LXX. τι ἐστιν τούτο, What is this? and by the vulgar Latin, Quid est hoc? But this difficulty remains, that מ Man is not in the Hebrew tongue an interrogative of the thing, no nor yet of the person, nor doth signify what. Aben Ezra says it is an Arabic word. Chiskuni, an Egyptian; and it is evidently an interrogative of the person in the Chaldee, and sometimes of the thing, as Judg. xiii. 14. מ Man, What is thy name? Yea, it seems to be used towards this sense in the Hebrew, Ps. lxi. 8. שִׁמְךָ אָדָם מַנָּא אִנֵּהֵר, where though most take מ Man, to be the imperative in Pihel from מ Manah, which no where else occurs, yet the LXX. took it to be an interrogation from the Chaldee, rendering the words τις εἰπεν, 'Who shall find out?' This being then the language of the common people in their admiration of a thing new unto them, it is no wonder that they made use of a word that had obtained amongst them from some of the nations with whom they had been conversant, differing little in sound from a word of their own, of the same signification, and afterwards admitted into common use amongst them. From this occasional interrogation, did the food provided for them take its name of Man, called in the New Testament manna. This occasional imposition of names to persons and things has been at all times frequent and usual; as in the chapter foregoing, the place was called Marah, from the bitterness of the water, of which they complained upon their first tasting it. And in the next chapter the names of Massah and Meribah, are derived from their temptations and provocations. The only observation which we would make concerning this dispensation of God towards them is, that they had this eminent renewed pledge of the Lord Christ that bread of life, and food of their souls given unto them, before they were entrusted with the law. But they making the law their only glory, and betaking themselves to it, without the healing tree and heavenly manna, the law thus used has become their snare and ruin. See John vi. 31, 32, 46, 49, 51. Rev. ii. 17.

§ 27. A third signal preparation for the law on the like occasion, and to the same purpose with the former, is repeated, Exod. xvii. 1—7. 'And all the congregation of the children of Israel journeyed from the wilderness of Sin, after their journeys, according to the commandment of the Lord, and pitched in Rephidim; and there was no water for the people to drink.
Wherefore the people did chide with Moses, and said, *Give us water that we may drink.* And Moses said unto them, *Why chide ye with me? wherefor do ye tempt the Lord?* And the people murmured against Moses, and said, *Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt to kill us with thirst?* And Moses cried unto the Lord, saying, *What shall I do unto this people? they be almost ready to stone me.* And the Lord said unto Moses, *Go on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel, and thy rod wherewith thou smitest the river take in thine hand, and go: behold I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it that they may drink.* And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel. And he called the name of the place Massah and Meribah, because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, *Is the Lord amongst us or not?* Marching up farther into the wilderness, they came to Rephidim, their fourth station from the Red Sea. There they met with no waters to their satisfaction, and therefore they fell into a high murmuring against the Lord, and mutiny against Moses their leader. And this iniquity the Jewish doctors suppose was the more aggravated, because they were in no absolute necessity for water, the dew which fell from the manna running in some streams. Hereon God commands Moses to go to the rock of Horeb, which he had prepared for the place of giving the law, and promises to meet him there; he commands him also to take his rod in his hand to smite the rock, and when this was done, waters flowed out for the relief of this sinful murmuring people. The Holy Ghost hath put sundry remarks upon this dispensation of God towards them.

First. Because of the sin of the people, he gave a double name to the place where they sinned, for a memorial to all generations: he called it Massah and Meribah, which words our apostle renders by Ρηρασμος and Παραπικρασος, chap. iii. 9, *temptation and provoking contention.* And it is often mentioned both with respect to the people, either to reproach and burden them with their sin, as Deut. ix. 22, *‘And at Massah ye provoked the Lord to wrath;’ or to warn them of the like miscarriage, chap. vii. 16, ‘You shall not tempt the Lord your God, as you tempted him in Massah;’ as also Ps. xcv. 8. It is also mentioned with reference to Moses, as to the signal trial that God had there made of his faith and obedience, in that great difficulty with which he conflicted; as also of those of the tribe of Levi, who in a preparation to their ensuing dedication to God, clave to Moses in his straits, Deut. xxxiii. 8, ‘And of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.’

The mercy, likewise, that ensued, in giving them water from the rock, is most frequently celebrated, Deut. viii. 15; Psal. lxviii. 15, 16; Psal. cv. 41; Neh. ix. 15. Now, all this was done to bring them to attend and inquire diligently into the kernel of this mercy, whose outward shell was so undeservedly free, and so deservedly precious. For by this rock of Horeb was typified a spiritual rock, as our apostle tells us, 1 Cor. x. 4, even Christ the Son of God, who, being smitten with the rod of Moses, or the stroke and curse of the law administered by him, gave out waters of life freely to all that thirst and come unto him.

§ 28. Thus did God prepare this people for the receiving of the law, by a triple intimation of him who is the Redeemer from the law, and by whom alone the law that was to be given could be made useful and profitable to
them. And all these intimations were still given them on their great and signal provocations, to declare, that neither did their goodness deserve them, nor could their sins hinder the progress of the counsel of God’s will, and the work of his grace. Hereby also did God revive unto them the grace of the promise, which being given, as our apostle observes, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law, could not be disannulled thereby.

And these I call the remote preparations of the people for the receiving of the law, consisting in three revelations of the grace of God in Christ, happening and granted unto them in the three months space which they spent between the Red Sea, and their coming unto the wilderness of Sinai, or to the mountain where they received the law.

§ 29. The immediate preparations for giving of the law are all of them expressed, Exod. xix., and these we shall briefly notice, the most of them being insisted on, or referred to by our apostle in the places before mentioned.

First. The time of the people’s coming to the place where they were to receive the law is related, ver. 1. It was ‘novilunio tertio,’ in the third month after their coming up out of Egypt; that is, on the first day of the month, the month Sivan, on the day of the new moon. And, therefore, it is added, ‘on the same day;’ on which Aben Ezra observes, Moses went up first into the mountain to receive the commands of God, and returning on that day to the people, he went up again on the third day, that is, the third day of the month, to give in their answer unto the Lord, ver. 11, 16. And this fell out, if not on the day, yet about the time of Pentecost, on which afterwards the Holy Ghost-descended on the apostles, enabling them to preach the gospel, and by it our deliverance from the curse of the law given at that time.

§ 30. For the special time of the day when God began to give out the appearances of his glory, it is said, ver. 16, ‘early in the morning,’ which he proves from chap. xxxiv. 4, ‘And Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto Mount Sinai.’ And ‘Boker,’ properly signifies the ‘first appearance of the morning,’ the light that must be inquired and sought after before the rising of the sun. So David, Psal. cxxx. 6, compares the earnest expectation of his soul for mercy, to the diligent watching of men for the morning, that is the first appearance of light. And this was the season in which our blessed Saviour rose from the grave, and from under the curse of the law, bringing with him the tidings of peace with God, and deliverance. He rose between the first dawning of light, and the rising of the sun, Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; to that latitude of time doth the Scripture assign it, and the first evidence of it. For, whereas John says, that ‘Mary Magdalen came to the sepulchre very early while it was yet dark,’ chap. xx. 1. Matthew, ‘when it began to dawn towards day,’ chap. xxviii. 1. Mark, ‘very early in the morning,’ at the ‘rising of the sun,’ chap. xvi. 2, who compriseth the utmost abode of the women at the sepulchre; Luke expresses it indefinitely, ‘profundo mane,’ that is, ‘in the first appearance,’ and dawning of light, at which time the preparation for the promulgation of the law began.

§ 31. The place they came to is called the wilderness of Sinai, ver. 2, and so was the mountain also itself on which the glorious majesty of God appeared, ver. 20. It was also called Horeb, Exod. iii. 1. ‘He came
to the mountain of God, even to Horeb,’ where they were to serve God, ver. 12, and it was on this account afterwards called Horeb, the mount of God, 1 Kings xix. 8. And the whole wilderness was termed the wilderness of Horeb, Deut. i. It is, therefore, generally supposed that they were several names of the same places; the mountain and wilderness wherein it was, being both called Sinai and Horeb. And they were both occasional names, taken from the nature of the place, נֵבֶל, ‘Sinai,’ from סֶנֶה, ‘Seneh,’ a bush, such as that in which the angel appeared unto Moses, Exod. iii. 2, of which a multitude were in that place; and Horeb, from its drought and barrenness, which is the significature of the word. But the opinion of Moses Gerundensis is far more probable, that Horeb was the name of the wilderness, and Sinai of the mountain. That Sinai was the name of the hill, is expressly affirmed, chap. xix. 18, 20, ‘And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai, on the top of the Mount,’ so Psal. lxviii. 17. And, whereas mention is made of the wilderness of Sinai, it is no more than the wilderness in which Mount Sinai was. And for those places before referred to, where Horeb seems to be called the mount of God, the words in all of them will bear to be read, ‘to the mount of God in Horeb.’ Strabo calls this very mount, Σαινα, lib. 16, and Justin says of Moses, ‘Montem Sinan occupat.’ The people, therefore, abode in Horeb, at the foot of the mountain, or about it, and the law was promulgated on the top of Sinai, in the most desert solitude of that wilderness. And in this place the superstition of some Christians in latter ages has built a monastery for the celebration of their devotion by an order of monks, whose Archimandrite was not many years since in England. But as the place, materially considered, is as evident an object of God’s displeasure against the lower part of the creation, upon the account of sin, as almost any place in the world, being a waste and howling wilderness, a place left to solitude and barrenness; so in its allusion or relation to the worship of God, it is cast by our apostle under bondage, and placed in opposition to the worship and church state of the gospel, Gal. iv. 24, 25.

§ 32. When they came to this place, it is said, ‘Moses went up unto the mount unto God.’ It doth not appear that he had any new immediate express command to do so. Probably he both came to that place, and as soon as he came thither, went up into the mountain, in obedience to the command, and in faith of the promise of God which he received upon his first call, Exod. iii. 12. For at that time he was assured, as a token and pledge of their deliverance, that they should worship God, or receive the law in that mountain; which is also the judgment of Aben Ezra upon the place. And it is not unlikely but that God at that time fixed the cloud which went before them, as the token of his presence, on the top of Sinai, as a new direction to Moses for his going up thither.

§ 33. Having ascended, God calls to him (the word of the Lord saith Jonathan) and teacheth him to prepare the people for the receiving of the law, ver. 4, 5. Two things he proposeth to their consideration: First, The benefits of which they had already been made partakers, signified to them by the mighty and wonderful works of his power. And, Secondly, new privileges to be granted unto them. In the first, he reminds them that he had borne them on eagles’ wings. This Jarchi interprets of their sudden gathering out of all the coasts of Goshen unto Ramesis, to go away together the same night, chap. xii. 37. But, although it may be allowed that this wonderful assembling of them was effected by some special assistance
of Providence, besides the preparation which they had been making for sundry days before, yet this expression evidently extends to the whole dispensation of God towards them, from the first of their deliverance unto that day. Generally, they all of them explain this allegorical expression from the manner in which the eagles, as they say, carry their young, which is on their backs or wings, because they fear nothing above them, as soaring over all; whereas, other fowls carry their young between their feet, as fearing other birds of prey above them. But there is no need to force from the expression such uncertain niceties. There is no more intended but that God carried them speedily and safely, as an eagle is borne by its wings in her course.

To this remembrance of former mercies, God adds secondly a threefold promise. First, That they should be "Segullah," a word that hath none to declare it by. "We render it here and elsewhere, 'a peculiar treasure,' Eccles. ii. 8. It is rendered by our apostle, Titus ii. 14, λαος περιουσιος, 'a peculiar people;' and by another, λαος εις περιποιησιν, 1 Pet. ii. 9, which we translate in like manner. Secondly, That they should be "a kingdom of priests," that is, άρχαι, 'of princes,' saith Jarchi, as David's sons who were princes, are said to be דודים. And it is not denied but that the word is sometimes so used. But, whereas it here means the special separation and dedication of the people to God, after the manner of priests, thence the allusion is taken, the dignity of princes being included in that of a kingdom. And this Peter renders βασιλεϊς εἱρατεύμα, 'a kingly priesthood,' And in the transference of this privilege unto believers under the gospel, it is said, that by Christ they are made 'kings and priests unto God,' Rev. i. 6, and it is added, that they should be 'a holy nation,' as expressly, 1 Pet. ii. 9.

§ 34 That which God on the other hand requires of them is, that they keep his covenant, ver. 5. Now, this covenant of God with them had a double expression. First, In the giving of it unto Abraham, and its confirmation by the sign of circumcision. It is not this, however, which is here especially intended, but it is the administration of the covenant, wherein the whole people became the peculiar treasure and inheritance of God upon a new account, which is respected. Now, this covenant was not yet made, nor was it ratified until the dedication of the altar, when it was sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, as Aben Ezra well observes, and as our apostle manifests at large, chap. ix. 10—21. Wherefore, the people taking upon themselves the performance of it, and of all its statutes and laws, while yet they knew not what they were, did give up themselves to the sovereignty and wisdom of God, which is the indispensable duty of all that will enter into covenant with him.

§ 35. For the farther preparation of the people, God appoints that they should be 'sanctified, and wash their clothes,' ver. 10, which was done accordingly, ver. 14. The first contained their moral, the latter their ceremonial significative preparation for converse with God. The former consisted in the due disposal of their minds to that godly fear and holy reverence, that becomes poor worms of the earth, to whom that glorious God makes such approaches as he did unto them. The latter denoted that purity and holiness which was required in their inward man. From this latter institution, which was temporary and occasional, and of this kind they had many granted to them whilst they were in the wilderness before the giving of the law, the rabbins have framed a baptism for those that enter into their synagogue, a fancy too greedily embraced by some Christian
writers, who would have the holy ordinance of the churches' baptism to be derived from thence. But this washing of their clothes, not of their bodies, was temporary, never repeated, neither is there any thing of any such baptism or washing required in any proselytes, either men or women, where the laws of their admission are strictly set down. Nor are there the least footsteps of any such usage amongst the Jews, until after the days of John Baptist, in imitation of whom it was first taken up by some anti-mishnical rabbins.

§ 36. The next thing which Moses did by the command of God, after he returned from the Mount, was to set bounds to it, and to the people, that none of them might press to go up, until the trumpet had finished its long and last sounding, a sign of the departure of the presence of God, ver. 12, 13. 'And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves that you go not up into the Mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the Mount shall be surely put to death; there shall not an hand touch it, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man it shall not live: when the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the Mount.' The law, the sanction, and the duration of the obedience required, are here stated. The law expresseth an evil prohibited both in itself, and in the end of it. The evil itself was, going up into, or so much as touching by any means the mountain, or the border of it. The reason why this was prohibited was, that they might not gaze, ver. 21, 'Charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze.' The sanction is death, enjoined from the hand of men in these verses, and threatened from the hand of heaven, ver. 21, 24. The continuance of the observance was until the the trumpet sounded long, or had done sounding, the sign of the departure of God's special presence, which made the place holy only during its continuance.

§ 37. For the law it is said expressly that the Mount was not to be touched; it might not be touched by man or beast. Yet our apostle treating concerning it, calls it, 'the Mount that might be touched,' Heb. xii. 21. For, although de jure, whilst that temporary command continued in force, it might not be touched, which seemed to render it glorious, yet, saith the apostle it was but a carnal thing, that might de facto be touched by man or beast, had they not been severely prohibited; and so is no way to be compared with that heavenly Mount Sion to which we are called in the worship of God under the gospel.

§ 38. The contexture of the words in our translation seems to have some difficulty: 'Whosoever toucheth the Mount, ver. 12, 13. 'There shall not an hand touch it' ד רב בה יכ סל, it should seem that by רב, the Mount itself is intended, and that the law is reinforced in a particular caution, that so much as a hand should not touch the Mount. But it is far more probable that by רב, touch it, the person, man or beast that touched the mountain, is intended. And the words declare the manner in which the offender should be destroyed. Being made anathema, devoted, accursed by his presumptuous sin, no man was to touch him, or to lay hand on him to deliver him, lest he also should partake of his guilt. And this sense the ensuing words, with the series of them evinceth. That is, no hand shall touch it, either to save it, or to punish it, but stoning it shall be stoned, or thrusting through it shall be thrust through, whether man or beast it shall not live. Let none think by laying hand on it, to deliver it. Whence Aquila renders דנ ינ by בזגנמי, he shall be slain or destroyed 'cum impetu et horrore,' with force and terror, all
being to cast stones at him, or to shoot him through with arrows, or thrust him through with darts. So Aben Ezra, אַלֹּ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ תִּשְׁאֲל֣וּן אֶת֖וֹ בָּאֵ֣ה הַמַּכִּנָּ֔ן הַמֵּתָּ֖ן לְאָדָּֽם. The meaning is, 'Men should not gather about him to take him, but those that see him, shall stone him from the place of their station. And if he be afar off, they shall shoot him through with arrows.'

§ 39. Touching the mountain, or the border, limit, or bound set unto it by God's appointment, was the sin forbidden. And the end of it, as was said, was, that they should not break through, וַגְּדַלְךָ֥, to see, to gaze say we properly, to look with curiosity on the appearances of God's glory; for which cause he smote the men of Bethshemesh upon their looking into the ark, I Sam. vi. God intended by this prohibition to beget in the people an awe and reverence of his holy majesty as the great Law-giver; and by the terror thereof, to bring them and their posterity into that bondage in the frame of their spirit, that servile awe that was to abide upon them, until such time as he should come, who was to give liberty and boldness to his church, by dispensing to believers the spirit of adoption, and so enabling them to cry Abba, Father, and to enter with boldness into the holy place, even to the throne of grace.

§ 40. In case the punishment appointed were neglected by the people, God threatens to see the execution of it himself, ver. 21, 'Lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish;' ver. 24, 'And let not the priests and the people break through to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them.' For to make them watchful in their duty, he lets them know that their miscarriage in this matter, by their neglect leaving to him the punishment of the transgressor, should be imputed by him to the whole people, so that he would in such a cause break forth upon them with his judgments, and many of them should be consumed to the terror and warning of the remnant.

The continuance of this prescription was from the day before the appearance of the glory of God on the Mount, until by the long sounding of the trumpet, they perceived the presence of God had left the place, ver. 13, 'When the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the Mount;' that is, they had liberty so to do.

§ 41. Things being thus prepared, the people were brought forth to their station to attend to the law, ver. 17, 'And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp for to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the Mount.' This station of the people in Mount Sinai, is amongst the Jews the most illustrious thing that ever befell them. And many disputes they have about their order therein; some few things we may observe from it.

Moses brought forth the people שִׁים הַמַּכִּנָּן הַמֵּתָּן דָּבָ֖ר לְאָדָּֽם, 'in occurruntm ipsius Dei,' 'to meet with God himself:' דָּבָֽר לְאָדָּֽם, 'to meet with, or before the Word of God,' saith Onkelos. דָּבָֽר לְאָדָּֽם, saith Ben Uzziel, 'the glorious presence of God,' ἐς ὑπάρχον ὁ θεόν, and ἁπαναγμα τῆς ἐόντος αὐτοῦ, 'the essential Word of God, the brightness of his glory;' the Son of God, the Head and Law-giver of the church in all ages.

§ 42. And they stood at the nether part of the Mount. Ver. 2, it is said, 'And Israel encamped there before the Mount,' in the singular number, that is in such order, saith Jarchi, that they were all as one man. And, saith he, they were on the east side of the mountain, where also they kept their station at the giving of the law; for so he would have the word דָּבָר to denote, though he gives no instance to confirm his
opinion. But Aben Ezra expressly rejects this fancy, and that by a notable instance, where it is said, 'the people pitched their tents before (גְּלוּ) the tabernacle of the congregation round about.' So that although they were round about the tabernacle, they are said to be before it, because of the special regard which they had unto it. And at this station in the wilderness, command was given to set bounds to the Mount בֵּית, round about, ver. 12, which there had been no need of, had not the people been gathered round about the mountain.

§ 43. Now they generally agree, that this was the order wherein they stood: First stood the priests, mentioned expressly, ver. 22, and said there to draw near unto the Lord; that is, nearer than the rest of the people, though they also are expressly forbidden to come so nigh as to touch the Mount, ver. 24. These priests were as yet the first born of all the families, before a commutation was made, and the tribe of Levi accepted in their room. Next to the priests, stood the princes or heads of the tribes, attended with the elders and officers of the people. The body of the people, or the men of Israel, as they speak, stood next to them; and behind them, the women and children. The remotest of all in this order being, as they suppose, the proselytes that adhered unto them. Thus Aben Ezra expressly, 'First were the first born who drew nigh to God,' and after them were the heads of the tribes, that is the princes, 'after them the elders.' And after them the officers; and after them all the men of Israel,' after them the children,' that is, males; and after them the women, 'after them the proselytes or strangers.'

§ 44. All things being thus disposed, in the morning of the third day, the appearances of God's glorious presence began to be manifested, ver. 16, 'And it came to pass, on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders, and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, so that all the people that was in the camp trembled.' Ver. 18, 'And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole Mount quaked greatly.' That all these things were the effects of the ministry of angels preparing the place of God's glorious presence, and attending upon him in their work, the Scripture elsewhere testifies, and we have before manifested, so that there is no need here farther to insist upon it.

§ 45. Upon this preparation for the descent of the glory of God, upon the sight of his harbingers and evidence of his coming, Moses brought forth the people לאשה אֶלֶף, 'to meet with God.' He brought them out of the camp, which was at some farther distance, unto the bounds that by God's prescription he had set unto Mount Sinai. And Rashi on the place observes, not unfitly, that this going of the people to meet with God, argues that the glory of God came also to meet with them, as the bridegroom goeth out to meet the bride; for it was a marriage covenant into which God then took the people, whence it is said that God came from Sinai, namely to meet the people.

§ 46. The utmost of the approach of the people was to the nether part of the Mount. From this expression, the Targum of Jerusalem hath a foolish imagination, which they have also in the Talmud; namely, that Mount Sinai was plucked up by the roots, and lifted up into the air, that the people stood under it, which Jarchi calls a Midrash, that is, though not in
the signification of the word, yet in the usual application of it, an allegorical fable.

In this posture, the people trembled and were not able to keep their station, but removed from their place, ch. xx. 28. And the whole Mount quaked greatly, ver. 18, so terrible was the appearance of the majesty of God in giving out his fiery law.

In this general consternation of all, it is added, that ‘Moses himself spake,’ ver. 19, ‘and God answered him by a voice.’ What he spake is not declared, nor was there any occasion for his speaking, nor can any account be given why he should speak to God, when God was solemnly preparing to speak to him and the people; nor is it said, that he spake to God, but only that he spake. And it is signally added, that God answered him, נְפָּעִי בְאָשֶׁר, in, or by a voice. For my part, I doubt not but that in this general consternation that befell all the people, Moses himself being surprised with fear, spake the words recorded by our apostle, ch. xii. 21, ‘I exceedingly fear and quake,’ which condition he was relieved from by the comforting voice of God, and so confirmed for the remainder of his ministry. These brief remarks being given upon the preparation for, and the manner of the giving of the law, we shall summarily consider the general nature of the law, and its sanction, in our next Exercitation.

EXERCITATION XX.


§ 1. The law itself, and its sanctions, are the next thing of which our apostle makes mention in the economy of the Jewish church. By this law he especially understands the law given on mount Sinai, or partly there, and partly from the tabernacle, the type of Christ, after it was erected. The Jews by the תְּנִנָּה, or law, generally understand the whole five books of Moses, as they are also called in the New Testament, and all precepts that they can gather out of any of them, they refer to the law, for which they are not to be contended with.
§ 2. This whole law is generally distributed into three parts. First, the moral; secondly, the ceremonial; thirdly, the judicial part of it. And indeed there is no precept but may conveniently be referred to one or other of these heads, as they are usually explained. That which is commonly called the moral law, the Scripture terms דְּבָרֵי נַעַר הָדָּבָרִים, Exod. xxxiv. 28. The words of the covenant, the ten words. From this is formed the Greek Δικαλογος, or the law of ten words, or precepts: all which in their substance are moral and universally obligatory on all the sons of man. That part of the law, in Scripture called מַעַרְכֵּם, judgments, Exod. xxi. 1, which determines rights between man and man, and punishments upon transgressions, with special reference to the interest of the people in the land of Canaan, is by us usually termed the judicial law. And the institutions of ceremonial worship are most commonly expressed by the name of מִדְבַּר, the whole system whereof is termed the law ceremonial.

§ 3. The Jews either do not acknowledge, or do not much insist on this distinction, though it is evidently founded in the things themselves; but casting all these parts of the law together, contend, that there is amongst them 613 precepts. For the numeral letters of נוּס, denote 611 of them; and the other two, which, as they say, are the two first of the decalogue, were delivered by God himself to the people, and so come not within the compass of the word torah in that place, whence they take this important consideration, namely, Deut. xxxiii. 4, 'Moses commanded us a law,' that is, of 611 precepts; two being given by God himself, completes the number of 613. The folly of these things is obvious to all; yet this is a part of their oral law, to which, as hath been shown, they ascribe more oftentimes than to the written word itself.

§ 4. Of these 613 precepts, 248, they say, are affirmative precepts; because there are, as they affirm, so many distinct members or bones in the body of a man; of this I leave our anatomists to judge: and 365 negative precepts, because there are so many days in the year; man being bound to keep the law with his whole body all the year long; both which numbers make up 613. And lest this observation should not seem sufficiently strengthened by these arguments, they add that which they suppose conclusive, namely, that in the decalogue there are 613 letters, if you will but set aside the last two words; and this, in common civility, cannot be well denied unto them.

§ 5. These 613 precepts they divide or distinguish into twelve families, according to the number of the tribes of Israel; that is, either general part into twelve; first the affirmative, and secondly the negative. And although this distribution be not satisfactory for many reasons, as others have shown, yet for the advantage of the reader, I shall here give a summary account of them.

§ 6. The first family, which hath relation to God and to his worship, consists of twenty precepts. These, as well as those which follow, I shall briefly enumerate, without any examination of the reasons which may have led the Jews to place them in their several stations. 1. Faith, and acknowledgment of God's divine essence and existence, Exod. xx. 2. Faith of the unity of God, Deut. vi. 4. xxxii. 39. 3. Love of God, Deut. vi. 5. x. 12. 4. Fear of God, Deut. vi. 13. 5. Acknowledgment of God's righteousness in afflictions, Deut. viii. 5. 6. Prayer to God, Exod. xxi. 25; Deut. xi. 13. 7. Adherence to God, Deut. x. 20. 8. To swear by the name of God, Exod. vi. 13; Deut. x. 20. 9. To walk in the ways of God, Deut. xxviii. 9. 10. To sanctify the name of God, Levit. xxii. 32. 11.
Twice a-day to repeat that section, 'Hear, O Israel,' Deut. vi. 7, xi. 19. 12. That we learn and teach the law, Deut. v. 1, xi. 8. 13. To wear phylacteries or tephilin on the head, Deut. vi. 8. 14. To wear them on the arm, in the same place. 15. To make fringes, Numb. xv. 38—40. 16. To put writings of the Scripture on the posts of our doors, Deut. vi. 9. 17. That the people be called together to hear the law at the end of the feast of tabernacles, Deut. xxxi. 12. 18. That every one write him a copy of the law, Deut. xxxi. 19. 19. That the king moreover write out another for himself as king, Deut. xvii. 28. 20. That at our eating of meat we give thanks or bless God, Deut. viii. 10. This is the first family, which though it sometimes fail in educating its precepts from the word, yet good use may be made of the observation, in reducing these things to one certain head.

§ 7. The second family, of the first general head of affirmative precepts, contains those which concern the sanctuary and priesthood, being nineteen in number. 1. That a sanctuary, tabernacle, or temple, should be built, Exod. xxv. 8. 2. That being built it should be reverenced, Levit. xix. 30. 3. That the priests and Levites, and no other, should always keep the temple, Numb. xviii. 2. 4. That the work or ministry of the temple should be performed by the Levites, Numb. xviii. 23. 5. That the priests should wash their hands and feet before their ministry, Exod. xxx. 9. 6. That the priests should attend the lamps of the sanctuary, Exod. xxvii. 21. 7. That the priests should bless the people, Numb. vi. 23. 8. That every day the shew-bread should be renewed. 9. That incense should be offered twice a-day on the golden altar, Exod. xxx. 7, 8. 10. That the fire on the altar should be kept always burning, Levit. vi. 12, 13. 11. That the ashes should be removed from the altar every day, Levit. vi. 10. 12. That the unclean should be separated from the camp and temple, Numb. v. 2; Deut. xxiii. 10. 13. That Aaron and his posterity should have the principal place and honour in sacred things, Levit. xxi. 8. 14. That the priests should wear the garments appointed to their special ministry, Exod. xxviii. 2. 15. That the ark should be carried on the shoulders of the Levites, Numb. vii. 9. 16. That the anointing oil should be made to anoint kings and priests, Exod. xxx. 25—27. 17. That the families of the priests should minister in the sanctuary by turns, but that all should be present at the great anniversary feasts, Deut. xviii. 6. 18. That the priests mourn and be defiled for their near relations, Levit. xxi. 3. 19. That the high priest marry a virgin, Levit. xxi. 13.

This is the second family, liable to the same mistakes in many things with the former; but yet containing a collection of things suitable to each other, and belonging for the most part to the same general head.

§ 8. The third family relates to sacrifices, containing fifty-seven precepts. As, 1. That the קְדֵשׁ, tamid, or continual sacrifice, be offered every day, Exod. xxix. 38; Numb. xxviii. 2, 3. 2. That the high priest offer his minchah or corban every day, Levit. vi. 20. 3. That every sabbath day two lambs of a year old be offered as a sacrifice morning and evening, Numb. xxviii. 9. 4. That the sacrifice of the new moon be observed, Numb. xxviii. 2. 5. That during the feast of the passover, the special sacrifices appointed to be added to the continual sacrifice, Levit. xxiii. 6, 7; Numb. xxviii. 19. 6. That at the feast of Pentecost, the offering of new corn be observed, Numb. xxix. 1. 7. That it be accompanied with alms. 8. Likewise that on the day of expiation, Numb. xxix. 7. 9. And that on the feast of tabernacles for seven days, Levit. xxiii. 34. 10. That on the eighth or last day of the feast, Numb. xxix. 35, 36. 11. That on the second day of the
feast of the passover an homer of meal be offered with a lamb, Levit. xxiii. 12. That on the feast of Pentecost two new loaves be offered, with its especial sacrifice, Levit. xxiii. 17. 13. That all things be done aright on the feast of expiation, Levit. xvi. (These general things are evidently put in to fill up the number of precepts that they had fixed on, there being no special precept in them.) 14. That three times in the year an holy feast be kept to the Lord, Exod. xxiii. 14. 15. That on these feasts all the males appear before the Lord, Deut. xvi. 16. 16. That they should rejoice in all their feasts, Deut. xvi. 14. 17. That the paschal lamb be slain, Exod. xii. 6. That his flesh be eaten roasted, Exod. xii. 8. 19. That in the second month, on the fourteenth day, another passover be kept. 20. That the lamb be then eaten with unleavened bread, and sour herbs, Numb. xix. 10. 11. 21. That the sounding of trumpets be used with the sacrifice, in the day of the afflicting their souls, Numb. x. 9, 10. 22. That the creatures to be sacrificed should be eight days old and upwards, Levit. xxii. 27. 23. That every creature to be sacrificed be perfect, Levit. xxii. 13. 24. That salt be used in all sacrifices, Levit. ii. 13. 25. That whole burnt offerings be offered according to the law, Levit. i. 3. 26. That so also be the sin-offering, Levit. vi. 18. 27. And likewise the trespass-offering, Levit. vii. 1. 28. And the peace-offering, Levit. vii. 2. 29. And the meat-offering, Levit. xi. 1. 30. That if the whole congregation offend, a sacrifice be offered for it, Levit. iv. 13. 31. If a private man sin by ignorance, he must offer his sin-offering, Levit. iv. 27. 32. That a sacrifice be offered for an uncertain crime, Levit. v. 17, 18. 33. That a sacrifice be offered for sin certain and known, Levit. vi. 2, v. 16. 34. That every one's sacrifice be according to his substance or wealth, Levit. v. 7. 35. That whosoever sinned, together with his sacrifice, he make confession of his sin, Numb. v. 6, 7. 36. That involuntary pollution be cleansed by sacrifice, Levit. xv. 13. 37. That women do so likewise in the case mentioned, Levit. xv. 28. 38. That the leper, being cleansed, do offer sacrifice, Levit. xiv. 10. 39. That a woman after child-birth offer sacrifice, Levit. xii. 6—8. 40. That the tenth of every clean beast be separated to the Lord, Levit. xxvii. 32. 41. That every first-born male be sanctified and offered to the Lord, Exod. xiii. 2; Deut. xv. 19. 42. That every first-born of man be redeemed with a certain price, Numb. xviii. 15. 43. That the first-born of an ass be redeemed with a lamb, Exod. xiii. 14. 44. That if it be not redeemed its neck be broken, Exod. xiii. 14. 45. That any sacred beast, that is firstling or tenth, wherein is a blemish, be redeemed, Deut. xii. 15. 46. That which is changed, and that which it is changed for, are to be both the Lord's, Levit. xxvii. 10. 47. That all offerings, both those which were necessary by legal prescription, and also free-will offerings, be brought to Jerusalem on the next feast, Deut. xii. 5, 6. 48. That all sacrifices be offered at the sanctuary, Deut. xii. 14. 49. That sacrifices vowed out of the holy land be offered at Jerusalem, Deut. xii. 27. 50. That Aaron and his sons eat the remainder of the meat-offerings, Levit. vi. 16. 51. That the males of the house of the priests eat the flesh of the sin and trespass-offering, Exod. xxix. 33. 52. That holy flesh which hath touched any unclean thing be burned in the fire, Levit. vii. 19. 53. That the flesh of the sacrifices that remain above the third day be consumed with fire, Levit. vii. 17. 54. That a Nazarite suffer his hair to grow, Numb. vi. 5. 55. That he shave his hair after his vow is accomplished, ver. 9. 56. That every man perform his vows to God, Deut. xxiii. 23; Numb. xxx. 2. 57. That judgment be made of the obligations of vows according to the law, Numb. xxx. 3—5.
§ 9. The fourth family of affirmative commands respects cleanness and uncleanness, whereof they reckon up eighteen precepts; as, 1. He that touches that which dies of itself is unclean, Levit. xi. 39. 2. Eight kinds of creeping things are unclean, Levit. xi. 29. 3. Sundry things that may be eaten are yet capable of uncleanness, Levit. xi. 34. 4. A woman in her natural disease is unclean, Levit. xv. 19. 5. And she that is delivered of a child, Levit. xiii. 2. 6. The leper is unclean, and defileth other things, Levit. xiii. 2. 7. A cloth infected with leprosy is unclean, Levit. xiii. 47. 8. And an house likewise, Levit. xiv. 35. 9. He that hath an issue is unclean, Levit. xv. 2. 10. And to the same purpose, Levit. xv. 16. 11. And in a woman, ver. 25. 12. A dead body is unclean, and defileth, Numb. xix. 14. 13. All cleansing must be accompanied with bathing or washing, Levit. xv. 16. 14. The cleansing of the leper must be with cedar, hyssop, scarlet wool, and the other ceremonies, Levit. xiv. 2. 15. The leper must shave all the hair off his head on the seventh day, Levit. xiii. 45. 16. The leper must not go abroad, but with the signs of his leprosy, Levit. xiii. 45. 17. That the red heifer be burned according to order, Numb. xix. 2. 18. That the water of the ashes of a red heifer be sprinkled in purification, Numb. xix. 19.

§ 10. The fifth family of this sort of commands, concerns alms and tithes, consisting of thirty-two precepts. 1. That alms be given to the poor, Deut. xv. 8. 2. That he who promiseth the price of redemption for the first-born, pay it assuredly, Lev. xxvii. 2. 3. That he who is to pay the redemption price of an unclean firstling, pay it accordingly, Lev. xxvii. 11. 4. That the price of a devoted house be so paid, according to the judgment of the priest, Lev. xxvii. 14. 5. The same of a field, Lev. xxvii. 16. 6. That he who deceiveth by ignorance, add a fifth part to the price of the thing itself, Lev. xv. 16. 7. That the fruits of the fourth year be dedicated to God, Lev. xix. 24. 8. That the corners of the fields be left to the poor to cut and gather, Lev. xix. 9. 9. That ears of corn be left for the poor in harvest, Lev. xix. 9. 10. That a sheaf of corn forgotten be left for the poor, not sought for again, Deut. xxiv. 19. 11. That the gleanings of the vine branches, be left to the poor, Lev. xix. 10. 12. And the grapes that fall to the ground, v. 20. 13. That all first fruits of the earth be brought to the sanctuary or temple, Exod. xxiii. 19. 14. That the words appointed, Deut. xxvi. 5—7, be repeated over the first fruits. 15. That the heave-offering, or terumah for the priest, be observed, Deut. xviii. 4. 16. That the tithes be separated for the use of the Levites. 17. That a second tithe be taken by the owners, to spend at the tabernacle or at Jerusalem, Deut. xiv. 22. 18. That out of the tenth of the Levites, a tenth be taken home for the priests. 19. That on the third and sixth year, in the room of this second tenth, a tenth be given to the poor, Deut. xiv. 28, 29. 20. That confession be made over the tithes, Deut. xxvi. 13. 21. That a cake of the dough be separated unto the priests, Numb. xv. 20. 22. That the whole increase of the land every seventh year be common to all, Exod. xxiii. 10, 11. 23. That the seventh year be a year of rest to the whole land, Exod. xxiv. 21; Lev. xxv. 2. 24. That the year of the jubilee be reckoned by the years of rest, or weeks of years, Lev. xxv. 3—10. 25. That the year of jubilee be separated or sanctified, v. 6—10. 26. That on the tenth day of the month Tisri, the trumpet shall sound for the beginning of the jubilee, Lev. xxv. 10. 27. That a redemption, or restitution of the land be granted in the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. 24. 28. He that sells an house in a walled town, may redeem it within a year, Lev.
xxv. 29. 29. That debts be remitted on the seventh year, Deut. xv. 2. 30. That in all offerings and sacrifices for sin, the priest have the right shoulder, the breast and the cheek for his portion, Deut. xviii. 3. 31. That the first fleece of sheep being shorn be given to the priests, Deut. xviii. 4. 32. That right judgment be made of things devoted, as to the part of God, and that of the priests.

§ 11. The sixth family contains seven precepts about things to be eaten.

1. That all creatures to be eaten, beasts and birds, have their heads taken off, Deut. xii. 2. 2. That the blood of beasts and birds killed to be eaten, be covered with earth or dust, Lev. xvii. 23. 3. That the mother be left free from the nest, when the young ones are taken, Deut. xxii. 6. 4. That the signs of clean and unclean beasts be diligently observed, Lev. ii. 25. 5. That signs to the same purpose be observed in some birds, Deut. xiv. 6. 6. And the same concerning locusts that may be eaten, Lev. xi. 21. 7. That the signs in fishes be observed, Lev. xi. 9.

§ 12. The seventh family of affirmative precepts, respects the passover and other feasts as to the time of their observance, having twenty commands appertaining to it. 1. That the course of the sun and moon, be exactly observed for the right constituting of the anniversary feasts, Deut. iv. 6. 2. That the beginning of the months be appointed by the house of judgment, Exod. xii. 2. 3. That we rest on the Sabbath, Exod. xxvii. 12. 4. That the Sabbath be sanctified, Exod. xx. 8. 5. That all leaven be thrust out of doors on the feast of the passover, Exod. xii. 15. 6. That on the night of the passover the first discourse be about the deliverance out of Egypt, Exod. xiii. 10. 7. That unleavened bread be eaten on that night, Exod. xii. 18. 8. That the first day of the feast of the passover be a day of rest. 9. Likewise the seventh day also, Exod. xii. 16. Lev. xxvii. 10. 11. That forty nine days be reckoned to the feast of weeks, Lev. xxvii. 15. 11. That on the fiftieth day rest be declared, Lev. xxvi. 21. 12. That on the first day of the seventh month, there be rest from all works, Lev. xxvii. 24. 13. That the trumpet sound on that day, Numb. xxix. 1. 14. That every one afflict his own soul on the tenth day of September, Lev. xxvii. 27—29. 15. That there be a rest and ceasing from all works on the day of expiation, Lev. xxvii. 32. 16. That there be a rest from labour on the first day of the feast of tabernacles, Lev. xxvii. 35. 17. Likewise on the eighth day, ver. 36. 18. That the people dwell in booths seven days, Lev. xxvii. 43. 19. That on the first day of the feast of tabernacles, branches of palm be carried, Lev. xxvii. 40. 20. That every Israelite that is a male, offer every year half a shekel to the Lord, Exod. xxx. 13.

§ 13. The eighth family concerns rule and judgment, made up of thirteen precepts. 1. That obedience be yielded to every prophet speaking in the name of God, Deut. xviii. 15. 2. That the people choose a king, Deut. xvii. 15. 3. That judges and rulers be appointed in every city of the people, Deut. xvi. 18. 4. That the laws and decrees of the great council be observed, and obeyed, Deut. xvii. 10. 5. That in doubtful cases the major part of suffrages is to determine, Exod. xxiii. 1. 6. That all men be judged equally without respect, Lev. xix. 15. 7. That every one who can testify the truth in any case, he is of his own accord to repair to the judges so to do, Lev. v. 1. 8. That witnesses be examined strictly and their testimony duly weighed, Deut. xiii. 14. 9. That false witnesses have that done to them, which by their false testimony they would have done to others, or brought upon them, Deut. xix. 19. 10. That a calf be slain where a dead body is found, the murderer not being known, Deut. xxi. 1. 11. That
six cities of refuge for the man-slayer be appointed, and the ways to them be prepared, Deut. xix. 2. 12. That the Levites have cities and suburbs granted them, Numb. xxxv. 2. 13. That the tops of the houses have a battlement about them, Deut. xxii. 8.

§ 14. The ninth family of affirmative precepts, respects truth and doctrines, comprehending twenty-five commands. 1. That the idolatry of the Gentiles be extirpated out of the land, Deut. xii. 2. 2. That the city and citizens which fall into idolatry, be utterly destroyed, Deut. xiii. 3. 3. That the seven nations of Canaan be blotted out, Deut. xx. 4. 4. That the Israelites remember what Amalek did unto them, Deut. xxxv. 5. 4. 5. That the memory of Amalek be blotted out from under heaven, Exod. xvii. 6. 6. That war be undertaken and managed according to the law, Deut. xx. 1. 7. That a priest be anointed to go forth to the war, Deut. xx. 2. 8. That every one carry a paddle with his arms, Deut. xxiii. 9. 9. That a place be assigned for covering the ejections of nature, v. 12. 10. That what is stolen be restored, Lev. vi. 11. 11. That a Hebrew servant be well rewarded at the end of his service, Deut. xv. 12. 12. That we lend freely to the poor and needy, Exod. xxii. 13. 13. That the pledge be restored to the owner, Deut. xxiv. 14. 14. That the labourer be paid his hire or wages the same day, Deut. xxiv. 15. 15. That the hireling working in the field, or vineyard may eat of the fruits to his satisfaction, Deut. xxiii. 24, 25. 16. That we help the beast of our neighbour fallen under his burden, Exod. xxiii. 17. 17. That we help our neighbour in leading his beast by the way, Deut. xxii. 18. 18. That what is lost by one, and found by another, be restored to the right owner, Deut. xxii. 19. 19. That we rebuke our neighbour when he sinneth, or offendeth, Lev. xix. 20. 20. That we love our neighbour, Lev. xix. 21. 21. That we love a stranger, Lev. x. 22. 22. That weights and measures and scales be exact, Lev. xix. 23. 23. That wise men, or men skilful in the law be honoured, or had in reputation, Lev. xix. 24. 24. That father and mother be honoured, Exod. xx. 25. 25. That they be feared, Lev. xix. 3.

§ 15. The tenth family concerns women and matrimony, in twelve precepts. 1. That marriage be entered into by all, Gen. i. 28. 2. That a contract, or betrothing precede marriage, Deut. xxiv. 3. 3. That the new married man rejoice with his wife the first year, Deut. xxiv. 4. 4. That the male children of Israel be circumcised, Gen. xvii. 10; Lev. xii. 5. 5. That the widow of a man dying without children, marry her husband's brother, Deut. xxxv. 6. 6. That he who refuseth so to take the widow of one dying without children, being next of kin, have his shoe pulled off, and be spit upon, Deut. xxv. 7. 7. That he who hath violated the chastity of a virgin by force, be compelled to marry her, Deut. xxii. 8. 8. That he who hath defamed his wife without cause, keep her without hope of divorce, Deut. xxii. 9. 9. That he who seduces a virgin to fornication, pay fifty shekels, Exod. xxii. 10. 10. That a fair woman taken in war be dealt with according to the law, Deut. xxi. 11. 11. That divorces be made by a writing, or bill of divorcement, Deut. xxiv. 12. 12. That a woman suspected of adultery be dealt with according to the law, Numb. v. 30.

§ 16. The eleventh family concerns criminal judgments and punishments, and has eight precepts belonging unto it. 1. That criminal persons not guilty of sins deserving capital punishments be beaten with stripes, Deut. xxiv. 2. That he who slew a man at unwares be banished from conversing among the people, Numb. xxxv. 25. 3. That those guilty of it be hanged, or strangled, Lev. xx. 4. 4. That others, as is appointed,
be slain with the sword, Exod. xx. 21. 5. Others to be burned, ch. xx. 14.
6. That those who deserve it by the law, be stoned with stones. 7. That those appointed to this death be hanged up after death, Deut. xxi. 22.
8. That all who suffer death, be buried the same day, Deut. xxi. 23.

§ 17. The twelfth and last family of this sort of precepts, which is about judgments in civil cases, contains seventeen precepts. 1. That the Hebrew servant be dealt with according to the law, Exod. xxi. 2. That a Hebrew maid servant be married to her master, or his son, if humbled by either of them, Exod. xxi. 3. That a Hebrew maid servant may be redeemed, Exod. xxi. 4. That only Canaanites, or heathens, may be made perpetual servants, or brought into bondage for ever, Lev. xxv. 46. 5. That he who procures the hurt of any, one, do repair it by a pecuniary mulet. 6. That hurt done by a beast be repaired, Exod. xxi. 28, 29. 7. That loss or hurt from the not covering or safeguarding of a pit, be repaired, Exod. xxi. 23. 8. That theft be judged according to the law, Exod. xxii. 1. 9. That the damage done by one man's beasts in other men's fields be repaired, Exod. xxii. 5. 10. That damage by fire voluntarily raised, be repaired, Exod. xxii. 6. 11. That judgment be made of any thing deposited or trusted, without reward, according to the law, Exod. xxii. 6. 12. That what is lent or hired for gain, if lost, be judged of according to the law, Exod. xxii. 10. 13. Also what is borrowed for use, ver. 14. 14. That things concerning buying and selling be judged according to the law, Lev. xxv. 14. 15. That the cause of the plaintiff and defendant be judged according to the law, Exod. xxii. 9. 16. That a man pursued by his enemy to death, may be delivered with the death of his pursuer, Deut. xxv. 12. 17. That the rights of inheritances be determined according to the law, Numb. xxvii. 8—11.

§ 18. These are the precepts which they gather out of the law, as affirmatively expressed. That some of them are by no means rightly educed from those texts which they draw them from, will appear at first view unto him that shall examine them. It is also justly questionable, whether sundry of them be indeed precepts of God or no, especially as by them explained. But that this is the just number of the affirmative precepts of the law, that there are no more of that kind, and that these are all so many distinct precepts, it is vain to imagine. But as in general, the most of the particular commands that belong to the same things, are gathered by them into certain heads, wherein they are summarily represented, I thought it not unmeet to give them here in their order.

§ 19. The negative precepts also are by them in like manner cast into twelve distinct families; these also we shall recount with the same brevity.

§ 20. The first family of these precepts relates to false worship, concerning which they collect forty-seven prohibitions. 1. That we have no other God but Jehovah, Exod. xx. 3. 2. That we make no images for ourselves, nor employ others to make them for us, Exod. xx. 4. 3. That we make no images for others, or for their use, Lev. xix. 4. 4. That we make no images for ornament, Exod. xx. 23. 5. That we bow not down to any idols. 6. Nor serve them, Exod. xx. 5. 7. That none offer in the fire his son or daughter to Moloch, Lev. xvii. 2. 8. That none have a familiar spirit, or Ob. 9. That none have a familiar spirit, or Jideon, Lev. xix. 31. 10. That none consult with Ob. 11. That none ask counsel of Jideon, Deut. xviii. 11. 12. That we look not towards idols, Lev. xx. 4. 13. That we set not up a statue or image any where, Deut. xvi. 22. 14. That no
It and no tree shall be planted in the sanctuary, Deut. xvi. 21. 16. That we swear not by false gods, Exod. xxxiii. 13. 17. That none lead the Jews to idolatry, 18. That none stir up any single Jew to idolatry, Deut. xiii. 6. 19. That we love not a seducer, 20. That we hate him. 21. That we aid him not in danger of death. 22. That he whom he would seduce, intercede not for him. 23. That he conceal nothing which may tend to his condemnation, Deut. xiii. 8. 24. That we covet not, or turn to our use, any things, whereewith idols have been adorned, Deut. xxvii. 25. 25. That we make no profit of any thing that belongs to false worship, Deut. vii. 26. 26. That no city seduced to idolatry and destroyed, be ever built again, Deut. xiii. 26. 27. That nothing of its spoils be turned to private use, v. 17. 28. That none prophesy falsely, Deut. xviii. 29. 29. That we fear not to slay a false prophet, v. 22. 30. That none prophesy in the name of false gods, Deut. xviii. 31. 31. That none so prophesying, be attended to, Deut. xxxii. 2. 32. That we walk not in the ways and customs of the heathens, Lev. xx. 23. 33. That none use divination, Deut. xviii. 34. Nor sorcery, ver. 10. 35. That no soothsaying be used, Lev. xix. 36. 37. That there be no enchantments or conjuring, Deut. xviii. 1. 38. That none ask counsel of the dead, Deut. xviii. 11. 39. That a woman wear not the apparel of a man. 40. That a man wear not the apparel of a woman, Deut. xxii. 41. That no cutting or incision be made in the body, Lev. xix. 42. 43. That clothes made of linen and woollen be not made or worn, Deut. xxii. 11. 42. 43. That the corners of the head be not rounded. 44. That the corners of the beard be not marred, Lev. xix. 45. That none tear their flesh with their nails, or, 46. Pull off their hair, for the dead, Deut. xiv. 1. 47. That we walk not after the thoughts of our hearts, or sight of our eyes, Numb. xv. 39.

§ 21. It is evident that in this family many precepts are distinguished, and the number multiplied thereby. In particular, the second command is divided into two, or three, which God makes to be but one; and general rules are made particular prohibitions, all to fill up the number which they had designed. However, most things, as we observed before, belonging to this general head, are brought into this collection.

§ 22. The second family concerns separation from the heathen, in thirteen prohibitions. 1. That no covenant be made with any of the seven nations of Canaan, Exod. xxiii. 32. 2. That none of them be suffered to live, Deut. xx. 16. 3. That we pity not those idolaters, Deut. vii. 2. 4. That we suffer them not to dwell in the land, Exod. xxiii. 33. 5. That no marriages be made with the heathen, Deut. vii. 3. 6. That no Ammonite or Moabitite marry a Jewish woman, Deut. xxiii. 7. That no peace be offered to the Ammonites or Moabites as to other nations, Deut. xxiii. 6. 8. That they separate not from the Edomites beyond the third generation. 9. Nor from the Egyptians, Deut. xxiii. 7, 8. 10. That they never return to dwell in Egypt, Deut. xvii. 16. 11. That they destroy not fruit-trees, Deut. xx. 19. 12. That soldiers in war be not fearful, Deut. xx. 3. 13. That they forget not the wickedness of Amalek, Deut. xxy. 20.

§ 23. The third family of this sort of precepts, concerns the due regard that is to be had to things sacred, in twenty-nine precepts. 1. That none blaspheme, Exod xxii. 27. 2. That none swear falsely, Levit. xix. 12. 3. That none swear in vain, Exod. xx. 7. 4. That the name of God be not profaned, Lev. xxii. 32. 5. That God be not contemned, Deut. vi. 16. 6. That holy places be not destroyed, Deut. iii. 4. 7. That he who is hanged
on a tree be not suffered to remain all night thereon, Deut. xxi. 23. 8. That the watch about the sanctuary fail not, Numb. xviii. 5. 9. That the priests go not at all hours into the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 2. 10. That none defiled come to the altar, Lev. xxi. 23. 11. That none defiled serve in the sanctuary, ver. 17. 12. That none polluted by accident draw nigh to the holy service, ver. 21. 13. That the Levites invade not the priests' office, nor the priests do the work of the Levites, Numb. xviii. 3. 14. That none who have drunk wine enter the sanctuary, Lev. x. 9. 15. That no stranger serve in the sanctuary, Numb. xviii. 4. 16. That no priest that is unclean draw nigh to it. 17. Nor on that day wherein he washeth from his uncleanness, until it be evening, Lev. xxii. 18. 19. That no unclean person enter into any part of the temple, Numb. v. 3. 19. Nor into the camp or tents of the Levites, Deut. xxiii. 10. 20. That the altar be not built of hewn stones, Exod. xx. 25. 21. That they go not up by steps to the altar, Exod. xx. 26. 22. That no sacrifices be offered on the golden altar, Exod. xxx. 9. 23. That no oil or ointment be made like that of the tabernacle. 24. That no stranger be anointed with it, Exod. xxx. 31—33. 25. That no incense or perfume like that prescribed in the law, be made, Exod. xxx. 37. 26. That the fire on the altar go not out, Lev. vi. 12. 27. That the bars or staves be not pulled out of the sides of the ark, Exod. xxv. 14. 28. That the breast-plate in the priests garment be not loosed from the ephod, Exod. xxviii. 28. 29. That the robe of the ephod be not torn nor rent, Exod. xxviii. 32.

§ 24. The fourth family is comprehensive of the prohibitions given about sacrifices and priests, being in number eighty-two. 1. That no sacrifice be used but at the temple, Deut. xii. 13, 14. 2. That no sacred beast be killed but at the temple, Levit. xvii. 3, 4. 3. That no blemished thing be brought to the altar, Levit. xxii. 20. 4. That no blemished thing be offered in sacrifice, ver. 21, 22. 5. That the blood of a blemished beast never be laid on the altar, ver. 24. 6. Nor the fat of it, ver. 22. 7. That no beast with an accidental blemish be offered, Deut. xvii. 1. 8. That no blemished beast received of a heathen or Gentile be offered, Levit. xxii. 25. 9. That no blemish be in any dedicated beast or firstling, Levit. xxii. 10. That no offering be of leaven or honey, Levit. ii. 11. 11. That no sacrifice be without salt, Levit. ii. 13. 12. That the price of a dog, or a whore, be not offered to God, Deut. xxiii. 18. 13. That a beast and its young be not killed or sacrificed the same day, Levit. xxii. 14. That no oil be put to the offering of him that offers the sin-offering. 15. Nor frankincense, Levit. v. 16. That oil be not put to the gift of a woman suspected to have gone astray. 17. Nor frankincense, Numb. v. 15. 18. That no devoted beast be changed, Levit. xxvii. 32, 33. 19. That one sacrifice be not changed into another, or for another, ver. 28. 20. That the firstling of a clean beast be redeemed, Numb. xviii. 17. 21. That the tenthss of beasts be not sold, Levit. xxii. 23. 22. That a devoted field be not sold. 23. Nor redeemed, Lev. xxvii. 24. That the head of the bird to be offered on the day of expiation be not separated from the body, Lev. v. 8. 25. That sacred beasts be not used to labour. 26. Nor be shorn, Deut. xv. 19. 27. That the paschal lamb be not slain whilst any leaven remains, Exod. xxiii. 13. 28. That nothing be left of the paschal lamb, Exod. xii. 10. 29. That nothing be left of the paschal lamb to be offered on the second month, Exod. xii. 46. 30. That no bone of the paschal lamb be broken, Exod. xii. 46. 31. That its flesh be not eaten raw or boiled, Exod. xii. 9. 32. That nothing of its flesh be carried out of the company by whom it is to be eaten, Exod. xii. 46. 33. That no
stranger or hireling eat of it, Exod. xii. 45. 34. That no uncircumcised
person eat of it, ver. 49. 35. That no Israelite that hath been changed do
eat of it, Exod. xii. 43. 36. That the fat of it abide not one night, Exod.
xxiii. 18. 37. That the flesh of the peace-offerings be not kept until the
morning, Lev. vii. 15. 38. That nothing remain of sacrifices to the third
day, Lev. vii. 16, 17. 39. That the priests' portion of the sacrifices or
meat-offerings be not baked with leaven, Lev. vi. 17. 40. That no unclean
person eat that which is holy, Lev. vii. 20. 41. That the holy things once
defiled, be not eaten, Lev. vii. 19. 42. That what remains of the sacri-
fices above the time appointed be not eaten, Lev. xix. 18. 43. That nothing
be eaten which is an abomination, Lev. vii. 18. 44. That no stranger eat
of holy flesh. 45. Nor the hired servant of the priest, Lev. xxii. 10. 46.
Nor he that is uncircumcised. 47. Nor the priest when he is defiled, Lev.
xxii. 4. 48. Nor the daughter of the priest which is married to a stranger,
Lev. xxii. 12. 49. That the offerings of the priest be not eaten, Lev. vi.
22. 50. That the inwards of the sin-offering be not eaten, Lev. vi. 30.
51. That beasts made holy that are any ways corrupted be not eaten, Deut.
xiv. 3. 52. That the second tenths of fruits be not eaten out of Jeru-
alem. 53. That the tenth of the wine be not drunk. 54. That the tenth of
the oil be not eaten elsewhere, Deut. xii. 17. 55. That the priests eat not
the firstlings out of Jerusalem, ch. vii. 17. 56. That they eat not the sin-
offering out of the holy place, ver. 17. 57. That none of the flesh of the
burnt-offering be eaten, ver. 17. 58. That the flesh of the free-will offering
be not eaten before the blood of the sacrifice be poured upon the altar.
59. That the priests eat not the first-fruits before he have laid it up in the
temple. 60. That no stranger eat that which is most holy, Exod. xxix. 33.
61. That the second tenths be not eaten in mourning. 62. Nor in unclean-
ness. 63. That the money it is sold for be not laid out in any thing but
what is to be eaten or drunk, Deut. xxvi. 14. 64. That no meat be eaten
before the things to be separated from it be taken away, Lev. xxii. 25.
65. That the order of tenths, and first-fruits or heave-offerings, be not per-
verted, Exod. xxii. 29. 66. That vows be not deferred, Deut. xxiii. 22.
67. That none go up to the passover without a sacrifice, Exod. xxii. 15.
68. That none break his vows, Numb. xxx. 3. 69. That the high-priest
marry not a whore. 70. Nor one any way corrupted. 71. Nor one di-
 vorced. 72. Nor a widow, Lev. xxi. 7. 73. Nor defile himself with a
widow, Lev. xxi. 14, 15. 74. That the priests enter not the sanctuary with
long hair. 75. Nor with torn garments, Lev. x. 6, xxi. 10. 76. That the
priests go not forth of the temple at the time of divine worship, Lev. x.
7. 77. That no inferior priest defile himself for the death of strangers,
Lev. xxi. 1. 78. That the high-priest defile not himself, no not for his pa-
rents, ver. 11. 79. That he go not in where is any dead, ver. 11. 80. That
the tribe of Levi have no lot in the land. 81. That they have no lot in the
spoils of war, Deut. xviii. 2.
§ 25. The fifth family of negative precepts compriseth thirty-eight
prohibitions about meats or what may be eaten. 1. That no unclean beasts
be eaten, Lev. xi. 4. 2. That no unclean fish be eaten, ver. 11. 3. That
no unclean bird or fowl be eaten, ver. 13. 4. That no creeping thing that
also lieth be eaten, ver. 41. 5. That no creeping things of the earth be
eaten, ver. 41. 6. That no creeping thing of the waters be eaten, ver. 41.
7. That no worms of the earth be eaten, ver. 44. 8. Nor the worms of
fruit, ver. 42. 9. That what dieth of itself be not eaten, Deut. xiv. 21.
10. Nor that which is torn, Exod. xxi. 31. 11. No blood be eaten, Lev. vii. 26. 12. That the fat be not eaten, ver. 23. 13. That no member taken from a living creature be eaten, Deut. xii. 23. 14. That the sinew which shrank be not eaten, Gen. xxxii. 32. 15. That flesh be not boiled in the milk of the beast, whose it is. 16. That the flesh be not eaten with milk. Exod. xxxiii. 19. 17. That the flesh of an ox stoned for pushing or going be not eaten, Ex. xxi. 28. 18. That new bread be not eaten until after the offering of the homer. 19. That parched corn, 20. That green ears be not eaten until an offering be first given, Lev. xxiii. 14. 21. That the fruit of a young tree be not eaten until it hath borne three years, Lev. xix. 23. 22. That a mixture of fruits from the vineyard be not eaten, Deut. xxii. 10. 23. The wine of drink-offerings offered to idols be not drunk, Deut.xxxii. 38. 24. That none eat as a glutton, Lev. xix. 26. 25. That none eat on the day of expiation, Lev. xxiii. 27, 28. 26. That no leaven be eaten on the passover, Exod. xii. 15. 27. Nor any thing mixed with leaven, ver. 20. 28. That no leaven be eaten on the even of the passover, Deut. xvi. 3. 29. That no leaven be found in our houses after that time, Exod. xii. 19. 30. That no leaven be found in any place under our power, Exod. xiii. 31. That the Nazarite drink no wine, nor any thing that comes of it. 32. That he eat no green grapes. 33. Nor pressed grapes. 34. Nor the kernels of the grapes. 35. Nor the husks of them, Numb. vi. 2, 3, 4. 36. That he shave not his head. 37. That he defile not himself for the dead. 38. That he enter not a house where any is dead, ver. 5, 6, 7.

§ 26. The sixth family compriseth eighteen prohibitions, about fields and harvest. 1. That the whole field be not mowed or reaped. 2. That the ears which fall in reaping be not gathered up. 3. That the grapes left by vine gatherers be not sought after. 4. That the unripe grapes be not gathered, Lev. xix. 9, 10. 5. That men return not for a sheaf forgotten, Deut. xxiv. 9. 6. That mixed seeds be not sown in the same field, Lev. xix. 19. 7. That plants of several kinds be not set in the same vineyard, Deut. xxii. 10. 1. That there be no mixture of beasts of several sorts. Lev. xix. 19. 9. That we plough not with an ox and an ass, Deut. xxii. 11. 10. That the mouth of a beast labouring in that which may be eaten, be not muzzled, Deut. xxv. 4. 11. That in the seventh year, the land be not ploughed. 12. Nor the trees dressed. 13. Nor things moved that grow on their own ground. 14. Nor the fruits gathered as in other years, Lev. xxv. 4. 15. That the earth be not tilled in the year of Jubilee. 16. Nor things cut down growing on their own field. 17. Nor the fruits of that year be gathered. Lev. xxv. 11. 18. That no field in the Holy Land be sold for ever.

§ 27. The seventh family they call the house of doctrines, under which head they refer things of sundry kinds which they know not well how to reduce unto one general sort, or head of one name, and it is branched into forty-five prohibitions. 1. That the Levites be not forsaken, Deut. xii. 19. 2. That the fields and suburbs of the Levites be not changed, Lev. xxv. 34. 3. That no debt be claimed after the year of release, Deut. xv. 2. 4. That we forget not to give to the poor what he wants, Deut. xv. 7, 8. 5. That we omit not to lend to the poor, because the year of release draws nigh, ver. 9, 10. 6. That a Jewish servant be not set at liberty empty, ver. 13. 7. That a debt be not exacted of the poor, Exod. xxi. 25. 8. That no money be lent to an Israelite on usury, Lev. xxv. 37. 9. That what is lent be not received again with usury, Deut. xiii. 19. 10. That we be not arbitrators between lenders and borrowers on usury, Exod. xxii. 25. 12.
That a pledge be not taken of a borrower with rigour or violence, Deut. xxiv. 10, 11. 13. That the pledge of a poor man that wants it, be not detained, ver. 12. 14. That a pledge be not taken of a widow's garment, ver. 17. 15. That things necessary to sustain human life, be not taken to pledge, ver. 6. 16. That none steal, Exod. xx. 13. 17. Nor take the goods of any by robbery, Lev. xix. 11. 18. That we oppress not our neighbour. 19. Or take his goods by violence, ver. 13. 20. That no man deny his neighbour's goods that are with him. 21. That none swear falsely concerning any thing deposited with him, Lev. xix. 13. 22. That we straiten not the bounds of our neighbour, Deut. xix. 14. 23. That none deceive his neighbour in buying and selling, Lev. xxv. 14. 25. That we deceive him not in words, vii. 17. 26. That no stranger be deceived in words. 27. Nor in buying or selling, Exod. xxii. 21. 28. That the widow and orphan be not oppressed, ver 22—24. 29. That a servant flying from his master into the holy land, be not given up to him. 30. That he be not defrauded in any thing, Deut. xxxiii. 15. 31. That a Hebrew servant be not used as a bondman. 32. That he be not sold for a slave. 33. That service be not exacted of him with bitterness. 34. That no heathen be suffered to treat him hardly, Lev. xxv. 39, 42, 43, 46, 47. 35. That a Jewish maidservant be not sold to another. 36. That the three things required in the law be not denied to such a servant, Exod. xxi. 7—11. 37. That a fair woman taken in war be not sold. 38. That she be not used as a bondwoman, Deut. xxi. 24. 39. That we covet not, Exod. xx. 17. 40. That nothing of other men's be desired, Deut. v. 21. 41. That the hireling eat not whilst he is the field. 42. That he take no more out of the field than what he can eat, Deut. xxxiii. 24. 43. That what is lost be not hidden, Deut. xxii. 1—3. 44. That we leave not a beast under its burden, ver. 4. 45. That there be no deceit in weights and measures, Lev. xix. 35. 46. That we keep no false weights or measures in our houses, Deut xxv. 13, 14.

§ 28. The eighth family relates to justice and judgment in forty-six prohibitions. 1. That justice be not violated, Lev. xix. 15. 2. That gifts be not received in judgment, Exod. xxxii. 8. 3. That none be respected in judgment, Lev. xix. 15. 4. That none fear a wicked man in judgment, Deut. i. 17. 5. That we pity not a poor man in judgment, Exod. xxxii. 3. 6. That we have no pity for a man-slayer, or other criminal person, Deut. xix. 13. 7. That the judgment of the poor be not perverted, Exod. xxiii. 6. 8. Nor of the stranger, widow, nor orphan, Deut. xxiv. 17. 9. That one party be not heard in the absence of another, Exod. xxxiii. 1. 10. That we decline not after many in the judgment of law. 11. Nor shall a judge condemn according to the opinion of another, but his own, Exod. xxxiii. 2. 12. That none be chosen a judge, that is not learned in the law, though he be wise in other things, Deut. xvii. 17. 13. That none bear false witness, Exod. xx. 14. 14. That no offender be justified, Exod. xxiii. 1. 15. That kinsmen be not witnesses, Deut. xxiv. 16. 16. That none be condemned upon one witness, Deut. xix. 15. 17. That none be condemned to death on conjecture, opinions, or thoughts, but upon clear witnesses, Exod. xxiii. 7. 18. That we kill not, Exod. xx. 13. 19. That a guilty person be not put to death, before he appear in judgment, Num. xxxv. 12. 20. That no reward be taken for the life of a murderer. 21. Nor for him that commits manslaughter by error, Num. xxxv. 31. 22. That none be judge and witness in a criminal cause, ver. 30. 23. That none pity the woman mentioned, Deut. xxv. 12. 24. She that is forced, is not to be punished, Deut. xxii. 26. 25. That none appear against the blood of his neighbour, Lev. xix.
16. 26. That no cause of offence, or falling be left in a house, Deut. xxii. 8. 27. That none lay a stumbling block before an Israelite, Lev. xix. 14. 28. That the beating with stripes exceed not the number of forty, Deut. xxv. 3. 29. That none calumniate or accuse falsely, Lev. xix. 16. 30. That we hate not our neighbour in our heart, ver. 17. 31. That none put an Israelite to reproach, ver. 17. 32. That none exercise revenge on his neighbour. 33. That none bear ill-will in their mind, ver. 18. 34. That the mother and its young be not taken together, Deut. xxi. 6. 35. That a scall be not shaven, Lev. xiii. 33. 36. That the signs of leprosy be not removed, Deut. xxvii. 8. 37. That the place where the heifer is beheaded be not tilled, Deut xxi. 4. 38. That a sorcerer be not suffered to live, Exod. xxii. 18. 39. That a new married man be not bound to go forth to war, Deut. xxiv. 5. 40. That none be rebellious against the sanhedrim at Jerusalem, and their doctrine, Deut xvii. 11. 41. That nothing be added to the precepts of the law. 42. That nothing be taken from them, Deut. iv. 2. 43. That we speak not evil of the judge, nor of the princes of the people, Exod. xxii. 23. 44. That none speak evil of any in Israel, Lev. xix. 14. 45. That none curse father or mother. 46. That none strike father or mother, Exod. xxi. 17.

§ 29. The ninth family of negative precepts concerns feasts, and contains ten prohibitions. 1. That no work be done on the Sabbath, Exod. xx. 10. 2. That none go out or beyond the bounds of the city on the Sabbath, Ex. xvi. 29. 3. That no punishment be inflicted on the Sabbath, Exod. xxxv. 4. That no work be done on the first day of the passover. 5. That no work be done on the seventh day of the passover, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8. 6. That no work be done in the feast of weeks, ver. 21. 7. That no work be done on the first day of the seventh month, ver. 24, 25. 8. That no work be done on the day of expiation, ver. 30. 9. That no work be done on the first day of the feast of tabernacles. 10. That no work be done on the eighth day of release, ver. 34, 35, 37.


§ 31. The eleventh family concerns marriages in eight prohibitions. 1. That a bastard take not a female Israelite to wife, Deut. xxiii. 2. 2. That no eunuch take a daughter of Israel, ver. 1. 3. That no male be made an eunuch, Lev. xxii. 24. 4. That there be no whore in Israel, Deut. xxiii. 17. 5. That he who hath divorced his wife, may not take her again, after she hath been married to another, Deut. xxiv. 4. 6. The
brother's daughter marry not with a stranger, Deut. xxv. 5. 7. That he divorce not his wife who hath defamed her in her youth, Deut. xxii. 19. 8. He that hath forced a maid shall not divorce her, Deut. xxii. 29.

§ 32. The twelfth family concerns the kingdom, and is made up of four precepts. 1. That no king be chosen of a strange nation, Deut. xvii. 15. 2. That the king get not himself many horses, ver. 16. 3. That he multiply not wives. 4. That he heap not up to himself treasures of silver and gold, ver. 17.

§ 33. This is the account that the Jews give of the precepts of the law. The number of them, as also the distinction and distribution of them into their several classes, are parts, as they pretend of their oral law, from which the vanity of it might be easily shown. For it is evident, that many of these precepts are coincident; many of what are pretended so to be, are no precepts at all; and sundry of them are not founded on the places from whence they profess to gather them; yea, in many of them the mind of the Holy Ghost is plainly perverted, and a contrary sense annexed to his words. Moreover, it is most unquestionable, that there are sundry commands and institutions, especially concerning sacrifices, that are not at all taken notice of by them in this collection. These charges I could easily make good by instances sufficient. It is evident then, that the oral law, of which this collection is said to be a part, cannot be of God; but, as I have before observed, as there is a representation in them of no small multitude of commands, especially in things concerning their carnal worship, it was necessary that they should be here represented, though they had been before transcribed from them by others. My principal design herein, is to illustrate some passages both in the writings of our apostle, as also in other parts of Scripture, concerning this law of commandments contained in ordinances.

§ 34. The censure which our apostle gives of this whole system of divine worship is very remarkable. 'The first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary, which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation,' Heb. ix. 1, 10. Let any one cast an eye upon the multitude of commands here collected, about meats and drinks, washings, and outward carnal observances, and he will quickly see how directly and pertinently the description given by our apostle is suited to their services. And that, not only as to the manner and multitude of them, but also as to their natures. They are carnal things, and could by no means affect the great, spiritual, glorious, and eternal ends which God had designed, proposed, and promised in that covenant, to whose administration they were annexed, until the time of reformation should come. Hence, elsewhere he calls them the rudiments of the world, ordinances about touching, tasting, and handling, about meats and drinks, things outwardly clean or unclean, all which perish with their using, Col. ii. 20—22

§ 35. A little view also of the multiplicity of these precepts, and their circumstances, and the scrupulous observances required by them, will give light unto the mind of another apostle, who calls the law 'a yoke which neither their fathers nor they were ever able to bear,' Acts xv. 20. For, although the weight of this yoke did principally consist in the matter of it, and in the duties to be performed, yet it was greatly increased and aggravated by that multiplicity of the commands of which it consisted. Whence our apostle calls it, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, Eph. ii. 15, as it consisted of an endless number of commands, concerning which their minds could never attain any comfortable satisfaction, whether they had answered their duty aright in them or not.
EXERCITATION XXI.


§ 1. By the sanction of the law, we intend the promises and penalties with which God enforced the observance of it. To this the apostle refers in sundry places of this Epistle, the principal whereof are reported in the foregoing dissertation. To exhibit this subject distinctly, we may observe that the law falls under a threefold consideration. First. As it was a repetition and expression of the law of nature, and of the covenant of works established thereon. Secondly. As it was administered for a new end and design, namely, to direct the church to the use and benefit of the promise given of old to Adam, and renewed to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before this new administration of the law. Thirdly. As it was the instrument of the rule and government of the church and people of Israel, with respect to the covenant made with them about the land of Canaam. And in this threefold respect, it had a threefold sanction.

§ 2. First. As considered absolutely, it was attended with promises of eternal life, and threatenings of eternal death. The original promise of life upon obedience, and the curse upon transgression, were inseparably annexed to the law; yea, were essential parts of it, as it contained the covenant between God and man. See Gen. ii.; Deut. xxvii. 26; Rom. vi. 23; Rom. iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 6; Lev. xviii. 5; Ezek. xxix. 11; Gal. iii. 12, 13.

§ 3. Now, in the administration of the law, the church was thus far brought under the obligation of these promises and threatenings of life and death eternal; thus far interested in the one and made obnoxious to the other, that if they used not the law according to the new dispensation of it, (wherein it was put into a subserviency to the promise, as Gal. iii. 19—24,) they were left to stand and fall, according to the absolute tenure of that first covenant and its ratification, which by reason of the entrance of sin proved fatally ruinous to all that cleaved unto it, Rom. viii. 3, ix. 31.

§ 4. Secondly. The law had, in this administration of it, a new end and design put upon it, and that in three things. First. That it was made directive and instructive to another end, and not merely preceptive, as it was at the beginning. The authoritative institutions that in the new administration of the law were superadded to the moral commands of the
covenant of works, did all of them direct and teach the church to look for righteousness and salvation, the original ends of the first covenant, in another and by another way; as the apostle at large disputes in this Epistle, and declares positively, Gal. iii. throughout. Secondly. In that it had a dispensation added to the commands of obedience, and an interpretation κατ' επιτιμίαν, by condescension, given by God himself, as to the perfection of its observance, and manner of its performance, in reference to this new end. It required not absolutely perfect obedience, but perfectness of heart, integrity, and uprightness in them that obeyed. And unto the law thus considered, the former promises and threatenings are annexed. For the neglect of this use of it left the transgressors obnoxious to the curse denounced in general against them that 'continued not in the whole law to do it.' Thirdly, It had a merciful relief provided against sin, for the support and consolation of sinners, as we shall see in the consideration of their sacrifices.

§ 5. Thirdly. It may be considered as it was the instrument of the rule and government of the people and church of Israel, according to the tenure of the covenant made with them about the land of Canaan, and about their living to God therein. And in this respect it had four things in it. First. That it represented to the people the holiness of God, the effects whereof are manifest in the law, according to its original constitution; accordingly in it they are often called to be holy, because the Lord and Lawgiver was holy. Secondly. A representation of his grace and condescension, in pardoning sin by the covenant of mercy, as he allowed a compensation by sacrifices for so many transgressions, which in their own nature were forfeitures of their interest in that land. Thirdly. That it was a righteous rule of obedience to that people, in their special covenant condition. Fourthly. That it fully represented the severity of God against wilful transgressors of his covenant, as now renewed in order to the promise, seeing every such transgression was attended in their administration of rule, with death without mercy.

§ 6. It is of the law under this third consideration that we now treat; though not absolutely, as it was the instrument of the government of the people in Canaan, but as it had a representation in it of that administration of grace and mercy which was contained in the promises. Concerning this, or the law in this sense, we may consider, first the promises, then the threatenings of it. And the promises are of two sorts: First. Those, the accomplishment of which God took immediately upon himself. Secondly, Such as others, by his institution and appointment, were to communicate the benefit of to the obedient.

§ 7. The first are of three sorts: First. Of life temporal, as it was an instrument of their government, and eternal with God, as the promise or covenant of grace was exemplified therein, Lev. xviii. 5; Ezek. xx. 11; Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12. Secondly. Of a spiritual Redeemer, Saviour, Deliverer, to be exhibited in the fulness of time, really to effect what the ordinances of institution did represent, and so to save them eternally. This we have already proved at large. Thirdly. There are given out with the law various promises of intervenient and mixed mercies, to be enjoyed in earthly things in this world, which had an immediate respect to the mercy of the land of Canaan, and which represented spiritual grace, annexed to the then present administration of the covenant of grace. Some of these concerned the bestowing of good things upon them; others, the preventing of evils, or their deliverance from them, and both are expressed in a great variety of ways.
§ 8. Of the promises, whose accomplishment depended on others acting according to the institution of God, that is the principal and comprehensive of the rest, which is expressed, Exod. xx. 12. 'Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be prolonged.' 'This, saith our apostle, is the first commandment with promise, Eph. vi. 2. Not that the foregoing precepts have no promises annexed to the observance of them, not merely because this hath a promise literally expressed, but because it had the special kind of promise, wherein parents, by God's institution, have power to prolong the lives of obedient children, דְּרַכָּם מִרְכָּם, 'they shall prolong thy days,' that is, negatively, in not cutting off their life for disobedience, which it was then the in power of natural parents to do; and possibly, by praying for their prosperity, blessing them in the name of God, and directing them to the ways and means of universal obedience, whereby their days might be multiplied, and on sundry other accounts.

§ 9. For the penalties annexed to the transgression of the law, to which our apostle has special respect in his discourses on this subject, they will require a consideration somewhat larger. These were of two sorts: First, such as God took upon himself to inflict; and Secondly, such as he appointed others to see to the execution of.

The first are of three sorts: First. That eternal punishment which he threatened to them that transgressed and disannulled his covenant, as this was renewed and ordered in the administration of the law, and the ordinances thereof. This we have manifested elsewhere to be the import of the curse, to which every such transgressor was obnoxious.

Secondly. The punishment which the Jews express by תֹּרַכָּם and תֹּרַחְרְחִים, 'excision or cutting off.' It is first mentioned, Gen. xvii. 14, in the matter of circumcision. Sometimes emphatically, Num. xv. 31. תֹּרַחְרְחִים, 'Cutting off that soul shall be cut off from among his people;' and frequently afterwards, Exod. xii. 15, 19, xxxi. 14; Lev. vii. 10, xx. 3, 5, 6. It is rendered by the apostle, εὐθεῖα ἐπικαταβίβασιν, Acts iii. 23, 'shall be destroyed from among the people,' that is, by the hand of God, as is declared, 1 Cor. x. 10; Heb. xi. 28. Twenty-five times is this punishment threatened in the law, still unto such sins as disannul the covenant, to which our apostle has express respect, chap. ii. 2, as shall be declared on that place.

§ 10. Now, this punishment the Jews generally agree to be בָּרַחְרְחִים מִרְכָּם, 'by the hand of heaven,' or that which God himself would immediately inflict; and it is evidently declared so to be in the interpretation given of it, Lev. xvii. 10, xx. 4—6.

But what this punishment was, or wherein it did consist, neither Jews nor Christians are absolutely agreed: the latter, on this subject doing little more than representing the opinions and judgments of the other, which course also we may follow. Some of them say, that untimely death is meant by it; so Abarbinel on Num. v. 22, מְנַזִּים מִי מְנַזִּים מֵאַרְגֵּנָה קָדָם קָלָד. In this, however, we cannot approve, but that is the cutting off the days of the sinner, and his death before the natural term of it, inflicted by the hand of heaven.' This untimely death they reckon to be between the years of twenty and sixty: whence Schindler, תֹּרַחְרְחִים, exterminium, cum quis praematura morte inter vigesimum et sexagesimum annum dicit e medio tollitur, ita tamen ut reliquitut liberos: 'Cutting off is, when any one is taken away by untimely death, between the twentieth and sixtieth year of his age: yet so, as that he leave children.' That clause or condition, so that yet he leave posterity or children behind him, is, as far as
I can find, nowhere added by them, nor doth any thing in the Scripture give countenance to it. Yea, many of the Hebrews think, that this punishment consisted in this, that such a one should leave no children behind him, but that either he should be wholly ἀτεκνος, 'without children,' or if he had any before his sin, they should all die before him, and so his name and posterity be cut off, which say they, is to be cut off from among his people. So Aben Ezra on Gen. xvii. 14. And this opinion is not without its countenance from the Scripture itself; and therefore, Jarchi on the same place, with much probability, puts both these together, 'He shall be cut off by untimely death, and leave no children behind him to continue his name or remembrance amongst the people,' מ שמו יָשָׁמֶל לְבֵהוּ כַּמָּה בַּכּל, and מ שמו יָשָׁמֶל לְבֵים כַּמָּה דֶּוַּר, as they speak, 'He that hath no children is accounted as dead: but he that hath, as if he lived, and his name is not cut off.'

§ 11. They have a third opinion also, by this cutting off, the death of the soul is intended, especially when the word is ingeminated, Cutting off he shall be cut off, as Numb. xv. 31. So Maimonides, מִכְּחָסְדֵּן דְּמַשְׂעָה אֲלֵהוֹ הַיְּחִי, נַעֲמַת חֲרֵם, 'that soul shall perish: it shall not live or subsist any more for ever.' Few embrace this opinion, as being contrary to their general persuasion of eternal punishments for the transgressions of the covenant. Wherefore it is disputed against by Abarbinel on Numb. xv. who contends that the death of the soul in everlasting separation from God is intended in this threatening. And both the principal parts of these various opinions, namely, that of immature corporeal death, and eternal punishment, are joined together by Jonathan, in his Targum on Numb. xv. 31. 'He shall be cut off in this world, and that man shall be cut off in the world to come, and bear his sin in the day of judgment.' For my part, as I have shown that eternal death was contained in the curse of the law, so this special חֲרֵם, or extermination from among the people, seems to me to intend some special judgment of God, in taking away the life of such a person, answering to the infliction of death by the judges and magistrates, when men were known to have incurred such punishment, according to the command of God. And in this there was also an eminent representation of the everlasting cutting off of obstinate and final transgressors of the covenant.

§ 12. Thirdly. In judgment be brought providentially upon the whole nation by pestilence, famine, sword, and captivity, which are at large declared, Lev.xxvi. ; and Deut. xxviii.

Fourthly. The total rejection of the whole body of the people, in case of unbelief and disobedience, upon the full and perfect revelation that was to be made of the will and mind of God upon the coming of the Messiah, Deut. xviii. 18; Acts iii. 32; Hos. ii. 23; Isa. x. 22, 23; Rom. ix.

These are the heads of the punishments, which God took upon himself to inflict in an extraordinary manner, on the transgressors of the law, that is, on those who transgressed with a high hand; for his covenant was thus made void as to all the ends of its re-establishment in the administration of the law.

§ 13. The second sort of penalties annexed to the transgression of the law, were such as men, by God's institution and appointment, were enabled to inflict; concerning which we must consider, first, who and what the persons were, who were empowered and authorized to inflict these penalties. Secondly, of what sort these penalties were, and for what transgressions they were necessarily inflicted.
§ 14. The original division of the people, after the days of Jacob, was into במדבר ‘tribes.’ Of these there were at first twelve, which by the division of the tribe of Joseph into two, were increased to thirteen; but as to possessions in Canaan, they were again reduced to twelve, by the special exemption of the tribe of Levi from inheritances, and their separation to the worship of God. Secondly, הבנים ‘families,’ or הבנות ‘houses of fathers,’ which for many probable reasons may be supposed to have been seventy, the number of them who went down with Jacob into Egypt, each of which constituted a particular family. And הרה ‘particular households,’ all which are enumerated, Josh. vii. 15. This distribution, and this alone, continued among the people while they were in Egypt, as they had no opportunity of there adopting any civil order, by reason of their oppressions: they therefore contented themselves with that which was natural. Accordingly, there were three sorts of persons that were in some kind of dignity and preeminence among the people, although after their oppressors began, these were probably hindered from exercising the authority that belonged to them. First. As to the tribes, there were some who were נביאים לארץ, ‘the princes or heads of the tribes,’ Numb. i. 16. Twelve in number according to the number of the tribes. Secondly. For the families, or principal houses of the fathers, there were מכרים, the ‘elders’ who presided over them. These Moses and Aaron gathered together, at their first coming into Egypt, Exod. iv. 29. And these, as I said before, being the rulers of the first families, were probably in number seventy; from whence afterwards was the constitution of seventy elders for rule, Exod. xxiv. 1. Thirdly. מנהיגים, or ‘priests,’ it may be in every private household the first-born, which are mentioned, and so called before the constitution of the Aaronical priesthood, Exod. xix. 21. Besides these, there were officers who attended the service of the whole people, as to the execution of justice and order, called מ👮咪ר, ‘Shoterim,’ which we have rendered by the general name of officers, Exod. v. 14. And they are afterwards distinguished from the elders and judges, Deut. xvi. 18. For there are two sorts of persons mentioned, that were over the people in respect of their works, even in Egypt, מנהיגים, ‘exactors or task-masters,’ and מamedi, ‘officers,’ Exod. v. 6. The former, or the Nogheshim, the Jews say, were Egyptians, and the latter, or the Shoterim, Israelites, which occasion that distinct expression of them: ‘Pharaoh commanded the same day the taskmasters of the people and their officers;’ and ver. 13, 14. ‘And the taskmasters hasted them, saying, Fulfil your works, and the officers of the children of Israel were beaten.’ And they tell us in Midrash Rabba, on Exod. sect. 1, that one of the Nogheshim was over ten of the Israelitish officers, and that one of these was over ten Israelites; whence was the following division of the people into tens and hundreds, and to this in the same place, they add a trifling story of an exactor killed by Moses.

§ 15. Respecting the authority of these officers, and how it was executed by them in Egypt, there is nothing recorded. Probably, at the beginning of their works and afflictions they were made use of only to answer for the pretended neglects or miscarriages of the multitude of their brethren, as Exod. v. 14.

After their coming up out of Egypt, during their abode in the wilderness, Moses presided with all manner of authority over the people, as their lawgiver, king, and judge. He judged and determined all their causes, as is frequently affirmed, and that alone, until by the advice of Jethro, he took
others to his assistance, Exod. xv. 16, 25. And there is mention of four particular cases that he determined. One religious, one civil, and two capital relating to religion; in these he made special inquiry of God. The first was about the unclean that would keep the passover, Numb. ix. 7, 8. The second about the daughters of Zelophehad, who claimed their inheritance, Numb. xxvii. 4, 5. The third about the blasphemer, Lev. xxiv. The last about him that profaned the Sabbath, Numb. xv. 32—34. In which also, as the Jews say, he set a pattern to future judges, as determining the lesser causes speedily, but those wherein blood was concerned, not without stay and much deliberation.

§ 16. In the wilderness the people were classed into divisions of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, over each of which there were peculiar officers or rulers, chosen from amongst themselves, Exod. xviii. 25; Deut. i. 13, 14. And Moses is said to choose them, because being chosen by the people, he approved of them, as the places foregoing compared, do manifest. The greater number of each of these divisions, settling together in the cities or towns of Canaan, however they might afterward be multiplied or decreased, continued to be called by the names of the thousands of Israel, or Judah. So Bethlehem Ephratah is said to be little among the thousands of Judah, Micah. v. 2. For one of those thousands, which had a special head and ruler, and a distinct government, as to their own separate concerns, had settled at Bethlehem, which colony afterwards variously flourished or drew towards a decay.

§ 17. After these things the great court of the Sanhedrin was constituted by the appointment of God. But as we have elsewhere treated of this, and of those lesser courts of justice which were constituted in imitation of it, sufficiently for our purpose, I shall here wholly omit the consideration of it. Neither shall I need to mention the judges raised up in an extraordinary manner by God, for the general rule of the whole people. Nor need we treat of their kings continued by succession in the family of David, because their story in general is sufficiently known, and the particular consideration of their power, with the manner of the administration of it, would draw us too far out of the way of our present design. And these are they to whom the Lord in their several generations committed the execution of these punishments, that he had allotted to the transgression of the law.

§ 18. The penalties themselves with the special causes of them are lastly to be considered. And these in general were of two sorts. First, ecclesiastical: secondly, civil. Ecclesiastical penalties were the authoritative exclusion of an offending person from the society of the church, and the members of it. That such an exclusion is prescribed in the law in sundry cases, hath in several instances been by others evidenced. Many disputes also have been about it, both concerning the causes of it, the authority whereby it was done, with its ends and effects. But these things are not for our present consideration, as we intend only to represent things as they are in facto instituted or observed.

§ 19. Of this exclusion, the Jews commonly make three degrees, and that not without some countenance from the Scripture. The first they call, נדעי, 'Niddui.' The second, חרם, 'Cherem;' and the third, שמאמה, 'Shammatha.' That which they call Niddui, from המק, to expel, to separate, to cast off, is with the most of them the first and lowest degree of this separation and exclusion. And the persons who are to pronounce this sentence and put it into execution, are according to the Jews, any court from the
highest Sanhedrim of seventy-one at Jerusalem, to the meanest of their synagogues. Yea, any ruler of a synagogue, or wise man in authority, might according to them, do the same thing. And many ridiculous stories they have about the mutual excommunication and absolution of one another by consent. The time of its continuance, or the first space of time given to the persons offending to repent, was thirty days; on his neglect of this period, he was allowed till sixty days, and then to ninety, when upon his obstinacy he was obnoxious to the Cherem. As the causes of inflicting this punishment of Niddui, they reckon up in the Jerusalem Talmud, mood Katon, twenty-four crimes, on the guilt whereof any one may be thus dealt with.

1. 'He that despiseth a wise man, that is, a Rabbi, master, or doctor, even after his death. 2. He that contemneth a minister or messenger of the house of judgment. 3. He that calleth his neighbour, servant or slave. 4. He to whom the judge sends and appoints him a time of appearance, and he doth not appear. 5. He that despiseth the words of the scribes, much more the words of the law of Moses. 6. He that doth not obey, and stand to the sentence denounced against him. 7. He that hath any hurtful thing in his power, as a biting dog, and doth not remove it. 8. He that sells his field to a Christian, or to any heathen. 9. He that gives witness against an Israelite in the courts of the Christians. 10. A priest that killeth cattle, and doth not separate the gifts that belong to another priest. 11. He that profaneth the second holy-day in captivity. 12. He that doth any work in the afternoon before the passover. 13. He that taketh the name of God in vain on any account. 14. He that induceth others to profane the name of God. 15. He that draweth others to eat of holy things without the temple. 16. He that computes the times, or writes calendars, or almanacs, fixing the months out of the land of Israel. 17. He that causeth a blind man to fall. 18. He that hindereth others from doing the work of the law. 19. He that makes profane the killing of any creature by his own fault. 20. He that killeth and doth not show his knife beforehand before a wise man, whereby it may appear to be fit. 21. He that is unwilling to, or makes himself difficult in learning. 22. He that putteth away his wife, and afterward hath commerce with her in buying and selling, which may induce them to cohabitation. 23. A wise man of evil fame and report. 24. He that excommunicateth him who deserveth not that sentence.

§ 20. An instance of this exclusion, we have expressly in the gospel, John ix. 20. 'The Jews had already agreed, that if any man should confess he was Christ, ἀποστραγάνως γενήται, he should be put out of the synagogue. He should be ἐννηστα, 'Menuddeh;' put under the sentence of Niddui. And according to this sentence they proceeded with the blind man, whose eyes were opened by the Lord Christ, ver. 34, ἤξηβαλον, that is, saith the margin of our translation, they excommunicated him. But this is not the signification of the word; it denotes only their causing him to be thrust out of the synagogue by their officers, although there is no doubt, but at the same time they pronounced sentence against him.

§ 21. If a man died under this sentence they laid a stone upon his bier, intimating that he deserved lapidation if he had lived. Howbeit they excluded him not from teaching or learning of the law, so that he kept four paces distant from other persons. He came in, and went out of the temple at the contrary door to others, that he might be known. All which, with sundry other things, were of their traditional additions to the just prescriptions of the word.
§ 22. In case this process succeeded not, and upon some greater demerits, the sentence of לֹא חֶרֶם Cherem was to be proceeded to.

This is a high degree of authoritative separation from the congregation, and is made use of either when the former is despaired, or as was said upon greater provocations. This sentence must not be denounced, but in a congregation of ten at least, and with such an one as is מָטָר, thus anathematised, it is not lawful so much as to eat.

The third and last sentence in this kind which contains a total and irrecoverable exclusion of a person from the communion of the congregation, is called, כָּתֹן, 'Shammathah.' Some of the Talmudical Rabbins in moed katon give the etymology of this word as if it should be as much as זה כו, 'Sham metha,' death is there. But it is generally agreed, that it is from חַמְתָּה, to exclude, expel, cast out, that is, from the covenant of promise, and commonwealth of Israel. And this the most take to be total and final, the persons that fall under it being left to the judgment of God without hope of reconciliation to the church. Hence it is called in the Targum, Numb. xxi. 25; Deut. vii. 27, 'The curse, the exaction of God;' and by the Talmudists, קָטֹן, 'The anathema of the God of Israel.' But yet it cannot be denied that in many places, they speak of it as the general name for any excommunication, and so as not at all to distinguish it from Niddui, which is taken to be the least degree thereof. The most learned Buxtorf hath given us out of an ancient Hebrew manuscript, a form of this excommunication, which is truly ferale carmen, as sad and dismal an imprecation, as according to their principles could well be invented. It is indeed by him applied to the Cherem, but as L'Empereur hath observed in his Annotations on Bertram, it was doubtless only made use of in the last and greatest exclusion, which is supposed to be the Shammotha. The form of the curse is as ensues.

§ 23. 'By the sentence of the Lord of lords, let such a one, the son of such a one, (תֵּל הָרִים) be in anathema, or be accursed in each house of judgment, that above, and that below, (that is) by God and his church) in the curse of the holy ones on high: in the curse of the seraphims and Ophannim, (the Wheels or Cherubims in Ezekiel's vision,) in the curse of the whole church from the greatest to the least: Let there be upon him strokes great and abiding; diseases great and horrible: Let his house be an habitation of dragons (תְּרָפִים) or serpents. Let his star, or planet, be dark in the clouds: Let him be exposed to indignation, anger, and wrath; and let his dead body be cast to wild beasts and serpents: Let his enemies and adversaries rejoice over him, and let his silver and gold be given to others; and let all his children be cast at the doors of his adversaries; and let posterity be astonished at his day: Let him be accursed out of the mouth of Addiriron, and Athariel; from the mouth of Sandalphon, and Hadraniel; from the mouth of Ansisiel, and Pathiel; from the mouth of Seraphiel, and Sagansael; from the mouth of Michael, and Gabriel; from the mouth of Raphael, and Mesharethiel; Let him be accursed from the mouth of Zazzabib, and from the mouth of Havabib, who is the great God; and from the mouth of the seventy names of the great King: and from the mouth of the Tzorlak the great Chancellor, (these names partly significant, and partly insignificant, coined to strike terror into the minds of weak and disTEMPered persons, they invent and apply at their please to angels, good and bad; not unlike the monstrous names which the gnosticks gave to the ἀγών, who borrowed many things from the tradition of the Jews, and returned them again unto them with an improvement, but they proceed): Let him
be swallowed up as Corah and his company; and let his soul depart with fear and terror: Let the rebuke of the Lord slay him, and let him be strangled like Ahitophel: Let his leprosy be as the leprosy of Gehazi, neither let there be any restoration of his ruin: Let not his burial be in the burials of Israel: Let his wife be given to strangers, and let others humble her in his death. Under this curse, let such a one, the son of such a one, be, with his whole inheritance. But unto me, and all Israel, let God extend his peace and blessing. Amen.'

§ 24. Now, because it is certain, that this is a form of the greatest and last anathema, of a final and total excommunication, and yet he who is devoted is every-where said to be מְרָא, Muchram, and under the Cherem, it is almost evident, that these three degrees are not distinguished as is commonly supposed, namely, that the Shammatha should exceed the Cherem, and that this last should exceed only the Niddui, for we find the highest and extreme sentence in this solemn form, is often called the Cherem. Shammatha, therefore, is only a general name for the expulsion of a person, sometimes with the Niddui, and sometimes with the Cherem, which yet I do not suppose was always thus horrid and fierce.

§ 25. To add to the terror of this sentence, they used to accompany the pronouncing of it with the sound of trumpets and horns, as the Targum says that Barak did in his cursing of Meroz, Judges v. 23. He shammatised him with four hundred trumpets. And herein have they been imitated by the Church of Rome, in their shaking of candles, and ringing of bells, on the like occasion.

I have not reported these things, as though for matter and manner they wholly belonged to the law as penalties of divine institution. Many things in the manner of their performance, as they are now expressed by the Rab-bins, were certainly of their own arbitrary invention. When the use of these first began amongst them is unknown; though it be not improbable, that sundry things of this nature were practised by them before the destruction of the second temple; for then they had mixed many of their own superstitions with the worship of God, as is evident from the gospel.

§ 26. But this also is certain, that God in sundry cases had appointed that some transgressors should be separated from the congregation, devoted to destruction, and cut off. An instance of the execution of which institution we have, Ezra x. 7, 8. 'They made a proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem unto all the children of the captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem, and that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes, and the elders, all his substance should be divided, and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away.' A double penalty is here threatened to disobedient persons; the one concerned the person of such a one, יִבְרֹא לְכָל מַכֹּל תְּפוּלָה תְּתוֹלָה, 'He shall be separated from the congregation of the captivity,' that is, of Israel then returned out of captivity. And this was the Niddui, or expulsion from sacred communion, which we have before described: he should be esteemed as a heathen man. Secondly, as to his substance, חָזוֹם כֹּל רֶשֶׁת, 'All his substance, his goods and possessions, should be anathematized,' devoted, put under Cherem, taken away for sacred uses. Hence some have made this distinction between the three degrees of excommunication.

First. The Niddui concerned only the person, and his separation from sacred offices. Cherem had also confiscation of goods attending it, the substance of the transgressor being devoted. And Shammatha was accom-
panied with the death of the devoted person. Now these carnal penalties being removed, under the New Testament dispensation, that great and sore revenge which disobedient sinners are to expect from the hand of God at the last day is substituted by our apostle in the room of them all, Heb. x. 28, 29.

§ 27. Civil punishments next succeed, and they were of three sorts. First, corporeal. Secondly, such as respect the outward estate and condition of the offender. Thirdly, capital.

First. Corporeal. The only corporeal punishment was that of stripes, not exceeding the number of forty, Deut. xxv. 23. An account of the opinions of the Jews, and of the manner of their inflicting this punishment, is given us by many; in particular, it is given very exactly by Buxtorf in his preface to his Bibliotheca Rabbina, to which I refer the reader. They call it מָזוֹן, or beating by strokes, and sometimes מָזוֹנָן, the beating of forty, or with forty. And he that was liable unto it was מָזוֹנָן, filius plagarum. Many crimes doubtless rendered persons obnoxious to this penalty, but they are not directly expressed in the law. The Jews now reckon up seven instances of unlawful copulation with women free and unmarried, (for adultery, as is known, was capital by the express sentence of the law.) As, 1. With a sister. 2. A father’s sister. 3. A mother’s sister. 4. A wife’s sister. 5. A brother’s widow. 6. An uncle’s widow. 7. A woman separated. Under this head they also reckon up many crimes with reference to ceremonial institutions, as eating of fat, and blood, and leaven, on the passover, making an oil like the holy oil; indeed they here include all such transgressions as are threatened with punishment, but have no express kind of punishment annexed to them.

§ 28. Secondly. Punishments respecting state and condition were of two sorts. First, pecuniary, in a quadruple restitution in case of theft. Secondly, personal, in banishment, or confinement to the city of refuge for him that had slain a man at unawares, Num. xxxv. 25.

§ 29. Thirdly. Capital punishments they inflicted four ways. First, by strangulation, which was inflicted on six sorts of transgressors. 1. Adulterers. 2. Strikers of parents. 3. Men-stealers. 4. Old men ex-emplarily rebellious against the law. 5. False prophets. 6. Prognosticators by the names of idols. Secondly, burning, Lev. xx. 14. And this the Jews say was inflicted by pouring molten lead into their mouths; and the crimes for which this punishment was inflicted, were, 1st. the adultery of the priest’s daughter. 2d. Incest. 1. With a daughter. 2. With a son’s daughter. 3. A wife’s daughter. 4. A wife’s daughter’s daughter. 5. A wife’s son’s daughter. 6. A wife’s mother. 7. The mother of her father. 8. The mother of her father-in-law. Thirdly, death was inflicted by the sword, Deut. xx. 21. 1. On the voluntary man-slayer. 2. On the inhabitants of any city that fall to idolatry. Fourthly, by stoning; which was inflicted for incest. 1. With a mother. 2. A mother-in-law. 3. A daughter-in-law. 4. Adultery with a betrothed virgin. 5. Unnatural uncleanness with men. 6. With beasts by men. 7. With beasts by women. 8. Blasphemy. 9. Idolatry. 10. Offering to Moloch. 11. A familiar spirit of Ob. 12. Of Jiddeoni. 13. On impostors. 14. On seducers. 15. On enchanters or magicians. 16. Profaners of the Sabbath. 17. Cursers of father or mother. 18. The dissolve and stubborn son: concerning all of which it is expressly said, that they shall be stoned.

§ 30. To the execution of these penalties there were added two cautionary laws. That they who were put to death, for the increase of their ignominys,
and terror of others, should be hanged on a tree, Deut. xxi. 21. Secondly, That they should be buried the same day, ver. 23. And this is a brief abstract of the penalties of the law, as it was the rule of the polity of the people in the land of Canaan.

EXERCITATION XXII.


§ 1. The people having received the law in the wilderness, and the foundation of their future church state and worship, which was to continue until the times of reformation, Heb. ix. 10, being thus laid; there was also assigned to them, by God's direction, a place and building for the seat of that worship. This was the tabernacle erected in the wilderness, in a manner suited to their then changing condition. When they had attained a fixed station in the land of promise, the temple built by Solomon came in the room of this tabernacle. Our apostle, in treating of the ordinances of that church, as first instituted by Moses, of which the Hebrews boasted as their privilege, and to the observances of which they obstinately adhered, insists only on the tabernacle, from which the temple and its services were derived, and to which they were conformed. And this he doth principally, ch. ix. 1—5, 'Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant, overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat.'

§ 2. The preparation for the directions which God gave for the building of this tabernacle is declared, Exod. xxiv. The body of the people having heard the law, that is the ten commandments, which were written on two tables of stone, and the people no more than these, Deut. ix. 10, they removed to a greater distance from the mount, Exod. xx. 18, 19. After their removal, Moses continued to receive from the Lord that summary of the whole law which is expressed, chap. xxi, 22, 23. And all this, as it should seem, at the first hearing; he wrote in a book from the mouth of God. For it is said, xxiv. 4, that he wrote all the words of the Lord. And, ver. 7, that he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people.

§ 3. The Jewish masters suppose that it was the book of Genesis that is there intended. For, say they, the rest of the law was not yet written; for
this took place before God himself had written or engraven the ten words on the two tables of stone. But this is a fond imagination, seeing the book which Moses read contained the form and tenour of the covenant made with that people at Horeb, and is expressly so called, and as such was then solemnly confirmed and ratified by sacrifice. It may therefore be rather sup- posed, that there is a prolepsis used in the recording of this story, and that indeed the confirmation of the covenant by sacrifice, which was accompanied with the reading of the book, was not until after the third return of Moses from the mount with the renewed tables. But this also may well be doubted, seeing this sacrifice was prepared and offered by the young men of the children of Israel, ver. 5, that is, the first-born, whose office was sus- pended upon the separation of Aaron and his sons unto the priesthood, which God had designed before that last descent of Moses from the mount. We must, then, leave things in the order in which they are recorded. It appears, therefore, that Moses wrote the law as he received it from God. This being done, he came down and read it in the ears of the people. And he proposed it to them, as containing the terms of the covenant that God would have them enter into. This they solemnly engaged to the perform- ance of, and thereby had their admission into a new church state. This being done, the whole was confirmed by sacrifice, and the sprinkling of blood, to prefigure the great confirmation of the new covenant by the blood of Christ, as we shall see afterwards.

§ 4. Things being thus settled, Moses goes up again into the mount, to receive directions for that worship of God which he appointed and enjoined to them in that church state into which they were newly admitted. And here, in the first place, the Lord instructs him respecting the frame and whole fabric of the tabernacle, as that which was an eminent type of the human nature of Christ, and so indispensably necessary to the solemn worship then ordained, that no part of it could be rightly performed but with respect thereunto. This, therefore, with all the parts and utensils of it, should now come under consideration. But there are various reasons for which I shall omit it in this place: as, 1. The most material things be- longing to it must necessarily be considered in our exposition of those places of the Epistle where they are expressly insisted on. 2. Many things relating to it, as the measures of it, some part of the matter whereof it was made, divers colours used about it, are very dubious, and some of them so absolutely uncertain, that the Jews themselves can come to no agreement about them; and it is not meet to enter into the discussion of such things, without more room and liberty than our present design will afford. 3. Many learned men have already laboured with great diligence and skill in the discovery of all the several concerns of the tabernacle and temple, from whom the reader who hath a mind to inquire into these things may receive much satisfaction. Moreover, this part of these discourses is written in such circumstances as afford me very little encouragement or assistance to enlarge on this subject. Only that the reader may not go away without an instance of what in other circumstances might have been here introduced, I shall select one particular utensil of the tabernacle, and give an account of it. And this shall be the ark, and the things connected with it.

§ 5. The ark was the only furniture of the most holy place, the most sacred and holy of all the utensils of the tabernacle and temple. And it was the same in them both, as is evident, 1 Kings viii. 4, 6. It was the repository of the covenant; for so the law written by the finger of God in tables of stone is often called metonymically, and being anointed, Exod. xl.
9, it became קָדָשׁ וְקָדָשׁוֹת, ‘holiness of holinesses,’ or most holy, a type of him who was to fulfil the law, and establish the covenant between God and man, being thereunto anointed as the most holy, Dan. ix. 26. It was also the great pledge of the presence of God in the church; whence it is sometimes called his glory, Ps. lxxviii. 61. He gave רָאוּת שָׂם, ‘his glory,’ beauty, majesty, into the hand of the enemy, when the ark was taken; on which occasion, the wife of Phineas cried, דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה, § 8, ‘Where is the glory?’ 1 Sam. iv. 24, because therein the glory departed with the ark from Israel, ver. 22. Also in the presence of the ark, glory was said to dwell in the land, Ps. lxxxiv. 9. לֹא יִשָּׂךְ דֶּבָּרָם, because on it the Shchina, or Chabod, or glorious presence of God, dwelt and abode among his people. Yea, it hath the name of God himself attributed to it, by reason of its representation of his majesty, Ps. xxiv. 7, 9, 10.

We call it by the same name with the great vessel wherein Noah, and the seed of all living creatures, were preserved. But their names are very different in the original, both in sound and signification. The Hebrew word for the ark of the covenant made under the ministry of Moses, is רַבָּא, ארון, a chest, it may be from יָרֵא, a certain wood whereof such chests were made. The word for the other is, הרבח, תבח, the name of any vessel in the water, great or small, though made with bulrushes, Exod. ii. 3.

§ 6. As the ark was the principal, so it was the first utensil of the tabernacle that God appointed to be made, Exod. xxv. 10. It was as the heart from which sacred holiness from the presence of God flowed to enliven and to give spirit to all other things belonging to his worship. Hence, when it was brought into the temple, and not till then, the visible pledges of the presence of God appeared there, 1 Kings viii. 8—12.

§ 7. The matter whereof it was made, was לֵבָנָה שֶׁמֶשׁ, Exod. xxv. 10, שִׁיתִימִ-וּזֵד, or boards of the שִׁיתִים tree mentioned, Isa. xli. 18. What wood this was, is altogether uncertain, although it seems sure enough that none of it grew in the wilderness, where the people were at the erection of the tabernacle. For these Shittim boards were reckoned amongst the stores of silver and brass, and such other things as they had brought with them into the wilderness, Exod. xxxix. 25, and that expression, לְכָל אֵזֵד מַגְּם אֵזֵד, ‘every one with whom was found Shittim-wood,’ intimates the rarity of it, and that, it may be, it had been preserved by them for sundry generations. There is indeed a place called Shittim, and Abel Shittim, mentioned Numb. xxv. 1, and xxxiii. 49, but it is not probable that this name was derived from these trees. However this place was in the plains of Moab, to which the Israelites came not until forty years after the making of the ark. Indeed, there is nothing now known of the Shittim tree, or of this wood; for all that has been written respecting it, and many have written, is mere conjecture, ending in acknowledged uncertainty. Only it seems to have been notable for firmness and duration, as continuing in the ark apparently 900 years, even from the making of it till the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans. And perhaps it was restored to the second temple, not perishing absolutely until the covenant with that people expired, 600 years after the captivity. But it had indeed this advantage for preservation from all external causes of decay, that it was inclosed on all parts in a covering of gold.

§ 8. The ark was in the form of an oblong chest, of small dimensions, being two cubits and a half in length, and one and a half in breadth, and of the same height, Exod. xxv. 10. It was thus, according to the most
approved estimation of their measures, near four feet long, and two feet and some inches broad and high; and farther exactness or accuracy about these measures is of little certainty, and less use. How the boards of it were joined, is not mentioned. It was overlaid with beaten gold, pure and unmixed, בָּשָׂךְ עַל הַבַּנֵי יָדָוֹר, intus et extra, undequeaque, on all the boards of it, both within and without, so that no part of the wood was any where to be seen or touched. Round about it, that is, on the edge of the upper side, it had על יִלְּדָוֹר upon it round about, דַּיּ a diadem, or a fringe of gold work, such as encompassed diadems or crowns. And this דַּיּ, or diadem, was put only on the ark, the mercy-seat, and the altar of incense, intending expressions of rays of gold, as coming from דַּיּ, to scatter abroad in the manner of rays and beams, which Heb. i. 3, is called απανταγεθμα, 'the brightness of glory.' And hence the rabbins speak of a threefold crown, that of the ark, that of the altar, and that of the table; of the last for the king, of the midst for the priest, of the first they know not from whom, as Rabbi Solomon says expressly. Indeed all of them represented the threefold offices of Christ, for whom the crowns were laid up, Zech. vi.

§ 9. At the four corners, on the outside, were annexed to it four rings of gold, on each side two. Through these rings went two staves or bars, wherewith the ark was to be carried on the shoulders of the Levites, Exod. xxv. 11, 12, for the neglect of which service strictly enjoined them, Num. vii. 9, God made a breach on Uzza in the days of David, 2 Sam. vi. 7.

§ 10. The end for which God appointed the making of this ark, was to put therein בִּלּוּדֵי, 'the testimony,' Exod. xxv. 16, that is the two tables of stone, on which were engraved by the finger of God the ten commandments which had been pronounced by the ministry of angels. Besides this, there was nothing in it, as is expressly affirmed, 1 Kings viii. 9. 2 Chron. v. 10; Deut. x. 2, 5. The different idea which appears to be suggested by an expression of the apostle, Heb. ix. shall be considered in its proper place.

§ 11. This ark made at Horeb, 1 Kings viii. 9, that is, at the foot of the mountain where the people encamped, was finished with the rest of the tabernacle on the first day of the first month of the second year from the coming of the Israelites out of Egypt, Exod. xl. 13. We have shown that it was the visible pledge of the presence of God amongst them; as such, it was placed with its tabernacle in the midst of the people, whilst they were encamped in the wilderness, they being distributed into four hosts to the four quarters of heaven, Numb. ii., that a blessing from thence might be equally communicated to them all, and that all might have an alike access to the worship of God. For the same purpose, it was carried in the midst of their armies when on their march, and a solemn benediction was pronounced when it began to set forward, and when it returned to its repository in the most holy place, Numb. x. 35, 36. This was the ordinary course in the removals of the ark. In an extraordinary manner, God appointed it to be carried before all the people, when the waters of Jordan were divided by his power, of which the ark was a pledge, Josh. iii. 15. But when the people, without the appointment of God, afterwards attempted to imitate this, carrying the ark with them in their wars with the Philistines, they received a sad reward of their temerity, 1 Sam. iv.

From the wilderness, the ark was carried to Gilgal, Josh. v. 10, from thence it was removed with the tabernacle to Shiloh, Josh. xviii. 2. Some suppose, that after this it was occasionally removed to Mizpeh, as Judges xi. 11, xx. 1, 27, xxi. 1, 2, because it is said in those places, that such
things were done before the Lord in Mizpeh; but that expression doth not necessarily infer the presence of the ark and sanctuary in that place. Yea the context seems to intimate, that it was at another place distant from thence, as ver. 26, ‘They went up from the place of the assembly in Mizpeh to the house of God, where the ark was.’ In Shechem also it is supposed to have been, from the assembly that Joshua made there, ch. xxiv. 1, upon the close whereof he fixed a stone of memorial before the sanctuary, ver. 26. But yet neither doth this evince the removal of the ark or sanctuary. For Shechem being not far from Shiloh, the people might meet in the town for convenience, and then go some of them with Joshua to Shiloh, as it is most probable that they did. From Shiloh, it was carried into the field of Aphek against the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv. 2, and being taken by them, was carried first to Ashdod, then to Ekron, then to Gath, 1 Sam. v. It was then brought to Kirjath-jearim, 1 Sam. vi. to the house of Abinadab, 1 Sam. vi., thence to the house of Obed-Edom, 2 Sam. vi., thence to mount Sion in Jerusalem, 2 Sam. vi. into a place prepared for it by David. And from thence was solemnly introduced into, and enthroned in the most holy place of the temple built by Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 6, 7. In the meantime, whether occasionally, or by advice, the tabernacle was removed from Shiloh, and that first place of the solemn worship of God altogether deserted, and made an example of what God would afterwards do unto the temple, when his worship was there also neglected and defiled, Jer. vii. 12, 14, xxvi. 6, 9. In the temple of Solomon, it continued either until the captivity of Jehoiakim, when Nebuchadnezzar took away all the goodly vessels of the house of the Lord, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, or until the captivity of Zedekiah, when he carried away all the remaining vessels, great and small, ver. 18. Of the Talmudical fable concerning the hiding of it by Josiah or Jeremiah, with the addition of its supposed restoration at the last day, in the second book of Maccabees, I have spoken elsewhere. Whether it was restored again with the vessels of the house of the Lord by Cyrus, is uncertain. If it was not, it was an intimation that the covenant made with that people was waxing old, and hastening to an expiration.

§ 12. The things that accompanied this ark in the most holy place, were the mercy-seat upon it, and on the ends of it the two cherubim. The mercy-seat, as to its making, form, use, and disposition, is declared, Exod. xxv. 17. It is called חֶרֶב, Cipporeth. כְּפֹרֶת signifies to hide, to cover, to plaster over, to shut, to plaster with Bitumen or pitch: in Pihel, to expiate sin, Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. iv. 10. If the name of the mercy-seat be taken from the word in Kal, it signifies only ‘ omerimentum, tegumentum, tegmen,’ a covering, and so ought to be rendered. If it be taken from the sense of the word in Pihel, it retains the signification of expiation, and consequently of pardon and mercy. So it is by our translators rendered a mercy-seat, and that with respect to the rendering of it by the apostle, λαστηριον, Heb. ix. as by the LXX. in this place, επιθικεν του θρευντου, the propitiatory placed on the ark. The reference which this had to the Lord Christ, the apostle declares, Rom. iii. 29, and largely in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. ix.

§ 13. The mercy-seat was made of pure gold, and for its dimensions as to breadth and length, were the same as those of the ark on which it was laid, Exod. xxv. 17. And this mercy-seat, or covering of gold, seems to have been laid upon the ark within the verge of gold, or crown, that encompassed it, being itself plain without any such verge or crown; for it was placed על, upon the ark, just over it, ver. 21, and so was encompassed with its crown, the glory both of justice and mercy, of law and gospel, being the same in Christ Jesus.
§ 14. At the two ends of this mercy-seat, were placed two cherubim, one at the one end, the other at the other, both of gold, and, as it should seem, of one continued work with the covering itself. The name of cherubim hath prevailed for these figures or images from the Hebrews; partly because it is retained by our apostle, who calls them cherubim of glory, χερουβιμ εσχατος, Hebr. ix. 5, and partly because the signification of the word being not well known, it cannot properly be otherwise expressed; for which reason it was retained also by the LXX. They were of those things which our apostle, ch. ix. 23, terms υποδειγματα των εν τοις ουρανοις; examples, expressions, or similitudes of things in heaven, the framing and erection of which in reference to the worship of God, is forbidden under the name of חל ומותות אפר� ביימיו, Exod. xx. 3, 'the likeness of any thing in the heavens above.' The first mention of cherubim is in Gen. iii. 24. 'God placed cherubim,' which seems to intimate, that the proto-types of these figures were heavenly ministers or angels, though Aben Ezra supposes that the word denotes any erected figures or appearances whatever. Others of the Jews, as Kimchi, think that the word is compounded of כ cupid, a note of similitude, and ב הר, a Chaldee word for a child, and that it thus signifies like a child, this name being given to them from their form and shape. But this answers not to the description given afterwards of them in Ezekiel, much less will it answer to the same appellation given to the winds and clouds, Psal. xviii. 10. The word hath a great affinity with מاهر, a chariot; accordingly the angels of God are called his chariots, Psal. lxviii. 17. Thus also David calls expressly the cherubim that were to be made in Solomon's temple, 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, gold for the pattern, מערת המחרב מחרב, hammercheba hacherubim, 'chariot of the cherubim.' Here the allusion is evident, and Ezekiel describes his cherubim as a triumphant chariot, ch. x. It is not therefore unlikely that their name is derived from בחר, which signifies to ride, or to be carried, to pass on swiftly, thus to express the angelical ministry of the blessed spirits above. Or perhaps they were rather mere emblems of the power and speed of God in his works of grace and providence.

§ 15. These Cherubims are said to be מערת, that is, not molten, but beaten, even and smooth, and seem to have been one continued piece with the mercy-seat, beat out with it and from it. There is no more mention of their form but only that they had faces and wings. Of what sort those faces were, or how many in number were their wings, is not expressed.

§ 16. In Ezekiel's vision of the living creatures, which he also calleth Cherubim, ch. x. 2, there is the shape of a man ascribed unto them, they had the likeness of a man, ch. i. 5, faces, ver. 6, feet, ver. 7, hands, ver. 8, sides, or body, ver. 8, 11, each of them also had four faces, of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, ver. 10, and each had four wings, ver. 23. In John's vision in the revelation, which seems to correspond with this of Ezekiel's Cherubim, from the eyes that his living creatures were full of, and from the appearance of their faces, they had each of them six wings, answering to those of the Seraphim in the vision of Isaiah, ch. vi. 2.

§ 17. The Jews generally affirm, that these visions of the glory of God granted to Isaiah and Ezekiel were the same, and that Ezekiel saw nothing but what Isaiah saw also; only they say, that Ezekiel saw the glory of God and his majesty, as a countryman who admires all the splendour of the court of the king, Isaiah as a courtier, who took notice only of the person of the king himself. But there are many evident differences
in their visions. Isaiah calls the glorious ministers of God סְרָפִים, Seraphim, from their nature, compared to fire and light; Ezekiel חֵרָבִים, Cherubim, from their speed in the accomplishment of their duty. Isaiah saw his vision as in the temple. For although from those words, 'I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple,' Aben Ezra and Kimchi suppose, that he saw the throne of God in heaven, and only his train of glory descending into the temple, yet it is more probable that he saw the throne itself in the temple, his train spreading abroad to the filling of the whole house. For the temple is called the throne of his glory, Jer. xiv. 21, and a glorious high throne, ch. xvii. 12, that is, a throne high and lifted up, as in this place. Ezekiel saw his vision abroad in the open field, by the river of Chebar, ch. 1, 3. Isaiah first saw the Lord himself, and then his glorious attendants: Ezekiel saw first the chariot of his glory, and then God above it. Isaiah's seraphim had six wings, with two whereby they covered their faces, which Ezekiel's cherubim had not; and that because Isaiah's vision represented Christ, John xii. 41, with the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jews, which the angels were not able to look into, Eph. iii. 9, 10, and were therefore said to cover their faces with their wings, as not being able to look into the depths of those mysteries; but in Ezekiel's vision, when they attended the will of God in the works of his providence, they looked upon them with open face. Wherefore from the diversity in all these visions, it appears that nothing certain concerning the form or wings of the cherubim made by Moses, can be collected. Most probably they had each of them only one face, directly looking one towards the other, and each two wings, which being stretched out forward over the mercy-seat, met each other; and were mere emblems of the divine presence and care over his covenant, people, and worship.

§ 18. And this was the whole furniture of the most holy place in the tabernacle of Moses. In the most holy place of the temple of Solomon, which was more august and spacious, there was by God's direction two other cherubim added. These were great and large, made of the wood of the olive tree, overlaid with gold, and they stood on their feet behind the ark, westward, with their backs towards the end of the oracle, their faces over the ark and mercy-seat eastward towards the sanctuary, their wings extended twenty cubits long, even the whole breadth of the house, and met in the midst, their inward wings were over the ark, 1 Kings vi. 23, 28; 2 Chron. iii. 11—13.

§ 19. And this was that appearance of his glory which the Lord God of Israel granted to his church of old. It was beautiful and excellent, as appointed by himself, yet was it but carnal and worldly, in comparison of the heavenly and glorious mysteries of the gospel; especially of him, who being obscurely shadowed out by all this preparation of glory, was in himself the real brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, as shall further be declared on chap. i. 3.
EXERCITATION XXIII.

§ 1. Of the office of the priesthood; the high-priest in particular, the most illustrious type of Christ. § 2. The call of Aaron to the priesthood. § 3. Things concurring to his call, and separation to his office. § 4, 5. The garments prescribed to him. Ordinary. § 6. Extraordinary. § 7. The nature of the office of the high priest. What he performed himself alone. What with the assistance of other priests. What with the assistance of priests and Levites. § 8. His blessing the people. His judging of them. § 9. The succession of these priests. § 10. How many served under the tabernacle. § 11. How many under the first temple. § 12. How many under the second temple. The disturbance of the succession. Fatal end of the Aaronical priesthood.

§ 1. The principal glory of all the Mosaic worship consisted in the person and office of the high priest. The Scripture calls him, לְוָיָה נְזֶב, the great priest, ἱερέως ὃ μεγάς, or ἀρχιερέως. This priest, with his attendants of the same family, was the foundation on which the whole worship of the Jewish church depended. And, therefore, our apostle undeniably proves, that the law of commandments contained in ordinances was to be changed, because there was a promise of raising up a priest that was not of the house of Aaron, nor of the tribe of Levi; for the observance of the law in the worship of God, could not consist with such a change of priesthood, Heb. vii. 11, 12. Now, the high priest being in his person and his office, the most illustrious type of the Messiah and of his office, and the principal means whereby God instructed his church of old in the mystery of the reconciliation and salvation of sinners, most things concerning him are handled expressly and at large by our apostle. As, therefore, these must (God assisting) come under our consideration in the several places in which they are insisted on by him; I shall, in these previous discourses, only give a brief account of such things relating to the person and office of the Jewish high priest, as will not directly occur to us again.

§ 2. I have elsewhere considered the state of the priesthood in the church from the foundation of the world, till the time of which we now treat; also, by whom that office was executed, how they obtained it, and wherein it did consist. The foundation of an especial priesthood in the church of Israel, is laid, Exod. xxviii. 1. Provision of holy things being made, God proceeds to supply the church with holy or dedicated persons for the administration of these. The first thing expressed is, the call of the high priest. Of this there are two parts. First. God's revelation and authoritative constitution concerning it. Secondly. His actual consecration. The former is expressed, Exod. xxviii. 1, 'And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office.' Aaron was the elder brother of Moses, born three years before him, Exod. vii. 7, and was now eighty-four or eighty-five years of age, when God thus calls and appoints him to the office of the priesthood. With him, all his sons, all the males of his family were dedicated to the service of God in their successive generations. And in this call to his office, he was a type of Christ, who entered not on his priesthood, but by the designation and authority of the Father, Heb. v. 4, 5.

§ 3. Secondly. Unto the completing of his call, there concurred his consecration or separation to God, at large described, Exod. xxix. In general
it is expressed, ver. 1, by שׁדֶת, which we render to hallow, that is, to sanctify, to separate unto God in the work of the priesthood. This is the general expression of his consecration, for what we afterwards translate to consecrate, ver. 9, 20, respects only one particular act of the whole work or duty. Now, the parts hereof were many, which may briefly be enumerated.

First. There was their manuduction, or the bringing them to the door of the tabernacle, chap. xxxix. 4, יִרְדָּה, 'thou shalt bring them nigh,' the word used in all sacred approaches and dedications to God. The priests themselves were made a Corban.

Secondly. They were washed with water, ver. 4, 'Thou shalt wash them with water.' After this the priests on all occasions were to wash themselves; at present, this being a sacred action, and they being not as yet consecrated, it was performed towards them by Moses, who at this and other times discharged the office of an extraordinary priest.

Thirdly. Being washed, they were clothed with the holy garments, ver. 5, 6, of which afterwards.

Fourthly. The high priest being clothed, was anointed with the holy oil poured on his head, and running down over all his garments, ver. 7; Psal. cxxxiii. 2. The making and use of this ointment, which are enjoined, Exod. xxx. 25—33, prefigured the unction of the Lord Christ, with all the graces of the Spirit, Heb. i. 6.

Fifthly. Sacrifices of all sorts were offered unto God. 1. The Mincha, or meat-offering. 2. The Chataath, or sin-offering, Exod. xxix. 13, 14. 3. The Hola, or whole burnt offerings, ver. 18, 25. 4. The Shelamin, or peace-offerings, ver. 25. 5. The Tenumoth and Temuphoth, heave and wave-offerings, ver. 25, 26. 6. The Nesek, or the drink-offerings, ver. 40. So that in the consecration of the priest, all sacrifices also were as it were anew consecrated unto God.

Sixthly. In the use of this sacrifice, there were five ceremonies used, belonging in a peculiar manner unto their consecration. 1. The filling of their hand, ver. 9, בֶּן מַעֲרָל. This we have rendered, 'Thou shalt consecrate them,' as though their consecration was some peculiar act distinct from these prescribed ceremonies. But that which is thus expressed, is only one of the ceremonies, or the putting of some parts of the sacrifice into or upon their hands to bear to the altar; which being their first action belonging to the sacerdotal office, (for in all that is mentioned before, they were merely passive,) is sometimes by a synecdoche used for consecration itself.

2. The putting of blood upon the tips of their right ears, and upon the thumbs of their right hands, and the great toes of their right feet, ver. 20, intimating their readiness to hear and perform the will of God. And this blood was taken from one of the rams that was offered for a burnt-offering.

3. The sprinkling of blood from the altar, and the anointing oil together, upon Aaron and his sons, and upon all their garments, ver. 21. 4. The imposition, or laying of their hands on the head of the beast to be sacrificed for a sin-offering, ver. 10, 15, denoting the passing away of their sin from them, that they might be fit to minister before the Lord. 5. The delivering of the wave-offering into their hands, as a pledge of their future portion, ver. 24, 28.

Seventhly. The continuance of all this ceremony is observed, ver. 30. By the repetition of the sacrifices mentioned, it was continued seven days. During this time, Aaron and his sons abode night and day at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; after all which, they were admitted
into it, and ministered in their office. Now, all this solemnity was used by the appointment of God, partly, to beget a reverence in the priests themselves for his worship, and in the administration of it; partly, to instruct the whole church in the mysteries of their redemption by the true high priest, whose person and office was shadowed out hereby, as afterwards will more fully appear.

§ 4. Immediately upon the revelation of the mind of God, for the setting apart of Aaron to the priesthood, he prescribes the garments that he was to use in the discharge of the duties of his office. For the worship now instituted, being outward and carnal, that which made an appearance of glory and beauty, as these vestments did, was of principal consideration therein.

These garments of the high priest were of two sorts. First. Those of his ordinary and constant ministration in the sanctuary: Secondly. Those of his annual and extraordinary ministry in the most holy place. The first are appointed, Exod. xxviii. consisting of eight parts.

First. מֶרֶם בַּלַּעַת בֶּן חֶסֶד אֲדֹנָי: breeches of linen for to cover the flesh of his nakedness, Exod. xxviii. 42, 43, that is, to wear next unto him on his loins.

Secondly. הבנהמה שֶׁשֶׁמֶשׁ מִלְשָׁנָה, Exod. xxxix. 27. A coat of fine linen, or silk, which was next them over the breeches, from the shoulders to the ancles.

Thirdly. הבּאֶבֶּס, Exod. xxxix. 29. A girdle of silk, or twined linen, with purple, blue, and scarlet, wherewith they girt the coat under the paps or breast.

Fourthly. ḫנָא, Exod. xxviii. 4. A robe, all of blue, with bells of gold, and pomegranates, hanging interchangeably at the fringes of it, in number, as the Jews say, seventy-two of each sort; this robe covered the coat and girdle.

Fifthly. Upon the robe was אֹנַךְ, the ephod, which name we have retained, as not finding any garment in use elsewhere that should answer to it. It was a covering for the shoulders, made of gold, purple, scarlet, and fine linen, curiously wrought. In the top of it, on the shoulders of the priest, were two precious stones, onyx say some, beryl say others, with the names of the tribes of the children of Israel engraven on them, six on one stone, and six on the other, Exod. xxviii. 6—11.

Sixthly. נָשָׁה, which we render a breastplate, wrought as the ephod, and of the same materials. In it were fastened, inouches of gold, twelve precious stones, with the names of the tribes engraven on them; which jewel, because of its use in judgment, was called, as I suppose, Urim and Thummin, Exod. xxviii. 15—18, 30.

Seventhly. כַּפָּרָה, or a mitre for the head, made of fine linen, after the fashion of an eastern turban, sixteen cubits long, wreathed about his head, Exod. xxviii. 37, 39.

Eighthly. בּוֹרֵד דָּבָק, a plate, a flowering of gold, fastened with a lace of blue on the fore-front of the mitre, wherein was engraven, קַדְשׁ שׁוֹרָה, Holiness to the Lord, Exod. xxviii. 36.

§ 5. I have only named these things, without farther consideration of them; partly, because they have been inquired into, and controverted by many already; and partly, because I cannot myself come to any certainty about sundry things relating to them. The colours which we render blue, purple, and scarlet, with the substance of that which we translate fine linen, cannot be clearly ascertained. The stones of the breastplate and
ephod for the most part are unknown, and their names are applied only by conjecture, to stones known to us. Concerning these things, the Jews themselves are at a loss, and give us only various rumours and surmises; and I shall not add to the heap of conjectures which have already been cast into this treasury.

§ 6. The extraordinary garments of the high priest, were those which he wore only on the day of atonement. And these he used not in the whole service of that day, but only when he entered into the most holy place. Now these, though for the kind of them they were the same with the linen garments before mentioned, yet they were made particularly for that day; for after the service of that day, they were laid up in some of the chambers belonging to the sanctuary. There were four of these garments: linen breeches, a linen coat, a linen girdle, and a linen mitre, Lev. xvi. 4, 25. These the Jews call the נִלְתָּן נַחֲלָה, 'white garments,' and the other his נִלְתָּן נַחֲלָה, 'garments of gold.'

§ 7. The high priest being thus arrayed, was prepared for the work of his office, which was threefold: 1. To offer sacrifices to God for the people. 2. To bless the people in the name of God. 3. To judge them. As to the first, our apostle declares it, and insists upon it frequently in this Epistle, chap. viii. 3, ix. 3, 4, vii. 2, x. 1. And his work in the business of sacrifices was threefold.

First. That which he performed himself alone, none being admitted to assist him, or to be present with him, or so much as to look upon him. This was that which he performed when he carried the blood into the most holy place on the day of atonement, Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix. 7. The sacrifice before the ark, mercy-seat, and cherubim, was peculiar to himself alone. And in case of any occasional hindrance or impediment that might befall him, there was always a second priest who was substituted in his room, that the great service of that day might not be omitted.

Secondly. That which he performed, assisted by other priests. Such was the whole service of the sanctuary, Heb. ix. 6, about the daily incense, the shew-bread, the candlesticks and lamps, even all the service of the holy place.

Thirdly. That wherein he had the assistance of the other priests, and the service of the Levites. Such were all the services of the court at the brazen altar, where the Levites assisted in the killing, flaying, and removal of the bodies of the beasts that were sacrificed.

The especial season of these services, diurnal, sabbatical, monthly, and annual, are of too great variety and extent to be here insisted on.

§ 8. Secondly. His blessing of the people was twofold. First. Solemn, at stated seasons, according to a prescribed form, Numb. vi. 23—27. Secondly. Occasional, with respect to particular seasons, as Eli blessed Hannah, 1 Sam. i. 17.

Thirdly. It was his work also to judge the people. 1. In things concerning the house and worship of God, Zech. iii. 7. 2. In hard and difficult cases, he joined with the judge or ruler, in judging between men according to the law, Deut. xvii. 12. 3. He was always a member of the Sanhedrim. This, I know is denied by some of the Jews, but it seems to be warranted from Deut. xvii. 8—13.

§ 9. The office of high priest being thus appointed, a succession of priests was instituted in the first-born male of the eldest branch of the posterity of Aaron. But the tracing of this succession is greatly perplexed, as it is nowhere directly given us in the Scripture, for that space of time wherein
the story of the church is recorded. Different names are also in several places given to the same persons, as seems most probable. Besides, Josephus, who is the only approved writer of the Jews in things of this nature, is either corrupted in some passages on this subject, or doth palpably contradict himself. The post-talmudical masters are so far from yielding any relief in this matter, that by their jarrings and wranglings they render it more perplexed. Neither have those amongst our writers, who of old or of late have laboured to trace this succession, been able to agree in their computations. I could give four or five differing catalogues, that are contended for with some earnestness. I shall not therefore hope, in this brief account of things to which I am confined, to throw light upon a matter of such intricacy. I shall content myself with giving the account, which is most received among the Jews, of this succession in general, with some few observations upon it, and so close this discourse.

§ 10. It is generally agreed after Josephus, that the whole number of high priests, from Aaron inclusively to the destruction of the second temple, was eighty-three. For though in the Babylonian Talmud, some of them reckon up above eighty high priests under the second temple alone, yet the more learned of the later Jews, as the author of Tzemach David ad Millen. 4. An. 829, expressly prefer the authority of Josephus above them all.

Of these eighty-three, thirteen administered before the Lord under the tabernacle, or whilst the tabernacle built by Moses in the wilderness was the sacred seat of divine worship. Of these, the first was Aaron, the last Abiathar, who was thrust out from the priesthood by Solomon, a little before the building of the temple. And in this succession there was but one interruption; namely, when Eli of the house of Ithamar, the younger son of Aaron, was preferred to the priesthood. It is probable that he had been second priest in the days of his predecessor, and he was doubtless admitted to the office upon the reputation of his holiness and wisdom. And it may be that he of the house of Phinehas, whose right it was to succeed, was either incapable or judged unworthy.

§ 11. In the temple built by Solomon, there administered eighteen high priests, whose names are recounted by Josephus, lib. 11, cap. 4.; lib. 20, cap. 4. Of these, the first was Zadok; the last Jehozadak, who was carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, 1 Chron. vi. 14, though I question whether ever he ministered as high-priest, only he was left at the destruction of the city and temple, after the death of his father Seraiah. Nor was there any known interruption in this series, the succession being carried down in a right line from the house of Phinehas by Zadok.

§ 12. The remainder of the number before mentioned, served under the second temple, being multiplied by the tumults and disorders which the people then fell into. The first of them was Joshua the son of Josedeck; the last one Phinehas, or Phanannias, made high priest by the seditious villains, a little before the last siege and destruction of the city.

And this succession, or that during this season, had interruptions many and great. The first mentioned by Josephus was after the death of Onias, the fourteenth high priest from the building of the temple, when Antiochus first put in Joshua, who was called Jason, the brother of Onias, and afterwards displacing him, thrust Menelaus into his room. After a while he put out this Menelaus, and placed one Alcimus, of another family in his stead.

After this Alcimus, the family of the Maccabees, or Hasmoneans, took on them the office of the high priesthood. Their race being extirpated by
Herod, Ananus a private priest, was by force and power put into the place. And from this time forward, to the destruction of the temple, there was no order observed in the succession of the high priest, but persons were put in and out at the pleasure of those who ruled, whether the Romans or the Herodians. For Hyrcanus being taken prisoner by the Parthians, and Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus his brother, being taken by Herod and Sosia, and crucified at Antioch by Marc. Antony, in him the race of the Hasmoneans ended. After this, vile persons were put in and out at pleasure, some for a year, some for a month, one for a day, some for a longer season. At last the whole nation, church and state, rushed to its final ruin, and in their rebellion at Jerusalem they thrust out Matthias, who had been put in by Agrippa, and chose one by lot to succeed him. God, to manifest his disapprobation of them, caused the lot to fall upon one Phananius, a mere idiot, who knew nothing of the place or office which they called him to, with whom ended the church and priesthood of the Jews.

EXERCITATION XXIV.

§ 1. Sacrifices the principal worship of God. § 2. Three sorts of them. 1. Of the brazen altar. 2. Of the sanctuary. 3. Of the most holy place. § 3. Referred to by the apostle. § 4. All sacrifices of the altar were שִׁבָּרוֹת. § 5. Every Corban either Isha or Terumah. § 6. שִׁבָּרוֹת of six sorts. 1. Hola. 2. Mincha. 3. Chataath. 4. Asham. 5. Miluim. 6. Shelamim. § 7. A second distinction of fire offerings, Either Zebach or Mincha. § 8—12. These distinctions and differences explained at large. § 13. The matter of all sacrifices. § 14. מִּצְבָּח, the first particular sacrifice. The rise, use, and direction of it. § 15. Use of it among the heathen. § 16, 17. What of ancient tradition, what of their own invention. § 18—21. The manner of this sacrifice. § 22. The end of it. To make expiation or atonement, what. § 23. Seasons and occasions of this sacrifice. § 24. מִּצְבָּח a meat-offering. § 25. The use of that name; general, particular. § 26. 27. The matter of this offering. § 28, 29.דֶּקֶך, the drink-offering. The matter of it. § 30. מִּצְבָּח, peace-offerings. § 31. Reason of the name. § 32. matter of this offering. § 33, 34. Things peculiar to this kind of Sacrifice. § 35. The use of it among the heathen. § 36. מִּצְבָּח, the sin-offering. The name and causes of it. § 37. Sins, מִּצְבָּח, what. § 38. The persons to offer this sacrifice. 39. The anointed priest, who, Lev. iv. 3. § 40. The whole congregation. The ruler. A private person. § 41. The time and manner of this sacrifice. § 42. The sprinkling of blood in it. § 43. מִּצְבָּח, the trespass-offering. Its difference from the sin-offering. § 44. מִּצְבָּח, consecration-offerings. § 45 Second sort of Corbans. Terumoth.

§ 1. The principal worship and service of God, both in the tabernacle and temple, consisted in offerings and sacrifices. For these did directly represent, and in their general nature answered that which was the foundation of the church, and of all its worship; namely, the sacrifice of the Son of God. Accordingly he is called, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,' John i. 29, because he fulfilled and perfectly accomplished what was prefigured by the sacrifice of lambs and other creatures, from the foundation of the world. These offerings and sacrifices were nothing but means of God's institution, that men might express by them their faith in the first promise. Nor were sacrifices in general now first instituted, nor the kinds of them first appointed; for the most of them had been observed.
upon divine revelation and command from the entrance of sin, and the giving
of the promise. But they were now rescued, in the repetition of them to
Moses, from the superstition that had connected itself with the observance of
them, and were directed to a right object, and attended with suitable in-
structive ceremonies in the manner of the performance of them.

§ 2. Now these offerings were three sorts. First, those of the court, or
brazen altar, by blood and fire. Secondly, those of the sanctuary at the
altar of incense, and table and shew-bread. Thirdly, those of the most
holy place before the ark, mercy-seat, and oracle. The first of these repre-
ented the bloody death of Christ, and his sacrifice on the cross; the second
his intercession in heaven; and the third the ἀποτελεσματα, or effects of
both in atonement and reconciliation. And these our apostle mentions,
chap. viii. 3, 4. He says, 'Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and
sacrifices: and there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.' Chap.
ix. 7, 'Into the second went the high priest alone once every year; not
without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people.'
Ver. 12, 'By the blood of bulls and calves.' Ver. 13, 'The blood of bulls
and calves, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkled.' Ver. 22, 'Almost all
things are by the law purged with blood.' Chap. x. 1, 'For the law having
a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things, can
never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually make
the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be
offered; because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more
conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is remembrance again
made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and
of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the
world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not.' Ver. 11, 'And
every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same
sacrifices, which can never take away sins.' Chap. xiii. 11, 'For the
bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high
priests for sin, are burnt without the camp.'

§ 3. It is evident that these and the like passages, in which our apostle
refers to the institution, nature, use, end, and manner of the observance of
sacrifices, cannot be rightly understood, without some distinct notion of
these as they were prescribed by God to Moses, and observed by the people
under the Old Testament. I shall therefore here give a brief system of
them, and account concerning them.

§ 4. Sacrifices of the altar in general were יַרְכָּב 'Corbanim.' The
name it may be of יַרְכָּב is not distinctly applied unto every sort of them;
but whereas every thing that any man יַרְכָּב 'brought nigh' to dedicate
or offer unto God, was thence יַרְכָּב, we may allow it to be the general name
of all sacrifices. And therefore on the close of the enumeration of all fire
offerings, it is added, 'This is the law which the Lord commanded Moses
in mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to
offer, or bring nigh יַרְכָּב תָּנָה, 'their corbans,' that is, offerings or sacrif-
cices of all sorts.' Lev. vii. 30.

§ 5. Now every יַרְכָּב, was either יִשָּׁה 'Isha,' a firing, or יִרְוָהּ 'teru-
mah,' a heave-offering, or יִשָּׁה 'menah 'tenumphah,' a wave-offering; the יִשָּׁה 'ishim' were יִרְשָׁה 'kodesh, kodashim,' holiness of holinesses, or most
holy; all but one; the other were קְדוֹשִׁים 'kodesh hillulim,' holiness of
praises, Lev. xix. 24.

The יָמָש or firings, fire-offerings, were expressly of six sorts, as they are
distinctly set down in Lev. vii. 37. 1. יָמָש 'hola' the burnt-offering;
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2. הָבֹֽדֶה ' mincha,' the meat-offering; 3. תַּחֲאָת 'chataath,' the sin-offering; 4. אָשֶֽׁמֶשׁ 'asham,' the trespass-offering; 5. מְלַאכְתֹּֽו ' millium,' consecration; 6. זְבַֽאָכָת 'zebach shelamim,' peace-offerings; so are they rendered by ours, how rightly we shall see afterwards. Besides, the מְלַאֲכָת 'mincha' contained that, properly so called, the meat-offering; and מְלַאֲכָת 'nesek,' the drink-offering. The LXX. render the verse, ὡντος ὁ νομὸς τῶν διακοο-ματων, καὶ ξύνας, καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας, καὶ πλημμελείας, καὶ τῆς τελειωσεως, καὶ τῆς ξύνας τοιου πωμπον. 'This is the law of whole burnt-offerings, and of sacrifices, and for sin, and trespass, and of perfection, or consumption, and of the sacrifice of salvation.' The particulars shall be examined as they occur. The vulgar Latin reads the words, 'Lex holocausti, et sacrificii pro pecato, et delicto, et pro consecratione, et pacificorum victimis: 'This is the law of the whole burnt-offering, and of the sacrifice for sin, and trespass; and for consecration, and for the sacrifices of peace-makers.' And herein either the mincha is wholly left out, or the words should be read, et sacrificii, et pro peccato; and so answer to the Greek, expressing the מְלַאֲכוֹת by ξύνα, 'sacrificium,' though improperly.

§ 7. These מְלַאֲכוֹת, fire-offerings are moreover distinguished into הָבֹֽדֶה 'zebach and מְלַאֲכָת 'mincha' in a large sense. For it is evident that מְלַאֲכוֹת 'mincha' is used very variously. For 1. Sometimes it is of as large a signification as בָּרֶק 'corban,' itself; and is frequently applied to offerings of blood, as well as of meat and drink, Gen. iv. 4. 2. Sometimes it is contra-distinguished from הָבֹֽדֶה, and denotes all sacrifices by fire, not of beasts and blood; Ps. xl. 6; Dan. ix. 27; Lev. vii. 34. 3. Sometimes it signifies that peculiar offering, which being made with flour or meal and oil, we call the meat offering, Lev. ii. 1. Wherefore in this distribution, הָבֹֽדֶה מְלַאֲכוֹת, 'victimam, sacrificium matutum,' a slain sacrifice, compriseth, מְלַאֲכוֹת 'hola,' תַּחֲאָת 'chataath,' מְלַאֲכָת 'asham,' מְלַאֲכָת 'shelamim;' מְלַאֲכוֹת מְלַאֲכוֹת, that which was peculiarly so, מְלַאֲכָת, and מְלַאֲכָת 'nesek;' מְלַאֲכוֹת מְלַאֲכוֹת 'millium,' partook of both. And these things must be a little further explained.

§ 8. First, בָּרֶק 'corban,' the general name of all sacrifices, taken from their general nature, in that they were brought nigh to God. This is usually rendered by the vulgar Latin, oblatio, and after it by us an offering; but it is properly appropinquatio, a drawing nigh, from בָּרֶק to approach, to draw near. The LXX. render it constantly by ὑψωτος, 'mumus,' a gift; unless it be in Neh. x. 34. xiii. 30. And so 'donum' is rendered by the Evangelist, Matt. v. 23, 24, xv. 5. Usually it is such a gift, as is presented to appease, reconcile, or obtain favour; which amongst men the Hebrews call דָּבָר shochad.' So Plato, δώρα ἅγιοις πείθει, καί αἰ δοτοὺς βασιλην; which the poet translates,

Munera (crede mihi) placant hominesque deosque,
Placatur donis Jupiter ipse datis.

And to this Joash in his parable seems to allude, Judges ix. 13, where he brings in the vine saying, 'Shall I leave my vine, מְלַאֲכָת מְלַאֲכוֹת מְלַאֲכוֹת מְלַאֲכוֹת, delighting God and man,' namely, in sacrifices and gifts; which are a great propitiation, which always ariseth from a savour of rest. Corban then is any gift brought nigh and offered to God in any sort.

Of these offerings or gifts, some were מְלַאֲכָת ishim. מְלַאֲכָת is first mentioned, Exod. xxix. 10. 'Thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar, it is a burnt-offering unto the Lord,' מְלַאֲכָת אָמַר הַכֹּהֵן מְלַאֲכָת לְרֹזֹר מְלַאֲכָת; a savour of rest, a firing unto the Lord; ignitio. Thus all sacrifices were called that were
burned on the altar, either wholly or any part of them. The Greeks, who thought that they had no proper word to express this, as frequently in all their abundance, they are straitened in expressing the signal emphasis of the divine Hebrew, have rendered it in various ways, but none of them are proper, or convey any intimation of the native import of the word. Sometimes they translate it, ἱππασμα, Exod. xxxix. 18, sometimes to the same purpose άσσα, Lev. xi. 13, ii. 2, a sacrifice. Sometimes they translate it καρπωμα, Lev. ii. 9, that is, an oblation, an offering; thus they render it most frequently; but that word signifies primarily the seed of fruit, or the profit made by it, and is applied to oblations only by accommodation; it cannot properly express ἀπολλων, which principally means the sacrifices of beasts, as burnt in the fire. It is then the general name of all sacrifices or gifts burnt on the altar, in part or in whole.

Every ἀπολλων or fire offering, was either δυσχ or ὁμαν. δυσχ zebach the Greeks render constantly by ἱσσα, and words from the same root, that is, a sacrifice of slain beasts. 'Victima, hostia, maacta.' άσσα is to sacrifice by killing; though I know that Eustathius thinks that Homer useth ἱσσα only for ἱππασμα; but its constant use in all authors is to kill in sacrifice. And ἱσσα is properly a slain sacrifice; though it be often used in the Scripture metaphorically. δυσχ properly means the same with δυσχ, teth and zain being easily and often changed, and signifies to kill or to slay. And Elias Levita observes, that it is but twice used, when it doth not directly denote killing. And from this kind of sacrifices had the altar its name, ἰππας 'misbeach,' and so in the Greek ἱππαστρπων. Now of the sacrifices that were ἰππας there were four sorts; 1. ἅλω the burnt-offering; 2. Ἰσσαι the sin-offering; 3. Ἰταιμ the trespass-offering; 4. Μαιας peace-offerings; and in part also the ἱππας or consecration-offerings, &c. as was before observed.

§ 11. ἰππας was the second species of the ἱππας; the word is of an uncertain origin, and various signification. Those who suppose that it respected only offerings of the fruits of the earth, are greatly mistaken. Instances have been given already to the contrary, and more shall be added. Generally learned men deduce the word from ἰππας, that Mem may be esteemed a radical letter, whence in the plural number it is read ἱππας in the misma; which yet is but a feigned radix, no where used in the original, or the Targum: and it is read ἰππας in the Scripture, as Ps. xx. 3. Hence some deduce it from ἰππας, to lead or bring to, making it to agree in its general signification with κόπον corban. Some think it may rather be deduced from ἰππας to refresh, recreate, give rest; because it is called emphatically a savour of rest unto the Lord, Lev. ii. 2. The LXX. sometimes render it μενας, manifesting that they knew not the precise import of the word, and that therefore they left it untranslated. It comprised, as was said, the mincha properly so called, and the δυσχ or drink-offering, and had a place also in the offerings of consecration. And these were the corbanim or oblations, that were ἵσιμ, or fire-offerings, and ἱππας κριμα most holy to the Lord.

§ 12. Of the other sort of offerings, which were only κόπον, 'holliness of praises,' there was no general name; but they were either ἱππας 'terumah,' the heave-offering, or ἱππας 'tenuplah,' the wave-offering, whereof we shall speak afterwards.

§ 13. The matter of all these sacrifices was of three sorts. 1. Beasts. 2. Fowls, or birds. 3. Fruits of the earth, all accompanied with salt and incense. Of beasts there were also three sorts designed to this use and ser-
vice; one of the herds, namely, bullocks; and two of the flocks, 1. sheep, 2. goats. Of fowls or birds, two sorts were used; 1. turtles, 2. pigeons, and it may be sparrows in one case, namely the sacrifice for the cleansing of the leper, Lev. xiv. 4. In all of these, that is, of the beasts, it was required that they should be, 1. Males, unless in the sin and trespass-offering. 2. Without blemish. The fruits of the earth were of all sorts of fruit useful to the life of man. And all these sacrifices from their general ends may be reduced to three heads. For they were all of them either, 1. Propitiatory, as designed to make atonement for sins; or, 2. Eucatolical, to impetrate mercies from God; or, 3. Eucharistical, to return praises to him for mercies received.

§ 14. The first particular sacrifice instituted in the church of Israel, was the מָכֶס, the burnt-offering, Lev. i. I say it was then first prescribed unto that church, after the rearing of the tabernacle, and regulated as to the times, occasions, and seasons of its celebration; for as to the nature of it, it was instituted and observed from the foundation of the world. And it seems to have been the first acceptable sacrifice, namely, that which Abel offered, Gen. iv. 4. For whereas it is expressly said of the offering of Cain, not only that it was mincha, but that it was of the fruits of the earth, that is, a meat-offering; it is said only of Abel, that he brought מְכֶס וּכְרָסִים, ‘of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof;’ that is, either with their fat, or the fat firstlings, the proper matter of this sacrifice. Our apostle calls it his δώρον, his gift, that is, his βρισκόμεν, or free will offerings, as all were before the law; and his δωσις, Heb. xi. 4, the ‘sacrifice that he slew to the Lord.’ But the name is first expressed, Gen. viii. 20, where both the matter and nature also of it is set down; ‘Noah built an altar, and took of every clean beast,’ (bullocks, sheep, and goats) ‘and of every clean fowl’ (turtles and pigeons, as God had instructed him) מַלְכָּס וּכְרָסִים, ‘and offered burnt offerings on the altar.’ So did Job, before the giving of the law, ch. i. 5, which God also prescribed unto his friends, ch. xlii. 8, as did Jethro also in the wilderness, Exod. xviii. 12. And from this sacrifice of Noah, was the rite of whole burnt-offerings derived by tradition to all nations of his posterity; but the end and use of it being lost, in process of time, by the craft of Satan, it became the principal rite of idolatry.

§ 15. The matter therefore of this sacrifice was preserved among the heathen; although they made use of other creatures also, besides those which were allowed in the law of Moses, or were used in sacrifice by any who were guided by divine direction. Their principal solemn sacrifices were of the herd, which therefore they called βουκυνοσ, or buthysia, the sacrifice of oxen, and that of all sorts of kine. Thus Virgil,

Taurum Neptuno, taurus tibi pulcher Apollo.

And he also speaks of the way of offering these bulls or oxen to Neptune, Apollo, and to others of their feigned deities.

Et solida imponit taurorum viscera flammis.

They committed their whole inwards to the flames on the altar; which expresses this Holocaust. And they offered kine of all sorts. So Homer tells us, that Nestor sacrificed ηνυ, that is an heifer or a bullock of one year old, εναυσιαναυυ, says Eustathius; as in many cases the law directed. And the poet adds,

Ην ουπο υπο ζυγον ηγαν ενηρ.
Which none had brought to the yoke, as the same was required in the sacrifices of the law. To the moon they sacrificed a bullock, whose horns turned into the likeness of her first appearance:

—sterilemque tibi Proserpina vaecam.

‘And a barren heifer to Proserpina.’ And Plutarch tells us, that some of the old Egyptians offered a red heifer in sacrifice: this I much doubt; and suppose rather the report to have arisen from the ceremonies of the red cow instituted in the wilderness, when the people came out of Egypt. But whereas an ox was a harmless and useful creature, some of them began at length to suppose that it was not meet to use them in sacrifice. But to keep up the old tradition of this kind of offering, they made a cake, which they called papanon, and fashioned it into the similitude of an ox, and termed it an ox, as Hesychius in παπανον. So the images of idolatrous groves, placed by idolaters in the temple of old are called groves in the Scripture; and the small shrines made for Diana, are called temples.

They sacrificed also sheep, especially lambs, to Jupiter, Minerva, and Diana; and goats or kids to Bacchus. Hence the words of the poet.

Rode caper vites, tamen hinc cum stabis ad aras,
In tua quod spargi cornua possit, erit.
‘The vines, crop by the goat, yet wine suffice
‘To sprinkle him when made a sacrifice.’

Which, as Suetonius testifies, was sarcastically applied to Nero Caesar, upon his foolish edict for the cutting down of vines in Italy. Birds or fowls also they sacrificed without distinction; cocks, geese, turtles, and the like.

§ 17. But besides these things that were of ancient tradition, they added as the matter of their sacrifices, all sorts of living creatures, even such as the law of nature refused, and such as among the Jews were in an especial manner forbidden; and which were never in use among the first fathers of the world, or till after the Babylonian dispersion. Of the first sort was their sacrificing of men, which I have elsewhere shown to have been catholic in the world. Of the latter, to omit horses, dogs, and the like, we may take an instance in that of swine: ἀθυσία, the offerings of swine, was the principal, and as the most of them judged the most ancient kind of sacrifice amongst them. This they constantly used, whether in consecrations, or lustrations, or confirmations of covenants, the most solemn occasions of their sacrifices. So in the first way he speaks in Aristophanes,

Εἰς χοιρίδιον μοι νῦν δανεισον τρεις δραχμας,
Δει γαρ μνημεια με πριν τεθηκεναι.

Money I want a sacred swine to buy;
I would be consecrate before I die.

And in case of lustration or expiation, Plautus speaks to the same purpose in his Menæchmi,

Adolescens quibus hic pretiis porci vencunt sacres sinceri?
Nummum unum en a me accipe; jube te piari mea pecunia;
Nam ego quidem insanum esse te certe scio.

‘Young man, what is here the price of swine fit for sacrifice? take a piece
of silver of me, and get thyself expiated, (or freed from thy malady by sacrifice) with my money; for I know certainly that thou art mad.'

And another concerning covenants:

Cæsa junegnant sedera porca.

'They ratified their covenants by the sacrifice of a female swine.' But this by the way; we return.

§ 18. The nature and manner of it in the church of Israel, is directed, Lev. i. In general as was said, it was בָּשָׂר, 'corban,' a gift brought nigh to God; ver. 3. וַיּכֵר בַּהֲדוֹתָם הָעלְ אָשָׂא; if his 'corban be hola.' It was so called from הָעל, 'hala, ascendit,' to go upward. The LXX. render it for the most part by ὀλοκαυνωμα, or ὀλοκαυνωμα, as doth our apostle ch. x. 6, that which is wholly consumed or burnt, as all such sacrifices were except the skin. For the יִתֵּן mentioned, v. 8, and ch. viii. 20, and no where else in the Scripture, rather signifies the whole trunk of the body after the head was cut off, than the fat of the caul, as we render it. And it is not unlikely that they might make use of the word ὀλοκαυνωμα, because the beginning of it answers in sound to the Hebrew שלם, for that they were at a loss in expressing the names of the particular sacrifices, hath been declared. But שלם signifies to ascend; and because things that do so, do disappear, and seem not to be, it denotes also to consume, or to be consumed; and from either of these significations, this sacrifice, which was wholly burnt, may take its name.

§ 19. In the manner of this sacrifice, it is observable; that he who brought it was to put his hand on the head of it, v. 4. מְכָר מִדֶּרֶךְ יִלּוּ שָׂלָמָּה, ‘and put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering;’ lay them on, that the beast might seem to bear and sustain them; so we, after the vulgar Latin, manus suae, his hands, in the original his hand. And the Hebrews are divided, whether he laid on only one hand, his right hand, or both. In Chap. xvi. 21, where the high priest was to perform this duty in the name of the people, it is said expressly, that he shall put יָדָיוּ הַרְּעָם on both his hands on the head of it: whence most conclude, that both the hands are here also intended. But this seems rather to be an argument to the contrary. For in saying that the high priest, who was to offer for himself as well as the people, in his performance of this work, shall lay both his hands, and when a private person did it, he shall lay on his hand; the Holy Ghost seems to intimate a difference between them in this action. This ceremony was observed only when the offering was of beasts; not when it was of fowls or birds. And when the season of the sacrifice was stated by God's prescription for the use of the people, the priest was to perform this duty. The meaning of the ceremony was, 'quod illorum capiti sit;' typically and representatively to lay the sin of the offerer on the head of the offering; to instruct us in the bearing of our sin by Christ, when through the eternal Spirit he offered himself unto God.

§ 20. Secondly. The beast, now a Corban, by being brought unto the altar, was to be slain. יִמֹּשֵׁט וַעֲשָׂר הָעִבְרָם, ver. 5. 'He shall kill the bullock;' that is, say some, he that brought the offering, was to kill it. For, say they, those that killed the offering, are distinguished from them that took the blood of it, and sprinkled it on the altar, 2. Chron. xxix. 22. 'So they killed the bullocks, and the priests received the blood, and sprinkled it on the altar.' But those slayers seem not to have been the people, but the Levites, who were to assist the priests in their service, Numb. viii. 19, and who in all greater sacrifices did the outward work of killing and
slaying, see 2 Chron. xxxv. 10, 11. It is also said expressly, that they slew the Pascal lamb, 2 Chron. xxx. And to this killing of the bullock, or kid, or lamb, answered the wringing off of the head of the bird, if the burnt-offering were of fowls, which is expressly said to be done by the priest, ver. 15. And of him that kills the offering, ver. 5, it is said, he shall 'flay it and cut it into its pieces,' ver. 6, which was the work of the priests and their assistants.

The place where it was to be killed, was on the north side of the altar, ver. 11. And when it was killed, the blood was taken, or wrung out and sprinkled about the altar, ver. 5, which sprinkling of blood was used in all sacrifices of living creatures, as eminently prefiguring our sanctification, or purifying of our hearts from an evil conscience by the 'sprinkling of the blood of Christ,' Heb. ix. 14, xii. 24.

§ 21. The beast being killed, was flayed and opened; made γυμνόν καὶ πετραχηλίσμενον, naked and opened, to which our apostle alludes, Heb. iv. 13. Afterwards it was cut into pieces, Lev. i. 6, which pieces were salted, chap. ii. 13, and then laid in order on the wood upon the altar, i. 8, as also were the legs and inwards, after they were washed, ver. 9. As our bodies in our approach unto God are said to be washed with pure water, Heb. x. 22. The everlasting fire typical of the eternal Spirit through which Christ offered himself unto God, Heb. ix. 14, being applied by the priest to the wood, the whole was set on fire, Psal. xx. 3, and continued to burn till all was reduced to ashes. The fire might then sometimes burn all night long, though no sacrifice was to be offered but by day, which made them watch for the morning, Psal. cxxx. 6. The different ceremonies used in killing and offering of the fowls, are clearly expressed in the same chapter.

§ 22. The end of this offering was always to make atonement. So the text; רזא ורצזז, Lev. i. 4. 'It shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him: יסכ says one, 'Quod latine vertit expiare, hoc est, Deo aliquem commendare;' it is to commend any one to God. A sense which neither will the word bear, nor the nature of the thing admit: רזא is always, to be accepted; and for what end shall the sacrifice be accepted? יסכ, to appease, atone, to make atonement for him, as we shall show elsewhere; not indeed absolutely, this it could not do, but in a representation, as they were a shadow of good things to come, Heb. x. 1—3, 11.

§ 23. There are reckoned up eighteen times wherein this kind of offering was to be made by express institution; the enumeration of these does not belong to this place. Nine of them refer to particular occasions, the other nine had their fixed seasons, occurring daily, monthly, or annually. Only we may observe that of this kind of offering was the דניר, the juge sacrificium, or continual sacrifice which was offered morning and evening, with the final taking away of which, the church and worship of the Jews utterly ceased, Dan. ix. 27. And as there was a precise command for its being offered morning and evening continually, so in the constant acknowledgment of God therein, in the vicissitudes of night and day, there was such a suitableness to the light and law of nature in it, that it prevailed among the heathen themselves in their idolatrous services; as appears from these words of Hesiod,
And so at Rome, the Pinarii and Potitii sacrificed to Hercules, in Ara Maxima, morning and evening, as Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius testify. The custom, also, of feasts at this sacrifice, to testify mutual love and peace amongst men, was common with Jews and Gentiles. Thus when Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, offered a burnt-offering and sacrifices, Aaron and all the elders of Israel came to eat bread with him before God, Exod. xviii. 12. And in the sacrifices that Agamemnon offered, he called the ancients and princes of the Grecians to a banquet with him, Homer. Iliad, B., as did Nestor likewise with those about him, at his great sacrifice, Odys. G.

§ 24. The next sort of offerings that was regulated in the law, was the מזון המזון, which as it denoted an especial kind of sacrifice, we have from the matter of it rendered a meat-offering, Lev. ii. 1. And this, as was said of the whole burnt-offering before, was not then first instituted and appointed, but only regulated and solemnly approved. For it had been observed from the beginning, and consisting in the fruits of the earth, had a great foundation in the law of nature. Thus Cain brought his נזון מזון 'Mincha' of the fruits of the earth to offer unto God, Gen. iv. 3. And there is no doubt but that as to the kind of it, it was acceptable unto God, as of his own institution, though the person that offered it, for want of faith, was not approved, Heb. xi. 3.

§ 25. The name, as was in part before observed, is of an uncertain origin, and is variously used and applied. Sometimes it is used for a civil gift of men one to another; or a present, 1 Sam. x. 27. Sometimes for any offering or sacrifice. So Abel's sacrifice which was a burnt-offering, is called his מזון מזון Mincha, Gen. iv. 4. Hence it is sometimes rendered in the New Testament by θυσία, 'a sacrifice, a bloody sacrifice,' Mark ix. 49; Acts vii. 42. And our apostle from Ps. xl. 6, renders נזון מזון נזון מזון 'Zebach and Mincha,' by θυσία και προσφορά, Heb. x. 5, 'sacrifice and offering;' by both which terms, sacrifices only of atonement and propitiation were intended, and not the special meat-offering, which was properly eucharistical, and not propitiatory. And the expression in that of the Psalmist, answers directly to what God speaks concerning the house of Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 14. The sin of the house of Eli shall not be expiated, נזון נזון רם מזון רם מזון 'neither by Zebach, nor by Mincha;' that is, by no sort of sacrifices appointed to make atonement, or to expiate sin. So also is the word used, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. But as it denotes the special offering now under consideration, it was not ordinarily appointed to make atonement. I say not ordinarily, because there was an especial dispensation in the case of the poor man, who was allowed to bring flour and oil, the matter of the Mincha, instead of the מזון Asham, or trespass-offering, Lev. v. 11, 12. And yet atonement properly was not made thereby; only in it, or the appointment of it, God testified his acceptance of the person with a non obstante for his trespass. And hence doth our apostle use his σχέδιον, his almost, in this business, Heb. ix. 22, 'Almost all things are purged with blood.' The like allowance was in the offering of the jealous person. It was to consist of barley meal, the matter of the meat-offering; but it made no atonement, for it is expressly said, 'that it was to bring sin to remembrance,' Numb. v. 15. Whereas, every sacrifice of atonement was for the covering of sin, and the casting of it out of remembrance.

§ 26. As the Mincha denotes a peculiar offering, whose laws and ordinances are recorded, Lev. ii. 1, 2, &c., the matter of it was, 1. מזון, Soleth, simila, ver. 7, 'the flour of wheat.' So it is expressed, Ezek. xlv. 13—15. In one case, מזון ופריס, farina hordacea, 'barley-meal,' so we render the word, was used, Numb. v. 15. But מזון Kemach, is properly 'bran, barley-
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bran.' This was the offering in the case of jealousy, God appointing therein the use of barley, the worst of bread corn, and the bran of it, the worst of that grain, prohibiting the addition of oil and frankincense, to testify his dislike of the matter either in the sin of the woman, or the causeless jealousy of the man. 2. Bicurim, prime fruges, frugum primitiae, first-fruits; that is, bijb, corn newly ripened in the ear. 3. Oil. 4. Frankincense. 5. Salt, ver. 1—3, &c. And the use of two things are expressly forbidden, namely, leaven and honey, ver. 11. Hereunto also belongeth the נסיק, Nesek, or drink-offering, which was never used separately, but was an addition of wine to some sacrifices. And the Psalmist shows how this degenerated amongst idolaters, who in their superstitious rage made use of the blood of living creatures, it may be of men, in their 'libamina.' They had חמקים המים, 'drink-offerings of blood,' which he abhorred, Ps. xvi. 3.

§ 27. Now this offering was sometimes offered alone, and then it was of the number of free-will offerings, whose law and manner is prescribed, Lev. ii. For the most part it was annexed to other sacrifices; and it was either stated and general, or occasional and particular. The stated meat-offerings, say some, concerned the whole congregation, and they reckon up three of them. 1. The wave sheaf, Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. 2. The two wave loaves, ver. 17. 3. The daily shew-bread, Lev. xxiv. 5. But whereas we have showed that the דומד, Mincha, was one of the ס massa, or 'fire-offerings,' and also that it was נטוש 'most holy,' Lev. ii. 10, as none of these three were fire-offerings, they belonged unto the Terumah, of which afterwards, and were none of them Mincha, or the meat-offering properly so called. It is true, at the offering of the wave sheaf, and the wave loaf, there was a meat-offering offered unto God, consisting of two tenth deals of Soletb, or wheat-flour mingled with oil, and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink-offering, which were burned in the fire, Lev. xxiii. 13; but the wave sheaf and the wave loaf themselves were a Terumah, and not a Mincha. The particular and occasional offerings of this nature are reckoned to be, 1. The poor man's offering, Lev. v. 11. 2. The jealousy-offering, Num. v. 15. 3. The offering of the priests at their consecration, Lev. viii. 26—28. 4. The high priest's daily meat-offering, Lev. vi. 20. 5. The leper's offering, Lev. xiv. 10. 6. The dedication offering mentioned, Num. viii. But some of these have a participation in the matter, but not in the nature of the especial Mincha. The principal signification of this offering is expressed, Isa. lxvi. 20, compared with Rom. xv. 16, and Mal. i. 10, 11, compared with 1 Tim. ii. 8. And two things in it express the grace of the covenant: First, The handful that was for a memorial; that is, to bring to memory the covenant of God; and secondly, The salt, which declared it firm and stable.

§ 28. To this, as we have said, belongs the נסיק, 'nesek,' which, as directed in the law, was but one part of the Mincha, and is not reckoned among the distinct species of offerings, as they are summed up, Lev. vii. 37. And the reason is, because under the law it was never offered by itself, but in connexion with burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and peace-offerings, to complete the Mincha, or meat-offering that accompanied them. But of old, before the reformation of sacrifices by Moses, it was a distinct offering by itself, Gen. xxxv. 14, 'Jacob offered a drink-offering,' that is of wine, which was its primitive institution and practice. And it was always to be of wine, Num. xv. This, ch. xxviii. 7, is called מזון, Shechar, which although we generally translate 'strong drink,' yet it appears from hence to have been a
strong inebriating wine; and so the most learned of the Jews suppose. We call this Nesek, a drink-offering, in answer to the name we give unto the Mincha, a meat-offering, that is, offerings whose matter was of things to be eaten and drunk. It may be otherwise called a pouring, an offering poured out: Libamen, a sacred effusion. And these offerings were most holy also, Lev. ii. 10.

§ 29. As these offerings of the fruits of the earth were in use among the heathen, the most learned of them did contend, that they were far the most ancient kind of sacrifices amongst men, as Plato says expressly, lib. 6, de Legib.; but we know the contrary from Gen. iv. where the first sacrifices in the world are recorded. The latter Pythagoreans also condemned all other offerings, all that were κυβήρια ερυθρων, of living creatures, as I have elsewhere showed out of Porphyry; though Cicero testifies of Pythagoras himself, that he sacrificed an ox. And whatever was appointed in this meat-offering, they also made use of. Their Far, Mola salsa, φυλεκτή, that is, flour of wheat, or barley mingled with water and salt, is of most frequent mention amongst their sacred things. So also were their placenta and Liba adorea, their cakes made with flour, oil, and honey. What was the use of these in their sacred rites, and also of wine and frankincense, the reader may see at large in the seventh book of Arnobius advers. Gentes.

§ 30. The next solemn sacrifice in the order of their appointment under the law, is that which is called זבח ברכוים, Zebach Shelamim, which we render peace-offerings Lev. iii. 1. It is by translators rendered with more variety than any other word used in this matter. By the Greeks θυσία σωτηρίας, and προσελέγοντος, and ανεμεύνως, and τελευσόντος, 'a sacrifice of salvation, of expiation, of praise, of perfection.' And the Latins have yet more varied their expression of it: 'Sacrificium pacium, perfectionum, gratulationum, salutis, retributionum, integrorum, mundorum, sanctificatorum, immaculatiorum:'—'A sacrifice of peace, of perfection, of thanksgiving, of safety or salvation, of retribution, of them that are clean, or sanctified, or unsullied.' Most of these various expressions also arise from the different signification of the word לשתל, whence most suppose that לשתל was taken. But others think that it comes from לשתל, 'peace, which of late is almost generally received. In general, this sacrifice was corban, a gift or offering brought nigh and dedicated unto God; and מנה, 'a firing,' or an offering by fire; and in specie מנה, 'a sacrifice' from the slaying and killing of the beast that was offered. But it is nowhere said to be מנה לשתל, or 'most holy,' as being merely expressive of moral duties, in a way accommodated to the present economy of divine worship; see Heb. xiii. 15, but it is usually reckoned amongst them that were so.

§ 31. Peace-offerings, as was observed, is the name that hath prevailed, though it respected vows of thanksgiving, or for the impetration of mercies: see Lev. vii. 12—17. The reason given by Jarchi for this appellation, namely, because it brought peace unto the world, is like much of what they say in such cases, a sound of words without any meaning. Kimchi gives a more sober and rational account of it. The מנה, saith he, or burnt-offering, was all of it burned, only the skin was the priests.' The מנה אבק and מנה נמחה, 'sin and trespass-offering,' were burned in part; the breast and shoulder were the priests, and all the flesh that was not burned, as also the skin. But in this sacrifice, מנה לשתל, 'the fat,' ascended on the altar, the breast and shoulder were the priests, and the residue of the flesh belonged to the offerers, that they and their friends might eat it; and so it was a sacrifice of peace among
all parties. If this reason please not, we may choose one of the other significations of the word, as of perfections or retributions, which latter the nature of it inclines unto.

§ 32. The matter of this sacrifice was the same with that of the burnt-offering; namely, as to beasts of the herd, bullocks or heifers; of the flock, goats, rams, lambs, or kids; of fowls, the same with the former, Lev. iii. 6, 7. In the causes of it, it was either a free-will offering for imprecation, or after a vow for thanksgiving or retribution. The appointed seasons and occasions of it were, 1. At the consecration of a priest, Exod. xxix. 2. At the purification of a leper, Lev. xiv. 3. At the expiration of a Nazaretical vow, Num. vi. 14. 4. At the solemn dedication of the tabernacle and temple. The manner of its offering is peculiarly described, Lev. iii., and the observations of the Jews about it, the reader may see in the annotations of Ainsworth on the place.

§ 33. Two things were peculiar to this sacrifice. First, that it is appointed to be offered בֹּאל תִּהְרֹת, Lev. iii. 5, ‘And Aaron’s sons shall burn it on the altar,’ בֹּאל תִּהְרֹת, that is, saith the vulgar Latin in holocaustum, for a burnt offering: as though it were so itself, or substituted in the room of the whole burnt offering. The LXX, ἐπὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυνωματα, upon the burnt-offering. So we, upon the burnt-sacrifice. But what the meaning of that expression is, is not so evident. The Jews say, that the daily burnt-offering is intended, which was always first to be offered, and then immediately upon it, or whilst it was yet burning, the peace-offering was to be added thereunto. It is not, indeed, declared whether the hola mentioned, were the daily burnt-offering or no. Most probably it was so, and that being a sacrifice of atonement rendered this of thankfulness acceptable unto God; see Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

§ 34. Secondly. The peculiar parts of the beast in this sacrifice that were to be burned on the altar, are enumerated; namely, the kidneys and their fat, the fat on the flanks, and the caul of the liver, or the midriff. Hence it is laid down as a general rule, that all ‘the fat is the Lord’s,’ Lev. iii. 14—16. And it is called a perpetual statute for all ‘their generations through all their dwellings, that they should eat no fat,’ ver. 17. But yet this general precept had a double limitation. First, that only that fat which was to be offered, was excepted from eating. Of the other fat diffused through the rest of the flesh, they might eat. Secondly, it was only the fat of beasts appointed to be offered in sacrifice that was forbidden, as it is directly expressed, Lev. vii. 25. Of the fat of other clean beasts they might eat. And this offering of the fat, seems to denote our serving God with the best that we have; which yet is not acceptable, but by virtue of the blood of Christ, as the fat was to be burned in the burnt-offering, or sacrifice of atonement.

§ 35. Of the kind of these ‘shelamim’ were the offerings among the heathen, which they sacrificed either upon any great undertaking which they called εὐοδία, in a way of vow, or upon any success. So Cyrus Minor, Xenophon, and Arrianus in their expeditions sacrificed, ‘sacrificia votiva;’ and the latter sort were in an especial manner provided for in the Pontifical law, as it is reported by Festus. ‘Cujus auspicio classe procineta optima spolia capituntur, Jovi feretrio daritur oportet, et bovem caeido qui capit aries ducet. Secunda spolia in Martis aram in campo, solitaurilia utra voluerit caeido. Tertia spolia Jano Quirino agnum marem caeido, centum qui cepit ex ere dato.’

§ 36. The next sort of sacrifice was the נָצָה, ‘chataathl’ or sin-offering,
whose laws and rites are described, Lev. iv. This sacrifice is not expressly
called a corban, or a gift, it being wholly a debt, to be paid for expiation and
atonement; but being brought nigh unto God, it partook in general of the
nature of the מְנַדֵּר, Corbanim. It was of the מְנַדֵּר, offerings, or fire-offer-
ings expressly, ver. 12, because of the burning of the fat on the altar; and
of course it belonged to the מְנַדֵּר, or slain sacrifices. And also it was of the
מידֵד, or most holy things from its institution and signification.
The name of it is מַכָּאוֹן, Chataath, that is, sin. 'He shall do to the bullock,
as he did,' מַכָּאוֹן, 'to the bullock of the sin;' that is, of the sin-offering
Lev. iv. 20. So Ezek. xlv. 1, 'The priest shall take מַכָּאוֹן, of the
blood of the sin;' that is, the sin-offerring. מַכָּאוֹן Chata in kal is to sin, to
offend, to err from the way, to contract the guilt of sin. Hence
Mַכָּאוֹן, Chataim, are men given up to sin, and wandering in its ways. Psalm i. 1.
In Piel it hath a contrary signification; namely, to purge, to expiate,
to cleanse, to make atonement, to undergo penalty, to make satisfaction, Gen.
xxxiii. 39. 'That which was torn,' saith Jacob to Laban, 'I brought it not
to thee,' מַכָּאוֹן, 'achatennah,' I answered for it; I paid for it, I suffered
the loss of it. See Exod. xxix. 36; Num. xix. 19; Lev. vi. 26. According to
this signification of מַכָּאוֹן, מַכָּאוֹן is used to denote an offering for sin;
that whereby sin is expiated, pardon of it is procured, atonement is made:
so David prays, Ps. li. 7, מַכָּאוֹן, 'thou shalt purge me' with hyssop, as Num.
xix. 19, that is clear me, free me, as by an offering for sin. And this kind
of expression, our apostle retains, not only when he cites from the Old Testa-
mament, as Heb. x. 6, מַכָּאוֹן מֵאָבְכִּי מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּאוֹן מַכָּא

§ 37. The general cause of this sacrifice was sin committed מְנַדֵּר, Lev.
iv. 2, say we through ignorance. So the LXX. εν αγνωσίᾳ; and the vulgar
Latin, per ignorantiam; through ignorance. Some old copies of the Greek
have ακούωνας; not voluntarily; not wilfully; for it had respect to all such
sins, as were not committed so εκουσιως, willingly, wilfully, presumptuously,
as that there was no sacrifice appointed for them, the covenant being disan-
nulled by them, Heb. x. 26. And there is no sin whatever, that is between
this מְנַדֵּר, this sin of ignorance, or error, and sin committed מְנַדֵּר, with
an high hand, or presumptuously. See expressly, Num. xv. 28—30.
Hence this מְנַדֵּר, this sin-offering was the great sacrifice of the solemn day of
expiation, Lev. xvi. whereby atonement was made, 'For all the unclean-
ness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all
their sins,' ver. 16. And upon the head of the live goat, which was a part of
the sin-offering, on that day, there was confessed and laid, all the in-
iquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their
sins, ver. 27. That is all iniquities not disannulling the covenant, which
had ενδοκόν μεθαπεξίων, a revenging recompence allotted unto them, Heb.
ii. 2, And accordingly those words are to be interpreted where the cause of
this sacrifice is expressed, Lev. iv. 2, 'If a soul sin מְנַדֵּר, by error, igno-
rance, imprudently, against any of the commandments of the Lord, as it
ought not to do, and shall do against any of them.' And an instance is given
in him who killed his neighbour without prepense malice, Deut. ix. 4. Any
sin is there intended into which men fall by error, ignorance, imprudence,
incoigitancy, temptation, violence of affections, and the like. For such was this sacrifice instituted. And that which it typically represented is expressed, 1 John ii. 1, 2, 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins;' namely, in the room of, and as represented by the sin-offering of old, whereby atonement and propitiation was typically made for sin. Only there was this difference, that whereas the law of Moses was appointed to be the rule of the political government of the people, wherein many sins, such as adultery and murder were to be punished with death, and the sinner was to be cut off, there were in such cases no sacrifices appointed, nor admitted; but in the sacrifice of Christ there is no exception made of any sin, in those that repent, believe, and forsake their sins; particularly not of those which were excepted in the law of Moses, Acts xiii. 39. So that as the sin-offering was provided for all sin that disannulled not the covenant made at Horeb, which allowed no life nor interest in its blessings to murderers, adulterers, blasphemers, and the like, in the typical land; so the sacrifice of Christ is extended to all sinners who transgress not the terms and tenor of the new covenant, for whom no place is allowed, either in the church here, or in heaven, hereafter.

§ 33. Of the matter of this offering, see Lev. iv. 2. As it differed very little from the matter of the burnt-offering, I shall not particularly insist upon it.

As to the persons that were to bring this offering, there is a general distribution of them in the text comprehensive of all sorts of persons whatever. For it is applied to 1st. The priest; 2nd. The whole congregation jointly; 3rd. The ruler; and 4th. To any of the people of the land; so that none were excluded from the privilege and benefit of this sacrifice.

§ 39. The first person mentioned, is רֹעֵשׁ הָעָם, the anointed priest, Chap. iv. 3, that is, say the Jews generally and our expositors also, שְׁנֵי הָעָם, the high priest, Aaron and his sons that ministered in his room in their succession; for those only, say they, were anointed. But this seems not to be the truth. For if the high priest alone be intended, there is no provision made for any other priest to have an interest in this sin-offering.

For the priests are not comprised in any other class of the distribution of characters before mentioned, particularly not in that in which with any colour they might be looked for, namely, the מַשְׁחַת עֲנֵי, ver. 27, 'The people of the land,' that is, the common people, from whom the priests were always distinguished. Any priest therefore is intended; and רֹעֵשׁ, anointed, is no more but dedicated, separated to the office of the priesthood, or it respects that original anointing which they all had in their fore-fathers the sons of Aaron, when they were first set apart to God; Exod. xxiv.

The case of the priest wherein this sacrifice was allowed him, is expressed in the same place, with words somewhat ambiguous; if הָאֱנוֹמָה, וַיִּלְאַכֵּד הָאָדָם; 'if he sin according to the sin of the people,' so we; Castalio renders the passage, 'si sacerdos inunctus deliquerit in noxiom populi,' 'if the anointed priest so sin, as to bring guilt upon, or damage unto the people.' As Achan did, and David also. Vulg. Lat. 'delinquire faciens populum;' 'causing the people to sin;' which is another sense of the words. And this sense the Jews generally embrace. For they apply this sinning of the anointed priest, to his teaching the people amiss, causing them to err thereby; so Aben Ezra, and others on the place, who are followed by many of ours. But if this be so, the priest was not allowed the benefit of this sacrifice of the sin-offering for any sin of his own, but only when he caused
the people to sin also, which would render his condition worse than theirs, and is contrary to that of our apostle; that the priest was 'to offer for his own sins,' and then for the sins of the people. I would there, in Heb., take צ for כ and render it with our translators, 'according to;' when he sinned as another man of the people; their place and office, not freeing them from the common sins of other men. And so our apostle seems to expound this place; Heb. v. 2, 3. The priests of the law were compassed with infirmities, and by reason thereof, had need to offer sin-offerings for their own sin, as well as for the sins of the people; seeing he also sinned, 'according to the sin of the people.' But it is otherwise now, saith he, with the people of God, ch. vii. 26, 27. Our High Priest being holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, that is, not sinning according to the sins of the people, as the priests did of old.

§ 40. Secondly. The whole congregation jointly had an interest in this sacrifice, when any such sin was committed as might reflect guilt upon it, Lev. iv. 13. For the observance of the law being committed in an especial manner to the whole congregation, there were many transgressions in the guilt of which the whole body of it might be involved.

Thirdly. The ruler (or rulers) had this privilege also, Lev. iv. 22, with respect, as appears by this peculiar institution, to his miscarriages in his office, God graciously providing a relief against the sins of men in their several conditions, that they might not through a consciousness of their infirmities be deterred from engaging in any necessary employment among the people, when called to it.

Fourthly. Any one of the common people had the same liberty, and were obliged to the same duty, Lev. iv. 27. And this distribution of the people, as to their interest in this sin-offering, comprising them all of all ranks, even all that belonged to the congregation of Israel, had its accomplishment in the sacrifice of Christ, from which none are excluded that come to God by him, for 'he will in no wise cast them out.'

§ 41. For the time and season of this sacrifice, it may be briefly observed, that there were solemn and set occasions, some monthly, some annual, wherein it was to be offered for the whole congregation by special command and institution. As, 1. On every new moon. 2. On the fifteenth day of the first month, and seven days together during the feast of unleavened bread. 3. At the feast of first-fruits. 4. At the feast of trumpets. 5. On the day of expiation. 6. On the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and for eight days together during the feast of tabernacles. And the frequent repetition of this sacrifice was to intimate that nothing was accepted with God, but on the account of what was prefigured thereby, namely, that perfect sacrifice which 'took away the sin of the world.' There were also especial occasions of it, with reference to the persons before enumerated, which have been collected by others.

§ 42. The principal ceremony in the manner of its oblation, was the disposal of the blood. For the blood of this sacrifice was disposed of in three ways. The greater part of the blood was poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offerings, in the court before the door of the tabernacle. A part of it was taken and carried by the high priest into the sanctuary, and put upon the horns of the altar of incense, that was therein, Lev. iv. 7. The third part (which was first disposed of) was to be carried into the most holy place, as it was done accordingly on the day of expiation, Lev. xvi. But because it was not lawful for him to enter in thither but once in the year, namely, on that day, at all other times he dipped his
finger in the blood, and sprinkled it seven times towards the veil that parted the most holy place from the sanctuary, Lev. iv. 7. So that every place of the tabernacle, and all that pertained to it, were sanctified with this blood; even as Jesus Christ, who was represented in all this, was dedicated unto God in his own blood, the blood of the covenant, Heb. x. 29. That seven is the number of perfection, greatly used and variously applied in the Scriptures, many have observed. And the perfect cleansing of sin by the blood of Jesus, was evidently represented by this sevenfold sprinkling, Heb. ix. 13, 14; and therefore, in allusion hereunto, it is called the blood of sprinkling, Heb. xii. 24, even that which was prefigured by all the blood of the sacrifices, that was sprinkled towards the most holy place, and the mercy seat there.

§ 43. The next sort of fire-offerings was the ἁέμαν, 'Asham,' whose laws and ordinances are directed, Lev. vi., and the particular occasion of it, ch. vii. We call it the trespass-offering. And it differed very little from that which we have just described. For it is not only said concerning them, as is the 'Chataath,' or sin-offering, so is the 'Asham,' or trespass-offering, there is one law for them, Lev. vii. 7, but also that he who had sinned or trespassed should bring his ἁέμαν, 'his trespass-offering unto the Lord, for his sin which he had sinned, a female from the flock, or a kid of the goats, ἁναστὴμι, for a sin-offering.' Some think that there was a difference between them, and that it lay in this, that the 'Chataath' respected sins of omission, and the 'Asham' sins of commission. But that this will not hold is openly evident in the text. Some think that whereas in both these offerings there was respect unto ignorance, that the ignorance in the 'Chataath' was Jūris, of the right or law, that in the 'Asham' was Facti, of the particular fact. But this opinion also may be easily disproved from the context. This to me seems to be the principal, if not the only difference between them; that the 'Asham' provided a sacrifice in some particular instances, which seem not to be comprised under the general rules of the sin-offering. And hence in a peculiar manner it is said of Jesus Christ, that he should give ἁέμαν ἀναστήμι, 'his soul,' an 'Asham,' or 'particular sacrifice,' as for all, so for such delinquencies and sins as seem to bring a destroying guilt on the soul, Isa. liii. 10. And this kind of offering also was called ἀριστεύς τῶν σάκων, 'most holy,' Lev. vi. 20.

§ 44. The last sort of fire-offerings were the ἡμέλια, which are reckoned as a distinct species of sacrifices, Lev. vii. 36, that is, 'plenitudo, implication, consecrationum,' sacrifices of consecration, or that were instituted to be observed at the consecration of priests. Its name it seems to have taken from the filling their hands, or their bringing their offering in their hands, when they approached to the Lord when set apart to their office. And thence was the expression of him that came to be consecrated a priest: ἡμέλια θαυμάσσοντας ἡμέλια, 2 Chron. xiii. 9: 'He that came to fill his hand with a bullock.' The rise of this expression we have marked before, on Exod. xxviii. 41. The Lord giving directions to Moses for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, he tells him, γεύσασθαι ἁμαρτήματα, 'thou shalt fill their hand,' that is, put the flesh of the sacrifice, with the bread and its appurtenances, into their hands, which, being the initiating ceremony of their investiture with office, gave name afterwards to the whole. And hence the sacrifices appointed then to be offered, although they differed not in kind from those foregoing, yet are accounted to be a distinct offering, and are called ἡμέλια, or fillings. And this may suffice as a brief account.
of the fire-offerings of the law of Moses, in the use of which we are fully instructed in this Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 45. There was also under the law a second sort of Corbans, or offerings to God, which were of things, or parts of things, not burned on the altar, but one way or other consecrated to God and his service. These were the תרומת and ‘Terumoth,’ which we have rendered sometimes offerings in general, and sometimes heave-offerings, under which kind the דתות or ‘wave-offerings’ also were comprised. The consideration of these involves some difficulties, and some things not generally known might have been advanced respecting them; they are also important, as they entered into all the parts of the Old Testament worship. I therefore intended to have discussed this subject at large; but as it is not directly referred to by our apostle in this Epistle, and as these discourses have increased much beyond my first design, I shall here wholly omit all farther disquisition about them.

EXERCITATION XXV.

§ 1. Excellence and usefulness of this Epistle; doctrine of the priesthood of Christ fully revealed and taught therein alone. § 2. This doctrine abstruse and mysterious. § 3. The manner of the handling of it by the apostle; that now proposed. § 4. Doctrine of the priesthood of Christ variously opposed and depraved by Papists, Socinians, and others. § 5. Other reasons of handling it in these excertations. Prefigurations of it.

§ 6. א mężczy A priest. Signification of the word, Ps. lxi. 10. § 7. רב to divine. Divination and prognosis by priests. § 8. Of the priests of Egypt. § 9. Rulers called Cohenim, and why. Cohen properly a sacrificer. § 10. Melchisedec the first priest, a sacrificer; corruption of the Targum. Of his bringing forth bread and wine. The tenth of the spoils offered to God. § 11. Institution of a priesthood under the law to offer sacrifice. A priest and a sacrificer the same.

§ 1. Amongst the many excellencies which render this Epistle to the Hebrews as useful to the church as the sun is to the world, the revelation which it contains concerning the nature, the singular preeminence, and use of the priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ, deserves the first and principal place. For as the whole matter of the sacrifice which he offered, and the atonement which by it he made, and all the inestimable benefits which thus redound to them that do believe, depend solely on the priesthood of our Lord; the excellency of this doctrine must be acknowledged by all who take any interest in these things. It is, indeed, in substance, delivered in some other passages of the books of the New Testament; but yet more sparingly and obscurely than any other truth of similar importance. The Holy Ghost reserved the full statement of it to this Epistle, as to its proper place. And here, when considering the institutions of the Old Testament, and their removal out of the church, he is led most naturally to consider our Lord as the great High Priest, who put an end to all those institutions, by accomplishing that which they typified; and who gives life to all those ordinances of evangelical worship, which were to succeed in their room. When our Lord Jesus said that he came to give his life a ransom for many, Matt. xx. 28, he had respect to the sacrifice which he was to offer as a priest. The same also is intimated, where he is called
the Lamb of God, John i. 29. For he was himself both priest and sacrifice. Our apostle also mentions his sacrifice and his offering of himself unto God, Eph. v. 2; and on the account of this he calls him a propitiation, Rom. iii. 25; and mentions also his intercession, with the benefits thereof, Rom. viii. 34. But the clearest testimony to this purpose is that of the apostle John, who puts together both the general acts of his sacerdotal office, and also intimates their mutual relation, 1 John ii. 2; for his intercession as our advocate with his Father has respect to his oblation, as he was a propitiation for our sins. So the same apostle tells us to the same purpose, that 'he washed us in his own blood,' Rev. i. 5, when he expiated our sins by the sacrifice of himself. These are, if not all, yet the principal places in the New Testament in which immediate respect is had to the priesthood or sacrifice of Christ. But in none of them is he called a priest, or a high priest; nor is he said in any of them to have taken any such office upon him. Neither is the nature of his oblation or intercession explained in them, nor are the benefits which accrue to us from his discharge of this office stated in a particular manner. In the ensuing exposition we shall, with the assistance of God, declare of what concern these things are to our faith, obedience, and consolation; of what use to us in the whole course of our profession, in all our duties and temptations, sins and sufferings. Now for all the knowledge which we have of these and of sundry other evangelical mysteries connected with them, or depending on them; and for all the light which we have into the nature and use of Mosastic institutions, and of the types of the Old Testament, which make so great a part of the Scripture given and continued for our instruction; we are entirely indebted to the revelation made in this Epistle.

§ 2. This doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ, and the sacrifice that he offered, is on many accounts deep and mysterious. This our apostle plainly intimates in sundry passages of this Epistle. With respect hereunto he saith, the discourse he intended was ἐνσυννηστος λέγειν, 'hard to be uttered,' or rather hard to be understood when uttered, ch. v. 11. As another apostle also says, in reference to this doctrine, that there are in this Epistle ἐνσυννηστα τίνα, 2 Pet. iii. 16, 'some things hard to be understood.' Hence he requires that those who attend to this doctrine should be past the condition of living on milk only, or being contented with the first rudiments and principles of religion, and that they should be able to digest strong meat, by having their senses exercised to discern good and evil, ch. v. 12—14. And when he is about to proceed in the explication of it, he declares that he is leading them on to perfection, ch. vi. 1, or to the highest and most perfect doctrines in the mystery of the Christian religion. And in several other ways he manifests his judgment both of the importance of this truth, and of the necessity of knowing it, and also of the difficulty there is in coming to a right and full understanding of it. All these things justify a special and peculiar inquiry into this doctrine of the priesthood of Christ.

§ 3. Now although our apostle, in the excellent method which he has adopted, delivers to us all the material concerns of this sacred office of Christ, yet he has not done it in an entire discourse, but in such a way as his subject-matter and principal design would admit of, and indeed as it required. He does not in any one place, nor upon any one occasion, expressly and teach the whole of the doctrine concerning it; but, as himself speaks in another case, πολυμερος και πολυτροπος, by various parts or degrees, and in sundry ways, he declares the several concerns of it. For this
he did partly as the Hebrews could bear it; partly as the series of his discourse led him to the mention of it, having another general end in view; and partly, as was requisite, for the explanation of the old Aaronical institutions and ordinances, which for the benefit of those who still adhered unto them he aimed at. To have undertaken the consideration of the whole subject, in the exposition of any particular passage, would have interrupted the reader's attention to the scope of the apostle, by the length of the digression. And had I insisted on the several parts of it as they occur, I should have been necessitated to a frequent repetition of the same things; and in neither way could I have given an entire representation of it, by which the beauty and the symmetry of the whole might be made evident. This, therefore, inclined me in the first place to comprise a summary of the entire doctrine concerning it, in these previous excursions. From hence, as the reader may take a prospect of it singly by itself, so he may, if he please, carry much insight with him from it, into the most abstruse passages in the whole Epistle. And this, added to what we have discoursed on ch. i. 2, concerning the kingly right and power of Christ, will give a more full and complete account of these his two offices than, it may be, hath as yet been attempted by any.

§ 4. Moreover, the doctrine concerning the priesthood and sacrifice of the Lord Christ hath in all ages, by the craft and malice of Satan, been either directly opposed or variously corrupted. For it contains the principal foundation of the faith and consolation of the church, which are by him chiefly maligned. In how many things, and by how many ways, it hath been obscured and depraved in the papacy, is generally known. Some of these corruptions we have occasion to consider in our exposition of many passages of the Epistle. For they have not so much directly opposed the truth of the doctrine, as disbelieving the use and benefit of the thing itself to the church; they have substituted various false and superstitious observances, to effect the end for which this priesthood of Christ alone is designed of God. These, therefore, I shall no otherwise consider, but as their opinions and practices occasionally occur to us, either in these excursions, or in the exposition ensuing. But there is a generation of men, whom the craft of Satan hath stirred up in this and the foregoing age, who have made it a great part of their preposterous and pernicious endeavours about religion, to overthrow this whole office of the Lord Christ, and the efficacy of the sacrifice of himself depending thereon. This they have attempted with much subtlety and diligence, by introducing a metaphorical or imaginary priesthood and sacrifice in their room. Thus they would rob the church of its principal treasure, and pretend to supply the use of it from their own fancies. The Socinians are the persons to whom I refer. And there are more reasons than one, why I could not omit a strict examination of their reasonings and objection against this great part of the mystery of the gospel. The reputation of parts, industry, and learning, which the bold curiosity of some hath given to them, makes it necessary, at least upon proper occasions, to obviate the insinuation of the poison of their religious tenets, the circulation of which is promoted by their reputation for learning. Besides, there are not few, even among ourselves, who embrace and do endeavour to propagate their opinions. And the same course, though their faces seem to look another way, is steered by the Quakers, who have at last openly espoused almost all their pernicious tenets: in some things, indeed, they as yet obscure their sentiments in cloudy expressions, through want either of will or skill to make a more
perspicuous declaration of them. And there are others, also, pretending to more sobriety than those before mentioned, who do yet think that these doctrines concerning the offices and mediation of Christ are, if not unintelligible by us, yet not of any great necessity to be insisted on. Such is the esteem in which the mysteries of the gospel are held by some, yea, by many among us. With respect to all these, and for the edification of those that are sober and godly, I esteemed it necessary to handle this whole doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, distinctly and previously to our exposition of the uses of it, as they occur in the Epistle.

§ 5. There are also various things which may illustrate this doctrine, and be useful in the explication of the terms, notions, and expressions which are used in the declaration of it, that cannot directly and orderly be reduced under any single text in the Epistle. Many dawning there were in the world, before the rising of this Sun of righteousness. Many preparations for the actual exhibition of this high priest for the discharge of his office. And some of these tend greatly to instruct us in the nature of this priesthood, as being appointed of God for that purpose. Such was the use of sacrifices, ordained from the foundation of the world, or from the first entrance of sin; and the designation of persons in the church to the office of a figurative priesthood, for the offering of these sacrifices. By these God intended to instruct the church in the nature and benefit of what he would after accomplish in and by his Son Jesus Christ. What belonged then to the rite of sacrificing, and to the Mosaic priesthood, must be taken into consideration, as retaining yet that light in them which God had designed them to communicate. And indeed our apostle himself refers many of the instructions which he gives us in the nature of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, to those institutions which were designed of old to typify and represent them. Besides all these, in the common usages of mankind there may be found traces of this office, and of the discharge of it in general, which deserve our consideration. For although all who were left out of the church's enclosure, through their own blindness, and the craft of him who originally seduced them into an apostasy from God, had, as to their own interest and practice, miserably deprived every thing that belonged to the worship or service of a divine being; yet they still carried along with them something which had its origin in divine revelation, and which had a congruity to the inbred principles of nature. In these, also, where we can separate the wheat from the chaff, what was from divine revelation, or the light of nature, from what was of diabolical delusion or vain superstition, we may discover what is useful and helpful unto us in our design. By these means we may be enabled to reduce all sacred truth in this matter to its proper principles, and direct it to its proper end. For these reasons, though we shall have frequent occasion to insist on this office of Christ, with the proper acts and effects of it, in our ensuing exposition; yet I thought meet to handle the whole doctrine of it apart in preliminary discourses. And let not the reader suppose that he shall be imposed on with the same things, handled in several ways, twice over. For as the design of the exposition is to open the words of the text, to give their sense, with the purpose and arguings of the apostle, applying all to the improvement of our faith and obedience, whereof nothing will here fall under our consideration; so what may be here discoursed historically, philosophically, dogmatically, or critically, will admit of no repetition or rehearsal in the expository part of our endeavours. These things being premised, as was necessary, we now proceed to the work before us.
§ 6. Our Lord Jesus Christ is prophesied of in the Old Testament, under the name of Cohen: Psal. cx. 4, Thou art Cohen for ever. And Zech. vi. 13, and he shall be Cohen upon his throne. We render it in both places a priest, that is iereus, Sacerdos. In the New Testament, that is in this epistle, he is frequently said to be iereus and arxierus, which we likewise express by priest and high-priest; Pontifex, Pontifex Maximus. The meaning of these words must be first inquired into.

§ 7. יֵרֵעַ the verb is used only in Piel, Cohen: and it signifies Sacerdotio fungi, or Munus Sacerdotale exercere; to be a priest, or to exercise the office of the priesthood; ierophyew. The LXX. mostly render it by ieratenvo, which is Sacerdotio fungor, to exercise the priestly office; although it be also used in the inauguration or consecration of a person to the priesthood. Once they translate it by leitouweg, 1 Chron. xi. 23, 'in sacris operari,' to serve and minister in or about sacred things. ierophyew is used by our apostle in this sense, and applied to the preaching of the gospel, Eic to eivai me leitouwvov Iesou Khrystov eis ta eivn ierouphwnta to evaygeiou tou Theou, Rom. xv. 16. Here it means Employed in the sacred ministration of the gospel. He useth both leitouweg and ierophyew metaphorically, with respect to the προσφορά or sacrifice which he made of the Gentiles, which was also metaphorical. And ieratenvo is used by Luke with respect to the service in the Jewish temple, chap. i. 8, for originally both the words have respect unto proper sacrifices. Some would have the word יֵרֵעַ to be ambiguous, and to signify ' officio fungi, aut ministrale in sacris aut politicis,' to discharge an office, or to minister, either in things sacred or political. But no instance can be produced of its use to this purpose. Once it seems to be applied unto things not sacred: Isa. lxi. 10. יֵרֵעַ יָדָא נַע מֵא ה. 'As a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments,' or adorneth himself with beauty, that is beautiful garments. If the word did originally and properly signify to adorn, it might thence be applied to the exercise of the office of the priesthood, seeing the priests therein were by special institution to be clothed with garments יִרְפָּי לָצָא פָּר לָיֵי הָל וְחֶלֶב Exod. xxviii. 40, for glory and for beauty. So the priests of Moloch were called Chemarim, from the colour of their garments, or their countenances made black with the soot of their fire and sacrifices. But this is not the proper signification of the word. But as the priesthood was to be exercised in beautiful garments and sundry ornaments, the word was thence employed to express adorning. The LXX. render it by περιτιθημι, but withal acknowledge somewhat sacerdotal in the expression; ύς νυμφιν περιεβεβηκε μοι μιτραν; 'He (that is God) hath put on me a mitre as on a bridegroom,' which was a sacerdotal ornament. And Aquila, as a bridegroom, ιερατευομενος στεφανος, bearing the crown of the priesthood, or discharging the priest's office in a crown. And the Targum, observing the peculiar application of the word in this place, adds רָבָא אֵלֶה נָחָת, and as an high priest is adorned. All agree that an allusion is made to the garments and ornaments of the high priest. The place may be rendered, As a bridegroom, He (that is, God the bridegroom of the church) doth consecrate me with glory,' gloriously set me apart for himself. The word יֵרֵעַ therefore is sacred; and though it is sometimes transferred to signify other persons, as we shall see afterwards; yet יֵרֵעַ properly is only used in a sacred sense.

§ 8. The Arabic יֵרֵעַ Cahan is to divine, to prognosticate, to be a soothsayer, to foretel; and יָנָכ Caahan is a diviner, a prophet, an astrologer, a figure caster. It came to be used in these last senses, after the priests had
generally taken themselves to such arts, partly curious, partly diabolical, by the instigation of the false gods to whom they ministered. Homer puts them together, as they came afterwards mostly to be the same.

ΔΛΛ' αγε δη μαντιν ερειομεν η ιερεια
Η και ονυροπολον.

'A prophet, or a priest, or an interpreter of dreams.' To the same purpose we read in Herodotus, Μαγος και αστρονομος τε και ιερος μετετεμπετο, Herod. lib. 4. 'He sent for magicians, astronomers, and priests; for ιερος is a priest.' The priests first gave out oracles and divinations in the temples of their gods; and from them proceeded a generation of impostors, who exceedingly infatuated the world, with a pretence of foretelling things to come, of interpreting dreams, and with doing things uncouth and strange, to the amazement of the beholders. And as they all pretended to derive their skill and power from the gods, whose priests they were, so they invented or had suggested to them by Satan, various ways and means of divination, or of attaining the knowledge of particular future events. From those ways to which any of them were chiefly addicted, they derived their names. Generally they were called wisemen, as those of Egypt, Gen. xli. 8, and of Babylon, Dan. ii. 12, 13. Hence we render μαγος, the followers of their arts, wisemen, Matt. ii. 1. Among the Egyptians they were divided into two sorts, μεσταις γεραι' and ἄραμειν, Exod. vii. 11.; the head of one sort, probably in the days of Moses, being Jannes, and of the other Ιαμβρης, 2 Tim. iii. 1. We call them magicians and sorcerers. Among the Babylonians there is mention of these, and two sorts more are added unto them, namely, προφηται and σαραίας, Dan. ii. 2. Of the difference and distinction among these, we shall treat afterwards. From this practice of the generality of priests, did ἵνα come to signify to soothsay or divine.

§ 9. Ἰερεια is then a priest. And he who was first called so in the Scripture, probably in the world, was Melchisedec, Gen. xiv. 18. On what account he was so called, shall be afterwards declared. Sometimes, though rarely, it is applied to express a priest of false gods; as of Dagon, 1 Sam. v. 5, of Egypt, Gen. xli. 45, 'Joseph married the daughter of Potiphera ἱερεια of On,' that is, Heliopolis, the chief seat of the Egyptian religious worship. Nor is there any colour why the word should here be rendered prince, as it is מפרוש by the Targum. The Latin version renders the word here by sacerdos, and the LXX. by ἱερευς; for the dignity of priests, especially of those who were eminent among them, was not less at that time in Egypt, and in other parts also of the world, than that of princes of the second sort; yea, we shall consider instances afterwards, wherein the kingly and priestly offices were conjoined in the same person, although none ever had the one by virtue of the other, but for some special reason. It was therefore intended by Pharaoh, as an honour to Joseph, to be married to the daughter of the priest of On. For the man, according to their esteem, was wise, pious, and honourable; seeing the wisdom of the Egyptians at that time consisted principally in the knowledge of the mysteries of their religion; and they who excelled in this knowledge of the mysteries of their religion; and they who excelled in this knowledge, were exalted, and esteemed honourable. Nor can it be pleaded against this exposition, that Joseph would not marry the daughter of an idolatrous priest, for all the Egyptians were no less idolatous than their priests. And he might as soon
convert one of their daughters to the true God, as the daughter of any other Egyptian, which most probably did happen, and she would thus become a mother in Israel. In other places where, by נדה an idolatrous priest, is intended, the Targum, renders it by נזרו, Comara, whence are Chemarim. Yet the Syriac translator of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls a priest, and a high priest, even when applied unto Christ, נזרו and נזרו, though elsewhere in the New Testament he useth נזרו Chahana constantly. The reason hereof I have declared elsewhere.

§ 10. It is confessed that this name is sometimes used with respect to princes of a second rank or degree, but is never once applied to a chief supreme prince, or a king, though some kings, by virtue of some special warrant, were Cohanim also. The Jews therefore, after the Targum, offer violence to the text, Ps. cx. 4, where they would have Melchisedec to be called a Cohen, because he was a prince. But it is said expressly he was a king. Now no king on account of his kingly office was ever called Cohen. But unto those of a second rank it is sometimes accommodated. 2 Sam. xx. 26, 'Ira the Jairite was נזרו נזרו a chief ruler (say we) about David.' A priest he was not, nor could be; for as Kimchi on the place observes, he is called the Cohen of David; but a priest was not a priest to one man, but to all Israel. So David's sons are said to be Cohanim, 2 Sam. viii. 18. יבnée דרוי רחל, 'and the sons of David were Cohanim;' that is princes; though the Vulgate render it sacerdotes. So also Job xii. 19, we translate it princes. And in those places, the Targum useth ראוב, Rabba: the LXX. sometimes ἀνάρεψις, 'a principal courtier,' and sometimes συνετος, 'a counsellor.' It is granted then, that princes were called נזרו נזרו, not properly however, but by way of allusion, as being persons of dignity; for the most ancient dignity was that of the priesthood. And the same name is therefore used metaphorically to express especial dignity, Exod. xix. 6, ויהי נזרו, 'and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests,' speaking of the whole people. This Peter renders, βασιλεῖον ἐρατεύμα, 1 Pet. ii. 9, a kingly or royal priesthood. The name of the office is רכוב, Exod. xlv. 13, ἐρατεύμα, 'pontificatus sacerdotium, the priesthood. Allowing therefore this application of the word, we may inquire what is the first proper signifies of it. I say therefore that נזרו, Cohen, is properly סנִכְו, 'a sacrificer;' nor is it to be expounded otherwise in any passage, unless it is obvious that it is there used in a metaphorical sense.

§ 11. He who is first mentioned as vested with this office, is Melchisedec, Gen. xiv. 18, 'לעליו נזרו נזרו, and he was a priest unto the most high God.' The Targumists make a great difference in rendering the word נזרו. Where it intends a priest of God properly they retain it, נזרו and נזרו. Where it is applied to a prince or ruler, they render it by ראוב, Rabba; and where an idolatrous priest, by נזרו. But in this matter of Melchisedec they are peculiar. In this place they use משלמה, Meshamesh, נזרו משלמה חסלא נזרו, 'and he was a minister before the high God.' And by this word they express the ministry of the priests, Exod. xix. 22, נזרו נזרו נזרו נזרו, 'the priests who draw nigh to minister before the Lord;' whereby it is evident that they understood him to be a sacred officer, or a priest to God. But in Ps. cx. 4, where the same word occurs to the same purpose, they render it by ראות, 'a prince or great ruler;' 'Thou art a great ruler, like Melchisedec,' which is a part of their evident corruption of that Psalm, with the design of applying it to David. For the author of that Targum lived after they knew full well how the prophesy in that Psalm was applied in our books, and by Christians to the
Messiah; and how the ceasing of their law and worship was from thence invincibly proved in this Epistle. This led them to a malicious perversion of the words in their paraphrase, although they durst not violate the sacred text itself. But the text is plain: Melchisedec was Cohen to the high God; that is, he was a priest, or one that was called to the office of solemnly sacrificing to God; for he that offereth not sacrifices to God, is not a priest to him, for this is the principal duty of that office, from which the whole receives its denomination. That he offered sacrifices, those of the church of Rome would prove from those words, Gen. xiv. 13. דנהו אָנָּה יֵלְכִּישֶדֶכָּא 'he brought forth bread and wine.' But neither the context nor the words will support them in this; nor if they could prove what they intend, would it serve their purpose. Coming forth to meet Abraham, (as our apostle expounds this passage, ch. vii. 1,) he brought forth bread and wine for the relief and refreshment of himself and his servants, as a supply, supposing them wearied by their travel. So dealt Barzillai the Gileadite with David and his men in the wilderness, 2 Sam. xvii. 27—29. They brought out necessary provision for them, for they said, 'The people is hungry, and weary, and thirsty in the wilderness.' And Gideon punished them of Succoth and Peniel for not doing the like, Judges viii. 5, 8, 10, 17. But the aim of these men, is to find some countenance to their pretended sacrifice of the mass, which yet is not of bread and wine, for before the offering, they suppose them to be quite changed into the substance of flesh and blood. The weakness of this pretence shall be elsewhere more fully declared. At present it may suffice to observe, that נְפֶס is no sacred word, or that it is never used to express the offering of any thing to God. Besides, if it were an offering he brought forth, it was a מָזִיק, or meat-offering, with a בָּשׂ, or a drink-offering, being of bread and wine. Now this was only an acknowledgement of God the Creator as such, and was not an immediate type of the sacrifice of Christ, which was represented by those offerings alone, which being made by blood, included a propitiation in them. But that Melchisedec was by office a sacrificer, appears from Abraham's delivering up unto him, הַמִּלְפֶּרֶד הַמַּכֶּל, Gen. xiv. 20, 'the tenth of all;' that is, as our apostle interprets the place, הוֹנַא אָכְרֹדִיִיוֹנֵו, of the spoils he had taken. נְפֶס is a sacred word, and denotes God's portion according to the law. So also those who had only the light of nature, and it may be some little knowledge of what was done in the world of old, whilst God's institutions were of force among men, did devote and sacrifice the tenth of the spoils they took in war. So Camillus framed his vow to Apollo, when he went to destroy the city of Veii, 'Tu quoque, Pythica Apollo, tuoque munime instinctus, pergo ad delendum urbem Veios, tibiique hinc decimam partem predae voveo.'

The like instances occur in other authors. אכָרְוָדִיִיוֹנֵא is not used for the spoils themselves any where but in this place. In other authors, according to the derivation of the word, as it signifies the top or uppermost part of a heap, it is used only for that part or portion of spoils taken in war, which was devoted and made sacred, Herod, lib. 1, אֶתְו קֵד אָכְרֹדִיִיוֹנֵא. And again, lib. 8, פְּרֹומְא מֵאֶנ קַוֵל אכְרֹדִיִיוֹנֵא אָכְרֹדִיִיוֹנֵא. 'They took out the dedicated spoils for the gods.' And the reason why our apostle useth the word for the whole spoils, whence a tenth was given to Melchisedec, is because the whole spoil was sacred and devoted unto God, whence an honorary tenth was taken for Melchisedec; as the priests had afterwards out of the portion of the Levites, for all Levi was now to be tithed in Abraham. Among those spoils, there would, without doubt, be many clean beasts meet for sacrifice. For the principal
riches of those days consisted in flocks and herds, and these of course were the principal spoils of war, Num. xxxi. 32, 33. And because Saul knew that part of the spoils taken in lawful war was to be given for sacrifices unto God, he made that his pretence of saving the fat cattle of the Amalekites, contrary to the express command of God, 1 Sam. xv. 15. Abraham therefore delivered these spoils unto Melchisedec, as the priest of the high God, to offer in sacrifice for him. And although the pre-eminence of Melchisedec, and his being the first and only priest in office, by virtue of a special call from God, was the principal consideration, yet perhaps Abraham was induced to give him the tenth of the spoils, from this consideration also, namely, because as he had just come from the slaughter of many kings, and of their numerous army, he was not yet prepared for this sacred service. For even among the heathen, they would abstain from their sacred offices after the shedding of blood, until they were one way or other purified to their own satisfaction. So in the poet:

Tu Genitor cape sacra manu patrjosque penates;
Me bello e tanto digressum et cande recenti
Attracte nefas, donec me fulmine vivo
Abluero.

§ 12. The matter is made yet more evident, by the solemn erection of a priesthood among the ancient people of God, or the church in the wilderness. Sacrificing had, from the foundation of the world, been hitherto left at liberty. Every one who was called to perform any part of solemn religious worship, was allowed to discharge that duty also. But it pleased God, when he reduced his church into a peculiar order, to represent more conspicuously, by the appointment of a peculiar order by priesthood, what he would afterwards really effect in Jesus Christ. And, although this respected in general, τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεον, all things that were to be done in the service of God on the behalf of the people, yet the especial work and duty belonging unto it was sacrificing. The institution of this office we have, Exod. xxviii., whereof afterwards. And now the right to offer sacrifices was restricted to the priests, as soon as the office began to be discharged by them. And these two things are to be observed respecting the office of the priests:

1. That they were sacrificers. And,
2. That they only were so.

Which answers all that I intend to evince from this discourse; namely, that a priest is a sacrificer. Whereas, therefore, it is foretold that the Messiah should be a priest, and he is said so to be, the principle meaning of it is, that he should be a sacrificer; one that had right, and was called, to offer sacrifice to God. This was that for which he was principally and properly called a priest; and when he did act as a priest, then the right of sacrificing is confined to himself alone.

This is the general notion of a priest amongst all men throughout the world; and a due consideration hereof, is of itself sufficient to repel all the vain imaginations of the Socinians about this office of Christ, whereof we shall treat afterwards.
EXERCITATION XXVI.

§ 1. Of the origin of the priesthood of Christ. The eternal counsels of God; how to be inquired into. § 2. No priest or sacrifices in the state of innocence. § 3. Priesthood and sacrifices related. § 4. The nature of the office of the priesthood, Heb. v. 1, explained. § 5. In the state of innocence some might have acted for God towards men, none for other men towards God. § 6. No sacrifices in that state. To sacrifice is properly to slay. § 7. Killing essential to sacrifices. § 8. No revelation concerning sacrifices before the fall. § 9. Opinion of some that the Son of God should have been incarnate if man had not sinned. Of the necessity of sacrifices in all religious worship. § 10. Pretences of reasons for the incarnation of Christ, without respect to sin or grace. § 11. The whole unwritten. § 12. Contrary to what is written. § 13. And destitute of countenance from spiritual reason. § 14. Pleas of the Pelagians and ancient schoolmen for the incarnation of the Son of God in the state of innocence. Their first argument from the glory of God and good of the universe, proposed and answered. § 15. The second argument from the capacity of the human nature for the grace of union in the state of innocence, answered. § 16. The mystery of the incarnation not revealed to Adam in the state of innocence. The meaning of those words, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh. § 17. The order of God's decrees concerning his glory in the salvation of mankind, considered. No order of them to be conceived that is consistent with the pre-ordination of the incarnation, without respect to sin and redemption. § 18. The arguments of Osiander. The Son, how the image of the Father. The order of subsistence and operation in the Trinity. Christ, how the head of angels and men. § 19. The image of God in man, wherein it consisted. § 20. How Adam was made in the image of Christ, and Christ made in the image of Adam. § 21. The incarnation, how occasioned by the fall. § 22. The Son of God, the head of angels and men, had not sin entered into the world. § 23. No sacrifices in the state of innocence. Bellarmín's arguments for the necessity of a proper sacrifice in all religion. § 24. The mass not proved a sacrifice thereby. The use and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ in our religion. § 25. An answer to Bellarmín's arguments. His general assertion overthrown by his own instances. § 26. The conclusion.

§ 1. We have seen that Jesus Christ is a priest, that as such he was prophesied of under the Old Testament, and that he is declared so to be in the New. The origin of this office, is in the next place to be inquired after. This all will acknowledge in general, to lie in the eternal counsels of God. For known unto him are all his works from the foundation of the world, Acts xv. 18. But these counsels, absolutely considered, are hid in God, in the eternal treasures of his own wisdom and will. What we learn of them is by external revelation and effects. 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law,' Deut. xxix. 29. God frequently sets bounds to the curiosity of men, as in the station at Sinai, limits are fixed to the people that they should not gaze after his unrevealed glory, nor pry into the things which they have not seen. It was well said, that Scrutator Majestatis absorbetur a Gloria. Our work is to inquire wherein, how, and whereby God hath revealed his eternal counsels, to the end that we may know his mind, and fear Him for our good. And so even the angels desire to bow down, and to look into these things, 1 Pet. i. 12, not in a way of condescension, as things in their nature beneath them, but in a way of humble diligence, as into things which in their holy contrivance are
above them. Our present design therefore, is to trace those discoveries which God hath made of his eternal counsels in this matter, and that through the several degrees of divine revelation whereby he advanced the knowledge of it, until he brought them to their complement in the external exhibition of his Son, clothed in human nature, with the glory of this office, and discharging the duties thereof.

§ 2 The counsels of God concerning us, with our relation to him and his worship, are suited to the state and condition wherein we are; for these also are effects of his counsels. Our first condition under the law of creation was a condition of innocence and natural righteousness. In reference to this estate, God had not ordained an establishment of either priest or sacrifice; for as they would have been of no use therein, so there was nothing supposed in that condition, which might be prefigured or represented by them. Wherefore God did not preordain the priesthood of Christ with respect to the obedience of man under the law of creation; nor did he appoint either priesthood or sacrifice, properly so called in that state of things, whilst it did continue; nor would any such have ever been, supposing it had continued. And this we must confirm against the opposition of some.

§ 3. We have declared in our preceding discourse, that a priest, properly so called, is a sacrifter. There is, therefore, an indissoluble relation between these two, namely, priesthood and sacrifice; and they do mutually assert or deny each other. And where the one is proper, the other is so also; and where the one is metaphorical, so is the other. Thus, under the Old Testament, the priests who were properly so by office, had proper carnal sacrifices to offer; and under the New Testament, believers being made priests unto God, in a spiritual and metaphorical sense, their sacrifices also are spiritual and metaphorical. Wherefore, arguments against either of these, conclude equally against both. Where there are no priests there are no sacrifices; and where there are no sacrifices there are no priests; I intend only those who exercise the office of the priesthood for themselves and others. I shall, therefore, first manifest that there was no priesthood to be in the state of innocence, whence it would follow, that therein there could be no sacrifice. And secondly, That there was to be no sacrifice, properly so called; whence it will equally follow, that there was no priesthood therein. That which ensues on both is, That there was no counsel of God concerning either priesthood or sacrifice in that state or condition.

§ 4. Πας γὰρ αρχιέρευς, εἶς ανθρωπῶν λαμβανομένος, ὑπὲρ ανθρωπῶν καθισταται τα προς τόν θεόν; ἵνα προσφέρῃ ἑώρα τε καὶ ζυσίας ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίων; saith our apostle, Heb. v. 1. What is here affirmed of the high priest (חנכפִּי קדש) is true in like manner concerning every priest. Only, the high priest is here mentioned by way of eminence, because, by him our Lord Christ, as unto this office, and the discharge of it, was principally represented. Every priest, therefore, is one εἶς ανθρωπῶν λαμβανομένος, taken from amongst men; he is nature humana particeps, in common with other men partaker of human nature; and antecedently unto his assumption of his office, he is one of the same rank with other men; and he is taken or separated unto this office from among them. He is vested with his office by the authority, and according to the will of God. This office, therefore, is not a thing which is common to all, nor can it take place in any state or condition, wherein the whole performance of divine service is equally incumbent on all individually. For none can be taken from among others, to perform that, which those others are every one obliged personally to attend unto. But
every priest, properly so called, κασισταται ὑπὲρ ανθρωπών, is ordained and appointed to act for other men. He is set over a work in the behalf of those other men from among whom he is taken. And this is, that he may take care of and perform τὰ πρῶς τῶν Θεοῦ, the things that for men are to be done with God, καὶ ἀνάληψις; that is, to pacify, to make atonement and reconciliation. And this he was to do by offering ἡμείς τε καὶ διευθεστή unfairly sorts of gifts and sacrifices, according to God's appointment. Now, all slain sacrifices, as we shall manifest afterwards, were for sin. This office, therefore, could have no place in the state of innocence; for a state of innocence will not admit of an accommodation of any part of this description of the priesthood.

§ 5. I acknowledge that in the state of uncorrupted nature, there should have been some ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὰ πρῶς τοὺς ανθρωποὺς; to deal with others for and in the name of God; for some would have been warranted and designed to instruct others in the knowledge of God, and of his will. This, the state and condition of mankind did require. For, both the first relation of man and wife, and that which was to ensue thereon, of parents and children, include subordination and dependence. 'The head of the woman is the man,' 1 Cor. xi. 3, that is, the husband, Eph. v. 23. And the duty of the man it had been to instruct the woman in the things of God. For a pure nescience of many things that might be known to the glory of God and their own advantage, was not inconsistent with that estate; and their knowledge was capable of objective enlargements. And the design of God was gradually to instruct them in the things that might orderly carry them on to the end for which they were created. And in this, the man would have been used for the instruction of the woman, as the order of nature required. For man was originally the head of the woman; only upon the curse, natural dependence was turned into troublesome subjection, Gen. iii. 16. But the entrance of sin, as it contained in it the seeds of all disorder, so it plainly began in the destruction of this order: for the woman, undertaking to learn the mind of God from herself and the serpent, was deceived, and was first in the transgression, 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, 'Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.' From Adam's being first formed, and the woman out of him, and for him, she from this should have learned her dependence on him for instruction, by divine institution. But going to learn the mind of God of the serpent, she was deceived. She might have learned more than she yet knew, but this she should have learned of him who was her head by the law of creation. This case is the same as to the other relation that would have been between parents and children; yea, in this the dependence was far greater, and more absolute. For, although the woman was made out of the man, which argues subordination and dependence, yet she was made by the immediate power of God, man contributing no more to her being than the dust did to his. This gave them in general an equality. But children are so of their parents, as to be wholly from them, and by them. This makes their dependence and subjection absolute and universal. And, whereas parents were in all things to seek their good, which was one of the prime dictates of the law of nature; they were in the name and stead of God, to rule, govern, and instruct them; and that in the knowledge of God, and of their duty towards him. They were ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ, for God, ἐπὶ in his stead to them, to instruct them in their duty, suitably to the law of their creation and the end thereof. But every one thus instructed, was in his own name and person to attend to the things
of God, or to what was to be performed on the part of men. For, in reference to God, there would have been no common root or principle for men to stand upon. Whilst we were all in the loins of Adam, we stood all in him, and we also fell all in him, εφ' ψ πάντες ἡμαρτον, Rom. v. 12. But so soon as any one should have been born into this world, and so should have had a personal subsistence of his own, he was to stand by himself, and to be no more as to his covenant interest, concerned in the obedience of his progenitors. For the covenant of mankind would have been distinct with each individual, as it was with angels. There might have been, there would have been order, subordination, and subjection among men in respect of things from God unto them. So, probably, there is among the angels, although the investigation thereof be neither our duty nor in our power. But as was said, every one according to the tenor of the covenant then in force, was in his own person to discharge all duties of worship towards God. Neither could any one be taken from the rest of mankind, to discharge the works of religion towards God for them, in the way of an office, for this would have been to the prejudice of their right, and to the hindrance of their duty. It follows, therefore, that the office of a priest, or of one who should be ordained ὑπερ αὐτων τα προς τον θεον; was inconsistent with the nature of that condition: and if any such office been possible, there would not have been in it any prefiguration of the priesthood of Christ, as will afterwards appear.

§ 6. The same is the state of things with reference unto sacrifices. There is, as was said before, a relation between them and the priesthood. Hence is that saying in Bereshith. Rabb. המה הכהן, as is the altar of sacrifice, so are the priests that belong unto it. And by sacrifices in this inquiry, we understand those that are properly so; for that which is proper in every kind, is first. Nor is there any place for that which is improper, or metaphorical, unless something proper, from whence the denomination is taken, have preceded; for an allusion thereunto doth the metaphor consist. Now the first possible instance in this matter, being in the state about which we inquire, there must be proper sacrifices therein, or none at all; for nothing went before, with respect whereunto any thing might be so called; as now our spiritual worship and service is, with allusion unto them under the Old Testament.

And concerning these sacrifices, we may consider their nature and their end. A sacrifice is תָּוָא: that is,_svma, 'victimia; sacrificium mactatum'; a slain or killed offering; yea, the first proper signification of תָּוָא is 'mactavit, jugulavit, decollavit,' to kill, to slay by the effusion of blood, and the like. Neither is this signification derived from its affinity to תָּוָא, to kill or slay, (the change of י and ו being frequent, as in the Chaldee it is almost perpetual) but it is its own native signification. Gen. xxxi. 54, תָּוָא יְָהָא תָּוָא יְָהָא. Say we, Jacob offered sacrifices. Junius, 'Mactavit animalia,' He slew beasts; which we follow in the margin, he killed beasts. Targum, תָּוָא תָּוָא is to kill or slay, and is constantly so used; and תָּוָא is no more than 'mactatio,' a slaughter; but because all sacrifices were offered by slaying, it is applied to signify a sacrifice also; so Isa. xxxiv. 6. It is true, there was a covenant made between Jacob and Laban; and covenants were sometimes confirmed by sacrifices with a feast of the covenancers ensuing thereon. But it is not likely that Jacob and Laban would agree in the same sacrifice, who scarcely owned the same God. It is therefore only the provision and entertainment that Jacob made for Laban and his company, for which he slew the cattle, that is intended. Otherwise the
sacrifice would have been mentioned distinctly from the feast. So are these things expressed; Exod. xviii. 12. And so הוב is rendered by us to kill or slay absolutely, 1 Sam. xxxviii. 24; Deut. xii. 15, 16; 1 Kings xix. 21. i. 9, and so also ought it to be translated Numb. xxii. 40, where in our version it is offered. הוב the substantive is also 'mactatio, jugulatio, occasio:' so Isa. xxxiv. 6; Zeph. i. 7, which James expresseth by σφαγη chap. v. 5. And זרכוב are absolutely no more than σφαγα; as from the slaughtering of the sacrifices, the altar is called זרכוב. θνω also, and סואא, do no otherwise signify, but to sacrifice, or sacrifice by mactation or killing.

§ 7. It is therefore evident, that there neither is nor can be any sacrifice, properly so called, but what is made by killing or slaying of the thing sacrificed. And the offerings of inanimate things under the law, as of flour, or wine, or the fruits of the earth, were improperly so called, in allusion unto, or, by virtue of their conjunction with proper sacrifices. They might be תול offerings or ascensions, but כיוב sacrifices they were not: And the act of sacrificing doth principally consist in the mactation or slaying of the sacrifices, as shall afterwards be manifested. And whereas the word obligation, when used about sacrifice, is commonly apprehended to consist in the actings of the sacrificer after the killing of the sacrifice or victim; it is so far otherwise, that it principally consists in bringing of it to be slain, and in the slaying itself; all that follows belonging to the religious manner of testifying faith and obedience thereby. This also discovers the proper and peculiar end of sacrifices, properly so called; especially such as might prefigure the sacrifice of Christ, to which our present discourse is confined. All such sacrifices must respect sin, and an atonement to be made for it. There never was, nor ever can be, any other end of the effusion of blood in the service of God. This the nature of the action, (quod in ejus caput sit) and the whole series of divine institutions in this matter do manifest. For to what end should a man take a creature which is in his possession, which also he might use to his advantage, and slaying it, offer it up unto God; if not to confess his guilt, or somewhat for which he desired to die; and to represent a commutation of the punishment due unto him, by the substitution of another in his place, according to the will of God? And this showeth that no sacrifice which could be prefigurative of the sacrifice of Christ, could be offered in paradise, or in a state of innocence. For as there should have been there no bloody mactation of our fellow-creatures, so a supposition of sin there implies an express contradiction:

§ 8. Again, Sacrifices require faith in the offerer of them, Heb. xi. 4. By faith Abel offered a sacrifice. And faith in the subject respects its proper object, which is divine revelation. Men can believe no more with divine faith than is revealed, and all our actings in faith must answer the doctrines of faith. Now, it can never be proved that sacrifices were revealed before the fall. And there was no doctrine belonging to the covenant of creation, that directly or analogically required or intimated an acceptance of any such religious worship as sacrifices. This might be manifested by a just consideration of the principles of that revelation, which God made of himself unto man under the first covenant, and what was necessary for him to know, that he might live unto God. But this I have done at large elsewhere, nor have I any thing of moment to add unto former discourses to this purpose. And this also renders it impossible that there should be any sacrifices properly so called, and prefigurative of the sacrifice of Christ in the state of innocence.
§ 9. But these things are opposed, and must be vindicated. And this opposition is made unto both the positions laid down, the one concerning a priest, the other concerning sacrifices. For some have been, and are of a mind, that if man had not sinned, yet the Son of God would have taken our nature on him, both for the manifestation of the glory of God, and for the cherishing of the creation. And if so, he should have been in some sense the priest of the world.

And those of this persuasion are of two sorts: First, Such as acknowledge a pre-existence of the Lord Christ in a divine nature. These affirm, that though sin had not entered into the world, he should have been so made flesh, by the uniting of our nature unto himself in his own person, as now it is come to pass. This some of the ancient schoolmen inclined unto; as Alexander ab Alez. Albertus Magnus, Scotus, Rupertus. As it is opposed by Aquinas, P. 3. Q. 3. 'Bonaventura in Sentent.' lib 3, dist. 1. Ár. 2, Q. 1; and others. Immediately on the Reformation, this opinion was revived by Osiander, who maintained that Adam was said to be made in the image of God, because he was made in that nature and shape in which the Son of God was to be manifested. And he also was herein opposed by Calvin, Institut. lib. 2, cap. 12. lib. 3, cap. 11. by Wigandus de Osian-drismo, p. 23, and Schusselburgius, lib. 6. Yet some are still of this judgment, or seem so to be.

The other sort are the Socinians, who contend that God would have given such a head to the creation, as they fancy Christ to be. For as they lay no great weight on the first sin, so they hope to evince by this means, that the Lord Christ may discharge his whole office, without making any atonement for sin by sacrifice. And this, with most of their other opinions, they have borrowed from the ancient Pelagians, as may be seen from the account given by Cassianus, 'de Incarnatione,' lib. 1, p. 1241. 'Quo factum est,' saith he of the Pelagians, 'ut in majorem quoque ac monstruosiorum insaniae prorumpentes, dicent Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, hunc in mundum, non ad prestandam humano generi redemptionem, sed ad prehenda bonorum actuum exempla venisse; videlicet ut disciplinam ejus sequentes homines, dum per eadem virtutis viam incedentem, ad eadem virtutum premia pervenirent.' Those who assert sacrifices to have been necessary in the state of innocence, are the Romanists. Bellarmin, Gregory de Valentinia, with others, do expressly contend for it; and these also have their peculiar design in this their peculiar opinion. For they endeavour to establish a general maxim, that proper sacrifices are indispensably necessary unto all religious worship, whereby to make way for their oblation of the mass. I shall consider the pretences of both sorts, and so proceed with our design.

§ 10. As to the first opinion, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God without respect to sin and redemption, there are many pretences given unto it, which shall be afterwards particularly considered. They say, 'That the manifestation of the glory of God, required that he should effect this most perfect way of it, that so he might give a complete expression of his image and likeness. His love and goodness also were thus to be perfectly represented in the union of a created nature with his own. And herein also God would satisfy himself in the contemplation of this full communication of himself unto our nature. Besides, it was necessary that there should be a head appointed to the whole creation, to conduct and guide it, man especially, to its utmost end.' And sundry other things they allege out of their own imaginations. It is granted, that even in that state, all immediate transactions with the creatures should have been by the Son. For
by him, as the power and wisdom of God, were they made, John i. 3; Heb. i. 2; Col. i. 16, 17. He therefore should have immediately guided and conducted man to his happiness, and that both by confirming him in his obedience, and by giving him his reward. Of this we have an express proof in the case of the angels that sinned not. But for the opinion of his being incarnate, without respect to redemption from sin and misery, the whole of it is ἀγγέλων, or 'unwritten,' and therefore uncertain and curious; yea ἀποκάλυψις, or contrary to what is written, and therefore false; and ἀλογον, or destitute of any solid spiritual reason for the confirmation of it.

§ 11. First. It is unwritten: it is nowhere revealed, nowhere mentioned in the Scripture: nor can it be shown, that this is the faith of any one of the saints of God, either under the Old Testament or the New. The first promise, and consequently first revelation of the incarnation of the Son of God, was after the entrance of sin, and has respect to the recovery of the sinner, to the glory of God. And by this all other promises, declarations, and revelations concerning it, as to their end, are to be regulated. For that which is the first in any kind, as to an end aimed at, is the rule of all that follows in the same kind. And therefore that on which men ground this opinion, is indeed neither argument nor testimony, but conjecture and curiosity. They frame to themselves a national state of things, which they suppose beautiful and comely, (as who are not enamoured with the fruits of their own imaginations?) and then they assert, that it was meet and according to divine wisdom, that God should so order things to his own glory, as they have fancied. Thus they suppose, that without respect to sin or grace, God would take to himself the glory of uniting our nature by him. Why so? Because that they find how greatly and gloriously he is exalted in his so doing. But does this proceed absolutely from the thing itself, or is it with respect to the causes, ends, effects, and circumstances of it, as they are stated since the entrance of sin, and revealed in the Scripture? Set aside the consideration of sin, grace, and redemption, with what attends them, and a man may say in a better compliance with the harmony and testimony of Scripture, that the assumption of human nature into union with the Divine, in the person of the Son of God, is no way suited to the exaltation of divine glory, but rather to beget false notions and apprehensions in men of the nature of the Godhead, and to disturb them in their worship thereof. For the assumption of human nature absolutely, is expressed as a great condescension, as it was indeed, Phil. ii. 7—9, and as that which for a season obscured the glory of the Deity in him that assumed it, John xviii. 5. But the glory of it lies in that which caused it, and that which ensued thereon. For in them lay the highest effects and manifestations of divine love, goodness, wisdom, power, and holiness, Rom. iii. 24—26. And this is plainly revealed in the gospel, if any thing be so. I fear therefore that this curious speculation that is thus destitute of any Scriptural testimony, is but a pretence for being wise above what is written, and a prying into things which men have not seen, and which are not revealed unto them.

§ 12. Secondly. This opinion is contradictory to the Scripture, and that in places innumerable. Nothing is more fully and perspicuously revealed in the Scripture, than are the causes and ends of the incarnation of Christ. For as it is the great display of the glory of God, the foundation of all that obedience which we yield to him, and of all our expectation of blessedness with him, and being a thing in itself deep and mysterious, it was necessary that it should be fully revealed and declared. It were endless to recite all the
testimonies which might be produced to this purpose; some few only shall be produced. First then, on the part of the Father, the sending of the Son to be incarnate, is constantly ascribed to his love to mankind, that they might be saved from sin and misery, with a respect to the promiting thus his own glory, as the ultimate end. John iii. 16, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Rom. iii. 25, 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation.' Chap. v. 8, 'God commendeth his love unto us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Chap. viii. 3, 'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh,' 1 John iv. 8; Gal. iv. 5, 6. Secondly. On the part of the Son himself, the same causes, the same ends of his taking flesh are constantly assigned. Luke xix. 10. The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.' 1 Tim. i. 15, 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.' Heb. ii. 14, 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil.' Gal. ii. 20; John xviii. 39, 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth; namely, of the promises of God made unto the fathers concerning his coming: see Rom. xv. 8; Phil. ii. 6—10. And all this is said in pursuit and in explication of the first promise concerning him, the sum whereof was, that he should be manifested in the flesh to destroy the works of the devil, as it is expounded, 1 John iii. 8. To this the whole Scripture constantly and uniformly giveth testimony: this is the design and scope of all its instructions: and the opposite doctrine, like the fancying of other worlds, or of living wights in the moon or stars, dissolves the whole harmony of it, and frustrates its principal design; and therefore is more carefully to be avoided, than what contradicts only some few testimonies of it. I say, that to ascribe unto God a will or purpose of sending his Son to be incarnate, without respect to the redemption and salvation of sinners, is to contradict and enervate the whole design of the revelation of God in the Scripture, as also it riseth up in direct opposition to particular testimonies without number. Origen observed this, Homil. 24, in Numer: 'Si non fuisset peccatum, non necesse fuerat Filium Dei Agnum fieri; sed manusisset hoc quod in principio erat, Deus verbum. Verum quoniam introiit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem necessitas propitiationem requirit, propitiatio vero non fit nisi per hostiam, necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato. 'If sin had not been, there would have been no necessity that the Son of God should be made a Lamb, but he had remained what he was in the beginning, God the Word. But seeing that sin entered into the world, and stood in need of a propitiation, which could not be but by a sacrifice, it was necessary that a sacrifice for sin should be provided.' So Austin, Serm. 8, de verbis Apostoli, Tom. 10. 'Quare venit in mundum, peccatores salvos facere. Alia causa non fuit, quare veniret in mundum.'

§ 13. Thirdly, This opinion is destitute of spiritual reason, yea is contrary to it. The design of God to glorify himself in the creation, and by the law or covenant of it, and his design to glorify himself in a way of grace, are distinct. Yea, they are so distinct, as with reference to the same persons and times to be inconsistent. This our apostle manifests in the instance of justification and salvation by works and grace. 'If it be by grace, then it is
no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace: but if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise works is no more works,' Rom. xi. 6. It is impossible that the same man should be justified by works and by grace too. Wherefore God, in infinite wisdom, brought the first design, and all the effects of it, into a subordination to the latter, and so he decreed to do from eternity. There being, by the entrance of sin, an aberration in the whole creation from that proper end, for following which it was formed at first, it pleased God to reduce the whole into a subserviency to the design of his wisdom and holiness in a way of grace. For his purpose was to make reconciliation, and to gather all things into a new head in his Son Jesus Christ, Eph. i. 10; Heb. i. 3, ii. 7, 8. Now, according to this opinion, the incarnation of the Son of God belonged originally unto the law of creation, and to the design of displaying the glory of God therein. And if this were so, it must with the whole old creation, and with all that belonged to it, be brought into a subordination and subserviency to the succeeding design of the wisdom of God, to glorify himself in a way of grace. But this is not so, seeing this itself is the fundamental and principal part of that design. Known indeed unto God are all his works from the beginning. Therefore this great projection of the incarnation of his Son, lying in the council of his will from eternity, he did, in wisdom infinite and holy, order all the concerns of the creation in such a manner, that they might be disposed into an orderly subjection to his Son incarnate. So that, although I deny that any thing was then instituted as a type to represent him, because his coming into the world in our flesh belonged not unto that estate, yet I grant things to have been so ordered, as that in the restoration of all into a new frame by Jesus Christ, there were many things in the works of God in the old creation, that were natural types, or things meet to represent much of this unto us. So Christ himself is called the second Adam, and compared to the tree of life, of which we have discoursed in our exposition on the first chapter.

§ 14. Let us therefore now consider the arguments or reasons in particular which they plead who maintain this assertion. The principal of them were invented or used by some of the ancient schoolmen; and others have since somewhat improved their conceptions, and added some of their own. Those of the first sort are collected by Thomas, 3a P. Q. 1. A. 3, as derived from the Pelagians. I shall examine them as by him proposed, omitting his answers, which I judge insufficient in many instances.

His first argument, the substance whereof I have lately heard pleaded with some vehemence, is as follows: 'It belonged to omnipotent Power and infinite Wisdom, to make all his works perfect, and to manifest himself by an infinite effect. But no mere creature can be said to be such an infinite effect, because its essence is finite and limited; but in the work of the incarnation of the Son of God alone, an infinite effect of divine power seems to be manifested, as things infinitely distant are thus conjoined, God being made man. And herein the universality of things seems to receive its perfection, inasmuch as the last creature or man, is immediately conjoined unto the first principle or God.'

Answer. This argument hath little more in it than curiosity and sophistry. For,

1. That God made all his works good, that is perfect in their kind, before the incarnation, we have his own testimony. He saw and pronounced of the whole, that it was דומך, valde bonum, every way good and complete.
It was so in itself, without the addition of that work, which is fancied necessary to its perfection.

2. It is merely supposed, that it was necessary that divine omnipotence should be expressed to the utmost of its perfection. It was enough that it was manifested and declared in the creation of all things out of nothing.

3. It is not possible that any effect in itself infinite, should be produced by the power of God. For then would there be two infinites, the producing and the produced; and, consequently, two Gods, the making God and the made: for that which is in itself absolutely infinite is God, and what is produced is not infinite. Wherefore the work of the incarnation was not of itself an infinite effect, although it were an effect of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness. And so also was the work of the first creation. And although they are all in themselves finite and limited, yet are they the effects of, and do abundantly declare, the infinite power and wisdom whence they were educed, Rom. i. 21, 22.

4. The perfection of the universe, or of the universality of beings, is to be determined by their state, condition, and end. And this perfection they had in their first creation, without any respect unto the incarnation of the Son of God. For the perfection of all things consisted in their relation to God, according to the law and order of their creation, and their mutual regard to one another, with respect to the utmost end of the manifestation of his glory. And their perfection also consisted in their suitableness to bring that creature to the enjoyment of God in blessedness for ever, who was capable of it. And herein consisted the conjunction of the last creature to the first principle, when by the documents and helps of the creation which existed before he was formed, he was brought to the enjoyment of God. For,

4. That the conjunction of the last creature to the first principle, by way of personal union, was necessary for the good of the universe, is a fancy that every one may embrace, and every one may reject at pleasure. But it may be justly conceived, that it was more suitable unto order, that the conjunction mentioned should have been between God and the first creature, namely the angels; and reasons would have been pleaded for that order, had it so come to pass. But the Son of God took not on him their nature, because, he designed not to deliver them from sin, Heb. ii. 16, 17.

§ 15. Secondly, It is further pleaded, 'That human nature is not become more capacious of grace by sin than it was before. But now after the entrance of sin, it is capable of the grace of union, which is the greatest grace. Wherefore if man had not sinned, human nature had been capable of this grace. Neither would God have withheld any good from human nature whereof it was capable; therefore, if man had not sinned, God had been incarnate.'

Answ. 1. Place angelical nature in the argument, as to that part of it which pleads that it must have all the grace which it is capable of, instead of human nature, and the event will show what force there is in this ratiocination. For angelical nature was capable of the grace of union, and God would not withhold any thing from it whereof it was capable. But why then is it otherwise come to pass?

2. It must be granted, though indeed this argument is not very applicable either in the one way or the other, that human nature is both capable of more grace, and actually made partaker of more after the fall, than it was
capable of, or did receive before. For it is capable of mercy, pardon, reconciliation with God, sanctification by the Holy Ghost, all which are graces, or gracious effects of the love and goodness of God; and of these things in the state of innocence, man was not capable. Besides, there is no difference in this matter; for the individual nature actually assumed into union was, and was considered, as pure in its first origin and creation.

3. The ground of this reason lies in this pretence, that whatever any creature was capable of, not in, by, or from itself, but by the power of God, God was obliged to do that, in it and for it. Now this is plainly to say, that God did not communicate of his goodness, and of his power to the creatures according to the counsel of his will, but producing them by the unavoidable destiny of some eternal fate, he acted naturally and necessarily, ad ultimum virium, in their production. But this is contrary to the nature and being of God, with all the properties thereof. Wherefore the creation is capable in every state of what God pleaseth, and of no more. Its capacity is to be regulated by the will of God. And no more belonged to its capacity in the state of nature, than God had assigned to it by the law of creation.

4. It is a presumptuous imagination to talk of the grace of union being due to our nature in any condition. Why then is it not due to the nature of angels? Or did our nature originally excel theirs? Besides, the Scripture every where expressly mentions this union as an effect of free love, grace, and bounty, John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9, 10.

5. That by the entrance of sin, both the display of the glory of God, and the good of the creature itself, should be heightened, is an effect of infinite wisdom and grace. Nor did God permit the entrance of sin, but with a design to bring about a glory greater and more excellent than the antecedent order of things was capable of. The state of grace exceeded the state of nature. In brief, God permitted that greatest evil, the fall of man, to make way for the introduction of the greatest good in our restoration by the incarnation and mediation of his Son.

§ 16. Thirdly, it is also pleaded, 'That the mystery of the incarnation was revealed unto Adam in the state of innocence. For upon the bringing of Eve unto him, he said, 'This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh.' 'But this,' saith the apostle, 'is a great mystery; but he speaks it concerning Christ and the church,' Eph. v. 32. But man could not foresee nor foreknow his own fall, any more than the angels could theirs. It follows, therefore, that he considered the incarnation as it should have been, had the state of innocence continued.'

Answ. 1. It seems to be supposed in this argument that there was indeed a revelation made unto Adam, Gen. ii. 23, of the incarnation of Christ, so that nothing remains to be proved, but that he did not foreknow his fall; whence it would ensue that the pretended revelation belonged to the state of innocence. But, indeed, there is no intimation of any such revelation. For,

2. I have manifested elsewhere, how God in his infinite wisdom ordered the things of the first creation, so as they might afterwards be made to subservie in a way of representation to the new creation, or to the renovation of all things by Jesus Christ. That is, he so made them, as that they might be natural types, of what he would do afterwards. This doth not prove, that they were designed to make any revelation of Christ or of his grace, or to prefigure them; but only that they were meet to be brought into an useful subordination to them, so that from them, instructive allusions might
be taken. Thus it was in the first marriage, in the law of creation. It had no other nature, use, nor end, but to be the bond of individual society of two persons male and female, for the procreation and education of children, with all mutual assistances to human life and conversation. And the making of woman out of the man, 'bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh,' was intended only for laying the foundation of that society, whose intimacy was to be unparalleled. But both these things were so ordered in the wisdom of God, as that they might represent another union in a state that God would bring in afterwards, namely of Christ and his church. What Adam spake concerning the natural condition and relation of him and Eve, that our apostle speaks concerning the spiritual and supernatural condition and relation of Christ and the church, because of some resemblance between them. Aquinas himself determines this whole matter, with an assertion to which it would have been for his own advantage to have attended upon other occasions. Saith he, 'Ea que ex Sola Dei voluntate proveniunt supra omne debitum creature, nobis innotescere non possunt, nisi quatenus in sacra Scriptura traduntur, per quam divina voluntas innotescit. Unde cum in sacra Scriptura ubique Incarnationis Ratio ex peccato primi hominis assignetur, convenientius dicitur Incarnationis opus ordinatum esse a Deo in commodum contra peccatum, quod peccato non existente incarnatio non fuisset.'

§ 17. There is yet another argument mentioned by Aquinas, and much urged by the modern Scotists; it is insisted on also by some divines of our own; which deserves somewhat a fuller consideration. And this is taken from the predestination of the Man Christ Jesus. This the schoolmen consider on that of our apostle, Rom. i. 4, 'concerning Jesus Christ,' εριεκεντος νυοι θεον ευ ενυμελε, which the Vulgate renders, Qui praeestinatus est Filius Dei in virtute: 'Predestinated the Son of God with power,' as our Rhemists. But εριεκεντος there, is no more than αποδεκεντος, 'manifested, declared,' as it is well rendered by our's. Nor can expositors fix any tolerable sense to their 'predestinated' in this place. But the thing itself is true. The Lord Christ was predestinated or pre-ordained before the world was. We were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, προεγνωμενον προ κατα-€νολης κοσμου, 1 Pet. i. 20, 'Fore-ordained, predestinated before the foundation of the world.' Now it is pleaded, that this predestination of Christ to the grace of union and glory, was the first of God's purposes and decrees, in order of nature, and antecedent to the predestination of the elect, at least as it should comprise in it a purpose of deliverance from the fall. For God first designed to glorify himself in the assumption of human nature, before he decreed to save the elect by that nature so assumed. For we are said to be chosen in him, that is, as our head, Ephes. i. 4, whence it necessarily ensues that he was chosen before us; and so without respect unto us. So in all things was he to have the pre-eminence, Col. i. 19. And thence it is that we are 'predestinated to be conformed to his image,' Rom. viii. 29. This pre-ordination, therefore, of the Lord Christ, which was unto grace and glory, was antecedent to the permission of the fall of man, so that he should have been incarnate, though the fall had never taken place.

These things have been explained at large by other writers on the subject; but this is the sum of what is pleaded in the pursuit of this argument, which shall be examined as briefly as the nature of the matter itself will permit.

1. In treating of the divine decrees, many authors have considered at large their priority one to another, in order of nature and reason. In
using the phrase priority in order of nature, it is not of the decrees themselves that we speak, for these are all absolutely free and irrespective; but it is of the things decreed, which are arranged in such an order, that one should serve another. There are not a few, however, who suppose those discourses on all hands, to have more of nicety and curious subtlety, than of solid truth for edification. And because this is a matter on which the Scripture is utterly silent, though one opinion may be more agreeable to sound reason than another, yet none is built upon such certain foundations, as to become a matter of faith, or the principle of any thing that is so. That which explains this order most conveniently, and suitably to divine wisdom, will, and sovereignty; which best answers the common apprehensions of rational natures, and the rules of their actings; is to be preferred before any opinion, that includes what is opposite to, or alien from, any of those things to which that order hath respect. From any such order in the decrees of God, no support can be drawn to the opinion which is under consideration; but if men may be allowed to suppose what they will, they may easily infer from it what they please. Let us, therefore, take a view of the several series of divine decrees, which have been confirmed by the suffrage of a considerable number of learned men, setting aside particular conjectures, which were never received by any except their authors. And these may be reduced unto three. All agree, that the glory of God is the utmost and supreme end that he intendeth in all his decrees. Although they are free acts of his will and wisdom, yet on the supposition of the existence of these decrees, it is absolutely necessary from the perfection of his being, that he himself or his glory be their utmost end. His absolute all-sufficiency, will not allow that in them he should have any other end. Accordingly, in pursuit of them, 'He makes all for himself,' Prov. xvi. 4. And they serve to declare and make known the perfection of his nature, Ps. xix. 1; Rom. i. 19, 20. And it is his glory in the way of justice and mercy, which he ultimately intends in his decrees concerning the salvation of man by Jesus Christ. Whereas many things are ordered by him in a subserviency hereunto, the decrees of God concerning them, are conceived of by some in that order which answers the order of this accomplishment. As, first, they say God decreed to make the world, and man therein upright in his image. Secondly, to permit the fall, and the consequences thereof, man being to that end left to the liberty of his will. Thirdly, he designed to send his Son to be incarnate for the work of their redemption. Fourthly, he decreed to give eternal life to as many as should believe on him and obey him. And lastly, he determined to bestow effectual grace on some persons in particular; to work faith and obedience in them infallibly, and thereby to bring them to glory, to the praise of his grace and mercy. According to this order of God's decrees, it is plain that in the order of nature, the predestination of Christ is antecedent unto the election of other particular or individual persons; but withal that it is consequential to the decree concerning the permission of the fall of Adam; and accordingly his incarnation doth suppose it; which is inconsistent with the opinion under examination.

Others take a contrary course, and by misapplication of a common rule, that what is first in intention must be last in execution, they suppose that the order of God's decrees (which are his intentions and purposes,) may be best conceived in a direct retrogradation to the order of their execution. Supposing, therefore, that God determines to glorify himself in the way before mentioned; they judge that his first decree in order of nature, is for the eternal salvation and glory of some certain persons, who are at last ac-
tually brought to glory. For this being the last thing executed, must be first intended. Secondly, in subserviency to this, he purposeth to give them grace, and faith, and obedience thereby, as the way to bring them to the possession of glory. Thirdly, To those purposes of God, they make the decrees concerning the creation, and the permission of the fall of man, with the incarnation and mediation of Christ, to be subservient, some in one method, some in another. But it is evident, that all their thoughts respecting a decree predestinating the incarnation of Christ, prior to any decree with respect to sin and grace, must be inconsistent.

As both these ways are exposed to insuperable objections, some have fixed on another method for the right conception of the order of God's eternal decrees in these things. This method is consistent in itself, and may be fairly vindicated from all opposition, which is the utmost that with sobriety can be aimed at in these things. The supporters of this scheme, set out with observing, that nothing should be ascribed to God which is in the least unsuited to the infinite perfections of his nature, nor any thing proposed to the minds of men which is inconsistent with the general principles and rules of reason. They also lay down the general rule before mentioned; namely, that what is first in intention is last in execution. But secondly, they say withal, that this rule concerns only such things, as in their own nature and in the will of him that designs them, have to one another the relation of end and means. For this rule has no place among such things as are not capable of that relation. Moreover it is required that this end be ultimate and supreme, and not subordinate, for a subordinate end is also of the nature of means. The meaning of the rule then is no more than this, that in all rational purposes, there are two things considered: First the end aimed at, and then the means of its accomplishment. And that in the order of nature, the end, which is the last thing effected, is first designed, and then the means for it; which things are true and obvious to the understanding of all men. According to this rule, they ascribe to God only two decrees that have any order of priority between them. The first is concerning his end which is first intended, and last executed. The other is concerning all those means, which though second in order, being intended for the production of the end, are first accomplished and wrought. The first of these decrees respects the supreme end of all the dispensations of God, towards the things that are outward of him; this supreme end is his own glory, or the declaration of himself in a way of justice and mercy, mixed with infinite wisdom and goodness, as he is the first Being, Sovereign Lord and Ruler over all. The second decree respects things subordinate and subservient to the former, and consists in an intention concerning all intermediate acts of divine wisdom, power and goodness, which tend to the production of this ultimate end. Such are the creation, the permission of the fall, the pre-ordination of Christ, and others in him to grace and glory, by the way and means thereunto appointed. Now although these things are evidently subordinate, and subservient to one another, and although separate decrees concerning them may be conceived of, yet, because none of them do lie in the order of means and ultimate end, there is no priority of one decree before another to be allowed therein. Only a decree is supposed, for arranging them in their execution; or for disposing of the things to be executed, into that order both in nature and time, which may constitute them all one suitable means of attaining the supreme end intended. Now it is evident that according to this order, there cannot be a priority in the
pre-ordination of Christ, to the decree of the permission of the fall and entrance of sin.

It is true indeed, Christ was pre-ordained, or the Son of God was pre-ordained, to be incarnate before the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. i. 20. But how? Even as he was manifested in the last times.' As he was pre-ordained to be incarnate, so he was to be born of the blessed virgin: and this neither was nor could be, but with respect unto the redemption of mankind; for he took flesh of her, in answer to the first promise concerning the seed of the woman, which respected our recovery from sin. As he was born or made of her, he was the Lamb of God that was to take away the sin of the world. Besides, he was not ordained to the grace of union, before and without the consideration of glory and exaltation. But this included a supposition of his suffering for sin: for he was 'first to suffer, and then to enter into his glory,' Luke xxiv. 26. Accordingly he ordered his own prayer, John xvii. 4, 5. 'I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do, and now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self.' Neither Scripture nor reason, will allow us to suppose a pre-ordination of the Son of God to become incarnate without reference to the previous entrance of sin, or without reference to his being born of the blessed virgin, or without considering him as the Lamb of God, or without considering him as one to be exalted after suffering. It is said indeed that we are 'predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ,' Rom. viii. 29, which seems to imply an antecedency in his predestination unto our's. But the 'image of Christ' there intended, includes his sufferings, holiness, and exaltation to glory after his obedience, all which have respect to sin and redemption. And moreover the predestination here intended, is subordinate to our election to glory, being our designation to the assured and infallible means thereof, Eph. i. 4, 5. It is true it was the design of God, that he in all things should have the pre-eminence, Col. i. 18, and as this denotes excellency, worth, use, dignity, supremacy, nearness to God for the receiving, and to us for the communicating of all good; so it can have no respect to such a pre-ordination, as would imply his incarnation without an intention of glorifying God in the redemption of sinners; which alone we have undertaken to disprove.

§ 18. The arguments of Osiander in this case have been discussed by others.* I shall notice these arguments, only so far as is necessary to our present design, and that in those instances in which they have no coincidence with what hath been already discussed. And some few things may be premised, which will take away the suppositions on which all his reasonings are founded. As,

1. The Son was the essential and eternal image of the Father, antecedent to all consideration of his incarnation. He is in his divine person the 'image of the invisible God,' Col. i. 15. 'The brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person,' Ileb. i. 3. For having his essence and subsistence from the Father by eternal generation, or the communication of the whole divine nature, and of all its infinite perfections, he is the perfect and essential representation of him.

2. The order of operation in the blessed Trinity as to outward works, answers to and follows the order of their subsistence. Hence the Son is

considered as the next and immediate operator of them. Thus, as he is said to have made all things, John i. 3; Col. i. 16, so the Father is said to make all things by him, Eph. iii. 9, not as an inferior, subordinate, instrumental cause; but as acting his wisdom and power in him to whom they were communicated by eternal generation. Hence the immediate relation of all things so made, is to the Son, and by and in his person, is God, even the Father, immediately represented to them, as he is his image, and as the brightness of his glory shines forth in him. Hereon follows his 'rejoicing in the creation, and his delights in the sons of men,' Prov. viii. 30, 31, because of their immediate relation to him.

3. Therefore he would have been the immediate head and ruler of angels and men, if they had all persisted in their original integrity and innocence, Col. i. 16. For the representation of God to them, as the cause and as the end of their being, the object and end of their worship and service, should have been in and by his person as the image of the Father; and by and through him they should have received all the communications of God unto them. He should have been their immediate head, Lord and King, or the divine nature in his person. For this the order of subsistence in the blessed Trinity, and the order of operation thereon depending, did require.

These things being premised, it will not be difficult to remove out of our way, the reasons by which Osiander thought to prove, that Christ would have been incarnate, although sin had never entered into our world. We would not now have considered his reasonings, after they have been so long ago put to oblivion, were it not that they have been revived; and that the consideration of them will give occasion to the clearing of some truths not of small importance.

§ 19. First, Osiander's principal plea was taken, from 'the image of God wherein man was created.' 'For this,' he saith, 'was that human nature, consisting of soul and body, in the outward shape, lineaments and proportion which it hath in our persons, which the Son of God was to take upon him; God having ordained that his Son should take human nature, he created Adam in a conformity to the idea or image thereof.'

Answer. This doubtless is a better course for explaining creation in the image of God, than that of the old Anthropomorphites, who in the exposition of this expression, made God in the image of man. But yet it is not therefore according to the truth. The image of God in man was in general those excellencies of his nature, which made him superior to all other creatures here below. It particularly consisted in that uprightness and rectitude of his soul and of all its faculties, as one common principle of moral operation, by which he was enabled to live unto God as his chief good, and utmost end, Eccles. vii. 29. This by our apostle is termed 'righteousness and true holiness,' when he treats of the renovation of this image in us by Jesus Christ, Eph. iv. 24. To which he adds, (Col. iii. 10,) that which is the principle of them both in the renovation of our minds. Nor doth this image of God consist, as some fancy, in moral duties, in distinction from other duties, or in opposition to any other effect of the grace of Christ in the hearts of men, which acts itself in any other duty according to the will of God. To pray, to hear the word, to celebrate religious worship, they say, is no part of the image of God, because God doth none of those things, and an image must always correspond to that which it represents. But our likeness to God doth not consist in doing what God doeth, neither is his image in us in any thing more express than in our universal dependence on him, and resignation of ourselves to him, which is a
thing of which the divine nature is incapable. And when we are command-
ed to 'be holy as he is holy,' it is not a specific similitude, but analogical
only that is intended. Wherefore, as the image of God consists not in
outward actions of any kind whatever, so the internal grace that is acted in
prayer, hearing, and other acts of sacred worship according to the will of
God, doth no less belong to the image of God, than any other grace, or
duty, or virtue whatever. In like manner, faith also belongeth to the image
of God, and that not only as it is an intellectual perfection, but also with
respect to all its operations and effects, as the Lord Christ himself, and the
promise of the gospel, are in their several considerations the objects of it.
In our first creation, the image of God consisted in the concreted rectitude
of our natures, by which we were disposed and enabled to live to God ac-
cording to the law of our creation; and in this there was a great representa-
tion of his righteousness, or of the universal absolute rectitude of the
nature of him by whom we were made. In like manner, whatever is com-
municated to us by the grace of Jesus Christ, whereby our nature is repaired,
disposed, and enabled to live to God, with all acts and duties suitable there-
unto, according to the present law of our obedience, belongs to the restora-
tion of the image of God in us. In all the parts of this restoration, how-
ever, there always is a special respect to that spiritual light, understanding
or knowledge, which is the directive principle of the whole; for the 'new
man is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him,'
Col. iii. 10. This therefore being the image of God, it is evident that in
the creation of man in the image of God, there was no respect to the hu-
mnan nature of Christ, which, as the Son of God, he afterwards assumed
Only it is granted, that we are both formed and reformed immediately in
his image. For as he was and is, in his divine Person, the express image
of the Father, the divine qualifications wherein the image of God originally
consisted in us, were immediately wrought in us by him, as those wherein
he would represent his own perfection. And in the restoration of this
image to us, as God implanted in him incarnate, all fulness of that grace
wherein it doth consist, and as he therein absolutely represents the invisible
God to us, so we are transformed immediately into his likeness and image,
and into that of God by him, 2 Cor. iii. 18.

§ 20. It is further pleaded, 'That if the Son of God should not have
been incarnate, if Adam had not sinned, then Adam was not made in the
image of Christ, but Christ was made in the image of Adam.'
Answ. It has been declared that the image of God, in which Adam was
made, consisted in the rectitude of the principles of Adam's nature, with
respect to the condition wherein, and to the end for which he was made.
In this rectitude, there was a representation of the divine righteousness
and holiness. And in some sense Christ may be said to be made in the
image of Adam, inasmuch as he was made flesh, or partaker of the same
nature with him. For 'because the children were partakers of flesh and
blood, he also himself took part of the same,' Heb. ii. 14. He 'took upon
him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men,' Phil. ii.
7. And to this he was designed by God, even to take on him that nature
in which Adam was created, and in which he sinned. He was to be
'made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted,' Heb. iv. 15. Thus
his genealogy after the flesh is traced back by Luke to the first Adam,
ch. iii. 38. As he is called not the first, or the exemplar of the creation of
men, but the second Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 47, being to recover and restore
what was lost by the first. Wherefore, in respect of the substance and
essence of human nature, Christ was made in the image of Adam; but in
respect of the endowments and holy perfections of that nature, he was
made in the image of God.

§ 21. Moreover, it is objected, 'That the incarnation of Christ was a
thing decreed for itself, and as to its futurition depended only on the in-
mutable counsel of God. But this supposition, that it had respect to the
fall of man and to his recovery, makes it to depend on an external accident,
and which as to the nature of the thing itself might not have been.'

Aansw. The resolution of this objection depends much on what hath
been before discoursed concerning the order of the divine decrees, which
we need not here repeat. Only we may remember that the foresight of
the fall, and the decree of the permission of it, cannot with any reason be
supposed to be consequential to the decree concerning the incarnation of
the Son of God. For the reparation of man is every where in the Scrip-
ture declared to be the end of Christ's taking flesh. For in the 'fulness
of time God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,
that he might redeem them who were under the law,' Gal. iv. 4. Neither
can his incarnation be properly said either to be for itself on the one side,
or by accident on the other. For it was decreed and fore-ordained for the
glory of God. And the way whereby God intended to glorify himself
therein was in our redemption, which in his infinite love to mankind was
the moving cause thereof; John iii. 16. To the same effect is another
objection, That if the Son of God had not been incarnate, neither angels
nor men could have had their proper head and king. For as we have pre-
mised, the Son of God should have been the immediate head of the whole
creation, ruling every thing in its subordination to God, suitably to the
nature, state, and condition of the several parts of creation. For as he
was the image of the invisible God, so he was the first-born of every
creature, Col. i. 16; that is, the Lord, Ruler, and Inheritor of them, as we
have at large elsewhere declared.

§ 22. It is pleaded, in the last place, 'That had men continued in their
integrity, there should have been a season when they were to be changed
and translated into heaven. Now this being to be done by the Son of
God, it was necessary that he should be incarnate for that purpose.' This
consideration is urged so far by Osiander. But it is carried on by the
Socinians, and improved on another supposition of their own. Vid. Smal.

Man, they tell us, was created absolutely mortal, and should have actu-
ally died, although he had never sinned. That he might be raised again
from the dead, God would have sent a Messiah, or one that should have
been the means, example, and instrumental cause of our resurrection.

Answ. All persons of sobriety will acknowledge that there is nothing in
these reasonings but groundless curiosities, and vain speculations coun-
tenanced with false suppositions. For as God alone knows what would have
been the eternal condition of Adam, had he not violated the covenant of
his nature; so whatever change was to be effected in his condition as the
reward of his obedience, God could have effected it by his infinite wisdom
and power, without any such instrumental cause as these men imagine.
Secret things belong to the Lord our God; nor are we to be wise above
what is written. The notion of the Socinians that man would have died
naturally, though not penally, is a figment of their own, that hath been
elsewhere discussed, and is very unmeet to be laid as the foundation of new
assertions, that cannot otherwise be proved.
From what hath been discoursed, it appears that there was no revelation of the incarnation of the Son of God in the state of innocence; neither did it belong to that state, but was designed in order to his priesthood, which could therein have no place nor use.

§ 23. Our next inquiry is concerning sacrifices, and whether they were to have had either place or use in the state of innocence. This being determined, the way will be cleared for fixing on its true foundation the origin of the priesthood of Christ, after which we are now making inquiry. And this inquiry is made necessary by some of the Roman church, particularly Bellarmin and Gregory de Valentin. They have not indeed fixed any special controversy in this inquiry, whether there should have been any sacrifices in the state of innocence. But in an attempt to serve a principal concern of their own, they assert and contend for that which determines the necessity of sacrifices in that state, and in the condition of things between God and men at that time. For they plead in general, that "there neither is, nor ever was in the world, nor can be any religion without a true and real sacrifice." Their design in this is only to prove the necessity of the sacrifice of the mass. For on this supposition it must be esteemed to be of the very essence of the Christian religion, which some, on the contrary, judge to be overthrown thereby. Now it is certain that there was religion, and that this religion would have continued in the state of innocence, if that state had continued. Yea, therein all religion and religious worship was founded, being in-laid in our natures, and requisite to our condition in this world, with respect to the end for which we were made. In the state of innocence, then, on this supposition, sacrifices were necessary; which Bellarmin includes in that Syllogism, as he calls it, whereby he attempts the proof of the necessity of his Missatical sacrifice in the church of Christ. "De Missa, lib. 1, cap. 20, Tanta," saith he, "conjunctio est inter Legem seu Religionem, et Sacrificium externum ac proprie dictum, ut omnino necesse sit aut Legem et Religionem vere et proprie in Christi Ecclesia non reperiri, aut Sacrificium quoque externum et proprie dictum in Christi Ecclesia reperiri. Nullum autem est si Missam tollas; est igitur Missa Sacrificium externum proprie dictum." "There is such a conjunction between the law or religion, and a sacrifice external and properly so called, that it is altogether necessary, either that there is no law or religion truly and properly to be found in the church of Christ, or there is a sacrifice, external and properly so called, to be found therein. But take away the mass, and there is none. Wherefore the mass is an external sacrifice, properly so called."

§ 24. The invalidity of this argument to his particular purpose may easily be laid open. For setting aside all consideration of his mass, the Christian religion hath not only in it a proper sacrifice, but it has that very one sacrifice, from respect to which, the services of men in divine worship in the Old Testament church were called sacrifices; and by which they were animated, and rendered useful. For the sacrifices of the law had no other end or use, but to prefigure that sacrifice which we enjoy in the Christian religion, and to exhibit the benefits thereof to the worshippers. This is the sacrifice of Christ himself, which was external, visible, proper, yea, the only true, real, substantial sacrifice, and that offered once for all. And it is merely εἰκὸς αἰμάτωρ αὐτοῦ, or an immeasurably corrupted imagination which led Bellarmin to put in his frivolous and captious exception, to the sufficiency of this sacrifice in the Christian religion. For he pretends and pleads that this sacrifice did not belong to the Christian church, which
was founded in the resurrection of Christ, before which Christ had offered himself; as also that this sacrifice was but once offered, and now ceaseth so to be, so that if we have no other sacrifice but this, we have none at all. For, notwithstanding these bold and sophistical objections, our apostle sufficiently instructs us, that we have yet an High Priest, and an altar, and a sacrifice, and the blood of sprinkling, all in heavenly things and places. And, on purpose to prevent this cavil about this sacrifice not being offered again, he tells us that it is always ζωσα καὶ προσφατος, 'living and new slain.' And, beyond all contradiction he determined either this one sacrifice of Christ to be insufficient, or that of the mass to be useless. For he shows that where any sacrifices will make perfect them that come to God by them, there no more will be offered. And it is an undoubted evidence that no sacrifice hath obtained its end perfectly, as to making reconciliation for sin, where any other sacrifice properly so called doth come after it. Nor doth he prove the insufficiency of Aaronical sacrifices for this purpose, by any other argument, but that they were offered from year to year, and that another was to succeed in their room, when they were over, Heb. x. 1—5. And this, upon the supposition of the Romanist, and the necessity of their Missan- tical sacrifice, falls as heavily on the sacrifice of Christ, as on those of the law. It is apparent, therefore, that they must either let go the sacrifice of Christ as insufficient, or that of their mass as useless, for they can have no consistency in the same religion. Wherefore, they leave out the sacrifice of Christ, as that which was offered before the church was founded. But the truth is, the church was founded therein. And I desire to know of these men, whether it be the outward act of sacrificing, or the efficacy of a sacrifice that is so necessary unto all religion? If it be the outward act that is of such use and necessity, how great was the privilege of the church of the Jews above that of the Romanists. For, whereas these pretend but unto one sacrifice, and that one so dark, obscure, and unintelligible, that the μυστα and εποντα of their Sacra cannot possibly agree amongst themselves what it is, nor wherein it doth consist. The Jews had many plain, express, visible sacrifices, which the whole church looked on, and consented in. But this whole pretence is vain; nor is any thing of the least worth in religion, but on the account of its efficacy to its end. And that we have with us the continual efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, in all our religious worship and approaches unto God, the Scripture is full and express. But these things do not belong to our present subject, the consideration of them will elsewhere occur.

§ 25. As to our present purpose, I deny the major proposition of Bellarmin's Syllogism, if taken absolutely and universally, as it must be, if any way serviceable to his cause. This, therefore, he proves. 'Proposito,' saith he, 'prima probatur, primo ex eo quod fere omnis Religio seu vera seu falsa omni loct et tempore semper ad cultum Dei Sacrificia adhibuerit: Hinc enim colligitur, id prodire ex lumine et instinctu Nature, et esse primum quoddam principium a Deo nobis ingenitum. 'It is proved from hence that almost all religion, whether true or false, in all places and times, hath made use of sacrifices in the worship of God. For, hence it is gathered, that this proceeds from the light and instinct of nature, being a certain principle inbred in us from God himself.' And hereon he proceeds to confute Chenmitius, who assigned the origin of sacrificing among the heathen, to an instinct of corrupt nature, which is the root of all superstition. I shall not now inquire expressly into the origin of all sacrifices, it
must be done elsewhere. We here discourse only concerning those that are properly so called, and not only so, but propitiatory also; for such he contendeth his mass to be. It is indeed suitable to the light of nature that of what we have left in our possession, we should offer to the service of God, where he hath appointed a way for us to do so. But it is denied that in the state of innocence, he had appointed that to be by the way of sacrificing sensible things. All eucharistical offerings would have then been moral and spiritual in pure acts of the mind, and its devotion in them. Sacrifices of or for atonement were first instituted, and other offerings had their name from thence, by reason of some kind of analogy. And so far as thank-offerings were materially the same with those which were propitiatory, consisting in the death and blood of any creature, they had in them the nature of a propitiation also. That these were instituted after the fall, I have elsewhere sufficiently proved. Being, therefore, at first enjoined to mankind in general, as tokens of the recovery promised, they were retained and perpetuated amongst all sorts of men, even when they had lost all notion and remembrance of the promise, to which they were originally annexed. For sacrifices had a double advantage for the perpetuating themselves. First. A suitableness to the general principle of giving an acknowledgment to God, in a return of a portion of that which comes from him. Secondly. They had a compliance with the accusation of conscience for sin, by an endeavour to transfer the guilt of it to another. But their first origin was entirely from divine and supernatural revelation, and not from the light or guidance of nature, nor of any such innate principle as Bellarmin imagines. No such inseparable conjunction, as is pretended, between sacrifices and religion, can hence be proved; seeing they were originally an arbitrary institution, and that after there had been religion in the world. He thus proceeds further to confirm his first proposition. Sacrificium cum ipsa religione naturæ est, et cum illa extinguitur; est igitur inter ea conjunctio planæ necessaria. ‘Sacrificing was born with religion, and dies with it; there is, therefore, between them a conjunction plainly necessary.’ This is only a repetition of the proposition in other words. For to say that there is such a conjunction between sacrifices and religion, that the one cannot be without the other, and to say that they are born and die together, is to repeat the same thing. He adds, therefore, his proof of the whole. ‘Nam primi homines qui Deum coluisse leguntur Filii Adami fuerunt, Cain et Abel, illi autem sacrificia obtulisse dicuntur,’ Gen. iv. Afterwards, he proceeds to other instances under the Old Testament. Now, it is plain that by this first instance he has overthrown his general assertion. For he excludes from his proof the state of innocence, when unquestionably there was religion in the world, and that without sacrifices, if Cain and Abel were the first that offered them. He, therefore, by his instances doth neither prove what he proposed, nor touch upon our cause, that there were no sacrifices in the state of innocence, though that state is necessarily included in his general assertion.

§ 26. From what hath been spoken it appears, that there was no decree, no counsel of God concerning either priest or sacrifice, with respect to the law of creation and the state of innocence. A supposition of the entrance of sin, and of what ensued thereon in the curse of the law, lie at the foundation of the designation of the priesthood and the sacrifice of Christ. Now, concerning the fall of man, the nature of that sin whereby he fell, the propagation of it to all mankind, the distress, misery, and ruin of the world thereby, I have at large discoursed in our former exercitations. I
have also in them evinced in general, that it was not the will, purpose, or counsel of God, that all mankind should utterly perish in that condition, as He had determined concerning the angels that sinned; but that from the very beginning he had not only given various intimations, but also express testimonies of a contrary design. That, therefore, He would provide a relief for fallen man, that this relief was by the Messiah, whose coming and work He declared in a promise immediately upon the entrance of sin, hath been also demonstrated in those exercitations. Having removed some objections out of our way, it remains that we now build on these foundations. We proceed, then, to consider the special origin of the priesthood of Christ, in the counsel of God, with respect to the especial manner of deliverance from sin and wrath designed therein.

EXERCITATION XXVII.

§ 1. The design.

§ 2. The end of God in his works in general: in the creation of man, Personal transactions in the Holy Trinity concerning him. § 3. Gen. i. 26. § 4. Plurality of persons in the Holy Deity here first revealed. § 5. God speaks not more regio. § 6. Sentiments of the Jews on the words of this text inquired into and rejected. § 7. Objections of Eniedimus unto this testimony examined at large. § 8. Personal internal transactions in the Holy Trinity with respect to mankind, proved. § 9. Prov. viii. 22. Corrupt translation of the LXX. Arian pretences rejected. § 10. The Jewish interpretation of this place discussed and rejected. Objections of the Socinians. § 11. A divine Person intended; proved from the text and context in sundry instances. § 12. The application of this Scripture to the Son of God, vindicated at large from the objections of Eniedimus. § 13. Christ, with respect to God the Father, said to be יִהְיָה יְשֵׁר אֱלֹהִים; in what sense. § 14. The mutual delight and satisfaction of God and Wisdom in each other; what they were, and with respect whereunto, Ps. xl. 8. § 15. The joy and delight of wisdom with the sons of men, hath respect to their redemption and salvation. § 16. Objections of the Jews and Mahometans to the testimony given to Christ as the Son of God, Ps. ii. 1. § 17. The opposition of Eniedimus to the same purpose, removed. § 18. Eternal transactions between the Father and Son, about the redemption of mankind, hence confirmed.

§ 1. From what hath been already discoursed, it is manifest that the counsel of God concerning the incarnation, the priesthood, and the sacrifice of his Son, had respect to sin and to the deliverance of the elect from sin and all its consequences. The same truth has also been particularly discussed and confirmed, in our Exposition of the second chapter of this Epistle. That which now lies before us, is to inquire more expressly into the nature of the counsels of God in this matter, and into their progress in execution. And as in this endeavour we shall carefully avoid all curiosity or vain attempts to be wise above what is written, so on the other hand, we shall study with sober diligence to declare and illustrate what is revealed on this subject, to the end that we may so increase in knowledge, as to be established in faith and obedience. To this end are our ensuing discourses designed.

§ 2. God, in the creation of all things, intended to manifest his nature in its being, existence, and essential properties, and therein to satisfy his wisdom and goodness. Accordingly, we find his expressions concerning himself, in the work of creation, suited to declare these things; see Isa. xl. 12—15. Also that the things themselves that were made, had in their
nature and order such an impression of divine wisdom, goodness, and power upon them, as made manifest the original cause from whence they did proceed. To this purpose discourse our apostle, Rom. i. 19—21. Το γνωστον του θεου φανερον εστιν εν αυτοις: and the Psalmist, Ps. xix. 1, 2, as do sundry other divine writers also. Wherefore, the visible works of God, man only excepted, were designed for no other end, but to declare in general the nature, being, and existence of God. But in this nature there are three Persons distinctly subsisting. And, herein consists the most incomprehensible and sublime perfection of the divine Being. The manifestation and glory, then, of this mystery, was intended in the creation of man. For therein God would glorify himself as subsisting in three distinct Persons, and himself in each of those Persons distinctly. This was not designed immediately in other parts of the visible creation, but in this, which was the compliment and perfection of the other parts. And, therefore, the first express mention of a plurality of Persons in the divine nature, is in the creation of man. And therein, also, are personal transactions intimated, concerning the present and future condition of man. This, therefore, is that which in the first place we shall evince, namely, that there were from all eternity personal transactions in the Holy Trinity concerning mankind in their temporal and eternal condition, which transactions were first manifested in our creation.

§ 3. The first revelation of the counsel of God concerning the glorifying of himself in the making and disposal of man, is declared, Gen. i. 26, let us make man in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion. This was the counsel of God concerning the making of man, that is, not of that particular individual Person who was first created, and so called, but of the species or kind of creature, which in him he now proceeded to create. For the word Adam is used in this and the next chapter, in a threefold sense. First, for the name of the individual man who was first created. He was called Adam, from Adama, the ground, from whence he was taken, ch. ii. 19—21. ανθρωπος εκ γης χωκος, 1 Cor. xv. 47, of the earth, earthly. Secondly, It is taken indefinitely for the man spoken of, chap. ii. 7. ויהי האדם ים האדמה אשר יניש: 'And the Lord God created man,' not he whose name was Adam, for He Hajediah is never prefixed to any proper name, but the man indefinitely of whom he speaks. Thirdly, It denotes the species of mankind: so is it used in this place, for the redemption is in the plural number, 'And let them have dominion: the multitude of individuals being included in the expression of the species. Hence it is added, ver. 27. 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them; which is not spoken with respect unto Eve, who was not then made, but unto the kind or race wherein both sexes were included.

§ 4. Concerning them, God saith, ונהعوا, 'Let us make,' in the plural number; and so are the following expressions of God in the same work: בְּרָחַם, 'in our image,' בְּרָחַם, 'according to our likeness.' This is the first time that God so expresseth himself, and the only occasion whereon he doth so in the account of the creation. As to all other things, we hear no more but יָרָא, יָרָא, 'And God said;' in which word also I will not deny but respect may be had to the plurality of Persons in the divine essence, as the Spirit is expressly mentioned, chap. i. 2. But here the mystery of it is clearly revealed. The Jews constantly affirm, that the elders who trans-
lated the law at the request of Ptolemy, king of Egypt, changed or corrupted the text in thirteen places, whereof this was the first. For ἔργον, 'Let us make,' they rendered by ποιησόω, 'I will make,' and not ποιημένην, in the plural number. And this they say did, lest they should give occasion to the king or others to imagine that their law allowed of any more gods than one, or on any account departed from the singularity of the divine nature. Whether this was the case or not, I know not, and have sufficient reason not to be too forward in giving credit to their testimony, if nothing else be given in evidence of what they affirm. For no traces of any such corruptions remain in any copies or memorials of the translation intended by them, which are come down unto us. But this is sufficiently evident, that the reporter of this story apprehended an unanswerable appearance of a plurality of subsistences in the Deity, which they by whom the Trinity is denied, as we shall see immediately, know not what to make of, or how to solve.

§ 5. Some have indeed taken an easy way in the exposition of this place, to remove the difficulty which appears in it. God, they say, in it speaks more regio, 'in a kingly manner,' by the plural number. 'Mos est, saith Grotius, 'Hebreorum de Deo, ut de rege loqui: reges res magnas agunt de consilio primorum,' 1 Reg. xii. 6; 2 Paral. x. 9, sic et Deus, 1 Reg. xxii. 20. 'It is the manner of the Hebrews to speak of God as of a king. And kings transact important things by the counsel of their chiefs.' But the question is not about the manner of speaking among the Hebrews, (and yet no instance can be given of their speaking in the first person, as here,) but of the words of God himself concerning himself; and of the reason of the change of the expression constantly used before. God is king of all the world, of the whole creation; and if, in creating, he had spoken more regio, he would have done it with respect to the whole equally, and not singly with respect to man. Besides, this mos regius is a custom of a much later date; and that which then did not exist, could not be alluded to. And the reason added why this form of speech is used, namely, because 'kings do great things by the counsel of their principal attendants,' requires in the application, that God should consult with some created princes about the creation of man, which is an anti-scriptural figment, and shall be immediately disproved. Least of all is any countenance given to this interpretation from the place alleged, 1 Kings xxii. 20. The application of this passage to this purpose is borrowed from Aben Ezra on this place, in his attempt to avoid the testimony here given to the Trinity. 'Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead?' For as there is nothing spoken in the plural number to parallel this expression, so, if that allegorical declaration of God's providential rule be literally pressed, Satan, or a lying spirit, must be esteemed to be one of the chiefs with whom he consulted. 'But who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being the man of his counsel hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who made him understand?' Isa. xl. 13, 14.

The ancients unanimously agree, that a plurality of persons in the Deity is here revealed and asserted. Yea, the council of Syrmium, though dubious, yea Arianizing in their confession of faith, yet denounceanathema upon any that shall deny these words. 'Let Us make man,' to be the words of the Father to the Son, Socrat. Lib. 2, Cap. 25, Chrysostome lays the weight of his argument for it, from the change in the manner of expression before used, as he may do justly and solidly. 'Apparet,' saith Ambrose, 'Concilio Trinitatis creatum esse hominem.' Neither have any of those
who of late have tried to evade the evidence of this passage, in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, answered any of the arguments of the ancients for the sense we plead for; nor replied with any likelihood of reason to their objections against that interpretation, which they took notice of as invented long ago. Theodoret in his Quest. in Genes. Quest. 20, urgeth, That if God used this manner of speech concerning himself, merely to declare his mind more regio, he would have done it always, at least he would have done it often. And assuredly, it would have been the form of speech used in that kingly act of giving the law at Sinai; for that, if any thing, required the kingly style pretended. But the absolute contrary is observed. God in that whole transaction with his peculiar people and subjects, speaks of himself constantly in the singular number.

§ 6. But there are two sorts of persons who with all their strength and artifices, oppose our exposition of this place; namely, the Jews and the Socinians, with whom we have to do perpetually in whatever concerns the person and offices of Christ the Messiah, and in what any way relates thereunto. We shall, therefore, first consider what they offer to secure themselves from this testimony against their infidelity, and then farther show the force of the words, to the end peculiarly designed. And, although there is a great coincidence in their pretensions, yet I shall handle them distinctly, that it may the better appear wherein the one receiveth aid from the other.

The Jews are at no small loss, as to the intention of the Holy Ghost in this expression; and if we believe some of them, they have been so from of old. For, as we observed before, they all affirm that these words were changed in the translation of the LXX. because they could not understand how they might be properly expressed without giving countenance unto Polytheism. Philo, de Opificio Mun. knows not on what to fix, but after a pretence of some reason for satisfaction, adds, tην μεν ουν αληθινατην ανικαν, θαν αναγη μονον μεζιναι; The true reason hereof is known to God alone. The reason which he esteems most probable, is taken out of Plato in his Timeus. For whereas, he saith, there was to be in the nature of man a principle of vice and evil, it was necessary that it should be from another author, and not from the Most High God. But, though such woeful mistakes may be passed over in Plato, who had no infallible rule to guide him in his disposition after truth; in him who had the advantage of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, it cannot be excused, seeing this figment riseth up in opposition to the whole design of them. Some seek an evasion in the word פולשנ, which they would have to be the first person singular in Niphal; and not the first person plural in Kal. Having, therefore, a passive signification, the meaning is, that Homo factus est, man or Adam was made in our image and likeness; that is, of Moses and other men. Of this exposition of the words, Aben Ezra says plainly, דנה כהת עשה, that it is an interpretation for a fool; and well refutes it from those words of God himself, Gen. ix. 6, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man;' with other considerations of the text. R. Saadias would have it that God spake these words, 'Secundum consuetudinem Regum,' or ינש רבי כשנ, as Aben Ezra; the plural number, which is the custom of kings. This we have already rejected, and must yet farther call it into examination, as it is managed by the Socinians.

But it is evident that the introduction of this style is comparatively modern, and nothing but usage or custom has given reverence or majesty to
it. Joseph Kimchi would have it, that God speaks to himself, or to the earth, or to the four elements. For as the soul of man was to be immediately created by God, so his body was to be from the earth, by an union of the principles and qualities of it. And this man falls on the rock which he principally aims to avoid; namely, an appearance of Polytheism. For he makes the earth itself to be a God, that hath a principle of operation in itself, with a will and understanding whereby to exert it. Some of them affirm that in these words God consulted with his family above; that is, the angels; which Aben Ezra on the place principally inclines unto. This must afterwards be distinctly examined. Others say it is God and His house of judgment. His house is said to be, 'if it had been written, Let me, or I will make man, he had not taught us that he spake unto his house of judgment, but to himself,' the danger of which he shows, from the expressions in the plural number. Hence, some learned men have supposed that of old by God and his house of judgment, they intended the persons of the Holy Trinity, the Father, Word, and Spirit. But the explication which they frequently give of their minds herein, will not allow us so to judge, at least of any of their post-talmudical masters.

Other vain and foolish conjectures of their in this matter, I shall not repeat. These instances are sufficient as to my present intention. For, hence it is evident, in what uncertainties they involve themselves, who are resolved upon an opposition to the truth. They know not what to fix upon, nor wherewith to relieve themselves. Although they all aim at the same end, yet, what one embraces another condemns, and those that are wisest reckon up all the conjectures they can think of together; but fix on no one as true, or as deserving to be preferred before others. For error is nowhere stable or certain, but fluctuates like the isle of Delos, beyond the skill of men or devils to give it a fixation. And thus much also of their opinions was necessary to be expressed, that it might appear from whom the Socinians, and those who cooperate with them in opposing the testimonies given to the Trinity, do borrow their objections. Little or nothing have they to offer for the support of their cause, but what they have borrowed from those avowed enemies of our Lord Jesus Christ.

§ 7. I shall not in this instance collect the sentiments of the Socinians out of several of their writers, but I shall examine him, who was one of the first that made it his professed design to clade all the testimonies of the Scriptures, which are usually pleaded in the defence of the doctrine of the Trinity. This is Georgius Eniedimus; whose writings indeed gave the first countenance to the Antitrinitarian cause. And I shall the rather deal with him, because his perverse discourses, which were almost worn out of the world, are lately revived by a new edition, and are become common in the hands of many. Besides, indeed, there is little or nothing material added in this cause by his followers, to his sophistical evasions and objections; though what he had not done in the New Testament, being prevented by death, is pursued in his method by Felbinger. The title of his book is, 'Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis Dogma stabiliri solet;' whereof, this under consideration is the second. To the argument from hence for a plurality of persons in the same divine essence, he brings various objections, mostly borrowed from the Jews, and invented by them out of their hatred to the Christian faith. And both of these sorts of men do always think it sufficient to their
cause, to make cavilling objections to the clear evidence of any divine testimony, not regarding to give any sense of their own, which they will abide by, as the true exposition of the words.

He therefore first pleads; 'Si ex hoc loquendi formula numeros et natura Dei venenda et colligenda est, dicimus primo, non plus esse Trinitariis in hoc dicto ad tres Deitatis personas stabilendas præsidii, quam Gentibus et omnibus idololatris, ad sua multiplicia et numero carentia numina confirmandum. Illud enim, FACIAMUS, et NOSTRAM, tam potest ad decem, centum, mille, quam ad tria referri, neque quidquam est futilius et ineptius quam sic argumentari. Hic dicuntur esse multi; ergo sunt tres; nam possunt esse viginti, triginta, quinqua, &c. Ergo siquid roboris in hoc argumento est, hoc tantum concludit Deos esse multos. Absit autem a nobis, certe abest a Mose ista prophanitas, ut multitudinem Deorum, sacrarum literarum testimonio introducamus aut stabiliamus.'

But these things are sophistical and vain. The unity of the divine nature is always supposed in our disquisitions concerning the persons subsisting therein. And this is so clearly and positively asserted in the Scripture, particularly by Moses, Deut. vi 4, and any apprehensions to the contrary are so directly repugnant to the light of nature, that no expressions can be found to give the least countenance to any other notion, without ascribing direct contradictions to it, which if certain and evident, were a sufficient ground to reject the whole. No pretense therefore to any imagination of a plurality of Gods, can be made use of from these words. And the whole remaining sophistry of this objection, lies in a supposition that we plead for three distinct persons in the Trinity from this place, which is false. That there is a plurality of subsistencies in the divine nature, we plead from hence; that these are three, neither more nor less, we prove from other parts of Scripture, without number. Many of these I have elsewhere vindicated from the exceptions of these men. Without a supposition of this plurality of persons, we say, no tolerable account can be given of the reason of this assertion, by them who acknowledge the unity of the divine nature. .And we design no more, but that therein there is mutual counsel, which, without a distinction of persons cannot be fancied. This whole pretense, therefore, founded on a vain and false supposition, that this testimony is used to prove a certain number of persons in the Deity, is altogether vain and frivolous.

He adds, 'Secundo, illud quoque hic perpendendum est, quod ex his Mosis verbis, non sequitur hoc, Deum, qui dixit FACIAMUS,uisse multiplicem, sive non unum fuisset locutum, sed hoc tantum, habe verba prolata coram pluribus. Unus ergo erat, qui loquebatur, sed loquebatur præsentibus alius. Hinc autem non immediate sequitur Createores hominisuisse multos. Nam ad hanc conclusionem pluribus adhuc consequentissis opus est. Nimirum quareendum statim est, quinam illi fuerint, quos Deus allocutus est. Deinde Creaturæ, an increati？ Tum an illa quoque æqualiter cum Deo operati sint in formatione hominis.'

Although he only here proposeth in general, what he intendeth afterwards to pursue in particular, yet something must be observed thereon, to keep upright the state of our inquiry, which he endeavours perpetually to wrest to his advantage. And 1. The invidious expressions which he makes use of as Deum multiplicem, and the like, are devoid of ingenuity and charity; nothing that answers them being owned by those whom he opposeth. 2. It follows not from our exposition of these words, nor is it by us asserted, that man had many creators; which he need not pretend that
there is need of many consequences to prove, seeing none was ever so fond as to attempt the proof of it. I confess that expression in Job; יִאָדְקָה יֵאִישׁ, chap. xxxv. 10, 'Where is God my Creators?' doth prove that He is in some sense many who made us. But whereas creation is a work proceeding from, and an effect of the infinite properties of the one divine nature, our Creator is but one, although that one be equally Father, Son, and Spirit. 3. It is granted that one speaks these words, not more together; but he so speaks them, that he takes those to whom he speaks into the society of the same work with himself; neither is the speaker more or otherwise concerned, in, Let us make, and in our image, than are those to whom he speaks. Neither indeed is it the speaking of these words before many concerned, that Moses mentions, but it is the concurrence of many to the same work, with the same interest and concern in it. And whoever is concerned, speaking or spoken to, in the first word, Let us make, is no less respected in the following words, in our image and likeness. They must therefore be of one and the same nature, which was to be represented in the creature, to be made in their image. These things being premised, we may take a view of the pursuit and management of his particular objections.

'Atque quod ad primum attinet; Quinam scilicet illi fuerint, quos sit Deus allocutus; primo dicere possimus, non necessarium esse, propter hujusmodi locutionum formas, multa individua constituere. Sepe enim Scriptores aliquem, secum deliberantem et discipiantem, introducunt. Ex quo non statim sequitur ei plures in consultatione adesse, sed tantum hoc, illum diligentem et solicite omnia considerare et expendere. Ita ergo Deus animal omnium præstantissimum creaturus, introducuit a Mose consultabundus andropoσωσiāνως more Scripture. Unde tamen non sequitur, Deum in istud consilium alios adhibuisse.'

Hic author this author exceeds the confidence of the Jews; for they constantly grant, that somewhat more than one individual person must be intended in these words, or no proper sense can be elicited from them. But the whole of this discourse, and what he would insinuate by it, is merely petitio principii, accompanied with a neglect of the argument which he pretends to answer. For he only says that one may be introduced, as it were deliberating and consulting with himself, whereof yet he gives no instance, either from the Scripture, or from any other sober writing, nor can he give any parallel to this discourse here used. But he takes no notice that the words directly introduce more than one consulting and deliberating among themselves, about creating of man in their image. And of a form of speech answering hereunto, where one only and absolutely is concerned, no instance can be given in any approved author.

Again, what he concludes from his arbitrary supposition, namely, that hence it doth not follow, that God took counsel with others besides himself, is nothing to the argument in hand. For we prove not hence that God consulted with others besides himself, nor would it be to our purpose so to do. But this the words evince, that he who thus consulteth with himself, is in some respect more than one. But will this author abide by it, that this is the sense of the place, and that thus the words are to be interpreted? This he hath not the least thought of, nor will maintain that it is according to truth. For if they can invent objections against our interpretation of any testimony of Scripture, they never care to give one of their own, which they will adhere to and defend: which way of dealing in sacred things which are of so great importance, is very perverse and froward. Thus our author here relinquishing this conjecture proceeds:
Sed demus esto; Deum hic aliquos compellasse, quaramus quinam isti fuerint. Audite celi.

Rather than this man would omit any cavil, he will make use of such as are sapless and ridiculous. God doth not here speak to others that are not himself, but by speaking as he doth declares himself to exist in a plurality of persons, capable of mutual consultation and joint operation. But here he must be supposed, as some of the Jews fancied before him, to speak to the inanimate parts of the creation; as he speaks in the first of Isaiah, 'Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth.' But such rhetorical apostrophes are in truth spoken to men, and that scheme of speech is used merely to impress them with the things that are spoken. Apply this unto the words of God in the circumstances of the creation of man, and it will appear shamefully ridiculous. He therefore trusteth not to this subterfuge, but proceeds to another.


This man seems willing to grant any thing but the truth. That which this whole discourse amounts to is, that God spake these words to the angels, as the Jews pretend. So Jarchi says, that God spake unto them by way of condescension, that they should not be troubled to see a creature made little less excellent than themselves. Others of them say, that God spake to them as he is attended with them, or as they wait upon his throne, which they call his house of judgment, and this sense Ennedinus, and those that follow him, use. But this we have disproved already, so that it need not here be much insisted on. The Scripture expressly denies that God took counsel with any besides himself in the whole work of the creation, Isa. xl. 12—14. 'Creation is a pure act of infinite monarchical sovereignty, wherein there was no use of any intermediate instrumental causes, as there was in the government of the world. Wherefore, in the course of providence, God may be introduced as speaking with or to the creatures whom he will employ in the execution thereof, and who attend his throne to receive his commands; but in the work of creation, wherein none were to be employed, this can have no place, nor can God be represented as consulting with any creatures in the creation, without a disturbance of the true notion and apprehension of it. Besides, nothing of this nature can be proved, no not with respect to providential dispensations from the places alleged. For Isa. vi., it is the prophet only whom God in vision speaks to, calling forth his faith and obedience, 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' ver. 8. But whereas he speaks both in the singular and plural number; 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"
there is there also a plurality of persons in the same individual essence expressed; and to the other persons besides the Father, is this place applied by the Holy Ghost, John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 26. In the other two places, 1 Kings xxii. Job i. God is introduced speaking to the devil, which it is some marvel to find cited to this purpose, by persons of more sobriety and modesty than Eniedinus.

Again, man was made in the image and likeness of him that speaks, and of all that are as it were conferred with. 'Let us make man in our image."

But man was not made in the image and likeness of angels, but in the image and likeness of God, that is of God alone, as it is expressed in the next verse. And the image here mentioned, doth not denote that which is made to answer another thing, but that which another is to answer unto. 'Let us make man in our image,' that is, conformable unto our nature. Now God and angels have not one common nature, that should be the exemplar and prototype in the creation of man. Their natures and properties are infinitely distant. And that likeness which is between angels and men, doth no way prove that man was made in the image of angels, although angels should be supposed to be made before them. For more is required hereunto than a mere similitude and likeness, as one egg is like to another, but not the image of another. A design of conforming one to another, with its dependence on that other, is required hereunto; so man was made in the image of God alone. But he farther objects.

'Sed quid tum, si omnia demus; Deum non creaturis presentibus, neque illos esse allocutum his verbis; sequitur ne eum qui locutus est cum illis quos allocutus est ejusdem esse Naturae et essentiae? Hoc enim isti motulum. Certa fatum est ita colligere. Ille qui loquitur et illi quos allocuitur sunt ejusdem Essentiae. Sic enim Serpens erit Eva, et Homo Diabolum et quid non?"

At whose door the censure of folly will rest, a little examination of this sophism will discover. For whatever this man may imagine, it will certainly follow, that if God spake to any, and they were not creatures, those to whom he spake were of the same nature and essence with him that spake. For God and creatures divide the whole nature of beings; and therefore if any be spoken to that is not a creature, he is God; unless he can discover a middle sort of being, that is not God nor a creature, neither the maker nor made. Again, it is a wondrously vain supposition, that our argument from hence is taken, from this general proposition, 'He that speaks, and he that is spoken to, are of the same nature;' the absurdity whereof is obvious to children. But there is here such a speaking of one, as declares him in some respect to be more than one. And they are all assumed into the same society, in the forming of man in the likeness of that one nature, whereof they were equally partakers. All these pretences thereof are at last deserted by our author, who betakes himself to that which is inconsistent with them.

'Sed excipien punctasse, Mosem non tantum hoc significare, Deum esse allocutum presentes illos, sed eos in societatem operis vocasse, et creationis participes fecisse; faciamus inquit. At qui Creator est hominis, est etiam universi; qui universi est solus et verus Deus. Hoc igitur jam diligentius exequendum est; an Deus in hoc verbo faciamus, secum alios incluserit, atque creationem hominis alius quoque communicaerit? Nos enim dici mus, illud faciamus, etiamsi forma et voce sit plura, tamen significione et vi esse singulare; neque deullo alio nisi de solo loquente, hoc est de Deo esse intelligendum.'
As he here at once overthrows all his former pretences, with some others also that he adds from the Jews in the close of his discourse, he thus makes it sufficiently manifest that it is not truth, or the true sense of the words, which he inquires after, but merely how he may multiply captious objections to the sense by us pleaded for. And now when he comes to own a direct opposition to it, his discourse wherein he states the matter in difference, is composed of sophistical expressions. For whereas he pretends that our judgment is, ‘That God by these words, calls in others besides himself to himself into the society of this work;’ whereby it is proved that both he that speaks, and they that are spoken unto, are of the same nature, he doth but attempt to deceive the unwary reader. For we say not that ‘God speaks unto others besides himself,’ nor calls in others to the work of creation; but God alone speaks in himself and to himself, because as he is one in essence, so as to personal subsistence there are three in one, as many other places of the Scripture do testify. And these three are each of them intelligent operators, though all working by that nature which is one, and common to, or in them all. Therefore are they expressed as speaking thus in the plural number, which could not be in any congruity of speech, were he that speaks but one person as well as one in nature. And were not the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed in other places of Scripture, there could be no proper interpretation given of these words, so as to give no countenance to Polytheism. But that being so revealed and taught elsewhere, the interpretation of this place is easy and plain, according to the analogy thereof. But that one person alone is intended in these words, he proceeds to prove.

‘Primo enim hoc omnibus linguis usitatum est, ut numero plurali, cum de se cum de aliis etiam singularibus passim sine discrimine utantur; sic Christus cum de se solo loqueretur, John iii. 11, ait, Quod scimus loquimur, et quod videmus testamur; in quibus verbis Christum de se pluraliter loqui sequentia ostendunt; si, inquit, terrena dixi vobis. Sic Deus de seipso solo, Isa. xii. 22, Accedant et nuntient nobis, quaecunque ventura sunt, et ponemus cor nostrum et sciemus novissima corum et que ventura sunt indicate nobis. Quin etiam illud observavi potest, de eodem et unico singulari permixtum nunc singularem nunc pluralem usurpari numerum; et Isa. vi., dicit Deus, Quem mittam aut quis ibit pro nobis? Ex quibus et similibus locis et loquendi usu vulgare apparit, posse verbum plurale de uno solo recte intelligi et dici. Ergo etiamsi Deus hic dicat faciamus, tamen tandem est, ac si diceret faciam.’

What he saith is so usual in all languages, that one speaking of himself should speak in the plural number, having respect to no more than himself, nor letting any others into a concern with himself in the things spoken, he can give no instance of in any language, out of any ancient approved author.

1. That mode of speech is a novelty in the use of language. Particularly it is a stranger to the Scripture. As this author could not, no more can any of his successors produce, any one instance out of the Old Testament, of any one, unless it were God alone, were he never so great or powerful, that spake of himself in the first person in the plural number. Aben Ezra himself on this place grants that no such instance can be given. He is therefore at once deprived of the Hebrew language, in which alone his instances ought to be given, if he will argue from the use of language.

2. The places he recites relieve him not, John iii. 11. Our Saviour’s words respect not himself only, but his disciples also, who taught and baptized in his name, whose doctrine he would vindicate as his own. And as
for what he adds afterwards, 'If I have told you earthly things,' it relates
directly to that discourse which in his own person he had just held with
Nicodemus, with respect whereunto he changed his phrase of speech unto
the singular number, which overthrows his pretensions. The words of the
prophet, Isa. xli. 22, are either spoken of God alone, or of God and the
church, whom he called and joined with himself, in bearing witness against
idols and idolaters. And he may take his choice in whether sense he will
admit of them. If they are spoken of God alone, we have another testi-
mony to confirm our doctrine, that there must be and is a plurality of per-
sons in the one singular undivided nature of God. If of the church also,
there is no exception in them to our rule, that one person speaks of himself
in the Scripture only in the singular number.

3. His other instance out of the same prophet, Isa. vi. 8, 'Whom shall
I send, and who will go for us?' is indeed to his purpose of proving, that
the singular and plural number are used mixedly or promiscuously of one
and the same. But who is that one? It is God alone. No such instance
can be given in any other. And why are things so expressed by him and
concerning him? Who can give any tolerable reason, but this alone;
namely, because his nature is one and singular, but subsisting in more per-
sons than one. And indeed this place considered with its circumstances,
and the application of it in the New Testament, doth infallibly confirm
the truth we contend for. He hath not yet therefore attained to a proof
that the word may be so used as he pretends, which with these men is
enough to secure them from the force of any Scripture testimony. He
adds therefore:

'Secundo, Non solum posse, sed omnino necessarium esse, ut hic facia-
num singularare denotet individuum, inde probatur, quia si illa vox multitu-
dinem in se includeret, nunquam ausi fuissent sacri Scriptores eam immutare
et in singularem numerum vertere. At Prophetæ, Ipse Christus et apostoli
ubicunque de hac creatione loquuntur eam uni et quidem in singulari
usurpata voce attribuunt. Nam statim ipse Moses subjicit, Et creavit Deus
hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam. Quod proxime dixerat
faciamus, hic exprimit per Deus creavit; quod ibi in imaginem nostram, hic
in singulari, ad imaginem suam. Sic Cap. vi., Delebo hominem quem
creavi. Et Christus Matt. xix. 4. Qui fecit hominem ab initio, masculum
et feminam fecit eos. Marc. x. 6, Masculum et feminam fecit eos Deus.
iii. 10. Induentes novum hominem, eum qui renovatur ad agnitionem se-
cundum imaginem illius qui creavit illum. Cum ergo omnes testantur uni-
cum esse illum, qui hominem creavit, sequitur etiam hoc loco per verbum
faciamus, non nisi unum significari. Posse enim unum per plurale signi-
ficari jam monstravimus.'

Nothing can be more effectually pleaded, in the behalf of the cause op-
posed by this man, than what is here allledged by him in opposition to it.
For it is certain, that the holy writers would never have ascribed the cre-
ation of all unto one, and expressed it in the singular number, as they do
most frequently, had it not been one God, one Creator, by whom all things
were made. This is the position which he lays down as the foundation of
his objection. And he was not so brutish as once to imagine, that we
believed there were more creators, and so consequently more gods than one.
But takes this assertion also on the other side; namely, That the holy
writers would never have ascribed the creation to more than one, unless
that one in some sense or other had been more than one. Where-
fore they do not change, as is pretended, the plural expression into a singular, but the Holy Ghost expressing the same thing of making man in the image of God, sometimes expresseth it in the singular number, by reason of the singularity of the nature of God, which is the original of all divine operations, for God works by his nature; and sometimes in the plural, because of the plurality of persons in that nature. On which supposition these different expressions are reconciled, and without it they cannot be reconciled.

And all these objections and cavils are brought merely against the necessary use and signification of the word factamus, ‘Let us make,’ in the plural number. What is alleged by the ancients and others, to clear the intention of the expression in this place particularly, he takes no notice of. For he makes no inquiry, why seeing in the whole antecedent account of the work of creation, God is introduced speaking constantly in the singular number, here the mode of speech is changed, and God speaks as consulting or deliberating in the plural number. And he says not only, ‘Let us make,’ but adds, ‘In our image, and in our likeness.’ To imagine this to be done without some peculiar reason, is to dream rather than inquire into the sense of Scripture. And other reason besides what we have assigned, cannot be given with any tolerable congruity to the common use of speaking. But supposing that he hath sufficiently evinced what he intended, he proceeds to give a reason of the use of this kind of speech, where one is spoken of in the plural number.

Quae sit autem causa cur liceat per pluralem numerum significare unum, et quando hoc soleat fieri, variae afferri solent causae. Quidam censent fieri honoris gratia, ut de eminentibus et excellentibus personis pluraliter loquamur. Id usitatum esse linguæ Hebrææ annotant docti; inter quos Cevallérius in sua syntaxi hune tradit canonom: Quæ dignitatem significat pluraliter usurpantur ad ampliorem honorem. Ut, Jos. xxiv. 20, Dii sancti ipse. Exod. xxi. 29, Domini ejus pro Dominus. Isa. xix. 4, In manu Dominorum duri; pro Domini. Gen. xliii. 40, Domini terræ; pro Dominus. Imo hoc non tantum in Hebrææ, sed in aliis quoque linguæ esse usitatum, patet ex σχημα. Sophoclis; qui in OEdipo Coloneo annotavit poetam dixisse δούναι σφιν pro δούναι αυτῷ et addit scriptum esse κατα τιμην πληθυντικώς; propter honorem seu dignitatem pluraliter.

We also grant that it is one who is here intended, only we say, he is not spoken of under that consideration of being one. Nor is it enough to prove that the word may in the plural number be used in a singular sense, but that it is so in this place, seeing the proper import of it is otherwise. Neither can that expression concerning God, Josh. xxiv. 20, אֱלֹהִים וֹאֵת צְדָקָת, ‘Dii sancti ipse,’ be used, ‘Honoris Gratia,’ seeing it is no honour to God to be spoken of as many gods, for his glory is that he is one only. It hath therefore another respect, namely, to the persons in the unity of the same nature. I could easily give the reasons of all his other instances in particular, wherein men are spoken of, and manifest that they will yield him no relief. But this may suffice in general, that they are all speeches concerning others in the third person, and all our inquiry is concerning any one thus speaking of himself in the first person, whereof no one can be given. Wherefore our author not confiding to this his last refuge, takes himself to foolish imaginations of God’s speaking to the superior parts of the world, whence the soul of man was to be taken, and the inferior whence his body was to be made; to a design for the instruction of men, how to use counsel and deliberation in great undertakings; to a double knowledge in God, uni-
versal and particular; which are all of them rabbinical fopperies, evidently manifesting that he knew not what to confide in or rest upon, as to the true cause of this expression, after he had resolved to reject that alone which is so.

§ 8. The foundation of our intention from this place being thus cleared, we may safely build upon it. And that which hence we intend to prove is, that in the framing and producing the things which concern mankind, there were peculiar internal personal transactions, between the Father, Son, and Spirit. The scheme of speech here used is, in genere deliberativo; by way of consultation. But whereas this cannot directly and properly be ascribed to God, an anthropopathy must be allowed in the words. The mutual distinct actings and concurrence of the several persons in the Trinity is expressed by way of deliberation; and that because we can no otherwise, determine or act. And this was peculiar in the work of the creation of man, because of an especial designation of him to the glory of God, as three in one. Neither could he have been created in the accidental image of God but with immediate respect to the Son, as he was the essential image of the Father. The distinct personal actings of the Trinity, wherein the priesthood of Christ is founded, are not I confess, contained herein. For these things preceded the consideration of the fall, whereby the image now proposed and resolved to be communicated unto man in his creation was lost, which Christ was designed to recover. But here is enough to confirm our general assertion, that such distinct actings there were with respect to mankind; and the application hereof to our present purpose, will be directed in the ensuing testimonies. This therefore I have only laid down and proved as the general principle which we proceed upon. Man was peculiarly created unto the glory of the Trinity, or of God as three in one. Hence in all things concerning him, there is not only an intimation of those distinct subsistences, but also of their distinct actings with respect unto him. So it was eminently in his creation; his making was the effect of special counsel. Much more shall we find this fully expressed with respect unto his restoration by the Son of God.

§ 9. The same truth is farther revealed and confirmed, Prov. viii. 22—31, '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: when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth. While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there; when he set a compass upon the face of the depth. When he established the clouds above, when he strengthened the fountains of the deep. When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundation of the earth. Then was I by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. Rejoicing in the habitable parts of the earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.'

We must first secure this testimony against those who have attempted to deprive the church of God of its use and advantage; and then apply it unto our purpose. In the ancient church, none questioned but that the wisdom which here discourseth is the Son of God. Only the Arians greatly endeavoured to corrupt the sense of my passage in it, and thereby to wrest the whole to give countenance to their heresy. Those of late who agree with them in an opposition to the same truth, upon other principles,
observing how they failed in their attempt, do leave the sense of particular passages unquestioned; and call into question the whole subject of the discourse, wherein if they prevail, the sense of particular places must be accommodated to what they substitute in the room thereof.

It is wisdom that speaks and is spoken of. This we believe to be he who is the wisdom of God, even his eternal Son. This they will not grant; although they are not agreed what it is that is intended. A property, say some, of the divine nature; the exercise of divine wisdom in making the world, say others; the wisdom that is in the law, say the Jews; or as some of them, the wisdom that was given to Solomon; and of their mind have been some of late. With the Arians I shall not much contend, because their heresy seems to be much buried in the world, although some of late have endeavoured to give countenance to their opinions, or them who maintained them. Sand. Hist. Eccles. encl. lib. 3. It was the 22nd verse which they principally insisted on. For whereas it was granted between them and the HomooUsians, that it is the Son of God which is here spoken of, they hence pleaded for his creation before the world, or his production, εν ουκ ουτων, and 'that there was, when he was not.' This they did from these words, ὃν ἔκτισε, which words were rendered by the LXX. or the Greek translation then in common use, δ θεος ἐκτισε. τος, ἀρην ὄνων αυτον. 'Dominus condidit me initium viarum suarum.' And this is followed by all the old translations, יאראב say the Targum; and the Syriac, 'Creavit me;' and the Arabic follows them; only the vulgar Latin reads, 'possedit,' possessed me. On this corrupt translation the Arians bare themselves so high, as to provoke their adversaries to a decision of the whole controversy between them, by the sentence of this one testimony. But the corruption of the common translation is long since confessed. Aquila and Theodotion both render the word by εκτησατο 'he possessed.' Nor doth ἄρπ in any place, or on any occasion, signify to make or create, or any thing of the like import. Its constant use is either to acquire and obtain, or to possess and enjoy. That which any one hath, which is with him, which belongs to him, and is his own, he is ἄρπ the possessor of. So is the Father said to 'possess wisdom,' because it was his, with him, even his eternal Word or Son. No more is intended hereby, but what the apostle more clearly declares, John i. 1, 2, εν αρχε δ λογος ἦν προς τον θεον. 'In the beginning the Word was with God.' But with these I shall not contend.

§ 10. The Jews, and those who in the things concerning the person of Christ, borrow their weapons to combat his deity, we must not pass by. For an examination of their pretences and sophisms in this cause, at least occasionally as they occur unto us, I do not guess, but know to be necessary.

Grotius on this place tells us, 'Hæc de ea Sapientia quæ in lege apparat, exponunt Hebraei;' the Hebrews expound these things of that wisdom which is seen in the law. And as to many of them, this information is true; to which he adds of his own, 'Et sane ei si non soli, at precipue hæc Attributa conveniunt; and indeed the things here attributed to wisdom do agree to it, if not only, yet principally. Whether this be the case or not, the ensuing examination will evince.

The Jews then affirm that the wisdom here intended, is the wisdom of the law, as this appears in the law, or the wisdom that God used in giving the law. But how the things here ascribed to wisdom, can belong to the law given on Sinai, it is hard to conceive. To take off this difficulty they tell us that the law was one of the seven things which God made before
the creation of the world; which they prove from this place, ver. 22, 'In the beginning of his ways he possessed me; yea, and that as they say, two thousand years before the creation, signified by the two Alephs in that sentence. Midrash Bamidbar, in cap. 1. But Aben Ezra, in his preface to his annotations on the Bible, tells us, that they are mystical allegories, and not true in their literal sense; as doth also the author of Nizachon, Sec. Beresh. sect. 3, who likewise informs us, that these things said to be made before the world, תְּלֵי הָאָדָם תְּרָעָם; 'because of their excellency and worth,' whence they were first thought upon. But these fragments we need not trouble ourselves about. Their apprehension, that the wisdom intended is that of the law, which Grotius gives countenance to, shall be examined. The Socinians are not solicitous what the things mentioned are ascribed, if they can satisfy themselves in their objections to our ascription of them to the Son of God. I shall therefore first confirm our exposition of the place, and then remove their objections out of our way.

§ 11. First. It is an intelligent person that is here intended; for all sorts of personal properties are ascribed to it. It cannot therefore be merely an essential property of the divine nature. Nor can the things spoken concerning it with respect to God, be any way verified in his essential attributes. Much less is it wisdom in general, or wisdom in man; as by some it is expounded: no one thing here mentioned being in any tolerable sense applicable thereunto. For, 1. in the whole discourse Wisdom speaks as an intelligent person; whereof almost every verse in the whole chapter is an instance. 2. Personal authority and power are assumed by it, ver. 15, 16, 'By me kings reign, and princes decree justice; by me princes rule; and nobles, even the judges of the earth.' 3. Personal promises upon duties to be performed towards it, due unto God himself, ver. 17, 'I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me;' which is our respect to God. Ps. Lxxiii. 1, 'O God, thou art my God, early will I seek thee;' which is elsewhere often expressed. 4. Personal divine actions, ver. 20, 'I lead in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment.' ver. 20, 'That I may cause them that love me to inherit substance, and I will fill their treasures.' Ver. 30, 31, 'I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him, and my delights were with the sons of men.' 5. Personal properties, as eternity. Ver. 23, 'I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.' Ver. 24, 25, Wisdom, ver. 14, 'Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom, I have understanding and strength.'

Secondly. The name of Wisdom is the name of the Son, who is the wisdom of God. For the wisdom mentioned, chap. ix. 1, the Jews themselves confess that it is one of the נְעַם, or distinct properties that are in the divine נְעַם, that is substance or essence; whereby the Son of God alone can be intended.

Thirdly. The things here spoken of Wisdom, are all of them, or at least the principal of them, expressly elsewhere attributed to the Son, ver. 11. Phil. iii. 8, 15; Rev. xix. 16, 22; John i. 1—3. 23, 24; Col. i. 15—17. 39; John i. 14. 32; Rev. xxii. 1. 14.

Fourthly. The relation of the Wisdom that speaks to God, declares it to be his eternal Word or Son: 'I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him;' as he did in whom his soul is always well pleased. And lastly, as we shall farther see, they are the eternal transactions of the Father and Son that are here described, which are capable of no other interpretation.

§ 12. It is not my design to plead here the eternal existence of the Son.
of God, antecedent to his incarnation; I have done it also at large elsewhere. But because the faith thereof is the foundation of what I shall farther offer concerning the origin of his priesthood, the testimonies produced to that purpose, must be vindicated from the exceptions of the professed adversaries of that fundamental truth. And these, as to this place, are collected and summed up by Enedimus. And his manner is, as was before observed, to multiply sophistical exceptions, that so by any means they may distract the mind of the reader, and render him uncertain, and in this he is followed by all who are of his persuasion. They consider not whether what they offer be true or no; and commonly their evasions contradict and overthrow one another. But so the truth may be rejected, they regard not what is received. First, therefore, he lays his exception to the whole matter; and affirms, That it is not wisdom but prudence that speaks these words, and is the subject of the whole discourse.

"Quod ad primum attinet, ne illud quidem indubitatum est, verba prescripta a Sapientia dici. Si enim versio Pagnini, Merceri, et Textus Hebraicus consulatur, apparent verba illa proferri ab intelligentia vel prudentia, quae in hoc capite tum conjuncte, tum separatim cum Sapientia ponitur, ut appareat ex ver. 1. and 14, in ejus posteriori parte incipit intelligentia de se loqui. Nam ver. 14, secundum Pagninum haec est interpretatio: Penes me est consilium et sapientia; et hucusque loquitur de se Sapientia. Postea sequitur: Ego sum intelligentia, mea est fortiudo, &c. Ita ut sequentia omnia ad finem capitis ab intelligentia proferantur. Cum ergo Paulus Christum non intelligentiam sed sapientiam vocet, et verba prescripta ab intelligentia proferantur, sequitur locum hunc ad Christum non pertinere."

What those names of Pagnin, Mercer, and the Hebrew text are produced for, I cannot well conjecture. Both in the original, and in the versions of those learned men, the context is as clear to our purpose, as in any other translation whatever. And the view of the text will ease us of this forlorn exception. The comparing of the first verse with the 14th gives no countenance unto it. For 1st. in ver. 1, the mention of הוהי is not the introduction of a new person, or thing, but another name of the same person or thing, as the expositors agree whatever they apply the words unto. 2d. The words מָצְאֵת, ver. 1, and מָצְאַת, ver. 14, rendered both understanding, and both from the same root, are yet not absolutely the same, so that several things may be intended by them. 3d. The whole context makes it plain, that it is wisdom, which speaks those words, ver. 14, יָרוּץ אֶל חַיָּה כַּהַנִּים וְאֵילֶּלֶה. The preceding words are, 'I Wisdom dwell with prudence, and the evil tongue and froward mouth do I hate,' ver. 12, 13, whereon it follows, 'counsel is mine, and sound wisdom, or substance, I am understanding, I have strength.' As in the beginning Wisdom says, מָצְאֵת, so in the close, by a continuation of the same form of speech, מָצְאַת, is a defective expression, and there is no verb following to be regulated by מַכֵּה. Wherefore, according to the perpetual use of that language, the verb substantive is to be supplied, as it is in our translation, 'I am Understanding.' Understanding therefore cannot be the person speaking, but a descriptive adjunct of him that speaks. There is the same expression concerning Wisdom, ver. 12, מָצְאֵת, 'I Wisdom;' but is not defective because of the verb following, מַכֵּה, 'have dwelt,' or do dwell. Supply the verb substantive here where there is no defect, and the whole sense will be corrupted. But in this place, if it be omitted, there will be no sense remaining. Neither is מָצְאֵת of any other signification than מַכֵּה כַּהַנִּים וְאֵילֶּלֶה 'I have or am Un-
derstanding,' and 'I have strength.' This plea therefore evinceth nothing but the boldness of them that use it. He proceeds to another:

' Deinde hic Sapientia pro substantiva et Persona esse accipienda, non aliunde probari potest aut solet, quam quod hic loqui et clamare dicitur, atque actiones quaedam ei attribuuntur. At id usitatissimum in sacris est, ut etiam accidentibus actiones adscribantur per prosopopoeiam. Sic misericordia et pax de coelo prospicere, se mutuo osculari dicuntur. Et ne longe abeamus; hic Prudentia seu Intelligentia, vociferare, stare in semitis, clamar ad portas urbis dicitur. Neque tamen quisquam ita stolidus est ut non intelligat, misericordiam, pacem et prudentiam esse accidentia, et in his loquendi formulis prosopopoeiam non agnoscat.'

How we prove a person to be here intended, that is, the eternal Word of God, hath been declared. There are other considerations whic evince it, besides that here mentioned. But this 'prosopopoeia,' or fiction of a person, is of great use to the Antitrinitarians. By this one engine they presume they can despoil the Holy Ghost of his Deity and Personality. Whatever is spoken of him in the Scripture, they say it is by a 'prosopopoeia,' or the fiction of a person, those things being assigned to a quality or an accident which really belong to a person only. But as to what concerns the Holy Spirit, I have elsewhere taken this engine out of their hands, and cast it to the ground, so that none of them alive will erect it again. Here they make use of it against the Deity of Christ; as they do also on other occasions. I do acknowledge there is such a scheme of speech used by rhetoricians and orators, whereof some examples do occur in the Scripture. That which is indeed proper only to a person, is sometimes ascribed to a thing, or a person who is dead or absent may be introduced as present and speaking. But yet Quintilian the great master of the art of oratory, denies, that by this figure, speech can be ascribed to that which never had it. 'Nam certe,' saith he, 'sermo fingi non potest, ut non persone sermo fingatur.' If you feign speech, you must feign it to be the speech of a person, or one endowed with a power of speaking. And it is hard to find in good authors, an instance in which speech is thus ascribed to things inanimate, unless it be where, by another figure, they introduce countries or cities speaking or pleading for themselves, wherein by a metonymy the inhabitants of them are intended. But such an ascription is not to be found in the Scripture at all. For a 'prosopopoeia,' or fiction of a person, is a figure quite distinct from all sorts of allegories, pure, or mixed, from apologues, fables, and parables, wherein when the scheme is evident, any thing may be introduced speaking, like the trees in the discourse of Jotham, Judg. ix. The instance of 'mercy and peace looking down from heaven and kissing each other,' is an example of a mode of speech, in which different figures are mixed. The foundation is a metonymy of the cause for the effect, or rather of the adjunct for the cause; and the 'prosopopoeia,' is evident. But that a person should be introduced, speaking in a continued discourse, ascribing to himself all personal properties, absolute and relative, all sorts of personal actions, and those the very same which in sundry other places are ascribed to one certain person, (as all the things here mentioned are to the Son of God,) who yet is no person, never was a person, nor represents any person; and that this should be done without the least intimation of any figure therein, or of any thing inconsistent with the nature of things and persons treated of, and that in a discourse didactical and prophetical, is such an enormous fiction, as that nothing in any author, much less in the Old or New Testament, will give the least countenance to it.
There are in the Scripture, allegories, apologues, and parables; but all of them are so plainly, evidently, and professedly such, and so unavoidably require a figurative exposition from the nature of the things themselves, (as where stones are said to hear, and trees to speak;) that there is no danger of any mistake about them, nor difference concerning their figurative acceptance. And the only safe rule of ascribing a figurative sense to any expression in the Scripture, is when the nature of things will not bear that which is proper; as where the Lord Christ calls himself a door and a vine, and says that bread is his body. But to make allegories of such discourses as this, founded in the fiction of persons, is a ready way to turn the whole Bible into an allegory, which may be done with as much ease and probability of truth. He farther objects:

'Quod secundo loco contendunt, hic nihil figurare, sed omnia proprie dici, nimis absurdum est. Nam etiamsi daremus hic sapientiam esse Personam quandam, quam ipsi λόγον appellant; tamen certum eset illum tempore Solomonis in plateis non clamasse, nec cum hominibus hilariter conversatum esse, nec domum ædificasse, excidisse septem columnas, victimas obtulisse, miscuisse vinum, et cetera que hic recitantur proprie fecisse. Alias debuerunt fateri, Christum ab æterno fuisse incarnatum, quando quidem he actiones proprie non possunt nisi homini jam nato competere. Itaque et impudentis et indioci est negare hanc orationem Solomonis esse figuratum.'

He does not tell us who they are, who say that no expressions in this discourse are figurative. Neither doth this follow upon a denial, that the whole is founded in the fiction of a person. For a true and real person may speak things figuratively; and sometimes it is necessary that he should do so. These men will not deny God to be a Person, nor yet that he often speaketh of himself and of his works figuratively. The same doth Wisdom also here, in the declaration of some of his works. But that which animates this objection, is a false supposition, that the eternal Word cannot be said to do or to effect any thing, but what he doth immediately in his own Person, and that as incarnate. What God doth by the ministry of others, that He also doth himself. When He gave the law by the ministry of angels, He gave the law himself; and when He speaks by the prophets, He is everywhere said to speak himself. That therefore which was done in the days of Solomon, by the command, appointment, authority, and assistance of Wisdom, was done then by Wisdom itself. And so all things here ascribed unto it, some properly, some figuratively, were done by the Word in the means by him appointed. In the ministry of the priests, levites, prophets, teachers of the law, inviting all sorts of persons to the fear of the Lord, he performed the most of them. And the remainder of the things intended, he effected in his ordinances, and by the institutions of divine worship. Besides, there is a prophetical scheme in these words. There is here declared, not only what Wisdom then did, but especially what it should do, namely, in the days of the gospel. For the manner of the prophets is, to express things future as present or past, because of the certainty of their accomplishment. And these things they spake of the coming of Christ in the flesh. See 1 Pet. i. 11, 12, iii. 15.

But utterly to remove this pretence of prosopopoeias and figures, it is necessary only to observe that which none will deny, namely, that the Wisdom that speaks here, ch. viii. is the same that speaks, ch. i. from ver. 20, to the end. And if Wisdom there be not a Person, and that a divine Person, there is none in heaven. For to whom or to what else can those words be
ascribed, which Wisdom speaks, ver. 23—27, 'Turn you at my reproof: behold I will pour out my Spirit upon you, I will make known my words unto you. Because I have called, and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I will also laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer: they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me.' If these things express not a Person, and that a divine Person, the Scripture gives us no due apprehension of any thing whatever. Who is it that pours out the Holy Spirit? Who is it that men sin against in refusing to be obedient? Who is it that in their distress they call upon, and seek early in their trouble? The whole Scripture declares to whom, and to whom alone, these things belong, and may be ascribed.

After introducing some things nothing to the purpose, he yet makes three objections more to this testimony, to the eternal personal existence of this Wisdom. As,

'Praeterea haec Sapientia de qua agit Solomon, loquitur, docet, instituit homines. At Jesus Christus postremis tantum diebus, teste Apostolo ad Heb. i. locutus est hominibus; ergo non ætate Solomons.'

The apostle says not that Jesus Christ spake only in the latter days, Heb. i., but that 'God in the last days spake unto us in his Son.' And the immediate speaking to us by the Son in the last days, as he was incarnate, hinders not but that he spake before by his Spirit in the prophets, as the apostle affirms him to have done, 1 Pet. i. 11. And by this Spirit did he speak, that is, teach and instruct men in the days of Solomon, and from the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. iii. 18—20.

'Denique Prophetia illa, Isa. xlii. 2, Ecce servus meas quem eligi, non clamabit, neque audiet aliquis in plateis voce ejus, applicatur Christo, Matt. xii. 28. At haec Sapientia dictitur clamasse in plateis. Itaque falsum est hanc Sapientiam Solomonis fuisse Jesum Christum.'

A man of gravity and learning ought to have been ashamed of such a puerile cavil. The prophet Isaiah, setting out the meekness and peaceableness of the Lord Christ in the discharge of his office, with his tenderness and condescension towards the poorest and meanest that come to him, expresses it among others by these words, 'He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets; intending no more, but that he should do nothing by way of strife, contention, or violence, in private or in public places. And this prophecy is applied to him by Matthew at that very season when great multitudes followed him in the streets and fields, whom he taught and healed, Matt. xii. 15—17. Hence this man would conclude, that because Wisdom is said to cry in the streets, that is, to instruct men in public places, which he did formerly by his Spirit, and in the days of his flesh in his own person, the Son of God cannot be intended. Yet he further adds:

'Postremo de Sapientia ista, non dicitur quod sit ab æterno genita; sed tantum ut in Hebraeo habetur a seculo formata; quod longe alius significat, quam ab æterno gigni. Et potest aliquid a seculo, hoc est una mundi creatione vel etiam ante illam eunisse; inde tamen non sequitur esse æternum.'

He tells us not where in the Hebrew text Wisdom is said to be 'formata seculo.' Nor is there any such passage in the context. It says, indeed, ver. 23, מיעל 단כ הש, which words of themselves do not absolutely and necessarily declare eternity, though no other expression or antecedent
eternity be commonly made use of. But as this כותב is particularly explained in the whole ensuing discourse, especially in verses 25, 26, to denote the existence of Wisdom, before the whole creation or any part of it, it doth necessarily denote eternity, nor can it be otherwise expressed. And although we do not particularly prove the relation of the Son to the Father by eternal generation from this place, yet as Wisdom is not said here to be formed or created, so the word used, ver. 25, י bilder, which we have rendered, 'I was brought forth,' doth more than intimate that generation. This being the whole of what the enemies of the sacred Trinity have to object to our application of this discourse to the Eternal Word or Son of God, we may upon its removal proceed to the application of this testimony to our present design.

§ 13. 'A personal transaction before the creation of the world, between the Father and the Son, acting mutually by their one Spirit, concerning the state and condition of mankind, with respect to divine love and favour,' is that which we inquire after, and which is here fully expressed. For the Wisdom or Word of God, having declared his eternal existence with the Father, and his personal, distinction from him, manifests withal his joint creation of all things; especially his presence with God, when he made, Ps. 102. 26, 'The highest part of the dusts of the habitable world,' that is, את אבnią הבול, 'the first Adam,' as Jarchi interprets it, and that not improbably. Then He declares that He was ויסכנ, by Him, with Him, before Him, ver. 30, that is, προς τον θεον, John i. 1, 2. And He was with Him, ויסכנ, Nutritus, 'One brought up with Him.' The word seems to be of a passive signification, or the participle Pahul, and is of the masculine gender, though referring to אבניא, 'Wisdom,' which speaks of itself, and is of the feminine; and that because it is a Person which is intended: such constructions being not infrequent in the Hebrew, where the adjunct agrees with and respects the nature of the subject, rather than the name or some other name of the same thing; see Gen. iv. 7. The word may have various significations, and is accordingly variously rendered by interpreters. The Chaldee render it, סביר, that is, Faithful: 'I was faithful with him;' and the LXX. ἀμοιονων, 'framing, forming,' that is, all things with him. So also Ralbag on the place expounds it actively, 'One nourishing all things,' as Jarchi doth passively, י bilder עמי, 'brought up with him,' which sense of the words our translation follows. And it is used unto that purpose, Lam. iv. 5, י bilder עלי והוליע, 'brought up in scarlet.' And although it may not improperly be taken in an active sense, yet I rather judge it to be used passively: Nutritus, Alumnus, one that is in the 'care' and 'love' of another, and to be disposed by him.

And we may inquire in what sense this is spoken of the Son with respect to the Father. The foundation of the allusion lies in the eternal mutual love that is between the Father and the Son. Thereunto is added, the consideration of the natural dependence of the Son on the Father, compared to the love of a father to a son, and the dependence of a son on his father. Therefore, most translations, with respect to this allusion, supply as to the words, 'as one brought up.' Again, יammed, Alumnus, 'one brought up,' always implies brought up for some special end or purpose, or to some work and service. And this is principally here intended. It is with respect to the work that he had to accomplish, that he is called Alumnus Patris, 'one brought up of the Father.' And this was no other but the work of the redemption and salvation of mankind, the counsel whereof was then between the Father and the Son. In the carrying on of that work, the Lord Christ
every-where commits himself and his undertaking to the care, love, assistance, and faithfulness of the Father, whose special grace was the origin thereof. Ps. xxii. 9, 10, 11, 19, 20; Isa. 1. 7—9. And in answer hereunto, the Father promiseth him, as we shall see afterwards, to stand by him, and to carry him through the whole of it; and that because it was to be accomplished in such a nature as stood in need of help and assistance. Wherefore, with respect to this work, he is said to be 'before him,' as one whom he would stand by with love and faithfulness, and whom he would take care of, when in the prosecution of the work which proceeded from their mutual counsel, he should be clothed with that nature which stood in need of divine care.

§ 14. With respect hereunto, he adds, 'And was delights every day.' There are ineffable mutual delights and joys in and between the persons of the sacred Trinity, arising from that infinite satisfaction and complacency which they have in each other from their respective in-being, by the participation of the same nature, wherein no small part of the blessedness of God doth consist. And by this word, that peculiar delight which a father hath in a son is expressed, Jer. xxxii. 20, 'A pleasant child, a child of delights.' But the delights here intended, have respect to the works of God ad extra, as a fruit of that eternal satisfaction, which ariseth from the counsels of God concerning the sons of men. This the next verse makes manifest: 'Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights with the sons of men.' For after he had declared the presence of Wisdom with God before the first creation, which is a notation of eternity, and its co-operation with him therein, he descends to manifest the special design of God and Wisdom, with respect to the children of men. And here such an undertaking on the part of the Son is intimated, as that the Father undertakes the care of him, and his protection, when he was to be humbled in the form of a servant, in the prospect whereof he delighted in him continually.

So he expresseth it, Isa. xlii. 1—7, 'Behold, my servant whom I uphold, my elect in whom my soul delighteth,' (שְׁמֵעָהִים וַיִּלְוֶא יִשְׂרָאֵל, הַמֶּלֶךְ נְצֵרִי, see Matt. xii. 18, xvii. 5; Eph. i. 6,) 'I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles.' He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench. He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law. Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he that spreadeth forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: to open the blind eyes, and to bring out the prisoners out of the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.' This is the delight of the Father, and such is his presence with the Son in his work, whereof an eternal prospect is here represented. In answer whereunto the Son delights in him, whose delight he was, מַשְׁאָהָה לְמַעַן בַּלָּד הַנֶּפֶשׁ הָלָּא יִרְאוּי, 'rejoicing with exultation, with all manner of expressions of joy.' For the word properly signifies an outward expression of an inward delight, the natural overflowings of an abounding joy. And what this delight of the Son is, in answer to the delight of the Father in him, with respect to the work he had to do, the Psalmist declares, Ps. xl. 7, 8, 'Then I said, Lo I
come, in the volume of thy book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.' This דנס פדו, 'this volume of the book,' which our apostle calls κεφάλις βιβλίου, 'the beginning or head of the book,' Heb. x. 7, is no other but the counsel of God concerning the salvation of the elect by Jesus Christ, enrolled as it were in the book of life, and thence transcribed into the beginning of the book of truth in the first promise given to Adam after the fall. This counsel being established between Father and Son, the Son with respect to it, rejoiceth continually before God, on account of that delight which he had to accomplish his will; and also on account of that delight which he had in our nature, which was to be assumed to answer the law of mediation, which was prescribed unto him.

§ 15. Now this being declared to be the mutual affection of God and of his Wisdom towards one another, Wisdom proceeds to manifest with what respect towards outward things it was that they were so mutually affected, ver. 31, 'Rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men.' That the things here spoken of were transacted in eternity, or before the creation, is evident in the context. The counsels of eternity, and the purposes of God and Wisdom, with respect to the sons of men, are here expressed. The Word was now foreordained, even before the foundation of the world, to the work of mediation and redemption, 1 Pet. i. 20. And many of the sons of men were chosen in him to grace and glory, Eph. i. 4, and the bringing of them to that glory to which they were chosen, was committed to him as the Captain of their salvation. This work, and the contemplation of it, he now delights in, because of that eternity of divine glory which was to ensue thereon. And because he was designed of the Father hereunto, and the work which he had to accomplish was principally the work of the Father, or the fulfilling of his will, and the making his grace effectual, wherein he sought his glory, and not his own primarily, John vii. 18, he speaketh of him as a distinct person, and the sovereign Lord of the whole. He did it, רבד כנה, 'in the world of his earth.' And the same word which he useth to express his frame towards God, רבד נמשך, ver. 30, 'rejoicing, exulting,' he useth here in reference to his work, to intimate that it was on the same account that he is said to 'rejoice before the Father, and in the habitable parts of his earth;' that is, on account of the work he had undertaken. So also he expresseth his delight in the children of men, because of the concurrence of the glory of God therein, בקע ענני, the same word whereby he declares the Father's delight in himself, with respect to his work.

And these things cannot refer unto the first creation, seeing they regard רבד כנה כנה, 'the children of men,' the sons or posterity of him who was at first singly created. And these things are revealed for our consolation, and the strengthening of our faith, whereunto they may be improved. For if there were such mutual delights between the Father and the Son in the counsel and contrivance of the work of our redemption and salvation; and if the Son so rejoiced in the prospect of his own undertaking to that end, we need not doubt but that he will powerfully and effectually accomplish it. For all the difficulties of it lay open and naked under his eye, yet he rejoiced in the thoughts of his engagement for their removal and conquest. He now saw the law of God established and fulfilled, the justice of God satisfied, his glory repaired, Satan under his feet, his works destroyed, sin, and all the confusion and misery which it brought into the world, destroyed; these are all matters of everlasting joy. Here we place the first spring of
the priesthood of Christ; the first actings of God towards man for his reparation. These first actings of God he expressed by the mutual delight of the Father and Son in the work to which the Son was designed, and in the effects of it. And this was intimate love, grace, complacency, and infinite wisdom. God, foreseeing how the designed effect of love and grace in the recovery of mankind, by the interposition of his Son, would issue in his own eternal glory, was pleased therewith, and rejoiced therein. And the Son, considering the object of his love, and the peculiar glory set before him, delighted in the counsel of the Father. Wherefore, the foundation of Christ's priesthood herein designed, was in love, grace, and wisdom, though in its exercise it respects holiness and justice also.

§ 16. And this also seems to be expressed by the Psalmist, Ps. ii. 7, 'I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' The direct sense and import of these words hath been declared in our exposition of chap. i. 6, and the testimony that is given in them to the divine nature of Jesus Christ, I have also formerly vindicated, Vindic. Evangel. p. 236. And I have in like manner elsewhere declared the perverse iniquity of some of the more modern Jewish masters, who would apply this psalm singly to David, without any respect to the Messiah. This Rashi confesseth that they do on purpose to oppose the heretics or Christians. But this is contrary to the conceptions and expositions of all their ancient doctors, and to the express faith of their church whilst it continued. For from this place they constantly acknowledged, that the Messiah was to be the Son of God, or rather, that the Son of God was to be the Messiah. Hence was that inquiry of the high priest, Matt. xxvi. 63. 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.' According to the faith of their church, he takes it for granted that the Christ and the Son of God was the same. The same confession on the same principle made Nathaniel, John i. 49, 'Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel. And Peter's confession, Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 69, 'Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God,' was nothing but a due application of the faith of the Jewish church to the person of our Saviour, which was all that he then called for. 'Unless,' saith he, 'you believe that I am he, you shall die in your sins.' And this faith of the church was principally built on this testimony, where God expressly calls the Messiah his Son, and that on the account of his eternal generation.

So Maimonides, Jarchi himself, and Kimchi, do all confess that their ancients interpreted this Psalm of the Messiah. The words of Jarchi are plain, הרהרי זרש את ענני על ולך המוס היא לאמים ומלומדים והם הם hacen על דוד图案 Our masters expounded this Psalm,' or the construction of it, 'concerning the king Messiah; but as the words sound, and that an answer may be returned to the heretics, it is expedient to interpret it of David himself.' His confession is plain, that their ancient doctors looked on this Psalm as a prophecy of the Messiah, as is also expressly acknowledged by Maimonides and Kimchi in their expositions. But as to those words which originally formed a part of what Jarchi wrote,了一声השתה והмерיהו, and for an answer to the heretics, the reader will not find them either in the edition of Basil or of Venice; that is, of the Bible with their Masoretical criticisms, and Rabbinical annotations; being expunged by such as had the oversight of those editions, or before razed out of the copies they made use of.

A great number of instances of this sort, to excellent advantage, are col-
lected by the learned Dr. Pococke, Notae Miscellan. cap. 8. And in the same place, that we go no farther for it, the same learned author gives us an account of the evasions invented by some of the Mahometans against the force of this testimony, which yet they allow to respect Jesus Christ, whom they will by no means grant to be the Son of God. A Prophet, if we please, he shall be, but that none may believe him to be the Son of God, the impostor himself laid in provision, in the close of his Alcoran, in that summary of his confession of a musulman, 'He is one God, God eternal, who neither begotteth, nor is begotten, and to whom none is equal.' The reasons of their infidelity are putrid and ridiculous, as is commonly known, and their evasion of this testimony, a violent escape. For they tell us the text is corrupted; and instead of 'My Son,' it should be, 'My prophet;' and instead of, 'I have begotten thee,' it should be, 'I have cherished thee;' the former words in the Arabic language, consisting of the same letters transposed, and the latter differing in one letter only, and the fancied allusion between, or the change of the words, is not much more distant in the Hebrew. But it is ridiculous to suppose, that the Jews have corrupted their own text, to the ruinous disadvantage of their own infidelity.

§ 17. There is, therefore, an illustrious testimony in these words, given unto the eternal pre-existence of the Lord Christ, in his divine nature before his incarnation. And this causeth the adversaries of that sacred truth, to turn themselves into all shapes to avoid the force of it. He with whom we have before concerned ourselves, raiseth himself to such confidence, as to deny that the things mentioned in this Psalm had any direct accomplishment in Jesus Christ, as his next attempt is to prove that those words, Ps. xxii. 16, 'They pierced my hands and my feet,' had no respect unto him. To this purpose doth he here discourse:—

'Et quia hic dicitur si litera urgetur, nunquam in Jesu Christo completa sunt. Nam ejus divinitati haec non competere clarum est. Jam vero, ne cum natus quidem ex Maria est, historice haec illi evenerunt. Quo enim sunt isti quaeo populi, quae gentes, qui reges, qui contra Jesum jam regem constitutum consuerebant: Certe nec Pilatus, qui tamen rex non erat, nec Herodes ei hoc nomine ut illum solio et dignitate regia deturbarit illi molesti fuerunt; neque consilia adversus ejus regnum contulerunt, nec copias collegerunt. Imo Pilatus quamvis illum regem dici audiret, tamen liberare et dimittere paratus erat. Et Herodes adversus eum non fremuit, sed hominem contemptit, et ille suo cum in potestate sua haberet dimisit. Pilatus Johan. xviii. fatetur; gens tua et pontifices tradiderunt te mihi; soli ergo Judaei fuerunt hostes Jesu, et eorum consilia adversus eum non fuerunt irrita; sed optatum finem consecuta; cujus contrarium hic narratur. In summa, tantus concursus, tanta consecratio, tantus armorum strepitus, et apparatus bellicos, quantum haec verba Psalmi significat, nunquam contra Jesum extitit; praeterea isti reges et populi dicunt; dirupamamus vincula eorum, &c. At Jesu nec Judaeis nec gentibus imperitavit, nec vincula inject, nulla tributa imposuit, non leges praecepit, quibus illos constrictos tenuisset, et a quibus illi liberari concupivissent. Nam sitius haec ad doctrinam Jesu accommodet spiritualis et mysticum introductum sensum,' &c.

Having elsewhere handled, expounded, and vindicated this testimony, I should not here have diverted to the consideration of this discourse, had it not been to give an instance of that extreme confidence which this sort of men betake themselves to, when they are pressed with plain Scripture testimonies. For the Jews themselves, who despise the appli-
cation of this prophecy to Christ in the New Testament, do not argue more perversely against his concern therein, than this man doth. He tells us in the entrance of his discourse on this Psalm, that all the Hebrews whose authority in the interpretation of the Scripture no sober man will despise, are against the application of this Psalm unto Christ. But he is deceived if he thought that they all agree in denying this Psalm to be a prophecy of the Messiah; for, as we have shown, the elder masters were of that mind. And he that shall be moved with the authority of the later doctors in the interpretation of those places of Scripture which concern the promised Messiah, that is Jesus Christ, and yet pretend himself to be a Christian, will scarce retain the reputation of a sober person among such as are not stark mad. However, no Jew of them all can more perversely oppose the gospel than this man here doth, as will appear in the examination of what he says.

First. That the things spoken in this Psalm, regard the Lord Christ with respect to his divine nature alone, or as absolutely considered, none ever affirmed or taught. For they all regard him as incarnate, or as he was to be incarnate, and as exalted, or as he was to be exalted to his kingly rule and throne. But yet, some things here spoken are distinctly verified in his divine nature; some in his human, as I have elsewhere declared. In general they all regard his person with respect to his kingly office. But what ensues in this author, namely, that none of these things belong properly to Jesus Christ, is above the rate of ordinary confidence. All the apostles do not only jointly and with one accord apply the things here spoken unto the Lord Jesus, but also give a clear exposition of the words, as a ground of that application; a thing seldom done by the sacred writers, Acts iv. 24—28. 'They lifted up their voice unto God with one accord, and said, 'Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? the kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Israel, was gathered together: for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.' In their judgment, Herod and Pontius Pilate, with their adherents, as exercising supreme rule and power over that people, with respect to them on whom they depended, and whose authority they exerted, namely, the Romans, the great rulers over the world, were the kings and rulers intended in this Psalm. And so also the דניא, or heathen, they took to be the Gentiles, who adhered unto Pilate in the execution of his Gentile power; and he דניא mentioned to be the people of Israel. Let us, therefore, consider what the objections of this man are, against the exposition and application of these words made by the apostles, and which they expressed as the solemn profession of their faith; and we shall quickly find that all his objections are miserably weak and sophistical. Pilate, he says, was not a king; but he exerted regal power, or the power of a supreme magistrate among them; and such are every-where called kings in the Scripture. Besides, he exerted the power of the great rulers of the world, who made use of kings as instruments of their rule, so that in and by him the power of the Gentile world was used against Christ. Herod he grants to have been a king; who yet was inferior in power and jurisdiction to Pilate, and who received what authority he had by delegation from the same monarch with Pilate himself.

Secondly. He denies that these or either of them opposed Christ as to
his kingdom. For Pilate moved once for his deliverance, and Herod rather scorned him, than raged against his kingdom. But this unbridled confidence would much better become a Jew, than one professing himself to be a Christian. Did not they oppose the Lord Christ? Did they not rage against him, who persecuted him, who reviled him, who apprehended him as a thief or murderer, who mocked him, spit upon him, scourged him, crucified him, if not with their hands, yet with their power? Did they not oppose him as to his kingdom, who by all possible efforts, endeavoured to hinder all the ways and means whatsoever, whereby it was erected and established? Certainly, never had prophecy a more sensible accomplishment.

Thirdly. As to what he adds in reference to the Jews, that their counsels were not in vain against Christ, as those were that are here mentioned, but obtained their wished end; I cannot see how this can be viewed in any other light, than as a great outrage and excess of blasphemy. They did indeed, whatever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done, but that their own counsels were not vain, that they accomplished what they designed and aimed at, is the highest blasphemy to imagine. They took counsel against him as a seducer and a blasphemer, they designed to put an end to his work, that none might ever esteem him or believe in him as the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, the Son of God; was this counsel of theirs not in vain? did they accomplish what they aimed at? Then say there is not a word of truth in the gospel or Christian religion.

Fourthly. For that concourse of people, consultations, that noise and preparation for war, which being, as he says, mentioned in the text, he cannot find in the actings of men against the Lord Christ, it is all an imagination of the same folly. For there is no mention of any such preparation for war in the text, as he dreameth of. Rage and consultation, with a resolution to oppose the spiritual rule of the Son of God, are indeed described, and were all actually made use of, originally against the person of Christ immediately, and afterwards against him in his gospel, with the professors and publishers of it.

Fifthly. He adds hereunto, that Christ ruled neither Jews nor Gentiles, that he made no laws, nor put any bonds upon them, that they might be said to break. So answers Kimchi the testimony from Mic. v. 2, where Christ is called the Ruler of Israel; answer them, saith he, לא משל י السبت, ד שנל אחרון; that Jesus ruled not over Israel, but they ruled over him, and crucified him. But, notwithstanding all this petulancy, his enemies shall all of them one day know, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ. That he is a king for ever, and a lawgiver, that he came to put the holy bands and chains of his laws on the world, which they in vain strive to reject and cast out of the earth; for he must reign until all his enemies are made his footstool. It is granted that in some of these words, spiritual things are figuratively expressed; and their literal sense is that which the figure intends. So that no mystic nor allegorical sense is here to be inquired after; it being the Lord Christ the Son of God, with respect unto his kingly office, who is here treated of, primarily and directly, however any of the concerns of his kingdom might be typified in David; and he it is who says, 'I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'

§ 18. The foundation of this expression is laid in the divine and eternal filiation of the Son of God, as I have elsewhere evinced. But the thing
directly expressed, is spoken in reference unto the manifestation thereof, in
and after his incarnation. He that speaks the words is the Son himself;
and he is the person spoken unto, as Ps. cx. 1, 'The Lord said unto my
Lord;' wherein the same eternal transaction between the Father and Son
it declared. So here, He, (that is, the Father) said unto me; how, by the
way of an eternal statute, law, or decree, as he was the Son of God, so God
declares unto him that in the work he had to do, he should be his Son, and
he would be his Father, and make him as his first-born, higher than the
kings of the earth. And, therefore, are these words applied several ways
to the manifestation of his divine filiation, when he was declared to be the
Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead, Rom. i. 4. And
the words of this very decree, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten
thee,' are used by our apostle to prove the priesthood of Christ, which was
confirmed to him therein, Heb. v. 5. And this could no otherwise be, but
that God declared therein unto him, that in the discharge of that office, as
also of his kingdom and rule, he would manifest and declare him so to be.
It appears, therefore, that there were eternal transactions between the
Father and Son, concerning the redemption of mankind by his interposition
or mediation.

EXERCITATION XXVIII.

§ 1. Personal transactions between the Father and Son, about the redemption of mankind,
Federal. § 2. The covenants between God and man explained. § 3. Pœdus a covenant,
whence so called. § 4. συναφνίον why not used by the LXX. § 5. The various use of
τινος in the Scriptures. The tables of stone, how called the covenant; and the ark, The
same use of συναφνίον; The certain nature of a covenant not precisely signified by this
word. § 6. Covenants how ratified of old. § 7. Things required to a complete and
proper covenant. § 8. Of covenants with respect unto personal services. § 9. The
covenant between Father and Son express. How therein the Father is a God unto him;
and the Son less than the Father. § 10. Joint counsel of the Father and Son in this
covenant, as the foundation of it. § 11. The will of the Father in this covenant, abso-
lutely free. § 12. The will of the Son engaged in this covenant. The Son of God un-
dertakes for himself when clothed with our nature. § 13. The will of God how the
same in Father and Son; yet acting distinctly in their distinct persons. § 14. Things
disposed of in a covenant to be in the power of them that make it. This they may be
two ways: first, absolutely; secondly, by virtue of the compact itself. § 15. The sal-
vation of sinners the matter of this covenant; or the thing disposed of to the mutual
complacency of Father and Son. § 16. The general end of this covenant; the manifes-
tation of the glory of God. Wherein that consists. What divine properties are peculiarly
glorified thereby. § 17. The especial glory of the Son, the end of this covenant; what
it is. § 18. Means and way of entering into this covenant. Promises made to the Son
as incarnate. Of assistance, acceptance, glory. The true nature of the merit of Christ.
§ 19. Things prescribed to the Lord Christ in this covenant reduced to three heads. The
sacred spring of his priesthood discovered. § 20. The original reason and nature of the
priesthood of Christ. Occasion and use of priesthood and sacrifices under the law. § 21.
The sum of the whole. Necessity of Christ's priesthood.

§ 1. Our next inquiry is after the nature of those eternal transactions,
the existence of which in general we have declared from the Scripture, in
our foregoing exercitation. And these were carried on 'per modum fede-
ris,' 'by way of covenant,' compact and mutual agreement between the Father and the Son. For although it should seem that because they are single acts of the same divine understanding and will, they cannot be properly federal, yet because those properties of the divine nature are acted distinctly in the distinct persons, they have in them the nature of a covenant. Besides, there is in them a supposition of the reception of our human nature into personal union with the Son. On the consideration hereof he comes to have an absolute distinct interest, and to undertake for that which is his own peculiar work. And therefore these counsels of the will of God, wherein lies the foundation of the priesthood of Christ, are expressly declared as a covenant in the Scripture. For there is in them a respect to various objects and various effects, disposed into a federal relation one to another. I shall therefore in the first place manifest that there was such a covenant between the Father and the Son, in order to the work of his mediation, called therefore the covenant of the Mediator or Redeemer. And afterwards shall insist on that in it in particular, which is the original of his priesthood.

§ 2. First. We must distinguish between the covenant that God made with men concerning Christ, and the covenant that he made with his Son concerning men. That God created man in and under the terms and law of a covenant with a prescription of duties, and promise of rewards, is by all acknowledged. After the fall he entered into another covenant with mankind; which from the principal nature and end of it, is commonly called the covenant of grace. This, under several forms of external administration, hath continued ever since in force, and shall continue till the consummation of all things. And the nature of this covenant, as being among the principal concerns of religion, hath been abundantly declared and explained by many. The consideration of it is not our present business. That the Lord Jesus Christ was the principal subject-matter of this covenant, the undertaker in it, and surety of it, the Scriptures expressly declare. For the great promise of it was concerning him, and his mediation, with the benefits that should redound to mankind thereby in grace and glory. And the preceptive part of it required obedience in and unto him, new and distinct from that which was exacted by the law of creation, although it also contained all the commands of this law. And he was the surety of it, in that he undertook unto God to accomplish in his own person, whatever by the terms of the covenant was to be done for man; and he engaged to effect by his own Spirit and grace, whatever was to be done in and by man, that so the covenant on every side might be firm and stable, and the ends of it fulfilled. This is not that which at present we inquire into. But it is the personal compact that was between the Father and the Son, before the world was, as it is revealed in the Scripture, that is to be declared.

§ 3. To clear things in our way, we must treat somewhat of the name and nature of a covenant in general. The Hebrews call a covenant פֶּדֶּס, and the Greeks Συνθήκη, the Latins 'Fœdus;' the consideration of which words may be of some use, because of the original and most-famous translations of the Scripture. 'Fœdus some deduce a feriendo,' from striking. And this was from the manner of making covenants, by the striking of the beast to be sacrificed in their confirmation. For all solemn covenants were always confirmed by sacrifice, especially between God and his people. Hence are they said to 'make a covenant with him by sacrifice,' Ps. I. 5, offering sacrifice in the solemn confirmation of it. And when God solemnly confirmed his covenant with Abraham, he did it by causing a token
of his presence to pass between the pieces of the beasts provided for sacrifice, Gen. xv. 17, 18. So when he made a covenant with Noah, it was ratified by sacrifice, Gen. viii. 20, 21, ix. 9, 10. And to look still farther backwards, it is not improbable, but that upon the giving of the first promise, and laying the foundation of the new covenant therein, that Adam had offered the beasts in sacrifice with whose skins he was clothed. And how the old covenant at Horeb was dedicated with the blood of sacrifices, our apostle declares, ch. ix. 18—20, from Exod. xxiv. 5—9. And all this was to let us know, that no covenant could ever be made between God and man after the entrance of sin, but upon the account of that great Sacrifice of our High Priest, which by those other was represented. Hence is the phrase Fœdera ferire, 'to strike a covenant.' Cicero pro Caelio. Ideone ego pacem Pirrhì diremi ut tu amorum turpissimorum quotidiès Fœdēra ferires? Fœdēra ferire, and percurete, have the same rise and occasion. And the Hebrews express the making of a covenant by striking hands, though with respect unto another ceremony. Some derive the word 'a Porca fæde casa.' For an hog was clean in the devil's sacrifices. 'Caesa jungebant fœdēra Porca.' Virg. And thence was the ancient formula of ratifying covenants by the striking and therewith killing of a hog, mentioned by the Roman historian. 'Qui prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo tu illum Jupiter sic ferito, ut ego hunc Porcum hodie feriam; tantoque magis, quanto magis potes pollesque.' Upon the pronouncing of which words he killed the hog with a stone. And there was the same intention among them who in making a covenant, cut a beast in pieces, laying one equal part against another, and so passing between them. For they imprecated as it were upon themselves, that they might be so destroyed and cut into pieces if they stood not unto the terms of the covenant. See Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, where respect is had to the covenant made with the king of Babylon. But in the use and significance of this word, we are not much concerned.

§ 4. The Greek word is Συνθήκη; and so it is constantly used in all good authors for a solemn covenant between nations and persons. Only the translation of the LXX. takes no notice of it. For observing that הָרִיב 'Berith,' in the Hebrew was of a larger signification, being applied to things of another nature than Συνθήκη (which denotes a precise compact or convention) could be extended unto, they rendered it constantly by διαθήκη, whereof we must treat elsewhere. Gen. xiv. 13. They render הָרִיב יְלָע, covenaneters, by συνεμοταί, 'confèderati, or conjurati,' confederates sworn together. Wherefore of the word συνθήκη there is no use in this matter; the nature of the thing intended must be inquired into.

§ 5. הָרִיב is largely and variously used in the Old Testament. Nor are learned men agreed from what original it is derived: נָרָב, and הָרֵיב, and הָרָב are considered to this purpose. Sometimes it intends no more but peace and agreement, although there were no compact or convention to that purpose. For this is the end of all covenants, which are of three sorts, as the Macedonian ambassador declared to the Romans; for either they are between the conqueror and the conquered, or between enemies in equal power, or between those who were never engaged in enmity. The ends of all these sorts of covenants is mutual peace and security. Hence they are expressed by הָרִיב a covenant: so Job v. 23, 'Thy covenant shall be with the stones of the field,' say we, 'Thy league shall be;' that is, thou shalt have no hurt from them. And Hos. ii. 18, a covenant is said to be made with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of hea-
ven, and the creeping things of the earth. Security from damage by them, and the quiet use of them, is called a covenant metonymically and metaphorically, because peace and agreement are the end of covenants.

Secondly. Synecdochically, the law written on the two tables of stone was called the covenant, Exod. xxxiv. 28. 'He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.' Now this law was purely preceptive and an effect of sovereign authority, yet it is called a covenant. But this it is not absolutely in its own nature; seeing no mere precept nor system of precepts as such, nor any mere promise can be a covenant properly so called. But it was a principal part of God's covenant with the people, when accepted by them as the rule of their obedience, with respect to the promises wherewith it was accompanied. Hence the tables of stone wherein this law was written, are called the tables of the covenant, Deut. ix. 11; 'The two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant.' These tables were first made by God himself, Exod. xxxi., ult. and given into the hands of Moses. And when they were broken, he was commanded to effigiate them, or cut stones after their image, into their likeness; for the first were seen only by himself, Deut. x. 1; Exod. xxxiv. 1. And when they were broken, whereby their use and signification ceased, they were not kept as relics, though cut and written by the finger or divine power of God, which doubtless the superstition of succeeding ages would have attempted. But the true measure of the sacredness of any thing external, is use by divine appointment. And also the ark was hence called the ark of the covenant, and sometimes the covenant itself; because the two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant, were in it, 1 Kings viii. 9.

So among the Grecians, the tables or rolls wherein covenants were writ-
ted, engraven, or enrolled, were called συνθήκαι. So Demosthenes; Συγχωρῳ ανοιχθηναι τας συνθήκας ενταυθεὶς επὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου. 'I require that the covenants may be opened here in the court,' or before the judgment-seat; that is the rolls wherein, the agreement was written. And Arsitot. Rhetor. lib. 1. όποιοι γαρ αν τινες ωσιν οι επιγεγραμμενοι η φιλαστρωτες, τουτοις αι συνθηκαι πισται εισι. 'Covenants are of the same credit, with those that wrote and keep them; that is, the writings wherein such conventions are contained. For covenants that were solemnly entered into between nations, were engraven in brass, as the league and covenant made between the Romans and Jews in the days of Judas Machabæus, Mac. i. 7, or in marble, as that of the Magnesians and Smyrneans, illustrated by the learned Selden. And other covenants were enrolled in parchment by public notaries.

Thirdly. An absolute promise is also called נָב נ a covenant, the covenant of God, Isa. lix. 21. 'As for me this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth.' And God also calls his decree constitutive of the law of nature, and its continuance his covenant, Jer. xxxiii. 20. 'Thus saith the Lord, If you can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, that there should not be day and night in their season.' It is therefore certain that where God speaks of his covenant, we cannot conclude, that whatever belongs unto a perfect complete covenant is therein intended. And they do but deceive themselves who, from the name of a covenant between God and man, do conclude always unto the nature and conditions of it. For the word is used in great variety, and what is intended by it must be learned from the subject-matter treated of; seeing there is no precept or promise of God, but may be so called.
§ 6. In the making of covenants between men, yea in the covenant of God with men, besides that they were always conceived *verbis expressis*, there was some sign and token added for their confirmation. This was generally the slaying of some creature, and the dividing of it into parts before mentioned. Hence ‘sancire sedus’ and ‘sanctio federis,’ ‘are asanguine,’ from the blood shed in their confirmation. Of the slaying of a beast, there is mention in all who have spoken of ancient covenants. So was it between the Romans and Albans, the form of which is reported by Livy, as that whose tradition was of greatest antiquity among them. And there are likewise instances of the division of the slain beasts into two parts, like what we observed before concerning Abraham; and concerning the princes of Judah in Jeremiah. Οἱ Μολοσσοὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρκωμοις κατασχοπτοντες εἰς μικρὰ τοὺς βόους τὰς συνθήκας ἐποιοντο: Herod. ‘The Molossians in their confederations cut oxen into small pieces, and so entered into covenants.’ And how these pieces or parts were disposed, Livy declares, lib. 39. ‘Prior pars ad dextram cum extis, posterior ad laevam vicem ponitur; inter hanc divisam hostiam copiæ armatae traducuntur.’ And hence it is that נֶרֶב, which signifies to cut or divide, is used in the Scripture absolutely for making of a covenant without any addition of נֶרֶב, 1 Sam. xx. 16; 1 Kings viii. 9. And although such outward things did never belong to the essence of a covenant, yet were they useful significations of fidelity, intended and accepted in the performance of what was engaged in it. And therefore God himself never made a covenant with men, but he always gave them a token and visible pledge thereof. And whosoever is interested in the covenant itself, hath thereby a right unto, and is obliged to the use of the sign or token according to God’s appointment.

§ 7. An absolute complete covenant, is a voluntary convention, pact, or agreement between distinct persons, about the ordering and disposal of all things in their power, unto their mutual concern and advantage. 1st. Distinct persons are required unto a covenant, for it is a mutual compact. As a mediator is not of one, that is, there must be several parties, and those at variance, or there is no room for the interposition of a mediator, Gal. iii. 20, so a covenant properly so called, is not of one. In the large sense wherein נֶרֶב is taken, a man’s resolution in himself with respect unto any especial end or purpose may be called his covenant; as Job xxxxi. 1, ‘I made a covenant with my eyes.’ And so God calleth his purpose or decree, concerning the orderly course of nature, in the instance before given. But a covenant properly so called, is the convention or agreement of two persons or more.

2. This agreement must be voluntary and of choice upon the election of the terms covenanted about. Hence נֶרֶב is by some derived from נֶרֶב, which signifies to choose or elect. For such choice is the foundation of all solemn covenants: what is properly so, is founded on a free election of the terms of it, upon due consideration, and a right judgment made of them. Hence when one people is broken in war, or subdued by another, who prescribe terms unto them which they are forced as it were to accept for the present necessity, it is but an imperfect covenant, and as things are in the world, not like to be firm or stable. So some Legates answered in the Senate of Rome, when their people were subdued, Pacem habebatis qualem dederitis; si bonam, firmam et stabilem, sin haud diuturnam.

3. The matter of every righteous and complete covenant must be of things in the power of them who covenant and agree about them. Otherwise any, yea the most solemn compact is vain and ineffectual. A son or
daughter in their father’s house, and under his care, making a vow or covenant for the disposal of themselves, can give no force unto it, because they are not in their own power. Hence when God invites and takes men into the covenant of grace, whereunto belongs a restitipation of faith and obedience, which are not absolutely in their own power, that the covenant may be firm and stable, he takes upon himself to enable them thereunto; and the efficacy of his grace unto that purpose is of the nature of the covenant. Hence when men enter into any compact, wherein one party takes on itself the performance of that which the other thinks to be, but is not really in its power, there is dolus malus in it, which enervates and disannuls the covenant itself. And many such compacts were rescinded by the senate and people of Rome, which were made by their generals without their consent; as those with the Gauls who besieged the Capitol, and with the Samnites, ad Furcas Caudinas.

Lastly. The end of a covenant is the disposal of the things about which the covenant is made, to the mutual content and satisfaction of all persons concerned. Hence was the ancient form, ‘Quod foelix faustumque sit huic et illi populo.’ If either party be absolutely and finally detrimented by it, it is no absolute, free, or voluntary covenant; but an agreement of a mixed nature, where the consent of one party is given only for the avoiding of a greater inconvenience. And these things we shall find of use in our progress.

§ 8. As all these things concur in every equal compact, so there is an especial kind of covenant depending solely on the personal undertakings and services of one party, in order to the common ends of the covenant, or the mutual satisfaction of the covenanters. So it is in all agreements where any thing is distinctly and peculiarly required of one party. And such covenants have three things in them: 1. A proposal of service. 2. A promise of reward. 3. An acceptance of the proposal, with a restitipation of obedience out of respect unto the reward. And this indispensably introduces an inequality and subordination in the covenanters, as to the common ends of the covenant, however on other accounts they may be equal. For he who prescribes the duties which are required in the covenant, and giveth the promises of either assistance in them, or a reward upon them, is therein and so far superior unto him, or greater than he, who observes his prescriptions, and trusts unto his promises. Of this nature is that divine transaction that was between the Father and Son, about the redemption of mankind. There was in it a prescription of personal services, with a promise of reward. And all the other conditions also of a complete covenant before laid down, are all observed therein. And this we must inquire into, as that wherein doth lie the foundation and original of the priesthood of Christ.

§ 9. First. Unto a proper covenant, it is required that it be made between distinct persons. Such I have elsewhere proved the Father and Son to be; and in this discourse do take that fundamental principle of our profession as granted. That there were eternal transactions in general between those distinct persons, with respect unto the salvation of mankind, hath been evinced in the foregoing Exercitation. That these were federal, or had in them the nature of a covenant, is now farther to be manifested. And in general this is that which the Scripture intends, where God, that is the Father, is called by the Son; his God; and where he says that he will be unto him a God and a Father. For this expression of being a God unto any one is declarative of a covenant, and is the word whereby God con-
stantly declares his relation unto any, in a way of covenant, Jer. xxxi. 33, xxxii. 33; Hos. ii. 23.

For when God declares that he will be a God unto any, he engageth to exercise the holy properties which belong to him as God, in their behalf and for their good. And this is not without an engagement of obedience from them. Now this declaration the Scripture abounds in, Ps. xvi. 2, ‘Thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord;’ these are the words of the Son unto the Father, as is evident from ver. 9—11, Ps. xxii. 1, ‘My God, my God.’ Ps. xl. 8, ‘I delight to do thy will, O my God.’ Ps. xlv. 7, ‘God thy God hath anointed thee.’ Micah v. 4, ‘He shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God.’ John xx. 17, ‘I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.’ Rev. iii. 12, ‘I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God.’ All which expressions argue both a covenant, and a subordination therein.

And on this account it is that our Saviour says his Father is greater than he, John xiv. 28. This place I confess the ancients expound unanimously of the human nature only, to obviate the Arians who ascribed unto him a divine nature, but made, and absolutely in itself inferior to the nature of God. But the inferiority of the human nature to God or the Father, is a thing so unquestionable, as to need no declaration or solemn attestation; and the mention of it is no way suited unto the design of the place. But our Saviour speaks with respect unto the covenant engagement that was between the Father and himself, as to the work which he had to do. For therein, as we shall farther manifest, the Father was the prescriber, the promise, and lawgiver; and the Son was the undertaker upon his prescription, law, and promises. He is indeed, in respect of his divine personality, said to be God of God. No more is intended hereby, but that the person of the Son, as to his personality, was of the person of the Father, who communicated his nature and life unto him by eternal generation. But the Father on that account is not said to be his God, or to be a God unto him, which includes the acting of divine properties on his behalf; and a dependence on the other side on him who is so a God unto him. And this hath its sole foundation on that covenant, and the execution of it, which we are in the consideration of.

§ 10. Again, the transactions before insisted on and declared, are proposed to have been by the way of counsel, for the accomplishment of the end designed in a covenant, Zech. vi. 13. יְעֵצָה שְׁלֹם מְדִיבֵר הָיוֹת מְדִיבֵר הָיוֹת: ‘the counsel about peace-making between God and man, was between them both;’ that is the two persons spoken of, namely, the Lord Jehovah, and he who was to be מְדָבֵר the branch. And this was not spoken of him absolutely as he was a man, or was to be a man; for so there was not properly מְדָבֵר or counsel between God and him. For who ‘hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor?’ Rom. xi. 34. And besides, the Son in his human nature was merely the servant of the Father to do his will, Isa. xlvi. 1. But God takes this counsel with him, as he was his eternal Wisdom; only with respect unto his future incarnation. For therein he was to be both the branch of the Lord, and the fruit of the earth, Isa. iv. 2. Hereunto regard also is had in his name, Isa. ix. 6. ‘He shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor;’ for these titles, with those that follow, do not absolutely denote properties of the divine nature, though they are such divine titles and attributes as cannot be ascribed unto any but to him who is God.
Yet there is in them a respect unto the work which he had to do, as he was to be a child born and given unto us. And on the same account is he called the everlasting Father; a name not proper unto the person of the Son, merely with respect to his personality. There is, therefore, a regard in it to the work which he had to do, which was to be a father unto all the elect of God. And therein also was he the Prince of Peace—He who is the procurer and establisheer of peace between God and mankind. On the same account, God speaking of him, says, that he is רע הבד עMahon, ‘My companion, and the man my fellow,’ Zech. xiii. 7, such a one as with whom he had sweetened and rejoiced in secret counsel, as Ps. Iv. 14, according unto what was before declared on Prov. viii. 31, 32.

§ 11. Particularly the will of the Father and Son concurred in this matter, which was necessary that the covenant might be voluntary and of choice. And the origin of the whole is referred to the will of the Father constantly. Hence our Lord Jesus Christ on all occasions declares solemnly, that he came to do the will of the Father: ‘Lo I come to do thy will, O God,’ Ps. xl. 5; Heb. x. 5—10. For in this agreement, the part of the enjoiner, prescriber, and promiser, whose will in all things is to be attended to, is on the Father. And his will was naturally at a perfect liberty, from engaging in that way of salvation, which he accomplished by Christ. He was at liberty to have left all mankind under sin and the curse, as he did all the angels that fell. He was at liberty utterly to have destroyed the race of mankind that sprang from Adam in his fallen estate; either in the root of them, or in the branches when multiplied, as he almost did in the flood, and to have created another stock or race of them unto his glory. And hence the acting of his will herein, is expressed by grace; which is free, or it is not grace; and is said to proceed from love acting by choice, all arguing the highest liberty in the will of the Father, John iii. 16; Eph. i. 6.

And the same is farther evidenced by the exercise of his authority, both in the commission and commands that he gave to the Son as incarnate, for the discharge of the work that he had undertaken. For none puts forth his authority but voluntarily, or by and according unto his own will. Now he both sent the Son, and sealed him, and gave him commands, which are all acts of choice, and liberty, proceeding from sovereignty. Let none, then, once imagine, that this work of entering into covenant about the salvation of mankind, was any way necessary unto God, or that it was required by virtue of any of the essential properties of his nature, so that he must have done against them in doing otherwise. God was herein absolutely free, as he was also in his making of all things out of nothing. He could have left it undone without the least disadvantage unto his essential glory, or contrary unto his holy nature. Whatever, therefore, we may afterwards assert, concerning the necessity of satisfaction to be given unto his justice, upon the supposition of this covenant, yet the entering into this covenant, and, consequently, all that ensued thereon, is absolutely resolved into the mere will and grace of God.

§ 12. The will of the Son herein, was also distinct. In his divine nature and will, he undertook voluntarily for the work of his person, when the human nature, which he determined to assume, should be united therein. For what is spoken of the second Person, is spoken with respect unto his purpose to assume our nature; for the obedience whereof, in all that was to be done upon it or by it, he undertook. This the Scripture fully declares, and that for a double end. First. To demonstrate that the things which he underwent in his human nature were just and equal, inasmuch as he whose
it was, voluntarily consented thereto. Secondly. To manifest that those
very acts which he had in command from his Father, were no less the acts
of his own will. Wherefore, as it is said that the Father loved us, and gave
his Son to die for us, so also is it said, that the Son loved us, and gave him-
self for us, and washed us in his own blood. These things proceeded from,
and were founded in the will of the Son of God; and it was an act of per-
fected liberty in him, to engage in his peculiar concerns in this covenant.
What he did, he did by choice, in a way of condescension and love. And
this his voluntary suspension of the discharge of what he was, according to
the nature and terms of this covenant, to perform, was the ground of the
authoritative mission, sealing and commanding of the Father towards him;
see Ps. xl. 7, 8; Heb. x. 5; John x. 11, 12. And whatever is expressed
in the Scripture, concerning the will of the human nature of Christ, as it
was engaged in and bent upon its work, it is but a representation of the will
of the Son of God, when he engaged in this work from eternity. So then
he freely undertook to do and suffer whatever on his part was required, and
therein owns himself the servant of the Father, because he would obey his
will, and serve his purposes in the nature which he would assume for that
end, Isa. lxxii. 1, 6, lxxix. 9; Zech. xiii. 7, and therein acknowledgeth him
to be his Lord, Ps. xvi. 2, unto whom he owed all homage and obedience.
For this mind was in him, that whereas he was in the form of God,
he humbled himself unto this work, Phil. ii. 8, and by his own voluntary
consent was engaged therein. Whereas, therefore, he had a sovereign and
absolute power over his own human nature when assumed, whatever
he submitted to, it was no injury to him, nor injustice in God to lay it on
him.

§ 13. But this sacred truth must be cleared from an objection to which
it seems obnoxious, before we do proceed. The will is a natural property,
and therefore in the divine essence it is but one. The Father, Son, and
Spirit, have not distinct wills. They are one God, and God’s will is one, as
being an essential property of his nature. And, therefore, are there two
wills in the one person of Christ, whereas there is but one will in the three
Persons of the Trinity. How then can it be said, that the will of the Father
and the will of the Son did concur distinctly in the making of this co-
venant?

This difficulty may be solved from what hath been already declared.
For such is the distinction of the persons in the unity of the divine essence,
as that they act in natural and essential acts, reciprocally one towards another,
namely, in understanding, love, and the like: they know and mutually love
each other. And as they subsist distinctly, so they also act distinctly in
those works which are of external operation. And whereas all these acts
and operations, whether reciprocal or external, are either with a will, or
from a freedom of will and choice, the will of God in each person, as to
the peculiar acts ascribed unto him, is his will therein peculiarly and emi-
nettly, though not exclusively, to the other persons by reason of their
mutual inbeing. The will of God, as to the peculiar actings of the Father
in this matter, is the will of the Father; and the will of God, with regard
to the peculiar actings of the Son, is the will of the Son; not by a dis-
tinction of sundry wills, but by the distinct application of the same will
unto its distinct acts, in the Persons of the Father and the Son. And
in this respect, the covenant whereof we treat differeth from a pure
decree. For from these distinct actings of the will of God the Father,
and the Son, there doth arise a new habitude or relation, which is not
natural or necessary unto them, but freely taken on them. And by virtue hereof were all believers saved from the foundation of the world, upon the account of the interposition of the Son of God, antecedently to his exhibition in the flesh. For hence was he esteemed to have done and suffered what he had undertaken so to do, and which through faith was imputed to them that did believe.

§ 14. Moreover, a covenant must be about the disposal of things in the power of them that enter into it, otherwise it is null or fraudulent. And thus things may be two ways: first, absolutely; secondly, by virtue of some condition, or something in the nature of the covenant itself. 1. Things are absolutely in the power of persons, when they are completely at their disposal, antecedently to the consideration of any covenant or agreement about them. As in the covenant of marriage, where the several persons engaging are *sui juris*, they have an absolute power in themselves to dispose of their own persons with respect unto the ends of marriage. So it is in all covenants, when the things to be disposed of according to the limitations of the covenant are lawful and good, antecedently to any agreement made about them, and because they are in the power of the covenaners, they may be disposed of according to the terms of the compact.

So was it in this covenant. To do good unto mankind, to bring them unto the enjoyment of himself, was absolutely in the power of the Father. And it was in the power of the Son to assume human nature, which becoming thereby peculiarly his own, he might dispose of it to what end he pleased, saving the union which ensued on its assumption, for this was indissoluble. Again, some things are made lawful or good, or suited to the glory, honour, or satisfaction, and complacency of them that make the covenant by virtue of somewhat arising in or from the covenant itself. And of this sort are most of the things that are disposed in the covenant, under consideration between the Father and the Son. They become good and desirable, and suited unto their glory and honour, not as considered absolutely and in themselves, but with respect to that order, dependence, and mutual relation that they are cast into, by and in the covenant.

Such was the penal suffering of the human nature of Christ under the sentence and curse of the law. This in itself absolutely considered, without respect unto the ends of the covenant, would neither have been good in itself, nor have had any tendency unto the glory of God. For what excellency of the nature of God could have been demonstrated in the penal sufferings of one absolutely, and in all respects innocent? Nay, it was utterly impossible that an innocent person, considered absolutely as such, should suffer penalty under the sentence and curse of the law. For the law denounceth punishment unto no such person. Guilt and punishment are related, and where one is not real, or supposed, or imputed, the other cannot be. But now in the terms of this covenant, leading to the limitations and use of these sufferings, they are made good and tend to the glory of God, as we shall see. So the pardoning and saving of sinners absolutely, could have no tendency to the glory of God. For what evidence of righteousness would there have been herein, that the great Ruler of all the world should pass by the offences of men without animadverting upon them? What justice would have appeared, or what demonstration of the holiness of the nature of God would there have been therein? Besides it was impossible, seeing it is the judgment of God, that they who commit sin are worthy of death. But, as we shall see, through the terms and
conditions of this covenant, this is rendered righteous, holy, and good, and
eminently conducive to the glory of God.
§ 15. The matter of this covenant, or the things and ends about which,
and for which it was entered into, are next to be considered. These are
the things which, as we observed before, are to be disposed of unto the
honour, and, as it were, mutual advantage of them that make the covenant.
And the matter of this covenant in general is the saving of sinners, in and
by ways and means suited to the manifestation of the glory of God. So
it is compendiously expressed, where the execution of it is declared, John
iii. 16, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that
whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'
And upon the coming of the Son into the world, he was called Jesus,
because he was to save his people from their sins,' Matt. i. 21. 'Even Jesus
the Deliverer, who saves us from the wrath to come,' 1 Thess. i. 10. To
declare this design of God, or his will and purpose in and by Jesus Christ
to save his elect from sin and death, to bring his many sons to glory, or to
the full enjoyment of himself to eternity, is the principal design of the
whole Scripture, and whereunto the whole revelation of God unto men may
be reduced. This was that on the prospect wherein the Son or Wisdom of
God rejoiced before him, and had his delights with the children of men
before the foundation of the world, Prov. vii. 30, 31. Man having utterly
lost himself by sin, and coming short thereby of the glory of God, and
having become obnoxious to everlasting destruction, the prevision whereof
was in order of nature antecedent to this covenant, as hath been declared;
the Father and Son do enter into a holy and mutual agreement, concerning
the recovery and salvation of the elect in a way of grace. This we state as
the matter of this covenant, the thing contracted and agreed about. The
distinction of the parts of it into persons and things, the order and respect
in it of one thing to another, are not the subjects of our present considera-
tion. The explanation of them belongs to the covenant of grace, which
God is pleased to enter into with believers by Jesus Christ. But this was
that in general, that was to be disposed of, to the mutual complacency and
satisfaction of Father and Son.
§ 16. The end of these things, both of the covenant, and of the dispo-
sition of all things made thereby, was the especial glory both of the one
and the other. God doth all things for himself. He can have no ultimate
end in any thing but himself alone, unless there should be anything better
than himself, or above himself. But yet in himself he is not capable of
any accession of glory, by any thing that he intendeth or doth. He is abso-
lutely, infinitely, eternally perfect in himself and all his glorious properties,
so that nothing can be added to him. His end therefore must be, not the
obtaining of glory unto himself, but the manifestation of the glory that is
in himself. When the holy properties of his nature are exercised in ex-
ternal works, and are thereby expressed, declared, and made known, then
is God glorified. The end therefore in general of this covenant, which
regulated the disposal of the whole matter of it, was the exercise, exalta-
tion, and manifestation of the glorious properties of the divine nature;
other supreme and ultimate end it could have none, as hath been declared.
Now such is the mutual respect of all the holy properties of God in their
exercise, and such their oneness in that same divine Being, that if any one
of them be exerted, manifested, and thereby glorified, the residue of them
must be therein and thereby glorified also, because that nature is glorified
which they are, and whereunto they do belong. But yet in several particular works of God, his design is first, immediately and directly, to exercise in a peculiar and eminent manner, and therein to advance and glorify one or more of his glorious properties, and the rest consequentially in and by them. So in some of his works, he doth peculiarly glorify justice, in some mercy, in some his power. We may, therefore, as to the end of this holy eternal compact, consider what are those properties of the divine nature which were peculiarly engaged in it, and are peculiarly exerted in its execution, and were therefore designed to be exalted in a peculiar manner. Now these are three: 1. Wisdom attended with sovereignty. 2. Justice springing from holiness. 3. Grace, mercy, goodness, love, which are various denominations of the same divine excellency.

That this covenant sprang from these properties of the divine nature, that the execution of it is the work and effect of them all, and that it is designed to manifest and glorify them, or God in and by them unto eternity, the Scripture doth fully declare.

First. The infinite sovereign Wisdom of God, even the Father, exerted itself: 1. In passing by the angels in their fallen condition, and fixing on the recovery of man, Heb. ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6. 2. In the projection or provision of the way in general to bring about the salvation of man, by the interposition of his Son, with what he did and suffered in the pursuit hereof, Acts ii. 23, iv. 28. 3. In the disposal of all things in that way, in such a holy and glorious order, so as that marks and footsteps of infinite divine Wisdom should be imprinted on every part and passage of it, 1 Cor. i. 23–31; Rom. xi. 33–36; Eph. iii. 10, 11.

Secondly. His justice accompanied with or springing from holiness, gave as it were the especial determination unto the way to be insisted on for the accomplishment of the end aimed at; and it was effectually exerted in the execution of it. For upon a supposition that God would pardon and save sinners, it was his eternal justice which required that it should be brought about by the sufferings of the Son, and was itself expressed and exercised in those sufferings, as we shall afterwards more fully declare, Rom. iii. 25, 26, viii. 3; Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21.

Thirdly. Grace, love, goodness or mercy, chiefly induced to the whole. And these the Scriptures most commonly cast the work upon, or resolve it into. See John iii. 16, 17; Rom. v. 8, xi. 6; I Cor. i. 29–31; Eph. i. 5–7, iii. 7, 8. In these things, in the exercise, manifestation, and exaltation of these glorious excellencies of the divine nature, with their effects in and upon the obedience of angels and men, doth consist that peculiar glory which God, even the Father, aims at in this covenant; and which supplies the place of that security or advantage, which amongst men is intended in such compacts.

§ 17. There must also, moreover, be an especial and peculiar honour of the Son, the other party covenanted, intended therein; and was so accordingly, and is in like manner accomplished. And this was twofold: 1. What he had conjunct with the Father, as he is of the same nature with him, over all, God blessed for ever. For, on this account the divine excellencies before mentioned belong to him, or are his; and in their exaltation is he exalted. But, as his undertaking herein was peculiar, so he was to have a peculiar honour and glory thereby, not as God, but as the Mediator of the covenant of grace, which sprang from hence. For the accomplishment of the ends of this covenant, as we shall see, he parted for a season with the glory of his interest in these divine perfections, emptying himself.
or making of himself of no reputation, Phil. ii. 7—9. And he was to have an illustrious recovery of the glory of his interest in them, when he was declared to be the 'Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead,' Rom. i. 4, when he was again glorified with the Father, 'with that glory which he had with him before the world was,' John xvii. 3, namely, that peculiar glory which he had, and assumed upon his undertaking to be a Saviour and Redeemer to mankind; then when his delights were with the sons of men, and he rejoiced before the Father, and was his delight on that account. And this, 2dly, was attended with that peculiar glorious exaltation, which in his human nature he received, upon the accomplishment of the terms and conditions of this covenant. What this glory was, and wherein it doth consist, I have manifested at large in the exposition on chap. i. ver. 3. See Isa. liii. 12; Ps. ex. 6, ii. 8, 9; Zech. ix. 10; Ps. lxxii. 8; Rom. xiv. 11; Isa. xlv. 23; Matt. xxviii. 18; Phil. ii. 10; Heb. xii. 2, &c.

§ 18. The manner how these things were to be accomplished, that is, the condition and limitation of this covenant, as it had respect to a prescription of personal obedience and promises of reward, is lastly to be considered. For, herein lies the occasion and spring of the priesthood of Christ, which we are inquiring after. And this sort of covenants hath most affinity to those relations which are constituted by the law of nature. For every natural relation, such as that of father and children, of man and wife, contains in it a covenant with respect to personal services and rewards. Now, things were so disposed in this covenant, that on the account of bringing sinners unto obedience and glory, (to the honour of God the Father, and to the peculiar and especial honour or glory that was proposed unto himself,) that he, the Son, should do and undergo in his own person, all and every thing which in the wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and grace of God, was requisite or necessary to that end; provided that the presence and assistance of the Father was with him, and that he accepted of him and his works.

I shall a little invert the order of these things, that I may not have occasion to return again to them, after we are engaged in our more peculiar design. We may, therefore, in the first place, consider the promises that in this compact or covenant were made unto the Son upon his undertaking of this work, although they more naturally depend on the prescription of duty and work made unto him. But we may consider them as encouragements to the suspicion of the work. And these promises were of two sorts. 1. Such as concerned his person. 2. Such as concerned the prosperity of the work which he undertook. Those also which concerned his person immediately, were of two sorts. 1. Such as concerned his assistance in his work. 2. Such as concerned his acceptance and glory after his work.

1. The person of the Son of God, not absolutely considered, but with respect to his future incarnation, is a proper object of divine promises. And so was he now considered, even as an undertaker for the execution and establishment of this covenant; or as he became the minister of God to confirm the truth of the promises made afterwards to the fathers, Rom. xvi. 8. And, herein he had promises, 1. As to his assistance. The work he undertook to accomplish, as it was great and glorious, so also it was difficult and arduous. It is known from the gospel what he did and what he suffered, what straits, perplexities, and agonies of soul he was reduced to in his work. All this he foresaw in his first engagement, and thereon by his Spirit foretold what should befal
him, Ps. xxii.; Isa. liii.; 1 Pet. i. 11. Whatever opposition hell and the world, which were to prevail unto the bruising of his heel, could make against the Son of God, acting in the frail nature of man, he was to encounter. Whatever the law and the curse of it could bring on offenders, he was to undergo it. Hence, in that nature, he stood in need of the presence of God with him, and of his divine assistance. This, therefore, was promised unto him, in respect whereunto he placed his trust and confidence in God, even the Father, and called upon him in all his distresses, see Isa. xlii. 4, 6; Ps. xvi. 10, 11, xxii., lxxxix. 28.; Isa. i. 5—9. This God promised him, and of this he gave him such ground of assurance, that at all times he might safely trust that God would not leave him under his troubles, but stand by and assist him to the utmost of what had a consistence with the design itself, which he had undertaken to execute.

2. Promises were given unto him concerning his exaltation, his kingdom and power, with all that glory which was to ensue upon the accomplishment of his work. See Isa. liii. 12; Ps. ex. 1, 6, ii. 8, 12; Zech. ix. 10; Ps. lxix. 8; Dan. vii. 14; Rom. xiv. 11; Isa. xlv. 23; Phil. ii 10. And these promises the Lord Christ had a constant eye unto in his whole work; and upon the accomplishment of it, made his request, and expected that they should be made good and fulfilled, as well he might, being made unto him and confirmed with the oath of God, Luke xxiv. 26; John xvii. 3; Heb. xii. 2. And these are an essential part of the covenant that he was engaged by.

The second sort of promises made unto him, are such as concern his work, and the acceptance of it with God. By them was he assured that the children whom he undertook for, should be delivered and saved, should be made partakers of grace and glory; see Heb. ii. 9—11, &c., and our exposition thereon. And this is that which gives the nature of merit to the obedience and suffering of Christ. Merit is such an adjunct of obedience, as whereon a reward is reckoned of debt. Now, there was in the nature of the things themselves, a proportion between the obedience of Christ the Mediator, and the salvation of believers. But this is not the next foundation of merit, though it be an indispensable condition thereof. For there must not only be a proportion, but a relation also between the things whereof the one is the merit of the other. And this relation in this case, is not natural or necessary, arising from the nature of the things themselves. This, therefore, arose from the compact or covenant that was between the Father and Son to this purpose; and the promises wherewith it was confirmed. Suppose then, a proportion in distributive justice between the obedience of Christ and the salvation of believers, (and wherein this consists shall be declared afterwards,) then add the respect and relation that they have one to another by virtue of this covenant, and in particular, that our salvation is engaged by promise unto Christ, and it gives us the true nature of his merit. Such promises were given him, and do belong to this covenant, the accomplishment whereof he pleads on the discharge of his work, Isa. liii. 10, 11; Ps. xxii. 30, 31; John xvii. 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12—16; Heb. vii. 26; Isa. xliv. 5—9; Ps. ii. 7; Acts xviii. 3.

§ 19. The conditions required of, or prescriptions made unto the undertaker in this covenant for the end mentioned, and under the promises directed unto, do complete it. And these may be reduced unto three heads.

1. That he should assume or take on him the nature of those whom, according to the terms of this covenant, he was to bring to God. This was
prescribed unto him, Heb. ii. 9, x. 5, with which, by an act of infinite grace and condescension, he complied, Phil. ii. 6—8; Heb. ii. 15. And therein, although he was God, and was with God, and made all things in the glory of the onlybegotten Son of God, yet he was made flesh, John i. 14. And this condescension, which was the foundation of all his obedience, gave the nature of merit and purchase unto what he did. This he did upon the prescription of the Father, who is therefore said 'to send forth his Son, made of a woman,' Gal. iv. 4, and to 'send forth his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh,' Rom. viii. 3. In answer unto which act of the will of the Father, he saith, 'Lo! I come to do thy will.' And this assumption of our nature was indispensably necessary unto the work which he had to do. He could no otherwise have exalted the glory of God in the salvation of sinners, nor been himself in our nature exalted into his mediatory kingdom, which are the principal ends of this covenant.

2. That in this nature, so assumed, he should be the servant of the Father, and yield universal obedience to him, both according to the general law of God obliging all mankind, and according unto the especial law of the church under which he was born and made; and according to the singular law of that compact or agreement which we have described, Isa. xlii. 1, xlix. 5; Phil. ii. 6. He came to do, to answer, and fulfil the whole will of God; all that on any account was required of him. This he calls the commandment of his Father; the commands which he received of him, which extend themselves to all the prescriptions of this covenant.

3. Whereas God was highly incensed with, and provoked against all and every one of those whom he was to save and bring to glory; they having all by sin come short thereof, and rendered themselves obnoxious to the law and its curse; it was requisite for attaining the ends of this covenant, that he should, as the servant of the Father, make an atonement for sin in and by our nature assumed, and answer the justice of God by suffering and undergoing what was due unto them, without which it was not possible that they should be delivered or saved unto the glory of God, Isa. liii. 11, 12. And as all the other terms of the covenant, so this in particular he undertook to make good; namely, that he would interpose himself between the law and sinners, by undergoing the penalty thereof; and between divine justice itself and sinners, to make atonement for them. And so are we come to the well-head, or the fountain of salvation. Here lieth the immediate sacred spring and foundation of the priesthood of Christ, and of the sacrifice of himself, which, in the discharge of that office he offered unto God.

§ 20. Man having sinned, the justice of God, as the supreme Lord, Ruler, and Governor over all, was violated thereby, and his law broken and disannulled. Every sin personally added to the first sin, which was the sin of our nature in Adam, doth so far partake of the nature thereof, as to have the same consequences with respect unto the justice and law of God. In one or both these ways, all men had sinned and come short of the glory of God, or had apostatized from the end of their creation, without power, hope, or possibility in themselves, for the retrieval thereof. Neither was there any way for our recovery, unless God were propitiated, his justice atoned, and his law repaired or fulfilled. Now, it was this which in the eternal covenant, the Son of God as he was to be incarnate, did undertake to perform. And this could no otherwise be done, but by the obedience and suffering of the nature that had offended, whereby greater glory should redound to God, in the exaltation of the glorious properties
of his nature, through their eminent and peculiar exercise, than dishonour could be reflected on him or his government by sin committed in that nature. This was done by the death and blood-shedding of the Son of God, under the sentence and curse of the law. Hereunto, in this covenant he voluntarily gave himself up to the will of God, to undergo the penalty due to sinners, according to the terms and for the ends of the law. For, inasmuch as the sufferings of Christ were absolutely from his own will, the obedience of his will therein giving them virtue and efficacy; and seeing he did it in them and by them, interpose himself between God and sinners to make atonement and reconciliation for them; and seeing that to this end he offered up himself to the will of God, to do and suffer whatever he required in justice and grace, for the accomplishment of the ends of this compact and agreement; which, having effected, he would persist to make effectual unto those for whom he so undertook all the benefits of his undertaking, by a continual glorious interposition with God on their behalf; he so became the high priest of his people, and offered himself a sacrifice for them.

For when God came to reveal this counsel of his will, this branch and part of the eternal compact between him and his Son, and to represent to the church what had been transacted within the veil, for their faith and edification, as also, to give them some previous insight into the manner of the accomplishment of these his holy counsels; he did it by the institutions of a priesthood and sacrifices, or a sacred office and sacred kind of worship, suited and adapted to be a resemblance of this heavenly transaction between the Father and the Son. For the priesthood and sacrifices of the law were not the original exemplar of these things, but a transcript and copy of what was done in heaven itself, in counsel, design, and covenant, as they were a type of what should be afterwards accomplished in the earth. Now, although the names of priest and sacrifice are first applied to the office mentioned under the law, and to their work, from whence they are transferred under the New Testament to Jesus Christ, that we may learn thereby what God of old instructed his church in; yet the things themselves intended and signified by these names, belong first and properly unto Jesus Christ, upon the account of this his undertaking. And the very names of priest and sacrifices, were but improperly ascribed to them who were so called, to be obscure representations of what was past, and types of what was to come.

§ 21. The sum is, the Son of God, in infinite love, grace, and condescension, undertook freely in, and of his own will, to interpose himself between the wrath of God and sinners, that they might be delivered from sin, with all its consequences, and saved to the glory of God, according to the terms of the covenant explained. His offering, and the giving up of himself to the will of God in suffering and dying, in answer to his holiness, righteousness, and law, was in the revelation of this counsel of God unto the church, represented by his institution of a sacred office of men, to offer up by slaying the best of other creatures, and to minister by other rites of his own appointment. This office was called by him a priesthood, and these offerings were called sacrifices, these things in the first place belonging properly unto the accomplishment of the fore-mentioned holy undertaking, in and by the person of that Son of God. And, if it be inquired wherefore things were thus ordered in the wisdom and counsel of God, we answer, that with respect unto the holiness, righteousness, and veracity of God, it was absolutely and indispensably necessary, that they should be so disposed. For on the supposition of the sin of man, and the grace of
God to save them who had sinned, the interposition of the Son of God on their behalf was indispensably necessary, as shall be proved in the ensuing Exercitation.

EXERCITATION XXIX.

§ 1. The necessity of the priesthood of Christ, of what nature, and on what grounds, asserted. § 2. The general nature of justice or righteousness. § 3. The nature of the righteousness of God, as declared in the Scripture. The universal rectitude of his nature. § 4. Right of rule in God, whence it proceeds. § 5. The righteousness of God in particular exercise. § 6. ‘Justitia Regiminis,’ in God, the nature of it. § 7. Sundry things supposed to the necessary exercise of vindictive righteousness. § 8. The necessity and special nature of the priesthood of Christ founded thereon. § 9. Some attributes of God produce the objects about which they are exercised, some suppose them with their qualifications. Vindictive justice no free act of God’s will. The righteousness of rule in the prescription of a law, penal. Punishment, as punishment, necessary; not the degrees of it. God not indifferent whether sin be punished or not, but free in punishing; yet is it necessary that sin should be punished. § 10. Justice and mercy, not alike necessary as their exercise. § 11. The opinion of the Socinians, in opposition to the justice of God, declared. § 12. Positions to be proved. § 13. First argument taken from the holiness of God, Hab. i. 12. Of God’s jealousy, Josh. xxiv. 19. In what sense compared to a consuming fire, Heb. xii. 29. § 14. God the supreme Judge and Governor of the world, Gen. xviii. 25. § 15. The sum of what hath been pleaded concerning the righteousness of God. § 16. Opposition made to this righteousness of God, by whom. § 17. The arguments of Socinus examined. Justice and mercy not opposite, § 18. The twofold righteousness assigned unto God by Socinus, examined. § 19, 20. The righteousness of God in the punishment of sin farther vindicated against him. § 21. And against the exceptions in the Racovian Catechism. § 22. As also those of Crellius, who is farther refuted.

§ 1. It appears from the preceding discourse, that the priesthood of Christ was founded in sundry free acts of the will of God. Into that therefore it is principally to be resolved. The actual appointment of him also to this office, was a free act of the sovereign will and pleasure of God, which might not have been. The redeeming of man was no more necessary on the part of God than his creation.

Howbeit on this supposition, that God in his infinite grace and love would save sinners by the interposition of his Son, there was something in the manner of it indispensable and necessary. And this was, that he should do it by undergoing the punishment that, because of sin, was due to them who should be saved; or that he should offer himself a sacrifice to make atonement and reconciliation for them. This God did require, nor could it have been ordered otherwise, but that an inconsistency with the glory of his holiness, righteousness, and veracity, would have ensued thereon. The priesthood of the Son of God was necessary, not absolutely in itself, but on the supposition of the law, and entrance of sin, with the grace of God to save sinners.

This being a matter of very great importance, and without a due stating whereof, the doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ, or the nature and use of this office of his, cannot be rightly conceived or apprehended, I must insist upon it somewhat largely. And I shall do it the rather, because the truth in this matter is strenuously opposed by the Socinians, and
the defence of it deserted by some, who otherwise adhere to sound doctrine in the main of our cause. For I shall not mention them, who in these things are not wise beyond the writings of two or three whom they admire; nor those who, being utter strangers to the true reasons and grounds of truth herein, do boldly and confidently give vent to their own imaginations, and that with the contempt of all who are not satisfied to be as ignorant as themselves.

§ 2. Whereas we assert the necessity of the priesthood of Christ to depend on the righteousness of God, it is requisite that some things should be premised concerning the nature of righteousness in general, and in particular of the righteousness of God. Aristotle divides justice into that which is universal, and that which is particular. And he makes the former to be the same with virtue in general, only it hath, as he supposeth, a respect to others, and is not merely for itself, Ethic. lib. 5, cap. 1, 2. Particular justice is either distributive or commutative; and in its exercise it consists in words or deeds. That justice which consists in words, respects either commands, and it is called equity; or promises and assertions, and is veracity or truth. And both these, even equity in his commands, and truth or faithfulness in his promises, are frequently in the Scripture called the righteousness of God; see Ezra ix. 15; Neh. ix. 3; Ps. xxxi. 1; Rom. i. 17, iii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 8. And this is the righteousness of God which David and other holy men so often plead and appeal to, whilst in the meantime they plainly acknowledge, that in the strictness of God's justice, they could neither stand before him, nor find acceptance with him, Ps. exxx. 3, cxliii. 1, 2. The righteousness which consisteth, or is exercised in works or actions, is either the righteousness of rule in general, or of judgment in particular. And this latter is either remunerative or corrective; and this also is either chastening or avenging. And all these are subordinate unto distributive justice; for commutative hath no place between God and man, 'Who hath first given unto him, that it should be rendered unto him again.'

§ 3. And these distinctions are of use, in the declaration of the various acceptations of the righteousness of God in the Scripture. But their explication and farther illustration is not at present necessary unto us. For I shall take up with a more general consideration and distribution of the righteousness of God, whereunto whatever is ascribed unto it in the Scripture may be reduced. Wherefore the righteousness of God is taken two ways: 1. Absolutely in itself, as it is resident in the divine nature. 2. With respect to its exercise, or the actings of God suitable unto that holy property of his nature.

In the first sense or acceptance, it is nothing but the universal rectitude of the divine nature, whereby it is necessary to God to do all things rightly, justly, equally, answerably unto his own wisdom, goodness, holiness, and right of dominion, Zeph. iii. 5. 'The just Lord in the midst thereof, he will do no iniquity: morning by morning doth he bring his judgment to light.' I say it is the essential natural readiness and disposition of the holy nature of God to do all things justly and decently, according to the rule of his wisdom, and the nature of things, with their relation one to another. And this virtue of the divine nature considered absolutely, is not προς τερον, or doth not consist in an habitude of mind with respect unto others, as all justice in men doth, but is the infinite essential rectitude of God in his being. Hence it doth so preside in and over all the works of God, that there is none of them, though proceeding immediately from mercy and goodness on the one hand, or from severity or faithfulness on the other,
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but that God is said to be righteous therein, and they are all represented as acts of righteousness in God. And this not only because they are his acts and works who can do no evil, and who will do none, but also because they proceed from and are suited to that holy absolute universal rectitude of his nature, wherein true righteousness doth consist. So are we said to obtain faith through the righteousness of God, 2 Pet. i. 1, the same with abundant mercy, 1 Pet. i. 3; Isa.-li. 6, 'My salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished,' that is my faithfulness. See the description of it in general, Job xxxiv. 10—15. The absolute rectitude of the nature of God, acted in and by his sovereignty, is his righteousness, Rom. ix. 8, 14, 15.

§ 4. For between the consideration of this righteousness of God, and the actual exercise of it, which must respect somewhat without him, to be made by him, somewhat in his creatures, there must be interposed a consideration of the right of God, or that which we call *jus Dominii*, a right, power, and liberty of rule or government. For it is not enough that any one be righteous, to enable him to act righteously in all that he doth, or may do, with respect to others; but moreover he must have a right to act in those cases wherein he doth so. And this right which justice supposeth, is, or may be, twofold: 1. Supreme and absolute. 2. Subordinate. For we speak of justice and right only with respect to public actings, or actings of rule, which belong unto righteousness as it is distributive; for that which is commutative, and may have place in private transactions among private persons, we have here no consideration of. Now for that which is subordinate, it is a right to distribute justice or things equal to others, according to the direction, and by the authority of a superior. And this superior may either be only real, as is a law, in which sense the law of nature is a superior to all rulers on the earth, and the respective laws of nations to most; or personal also, which is that which is denied, where any one is acknowledged as a supreme Governor. That this right hath no place in God, is evident. He hath no greater whereby he may swear, and therefore swears by himself, Heb. vi. 13.

2. The right therefore which God hath to act his righteousness, or to act righteously towards others, is supreme and sovereign, arising naturally and necessarily from the relation of all things to himself. For hereby, namely by their relation to him as his creatures, they are all placed in a universal, indispensable, and absolutely unchangeable dependence on him, according to their natures and capacities. The right of God to rule over us, is wholly of another kind and nature than any thing is or can be among the sons of men; that which is paternal has the nearest resemblance to it, but it is not of the same kind. For it doth not arise from the benefits we receive from him, nor hath it any respect to our consent, for he rules over the most against their wills, but depends merely on our relation to him as his creatures, with the nature, order, and condition of our existence, wherein we are placed by his sovereignty. This in him is unavoidably accompanied with a right to act towards us according to the counsel of his will, and the rectitude of his nature. The state and condition, I say, of our being and end, with the relation which we have to him, and to his other works, or the order wherein we are set and placed in the universe, being the product or effect of his power, wisdom, will, and goodness, he hath an unchangeable sovereign right to deal with us, and act towards us, according to the infinite eternal rectitude of his nature. And as he hath a right so to do, so he cannot do otherwise, supposing the state and condition wherein
we are made and placed, with the nature of our relation to, and dependence on God; and God can act no otherwise towards us, but according to what the essential rectitude of his nature doth direct and require; which is the foundation of what we plead in the case before us, concerning the necessity of the priesthood of Christ.

§ 5. Secondly. The righteousness of God may be considered with respect unto its exercise, which is so frequently expressed in the Scripture, and whereon depends the rule and government of the world. This supposeth the right of God before declared; as that right itself is no absolute but a relative property of God, supposing the creation of all things, in their nature, order, and mutual respects, according to his wisdom, and by his power. On this supposition it followeth naturally and necessarily, not as a new thing in God, but as a natural and necessary respect which his nature and being hath unto all creatures upon their production. For suppose the creation of all things, and it is as natural and essential to God to be the ruler of them, and over them, as it is to be God. Now the exercise of the righteousness of God in pursuit of his right of rule, is either absolute and antecedent, or respective and consequential. As it is absolute, and acted antecedently to the consideration of our obedience or disobedience, so it is put forth and exercised in his laws and promises. For they are acts or effects of righteousness, disposing things equally according to their nature, and the will of God. God's ways are equal. His justice in legislation is universal equity. For all things being created in order by divine Wisdom, there arose from thence a το πράτων, a meetness and condeczy, wherunto respect was had in God's legislation, whereby his law or the commandment became equal, holy, meet, just, and good. And whereas it was necessary that the law of God should be accompanied with promises and threatenings, the eternal rectitude of God's nature acting righteously in their execution or accomplishment, is his truth. Hence truth and righteousness are in the Scripture frequently used to express the same thing.

§ 6. Again, There is a respective righteousness in actions, which also is either of rule or of judgment. First, there is, 'Justitia Regiminis,' or the particular righteousness of actual rule. I do not place this as though it were absolutely consequential unto that of legislation before mentioned. For take righteousness of rule or government in its whole latitude, and it comprehends in it the righteousness of legislation also, as a part thereof. For so it is the virtue or power of the nature of God, whereby he guideth all his actions or works in disposing and governing of the things created by him, in their several kinds and orders, according to the rule of his own eternal rectitude and wisdom. For righteousness of government must consist in an attendance unto and observance of some rule. Now this in God is the absolute righteousness of his nature, with his natural right unto rule over all, in conjunction with his infinitely wise and holy will, which is that unto him which equity or law are to supreme rulers among men. And therefore God, in the exercise of this righteousness, sometimes resolves the faith and obedience of men into his sovereign right over all, Job. xiv. 14, xxxiii. 12, 13, xxxiv. 12, 13, 14; Jer. xviii. 1—6; Isa. xlv. 9; Rom. ix. 20, xi. 32, 33. Sometimes into the holiness of his nature, Zeph. iii. 5; Ps. xxvii. 9. Sometimes into the equity and equality of his ways and works themselves, Ezek. xviii. 25. But there is a particular exercise of this righteousness of rule, which hath respect unto the law, any law given unto men immediately by God, as confirmed with promises and threatenings. The ruling and disposing of the temporal and eternal states or con-
ditions of men, according to the tenor and sentence of the law given unto them, belongeth hereunto. And as this is actually executed, it is called 'Justitia Judicialis,' or the righteousness of God, whereby he distributes rewards and punishments unto his creatures according to their works. Hereof one part consisteth in the punishing of sin as it is a transgression of his law; and this is that wherein at present we are concerned. For we say that the righteousness of God, as he is the supreme ruler of the world, doth require necessarily that sin be punished: or the transgression of that law, which is the instrument of his rule, be avenged.

§ 7. The exercise of this righteousness in God, presupposeth sundry things. As,

1. The creation of all things, in their kind, order, state, and condition by a free act of the will and power of God, regulated by his goodness and infinite wisdom. For our 'God doth whatever he pleaseth; he worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will.'

2. In particular the creation of intelligent rational creatures in a moral dependence on himself, capable of being ruled by a law, in order unto his glory and their own blessedness. The being and nature of mankind, their rational constitution, their ability for obedience, their capacity of eternal blessedness or misery, depend all on a sovereign free act of the will of God.

3. The nature of the law given unto these creatures, as the means and instrument of their moral orderly dependence on God; whereof the breach of that law would be a disturbance.

4. The eternal, natural, unchangeable right that God hath to govern these creatures according to the tenor of that law, which he hath so appointed for the instrument of his rule. This is no less necessary unto God than his being.

5. The sin of these creatures, which was destructive of all that order of things, which ensued on the creation and giving of the law. For it was destructive, 1st. Of the principal end of the creation, which could be no other but the glory of God from the obedience of his creatures; preserving all things in the order and state wherein he had made and placed them. 2d, Of the dependence of the creature on God, which consisted in his moral obedience unto him according to the law. And, 3d. It was introductory of a state of things utterly opposite to the universal rectitude of the nature of God. Only the right of God to rule the sinning creature unto his own glory, abode with him, because it belongs unto him as God. And this represents the state of things between God and the sinning creature: wherein we say that upon a supposition of all these antecedent free acts, and of the necessary continuance of God's righteousness of rule and judgment, it was necessary that the sinning creature should be punished according to the sentence of the law. Only observe, that I say not that this righteousness of judgment, as to the punitive part or quality of it, is a peculiar righteousness in God, or an especial virtue in the divine nature, or an especial distinct righteousness; which the schoolmen generally incline unto; for it is only the universal rectitude of the nature of God, sometimes called his righteousness, sometimes his holiness, sometimes his purity, exercising itself not absolutely, but on the supposition before laid down.

§ 8. On this state of things, on the necessary exercise of this righteousness of God upon the suppositions mentioned, depends both the necessity and especial nature of the priesthood of Christ. Designed it was in grace, as we have before proved, on supposition that God would save sinners; but
it was this justice that made it necessary, and determined its especial nature. For this was that which indispensably required the punishment of sin, and therefore it was necessary that he who would save sinners should undergo for them the punishment that was due to them. This was therefore to be done by the Son of God, in the interposition that he made with God on the behalf of sinners. He was to answer the justice of God for their sin. But because this could not be done by mere suffering or enduring punishment, which is a thing in its own nature indifferent, the will and obedience of Christ in the manner of undergoing it was also required. This made his priesthood necessary; whereby whilst he underwent the punishment due to our sins, he offered himself an acceptable sacrifice for their expiation. This is that therefore which is now distinctly proposed unto confirmation; namely, that the justice or righteousness of God, as exercised in the rule and government of his rational creatures, did indispensably and necessarily require that sin committed should be punished, whence ariseth the especial nature of the priesthood of Christ. And this I shall do, 1st. By premising some observations, making way unto the true stating and explication of the truth. 2d. By relating the judgment or opinion of the Socinians, our professed adversaries, in and about these things. 3d. By producing the arguments and testimonies whereby the truth contended for is established, by which the objections of the adversaries unto them shall be removed out of the way.

§ 9. First. There are some attributes of God which as to their first exercise 'ad extra,' require no object antecedently existing unto their acting of themselves, much less objects qualified with any sort of conditions. Such are the wisdom and power of God, which do not find but produce the objects of their first actings 'ad extra.' These therefore in these actings must needs be absolutely and every way free, being limited and directed only by the sovereign will and pleasure of God. For it was absolutely free to God whether he would act any thing outwardly or not; whether he would make a world or not, or of what kind. But on the supposition of the determination of his will so to act in producing things without himself, it could not be but he must of necessity, by the necessity of his own nature, act according to those properties, that is, infinitely powerfully, and infinitely wisely. But herein were they no way limited by their first objects, for they were produced and had being given unto them by themselves. But there are properties of the divine nature which cannot act according unto their nature, without a supposition of an antecedent object, and that qualified in such or such a manner. Such are his vindictive justice, and his pardoning mercy. For if there be no sinners, none can be punished or pardoned. Yet are they not therefore to be esteemed only as free acts of the will of God. For not their existence in him, but their outward exercise only, depends on and is limited by the qualification of their objects. So then,

Secondly. The rule of God's acting from or by his vindictive justice, is not a mere free act of his will, but the natural dominion and rule which he hath over sinning creatures, in answer to the rectitude and holiness of his own nature. That is, he doth not punish sin, because he will do so merely, as he made the world because he would, and for his pleasure; but because he is just and righteous and holy in his rule, and can be no otherwise, because of the holiness and rectitude of his nature. Neither doth he punish sin as he can, that is, to the utmost of his power, but as the rule of his government, and the order of things in the universe disposed unto his glory, doth require,

Thirdly. This justice exerted itself in one signal act antecedent unto the
Son of man; namely, in the prescription of a penal law, that is, in the annexing of the penalty of death unto the transgression of the law. This God did not merely because he would do so; but because the order of all things with respect unto their dependence on himself as the supreme ruler of all, did so require. For had God only given men a law of the rule of their dependence on him and subjection unto him, and not inseparably annexed a penalty unto its transgression, it was possible that man by sin might have cast off all his moral dependence on God, and set himself at liberty from his rule, as it was some such thing that was aimed at in the first sin, whereby man foolishly hoped that he should make himself like unto God. For having broke and disannulled the sole law of his dependence on God, what should he have had more to do with him? But this case was obviated by the justice of God, in predisposing the order of punishment to succeed in the room of the order of obedience, if that were broken. And that this provision should be made, the nature of God did require.

Fourthly. This justice of God required a punishment of sin as a punishment. Hereunto do belong the way and degree, the time, season, and manner of it; but these things are not necessarily stated in the justice of God. The assignation and determination of them, belongs unto his sovereign will and wisdom. So would things have been ordered in the execution of the sentence of the law on Adam, had it not been taken off by the interposition of the Mediator. Whatever therefore God doth in this kind, when he hasteneth or deferreth desired punishments, in the aggravation or diminution of penalties, it is all in the disposal of his holy will.

Fifthly. Whereas upon the supposition mentioned, I do affirm that it is necessary, on the consideration of the nature of God, and his natural right to govern his creatures, that sin should be punished; yet I say that God punisheth sin necessarily, which would express the manner of his operation, and not the reason of it. He doth not punish sin as the sun gives out light and heat, or as the fire burns, or as heavy things tend downwards by a necessity of nature. He doth it freely, exerting his power by a free act of his will. For the necessity asserted doth only exclude an antecedent indifferency upon all the suppositions laid down. It denies that on these respects it is absolutely indifferent with God whether sin be punished or no. Such an indifferency, I say, is opposite unto the nature, law, truth, and rule of God, and therefore such a necessity as excludes it must herein be asserted. It is not then indifferent with God, whether sin or the transgression of his law be punished or not; and that because his justice requireth that it should be punished; so far therefore is it necessary that so it should be. But herein is God a free agent, and acts freely in what he doth, which is a necessary mode of all divine actings 'ad extra.' For God doth all things according to the counsel of his own will; and his will is the original of all freedom. But suppose the determination of his will, and the divine nature necessarily requireth an acting suitable unto itself. It is altogether free to God whether he will speak unto any of his creatures or not. But suppose the determination of his will, that he will so speak, it is absolutely necessary that he speak truly. For truth is an essential property of his nature: whence he is God that cannot lie. It was absolutely free to God whether he would create this world or not. But on supposition that so he would do, he could not but create it omnipotently and wisely; for so his nature doth require, because he is essentially omnipotent and infinitely wise. So there was no absolute necessity in the nature of God, that he should punish sin; but on supposition that he would create man, and would permit him to sin,
it was necessary that his sin should be avenged; for this his righteousness and dominion over his creatures did require.

§ 10. It is objected that on the same suppositions it will be no less necessary that God should pardon sin, than that he should punish it. For mercy is no less an essential property of his nature than justice. And if on supposition of the proper object of justice and its qualification, it is necessary that it should be exercised; that is, that where sin is, there also should be punishment; why then on the supposition of the proper object of mercy, and its qualifications, is it not necessary that it also should be exercised; that is, that where there is sin and misery, there should be pity and pardon? And whereas one of these must give place unto the other, or else God can act nothing at all towards sinners, why may we not rather think that justice should yield as it were to mercy, and so all be pardoned, than that mercy should so far give place to justice as that all should be punished?

Ans. 1st. We shall make it fully appear that God hath in infinite wisdom and grace so ordered all things in this matter, that no disadvantage doth redound either to his justice or his mercy, but that both of them are gloriously exercised, manifested, and exerted. That this was done by the substitution of the Son of God to answer divine justice in the stead of them, who were to be pardoned by mercy, and that it could be done no otherwise, is that which we are in the confirmation of. And those by whom this is denied, can give no tolerable account why all are not condemned, seeing God is infinitely righteous; or all are not pardoned, seeing he is infinitely merciful. For what they fancy concerning impenitency will not relieve them. For if God can forgive any sin without satisfaction to his justice, he may forgive every sin, and will do so because he is infinitely merciful; for what should hinder or stand in the way, if justice do not? But,

2d. There is not the same reason of the actual exercise of justice and mercy. For upon the entrance of sin, as it respects the rule of God, the first thing that respects it is justice, whose part it is to preserve all things in their dependence on God, which without the punishment of sin cannot be done. But God is not obliged unto the exercise of mercy, nor doth the forbearance of such an exercise any way entrench upon the holiness of his nature, or the glory of his rule. It is true, mercy is no less an essential property of God than justice; but neither the law, nor the state and order of things wherein they were created, nor their dependence on God as the supreme governor of the whole creation, raise any natural respect or obligation between mercy and its object. God therefore can execute the punishment which his justice requireth, without the least impeachment of his mercy. For no act of justice is contrary to mercy. But absolutely to pardon, where the interest of justice is to punish, is contrary to the nature of God.

3d. It is denied that sin and misery do constitute the proper object of mercy. It is required that every thing contrary to the nature of God in sin and the sinner be taken out of the way, or there is no proper object for mercy. Such is the guilt of sin unsatisfied for. And moreover faith and repentance are required to the same purpose. Socinus himself acknowledgeth that it is contrary to the nature of God to pardon impenitent sinners. These none can have but on the account of an antecedent reconciliation, as is evident in the fallen angels. And on these suppositions, even mercy itself will be justly exercised, nor can it be otherwise.

§ 11. These things are premised, to give a right understanding of the truth which we assert and contend for. It remains that we briefly represent
what is the opinion which the Socinians advance in opposition unto this foundation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. For they are awake unto their concern herein, and there is none of them but in one place or other attempt an opposition unto this justice of God, and the necessity of its exercise upon the supposition of sin; though the defence of it hath been unhappily and causelessly by some deserted. The judgment of these men is expressed by Socinus, Prelec. Theol. Cap. 16. lib. 1. de Jesu Christo Servator. cap. 1. lib. 3. cap. 1. Catech. of Racov. cap. 3. Q. 12. Ossorod. Institut. cap. 31. Volck. de Ver. Relig. lib. 5. cap. 21. Crellius. lib. de Deo, cap. 23. Vindic. Socin. ad Grat. Cap. 1. de causis mortis Christi, cap. 16. Smalcius adv. Franzium, Disputat. Quarta. Gitichius ad Lucium. Woolzogen. Compend. Relig. Christianæ, § 48. The sum of what they all plead, is, That there is no such thing as justice in God, requiring that sin be punished. That the cause and fountain of punishment in God, is anger, wrath, or fury. That these denote free acts of the will of God, which he may exercise or omit at his pleasure. If he punish sin, he doth nothing against justice, nor if he omit so to do. In all these things he is absolutely free, such a governor of his creatures do they fancy him to be. Hence it follows that there was no necessity, no just or cogent reason, why the punishment of our sin, or the chastisement of our peace, should be laid on Christ; for there was neither need nor possibility that any satisfaction should be made to the justice of God. Only he hath freely determined to punish impenitent sinners, and as freely determined to pardon them that repent and believe the gospel. For this hath he sent the Lord Christ to testify and declare unto us; with respect whereunto, he is called and to be esteemed our Saviour. The words of Socinus are express to this purpose. De Christo Servatore, lib. 1. cap. 12. "Quærente aliquò, qui fiat, ut mortem aeternam meriti, nihilominus ad vitam aeternam perveniamus, non est generum responsum, quia Christum servatorem habemus: sed Quia supplicium mortis aeternæ a Deo, cujus libera voluntate atque Decreto eam meriti fureramus, nobis pro ineffabilis ipsius bonitate condonatum fuit; atque ejus loco datum vita aeternæ præmium; dummodo resipiscamus, et abnegata omni impietate vitae innocentiae ac sanitimiae deinceps studeamus. Quod si qua ratione istud nobis innotuerit quaeratur, cum neque Deum videamus unquam, neque audiamus loquentem, quisve nobis tanta divinae liberalitatis non dubiam fidem fecerit, Respondendum est, Jesum Christum id nobis enarrasse, et multis modis confirmasse." This is the substance of the persuasion of these men in this matter, and that this is contradictory to the whole mystery and design of the gospel, and contains a complete renunciation of the mediation of Christ, will in our ensuing discourse be made to appear.

§ 12. That therefore which we are engaged in the confirmation of, may be reduced to two heads. 1st. That the justice of God whereby he governeth the world, and ruleth over all, is an essential property of the divine nature, whence God is denominated just or righteous; and that on the account hereof, it is necessary that sin should be punished, or not be absolutely pardoned without respect to satisfaction given to that justice of God. 2d. That hence it became necessary, that in the designation of the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God to his office of priesthood, he should make his soul an offering for sin, to make an atonement thereby for it, without which there could have been no remission, because without it there could be no satisfaction given, or reconciliation made.

§ 13. Our first argument is taken from the consideration of the nature of
God and of his holiness. Whatever is spoken of the purity and holiness of God, with his hatred of and aversion from sin and sinners on the account thereof, confirmeth our assertion. For we intend no more thereby, but that God the great ruler of the world is of so holy a nature, as that he cannot but hate and punish sin, and that so to do, belongs unto his absolute perfection. For the purity and holiness of God is nothing but the universal perfection of his nature, which is accompanied with a disbelievency in and a hatred of sin, whence he will punish it according to its desert. So is it expressed Hab. i. 13. 'Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity.' Not to be able to look on or behold iniquity expresseth the most inconceivable detestation of it. God is holy; which expresseth the infinite holiness of his nature, with what respect therein he hath, and cannot but have, towards that which is perverse and evil. So when the prophet had made his inference from hence, namely, that he was holy, he teacheth, that any look or aspect unsuitable thereunto towards sin or evil, is not to be expected from him; he adds expressly, 'and he cannot (that is, because of the holiness of his nature, which such an action would be contrary unto) look upon,' that is, pass by, spare, or connive at iniquity. For that is the rule of what God can do, or cannot do. He can do every thing that is not contrary to himself, that is, the essential properties of his nature. He can do nothing that is contrary to or inconsistent with his truth, holiness, or righteousness. Wherefore, whereas not to look on sin, not to behold it, do include in them, and by the negation of contrary acts, express the punishing of sin, that is, all sin, or sin as sins, and these are resolved into the nature of God, or his essential holiness, this testimony declares that the punishment of sin is thence necessary to God, as he is the holy supreme Governor of the world.

Hence this holiness of God is sometimes expressed by jealousy, or hath jealousy joined with it, or accompanying of it; Josh. xxiv. 19, 'He is a holy God, he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your trespasses nor your sins.' And God makes mention of this his jealousy where he would instruct men in his severity in the punishing of sin, Exod. xx. 5. For the nature of jealousy is not to spare, Prov. vi. 34, nothing but the executing of vengeance will satisfy it. And this is that which God intended in the revelation of himself, which he made by the proclamation of his name before Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 7, 'That will by no means clear (or acquit) the guilty; namely, for whom no atonement is made.

And it is to instruct us herein, that this holiness of God is expressed by fire, Heb. xii. 29, 'Our God is a consuming fire.' 'Devouring fire and everlasting burnings,' Isa. xxxiii. 14, and that a fiery stream is said to proceed from him, and that his throne is like a fiery flame, Dan. vii. 9, 10. Now, it is certain that God acteth not in any external work, by a mere and absolute necessity of nature, as fire burneth. This, therefore, we are not taught by this representation of the holiness of God. But if we may not learn thence, that he will fire will burn any combustible thing that is put into it, so the holiness of God requires that all sin be as assuredly punished, we know not what to learn from it. And it is certainly not made use of merely for our amazement.

An account of the nature and holiness of God is given us to the same purpose, Ps. v. 4—6, 'For thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness, neither shall evil dwell with thee. The foolish shall not stand in thy sight, thou hatsest all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak lies: the Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.' All the actings of God in the hatred and punishment of sin, proceed from his na-
tute. And what is natural to God is necessary. The negative expression, 'Thou art not a God that hath pleasure,' ver. 4, includes strongly the affirmative expressed, ver. 5, 'Thou hastest the workers of iniquity.' And this he doth, because he is such a God as he is; that is, infinitely holy and righteous. And that hatred which is here ascribed unto God, contains two things in it. 1. A natural disprincency: he cannot like it, he cannot approve it, he cannot but have an aversion from it. 2. A will of punishing it proceeding therefrom; and which is therefore necessary, because required by the nature of God. Expressions are here multiplied, to manifest that sin is contrary to the nature of God, and that it is inconsistent with to pass it by unpunished. And if the punishing of sin depend upon a mere free act of the will of God, which might or might not he without any disadvantage to his nature, there is no reason why his holiness or righteousness should be made mention of, as those which induce him thereunto, and indispensably require it. This is that which from this consideration is confirmed to us, namely, that such is the holiness of the nature of God, that he cannot pass by sin absolutely unpunished. For it is contrary to his holiness, and, therefore, he cannot do it; for he cannot deny himself.

§ 14. Again, God, in the Scripture, is proposed unto us as the supreme Judge of all, acting in rewards and punishments according to his own righteousness, or what the rectitude and holy properties of his own nature do require and make just, good, and holy. Although his kingdom, dominion, government, and rule, be supreme and absolute, yet he ruleth not as it were arbitrarily, without respect unto any rule or law. That God should have any external rule or law in his government of the world, is absolutely and infinitely impossible. But his law and rule is the holiness and righteousness of his own nature, with respect to that order of all things which in his will and wisdom he hath given and assigned unto the whole creation. In respect hereunto, he is said to do right as a ruler and a judge, Gen. xviii. 25, 'Shall not the Judge of all the world do right?' נָאָבְנֵי, expresseth that σχέσεις of the divine nature, and that office as it were of God, which in this matter he represents himself to us, as vested withal. He is that supreme Rector or Governor of all the world, who useth and is to use, righteousness in his government, or to govern righteousness. Before such a one, the just and unjust cannot, ought not to be treated or dealt withal in the same manner. For, although none be absolutely righteous in his sight, yet some may be so comparatively, with respect unto some kind of guilt and guilty persons. According as the distance is between persons, so the righteousness of God requires that they be differently dealt withal.

But it is pleaded, that the intention of the expression here used, is to plead for mercy, that the just should not be utterly destroyed with the unjust, and that we improve the testimony unto a contrary end, namely, to prove that God must punish all sin.' But all that is hence aimed at, is no more but that God is denominated just and righteous, from that righteousness whereby he punisheth sin; which, therefore, can be no free act of his will, but is an essential property of his nature. And if so, then doth that righteousness of his require that sin be punished. For God doth right as a judge, and a judge cannot acquit the guilty without injustice. And what an external law is to a subordinate judge, that is God's righteousness and holiness unto him, as he is the Judge of all the earth. And this appeal of Abraham unto the righteousness of God, as he is a judge, is founded in a principle of the light of nature, and as such is repeated by our apostle,
Rom. iii. 5, 6. And unto this end is God, as the Ruler of the world, represented as on a throne, executing justice and judgment; the introduction of which solemnity is of no use, unless it instruct us that God governeth the world as a righteous Judge, and that justice requireth that he inflict punishment on sinners, Ps. ix. 7—14, lxxxix. 14, cxvii. 2, 'Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne;' that is, they always dwell and reside there, because God on his throne, acts according to the justice and righteousness of his nature. And, hence he is both denominated righteous, and declared so to be, in and by the punishment of sin, Rev. xvi. 5, 6. See Rom. i. 32; 2 Thess. i. 6; Exod. ix. 27. Which places I have to the same purpose pleaded and vindicated elsewhere.

§ 15. The whole of what hath been thus far pleaded, may be reduced to the ensuing heads.

1. God is naturally and necessarily the supreme Governor of his rational creatures, with respect unto their utmost end, which is his own glory. Upon the supposition of his being and theirs, an imagination to the contrary would imply all sorts of contradictions.

2. The law of obedience in and unto such creatures ariseth naturally and necessarily from the nature of God and thereon. For this original law is nothing but that respect which a finite, limited, dependent creature, hath upon an absolute, infinitely wise, holy, and good Creator, suited unto the principles of the nature which it is endued withal. Therefore, it is indispen-sably necessary.

3. The annexing of a penalty unto the transgression of this law, was nothing but what the righteousness of God as the supreme Ruler of his creatures did make necessary, as that without which the glory and holiness of his rule could not be preserved upon the entrance of sin.

4. The institution of punishment answerable unto the sanction of the law, is an act of justice in God, and necessary unto him as the supreme Governor of the universe.

And this is the first ground whereon the necessity of the satisfaction of Christ, and of the atonement he was to make as our High Priest, is founded. For on supposition that God in infinite grace and mercy would eternally save sinners, the punishment due to their sins was to be undergone by him who interposed himself between them and the justice of God which required it. Now, as there are some who believe the satisfaction of Christ on the abundant testimonies given unto it in the Scripture, and yet resolve the reason of it into the infinite wisdom and sovereign pleasure of God only, with whom I do not now expressly deal, because, although we differ about the way, we agree in the end; so the Socinians employ the chief of their strength in opposition unto this righteousness of God, as knowing that if it be maintained, they are cast in their whole cause. I shall, therefore, remove all those objections which they principally fortify themselves with, against the evidence of the truth asserted, and their exceptions also which they put in to the testimonies and arguments wherewith it is confirned, and thereby put an end to this excitation.

§ 17. He whom I shall first begin with, is Socinus himself, who in all these things laid that foundation which his followers have built upon. And as almost in all his other works, he casually reflects on this righteousness of God; so in that De Jesu Christo Servatore, he directly opposeth it in two chapters at large, lib. 1, cap. 1, lib. 3, cap. 1. In the first place, he designeth to answer the arguments produced by his adversary for it, and in the latter he levieth his objections against it. And in the first place he
proceedeth solely on this supposition, that the righteousness which we here plead for, and that mercy whereby God forgiveth sins, are contrary and opposite unto one another, so that they cannot be properties of his nature, but only external acts of his will and power.

This is the foundation of his whole discourse in that place; which he asserts as a thing evident, but undertakes not at all to prove. But this supposition is openly false. For the justice and mercy of God may be considered either in themselves, or with respect unto their effects. In neither sense are they contrary or opposite to each other. For in themselves, being essential properties of the nature of God, as they must be, in that they are perfections of an intelligent being, they differ not from the universal rectitude of his holy nature, but only add a various respect unto external things. So that, in themselves they are so far from being opposite, as that God is denominated just, from the exercising the perfections of his nature in a way of justice; and merciful, from a like exercise in a way of mercy. Absolutely, therefore, and essentially, they are the same. Neither are their effects contrary or opposite to each other, only they are diverse, or not of the same kind, nor are the effects of the one contrary unto the other. To punish, where punishment is deserved, is not contrary to mercy; but where punishment is not deserved, there it is so; for then it is cruelty. And yet also in that case, the part of wrong, namely, in punishing without desert, is more opposite to justice itself, than the cruel part is to mercy. And so is it where punishment exceeds guilt, or where proceedings are not according unto an equal measure or standard. Nor is to spare through or by mercy, contrary to justice. For if to spare and pardon, be not for the good of the whole, for the preservation of order, and the end of rule, it is not mercy to pardon or spare, but facility, remissness in government, or foolish pity. Secure those things in rule and government which justice takes care of and provides for, and then to spare in mercy, is no way contrary unto it. If these things be not provided for, to spare is not an act of mercy, but a defect in justice. And, if these things were not so, it would be impossible that any one could be just and merciful also, yea, or do any act either of justice or mercy. For if he punish, he is unmerciful, that is wicked, if punishment be contrary to mercy; and if he spare he is not just, if sparing be opposite to justice. There is, therefore, nothing solid or sound, nothing but an outward appearance of reason, really contrary to the highest evidence of right reason indeed, in this sophism which is laid as the foundation of the opposition made to the righteousness of God pleaded for.

§ 18. On this false supposition, Socinus grants a two fold righteousness in God with respect unto sin, and the punishment thereof; one which he perpetually useth, whilst he destroys obstinate, impenitent, and contumacious sinners; the other whereby sometimes he punisheth sinners according unto his law, which yet are not obstinate, without any expectation of their repentance. And these several sorts of justice in God, he confirms by sundry instances in the place before alleged. But it is plain that these things belong not unto the question under debate. For they respect only the external manner and acts of punishing; and nothing is more fond than thence to feign various righteousnesses in God, or to conclude that therefore, every transgression of the law doth not require a just recompence of reward. Nor is it supposed that the justice of God doth so exact the punishment of sin, as that all sin must be immediately punished in the same manner, especially as unto temporal punishments which respect this life.
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It belongs unto the sovereign authority and infinite wisdom of God, as the Governor of the world, so to dispose of the time, season, manner, and measures of the punishments due unto sin, as may most conduce to the end aimed at in the whole. Thus, he cuts off some in their entrance into a course of sin; others he endureth with much long suffering, though vessels of wrath and fitted for destruction, Rom. ix. And this he doth because he is willing so to do; or so it pleaseth him. But hence it follows not that finally he pardoneth or spareth some, or punisheth others merely because he willeth.

That, therefore, whereby he deceives himself and others in this matter is, the exclusion of the satisfaction of Christ, from having the place of any cause, or from being of any consideration in the matter of pardoning sin. For this he expressly pleads and contends, in this place, as is evident from the words before recited, wherein he allows no more to Christ and his mediation, but only that he came to declare that God would forgive us our sins. His whole proof, therefore, is but a begging of the thing in question. For the reason why God constantly punisheth them who are obstinate in their sin, and impenitent, is really because their sins deserve in his justice, and according to his law, so to be punished; and they are not spared, because they obstinately refuse the remedy or relief provided for them, in that they fulfill not the condition whereby they might be interested in the sufferings of Christ for sin. 

He that believeth not shall be damned; that is, shall personally be left unto the justice of God, and sentence of the law. Those whom God spareth and punisheth not, it is not because their sins do not deserve punishment, or because the justice of God, doth not require that their sins should be punished, but because they are interested by faith in the satisfaction made by Christ, when he underwent the punishment due to their sins, by the will of God. And this is the rule of punishment and sparing, as they are final and decretory, according to a sentence never to be repealed nor altered. As for temporary punishments, whether they are corrective only, or vindictive, their dispensation depends absolutely on the will and pleasure of God, who will so order and dispose of them, as that they may be subordinate unto his final determination of the eternal condition of sinners. But this exclusion of the consideration of the interposition of Christ, in a way of suffering punishment for the procuring of the pardon of sin, is that which disturbs the whole harmony of what is taught us, concerning the justice and mercy of God in the Scripture.

And the venom hereof hath so infected the minds of many in these latter days, that they have even rejected the whole mystery of the gospel, and taken up with a religion which hath more of Judaism, Mahometanism, and Gentilism, in it than of Christianity. And indeed if it be so, that in the remission of sins, there is no respect unto the Lord Christ but only that he hath declared it, and showed the way whereby we may attain it, it must be acknowledged that there is no righteousness in God requiring the punishment of sin; as also that it was merely from an act of the will and pleasure of God, that by any sins we deserve everlasting punishment. For neither then was the sanction of the law, or the constitution of the penalty of its transgression, any act of the justice in God, but of his will absolutely, which might not have been, and so notwithstanding the state and condition wherein we were created, and our moral dependence on God, and God's government over us, man might have sinned, and sinned a thousand times, and broken the whole law, and yet have been no way liable unto punish-
ment, namely, if God had so pleased; and it was as free unto him to reward sin as to punish it. For if you allow any reason to the contrary from the nature and order of things themselves, and our relation to God as rational creatures made meet to be subject unto him in a way of moral obedience, you introduce a necessity of punishment from the righteousness of God, which is denied. And on this supposition upon an alike act of the will of God, sin might have been made to be virtue, and obedience, sin; and so it might have been the duty of man to have hated God, and to have opposed him to the uttermost of his power. For all the merely free acts of God's will, might have been otherwise, and contrary to what they are. And if you say it could not be so in this case, because the nature of God, and his righteousness required it should be otherwise, you grant all that is contended for. This false supposition made way for the twofold righteousness which Socinus feigns in God. And the instances which he gives in the confirmation of it, respect only God's actual punishing of sin and sinners in this world, some sooner, and some after more forbearance, which none deny to proceed from his sovereign will and pleasure.

§ 19. The same author in the same place betakes himself to another plea; and will not allow that God doth at all punish sin because he is just; or that his so doing is an act of justice in him. For so he speaks, lib. I, p. 1, cap. 1, 'Ea res quæ ad Deum relata, misericordiae oppositum, non justitia appellatur, sed vel severitas, vel ira, vel indignatio, vel furor, vel vindicta, vel similis alio quopiam nomine nuncupatur.' Ans. There are no things in God that are opposite or contrary unto one another; and this sophism was before discovered. Nay, anger and fury, though they denote not any thing in God but outward effects from that which is in him, are not opposed to mercy. For mercy being a virtue and a divine perfection, whatever is contrary unto it is evil. Only as they are effects of justice, they are diverse from the outward effects of mercy. This therefore proves not, that, from whence it is that God punisheth sin is not justice, which must be proved, or this man's cause is lost. I do acknowledge that both ἀληθεία and ἐκκένωσις are variously used in the Scripture when applied unto God, or do signify things of a distinct consideration. For upon the supposition of the rectitude of the divine nature in all things, righteousness may be variously exercised, yea it is so in all that God doth. Hence Socinus gives sundry instances where God is said to be righteous, in acts of mercy and goodness, as very many may be given. For besides that the rectitude, equity, and holiness, which are in all his ways, is from his righteousness, in the declaration that he makes of himself, and his dealings with men, in a way of goodness, kindness, benignity, and mercy, there is universally a supposition of his promise of grace in Jesus Christ, the accomplishment whereof depends on his righteousness, which therefore may be pleaded, even when we pray for mercy, as it is often by David. For the faithfulness of God in fulfilling his promises, whether in the pardon of our sins, or the rewarding of our obedience, is his righteousness in his word. Thence is he justified in his sayings, Rom. iii. 4, that is, he is declared righteous in the fulfilling his promises and threatenings. Yet this hinders not, but that God is just when he taketh vengeance; that is, when he doth so, and in his so doing, Rom. iii. 5.

That anger and fury are not properly in God, all do acknowledge. The outward effects of the righteousness of God in the punishing of sin are so expressed, to declare the certainty and severity of his judgments. To say that God prescribes a penalty unto the transgression of his law, and
executeth accordingly merely in anger, wrath, or fury, is to ascribe that unto him, which ought not to be done unto any wise law-maker or governor among men. Nor will it follow, that because God is said to punish sin in anger and wrath, that therefore he punisheth sin only because he will, and not because he is just; or that his justice doth not require that sin be punished. Yea, it thence follows, that the justice of God is the cause of the punishment of sin. For to act in anger and fury, any otherwise than as they are effects of justice, is vicious and evil. God doth not therefore punish sin because he is angry, but to show the severity of his justice, he maketh an appearance of anger and wrath in punishing. These things belong to the outward manner, and not the inward principles of inflicting punishment.

§ 20. In the first chapter of his third book, he again attempts an opposition unto this righteousness of God. 'Justitia ista (saith he) cui vos satisfaciendum esse omnino contenditis, in Deo non residiit, sed effectus est voluntatis ipsius. Cum enim Deus peccatores punit, ut digno aliquo nomine hoc opus ejus appellemus, Justitia tune cum uti dicimus.' Therefore it seems do we deal benignly with God; and what he doth only in anger and fury, we give it a worthy name, and say he doth it in righteousness. But what shall we say when God himself ascribeth his punishing of sin, to his justice and judgment in governing the world? This he doth plainly, Ps. ix. 7, 8, l. 6, xcviii. 9.; Rom. i. 32, and iii. 5. Shall he also be said to find out a worthy name for what he doth, though he do it on such accounts as wherein the thing signified by that name is not concerned? It is a hard task, doubtful, to prove that God doth not judge the world in righteousness. But he hath reason as he supposeth for his assertion; for he adds, 'Quod autem justitia ista in Deo non residiat ex eo maxime apparet potest, quod si ea in Deo residiat nunquam est ne minimum quidem delictum cuiquam condonaret. Nihil enim unquam facit aut facere potest Deus, quod qualitatus qua in ipso residiat adversatur. Exempli causa cum in Deo sapientius atque justissime residiat, nihil unquam insipienter nihil iniquus facit aut facere potest.' 'That there is no such justice in God appears from hence, that if there were, he could never forgive the least sin unto any. For God doth nothing, nor can do any thing, that is contrary to the qualities which reside in him. For instance, whereas there is wisdom and equity in God, he can do nothing unwisely, nothing unjustly.' So he. But he seems not to observe that herein he pleads our cause more forcibly than his own. For we say, that because this justice is a natural property of God, he can do nothing against it, and so cannot forgive any sin absolutely, without respect unto satisfaction made to that righteousness. And when this is done, to pardon and forgive sin, is no way adverse or contrary unto it. This whole difficulty is reconciled in the cross of Christ, and can be so no otherwise. For God set him forth to be a propitiation, εἰς ἐνδεξάμενον τὴν δίκαιον τῶν, Rom. iii. 25, which when it is done, as pardon is a fruit or effect of mercy, so it is consistent with the severity of justice. See 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iii. 13, 14; Heb. ix. 14, 15. And the whole ensuing discourse of Socinus in that chapter, may be reduced unto these two heads. First. A supposition that Christ did not, nor could undergo the punishment due to our sins; which is to beg the matter in question, contrary to Scripture-testimonies innumerable, many whereof I have elsewhere vindicated from the exceptions of himself and his followers. For let this be granted, and all his discourse about the impossibility of pardoning any sin, upon the supposition of such a righteousness in God, falls to the ground.
And if he will not grant it, yet may he not be allowed to make a supposition on the contrary, to be the ground of his argument, whereby he endeavours to overthrow it.

Secondly. He confounds the habits of justice and mercy, with the acts of them. Hence would he prove an inequality betwixt justice and mercy, because there is so between punishing and pardoning. And so also God declares that he delights in mercy, but is slow to anger. But actually to pardon, is no way opposite to justice, where satisfaction is made; nor to punish, unto mercy, where the law of obtaining an interest in that satisfaction is not observed. And all that God declares in the Scripture concerning his justice and mercy, with the exercise of them towards sinners, is grounded on the supposition of the interposition and satisfaction of Christ. Where that is not, as in the case of the angels who sinned, no mention is made of mercy more or less, but only of judgment according to their desert.

§ 21. The author of the Racovian Catechism manageth the same plea against the vindictive justice of God, and gathers together the objections which Socinus more largely debated on, cap. 8. De morte Christi. And although little be added therein, to what I have already recited, yet, as it contains the substance of what they are able to plead in this cause, I shall take a view of it in the words of these Catechists. 'Eam misericordiam et justitiam qualem hic adversarii inseri volunt, negamus Deo inesse naturaliter. Nam quod attinet ad misericordiam, eam Deo non ita natura inesse, utisti sentiunt, hinc patet; quod si natura Deo inessest non potest Deus ullum peccatum prorsus punire; atque vicissim si ea justititia natura Deo inesset, utilli opinantur, nullum peccatum Deus remitteret. Adversus enim ea, quae Deo insunt natura, nunquam potest quidquam facere Deus. Exempli causa; cum Sapientia Deo insit natura, nunquam contra eam quidquam Deus facit, verum quecueque facit, omnia facit Sapienter. Verum cum Deum constet remittere peccata et punire, quando velit, apparet Deo ejusmodi misericordiam et justitiam, qualem illi opinantur, non inesse natura, sed esse effectus ipsius voluntatis. Preterea eam justitiam quam adversarii misericordiae opponunt, qua Deus peccata punit, nusquam literae sacrè hoc nomine justitiae insigniunt, verum iram et fureorem Dei appellant; immo justitiae Dei in Scripturis hoc attribuitur, cum Deus peccata condonat,' 1 John i. 9; Rom. iii. 25, 26. And hereon they conclude that there was no need, nor can there be any use of the satisfaction of Christ, Ans. I. The design of this discourse is to prove, that justice and mercy are not properties of the divine nature. For if they are, it cannot be denied but that the sufferings of Christ were necessary, that sin might be pardoned. Now herein we have against our adversaries the light of nature; and that not only as teaching us by the conduct of right reason, that there is a singular perfection in these things, which must therefore be found in him, who is so the Author of all goodness and limited perfections to others, as to contain essentially and eminently all goodness and perfection in himself; but also it is not difficult to evince the actual consent of all mankind, who acknowledge a deity, unto this principle—that God is just and merciful, with that justice and mercy which have respect unto the sins and offences of men. There is, indeed, this difference betwixt them, that justice is ascribed to God properly as a habit, or an habitual perfection; mercy analogically and reductively as an affection. And, therefore, mercy in God is not accompanied with that sympathy and condolency which are mixed with it in our human nature. But that natural goodness and benignity, whence God is
ready to relieve, whereof his sparing and pardoning are proper effects, are
that mercy of God, which he represents to us under the highest expressions
of tenderness and compassion; see Ps. cit. 8—14. And in such declarations
of himself, he instructs us, what apprehensions we ought to have of his
nature, which if it be not gracious and merciful, we are taught by him to
err and mistake. So, when God showed unto Moses his glory, and made a
declaration of himself by his name, he did it, not by calling over the free
acts of his will, or showing what he would or could do if so be he pleased;
but described his nature unto him by the essential properties of it, that the
people might know who and what he was with whom they had to do, Exod.
xxxiv. 6, 7. And yet among them is that mercy reckoned, which is
exerted in the pardoning of iniquity, transgression, and sin. The same is
to be said concerning the justice of God. For this vindictive justice
is nothing but the absolute rectitude of the nature of God, with respect
to some outward objects, namely sin and sinners. Had there, indeed, never
been any sin or sinners, God could not in any outward acts have exercised
either vindictive justice or sparing mercy; but yet he had been notwith-
standing eternally just and merciful.

And there is this difference between the justice and mercy of God on the
one hand, and his power and wisdom on the other; that these latter being
absolutely properties of the divine nature, without respect to any other
thing, do constitute their own objects; so that in all the works of God, he
doth not only not act against them, but he cannot act without them, for all
that he doth, must necessarily be done with infinite power and wisdom.
But for the other, they cannot outwardly exert nor act themselves, but
towards objects antecedently qualified; whence it is enough that God
neither doth nor can do any thing against them. And this he cannot do;
for, secondly, It is weakly pleaded, that if God be merciful, he cannot
punish any sin. For to punish sin absolutely, is no way contrary to mercy.
If it were, then every one who correcteth or punisheth any for sin, must
needs be unmerciful. Nor is it contrary to justice to pardon sin, where
satisfaction is made for it, without which God neither doth nor can pardon
any sin, and that for this reason, namely, that it is contrary to his justice so
to do. Thirdly. Whence God is said to pardon sin in his righteousness, or
because he is righteous, hath been declared before. His faithfulness in his
promises, with respect unto the mediation of Jesus Christ is so called, which
our adversaries cannot deny.

§ 22. Crellius, in almost all his writings, opposeth this justice of God,
oftimes repeating the same things, which it were tedious to pursue. Be-
sides, I have long since answered all his principal arguments and ob-
jections, in my Diatriba de Justitia Divina. I shall, therefore, here only call
one of his reasons to an account, whereby he would prove, that there was no
necessity of making any satisfaction to God for sin, because I find it to pre-
vail among many who are less skilled in disputations of this nature. And
this is that which he insists on, lib. de Deo, cap. 3, de Potestate Dei. He
lays down this as a principle: 'Deus potestatem habet infligendi poenam, et
non infligendi; justitiae autem divinae nequaquam repugnat peccatori, quem
puнеire jure possit, ignoscere.' He is treating in that place about the supreme
dominion and free power of God. And hereunto he saith, it belongeth to
inflict punishment, or to spare and pardon. But he is herein evidently mis-
taken. For although he who is absolutely supreme over all may punish and
spare, yet it belongs not to him, as such, so to do. For punishing and
sparing are the acts of a governor or judge, as such. And unto God, as such, are they constantly ascribed in the Scripture, James iv. 12; Ps. ix. 8, 9; Gen. xviii. 25; Ps. l. 6, xciv. 2; Heb. xii. 23. Now it is one thing what may be done by virtue of absolute sovereignty and dominion, setting aside the consideration of rule and government; and another what ought to be done by a righteous ruler or judge. And whereas he says it is not contrary to justice to spare one who might de jure be punished, if he means by saying that a ruler may punish him by right, no more but that he may do so and do him no wrong, were there no more in the case, it might be true. But it is not thus at any time with sinners; for not only may God punish them and do them no wrong, but his own holiness and righteousness require that they should be punished. And therefore the assertion, if accommodated to the cause in hand, must be this. It is no wrong to justice to spare them who ought to be punished, which is manifestly false. And Crellius himself grants, that there are sins and sinners, which not only God may punish de jure, but that he ought so to do, and that it would be contrary to his justice not to punish them: Adv. Grot. ad cap. 1, p. 98. ‘Deinde nec illud negamus, rectitudinem ac justitiam Dei nonnunquam eum ad peccata punitenda movere; eorum nempe quibus veniam non concedere, non modo requitati per se est admodum consentaneum, verum etiam divinis decretis ut itsa loquar debitum, quales sunt homines non resipiscentes, atque in peccatibus contumaciter perseverantes; maxime si illud peccati genus, in quo persistunt, insignem animi malitiam, aut apertum divinae majestatis contemptum spirat, si enim hujusmodi hominibus venia concederetur, facile suprerni Rectoris Majestas, et legum ab ipso latarum evilesceret, et gloria ipsius, quae praecipuus operum ejus omnium finis est, minueretur.’

What here he grants concerning some sins, we intend to be true concerning all. Neither doth that justice, equity, and rule, which require these sins of contumacy and impenitency to be punished, on a free decree or act of the will of God only; for then no sin of itself, or in its own nature, deserves punishment. And it implies a contradiction to say that it doth so, and yet that it depends so merely on the will of God. And in that book, ‘de Deo,’ he hath other conceptions to this purpose, cap. 23, p. 180. ‘Est ratio aliqua honestatis, circa quam Deus justus dispensare non potest;’ and p. 185, ‘Deo indignum est contumacium scelera impunita demittere;’ and cap. 28, ‘Nec sanctitas nec majestas Dei usquequaque fert ut impune mandata ejus violentur.’ If it be thus with respect to some sin, it must not be because of sin, but only of some degrees of sin, if it be not so with all sin whatever. And who can believe that the nature of sin is not contrary unto the holiness and majesty of God, but that some certain degrees only of it are so. And who shall give in that degree of sin, when it becomes inconsistent with God’s holiness and majesty? It is said that this is stubbornness and impenitency. But whoever sins once against God, will be impenitent therein, unless relieved by the grace of Jesus Christ, which supposeth his satisfaction. And this is evident in the instance of the angels that sinned.

§ 23. The defence which he makes of his former assertion, containing the substance of what remains of their plea against the necessity of the satisfaction of Christ, I shall now particularly examine, and put an end to this Exercitation. He therefore pleads: ‘Nemini, sive puniat, sive non puniat, facit injuriam; siquidem de jure ipsius tantum agitur; neque enim nocentii debetur pena, sed is cam debet; et debet quidem illi cui, injuria omnis ultimo
redundat, qui in nostro negotio Deus est; jus autem suum si rem spectes ut persequi cuique licet, ita et non persequi; et de eo quantumlibet remittere; haec enim juris proprie, ac dominici natura est.'

Answ. 'Jus Dei, δικαιωμα του Θεου, 'the right of God,' in this matter, is neither 'jus proprium,' which answers the right of every private person; nor 'jus dominicum,' or the right of absolute dominion; but the right of a ruler or supreme judge, whereunto the things here ascribed to the right of God in this matter do not belong, as we shall see. For whereas he saith, 1. That whether he punish or do not punish, he doth wrong to none, it is granted that no wrong is done to men, for by reason of his sovereignty he can do them none. But where punishment is due to any sin, it cannot be absolutely spared without the wrong or impeachment of that justice in whose nature it is to require its punishment. It is not then properly said, that if God should not punish sin, he should wrong any; for that he cannot, do he what he will; but not to punish sin, is contrary to his own holiness and righteousness. And for what he adds, secondly, That punishment is not due to the offender, but that he owes his punishment to him against whom the injury is done, who in this case is God; I say, certainly no man ever imagined that punishment is so due to the offender, or is so far his right, as that he should be injured if he were not punished, or that he might claim it as his right. Few offenders will pursue such a right. And whereas it is said, that the injury in sin is done to God, it must be rightly understood. For the injury that is done to him, hath no analogy with that which is done by one private man to another. Neither doth our goodness add any thing to him, nor our sin take any thing from him. Job xxxv. 6—8. 'If thou sinnest, what dost thou against him? Or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what dost thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art, and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.' But that which is here called injury, is the transgression of the law of the righteous Judge of all the world. And shall he not do right? Shall he not recompense to men according to their ways? And therefore that falls to the ground, which he adds as the proof of the whole; for as it is lawful for every one to prosecute his own right, so every one may forego it, remit of it, or not prosecute it at his pleasure. And this is that which is principally insisted on by them in this cause; namely, that the right of punishing being in God only, he may forego it if he please, seeing every one may recede from, or not pursue his own right at his pleasure. But a person may have a double right; first, that which ariseth from a debt, or a personal injury. This every man may pursue, so as that hereby he wrongs not any unconcerned therein, nor transgresses any rule of duty prescribed to himself, and every one may at his pleasure remit, so as no prejudice redound thereby to others. But our sins in respect of God, have neither the nature of debts properly, nor of personal injuries, though they are metaphorically so called. And there is a right of rule or government, which is either positive or natural. Of the first sort is that which magistrates have over their subjects. Hereunto belongs the right of exacting punishment according to the law. Now this is such a right as hath a duty inseparably annexed to it. This therefore a righteous magistrate cannot forego, without destroying the end of magistracy in the public good. For a magistrate to say, I have indeed a right to punish offenders in the commonwealth, but I will forego it, seeing all its exercise depends upon my will, is a rejection of his duty, and a renunciation of his authority. But, lastly. The right of God to rule
over all, is natural and necessary to him. So therefore is our obligation to obedience, or obnoxiousness to punishment. To say that God may forego this right, or remit of it, is to say, that he may at his pleasure cease to be our Lord and God. For the same nature of God, which necessarily requireth our obedience, doth indispensably require the punishment of our disobedience. And so have we closed our first argument in this cause, with our vindication of it.

A digression concerning the sufferings of Christ: whether they were of the same kind with what sinners should have suffered; or whether he suffered the same that we should have done.

Unto what we have argued in the foregoing excitation, it is generally objected, that if the justice of God did thus indispensably require the punishment of sin, which was the ground of the satisfaction made by Christ; then it was necessary that Christ should undergo the same punishment that the sinners themselves should have done, namely, that which the justice of God did require. But this was impossible, as is pretended. And to overthrow this apprehension, that the Lord Christ underwent the same punishment in kind which we should have done, or was due unto us, they have thus stated the opinion of them whom they do oppose. Some they say do maintain that our sins are to be looked on as our debts, or under the notion of debts, and God as the creditor, requiring the payment of them. Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ by his death and sufferings paid this debt; so that his death was 'solutio ejusdem,' or the payment of what was due in the same kind. This, say some learned men, gave great advantage unto Socinus, who easily proved that there was no necessity for a mere creditor to exact his debt, but that he might at his pleasure 'cedere jure suo,' or forego his own right. And this must needs be supposed of God in this matter, whose love and grace, and pardoning mercy are so celebrated therein. And to confirm this argument it is usually added, which is the main thing pleaded by Socinus and Crellius themselves, that the 'Lord Christ neither did nor could undergo the penalty due unto us, because that was eternal death.' And to plead that either that Christ should have undergone it, if he could not have delivered himself from it, or that what was wanting unto his sufferings as to their duration, was compensated by the dignity of his person, is to acknowledge that indeed he did not undergo the same punishment that we are obnoxious unto.

Learned men, and those sound in the substance of the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, being differently minded either in the thing itself, or about the sense of the terms whereby it is expressed, I shall endeavour to state right conceptions about it, or at least express my own, without a design to contradict those of any others. And, 1. For the consideration of our sins under the notion of debts, and God as creditor, it is generally known, that before the rising of any heresy, the most learned men have expressed themselves with such a liberty as advantage hath been thence taken, by such adversaries of the truth, as afterwards arose. Thus the Scripture, having called our sins our debts, and made mention of the payment made by Christ,
and compared God to a creditor, before Socinus called the whole matter of the satisfaction of Christ into question, it is no wonder, if the truth were commonly expressed under these notions, without such distinctions as were necessary to secure them from unforeseen objections. He with whom Socinus first disputed on this subject was Covetus; and he doth indeed make use of this argument to prove the satisfaction of Christ; namely, that our sins being our debts, justice required that there should be payment made of them or for them. But the truth is, he doth not take this argument from the nature of debts in general, but from the especial nature of these debts, as the Scripture calls them. For he made it appear that these debts are such as are crimes, or transgressions of the law of God: on the account whereof the persons that had contracted these debts, or were guilty of these crimes, became liable and obnoxious unto punishment, in the judgment of God who is the sovereign ruler over all. There is therefore a distinction to be put between such debts as are civil or pecuniary only, and those which are criminal also. And when the Scripture sets out our sins as debts, with such circumstances as allude unto pecuniary debts and their payment, it is to make the thing treated of obvious unto our understandings by a similitude familiar to all men; but as our sins are really intended, the expression is metaphorical. And Socinus, in his disputation about the nature of debts, creditors, and payments, had no advantage but what he took by a supposition, that the terms which were used by his adversary metaphorically, (his argument being taken from the thing intended,) were urged by him in their proper sense; which indeed they were not. And so whereas all his disputes respects civil or pecuniary debts only, he was far enough from triumphing over his adversary, who intended such as were criminal. Wherefore as this notion of debts, creditor, and payments, need not yet be forborne in a popular way of teaching, because it is made use of in the Scripture, to give us a sense of our condition upon the account of our sins, especially a declaration being made that these debts will be exacted of us; so in a disputation about the truth, it is necessary to declare of what nature these debts are, as all generally do, asserting them to be criminal.

Secondly. There is much ambiguity in that expression of Christ's paying the same which was due from us. For that term the same, may be variously modified from divers respects. Consider the punishment suffered, it may be it was the same; consider the person suffering, and it was not the same. And therefore it may be said, as far as it was a penalty, it was the same; as it was a payment it was not the same, or it was not the same as it was a satisfaction. For it was only what the law required, and the law required no satisfaction as formally such. Punishment and satisfaction differ formally, though materially they may be the same. I judge, therefore, that Christ was to undergo, and did undergo, that very punishment in the kind of it, which those for whom he suffered should have undergone, and that, among others, for the reasons ensuing.

1. Christ underwent the punishment which in the justice or judgment of God was due unto sin. That the justice of God did require that sin should be punished with a meet and due recompence of reward, we have proved already, and shall afterwards farther confirm. To answer and satisfy this justice it was that Christ suffered. And therefore he suffered what that justice required. And this is what is pleaded for, and all. We should have undergone no more but what in the justice of God was due to sin. This Christ underwent; namely, what in the justice of God was due to sin; and therefore what we should have undergone. Nor can it be
supposed that in the justice of God there might be two sorts of penalties due to sin, one of one kind, and another of another. If it be said that because it was undergone by another it was not the same, I grant it was payment, which our suffering would never have been; it was satisfaction which we by undergoing any penalty could not make; but he yet suffered the same penalty which we should have done. No more is intended, but that the Lord Christ underwent that punishment which was due to our sins; which I cannot see how it can well be denied by those who grant that he underwent any punishment at all; seeing the justice of God required no other.

Secondly. That which was due to sin was all of it, whatever it were, contained and comprehended in the curse of the law. For in the curse God threatened the breach of the law with that punishment which in his justice was due unto it, and all that was so. I suppose this will not be denied. For the curse of the law is nothing but an expression of that punishment which is due unto the breach of it, delivered in a way of threatening. But now Jesus Christ underwent the curse of the law, by which I know not what to understand, but that very punishment which the transgressors of the law should have undergone. Hence our apostle says, that he was made a curse for us, Gal. iii. 13, because he underwent the penal sentence of the law. And there were not two kinds of punishment contained in the curse of the law; one that the sinner himself should undergo; another that should fall on the mediator. For neither the law nor its curse had any respect unto a mediator. Only every transgressor was cursed thereby: the interposition of the mediator depends on other principles and reasons than any that the law was acquainted withal. It was therefore the same punishment in the kind of it, which was due to us, that the Lord Christ was to undergo, or it was that which neither the justice nor the law of God required.

Thirdly. It is said expressly, that God 'caused all our iniquities to meet on him,' Isa. lii. 6, or hath 'laid on him the iniquity of us all,' that he 'bare our sins,' ver. 10, or 'bare our sins in his own body upon the tree,' 1 Peter ii. 24. Whereby he who 'knew no sin, was made sin for us,' 2 Cor. v. 21. The sense of all which places I have elsewhere pleaded and vindicated. Now unless we will betake ourselves unto the metaphorical sense of our adversaries, and grant that all these and the like expressions in the Scripture, which are innumerable, signify no more, but that Christ took away our sins, by declaring and confirming unto us the way of faith and obedience whereby we may obtain the pardon of them, and have them so taken away; we can assign no sense unto them, but that the Lord Christ underwent the punish-ment due unto our sins, in the judgment of God, and according to the sentence of the law. For how did God make our sins to meet on him, how did he bear them, if he did not suffer the penalty due to them? or if he underwent some other inconvenience, but not the exact demerit of sin. And there is no other sense given of these places by them who plead for the satisfaction of Christ, but this, that he bare the punishment due to our sins, which is all that is contended for.

Fourthly. Christ suffered in our stead. He was our Αὐτεψινος. And it is usual with all learned men to illustrate his being so by the instances of such as have been renowned in the world on that account; which they have clear warrant for, from our apostle, Rom. v. 7. When one would substitute himself in the room of another who was obnoxious unto punishment, he that was so substituted was always to undergo that very penalty, whether by loss of limb, liberty, or life, that the other should have undergone. And,
in like manner, if the Lord Christ suffered in our stead, as our ἀντιψυχως, he suffered what we should have done. And to conclude, if a certain punishment of sin be required indispensably on account of the holiness and essential righteousness of God, I know not on what ground we can suppose, that several sorts or kinds of punishment might be inflicted for it at pleasure.

It remains, that we consider the principal objections that are usually levelled against the truth asserted, and either answer them, or show how that which we maintain is not concerned in them, nor opposed by them.

First, therefore, it is objected, that the punishment which we should have undergone, was death eternal. But this Christ did not, nor could undergo, so that he underwent not the same punishment that we should have done. Answ. Death as eternal was in the punishment due unto our sin, not directly but consequentially; and that ‘a natura subjecti,’ not ‘a natura cause.’ For that the punishment of sin should be eternal, arose not from the nature and order of all things, namely of God, the law, and the sinner, but from the nature and condition of the sinner only. This was such, as that it could no otherwise undergo a punishment proportionable unto the demerit of sin, but by an eternal continuance under it. This therefore was not a necessary consequent of guilt absolutely, but of guilt in or upon such a subject, as a sinner who is no more but a finite limited creature, is. But when by God’s appointment the same punishment fell on him, whose person upon another consideration was infinitely distanced from those of the sinners themselves, eternity was not of the nature of it. But then it may be said, that the admission of one to pay or suffer for another, who could discharge the debt in much less time than the other or offender could, is not the same that the law required. For the law takes no notice of any other, than the person who had offended. And if a mediator could have paid the same, the original law must have been distinctive, that either the offender must suffer or another for him. Answ. These things are for the most part true, but not contrary to our assertion, as is pretended through a misapprehension of it. For the law requires no such thing as one to suffer for another; nor absolutely considered doth admit of it. This was from God’s gracious dispensation of or with the law, as the supreme Lord and Ruler over all. The law itself takes notice only of offenders, nor hath any such supposition included in it, that the offender must suffer or a mediator in their stead, but this the law hath in it, and inseparable from it, namely that this kind of punishment is due to the transgressor of it. And by God’s gracious substitution of Christ in the room of sinners, there was no relaxation made of the law as to the punishment it required. Nor is there any word in the Scripture giving countenance unto such an apprehension. That there was a dispensation with the law so far as that one person should undergo the punishment (namely the Son of God) which others did deserve, he becoming a mediator for them, the Scripture every-where declares. Upon the supposition of his substitution in the place and stead of sinners, could there be any word of Scripture produced intimating such a relaxation of the law, as that it should not require of him the whole punishment due to sin, but only some part of it, or not the punishment which was due to sinners, but somewhat else of another kind that was not in the original sanction and curse of it, there would be an end of this difference. But this appears not, nor is there anything of sound reason in it, that one should suffer for another, in the stead of another, and thereby answer the law whereby that other was bound over unto punishment, and yet not suffer what he should have done. Nor is it pleaded in this case, that the dignity of the person makes up what
was wanting in the kind or degree of punishment, whence it is supposed that it would follow that then he who so suffered, suffered not what others should have done, who were not so worthy. It is only said, that from the dignity of the person undergoing the same kind of punishment that others should have done, that respect of it which consisted in its duration, and arose from the disability of the person liable unto it otherwise to undergo it, could have here no place.

It is yet farther pleaded, That if the same be paid in a strict sense, then deliverance would have followed 'ipso facto.' For the release immediately follows the payment of the same; and it had been injustice to have required anything farther of the offenders, when strict and full payment had been made of what was in the obligation. Ans. To discuss these things at large, would require a larger discourse than I shall now divert unto. But, 1. It hath been shown already, that although we allow the expression of paying the same, it is only suffering the same for which we contend. Christ underwent the same punishment the law required, but that his so doing should be a payment for us, depended on God's sovereign dispensation; yet so, that when it was paid, it was the same which was due from us. 2. This payment, therefore, as such, and the deliverance that ensued thereon, depended on a previous compact and agreement, as must all satisfaction of one for another. This compact, as it concerned the person requiring satisfaction, and the person making it, we have before described and explained. And as it concerns them who are to be partakers of the benefit of it, it is declared in the covenant of grace. Deliverance, therefore, doth not naturally follow on this satisfaction, but 'jure faederis,' and therefore was not to ensue 'ipso facto,' but in the way and order disposed in that covenant. 3. The actual deliverance of all the persons for whom Christ suffered, to ensue 'ipso facto' upon his suffering, was absolutely impossible. For they were not, the most of them, when he suffered. And that the whole of the time, way, and manner of this deliverance dependeth on compact, is evident from them who were delivered actually from the penalty, long before the actual sufferings of Christ, merely upon the account of his sufferings which should afterwards ensue. 4. Deliverance is no end of punishment considered merely as such, none is punished properly that he may be delivered; however the cessation of punishment may be called a deliverance. 5. Mere deliverance was not the whole end of Christ's sufferings for us; but such a deliverance as is attended with a state and condition of superadded blessedness. And the duties of faith, repentance, and obedience, which are prescribed unto us, are not enjoined only, or principally, with respect unto deliverance from punishment, but with respect unto the attaining of those other ends of the mediation of Christ, in a new spiritual life here, and eternal life hereafter. And with respect unto them, they may justly be required of us, though Christ suffered and paid the same which we ought. 6. No deliverance 'ipso facto,' upon a supposition of suffering or paying of the same, was necessary, but only the actual discharge of him who made the payment, and that under the notion and capacity of an undertaker for others, which in this case did ensue. For the Lord Christ immediately on his sufferings was discharged, and that as our surety and representative.

But it may be further objected, 'That it is impossible to reconcile the freeness of remission, with the full payment of the very same that was in the obligation. For it is impossible that the same debt should be fully paid and freely forgiven.' Ans. It is well if those who make use of this objection, because they suppose it of force and weight, are justified in their
own answers to the Socinians when it is much urged and insisted on by them. For it seems at first view, that if the freedom of pardon unto us, exclude any kind of satisfaction to be made by another for us, it excludes all. For as to the freedom of pardon, wherein soever that freedom doth consist, it is asserted in the Scripture to be absolute, without any respects or restrictions. It is not said that God will so freely pardon us, that he will not require all that was due, the same that was due, but somewhat he may and will. It is not said that he will not have a suffering of this kind of punishment, but the suffering of another kind of punishment he will. And so to suppose, is a thing unworthy of the grace and righteousness of God. To say, that God freely remitted our sins, abrogating the law and the curse of it, requiring no punishment, no satisfaction for them, neither from ourselves nor from the Mediator, hath, at first view, an appearance of royal grace and clemency, until, being examined, it is found inconsistent with the truth and holiness of God. To say that God required the execution of the sentence and curse of the law, in the undergoing of the punishment due to sin, but yet, out of his love and infinite grace, sent his Son to undergo it for us, so to comply with his holiness, to satisfy his justice, and fulfil his truth and law, that he might freely pardon sinners, this the Scripture every-where declares, and the so doing is consistent with all the perfections of the divine nature. But to say that he would neither absolutely pardon us without any satisfaction, nor yet have the same penalty undergone by Christ which his justice and law required as due to sin, but somewhat else, seems to be unworthy of the holiness of God on the one side, which is but partially complied withal, and of his grace on the other, which is not exalted by it, and is a conceit that hath no countenance given to it in the Scripture. Wherefore the absolute freedom of pardon to us, is absolutely consistent with Christ suffering the same penalty which was due to our sins.

And whereas it is pleaded, that satisfaction and remission must respect the same person; for Christ did not pay for himself but for us, neither could the remission be unto him; so that what was exactly paid by him, it is all one as if it had been paid by us; unless it could be cautiously explained, it hath a disadvantageous aspect towards the whole truth pleaded for. The Scripture is clear, that God pardoneth us for Christ's sake; and no less clear, that he spared not him for our sakes. And if what Christ did be so accounted as done by ourselves, or that payment and remission respect immediately the same person, then be it what it will, more or less that was so paid, or so satisfied for, we are not freely pardoned, but are esteemed to have suffered or paid so much, though not the whole. This is not that which we do believe. But satisfaction was made by Christ, and remission is made unto us. He suffered, the just for the unjust, that we may go free. In brief, Christ's undergoing the punishment due to our sins, the same that we should have undergone, (or to speak with respect to that improper notion, his paying the same debt which we owed,) doth not in the least take off from the freedom of our pardon, yea it much consists therein, or at least depends thereon. I say not that pardon itself doth so, but the freedom of it in God, and with respect to us, doth so. For God is said to do that freely for us, which he doth of grace, and whatever he doth of grace, is done for us freely. Thus the love and grace of God, in sending Jesus Christ to die for us, were free, and therein lay the foundation of free remission to us. The constitution by which he suffered the same punishment which was due to our sins, as the Surety and Mediator of the new covenant,
was free, and of mere grace, depending on the compact or covenant between the Father and Son before explained. The imputation of our sin to him, or the making him to be sin for us, by his own voluntary choice and consent, was in like manner free. The constitution of the new covenant, and therein of the way and law, of the participation of the benefits of the sufferings of Christ, was also free and of grace. The communication of the Holy Spirit unto us, enabling us to believe and to fulfil the condition of the covenant is absolutely free. And other instances of the freedom of God's grace, with respect to the remission of sin, might be given. To us it is every way free. In our own persons, we make no satisfaction, nor pay one farthing of our debt. We did nothing towards the procurement of another to do it. We bring neither money nor price to obtain a pardon, but are absolved by the mere free grace of God by Jesus Christ. And there is nothing here inconsistent with Christ suffering the same that we should have done, or his paying the same debt which we owed, in the sense before explained.

EXERCITATION XXX.

§ 1. The vindictive justice of God confirmed by other arguments. § 2. The common suffrage of mankind herein. § 3. Expressed in sacrifices. § 4. The anger of God wherein it consists. § 5. Arguments proving it necessary that sin should be punished. § 6. Some of the reasons for the necessity of the priesthood of Christ. § 7. No necessity nor use of his death on any other supposition.

§ 1. That which is proposed to confirmation in these Exercitations, is, that the justice or righteousness from whence it is that God punisheth sin, and which he exerciseth in so doing, is an essential property of his nature. There yet remain some other arguments whereby the truth hereof is confirmed, which I shall only briefly represent, that we be not too long detained on this particular head of our design. Besides I have both urged and vindicated these arguments already in another way.

§ 2. In the next place therefore to what hath been insisted on, we may plead the common suffrage of mankind in this matter. For what all men have a presumption of, is not free but necessary, nor can be otherwise; for it is from a principle which knows only what is, and not what may be, or may not be. Of such things, there can be no common or innate persuasion among men. Such are all the free acts of the will of God. They respect things that might be or might not be, otherwise were they not free acts. If therefore God's punishing of sin were merely an effect of a free act of his will, without respect to any essential property of his nature, there could never have been any general presumption or apprehension of it in the minds of men. But this there is, namely, that God is righteous, with that kind of righteousness which requires that sin be punished, and therefore he doth punish it accordingly. Hence our apostle, speaking of the generality of the heathen, affirms, that they 'knew that it was the judgment of God, that they who committed sin were worthy of death,' Rom. i. 32. They are enormous sins indeed mostly which he instanceth in. But his inference is from the nature, and not the degree of any sin. They who commit sin are worthy of death, that is, obnoxious to it on the account of their guilt, and which shall therefore be inflicted on them. And death is the punishment
due to sin. And this is the judgment of God, that which his justice requireth, which because he is just, he judgeth meet to be done. Or this is that right which God exerciseth in the government of all. And this was known to the Gentiles by the light and instinct of nature, for other instruction herein they had not. And this natural conception of their minds they variously expressed, as hath been elsewhere declared. Thus when the barbarians saw Paul bound with a chain, whence they supposed him to be a malefactor, they presently concluded, upon the viper's leaping on his hand, that vengeance from God was fallen on him, which he should not escape, notwithstanding the deliverance which he had at sea. For this φθονος, or 'vengeance,' they thought to be peculiarly designed to find out sinners, that had seemed to have made an escape from punishment justly deserved, Acts xxviii. 4. That such punishment is due to sin, they were sufficiently convinced of by the testimonies of their own consciences, Rom. ii. 14, 15. And whereas conscience is nothing but the judgment which a man maketh concerning himself and his actions, with respect to the superior judgment of God; a sense of the eternal righteousness of God was therein included.

§ 3. And this sense of avenging justice they expressed in all their sacrifices, wherein they attempted to make some atonement for the guilt of sin. And this in an especial manner evidenced itself, partly in that horrid custom of sacrificing of other men, and partly in the occasional devoting of themselves to destruction to the same end, as also in their more solemn and public lustrations and expiations of cities and countries in the time of public calamities and judgments. For what was the voice of nature in those actions, wherein it offered violence to its own inbred principles and inclinations? It was this alone: the Governor over all is just and righteous, we are guilty. He will not suffer us to live, vengeance will overtake us, if some way or other, some course be not found out to appease him, to satisfy his justice, and to divert his judgments, Micah vi. 6, 7. This they thought to be the most probable way, to bring about this end; namely, to take another of the same nature with themselves, and it may be dear to them, and to bring him to death, the worst that could be feared or suffered, in their own stead, with an imprecation 'quod in ejus caput sit,' upon him.

§ 4. Again, What is affirmed in the Scripture concerning the anger, wrath, and fury of God, against sin, and in the punishment of sinners, confirms what we affirm; see Rom. i. 18; Num. xxv. 4; Deut. xiii. 17; Josh. vii. 26; Ps. lxxxviii. 49; Isa. xiii. 9; Hab. iii. 8. Now, this anger and wrath, especially in the signification of the original words, do denote such commotions and alterations, as the divine nature is no way subject to. For with God there is neither variableness nor shadow of change, James i. 8, 18. Yet our apostle says, that this anger is revealed from heaven; namely, in the acts of divine providence in the world. Nothing therefore can be intended hereby, but the effects of anger, that is punishment. And so it is declared, Rom iii. 5; Eph. v. 6; Rom. ii. 5. For the anger or wrath of God is said to come upon men, when they are punished by him for their sins. Yet something in God is declared hereby. And this can be nothing but a constant and unchangeable will of rendering unto sin a meet recompense of reward, Rom. ix. 22. And this is justice, the justice pleaded for, which is inseparable from the nature of God. Hence God is said to judge and punish in his anger, Ps. lxi. 7. And if any thing but this vindictive justice be therein intended, that is assigned to him which ought not to be assigned to a man that is honest and wise. And this doth God no less manifest in the works of his providence than he doth his goodness and patience, though the instances of it neither are nor ought to be continual,
because of the future general judgment whereunto all things and persons are reserved.

§ 5. It will be granted by some, that there is such a natural property in God as that which we contend for; but it doth not thence follow, they say, that it is necessary that God should punish all sin; but he doth it, and may do it, by an absolute and free act of his will. There is therefore no cogent argument to be taken from the consideration hereof, for the necessity of the suffering of Christ. The heads of some few arguments to the contrary, shall put a close to this whole discourse.

First. God hateth sin, he hateth every sin: he cannot otherwise do. Let any man assert the contrary; namely, that God doth not hate sin: or that it is not necessary to him, on the account of his own nature, that he should hate sin, and the consequence thereof will quickly be discerned. For to say that God may not hate sin, is at once to take away all natural and necessary difference between moral good and evil. For if he may not hate it, he may love it. The mere acts of God's will, which are not regulated by any thing in his nature, but only wisdom and liberty, are not determined to this or that object, but he may so will any thing, or the contrary. And then if God may love sin, he may approve it; and if he approve sin, it is not a sin, which is a plain contradiction. That God hateth sin, see Ps. v. 4, 5, xi. 5, xiv. 1, lii. 2; Lev. xxvi. 30; Deut. xvi. 22; 1 Kings xxi. 26; Prov. xv. 5; Hab. i. 13. And this hatred of sin in God can be nothing but the disiplicency in, or contrariety of his nature to it, with an immutable will of punishing it, thence arising. For to have a natural disiplicency against sin, and not an immutable will of punishing it, is unworthy of God; for it must arise from impotency. To punish sin therefore according to its demerit, is necessary to him.

Secondly, God with respect unto sin and sinners is called a consuming fire, Heb. xii. ult; Deut. iv. 24; Isa. xxxiii. 15; and v. 24, and xiii. 14. Something we are taught by the allusion in this expression. This is not the manner of God's operation. God worketh freely, the fire burns necessarily. God I say always worketh freely, with a freedom accompanying his operation, though in some cases, on some suppositions it is necessary that he should work as he doth. It is free to him to speak unto us or not; but on supposition that he will do so, it is necessary that he speak truly; for God cannot lie. Fire therefore acts by brute inclination according to its form and principle. God acts by his understanding and will, with a freedom accompanying all his operations. This therefore we are not taught by this allusion. The comparison therefore must hold with respect unto the event, or we are deceived, not instructed by it. As therefore the fire necessarily burneth and consumeth all combustible things whereunto it is applied, in its way of operation, which is natural; so doth God necessarily punish sin, when it lies before him in judgment, in his way of operation, which is free and intellectual.

Thirdly. It is necessary that God should do every thing that is requisite unto his own glory. This the perfection of his nature and existence do require. So he doth all things for himself. It is necessary therefore that nothing fall out in the universe, which should absolutely impeach the glory of God, or contradict his design of its manifestation. Now suppose that God would, and should let sin go unpunished, where would be the glory of his righteousness as he is the supreme ruler over all? For to omit what justice requireth, is no less a disparagement unto it than to do what it forbids, Prov. xvii. 15. And where would be the glory of his holiness, supposing the description given of it, Hab. i. 13? Where would be that
fear and reverence which is due unto him? where that sense of his terribleness? where that secret awe of him which ought to be in the hearts and thoughts of men, if once he were looked on as such a God, as such a governor as unto whom it is a matter of mere freedom, choice, and liberty, whether he will punish sin or not, as being not concerned in point of righteousness or holiness so to do? Nothing can tend more than such a persuasion to ingenerate an apprehension in men, that God is such an one as themselves; and that he is so little concerned in their sins, that they need not themselves be much concerned in them. Such thoughts they are apt to conceive; if he do but hold his peace for a season, and not reprove them in their sins, Ps. I. 21. And if their hearts are fully set in them to do evil, because in some signal instances judgment is not speedily executed, Eccles. viii. 11, how much more will such pernicious consequents ensue, if they are persuaded that it may be God will never punish them for their sins, seeing it is absolutely at his pleasure whether he will do so or not; neither his righteousness, nor his holiness, nor his glory, require any such thing at his hands. This is not the language of the law, no nor yet of the consciences of men, unless they are debauched. Is it not with most Christians certain that eventually God lets no sinner go unpunished? Do they not believe that all who are not interested by faith in the sufferings of Christ, or at least that are not saved on the account of his undergoing the punishment due to sin, must perish eternally? And if this be the absolute rule of God's proceeding towards sinners, if he never went out of the way of it in any one instance, whence should it proceed but from what his nature doth require?

Lastly. God is, as we have shown, the righteous Judge of all the world. What law is unto another judge who is to proceed by it, that is the infinite rectitude of his own nature unto him. And it is necessary to a judge to punish were the law requires him so to do; and if he do not he is not just. And because God is righteous by an essential righteousness, it is necessary for him to punish sin as it is contrary thereunto, and not to acquit the guilty. And what is sin, cannot but be sin; neither can God order it otherwise. For what is contrary to his nature cannot by any act of his will be rendered otherwise. And if sin be sin necessarily, because of its contrariety to the nature of God, on the supposition of the order of all things by himself created, the punishment of it is on the same ground necessary also.

§ 6. On the grounds insisted on, it is argued and proved, that on the supposition before laid down and explained, namely, that God would glorify himself and his grace in the recovery and salvation of sinners, which proceeded alone from the free counsel of his will; it was with respect unto the holiness and righteousness of God, absolutely necessary, that the Son of God, in his interposition for them, should be a priest, and offer himself for a sacrifice, seeing therein and thereby he could and did undergo the punishment, which in the judgment of God was due unto the sins of them that were to be saved by him.

§ 7. Hereon we lay the necessity of the death and suffering of Jesus Christ; as also our apostle doth declare, Heb. ii. 10, 11. And they who are otherwise minded, are not able to assign so much as a sufficient cause, or just and peculiar reason for it, which yet to think it had not, is highly injurious to the wisdom and grace of God. The reason assigned by the Socinians is, that by his death he might confirm the doctrine that he taught, and our faith in himself, as also to set us an example of patient suffering.
But these things were not highly necessary if considered alone, nor peculiar, and such there must be, or no man can satisfy himself why the Son of God should suffer and die. For God sent many before to reveal his will, Moses for instance, whose declarations thereof all men were bound to believe; and yet caused them not to die violent, bloody, and cursed deaths in the confirmation of them. So the death of Moses was concealed from all the world, only it was known that he died; his doctrine was not confirmed by his death. Besides, our Lord had such a power of working miracles, as gave an uncontrollable evidence unto his being sent of God, and God's approbation of what he taught. Nor can it be pretended that it was necessary that he should die that he might rise again, and so confirm his doctrine by his resurrection. For he might have died for this end any other way, and not by a shameful and cursed death, not by a death in the view whereof he cried out that he was forsaken of God. Besides, on the supposition that Christ died to confirm his doctrine, his resurrection was not of any more virtue to ingenerate, strengthen, or increase faith in us, than any other miracle that he wrought. For, himself tells us that the rising of any one from the dead absolutely, is not accompanied with such a peculiar efficacy to that purpose, Luke xvi. 31. But on the supposition that he died for our sins, or underwent the punishment due to them, his resurrection from the dead, is the principal foundation of our faith and hope. Neither was his being an example unto us, dispensably necessary. For God hath given us other examples to the same purpose, which he obligeth us to conform ourselves unto, Jam. v. 10, 11. Whereas, therefore, all acknowledge that Christ was the Son of God, and there must be some peculiar reason why the Son of God should die a shameful and painful death, this cannot be assigned by them, by whom the dispensable necessity of punishing is denied.

Others say it was needful the Lord Christ should suffer, for the declaration of the righteousness of God, with his hatred of, and severity against sin. So indeed, the Scripture says; but it says so on the suppositions before laid down and proved. How they can say so with any congruity to, or consistency of reason, by whom these are denied, I cannot understand. For, if there be no such justice in God as necessarily requires that sin be punished, how can it be exalted or manifested in the punishment of it. If the punishment of sin be a mere free act of the will of God, which he may exert, or the contrary, the pleasure of his will is manifested indeed therein, but how his justice is made known I see not. Suppose, as the men of this persuasion do, that it was easy with God to pardon the sins of men freely, without any satisfaction or compensation; that there was nothing in his nature that required of him to do otherwise; that, had he done so, he had done it without the least disadvantage to his own glory; that is, he had acted therein as became his holiness and righteousness, as he is the supreme Governor over all; on these suppositions I say, who can give a reasonable account why he should cast all our sins on his Son, and punish them all in his person, according as if justice had required him so to do? To say that all this was done for the satisfaction of that justice which required no such thing to be done, is not satisfactory.

§ 8. From what hath been discoursed, both the origin and necessity of the priesthood of Christ are evidently demonstrated. There was no respect in the designation of it, to the state of innocence. Upon the supposition and consideration of the fall, the entrance of sin and the ruin of mankind thereby, there were personal transactions in the Holy Trinity with respect to the recovery of men; as there had been before in their creation. Herein
the Son undertook to be our Deliverer, in and by the assumption of our nature (wherein alone it could be wrought) into personal union with himself; because, for this end the justice and holiness of God required, that the penalty due and threatened unto sin should be undergone and suffered. This the Son willingly undertook to do in that nature which he assumed to himself. And, because the things themselves to be suffered, were not only, nor indeed so much, considered, as his will and obedience in suffering being an instance of obedience in compliance with the will and law of God, outbalancing the disobedience of the first, and of all our sins in opposition thereunto; therefore was he in all his sufferings to offer himself up freely to the will of God, which offering up of himself was his sacrifice, to which end he was called, anointed, ordained of God, a high priest. For this office consisteth in a power, right, and faculty given unto him of God to offer up himself in sacrifice, in, by, and under his suffering of the penalty due to sin, as thereby to make expiation of sin, and reconciliation for sinners, as we shall prove in our next discourse.

---

**EXERCITATION XXXI.**


§ 1. That our Lord Jesus Christ is the true and only High Priest of the church, hath been before declared, and it is in words acknowledged by all in some sense or other. The general nature also, of that office hath been fully manifested from what we have discoursed concerning its original, with the ends of it, and his designation thereunto; without the utter overthrow of those foundations in the first place, all the attempts of men against the true and proper nature of his office as vested in him, are weak and impotent. The sacrifice that he offered as a priest, the nature, use, and end thereof, must be considered apart afterwards, in its proper place. The qualifications of his person, with the love, care, and grace which he exerciseth in the discharge of this office, must all be distinctly spoken to, as they are represented to us by the apostle, in the epistle itself. Wherefore, there would be no necessity of handling the nature of this office here apart, were it not for the opposition that is made to it, and that depravation of the doctrine of the gospel concerning it, which some have attempted. For whereas the principal design of the Socinians in these things is to overthrow the sacrifice that he offered as a priest, they lay the foundation of their
attempt in an opposition to the office itself. It is, therefore, principally with respect to them that I have here proposed the nature of that office unto consideration, and shall be more conversant in its vindication than in its declaration, which most Christians are acquainted withal. And I shall proceed in this method herein: First. I shall declare what are in general their conceptions about this office, in opposition whereunto the truth declared in the Scripture shall be taught and vindicated. Secondly. I shall more particularly declare their opinions as to the several concerns of it, and consider as well their explanation of their own sense with their confirmation of it, as their opposition and exceptions to the faith of the church of God.

§ 2. In the first place, they grant that the Lord Christ is our High Priest; that is, that he is so called in the Scripture; but that he is so really they deny. For this name they say is ascribed unto him, not properly or directly to denote what he is or doth, but by reason of some kind of allusion that there is between what he doth for us, and what was done by the priests of old amongst the Jews, or under the Old Testament. He is, therefore, in their judgment, improperly and metaphorically called a priest, as believers are said to be kings and priests, though after somewhat a more excellent manner. For he is so termed because of the good offices that he doth for the church, and not that he is or ever was a priest indeed. Hereon they say,

Secondly. That he then entered on this office, or then began to do that work, with reference whereunto, because of its allusion to the work of the priest under the law, he is called a priest, when upon his ascension into heaven, and appearance in the holy place, he received power from God, to help and relieve, and assist the church in all its occasions. What he did and suffered before in the world, in his death and blood-shedding, was by virtue of God's decree a necessary preparation unto his discharge of this office, but belonged not thereunto, nor, did he there offer any sacrifice to God; wherefore they also affirm,

Thirdly. That this priesthood of Christ is indeed of the same nature with his kingly office, both of them consisting in a power, ability, authority, and readiness to do good unto the church. Only, herein there seems some difference between them, that as a King he is able to help and save us, but as a Priest he is willing and ready so to do.

Fourthly. That the object of the acts of the priesthood of Christ, is first and principally man, yea, it is only so, none of them having God for their object, no more than the acts of his kingly power have. For it is his care of the church, his love towards it, with the supply of his grace and mercy, which from God he bestows upon it, on the account whereof he is said to be a priest, and his so doing is called the exercise of his priesthood. This in general is the substance of what they affirm and teach concerning this office of Christ, as we shall more particularly manifest and evince in the ensuing Exercitation. Now, if these things are so, I confess all our exposition of this Epistle, at least, the principal parts of it, must fall to the ground, as being built upon the sandy foundation of many false suppositions. And not only so, but the faith of the whole church of God in this thing is overthrown, and so are also all the common notions of mankind about the office of the priesthood and its exercise, that ever prevailed in the world. And to lay the whole fabric of truth in all instances level with the earth, the instructive relation or analogy that is between the types of the Old Testament and the substance of things declared in the New, is taken
away and destroyed. Wherefore, it is necessary that we should diligently assert and confirm the truth in this matter, in opposition to all their bold assertions, and vindicate it from their exceptions, whereby we shall fully declare the nature of this blessed office of Christ.

§ 3. Our first difference is about the name and title as to the signification of it when applied to Jesus Christ. And we affirm that he is properly the High Priest of the church, and not metaphorically only. When I say he is properly the High Priest of the church, my meaning is, that he is so the High Priest, as he is the King and Prophet of the church. And observe, that by what means or arguments it may be proved that Christ is the true, real King and Prophet of the church, and not only so called metaphorically, by the same may it be proved that he is in like manner the High Priest of the church also. For, both the name is in like manner assigned unto him, and the office, and the acts of it, yea, they are so more fully and expressly than the other. And he may as well be said to be metaphorical in his person, as in his offices. But I shall distinctly manage those arguments, to which I challenge all the Socinians in the world to return a direct answer, and not by long digressions and tergiversations; a precedent for which is given them by Crellius in this case, whose sophistical evasions shall be called to particular account afterwards.

1st. He unto whom all things whatever, properly belonging to a priest are ascribed, and to whom belongs the description of a priest in all things essential to him, such ascription and accommodation being made by the Holy Ghost himself, or by persons divinely inspired by him; he is a High Priest properly so called. And that things are so with reference unto the priesthood of Christ, will appear in the ensuing instances.

1. As to the name itself, this is ascribed unto him; and no man durst have so called him, had he not been first called so by the Holy Ghost. And this he is both in the Old Testament and in the New. He is expressly said to be the πρεσβυτευτός, τέρευς, αρχιερεύς, a Priest, a High Priest, without the least intimation on any occasion, of impropriety or of a metaphor in this expression. And as he thus called frequently, so constantly with respect unto those acts and duties which are proper unto the office of the priesthood. Now, whatever colour may be given unto the metaphorical use of a word or a name where it is but once or rarely used, and that with respect unto such things as answer not unto the proper signification, there can be none where it is used frequently and in the same case invariably, and constantly with respect unto things that suit its proper signification.

2. The description of a high priest, properly so called, is given by our apostle, ch. v. ver. 1. Πας γὰρ αρχιερεύς, εἷς ἀνθρωπῶν λαμβανομένος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπῶν καθισταί τα πρὸς τον θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δύνα τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. A high priest is one who is taken from among other men, by the call and appointment of God, and is appointed in the stead or on the behalf of other men in things appertaining to God, that is to offer unto him gifts and sacrifices for sins. See this description explained in our exposition of the place. Now this is the description of a priest properly so called. For it is the priesthood of Aaron, which the apostle intends to express in the first place, as is evident in ver. 4. But Aaron was a priest properly so called, that is within his own sphere as a type; at least he was not so only metaphorically. To say he was, is to destroy the nature of the priesthood itself, and thereby to destroy the metaphor also; for a metaphor cannot be of nothing. But now whatever is contained in this description,
and whatever in answer to it was found in Aaron as belonging to this office, and not adhering unto him individually from the infirmity of his person, is all ascribed by the apostle unto Jesus Christ, as is undeniably evinced in our exposition of the place, whereunto I refer the reader. In brief, he was taken by the call and appointment of God from amongst men, Deut. xviii. 13; Heb. vii. 13, 14. He was appointed for man or to act in his behalf, 1 John ii. 1, 2, and that ἡ προς τὸν Θεον in things pertaining to God, Heb. vii. 26, ix. 14, 15, particularly to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin, Heb. viii. 3. If this were all that was required to constitute Aaron a priest properly so called; then the ascription of these things unto Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, is sufficient to declare him a priest properly so called. And there is strength added unto this argument, from what the apostle discourseth, concerning the necessity of a call from God unto this office. For he tells us, 'that no man taketh this honour to himself,' that is to be a priest, 'unless he be called of God as was Aaron,' ver. 4. And thence he shows and proves that Christ did not take this honour unto himself, but in like manner was called of God, ver. 5. Now, if not the honour of a real and proper priesthood with respect unto Christ be intended, but somewhat else metaphorically so called, then is the apostle's way of arguing utterly impertinent, as from an instance of one kind, he argues the necessity of a thing of another. And it may be replied unto him, that although a man must be called of God to a priesthood that was real and proper, such as was that of Aaron, yet it doth not thence follow, that such a call is necessary to that which is so metaphorically only. For so all believers are made priests to God, but yet none of them have any especial call from God thereunto.

3. The discourse of our apostle, ch. vii. 11—16, gives farther evidence to the same truth.

'If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another Priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron. For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity also a change of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood. And it is yet far more evident, for that after the similitude of Melchisedec, there ariseth another priest, &c. For we may observe,

1. That as Aaron was a priest, so there was a necessity from the prophecy of Ps. cx. 4, that there should be another priest. Now if this other priest were not a priest properly so called, as Aaron was, there is no consequence in the apostle's discourse, it proceeding on terms equivocal.

2. The priesthood, according to this prophecy, and our apostle's interpretation of it, was only to be changed. But if, after the removal of the law, there was no other proper priesthood to succeed, it was not changed but abolished. And it is more true that there was none, than that there was any; for properly there was none, though metaphorically there was.

3. On this supposition, all the circumstances insisted on by our apostle, as exceedingly observable to his purpose; namely, that our Lord was of the tribe of Judah and not of Levi, that he was constituted a priest in an especial way, and not like to that of old, are of no use. For there is nothing peculiar in these things, if he intend not a priest properly so called.

4. It utterly enervates that invincible argument whereby the apostle proves the necessary cessation of the law, and legal or Mosaical institutions.
For he builds on this supposition, that the priesthood being changed, the
law of divine worship or service must be so also. And this unavoidably
follows, because of the inseparable relation that was between the Aaronical
priesthood, and all the worship of the tabernacle. But if this other priest
whom he intends, was not properly but only metaphorically so, there might
be a thousand of them, and yet no necessity of the change of the law of
worship ensue. For two priests, one whereof is proper, and the other only
metaphorically a priest, are consistent at the same time; but two that are
properly so, are not; whence our apostle says, that the Lord Christ could
not be a proper priest of the same nature with those of the order of Aaron,
whilst they continued, Heb. viii. 4.

5. He is expressly said to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec.
But this Melchisedec was a priest properly so called. He therefore must
be so who is a priest according to the same order. For priests of several
sorts and kinds, as real and nominal only, or proper and metaphorical,
cannot be said to be after the same order. For no orders can be more
different than those whereof one is proper, the other metaphorical. This
difference is not in some property and adjunct, but in the whole kind; as
real and painted fire differ, or a man and his image: besides, he is said to
be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, so as that withal he is denied to
be a priest after the order of Aaron. But if he were not properly so called,
but only metaphorically, by reason of some allusion unto a proper priesthood
in what he did, the direct contrary might much rather be asserted. For
there was more allusion between Aaron in his priesthood and him, and our
apostle gives more instances of it, than between him and Melchisedec. And
if it be false that Christ was an high priest according to the order of Aaron,
notwithstanding the great allusion between what he did and what was done
by Aaron in that office, and the great representation made of him and his
actions thereby, then is it not true that Christ was called a priest after the
order of Melchisedec, by reason of some allusion unto the office of the
priesthood.

6. This conception would utterly enervate the sense of the general argu-
ment that the apostle manageth towards these Hebrews, as well as that
special one about the cessation of the law. For he is pressing them to
stability and constancy in the profession of the gospel, that they fall not
back unto their old Judaism which they had deserted. To enforce his
exhortation to this purpose, the principal argument he insists on, is taken
from the excellency and glory of the priesthood under the New Testament,
incomparably exalted above that of the Old, which yet was the most glorious
and useful part of their worship. But that which is metaphorical in any
kind, is evidently less than that which is properly so. It is replied by
Crellius, that what is only metaphorically so, may yet be more excellent
than that which is properly, whereof he gives some instances. And it is
true it may be so. But it cannot be so in that instance wherein the meta-
phor consists. Suppose the Lord Christ to be only metaphorically a priest,
yet he may on many other accounts be far more excellent and glorious than
Aaron. But yet the priesthood of Aaron being properly so, and his only
metaphorically so, the priesthood of Aaron was more excellent than his,
which is directly contrary to the scope of the apostle. Suppose the Lord
Christ were metaphorically only a prophet or a king, he might yet on
many other considerations be more excellent than either Moses or David;
yet they must on this supposition be granted to have had the offices of pro-
phet and king more eminently than he. So also must it be with his priesthood on this supposition with respect to that of Aaron.

7. Add unto all these particular instances to the contrary, that this Socinian fiction, of the Lord Christ being not a priest, but only called so by reason of some similitude between what he doth for the church, and what was done by the priests of the law, which indeed, as by them explained, is none at all, is directly opposite to the whole design and discourse of the apostle in this Epistle. For treating of the priesthood of Christ, he constantly calls him a priest in the sense which they had of that expression to whom he wrote, or he spake not to their understandings; assigns all sorts of sacerdotal actions to him, in all instances of duties belonging to a priest as such; and that in competition with and way of preference above the priests of the order of Aaron; nor doth in any place, either directly or indirectly, give the least information, that all these expressions of his were only tropical or metaphorical, not indeed signifying those things which those to whom he wrote understood by them. This had not been to instruct the Hebrews, but to deceive them, nor will be granted by those who have a greater reverence for the sacred writings, than to wrest them at their pleasure into a compliance with their own preconceived opinions.

And this is the first thing which we are to consider in the investigation and vindication of the true nature of the priesthood of Christ. It was such as that on the account thereof he was a priest properly so called; which, as it gives a rule to the interpretation of the nature of the sacrifice which as a priest he offered, so is the truth of it confirmed by all other things which are ascribed to him under that qualification, as we shall see afterwards. And what remains for the further confirmation hereof, will be added, in our ensuing consideration of the attempt of our adversaries to establish the contrary assertion.

§ 3. Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, his actings in that office do in the first place respect God himself: τα προς τον θεου, he did the things that were to be performed with God in the behalf of the people. And this further manifests the nature of his office. He came as a priest, εις το ιασακια τας ἁμαρτιας του λαον, Heb. ii. 17, that is, ιασεοια τον θεου περι των ἁμαρτιων as hath been observed by many, to make reconciliation with God for the sins of the people. For sins cannot be the immediate object of reconciliation; but he alone is so who was displeased with them, and by whom on that reconciliation they are pardoned, and the sinner acquitted. But yet neither can we carry this without controul. This also is denied by our adversaries in this cause, although therein they offer violence, not only unto all that we are taught in the Scripture about these things, but also unto all common sentiments of mankind, putting such senses on these expressions as are absolutely contrary to them, and inconsistent with them. What are these senses we shall afterwards examine; for the present it sufficeth to our purpose to take no notice of their denial, that the sacerdotal actings of Christ, that is his oblation and intercession, do respect God in the first place, the contrary whereunto we shall now teach and confirm.

The Scripture instructs us, as we have proved, that the Lord Christ was and is our high priest, and moreover that as such he offered himself to God once for all, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, as a propitiatory, expiatory sacrifice, Isa. liii. 10; Heb. i. 3, ii. 17, v. 7, vii. 27, x. 10;
Eph. v. 2; 1 John ii. 2. What the Holy Ghost intends hereby, and what is the meaning of these expressions, he had before instructed the church in, by those institutions under the Old Testament, whereby he foresignified and represented what was intended in them and by them. To suppose these expressions to have one signification under the Old Testament, and another quite of a different nature under the New; whereas the thing signified by the one were appointed only to teach and instruct us in the nature of the other, is to take away all certainty from what we are taught in the Scripture. We may therefore positively conclude, that if the actings of the priests under the Old Testament did respect God in the first place, then those of Christ did so also, or there is no similitude or analogy between these things, which to affirm is to overthrow both the Old Testament and the New. This therefore we must in the first place confirm.

The principal duty and work of the priests under the law, was to offer sacrifices. As the whole law speaks thus, so our apostle expressly confirms it, making that work the great end of the priesthood. Sacrifices had respect to sin. Priests were appointed to offer ἵνα δια παρεξέτον, 'sacrifices for sin.' And when God called them to the work, he said it was ἵνα ἀποκαταστήσει, ἵνα ἀπελευστήσει, that they should 'exercise the priesthood towards him,' Exod. xxxvii. 1. Had there been no sin, there had been no sacrifices, properly so called, as we have proved before. There might have been a dedication of any thing in our power to God as an acknowledgment of his sovereignty and bounty. But sacrifices by blood had all respect to sin, as the nature of them declare. Wherefore God appointing priests to offer sacrifice for sin, and therein to minister to him, he must be the first object of their actings as such.

Sacrifices by blood to be offered by these priests, and by them only, God appointed of various kinds, with respect unto various occasions, of bulls, goats, sheep, fowls, whose nature and differences I have explained in our former Exercitations, Exercit. xxiv. The principal end of all these sacrifices was to make atonement for sin. This is so express in their institution, as it is all one to deny that there were any sacrifices appointed of God, as to deny that they were appointed to make atonement. 'See Lev. i. 4, v. 5, 6, vi. 7, xvi. 6, 34, &c. Now the nature, use, and end of atonement, was to avert the anger of God due to sin, and so to pacify him that the sinner might be pardoned. This is the import of the word, and this was the end of those sacrifices whereby atonement was made. The word is sometimes used where no sacrifice was applied, but is never used in any other sense than that declared. So Moses spake unto the people upon their making of the calf; 'Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin,' Exod. xxxii. 30. He hoped that he should by his interposition turn away the wrath of God, and obtain pardon for them, which he calls making an atonement, because of its respect unto the great future sacrifice, by virtue whereof alone we may prevail with God on such occasions, Lev. v. 5, 6, as in many other places this is appropriated unto sacrifices; 'When a man is guilty in any of these things, he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing, and he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord for the sins which he hath sinned, and the priest shall make atonement for him concerning sin.' So also v. 17, 18, vii. viii. &c. The sin committed was against the Lord; the guilt contracted was confessed to the Lord; the sacrifice or offering was brought unto the Lord; the atonement was made by the priest before the Lord; all which give it the nature before described, and admit of no other. In some
instances the sins committed were to be confessed over the head of the sacrifice wherewith the atonement was to be made, which rendered the whole action more pregnant with representation. A person guilty of sin, convicted in his own conscience, condemned by the sentence of the law, by God's allowance and appointment brought a clean beast assigned in general for that use, and bringing it to the altar confessed over it his sin and guilt, laying them legally upon it, so delivering it up unto the hand of the priest, by whom it was slain, and the blood poured out, as suffering under the guilt laid upon it, wherein, with some other ensuing acts, it was offered to God to make an atonement for the sin committed and confessed. Thus was blood given unto the people to make atonement for their souls, because the life of the beast was in the blood, which was destroyed in the shedding thereof, Lev. xvii. 11.

Certainly no man can ever arrive unto so much confidence as to question whether the actings of the priests in these sacrifices whereby atonement was made, did not in the first place respect God himself; nor indeed do I know that it is by any positively and directly denied. For the sense we plead for, depends not on the use of any one single word, or the signification of it in these or other places, but upon the whole nature and express ends of these institutions. And herein all mankind are agreed, namely, that the divine power was the immediate object of sacerdotal actings; that they were done with God in the behalf of men, and not actings towards men on the behalf of God.

By all these terms and expressions doth our apostle describe the sacerdotal actings of Christ. For having declared him to be a high priest, he affirms that he offered a sacrifice to God; a sacrifice to make reconciliation for sin; as also that therein God made all our sins to meet upon him, which he bare in his own body on the tree. The question now is, what is intended thereby. Our adversaries say, it is the merciful and powerful actings of Christ towards us, giving out help, assistance, grace, and mercy from God to us, so delivering us from all evil, the whole punishment due to sin and eternal death. But why are these things called his offering of himself unto God a sacrifice to make reconciliation for sin? They say it is because of an allusion and similitude that is between what he doth so for us, and what was done by the priests of old in their sacrifices. But it is plain from what hath been declared concerning the sacerdotal actings of the priests of old in their sacrifices, that there is no allusion nor similitude between these things, nor can they assign wherein it should consist. Their actings were immediately towards God on our behalf, his are towards us on God's behalf; theirs were to make atonement for sin, his to testify love and mercy to sinners; theirs by shedding of blood, wherein was life, his in power and glory. Wherefore, I say, if we have any instruction given us in these things, if the office of the priesthood, or any duties of it, any sacrifices offered by the priests, were instituted to typify, prefigure, and represent Jesus Christ as the great high priest of the church, it cannot be but that his sacerdotal actings do first and immediately respect God himself, which shall now be farther confirmed.

§ 4. There are, (as is out of controversy,) three offices which the Lord Christ as the mediator and surety of the new covenant beareth and exerciseth towards the church; namely, those of king, prophet, and priest. And these, as they are distinctly assigned unto him, so they are distinct among themselves, and are names of divers things, as really, so in the common notions and sense of mankind. And in these offices, where there is an
affinity between them, or any seeming coincidence in their powers, duties, and acts, the kingly and prophetical more nearly coincide with each other, than either of them do with the sacerdotal, as shall afterwards be more fully evinced. For the nature of these two offices requireth that the object of their exercise be men; as in general it doth so, so in particular in those of Christ. He acts in them in the name of God, and for God towards men. For although a king be the name of one who is invested with power absolute and supreme, yet is it so, only with respect to them towards and over whom he is a king. As denoting an infinite, absolute, independent power, of necessity it belongs to God alone essentially considered. This office in Christ is considered as delegated by the Father, and exercised in his name; the head of every man is Christ, but the head of Christ is God. He anoints him king on his holy hill of Sion, Ps. ii. And he rules in the name and majesty of his God, Mic. v. 2. Wherefore the whole exercise of the power and duty of this office is from God, and for God towards men. In his name he rules his subjects and subdueth his enemies. None can fancy God to be the object of any of the acts of this office.

It is so in like manner with his prophetical office. God raised him up from among his brethren to be the prophet of his church, to reveal his will, and by him he spake to us. See Exposit. on Heb. i. 1. His whole work as a prophet is to reveal the will of God, and therein to teach and instruct us. Men, therefore, are the immediate object of the powers, duties, and acts of this office.

And that which we farther observe from hence is this, that there is no one thing that the Lord Christ acts immediately towards the church, but that it belongs unto, and proceeds from one or the other of these powers or offices. If any one be otherwise minded, let him prove the contrary by instances if he be able. The Scripture affordeth none to that purpose. It followeth, therefore, that God is the object of the acts of Christ in his priestly office. For if he be not so, then 1st. There is no room nor place in his whole mediation for any such office, seeing all he performs towards us belongs unto the other. And therefore those by whom this is denied, do upon the matter at length contend, that indeed he hath no such office. And if this be so, 2d. It doth not belong unto Christ as mediator to deal with God in any of the concerns of his people. For he must do so as a priest or not at all. And then we have no advocate with the Father, which is utterly abhorrent from the common faith of Christianity. And this absurd supposition shall be afterwards removed by express testimonies to the contrary. Take away this fundamental principle, that Christ as mediator deals with God for us, and you overthrow the faith of all Christians. 3d. This would render the whole instruction intended for the church in the Aaronical priesthood and sacrifices, useless and impertinent, nothing of the like nature being signified thereby. For that, as we have proved, openly respected God in the first place. And on this supposition the accommodation of it unto the priesthood of Christ by our apostle would be altogether vain. 4th. It is contrary to the common notion of the nature of the priesthood amongst mankind; for none ever yet owned such an office in things religious, who did not apprehend the use of it to be in doing the things with God that were to be done on the behalf of men. And hereby would, as was observed, the faith and consolation of all believers, which are resolved into what the Lord Christ hath done, and doth, for them with God, be utterly overthrown.

§ 5. Secondly. The same truth is undeniably evinced from the nature of
sacerdotal acts and duties. These are, as it is stated by common consent, those two of oblation and intercession. And both these are expressly ascribed unto the Lord Jesus Christ as he is a high priest, and nothing else immediately as he is so. The actual help and aid which he gives us, is the fruit and effect of these sacerdotal acts. The sole inquiry, therefore, in this matter is, what or who is the immediate object of oblation and intercession. Is this God or man? Did Christ offer himself as a sacrifice unto God or unto us? Doth he intercede with God for us, or with us only? A man would suppose that the absurdity of these imaginations, so expressly contrary to the Scripture and the common sense of mankind, should even shame our adversaries from the defence of them. But they are not so obtuse, or so barren in their invention, as to want evasions at any time. ‘Quid si manifesto tenentur? anguilla sicut elabentur.’ They therefore tell us, it is true, if you take oblation and intercession in their proper sense, then God and none other, must be their immediate object. But as they are ascribed unto Christ they are used only metaphorically, and do indeed denote such actions of his towards the church, as have some allusion unto oblation and intercession properly so called. But I say, 1st. There was never such a metaphor heard of before, that one thing should be called by the name of another, between which there is no peculiar similitude, as there is none between offering unto God, and giving grace unto men. 2d. Who hath given them this authority to turn what they please into metaphors, by which means they may, when they have a mind to it, make an allegory, and consequently a fable of the whole Scripture? It is expressly affirmed that the Lord Christ is a high priest; nothing is in the notion of that office taken properly, that is unworthy of him, no more than in those of king and prophet. No intimation is given us directly or indirectly that this office is ascribed to him metaphorically. As such he is said to make oblation and intercession to God; the things wherein the exercise of the priestly office doth consist. What confidence is it now to deny, that he doth these things properly and immediately with God as a high priest, by an arbitrary introduction of a metaphor to which the Scripture giveth not the least countenance!

§ 6. We might, moreover, plead the use and end of the sacrifice which he offered as a high priest, which was to make expiation of sin and atonement for it. But because we differ with our adversaries about the sense of these expressions also, I shall not make use of them as the medium of an argument, until the precise signification of them be evinced and determined, which shall be done (God willing) in our consideration of the nature of the sacrifice itself. Wherefore I shall close this head of our disputation with some express testimonies confirming the truth in hand. To this purpose speaks our apostle, ch. viii. 3, ‘For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.’ The things which the high priest had of old to offer as gifts and sacrifices, they offered unto God. This I presume is unquestionable: for God commanded them that all their gifts and sacrifices should be offered unto him upon his altar consecrated for that purpose. To have done otherwise had been the highest idolatry. But Christ, if he be a high priest, must, saith the apostle, of necessity have somewhat to offer, as they did, and after the same manner; that is, unto God. If this he did not, there is nothing of reason or sense in the apostle’s inference. For what necessity can there be, that because the high priests of old did offer sacrifices to God, that then, if Jesus Christ be a high priest, he must do something of another kind? They have nothing to say upon these instances but to con-
fess the words, and deny the thing; and then tell us that they agree to the words, but differ about their interpretation, the interpretation they suggest being a direct denial of the thing itself, whereof more afterwards. To the same purpose speaks our apostle, ch. v. 11, which place hath been before vindicated, and is so fully in the ensuing exposition, whereunto the reader is referred. And this consideration discovereth much of the general nature, use, and end, of the priesthood of Christ which we inquire after. For it is hence evident, that it is the power, office, and duty whereby he makes an interposition between God and us, that is with God on our behalf. And there are two general ends of this interposition, as the Scripture testifies, and which the common faith of Christians relies upon. And these are, 1st. 'Averruncatio mali,' the removal of all sorts of evil from us, every thing that did or might befall us in a way of evil, hurt, damage, or punishment, on the account of our sins and apostasy from God. 2d. 'Acquisitio boni,' the procuring and obtaining for us every thing that is good, with respect to our reconciliation to God, peace with him, and the enjoyment of him. And these are intended in the general acts of his office. For, 1st. His oblation first and principally respects the making atonement for sin, and the turning away of the wrath that was due to us as sinners; wherein he was Jesus the deliverer, who saves us from the wrath to come. And this is all that is included in the nature of oblation as absolutely considered. But as the oblation of Christ was founded on the covenant before described, it had a farther prospect. For with respect unto the obedience which therein he yielded unto God according to the terms of that covenant, it was not only satisfactory but meritorious; that is, by the sacrifice of himself he did not only turn away the wrath which was due unto us, but also obtained for us eternal redemption, with all the grace and glory thereunto belonging. There remains nothing to be done on our behalf after the once offering of himself, whereby he perfected for ever them that are sanctified, but only the actual application of these good things unto us, or our actual instating in the possession of them. Hereunto is his intercession, the second duty of his priestly office, designed; the especial nature whereof must be elsewhere declared and vindicated.

§ 7. For the farther clearing of the whole subject of our inquiry, we must yet consider both the call of Christ unto this office, his actual inauguration, and his discharge of it, both when and where. For all these belong unto its nature.

The call of the Lord Christ unto this office is expressly asserted by our apostle, ch. v. 4, 5, 'And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee, ver. 6. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' If the reader desire to see the particulars wherein the call of Christ consisted, its comparison with the call of Aaron, and preference before it, or exaltation above it, he may consult our exposition on that place, from whence I shall repeat nothing here. In general I say, that the call of Christ to the office of the priesthood, consisted in that eternal covenant which was between the Father and him concerning his undertaking the work of our recovery and salvation, which I have at large before described. He was not made a priest by virtue of any vocal command, as Aaron was called by a command given to Moses to that purpose, Exod. xxviii. 1, nor by virtue of any established law, which gave the posterity of Aaron their succession into that office. But he was called
by an immediate transaction between him and the Father, before the world
was. This call of his, therefore, may be considered either with respect to
designation or manifestation. As it intends the designation of Christ to his
office, so it is expressed in those words of God the Father to him, 'Thou
art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;' which what they import in the
covenant transactions between the Father and the Son, hath been before de-
clared. The manifestation of this call, consisted originally in the first
promise given concerning his incarnation and undertaking of the work of
our redemption, Gen. iii. 15. With respect hereunto he says, Ps. xl. 6 &
Amar, d nods mocal takap mocz masc man eul lii ushahd. d neutral,
yer. 7, 8, 'Then said I, Lo I come. In the volume of thy book, that is, 
the beginning of the sacred volume,' as our apostle renders it, ev kaphai. w, in
the head of it, ch. x. 7, that is, in that first promise recorded in the begin-
ning of the Scripture, wherein his own consent was tacitly included, and
the virtue of his office and sacrifice established; whence he became the
lamb slain from the foundation of the world. And more need not be
added in this place concerning this call of Christ to the office of the pri-
esthood.
§ 8. His actual inauguration into it, or suspicion of it, is next to be con-
considered. And he was vested with all his offices from his conception and
nativity. There was no time wherein he was, as to his human nature, and
was not the king, priest, and prophet of his church. For he received all his
offices by the unction of the Spirit, when God anointed him with the oil of
gladness above his fellows. And this was done fundamentally in his incar-
nation, when he was conceived and sanctified by the Holy Spirit, communi-
cated to him not by measure. And so he was born Christ the Lord, Luke
ii. 11. He was born one anointed by the Holy Ghost, Lord, and con-
sequently priest and prophet, all which offices were communicated by
unction. Together with those graces, gifts, and abilities, which were
necessary to their discharge, right, title, and authority, for their exercise in
their proper seasons, were conveyed to him thereby, and in those two doth
all office and power consist.

The actual exercise of all the offices of Christ was regulated by the will of
the Father, his own wisdom in compliance therewith, with the order and
nature of the things themselves about which he was to be conversant
therein. He was anointed to be the great prophet of the church from the
womb; yet he entered not upon the public discharge of that office, until
after his baptism, when his commission and call thereto were proclaimed
from heaven, Matt. iii. 17. So also was he Christ the Lord, that is, the
king of the church; yet began he not visibly to exercise that office in his
own person, until the mission of his apostles with authority from him to
preach the gospel, Matt. x. So had God disposed of all things, and so did
the nature of the work which he had to do require. And as to his priestly
office, he neither did nor could enter upon the exercise and discharge of it,
until the end of his prophetical ministry. For he could not do it but by his
death, which was to put an end to that ministry here on the earth, except-
ing only the instructions which he gave to his apostles after his resurrection,
Acts i. 3.

But to propose the whole matter somewhat more distinctly, there are
three things that concurred to the inauguration of the Lord Christ into this
office, or there were degrees of it. 1. His real unction by the Holy Ghost,
with an all-fullness of gifts and graces at his incarnation. This whole
work of the Spirit, with its effects, I have elsewhere at large discussed, and
shall not farther insist upon it. 2. His declarative unction at his baptism when the Spirit descended upon him, and filled him with power for the exercise of all the gifts and graces he had received for the discharge of his whole office. 3. To both these there succeeded an especial dedication to the actual performance of the duties of this office; and this was his own act, which he had power for from God. This himself expresseth, John xvi. 19, ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἔγγο ἄγιασσο εἰρήνην, 'I sanctify,' that is, 'I consecrate or dedicate myself.' For of real sanctification by purification, and further infusion of grace, he was not capable. And the communication of real grace to the human nature was the work of the Holy Ghost; he did not so sanctify himself; but he did dedicate, separate, and consecrate himself to God in the discharge of this office. It doth also respect the sacrifice which he was to offer. I consecrate and give up myself to be a sacrifice. But he who was to be the sacrifice, was also to be the sacrificer. This consecration therefore respected his person, and what he was to do as the sacrificer, no less than what he was to suffer as a sacrifice. For this also was necessary, and every high priest was so consecrated.

In that prayer therefore of our Saviour, John xvii. do I place the beginning and entrance of the exercise of his priestly office. Whatever he did after this, to the moment of his death, belonged principally thereunto. Sundry things, I confess, fell in occasionally afterwards, wherein he acted his prophetical office, in bearing witness to the truth. But the scope of all his ensuing actions and passions respect his priestly office only. For although his sacrifice, precisely considered, consisted of his actually offering of himself on the cross, yet his sacerdotal acts with reference to it, are not to be confined thereto. And what these acts were, without an inquiry into the nature of his sacrifice, which I have designed for the subject of another discourse, I shall briefly recount.

Sundry things were considerable in the sacrifices of old, which, although they did not all belong to the essence of them, yet they did to their completeness and perfection, being all types and resemblances of what was afterwards to be done by Christ himself. Some of these we shall call over to give an illustration thereto.

§ 9. 1. There was required thereto the adduction of the sacrifice, or of the beast to be sacrificed, unto the priest. With respect to the בְּרִית, or daily sacrifice in the temple, this it was incumbent on the priest to provide. This adduction belonged to the sacrifice, and is expressed by a sacred word, Lev. i. 2, בְּרֵית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית בְּרִית. This made it a Corban, 'a gift brought,' sacred, dedicated to God. For there was in it, 1. Ἀνίμων ὀφείλεται, the mind and intention of the offerer to devote it unto God, which was the foundation, and gave life to the sacrifice. Hence it was a principle even among the heathen, that no sacrifice was accepted that proceeded not a lu-benti animo, 'from a willing mind.' And this the apostle seems to allude to, 2 Cor. viii. 12, εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθεσία προκύπτη, 'if there be a free determination or purpose of mind,' namely, in offering any thing to God, εὐπροσδέκτος, καθό εἰσ' εὑρίσκειν, 'it is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according unto what he hath not.' It is the mind, and not the matter, that gives measure and acceptance to an offering. 2. There was in it loss and damage in the charge of it. The offerer parted with it e peculiu suo. He gave it up to make expiation for his sin. 3. The care of providing it according to the law, belonged also hereunto. The offerer was to take care that it were of clean beasts, a male or female, as the law required, without blemish. It is true, the priest was also to make judgment hereof after its
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bringing to him. But he that brought it was to use his utmost skill and diligence in the choice of a meat-offering out of his flock, or he fell under the curse of the deceiver, Mal. i. 13, 14. 4. The act of adduction itself belonged unto the holy service, with a testification of a desire, in a way of faith and obedience, to have it offered unto God. These things indeed were no essential parts of the sacrifice, but they were necessarily antecedent to it, and preparatory to it. And all these things in some cases were left to the people, although they signified what was to be done by Christ in his sacrifice, to manifest the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, which could not comprise nor answer all that was to be prefigured by sacrifices.

Secondly. There was mactation, or the killing the beast by priests at the altar. And herein consisted the essence, all that followed being instituted testification of its direction and dedication to God. Hence to slay and to sacrifice, in this matter are the same.

Et nigram mactabis ovem, lucumque revises.—VIR.

See our xxvith Exercitation for the confirmation hereof. And the substance of the sacrifice is to be thought principally to consist herein, though the offering of it was also necessary to its completeness and perfection. For,

1. Herein the intention of the sacrificer and sacrificed in that solemn Formula which was understood in all expiatory sacrifices, ‘Quod in ejus caput sit,’ was affected or accomplished. And as the common sense of all nations agreed in a commutation in such sacrifices, as I have proved elsewhere, so we are plainly taught it in the Scripture. For besides that this is the open sense and meaning of all institutions about them, so the especial rite of confessing sin over the head of the scape-goat, thereby laying it on him, yea, and the command that he who brought his sin or trespass-offering should therewithal confess his own guilt, do make it evident. Now this, as is manifest, was accomplished in the death and mactation of the sacrifice.

2. It was the blood whereby atonement was made, and that as it was the life of the creature. And the reason why it was given to make atonement, was because the life was in it. Wherefore that act whereby the blood of the creature was so taken away, as that thereby the life of it was destroyed, was the principal thing in the sacrifice itself. It is true, atonement on the altar was made with the blood after the effusion of it; but it was with it whilst it was yet warm, before the animal spirits were utterly departed from it, and that because its virtue for expiation depended on its being poured out in death. And no blood could have been offered, but that which was taken away in the mactation or total destruction of life of the sacrifice. And the pouring of the blood at the altar, with the sprinkling of it variously, belonged to the appropriation of the sacrifice to God, to whose sanctified altar it was brought.

3. There was the burning of the sacrifice, or in some cases the principal parts of it on the altar. This finished or completed the sacrifice. For whereas in the great anniversay of expiation some part of the blood of the sacrifice was carried into the holy place, it was no part of the sacrifice itself, but a consequent of it, in a holy improvement of what was finished before, as to the duty itself. And this was appointed for another end, but because it was the only way whereby the perpetual efficacy of the blood of Christ in heaven, which was shed on the earth, might be represented.

In these things did the discharge of the priestly office in those of the
order of Aaron principally consist. And all these things were exactly answered and fulfilled in a spiritual and glorious manner, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the great high priest of the church, who was himself to be all, and to do all, after he had solemnly dedicated and consecrated himself to this work; as we shall see by a review and application of the particulars recounted.

§ 10. First. There was the adduction, or his bringing himself to be an offering or sacrifice to God. And this consisted in all those sacred actions of his which were previously preparatory to his death. As, 1. His going to Jerusalem to that passover. He went on purpose to offer himself to God. And in his way he acquainted his disciples with what would befall him therein, Luke xviii. 31—33; Matt. xx. 17—19; which, when one of them would have dissuaded him from, he gave him that vehement and severe reproof, 'Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God,' Matt. xvi. 23. Peter, considering only the outward part of his sufferings, with the shame and scandal where-with it was attended, would have prevailed with him to have avoided it, which he knew was in his power to do. But withal, which he knew not, he dissuaded him from going to offer himself to God, for which cause principally he came into the world, and so fell under this sacred rebuke. For this great and weighty work of obedience was so fully implanted in the heart of Christ, that he could not bear with any thing that had the appearance of a diversion from it. With such intention, freedom, willingness, and readiness of mind did he go to offer himself according to the will of God, which gave life, virtue, and merit to his oblation. 2. His going into the garden the night before his suffering. What was it, but as it were the bringing of himself to the door of the tabernacle to offer himself to God, or to make his soul an offering for sin according to the will of God? 3. He offered up unto God prayers and supplications, which, because they had respect to his sacrifice, is reckoned by our apostle as sacerdotal acts, Heb. v. 7. Principally his prayers in the garden are intended; for his supplications there, with the manner of them, the apostle expresses and declares: see our exposition of the place. For all sacrifices were accompanied with supplications for grace and pardon. And herein did our Saviour actually give up himself to God to be a sacrifice, which was to be done by expressions of his obedience, and supplications for that issue thereof which was promised to him. 4. His pro-passion or fore-suffering in the garden, in the anguish of his soul; the agony of his mind and bloody sweat, belong hereto. Hereon indeed succeeded an external shame, which was necessary for the leading and bringing of him as a lamb to the slaughter, Isa. liii. 7, but his own mind and will it was, that brought him to be a sacrifice to God. The offering himself was his own act from first to last, and is constantly ascribed to him.

Secondly. There was mactation, or slaying of the sacrifice, which was in his death, as it was bloody. Herein consisted the essence and substance of the sacrifice. Herein he offered himself to God. For although the other acts of sprinkling the blood, and burning the carcase of the sacrifice, or its oblation, were in the typical sacrifices distinct from the slaying of it, yet this was by reason of the imperfection of all persons and things that were made use of in that sacred service. Hence many distinct acts succeeding one to another among them were necessary. In the Lord Christ, by reason of the perfection of his person, and that he himself was both priest and sacrifice, things were done at once, which were separately by them repre-
sented. Wherefore, in the very death of Christ, in and by his blood-shedding, he offered himself to God.

It is fondly excepted, that if his death were his sacrifice, the Jews and the soldiers who crucified him were the priests. The violence that was offered to him by all sorts of persons, was necessary on other accounts. So also were the assaults which he then conflicted with from the prince and power of darkness, for they belonged to the curse of the law which was now upon him. But his being a sacrifice depended only on his own will, offering himself in obedience to the will of God according to the compact before described. The soldiers were no more but as the cords that bound the sacrifice to the horns of the altar. Nor did they so take away his life, but that he laid it down; of his own mere will, in compliance with the command of the Father, John x. 18.

In the pouring out of his blood, the heavenly altar of his body was sprinkled, and all heavenly things purified, even with this better sacrifice, Heb. iv. 23. Thus is he said to pour out his soul to death, Isa. liii. 12. That expression contains the whole nature of a sacrifice. For his soul is said to be poured out to death, with respect to the pouring out of the blood. For in it was the life poured out, the blood being given to make atonement, because the life was in it.

Thirdly. There was the oblation itself. This, in those sacrifices, the sacred performance whereof was accomplished πολυμερως, by many parts and degrees, by reason of the imperfection of the sacrificer and sacrificed, followed after the mactation, with the shedding and sprinkling of blood. In this absolutely perfect sacrifice of Christ, it was not so. His oblation was at the same time, and in the same action with his blood-shedding. For it was his holy obediential giving up himself to the will of God, in undergoing what was due to our sins, making atonement for them thereby.

'He offered himself unto God through the eternal Spirit,' Heb. ix. 14. The Holy and Eternal Spirit of God dwelling in him in all fulness, supporting his faith, confirming his obedience, kindled in him that fire of zeal to the glory of God, and the reparation of his honour from the reflection cast upon it by the sin, apostasy, disobedience, and rebellion of mankind, with that flame of love to their salvation, which, as it were, consumed this sacrifice in its oblation to God. Thus, in and by his giving himself for us, that is, in and by his death, which is constantly intended by that expression, he made himself an offering and sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour, Eph. v. 2.

Fourthly. Hereon ensued the representation of the whole in answer to the high priest's entering into the holy place with a token, part, representation, and remembrance of the blood that was offered on the altar. This was done by Christ, when he entered into the holy place not made with hands, as it were sprinkled with his own blood, or accompanied with the efficacy and merit of his sacerdotal offerings, to appear in the presence of God for us. This was consequential to that offering of himself whereby he made atonement for us; for he entered into the holy place, αιωνιαν λυτρωσιν ειρημένος, Heb. ix. 12, 'Having obtained eternal redemption.' His obtaining eternal redemption was by the sacrifice of himself in his death. For redemption was by price and exchange. And the Lord Christ paid no other price for sin and sinners, but his own blood, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. And this was antecedent unto his entering into the holy place; for he did so having obtained eternal redemption. And it is in vain to expect that sometimes things present are expressed by verbs and participles
of a preterite signification, or in those tenses which denote things past, seeing they are not to be construed so, unless the matter spoken of do enforce such a construction, whereof here there is no pretence. Nor can any one instance be given of the use of εἰρησκόν in that way in the whole New Testament; see Heb. ix. 24.

§ 11. This brief account of the analogy that was between the sacerdotal actings in sacrificing under the law, and those of the Lord Christ offering himself as our high priest unto God, doth fully evince the time, place, and manner of his discharge of this office, whereby the nature of it is also manifested. The sacrifice indeed of Christ, was not carried on by those distinct, separate steps and degrees which the sacrifices of old were, by reason of the imperfection of the offerer, and what was offered, and the necessity of many circumstances in those things which were carnal in themselves, and appointed to be carnally visible; yet in the whole, in the transactions that were invisibly carried on between Christ the High Priest, and God, unto whom he offered himself, every thing that belonged unto the nature of a true and real sacrifice, or which, as such was represented by them of old, was in its proper place, order, and manner, actually accomplished. And I must needs say, that I look upon it as one of the boldest attempts on religion that ever was made by men pretending unto any sobriety, namely, to deny that the Lord Christ was a priest whilst he was on earth, or that he offered himself a sacrifice unto God in his death. And those who have the confidence to stand and persist in that opinion, against all that light which the nature of the thing itself, and the testimonies of Scripture do give unto the truth in this matter, need not fear that on any occasion they shall be wanting unto themselves therein. But of these things I must treat more fully in our ensuing excitation.

§ 12. I have only in this place taught the doctrine concerning the nature of the priesthood of Christ, and his discharge of that office, as my design did necessarily require I should do. The testimonies whereby the truth of it is confirmed, I have long since urged and vindicated from the exceptions of our adversaries in another treatise. Here, therefore, I shall only briefly represent some of them, Eph. v. 2, ὁ Χριστός ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφοράν καὶ ἔστιν τῷ Θεῷ, ἐς σωμάτι εὐνοίας. It is inconceivable that those expressions, 'He loved us and gave himself for us,' should not refer to what he did in his death. For they are never used in any other sense. So are they repeated, ver. 25, of this chapter, ἡγάπησε τὴν εκλεξίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτής; that is to die for it. For this was that whereby Christ expressed his love unto his church, John x. 15; Phil. ii. 7—10. So also speaks our apostle expressly, Gal. ii. 22, 'Christ loved me and gave himself or me.' The same with that of John: 'Who loved us, and washed us in his own blood,' Rev. i. 5. Which he did when he was delivered for our offences, Rom. iv. 25. Παρεδόθη διὰ τα παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, is the expression of what was done when παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. The subject, therefore, spoken of is agreed on, or cannot be questioned. Hereof the apostle says that it was Προσφορά καὶ ἔστις, an offering and a sacrifice; or that in giving himself for us, he offered himself to God an offering and a sacrifice. By these two words our apostle expresseth all sorts of sacrifices under the law, ch. x. 5, from Ps. xl. 7, where they are expressed by רְפֵאָה וּרְפֵאָה, for although Mincha be usually applied unto a peculiar thank-offering of meat and drink; yet, where these two are joined together, Zebach and Mincha, they denote all sorts of expiatory sacrifices, 1 Sam. iii. 14. The iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged רְפֵאָה וּרְפֵאָה.
by any sort of expiatory sacrifices. And θυσία or πάντα is such a sacrifice as consisted in mactation or killing, as we have proved before. This Christ offered in his death, or when, out of his love unto us, in obedience unto the will of God, he gave up himself unto death for us. This love and obedience the Socinians say, is the sacrifice intended in this place, which is, therefore, metaphorical; but that Christ offered himself a sacrifice in his death, they deny that the apostle here asserts. But, 1st. In all other places where there is any mention of the offering of Christ, it is expressly said that he offered himself, or his soul, or his body, Isa. liii. 10; Heb. ix. 14, x. 10, yea, as here he is said to offer sacrifice in his death, so his suffering therein is affirmed to be necessary to his sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 24, 25. He gave himself for us a sacrifice, is no more but that he suffered when he offered himself, as the apostle expressly affirms. 2d. Although προσφορά may be used for a metaphorical sacrifice, and so possibly may θυσία also, yet, whenever they are conjoined in the Scripture, they denote all sorts of proper sacrifices, as is evident from the place before cited; and therefore, they can intend here nothing but that sacrifice which all those proper sacrifices prefigured. Besides θυσία, unless the metaphor be evident and cogent, doth signify nothing but a sacrifice by immolation or killing. θευτος; as we have shown, is but σφατειν, to kill, only it is to slay in sacred services, with respect also whereunto the other word is used in good authors. So Plutarch affirms of the Gauls, that they believed, θεος ευνα χαίροντας ανθρωπον σφατομενων άματι, και ταυτην τηλειωταν θυσιαν, 'that the gods delighted in the blood of slain men, and that this was the most perfect sacrifice.' Ανθρωποσφαγία, if it respect things sacred, is the same with ανθρωποθυσία. So, whereas the Lord Christ was αρνησθεις εφαγμενον, 'a lamb slain,' Rev. v. 12, xiii. 8, being called a Lamb, and the Lamb of God, as all acknowledge with respect to the paschal lamb, it is said, πασχά ήμων εκθεθή Χριστος, 1 Cor. v. 7, 'Christ our passover (our paschal Lamb) is sacrificed for us.' θυσία, therefore, being used to express the nature of the death of Christ with respect to God, nothing can be intended thereby but a proper and bloody sacrifice. 3d. Our adversaries acknowledge, that the Lord Christ did offer himself as a complete expiatory sacrifice to God. I ask, then, when he is positively and directly affirmed to offer himself an offering and sacrifice to God, why is not that the expiatory sacrifice which he offered? They have not any thing to reply, but only that he offered not that sacrifice in his death, but only his entrance into heaven, which is only in favour of their own hypothesis, to contradict the apostle to his face. 4th. Προσφοράν και θυσίαν are regulated by the same verb with ειπτον; παρεδώκεν ειπτον προσφοράν και θυσίαν; so that there can be no other sense of the words, but, Christ offered himself a sacrifice, or gave himself a sacrifice. And, whereas it is objected, that παρεδώκειν is not used for sacrificing or offering sacrifice; besides, that it is false, as may be seen, Micah vi. 7, where καὶ in the original is rendered by παρεδώκειν, so, here there was a peculiar reason for the use of this word, because the apostle included in the same expression, both his giving himself for us, and the manner of it; namely, by giving himself a sacrifice to God for us. 5th. Whereas it is said that this sacrifice was a sweet-smelling savour unto God, it doth not advantage our adversaries, as I shall elsewhere manifest from the rise, nature, and first use of that expression. At present, it may suffice that it is used expressly concerning expiatory sacrifices, Lev. iv. 31, and whole burnt-offerings, which were of the same nature, Lev. i. 9. And whereas, this is the first kind of sacrifice appointed under the
law, and is said expressly to make atonement, ver. 4, and therein to be an
offering of a sweet savour to the Lord, it plainly declares that all other
sacrifices which made atonement, were in like manner a sweet savour to the
Lord; on the account whereof, that of Christ, wherein God rested and was
well pleased, is so called. But of these things we must treat elsewhere
more at large.

§ 13. Heb. v. 6, 7, 'As he also saith in another place, Thou art a priest
for ever after the order of Melchisedec: who in the days of his flesh, when
he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears,
unto him that was able to save him from death.' The reader may consult
the exposition of this place, wherein the difficulties of it are removed, and
the intention of the Holy Ghost in it is truly explained. At present I
shall only observe some few passages in confirmation of the truth under
consideration. As, 1. The works, acts, or duties here assigned to Christ,
are assigned to him expressly, as he was a high priest, as is undeniably
manifest in the context. Wherefore, they are sacerdotal acts, or acts of
Christ as a priest. 2. He performed them in the days of his flesh, and
that when he was in great distress, standing in need of aid and assistance
from God, that is, at the time of his death. 3. It is, therefore, here plainly
affirmed that our Lord Jesus Christ, as a high priest, did, in his dying for
us, 'offer unto God.' If we inquire in other places what he offered, it is
expressly said that it was himself, his soul, his body, as we have proved.
And that Christ, as a High Priest, in the days of his flesh, offered himself
to God, is all that we need for the confirmation of what we assert concern-
ing the time, place, and nature of the exercise of his priesthood. It will
be excepted, that Christ is not said in this place to offer himself, but only
to offer up prayers and supplications, which are a metaphorical and not a
real sacrifice. But the apostle did not solemnly introduce him as called to
the office of a high priest, and acting the powers of that office, merely with
respect to prayers and supplications considered by themselves, and to instance
in those only at his death, when he might have mentioned those when in
the course of his life he continued mighty by himself. What he offered
he intended afterwards to declare, and doth so expressly: here he designed
only to assert, that being called to be a high priest, he offered unto God,
and that as to the manner of that offering, it was with prayers and suppli-
cations, cries and tears, wherein he describes his offering of himself by
those adjuncts of it which were also sacerdotal.

§ 14. Heb. i. 3, Δι' ἐαυτοῦ καθαρίσμων πιστησάμενος τοις ἀμαρτίων ὑμῶν
ἐκαθίσεν εἰς καθαρίσμον τῆς μεγαλοσυνῆς εἰς υἱόν. 'When he had
by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty
on high.' It is agreed between us and our adversaries, that this purging of
our sins, was the effect of that expiatory sacrifice which the Lord Christ
offered unto God as our high priest. The whole question that can remain
is, when he offered it. And the apostle here expressly declares that this
was done before he sat down at the right hand of God. And this is so plain
in the words, as no exception can be invented against it. That alone which
they have invented for an evasion is, that Christ indeed offered himself at
his first entrance into heaven, and his appearance in the presence of God
for us, before he sat down at the right hand of God. This Crellius insists
upon, cap. 10, part. 31, p. 537, 538. But this will yield them no relief,
neither according to the truth, nor according to their own principles. For,
1st. Although we may have distinct apprehensions of Christ's entering into
heaven, and his sitting at the right hand of God, yet it is but one state of
Christ that is intended in both; his entrance into heaven being only the means of his sitting down at the right hand of God. And therefore, they are never mentioned together, but sometimes the one, sometimes the other is made use of to express the same state. So his sitting down at the right hand of God is expressed as immediately ensuing on his suffering, it being that state whereunto his resurrection, ascension, and entrance into heaven were subservient. 'He endured the cross, and despising the shame, is set down at the right hand of the throne of God,' Heb. xii. 2. The whole is, that he passed through the heavens, ch. iv. 14, and was thereon made higher than the heavens, ch. vii. 26. That is, he suffered, and so entered into his glory, Luke xxiv. 26. Nor doth the Scripture any where give the least intimation of any mediatorial act of Christ interposing between his entrance into heaven, and sitting down at the right hand of God. 2d. This answer hath no consistency with their own principles in this matter. For they contend that the expiation of our sins consists in the taking of them away, by freeing us from the punishment which is due unto them. And this must be done by virtue of the power which Christ received of God after his obedience. But this his receiving of power belongs unto his sitting at the right hand of God; so as he can in no sense be said to have purged or expiated our sins before it. And if they will allow that Christ expiated our sins any where in heaven or earth, antecedently unto our actual freedom in present pardon, or future complete deliverance, then doth not the expiation of sins consist in our actual deliverance from them, as they contend that it doth.

§ 15. To the same purpose speaks the apostle, Heb. ix. 12. Διὰ τοῦ εἰδοῦ αἵματος εὐθανασίας εἰς τὰ ἁγία, αἰώνιαν λυτρωσίν εὑραμένος. 'By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.' This entrance of Christ into the holy place was his entrance into heaven. Antecedently hereunto he is said to have obtained eternal redemption. This redemption we have by his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, Eph. i. 7. And this forgiveness, or the putting away of sin, was by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26. Wherefore, the sacrifice of Christ, whereby he obtained redemption, or put away sin, was by his blood-shedding. And this was, as it is here expressed, antecedent unto his entrance unto the holy place. Crellius, in answer to this testimony, p. 536, engageth into a long discourse to prove that things present, or not perfectly past, are sometimes expressed by the Aoristus, or sign of the time past, as if our argument from hence were builtmerely on that form of the word, on supposition of a general maxim that all words in that tense do necessarily signify the time past. But we proceed on no such supposition. We say indeed, and contend, that there must be some cogent reason to interpret that of the time present or to come, which is expressed as past and done. For this we say there is none in this place, nor is any pretended but the false hypothesis of our adversaries, that Christ offered not himself until his entrance into heaven, which they judge sufficient to oppose unto the clearest testimonies to the contrary; for, whereas the words of the apostle signify directly that the Lord Christ first obtained eternal redemption, and then entered into heaven or the holy place not made with hands; they will have his intention to be the direct contrary, that he first entered into heaven, and then obtained eternal redemption. For that offering of himself which they suppose, was consequential unto his entrance into the holy place. But we argue from the scope of the words. It is said that Christ entered into the holy place once by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption: I desire
to know, how or by what means did he so obtain, or find, or acquire it; is it not plain that it was by his own blood? and that which he shed before he entered into the sanctuary.

§ 16. Moreover, Christ is said to offer himself once, ch. vii. 27, ix. 28, x. 10, xii. 14. His offering was one, and once offered. An action once performed, and then ceasing to be performed, however it continue in its virtue and efficacy, is so expressed. The high priest entered into the holy place once in the year; that is, his so doing was an act that was at once performed, and after was not for that year. Hence, the apostle proves the excellency of this sacrifice of Christ, above those of the Aaronical priests, because they by reason of their weakness and imperfection were often offered, this of Christ being every way complete, and of infinite efficacy, was offered but once and at once, Heb. x. 1—4, &c. What sacrifice, therefore, can this be that was then but once offered? Doth this seem to express the continual appearance of Christ in heaven, which if a sacrifice, is always offering, and not once offered, and so would be inferior unto them which were offered only once a year. For that which effecteth its design by being performed once a year, is more efficacious than that which must be always effecting. Besides, our apostle says expressly that the Lord Christ was 'once offered to bear the sins of many,' ch. ix. 28. But this he did then, and only then, when he bare our sins in his own body on the tree,' 1 Pet. ii. 24, which irrefragably proves that then he was offered to God.

§ 17. Add yet hereunto that the offering of Christ, which the apostle insists upon as his great sacerdotal act and duty, was necessarily accompanied with suffering, and therefore was on the earth and not in heaven, ch. ix. 25, 26. 'Not that he should offer himself often, for then must he have often suffered from the foundation of the world.' The argument of the apostle is built upon a general principle, that all sacrifice was in and by suffering. The sacrificed beast was slain, and had his blood poured out. Without this there could be no sacrifice. Therefore, if Christ himself had been to have been often offered, he must have often suffered. It is excepted that although his offering did not consist in his suffering, nor did they both concur at the same time, yet his suffering was previously necessary as an antecedent condition unto his offering of himself in heaven. And on that account the apostle might well conclude, that if it were often to be offered, he must have often suffered. But, 1. There can be no reason given on the opinion of our adversaries, why the sufferings of Christ were antecedently necessary unto that offering of himself which they imagine. At best they refer it unto an absolute free act of the will of God which might have been otherwise, and Christ might have often offered, and yet not often suffered. 2. Christ is said not only to offer himself, but to be offered; Christ was 'once offered to bear the sins of many;' ver. 28. Now, though the offering of himself may be accommodated unto that presentation which he made of himself in heaven; yet, his being offered to bear sins, plainly includes a suffering in what he did. 3. There were many typical sacrifices which nothing belonging unto, went beyond their suffering. Such were all the expiatory sacrifices, or sacrifices to make atonement, whose blood was not carried into the sanctuary. For their slaying, the pouring out of their blood, the consumption on the altar, were all destructive unto their beings. And these sacrifices were types of the sacrifice of Christ, as our apostle testifies, Heb. vii. 27, 'Who needeth not daily (και δεν ἔχειν) to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once when he offered up himself.' Had he in-
tended only the sacrifice of the high priest, he could not have said that he was to offer it κατ᾽ ἡμεραν daily; when he was to do so only κατ᾽ εἰναυτον yearly, ch. x. 1. It is, therefore, the ἡμεραν or daily sacrifice that he intends, and this was not carried on beyond suffering.

And this is yet more plainly expressed, ch. x. 11, 12, 'And every priest standeth daily ministering and sacrificing oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God.' Comparing the sacrifices of Christ with these sacrifices, he declares that they were types and representations thereof, or there would be no foundation for such a comparison, nor for the exaltation of his above them, as to its efficacy and its consequents. But there was nothing of these sacrifices carried into the holy place, nor any representation made of them therein, but in their suffering and destruction they were consummated. For they were the sacrifices which every priest who ministered at the altar did offer either daily, or on all occasions. Wherefore if the sacrifice of Christ answered to them as the apostle teacheth us that it did, he offered it in his sufferings, his death and blood-shedding only. After this, he entered as our high priest into the holy place not made with hands, to appear in the presence of God for us. And as this was signified by the high priest's entering into the holy place, with the blood of the bullock and goat that were offered for a sin-offering, so it was necessary in itself to the application of the value and efficacy of his sacrifice to the church, according to the covenant between Father and Son before described.

What hath been pleaded, is sufficient to our present purpose, as to the declaration of the nature of the priesthood of Christ, his entrance upon it, and discharge of it. But there being another opinion concerning it, universally opposite in all particulars to the truth declared and vindicated, we must, for the security of the faith of the church, call it, with the ways, means, and artifices wherewith it is endeavoured to be supported, to an account, which shall be done in the ensuing Exercitations.

---

EXERCITATION XXXII.

§ 1. The opinion of the Socinians about the priesthood of Christ distinctly stated in eight particulars. § 2. Expressed by themselves. § 3. The faith of the church of God, in opposition thereto. § 4. Vindication of the whole doctrine of the priesthood of Christ from the perversion of it, and opposition made unto it, by Crellius. Its agreement and disagreement with his kingly office and power. § 5. How the priestly office of Christ is mentioned by the other writers of the New Testament, and why principally handled in this Epistle to the Hebrews. § 6. Intercession, no act of Christ's kingly power. Rom. viii. 34, vindicated. The mutual respect between the offices of Christ, with regard to the same general end. § 7. 1. John ii. 2, vindicated. Testimonies of the Old and New Testament omitted. Confidence of the Socinians in pretending to own the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. § 8. The priesthood of Christ is not comprehended by the holy writers in his kingly office. Attempts to prove it, vain. The nature of the expiation of sins vindicated, Heb. iv. 16. § 9. The words of the Psalmist, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' how and in what sense applied by the apostles, with respect to the office of Christ. § 10. Vanity of Crellius in assigning differences between the kingly and priestly offices of Christ. § 11. The differences assigned by him, examined. § 12. Real difference and distinction between these offices, proved. § 13. The dignity and honour of Christ exposed, by denying his real priesthood. § 14. The boldness of Smalcius in censuring the divine writers. His reason why they ascribed the priestly office to Christ.
§ 1. The opinion of the Socinians concerning the priesthood of Christ, was expressed in general in our preceding discourse. But for the clearer apprehension and confutation of it, it is necessary that it be more particularly declared in the most important parts of it; as also that its contrariety to the faith of the church may be the more plainly demonstrated. And the sum of what they pretend to apprehend and believe herein may be reduced to the ensuing heads.

1. 'That the Lord Christ was not, nor is a high priest, properly so called; but only metaphorically, by reason of some allusion between what he doth for the church, and what was done by the high priest under the law for that people.' And here, if they please, they may rest, as having in design utterly overthrown or rejected this office of Christ. But further to manifest their intentions, they add:

2. 'That he was not at all, in any sense, a high priest whilst he was in the earth, or before his ascension into heaven.' And this because he did not any of those things on the earth, on the account whereof he is called a high priest, in an allusion to the high priest under the law. Hence it follows, that in his death he offered no sacrifice to God, nor made any expiation of our sins thereby, which also that he did not, they expressly contend.

3. 'That therefore he became a high priest when he entered into heaven, and presented himself alive unto God.' Not that then he received any new office which he had not before, but only that, then he had power to do those things, from the doing whereof he is metaphorically denominated a priest. Wherefore they say,

4. 'That it is in heaven he makes atonement, and doth expiate our sins, which is called his offering himself unto God an expiatory oblation or sacrifice, which, as it consisted not in his suffering, death, and blood-shedding, so had it no virtue or efficacy from thence, but only as it was a condition pre-required thereunto.'

5. 'This expiation of our sins consists principally in two things, 1. Our deliverance from the punishment due unto them, initially in this world by pardon, and completely at the last day, when we shall be saved from the wrath to come. 2. In our deliverance from the power of sin by faith in the doctrine he taught, and conformity unto his example that we should not serve it in this world.' And,

6. 'Hence it follows, that believers are the first proper objects of the discharge of the duties of this office, or of all the sacerdotal actions of Christ.' For they consist in the help, aid, relief, and deliverance from our spiritual enemies which we have by him; his gracious and merciful will of relieving us, being that on the account whereof he is called a high priest, and wherein that office doth consist. Wherefore,

7. 'This priestly office of Christ is upon the matter the same with his kingly office; or it is the exerting and exercise of his kingly power with love, care, and compassion, so called in the Epistle to the Hebrews, out of an allusion to what was done by the high priests of old.

8. 'Whereas his intercession doth belong to this office of his, and is expressly assigned to him as a high priest, it is nothing but a note, evidence, or expression, to teach us, that the power which the Lord Christ exercised and putteth forth mercifully for our relief, he receiveth originally from God, as if he had prayed to him for it.'

§ 2. I have so included and expressed the apprehensions of these men, concerning the priesthood of Christ in these positions, as that I am persuaded that no one who is ingenuous amongst them will except against any parti-

VOL. I.
cular in the account. But that none may reflect in their thoughts about it, I shall repeat it in the words of one of their principal writers. To this purpose speaks Volckelius, De Vera Relig. lib. 3. cap. 37. p. 144. "Jam ut de pontificio Christi munere explicemus; primo loco animadvertendum nobis est, illud ab ejusdem officio regio, si in rem ipsum neutem intendas, non multum differre. Cum divinus Spiritus figurato hoc analogicoque dicendi genere, quo pacto Christus regni sui functionem administret, ante oculos nostros constitueret potissimum voluerit, nobisque ostendere illum non solum salutem nostram procurare posse, sed etiam nos juvare velle, et porro id omnino facere inque eo totum esse ut peccata nostra penitus expiét; [...]." Again, p. 146, "Ut huic sacerdotis officio rite praeponeretur Christus, non satis erat eum in homines esse misericordem, nisi insuper tanta illius, esset potestas, quanta ad homines miseriis oppressos divinissima ope sublevandos, pestemque æternam ab illorum capitibus propulsandam opus est; cunque omnis ad hanc rem in ccelo terraque potestas requiratur, consequens est Christum antequam in cœlum ascenderet, tantumque rerum omnium dominatun consequeretur, summum sacerdotem nostrum nondum perfectum fuisset." So he, and much more to the same purpose.

In like manner, "Catechis. Racoian. de Munere Christi Sacerdotali. Quest. 1. Munus sacerdotale in eo situm est, quod quemadmodum pro regio munere potest nobis in omnibus nostris necessitatibus subvenire; ita pro munere sacerdotali vult ac porro subvenit. Atque haec illius subveniendi seu opis afferenda ratio, sacrificium ejus appellatur.

"Quare haec ejus afferenda ratio sacrificium vocatur? vocatur ita figurato loquendi modo, &c.

"Quid porro est peccatorum expiatio? Est a poenis qua peccata tum temporaria, tum æternae comitantur, et ab ipsis etiam peccatis ne eis serviamus, liberatio.

"Cur id sacrificium Christi in cœlis peragitur? Ideo quod tale tabernaculum requireret, &c.

"Quid? Annon erat sacerdos antequam in cœlos ascenderet et presertim cruci affixus ponderet? Non erat."


§ 3. But the faith of the church of God stands up in direct opposition to all these imaginations. For it asserteth, 1. That our Lord Jesus Christ was, and is truly and properly, the high priest of the church, and that all others vested with that office under the law, were only types and representatives of him. And the description which the apostle gives of a high priest, properly so called, is accommodated and appropriated by himself unto him, Heb. v. 1—3, as also all the acts, duties, or offices of the priesthood, are accordingly ascribed unto him, ch. vii. 26, 27, x. 6, 7, ix. 24; 1 John ii. 21. 2. That he was perfectly and completely a high priest whilst he was on the earth, although he did not perfectly and completely discharge all the duties of that office in this world, seeing he lives for ever to make intercession for us. 3. That he offered himself an expiatory sacrifice to God in his death and blood-shedding, and was not made a priest upon his entrance into heaven, there to offer himself to God, where only the nature of his bloody sacrifice was represented. 4. That the expiation of our sins consisteth principally in the charging of the punishment due unto them upon the
Lord Christ, who took them on himself, and was made a sin-offering for them, that we may be freed from them, and from all the evil which follows them by the sentence of the law. And therefore, 5. God is the first proper object of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ; for to him he offered himself, and with him he made atonement for sin. And thereon, 6. This office of Christ is distinct from his kingly office, and not in any of its proper acts or adjuncts coincident therewithal: all which assertions have been before declared and proved, and shall now be further vindicated.

§ 4. He who is supposed, and that not unjustly, to have amongst our adversaries handled those things with most diligence and subtilty, is Crellius. I shall therefore examine what he on set purpose disputes on this subject, and that not by referring the substance of his discourses to the distinct heads before mentioned, but by taking the whole of it as disposed in his own method and words, and that with a design to give a specimen of those artifices, diversions, ambiguous expressions, and equivocations, which he perpetually maketh use of in this cause and controversy. And where he seems to be defective, I shall call in Smallius, and it may be some others of them, to his assistance. And I shall only transcribe his words in Latin, without adding any translation of them, as supposing that those who are competently able to judge of these things, are not wholly ignorant of that language, and that others may find enough for their satisfaction in our Discourses, so far as they are concerned.

This controversy he expressely engageth in, 'Respon. ad Grotium,' cap. 10. Partic. 56, p. 543. '1. Pontificiam Christi dignitatem a prophetica et regia distinctam agnoscamus, quamquam non pari modo distinctam. 2. Arctius enim cum regia dignitate cohaeret quam cum prophetica. 3. Unde duo ista munera regium nempe et pontificium, in sacris literis aperta a se invicem disjuncta, et ut in scholis loquuntur contradistincta, nusquam cernas sed potius alterum in altero. 4. Quodammodo comprehensum vides. Nam, 5. D. Auctor. Heb. iii. initio, Christi dignitatem quam ratione munericis sibi a Deo mandati habeat, nobis ante oculos ponere volens, et ad ejus considerationem nos cohortans, duo tantum illius officia commemorat propheticum et sacerdotale, quorum illud in terris olim absolvit, hoc in coeli perpetuo administrat, dum inquit: unde, fratres sancti vocationis coelestis participes, considerate apostolum (seu legatum) et pontificem confessionis nostræ Christum Jesum. Apostolum sive legatum confessionis, h. e. Religionis ac fidei nostræ quam profiteri debemus, vocat Christum, quia ad eam nobis annunciandam olim a Deo missus fuit quod est prophete. Pontificem autem ejusdem confessionis seu religionis appellat, 6. Quia ad eam perpetuo tuendam et curam ejus gerendam, h. e. ad omnia ea quae ad illam spectant administranda et ad exitum in nobis perduenda a Deo con-stitutus est; quasi summum religionis nostræ ac sacrorum presidium aut administratorem dicas, quod infra, cap. xii. ver. 1. illis verbis expressit, dum eum duceam et consummatorem fidei appellat; quia non tantum voce et exemplo nobis ad eam praevit, verum etiam eandem ad Dei dextram nunc collocatus perficat, atque ad optatum finem perducit.'

That the Lord Christ is called a priest on some account or other, and is so, these men cannot deny, and therefore on all occasions they do in words expressly confess it. But their endeavour is to persuade us, that little or nothing is signified by that appellation as ascribed unto him. At least they will by no means allow that any such thing is intended in that expression, as it signifies in all other authors sacred and profane, when not applied unto
the Lord Christ. They will not have a distinct office to be intended in it. Wherefore Crellius, although he acknowledge in the entrance of this discourse, 1st. That the priestly dignity of Christ is distinct from his kingly and prophetical dignities, yet his whole ensuing endeavour is to prove that the priesthood is not a distinct office in him. And he sophistically makes use of the word dignity, the priestly dignity, to make an appearance of a distinct office from the kingly, which here he expresseth by dignity also. And when he mentions officium pontificale; as distinct from the officium propheticum, he expressly intendeth his kingly office. And they do constantly in their other writings call the one officium regium, the other munus sacerdotale; supposing the first word to denote an habitual power, and the latter only actual exercise, wherein yet they are mistaken. The priestly dignity therefore here intended, and by which word he would impose on the less wary reader, is nothing but the honour that is due unto Christ for and in the discharge of his kingly office and power, in a merciful gracious manner, as the priests did of old. Wherefore he adds, 2d. Notwithstanding this distinction, yet the sacerdotal dignity comes nearer or closer to the kingly dignity than the prophetical. But this assertion is not built on any general principle taken from the nature of these offices themselves, as though there was a greater agreement between the kingly and priestly office, than between the priestly and prophetical. For the prophetical and sacerdotal offices, seem on many accounts to be of a nearer alliance than the sacerdotal and kingly, as we shall see afterwards. But this is only a step towards the main design, of totally subverting the sacerdotal office of Christ. For on this assertion it is added immediately, 3d. 'That in the Scripture these two offices, the kingly and priestly, are never disjoined openly, or as contradistinct one to another.' But yet his words are ambiguous. If he intend that they are not plainly and so openly distinguished in the Scripture one from the other, there is nothing more openly false. They are so in name and things, in the powers, acts, duties, and effects. If by a se invicem disjuncta et contradistincta, he intends such a divulsion and separation as that they should agree in nothing, not in their subject, not in their original, nor in their general ends and effects, so no offices of him are divided who in them all is the Mediator between God and men. But they are no where so conjoined as that one of them should be contained and comprehended in the other. 4th. 'Quodammodo,' after a sort as he speaks. For this word also is of a large and ambiguous signification, used on purpose to obscure the matter treated of, or the sense of the author about it. Is one so comprehended in the other, as to be the same with it, to be a part of it, or to be only the exercise of the power of the other in an especial manner? If this be the mind of this author, it can be expressed by quodammodo, for no other end, but because he dares not openly avow his sense and mind. But we deny that one is thus contained in the other, or any way so as to hinder it from being a distinct office of itself, accompanied with its distinct power, right, acts, and duties.

The argument from Heb. iii. 1, 2, 3, whereby he attempts to prove, 'that one of these offices is contained in the other 'quodammodo,' whatever that be, 5th, is infirm and weak. Yea, he himself knew well enough the weakness of it. It consists in this only, that the apostle in that place makes mention of the prophetical and of the priestly office of Christ, and not of the kingly; for which Crellius himself gives this reason in his commentary on the place, namely, because, as he supposeth, he had treated fully of the priestly office in the first chapter. In the third, the place here produced by
him, as himself observes, he is entering on his comparing Christ with Moses, who was the prophet, apostle, ambassador or legate of God to the people, and Aaron who was their priest; and with respect hereunto, he calls the Hebrews to a due consideration of him, especially considering that they had a deep and fixed apprehension concerning the kingly power of the Messiah, but of his being the great prophet and high priest of the church, they had heard little in their Judaism. It doth not therefore follow hence, that the kingly and priestly offices of Christ are comprehended one in another 'quodammodo,' but only that the apostle having distinctly handled the kingly office of Christ before, as he had done both in the first and second chapters, now proceeding to the consideration of his priestly and prophetical offices, makes no mention thereof, nor indeed would it have been to his purpose so to have done; yea, it was expressly contrary to his design. For what is next proposed concerning the nature of these offices, it is agreed, that the Lord Christ is called our apostle, as he was the prophet of the church, sent of God to reveal and declare his mind and love unto us. But it is not so that he is called, 6th, a high priest, that is principally, first and properly, because of the care he takes of our religion, and his administration of the affairs of it. Yea, there is nothing more opposite than their notion of the priesthood of Christ, not only to the general nature of that office, with the common sense of mankind concerning it, but also to the whole discourse of the apostle on this subject. For he not only asserts, but proves by sundry arguments, that the Lord Christ was made a priest to offer sacrifice unto God, and to make reconciliation for sin, and intercession for sinners. It is his being constituted a high priest for ever, and having offered the one sacrifice of himself, whereby all that come unto God are sanctified, he doth as such a high priest preside over the spiritual worship of the house of God, so that in and by him alone we have access unto the throne of grace, and do enter into the holy place through the blood of his sacrifice, wherein he consecrated for us a new and living way of access to God. Wherefore our author utterly fails in his first attempt for a proof of what he had asserted.

§ 5 His next endeavour towards the same purpose, is from the silence of the other writers of the New Testament concerning this office of Christ. This he supposeth would not have been considering the excellency and usefulness of it, had it not been included in his kingly office, for so he expresseth himself p. 544.

'Ceteri Scriptores N. Testamenti, 1. Regium potius et propheticum munus commemorant, nec ullus ex iis Christum, 2. Diserte sacerdotem aut pontificem vocat; facturi id proculdubio crebere rime, si id in ceteris ipsius munericibus atque imprimis in regio, consideratis certis eorum circumstantiis, in quibus sacerdoti legali similis est Christus, intelligi ac facile comprehendi non posset, cum ex eo munere, 3. Salus nostra eterna pendent, Heb. v. ix. x. viii. 21, 25. Quaunoquidem inde peccatorum nostrorum proficiscitur remissio et justification in qua beatitas nostra consistit.'

Answ. The intelligent reader may easily observe what is the judgment of this man concerning the priesthood of Christ; which is this, that in the exercise of his other offices he is so called because of some similitude unto the legal priests of old; which is plainly to deny and overthrow the office itself, and to leave no such thing in him, substituting a bare metaphorical allusive denomination in the room of it. And it is but a noise of words which is added concerning the dependence of our salvation on the sacerdotal duty of Christ, because indeed it is denied that he is a priest at all; and all that is intended thereby, is but the exercise of his other offices
in some kind of likeness unto the high priest under the law. To affirm on
this supposition, that forgiveness of sin, justification, salvation, blessedness,
depend on this office, that is on a name given from this allusion, is only to
serve a present occasion without respect to truth or sobriety. But in par-
ticular, I say, 1st. There is more express mention of the distinct office of
the priesthood of Christ, both as to its nature and its acts, than of his
prophethical. Why, 2d. they do not directly and expressly call him a
priest, they are not bound to give an account unto these men; it is
enough for the faith of the church, that they do really and expressly
scribe unto him, the acts and duties of that office, such as could be per-
formed by none but a priest properly so called, and particularly such as in
no sense belong either to the prophethical or kingly office; namely, to offer
himself a sacrifice, to be a propitiation, to wash us in his blood, to make
intercession for us; yea, to be made sin for us, and the like. But this Epis-
tle also belongeth unto the New Testament, nor is it as yet denied by the
Socinians so to do. And herein this office of Christ is so plainly, fully,
distinctly treated of and proposed, in its cases, nature, use and effects,
with its necessity and the benefits we receive thereby, as that no other office
of his, is in any part of the Scripture, nor in the whole of it, so gra-
phically described.

The reason also why the full revelation of the nature of this office of
Christ, was, in the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, reserved for this Epistle to
the Hebrews, is so evident, that our author need not think so strange of it.
It was among them that God of old had instituted the solemn representa-
tion of it in their typical priesthood. The nature of all these institutions
they were now to be peculiarly instructed in; both that they might see
the faithfulness of God in accomplishing what he designed by them, and
the end that he put thereby unto their administration. Now though these
things were of use to the whole church of God, that all might learn his
truth, wisdom, and faithfulness in the harmony of the Old Testament and
the New, yet were the Hebrews peculiarly concerned herein; and therefore
the Holy Ghost reserved the full communication of those things, to his
treating with them in an especial manner. But, 3d. All those acts of the
sacerdotal office of Christ, whereon the pardon of sin, justification, and sal-
vation do depend, are expressly mentioned by other writers of the New Test-
ament; as 1 John ii. 2; Ephes. v. 2; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. viii. 3, 4, 34;
1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 19, with sundry other places. Let it now
be judged whether any thing of the least moment, hath as yet been offered
in proof of the assertion laid down, namely, that the priestly office of Christ
is contained in the kingly, 'Quodammodo.'

§ 6. But he yet further enlargeth on this consideration. 'Quando autem
eacteri Scriptores sacri id commemorant quod ad sacerdolum Christi magis
proprie pertinet. 1. Munus hoc ipsius munere regio, aut functionem
functioni revera non opponit. Interpellationem Christi pro nobis, 2.
Semel nominavit Paulus, Rom. viii. 34, sed in ea. 3. Tacite actum etiam
regiae ipsius possestat ad nos a poena liberandos pertinentem, tanquam in-
terpellationis effectum quendam propositionem complexus est, ἐπέρηκα
enim seu operatio a regia Christi potestate manans, atque ad nos a poena liberandos
pertinens cure illius pro nobis susceptae quidam veluti effectus est et conse-
quens. 4. Regiam quidem potestatem Apostolus ibi commemoravit in
verbis: Qui etiam est in dextra Dei, et interpellationem ab ea distinxit;
sed potestatis illius actum expresse non commemoravit, contentus interpel-
lationem nominasse.'
A
d
sw. 1. This condition is imposed on us without warrant, that we should produce testimonies out of the other writers of the New Testament, where the priestly office of Christ is opposed unto his kingly; nor do we pretend that any such thing is done in this Epistle. Nor are the offices of Christ any where opposed one unto another, nor ought they so to be. Nor can any man show wherein there is an opposition made between his kingly and prophetical office, which these men acknowledge to be distinct. And it sufficeth unto our purpose that the kingly and priestly offices are in their names, powers, acts, and duties, distinctly proposed and declared. And this author ought to have considered all the testimonies before mentioned, and not to have taken out only one or two of them which he thought he could best wrest unto his purpose, which is all that he hath attempted, and yet hath failed of his end. It is here said, 2. that Paul in his other epistles doth but once expressly mention the intercession of Christ in heaven, but he mentioneth his oblation on earth more frequently, as may be seen in the places quoted. And the mentioning of it in one place in words plain, and capable of no other sense, is as effectual as if it had been expressed in an hundred other places. 3. It is both false and frivolous to say, that in speaking of Christ's intercession, he doth tacitly include any act of his kingly power, whereby he frees us from punishment. It is false, because as intercession is certainly no act of kingly power, nor formally hath any respect thereunto, it denoting the impetration of something from another, whereas all the acts of kingly authority are the exerting of that power which one hath in himself; so there is nothing in the text or context to give countenance unto any such imagination. For what relates unto the kingly power of Christ, namely, his sitting at the right hand of God, is expressed as a distinct act or adjunct of his mediatorial office, even as his dying and rising again are. And that his intercession is completely distinguished and separated from it, is plain in the expression whereby it is introduced; ὃ καὶ ἐστίν ἐν ἐξίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, 'who also is on the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' If therefore his being at the right hand of God is distinguished from his dying and rising again, so as not to be included in them, nor they in it, then are his intercession and sitting at the right hand of God so distinguished also. And the truth is, the apostle, for our consolation, here proposeth distinctly all the offices of Christ in their most effectual acts, or the most eminent notions of them, and that in the proper order of their discharge and exercise. And whereas the acts of his sacerdotal office are so distinct, as that between them the interposition of the acts of his other offices was necessary, he begins and ends with them as the order of their exercise did require. For, 1. he died for us as a priest; then, 2. he rose, giving testimony to the truth as the prophet of the church. 3. He possessed actually his kingly power, sitting at the right hand of God; and, 4. there carrieth on the perpetual exercise of his priesthood by intercession. Wherefore there is nothing in these words, that should tacitly intimate an inclusion of any act of the kingly office, but it is expressed in a clear distinction from it, as an act quite of another nature. And it will, if I mistake not, be a very difficult task for these persons to manifest in any tolerably rational manner, how the intercession of Christ doth include in it an act of his kingly power. 2dly. It is frivolous, if by this tacitly comprehended, he intend that the intercession of Christ, which is an act of his priestly office, hath its effects towards us by virtue of the interposition of some act or acts of his kingly office. For such a mutual respect there is between the acts of all the offices of Christ and
their effects. The oblation of Christ, which is an act of the priestly office
is made effectual towards us by the interposition of the exercise of his pro-
phetical office, 2 Cor. v. 18—21; Eph. ii. 14—17. And his teaching us as
the prophet of the church, is made effectual by those supplies of his Spirit
and grace, which are effects of his kingly power. Suppose, therefore, that
the energy and operation of Christ's kingly power, is put forth to make his
intercession effectual towards us, in the way mentioned by Crellius, which
yet in his sense is false; this proves not in the least, that his kingly power,
or any act of it, is included in his intercession, which is so distinctly ex-
pressed. Wherefore, 4, that the apostle should here mention the kingly
power of Christ, and name his intercession as the act thereof, seeing
he nameth no other, is a fond imagination; for intercession in its proper
nature both belongs to another office, and also it is peculiarly ascribed unto
the Lord Christ, by our apostle, as a high priest and not as a king, Heb. vii.
25—27. The intercession of Christ as a priest, is ordained of God as
a means of making his sacrifice and oblation effectual, by the application of
its virtue and efficacy unto us, and the actual communication of the truth of
it is committed unto him as our Lord, Head, and King. For whereas all
his offices being vested in the same person, and belonging all to the same
general work of mediation, have all the same general end; it is impossible
but that the acts of them must have mutual respect and relation to one
another, but yet the offices themselves are formally distinct.

§ 7. He yet proceeds on the same argument unto another instance. 'Jo-
hannes dum Christum Advocatum quem apud patrem habeamus, nominat,
et cum simul expiationem pro peccatis nostris censrat, 1. censeri potest
munus sacerdotale nobis descripsisse ubi 2. tamen regium munus non oppo-
nit. At cum ad 3. consolationem illam quam eo loco peccantibus
proponit Johannes, plurimum pertineat seire Christum plenissimam habere
pœnas peccatorum a nobis auferendi potestatem, 4. tacite id in suis verbis
inclusisse censendus est,' 1 Joh. ii. 2.

Aansw. Seeing he designed not to consider all the testimonies that are
usually pleaded for the priestly office of Christ in the New Testament,
I cannot but admire how he came to fix on this instance, which he can give
no better countenance to his evasion from. For, 1. The apostle may not
only be thought to describe the priestly office of Christ, but he doth it so
expressly, as that the contrary cannot be insinuated with any respect
to modesty. For the whole of the priestly office consists in oblation and
intercession, both which are here distinctly ascribed unto him; and to
describe an office by proper power and its duties, is more significant than to
do it only by its name. 2. It is acknowledged that here is no mention made
of Christ's kingly power, and it must also be acknowledged that the things
here ascribed unto Christ, do no way belong unto his kingly office. Hence
it follows, undeniably, that the writers of the New Testament do distinguish
these offices, and not include one of them in the other. Yea, but saith
Crellius, 3. The 'apostle is to be thought tacitly to include the kingly power
of Christ;' that is, although he mention it not, yet he ought to have done
so, and therefore is to be thought to have intended what he did not express.
That case is very desperate indeed which is only capable of such a defence
as this. But there is good reason to think why the apostle ought so to do;
that is, to do what indeed he did not, Crellius being judge. For, saith he, 4.
'The full power that Christ hath to deliver us from the punishment due to
sin, belongs unto that consolation which the apostle intended to give unto
sinners.' Answ. 1. I deny that the consideration of the power intended, did
at all belong unto the consolation that the apostle designs for sinners; and
that because neither directly nor indirectly it is mentioned by him. And he
knew what belonged unto the consolation which he intended, better than
Crellius did. This, therefore, is but a direction given the apostle (though
coming too late) as to what he ought to have written, and not an interpreta-
tion of what he wrote. 2. In proposing the expiatory oblation and
intercession of Christ as the ground of our consolation, because they are the
reasons, causes, and means of the forgiveness of our sins, the apostle had no
casion to mention the certain consequents thereof, such as is our deliver-
ance from the punishment due to sin. 3. The power of Christ to take away
sins, or to deliver us from the punishment due to sin, fancied by Crellius, is
indeed no principle of evangelical consolation, nor doth belong to the kingly
office of Christ, nor is consistent with the apostle's present discourse, which
lays our consolation on the real propitiation and intercession of Christ, both
which are excluded by this imaginary power of taking away the pe-
alty due to sin, absolutely, without respect to price, atonement, or satis-
faction.

And these are all the places which he thought meet to consider in
pursuance of his assertion, that all the 'writers of the New Testament,
excepting the author of this Epistle, did in a sort include the kingy
and priestly offices of Christ, the one in the other,' wherein how he hath ac-
quitted himself is left to the judgment of the indifferent reader. It was not,
I confess, improvidently done of him to confine himself to the New Testa-
ment, considering, that in the Old, he is expressly called a priest, Ps. ex. 4,
and that in conjunction with, and yet distinction from his regal power, Zech.
vi. 12, 13. As also he is said to have his soul made a sin-offering, and that
when, in and under his suffering, he bare our iniquities, Isa. liii. 10, 11,
whereby when he was cut off, he made reconciliation for iniquities, and
brought in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24, 25. Sundry testimonies
also of the New Testament before quoted, are utterly omitted by him, as
those which will not by any means be compelled unto the least appearance
of a compliance with his design. But these artifices are wanted to the
cause. Only, I must add, that I cannot but admire with what confidence
our adversaries talk of the priesthood of Christ, of his offering himself an
expiatory sacrifice, of his intercession, when all these things, in the proper
and only signification of the words, are expressly denied by them.

§ 8. Our author proceeds, in the next place, to give a reason of that
which neither is, nor ever was, namely, why the holy writers do in some
manner comprehend these offices one in the other; for they propose them to
us distinctly as their nature doth require.

* Neque vero immerito sacri Scriptores alterum officium in altero 1. quo-
dammodo comprehendunt. Nam quidquid a Christo ut Sacerdote 2, 3.
expectanus, id ab eo ut Regis ripsa proficisci dici potest. Sacerdotis est 4.
pecetam expiare et expurgare. Hoc fit dum 5. hostes Christi et nostri pcc-
atum nemp ipsum, mors et qui mortis habet imperium Satanas destruuntur.
At Christus hostes suos ac nostros debellat ac destruit ut Rex, I Cor. xv.
24—26; Phil. iii. ult. 6. Sacerdotis est auxilium is qui ad thronum
gratiae accedunt opportunum prarestre, et afflicitis prompte succurrere, Heb.
i. 17, 18, iv. 15, 16. 7. Ammon etiam Christi Regis est populo suo ad thron-
um ipsius confugienti succurrere, et afflicitis opem ferre?

Answ. 1. We observed before the looseness and ambiguity of that ex-
pression 'quadammodo,' or, after a sort. For if it signify any thing in this
case, it is the application of the distinct energies and operations of these
distinct offices unto the same end, wherein we own their agreement and concurrence. That which he should prove is, that they are one of them so contained in the other, as that they are not two distinct offices. 2. If whatever we expect from Christ as a priest, doth really proceed from him as a king, as here it is affirmed, then is his priesthood ὅποτε ἄλλο παλαιὸν ονόμα, a mere empty name, whereby no thing of any use or value is signified. 3. His arguments whereby he endeavours to prove, that the holy writers did not without cause, do that which indeed they did not at all, are sophistical, and inconclusive, not proving what himself intends. For, 1. what he says that we do expect from a priest, is sophistical. For it respects our present expectation of what is future; our hope, faith, and desire of what he will do for us. But this is but one part of the office and duty of a priest, yea that part which is expressly founded in what is done already. For Christ our high priest hath already expiated and purged our sins, and we have no expectation that he should do it again. He did by himself, that is, by the sacrifice of himself, purge our sins, and that before he sat down at the right hand of God, Heb. i. 3. And this he did once only, by his own sacrifice once offered, as we have proved. Wherefore, 2, 4, it is true that it belongeth unto a priest to expiate our sins and take them away. This we believe that Christ hath done for us as our high priest, but do not expect that he should do it any more, any otherwise but by the application unto us of the virtue and efficacy of what he hath already done. 3, 5. The description here given us of the expiation of sin, namely, that it consists in the actual subduing of Christ's enemies and ours, sin, death, and the devil, is absurd, dissonant from the common sense of mankind in these things, destructive to the whole nature of the types of the Old Testament, and contrary to the plain doctrine of the Scripture. This is a blessed consequent and fruit indeed of the expiation of our sins, when he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, when his soul was made an offering for sin, when he offered himself a sacrifice, a propitiation, price, and ransom, to make atonement and reconciliation for sin; but expiation itself consisteth not therein. These, therefore, we acknowledge that Christ effecteth by various actings of his kingly power; but all on a supposition of the atonement made by him as a priest, with respect unto the guilt and demerit of sin. Hereby he obtained for us eternal redemption, and we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. The things intended are therefore so distinct, that they prove the offices or powers from whence they proceed to be so also. For neither did Christ as a king expiate and purge our sins, which could be done only by a bloody sacrifice. Nor doth he as a priest subdue his enemies and ours, which is a work, whereunto the power of a king is required.

Nor hath he any better success in the next instance, as to encouragements of coming to the throne of grace. For (1. 6) the throne of grace mentioned, Heb. iv. 16, is not the throne of Christ as a king, 'his own throne,' as it is here rendered by Crellius, but the throne of God, where Christ as a high priest maketh intercession for us. So that when he says, that it is the office of a priest to succour them who come to the throne of grace, and the part of Christ to relieve them who come for help to his throne, it is evident that he sophistically confounds the things that are to be distinguished. We go to the throne of God through the interposition of Christ as our high priest, our propitiation, and advocate; and we go to the throne of Christ as king of the church, on the account of the glorious power committed to him for our help and relief. Wherefore, 2, the encourage-
ments we have to approach to the throne of grace, whereunto is our ultimate address, for help and relief from the priestly office and actings of Christ, are different and distinct from them which we have from his kingly office, as the actings of Christ with respect to the one and the other of those offices, are different and distinct. We go with boldness to the throne of grace, on account of Christ's being our high priest, as he who by the oblation of himself hath procured admittance for us, and consecrated a new and living way for our access thereunto; as he who by his intercession procures us favourable audience, and speeds our requests with God; see our exposition on the place. Our expectation of relief and aid from the Lord Christ as the king of grace and glory on his throne, ariseth from that all-power in heaven and earth, which is given to him for that end. In brief, as a priest he inter- poseth with God for us; as a king, he acts from God towards us.

§ 9. His last attempt to the same purpose, is in the ensuing discourse.

'Idem ex eo quoque apparet quod auctor divinus Epist. ad Heb. (1) locum illum Psalmi, filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te (4) ad (5) sacerdotium Christi aperte refert, cap. v. 5, 6, et pontificali ei dignitatem haec ratione a Deo conce-sam docet. At ea (6) de regno aperte loquuntur Nam. (2) David qui Christi typus, fuit explicat in iis verbis decretum Dei, quo rex, post diuturnum exilium reipsa fuit constitutus, et in solio regio collocatus, quemadmodum Psalmus inspectus quemvis docet, unde ea Paulus Christo e mortuis resuscitato demum ait impleta, Act. xiii. 32, 33. Nam tum de- num Deus secundum promissa sua regem dedit populo suo et Jesus constit- tuit Dominum et Christum; seu quod idem est, filium Dei in potentia, Act. ii. 36; Rom. i. 4. Et idem hic Scriptor ad Hebraeos, cap. i. 5, et ists verbis demonstrat praestantiam Christi supra angelos quam, ad dextram majestatis in excelsis collocatus, est adeptus. Quod si sacerdotium Christi a regia dignitate prorsus est distinctum, et Christus reipsa sacerdos fuit cum in cruce pateretur, imo tune proprii sacerdotii munere functus est in colo improprio, quomodo haec verba que de regia supremaque dignitate Christi loquuntur ad sacerdodium Christi accommodantur, quod tum revera fuerit peractum, cum Christus se maxime humiliavit, et minor apparuit angelis.'

Phil. ii. 8; Heb. ii. 8.

Answ. If it were determinately certain what he intends to prove, we might the better judge of the validity of his proofs and argument. But his limitation of 'quodammodo, videtur,' and 'aliqua ex parte,' leave it altogether uncertain what it is he designeth to evince. It is enough to our cause and purpose, if we manifest that nothing by him produced or insisted on, doth prove the kingly and priestly office of Christ to be the same, or that one of them is so comprehended in the other, as that they are not distinct in their powers, energies, and duties. And this is not done. For, 1. The words of the testimony out of the second Psalm, which is so variously applied by the apostles, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' do not formally express any one office of Christ, nor are used to that purpose. Only they declare the relation and love of the Father to his person, which was the foundation and reason of committing all that authority to him, which he exercised in all his offices, whereunto therefore they are applied. And therefore on several occasions doth God express the same thing in words very little varied, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,' Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17. For the declaration of Christ to be the eternal Son of God, is all that is intended in these words. 2. That these words were first used of David, and his exaltation to the throne of Israel after his banishment, is easily said, but not so easily proved.
Let our reader consult our exposition on ch. i. ver. 5: 3. The call of Christ to his offices of king, priest, and prophet, as it respects the authority and love of the Father, was but one and the same. He had not a distinct call to each office, but was at once called to them all, as he was the Son of God sent and anointed to be the Mediator between God and man. The offices themselves, the gifts and graces to be exercised in them, their powers, acts, and duties, were distinct, but his call to them all was the same. 4. The writer of this Epistle doth not accommodate these words to the priestly office of Christ, any otherwise but to evince that he was called of God to that office, on the ground of his relation to God and his love of him. For he produceth those words to declare who it was that called him, and why he did so; the call itself being expressed as respecting the priesthood in the other testimony: ‘Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.’ Wherefore there is not in these words any expression of the priesthood of Christ; see the exposition of the place. 5. These words are most eminently applied to the resurrection of Christ, Acts xiii. 32, 33. Now this principally belonged to his prophetical office, as that whereby the truth of the doctrine he had taught was invincibly confirmed. And you may by this means as well overthrow the distinction between his kingly and prophetical offices, as between his kingly and sacerdotal. But the reason why it is accommodated to the Lord Christ with respect to either of his offices, is because his relation to God therein expressed, was the ground of them all. 6. What if Cretius cannot prove that these words of the Psalmist have any respect to the kingly office of Christ. I deny at present that he can do so, and refer the reader for his satisfaction herein to the exposition of them as quoted by the apostle, ch. i. 5.

7. These words whereby he en largeth herein, ‘That then when Christ was raised from the dead, God gave unto his people a king according to his promises, and appointed Jesus to be both Lord and Christ, or which is the same, the Son of God in power, for which Acts ii. 36: Rom. i. 4, are urged,’ are partly ambiguous and sophistical, and partly false. For, 1. The things mentioned in those places are not the same. In the one it is said, that ‘God made him both Lord and Christ;’ in the other, that he ‘was declared to be the Son of God with power.’ And he doth woefully prevaricate when he so repeats the words, as if it were said that he was made or appointed to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection, when he was only publicly determined or declared so to be. 2. He insinuates that Jesus was not made Lord and Christ, or the Son of God, until after his resurrection. But this is openly false. For, 1. He was born both Lord and Christ, Luke ii. 11. 2. When he came into the world, the angels worshipped him as Lord and Christ, Heb. i. 6. 3. Peter confessed him before to be Christ the Son of the living God, Matt. xvi. 16. 4. He often affirmed, that all things before were given unto his hand, Matt. xi. 27. 5. If it were so, the Jews only crucified Jesus, and not Christ the Lord, or only him that was so to be afterwards, which is false and blasphemous. It is true, upon his ascension, not immediately on his resurrection, he was gloriously exalted into the illustrious exercise of his kingly power; but he was our Lord and King before his death. And therein also,

8. From what hath been spoken, it is easy to know what is to be returned to the conclusion that he makes of this argument. For the words produced in testimony, are not spoken immediately concerning any office of Christ whatever, as expressive of it; much less concerning his regal dignity in a peculiar manner. And God was no less the Father of Christ, he was
no less begotten of him, when he was humbled to death in the sacrifice of himself, that he offered as a priest, than when he was exalted in glory at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

§ 10. From this attempt to prove, that the sacerdotal office of Christ is comprehended in the regal by the divine writers, Crellius proceeds to show what differences there are indeed between them, and hereof he giveth sundry instances. But he might have spared that labour. This one would have sufficed; namely, that the Lord Christ is a king really and properly, he is a priest only metaphorically: that is, he is not so indeed, but is called so improperly, because of some allusion between what he did, and what was done by the priests of old; as believers are called kings and priests. A man would think this were difference enough, as amounting to no less but that Christ is a king indeed, but not a priest. There was therefore no need he should take the pains to find out, indeed to coin differences between two such offices, whereof one is, and the other is not. And all the differences he fixeth on, the first only excepted, whereunto some pretence may be given, are merely feigned, or drained out of some other false hypothesis of the same author. However, it may not be amiss, seeing we have designed the vindication of this office of Christ from the whole opposition that is made to it by this sort of men, to examine a little these differences he assigns between the real and supposed office of Christ, which he makes use of to no other end but to annihilate the latter of them.

§ 11. 'Distincto autem inter regium et sacerdotale munus primum in eocernitur, quod regium munus latius se porrigit quam sacerdotium; unde illius etiam erebrior fit mentio. Regis enim et etiam punire; sacerdotis vero tantum peccata populi expiare.'

Answ. This may be granted as one difference in the exercise of the power of these offices. For the kingly power of Christ is extended to his enemies, the stubbornest of them and those who are finally so. But Christ is a priest offered and intended only for the elect. But he might also have instanced in sundry other acts of the kingly power of Christ, as namely his law-giving, his universal protection of his people, his rule and government of the church by his Spirit and Word, which belong not at all to his priestly office. But this was not to his purpose, nor doth he design to evince any real difference between these two offices. For it is plain, that he opposeth punishing and expiating sin, the one to the other, assigning the former to the kingly, the latter to the sacerdotal office. But if to expiate sin, be only to remove and take away the punishment of sin, which is contrary to punishing, then Crellius maintains that Christ doth this by virtue of his kingly power and office. The sum therefore of this difference amounts to no more but this, that the Lord Christ as a king, and by virtue of his regal power, doth both punish sin and take the punishment of it, only he doth the latter as a priest, that is, there is an allusion in what he doth, to what was done for the people by the priests of old.

He adds another difference. (1) 'Deinde cum Christum regem appellamus, eo ipso nisi quid addamus aliud, nec (2) exprimimus cum hane potestatem aliunde accipisse, et quicquid beneficii ab ipso ut rege nostro proficiscitur (3) id totum Deo qui hanc ei potestatem largitus fuerit, ascribendum esse. (4) Regium enim munus et nomen per se nil tale indicat cum Deus etiam rex sit et dicatur, Matt. v. 35. At cum Christum sacerdotem vocamus, et (5) oblacionem et interpellationem tribuimus, eo ipso indicamus peccatorum nostrorum remissionem non ab ipso ut prima causa sed a Deo proficisci, et cum potestatem peccata nostra remittendi a seipso
THE TRUE NATURE OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST,

non habere (6) nec esse supremum omnium rectorem. (6) Quomodo enim offerret et interpelleret apud alium et sacerdotis munere fungeretur ad re-
missionem nobis parandam? Quare dum sacerdotis nomine insignitur a Deo
altissimo (7) cui alias potestate equalis est, aperte distinguetur, et Del pra-
ipso praerogativa atque eminentia indicatur, quae facile ob tantam Christi
præstantiam et gloriam qua ipsum Deus auxit, obscurari posset et sic Deo
gloria illa quam in Christo exaltando quæsivit eripi.'

Answ. 1. Here is neither difference, nor pretence of any difference be-
tween these offices of Christ assigned in these words, nor doth this discourse
seem to be introduced for any other end, but only to make way for that
sophistical objection against the deity of Christ wherewith it is closed. For
whatever notion the first sound of these words, king and priest, may re-
present to the minds of any prejudiced person, in reality Christ doth not
less depend on God with respect to his kingly office, than with respect to
his priestly, which Crellius also doth acknowledge. 2. When we call
Christ Lord and king, we consider both who and what he is, and thereby
do conceive and express his being appointed to that office by God the
Father. And of all men, the Socinians have the least cause to fear, that,
on the naming of Christ as king, they should conceive him to be indepen-
dent of God; for believing him to be a man and no more, there cannot
possibly an imagination thereof befal their minds. 3. It is not what we
express where we call Christ a King, but what the Scripture declareth con-
cerning that office of his, which we are to consider. And therein it is con-
stantly affirmed and expressed, that God made him both Lord and Christ;
that all his power was given of God; that he sets him his king on the holy
hill of Sion, and gives him to be head over all to the church. Wherefore,
to call and name Christ our King, and not at the same time to apprehend
him as being appointed of God so to be, is to renounce that only notion of
his being so, which is revealed to us, and is a folly which never any Chris-
tian fell into. Wherefore, when we call Christ King, we do acknowledge
that he is made so of God, who consequently is the author and principal
Cause of all the good and blessed effects which we are made partakers of,
through the administration of the kingly office and power of Christ, nor did
ever any sober person fall into an imagination to the contrary, seeing none
can do so without an express renunciation of the Scripture. 4. When God
absolutely considered is said to be King, the subject of the proposition
limits and determines the sense. For the nature of him which is represented
unto us under that name, God, will not allow that he should be so any other-
wise but on account of his infinite essentially divine power, which the
notion of Christ as Mediator doth not represent to us. 5. The reasons
taken from what is ascribed to the Lord Christ as a priest, to prove that in
our notion and conception of that office, we look on him as delegated by
God, and acting power for us on that account, are, although true in them-
selves, yet frivolous as to his purpose, because all these acts, duties, and
powers of his kingly office, do affirm and prove the same. Christ hath all
his power, both as king and priest, equally from God the Father; was
equally called of God to act in both these offices, in his name, majesty, and
authority towards us in one of them, and with or before him on our behalf
in the other. 6. Whereas he adds and enlargeth thereon, that by the obla-
tion and intercession of Christ, which are ascribed to him as a priest, it is
evident that he hath not power of or from himself to pardon our sins, as
also that he is not the supreme Rector, but is distinguished from the most
high God, to whom otherwise he is equal in authority: I ask, 1. Whether
Christ as a king hath power of himself, and from himself, to take away sin as the supreme Rector of all, and that power not delegated to him of God? I know he will not say so, nor any of his party, and therefore the difference between these two offices on that account, is merely pretended. 2. To make the Lord Christ, whom they will have to be a man only, to be equal in power on any account with God, is a bold assertion. How shall any creature be equal in any respect to God? To whom shall we equal him? How can he who receiveth power from another for a certain end, be equal in power to that other from whom he doth receive it? How shall he who acts in the name of another, be equal unto him? But these great expressions are used concerning things which are false, only to cover the sacrilege of taking that from him, wherein he was truly equal to God, and counted no robbery so to be. 3. It is confessed that the Lord Christ, as the high priest of the church, was inferior to God, that his Father was greater than he, that he offered himself unto God, and intercedeth with him; but that he is not equal with God, of the same nature with him under another consideration, this proveth not. And on the other side, there is not the least danger that the prerogative of God absolutely considered with respect to Christ as Mediator, should be obscured by the glory of the kingly office of Christ, among them who acknowledge that all the glory and power of it is freely given unto him of God.

He yet proceeds: 'Accedit quod cum Christus sacerdos dicitur, et quidem talis qui seipsum obtulerit, et mors ipsius, sine qua offerre se non potuit apertius includitur, quam regni mentio nullo pacto complectitur; (2) et cum ipsius admodum tenera et sollicita cura quam quo nobis gerit, et qua expiationem peccatorum nostrorum perfecti, magis quam regni nominis mentione indicatur. Unde non parum consolationis ex divina Christi potestate nobis accedit (3) quae alias magnitudine et sublimitate sua vilitatem nostram absterrere potuisse, quo minus tanta cum animi fiducia ad ipsum confugere, et open ab ipso expectare auderemus.'

Amsw. 1st. How, according to the judgment of these men, the death of Christ is more openly and plainly included in his being called a priest, than in his being a king, I know not. For he was not, if we may believe them, a priest in his death, nor did his death belong to his discharge of that office; only they say it was necessarily antecedent thereunto. But so also was it unto the discharge of his kingly office. For he 'ought first to suffer and then to enter into his glory,' Luke xxiv. 26. And his exaltation to his glorious rule was not only consequent to his humiliation and suffering, or to his death, but did also depend thereon, Rom. xiv. 9; Phil. ii. 7—11. Wherefore, with respect to the antecedent necessity of the death of Christ, there is no difference between these offices, it being equal with regard to them both. Had he placed the difference between these two offices with respect to the death of Christ herein, that Christ as a priest died and offered himself therein unto God, which no way belonged unto his kingly office, he had spoken the truth, but that which was destructive to all his pretensions. For what is here asserted constitutes no difference at all between them. 2d. It is acknowledged that the consideration of the priesthood of Christ, be-speaks much care and tenderness towards the church, which is a matter of great consolation to us. But, 1st. It is so when this care and tenderness are looked on as the effects and fruits of that love which he manifested and exercised, when in his death he offered himself a sacrifice for the expiation of our sins, and continueth to intercede for us, thereby rendering his oblation effectual. Herein doth the Scripture constantly place the love of Christ,
and thence instructs us in his tender care and compassion thence arising, Ephes. v. 25—27; Gal. ii. 20; Rev. i. 5. Remove this consideration of the priesthood of Christ, which is done by these men, and you take away the foundation and spring of that care and tenderness in him towards us a priest, whereby we should be, relieved and refreshed. Wherefore, 2d. This consideration is nowhere proposed to us, as that which ariseth absolutely from the office itself, but from what, out of his unspeakable love, he underwent and suffered in the discharge of that office. For being therein exercised with all sorts of temptations, and undergoing all sorts of sufferings, he is merciful and tender in the discharge of the remaining duties of this office. See Heb. ii. 17, and iv. 15, 16, and v. 2, 3, with our exposition on those places. I do not therefore see, that they who deny that Christ suffered any thing in being our high priest, can, from the consideration of the priesthood, draw any other arguments of his care and tenderness, than what may be taken from his other offices. 2d. Christ as a king absolutely considered, with respect to his sufferings, is no less tender to, no less careful of his church, than he is as he is a priest, his love and other qualifications for all his offices being the same; only his preparations for the exercise of his care and tenderness by what he suffered as a priest, makes the difference in this matter, the consideration whereby being removed, there remains none at all. To conceive of Christ as the king of his church, and not to conceive withal that every thing in him as such, is suited to the consolation and encouragement of them that do believe, is highly to dishonour him. He is as a king, the shepherd of his flock; his pastoral care belonging to his kingly office; as kings of old were called the shepherds of their people. But in his rule and feeding of the church as a shepherd, he is proposed as exercising all manner of care and tenderness, as the nature of the office doth require, Isa. xl. 10, 11. 3d. It is a fond imagination that believers should be frightened or deterred from going to Christ as a king, because of their own wileness and his glorious dignity, seeing that glorious dignity was conferred on him, on purpose to relieve us from our wileness. There is no office of Christ but containeth its encouragements in it, for believers to make use of it and improve it to their consolation; and that because the ground of all their hopes and comforts is in his person, and in that love and care, which he exerts in them all. But that we should consider any one of them as a means of encouraging us with respect unto another, the Scripture teacheth us not, any otherwise than as the effects of his priestly office in his oblation and intercession, are the fundamental reasons of the communication of the blessed effects of his kingly power to us. For all the benefits we are made partakers of by him flow from hence, that he loved us, and gave himself for us, washing us in his own blood.' Even the glorious greatness of God himself, which, absolutely considered, is enough to deter us as we are sinners from approaching to him, as he is in Christ reconciling the world to himself, is a firm foundation of trust, confidence, and consolation; and therefore the glory of Christ in his kingly power, must needs be so also.

He closeth his discourse in these words:  'Quare haec quoque fuit causa hujus, 1. appellatiois Christo tribuendae; ut 2. omittam multas similitudines quae Christo cum sacerdote legali et Melchisedeco, qui itidem fuit sacerdos Dei altissimi intercedendii; quae haec appellatioi in causam dererunt; quibus etiam addenda est similitudo multiplex cum victimis legalibus.'

Answ. Here, 1st. The whole design is plainly expressed. There is the name of a priest for some certain reasons attributed unto Christ, whereas,
truly and really he never had any such office, from whence he might be so
denominated. And this is that which in this whole discourse I principally
designed to evince. 2d. To say that Christ was called a priest, from that
likeness which was in sundry things (not in the office of the priesthood and
execution thereof) to the legal high priest, to Melchisedec, and to the sacri-
fices of the law, is only to beg or suppose the thing in question. They
were all instituted and made priests, and all their sacrifices were offered
principally to this end, that they might prefigure and represent him as the
only true high priest of the church, with that sacrifice of himself which he
offered for it. And without this consideration, there would never have
been any priest in the world of God’s appointment. And this is the whole of
what this man pleads, either directly, or by sophistical diversions, to con-
found these two offices of Christ, and thereby, utterly to evacuate his sacer-
dotal. Wherefore, before I proceed to remove his remaining exceptions
unto the truth and reality of this office, I shall confirm the real difference
that is between it and the kingly office, in confounding it wherewithal, the
strength of their whole endeavour against it doth consist.

§ 12. The offices of king and priest may be considered either absolutely,
or as they respect our Lord Jesus Christ. In the first way it will not be
denied but that they are distinct. The one of them is founded in nature,
the other in grace. The one belongs unto men as creatures capable of po-
litical society, the other with respect unto their supernatural end only. It
is true that the same person was sometimes vested with both these offices,
as was Melchisedec. And the same usage prevailed among the heathens, as
we shall see afterwards more at large.

Rex Anius, Rex idem hominum Phæbique Sacerdos.

But this hinders not but that the offices were thus distinct in their powers
and duties, as the regal and prophetical were, when David was both king
and prophet. But our inquiry is at present concerning these offices in
Christ only, whether they were both proper and distinct, or one of them
comprised in the other, being but a metaphorical expression of the manner
of the exercise of its powers and duties. And concerning this we may
consider,

1st. He is absolutely, and that frequently, called a priest, or a high priest,
in the Old Testament and in the New. This was demonstrated in the en-
trance of these exercitations. Now the notion or nature of the priest, and
the office of the priesthood, or what is signified by them, are plainly declared
in the Scripture, and that in compliance with the unanimous apprehension
of mankind concerning them. For that the office of the priesthood is that
faculty and power whereby some persons do officiate with God in the name
and on the behalf of others, by offering sacrifice; all men in general are
agreed. And thereon it is consented also, that it is in its entire nature dis-
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Scripture itself says no such things, but, as we shall see immediately, gives plain testimony to the contrary.

2. His first solemn type was both a king and a priest, and he was so as to both of these offices properly. He was not a king properly, and a high priest only metaphorically, or so called, because of his careful and merciful administration of the kingly power committed to him. But he had the office of the priesthood properly and distinctly vested in him, as both Moses and our apostle do declare, Gen. xiv. 18; Heb. vii. 1. And he was more peculiarly a type of Christ as he was a priest, than as he was a king. For he is said to be a priest, and not a king, after the order of Melchisedec. Therefore, that consideration of him is re assumed by the Psalmist, and by our apostle, and not the other. And it is not uncouth that God, designing to prefigure one that should be a priest metaphorically only, and properly a king, should do it in and by one person, who was a priest no less properly than he was a king, and in his so being, was peculiarly and principally designed to prefigure him? Who can learn any thing of the mind of God determinately, if his declarations thereof may be thus interpreted?

3. In the giving of the law, God did renew and multiply the instructive types and representations of these offices of Christ. And herein, in the first place, he takes care to teach the church, that he whom all those things which he then did institute, did signify, was to be a priest. For of any prefiguration of his kingly power, there is very little spoken in the law. I shall at present take that for granted, which I have sufficiently proved elsewhere, and which is not only positively affirmed, but proved with many arguments by our apostle, namely, that the principal end of Mosaical institution was to prefigure, represent, and instruct the church, though darkly, in the nature of the offices, work, and duties of the promised Messiah. This being so, if the Lord Christ were to be a priest only metaphorically and improperly, and a king properly, (his priesthood being included in his kingly office, and signifying no more but the manner of his administration thereof,) how comes it to pass that his being a priest should be taught and represented so fully and distinctly in so many ordinances, by so many types and figures as it is, and his kingly power be scarce intimated at all. For there is no mention of any typical kings in the law, but only in the allowance which God gave the people, to choose such a ruler in future times, wherein he made provision for what he purposed to do afterwards, Deut. xvii. 14, 15. Moreover, when God would establish a more illustrious typical representation of his kingly office in the family of David, to manifest that these two offices should be absolutely distinct in him, he so ordained in the law, that it should be ever afterwards impossible that the same person should be both king and priest, until he came, who was typified by both. For the kingly office and power was confined by divine institution to the house and family of David, as that of the priesthood was to the family of Aaron. If these offices had been to be one and the same in Christ, these institutions had not instructed the church in what was to come.

4. A distinct office is a distinct power and faculty for the performance of its acts, in a due manner, with respect to a certain end. And these things whereby it is constituted, are distinct in the kingly and priestly offices of Christ. For,

1. Moral powers and acts are distinguished by their objects. But the object of all the actings of the sacerdotal power of Christ, is God; of the regal, men. For every priest, as we have shown, acts in the name, and on the
behalf of men with God. But a king, in the name and on the behalf of God, with and towards men, as to the ends of that rule which God hath ordained. The priest represents men to God, pleading their cause, the king represents God to men acting his power. Wherefore, these being distinct powers, or faculties, duties, and acts, they prove the offices whereunto they do belong, or from which they proceed, to be distinct also. And this consideration demonstrates a greater difference between these two offices, than between the kingly and prophetical, seeing, by virtue of them both, some men equally act in the name of God towards others. But that the priesthood of Christ is exercised towards God on the behalf of men, and that therein the formal nature of any priesthood doth consist, whereby it is effectually distinguished from all other offices and powers that any men are capable of, we have the common consent of mankind, to prove the institution of God under the Old Testament, with express testimonies in the New confirming the same.

2. As the acts of these offices are distinguished by their objects, so also are they and their ἀποστελεσμάτα, between themselves or in their own nature. The acts of the sacerdotal office operate morally, only by way of procurement or acquisition. Those of the regal office are physical, and really operative of their effects. For all the acts of the priestly office belong to obligation or intercession. And their effects consist, either in 'Averruncatione mali,' or 'Procuracione boni.' These they effect morally only, by procuring and obtaining of them. The acts of the kingly office are legislation, communication of the Spirit, helps, aids, assistances of grace, destruction of enemies, and the like. But these are all physically operative of their effects. Wherefore, the offices whence they proceed, must be distinct in their natures, as they also are. And what hath been spoken, may suffice at present to evince the difference between these two offices of Christ, which those men are the first that ever called into doubt or controversy.

§ 13. I shall close this discourse with the consideration of an attempt of Crellius, to vindicate his doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ, from an objection of Grotius against it, namely, that it 'diminished the glory of Christ, in ascribing to him only a figurative priesthood.' For hereunto he answers, 1. By way of concession, that 'indeed they allow Christ to be a priest metaphorically only, as believers are said to be kings and priests, and to offer sacrifices.' Now this is plainly to deny any such real office, which sometimes they would not seem to do, and to substitute an external denomination in the room thereof. What are the consequents hereof, and what a pernicious aspect this hath upon the faith and consolation of all believers, is left to the judgment of all who concern themselves in these things. 2. He answers, 'That although they deny the Lord Christ to be a priest properly so called, yet the dignity which they ascribe to him under that name and title, is not metaphorical but real, and a greater dignity than their adversaries will allow.' For the latter clause, or who it is that ascribe most glory and honour to Jesus Christ, according as that duty is prescribed to us in the Scripture, both with respect to his person, his mediation, and all his offices, with the benefits redounding to the church thereby, they or we, is left to every impartial or unprejudiced judgment in the world. For the former, the question is not, about what dignity they assign to Christ, nor about what names or titles they think meet to give him, but about the real honour of the priesthood. That this is an honour in itself, that it was so to Aaron, that it is so to Christ, our apostle expressly declares, Heb. v. 4, 5.
If Christ had it not, then had Aaron a real honour which he had not, and therein was preferred above him. But, saith he, 'Although he is compared with Aaron, and his priesthood opposed unto his, and preferred above it, yet it is not in things of the same kind, though expressed under the same name, whereby things more perfect and heavenly are compared with things earthly and imperfect.' But, 1. This leaves the objection in its full force. For, whatever dignity Christ may have in other things above Aaron, yet in the honour of the priesthood Aaron was preferred before him, for it is a real priesthood which the prophet asserts to be so honourable. And, although a person who hath it not, may have a dignity of another kind, which may be more honourable than that of the priesthood, yet if he have not that also, he therein comes behind him that hath it. 2. It is true, where things fall under the same appellations, some properly and some metaphorically only, those of the latter sort, though they have not so good a title as the other to the common name whereby they are called, yet may they in their own nature be more excellent than they. But this is only when the things properly so called have notable defects and imperfections accompanying of them. But this consideration hath here no place; for the real office of the priesthood includes nothing in it that is weak or impotent, nor are the acts of it in any thing inferior to what may be fancied as metaphorical. And, whereas the dignity of all the mediatory actings of Christ are to be taken from the efficacy of them, and their tendency to the glory of God, and the salvation of the church, it is evident that those which are assigned to him as the acts of a real priesthood, are far more worthy and honourable than what they ascribe unto him, under the metaphorical notion of that office. 3. If the priesthood of Christ is not opposed as such to the priesthood of Aaron, on what grounds, or from what principles doth our apostle argue to the abolishing of the priesthood of Aaron, from the introduction of that of Christ, plainly asserting an inconsistency between them in the church at the same time. For there is no such opposition nor inconsistency, where the offices intended are not both of them properly so, but one of them is only metaphorically so called. So, there is no inconsistency in the continuance of the kingly office of Christ, which is real; and all believers being made kings in a sense only metaphorical.

§ 14. But Valentinus Smalcius will inform us of the original and occasion of all our mistakes about the priesthood of Christ, De Regn. Christ. cap. 23. 'Quo porro figurato loquendi nimio studio factum est, ut etiam de Christo dicatur cum apud Deum pro nobis interpellare,' &c. 'It was out of an excessive desire' (in the Holy Ghost or the apostles) 'to speak figuratively, that Christ is said to intercede for us; and consequently, to be a priest.' But he afterwards makes an apology for the Holy Spirit of God, why he spake in so low and abject a manner concerning Christ. And this was the care he took that none should believe him to be God. We have had some among ourselves, who have traduced and reproached other men for the use of fulsome metaphors, as they call them, in the expression of sacred things, though evidently taken out of the Scripture; but this man alone hath discovered the true fountain of that miscarriage, which was the excessive desire of the holy writers to speak figuratively, lest any one should believe Jesus Christ to be God, from the things that really belong to him.
EXERCITATION XXXIII.

OF THE ACTS OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST, THEIR OBJECT, WITH THE TIME AND PLACE OF ITS EXERCISE.

§ 1. The acts and adjuncts of the priesthood of Christ proposed to consideration. The acts of it two in general, oblation and intercession. Variety of concessions in general, ambiguous words, whilst their sense is undetermined. § 2. The true nature of the oblation of Christ. Opinion of the Socinians concerning it. § 3. The nature of his intercession, with their conceptions about it. § 4. Things proposed unto a further discussion. § 5. The time and place of Christ’s susception and discharge of the office of the priesthood. § 6. The first argument for the time of the exercise of this office taken from the concession of the adversaries. § 7. The second from the effect of his sacrifice in making atonement, and the prefiguration thereof in the sacrifices of the law. § 8. Thirdly, from his entrance into heaven as a high priest with respect to the sacrifice he had offered. § 9. Fourthly, other priests who entered not into the sanctuary, types of Christ in their office and sacrificing, vindicated from the exception of Crellius. § 10. The account given of the priesthood of Christ by Valentinus Smalecius examined. § 11. The arguings of Woolzogenius to the same purpose. § 12. The boldness and impiety of Smalecius re proved. § 13. God the immediate object of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ. § 14. Proved and vindicated from the exceptions of Crellius.

§ 1. Having declared and vindicated the nature of the sacerdotal office of our Lord Jesus Christ, it remaineth that we consider the acts of it distinctly, with some of the most important adjuncts of its exercise. And it is not so much the dogmatical declaration of these things that I design, which also hath already been sufficiently discharged, as the vindication of them from the perverse senses put upon them by the Socinians. The general acts of the Lord Christ as the high priest of the church are two, namely, oblation and intercession. These the nature of the office in general doth require, and these are constantly assigned unto him in the Scripture. But concerning the nature, efficacy, season, use, or end of these, there is no agreement between us and the Socinians. And I know not that there is any thing of the like nature fallen out among those who profess themselves to be Christians, wherein persons fully agreeing in the same words and expressions, as they and we do in this matter, should yet really disagree, and that to the greatest extremity of difference about every thing signified by them, as we do herein. And this sufficiently discovers the vanity of all attempts to reconcile the differing parties among Christians by a confession of faith, composed in such general words and terms, as that each party may safely subscribe and declare their assent unto. Neither is the insufficiency of this design relieved by the additional advice, that this confession be composed wholly out of the Scriptures, and of expressions therein used. For it is not an agreement in words and the outward sound of them, but the belief and profession of the same truths or things, that is alone to be valued, all that is beyond such an agreement being left at peace in the province of mutual forbearance. An agreement in words only, parrots may learn; and such an agreement will be better amongst them, than amongst men, because they have no mind to act dissenting and contradicting principles. But for men to declare their assent unto a certain form of words, and in the meantime in their minds and understandings expressly to judge and condemn the faith and apprehensions of one another about these
very things, is a matter that no way tends to the union, peace, or edification of the church. For instance, suppose a form of words expressing in general that Christ was a high priest, that the acts of the priesthood being oblation and intercession, Christ in like manner offered himself to God, and maketh intercession for us, that hereby he purgeth, expiateth, and doth away our sins, with many more expressions to the same purpose, should be drawn up and subscribed by the Socinians and their adversaries, as they can safely do on all hands, will this in the least further any agreement or unity between us, whilst we not only disagree about the sense of all these terms and expressions, but believe that things absolutely distant and inconsistent with one another, yea destructive of one another, are intended in them? But thus it really is between us herein, as the farther consideration of particulars will manifest.

§ 2. First. The oblation of Christ is that act or duty of his sacerdotal office whereby he offered himself, soul and body, or his whole human nature, an expiatory sacrifice to God in his death and blood-shedding, to make atonement for the sins of mankind, and to purchase for them eternal redemption. So that, 1. The nature of the oblation of Christ consisted in a bloody expiatory sacrifice, making atonement for sin, by bearing the punishment due thereunto. And, 2. As to the efficacy of it, it hath procured for us pardon of sin, freedom from the curse, and eternal redemption. 3. The time and place when and wherein Christ as our high priest thus offered himself a sacrifice to God, was in the days of his flesh, whilst he was yet in this world, by his suffering in the garden, but especially on the cross.

For the application of the effects of this oblation of Christ unto the church, and the completing of all that was fore-signified as belonging thereunto, it was necessary that as our high priest he should enter into the holy place, or the presence of God in the heavens, there to represent himself as having done the will of God, and finished the work committed to him; whereon the actual efficacy of his oblation, or the communication of the fruits of it to the church, according to the covenant between the Father and the Son before described, doth depend.

In all these things the Socinians wholly dissent from us; what they conceive about the nature of the office itself hath been already called to an account. For this act or duty of it they apprehend, 1. That the expiatory oblation or sacrifice ascribed to the Lord Christ as a high priest, is nothing but his 'presenting of himself alive,' in the presence of God. This therefore, 2. they say he did after his resurrection, upon his ascension into heaven, when he had revealed the will of God, and testified the truth of his ministry with his death, which was necessary to his ensuing oblation. 3. That his expiation of our sins consists in the exercise of that power which he is intrusted withal upon this offering of himself, to free us from the punishment due unto them. 4. That this presentation of himself in heaven might be called his offering of himself, or an expiatory sacrifice, it was necessary that antecedently thereunto he should die for the ends mentioned. For if he had not so done there would have been no allusion between his care and power in heaven which he exerciseth towards the church, and the actings of the high priest of old in their oblations and sacrifices, and so no sound or reason why what he did and doth should be called the offering of himself. Wherefore this is the substance of what they affirm in this matter. The place of Christ's offering himself was in heaven in the glorious presence of God; the time of it, after his ascension; the nature of it, a presenting himself in the presence of God, as one who, having declared his
name, and done his will, was gloriously exalted by him; the whole efficacy thereof being an effect of that power which Christ hath received as exalted to deliver us from sin.

In this imaginary oblation the death of Christ hath no part nor interest. They say indeed it was previously necessary thereunto; but this seems but a mere pretense, seeing it is not intelligible on their principles how it should so be. For they affirm that Christ did not offer in heaven that very body wherein he suffered on the tree, but a new spiritual body that was prepared for him unto that end. And what necessity is there that one body should suffer and die that another might be presented in heaven. The principal issues whereunto these differences between them and us may be reduced, shall be declared and insisted on.

§ 3. The sacred duty of the priestly office is intercession. How frequently this also is ascribed unto the Lord Christ as a high priest, hath been declared before. Now intercession is of two sorts: 1. Formal and oral. 2. Virtual and real. 1. There is a formal oral intercession, when any one by words, arguments, supplications, with humble earnestness in their use, prevails with another for any good thing that is in his power to be bestowed on himself or others. Of this nature was the intercession of Christ whilst he was on the earth. He dealt with God by prayers and supplications, sometimes with cries and tears, with respect to himself in the work he had undertaken, but principally for the church of his elect, Heb. v. 7; John xvii. This was his intercession as a priest whilst he was on the earth; namely, his interposition with God by prayers and supplications suited unto the state wherein he was, for the application of the benefits of his mediation unto the church, or the accomplishment of the promises made unto him upon his undertaking the work of redemption. 2. Virtual or real intercession differs not in the substance or nature of it from that which is oral and formal, but only in the outward manner of its performance, with respect unto the reasons of it as now accomplished. When Christ was upon the earth, his state and condition rendered it necessary that his intercession should be by way of formal supplications, and that as to the argument of it, it should respect that which was for to come; his oblation, which is both the procuring cause of all good things interceded for, and the argument to be pleaded for their actual communication, being not yet completed. But now in heaven the state and condition of Christ admitting of no oral or formal supplications, and the ground, reason, or argument of his intercession being finished and past, his intercession, as the means of the actual impetration of grace and glory, consists in the real representation of his offering and sacrifice for the procuring of the actual communication of the fruits thereof, unto them for whom he so offered himself. The whole matter of words, prayers, and supplications, yea of internal conceptions of the mind, formed into prayers, is but accidental to intercession, attending the state and condition of him that intercedes. The real entire nature of it consists in the representation of such things as may prevail in the way of motive, or procuring cause, with respect unto the things interceded for. And such do we affirm the intercession of Christ as our high priest in heaven to be.

It is no easy matter to apprehend aright what our adversaries judge concerning this duty of the priesthood of Christ. The expression, they all say, is figurative, and will not allow any real intercession of Christ, although the Scriptures so expressly lay the weight of our consolation, preservation, and salvation thereon, Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25—27; 1 John ii. 2. Neither
are they agreed what is signified by it. That which mostly they agree on, is that it is a word used to declare that the power which Christ exerciseth in heaven was not originally his own, but was granted to him of God, and therefore the good that by virtue thereof he doth to and for the church, is so expressed as if he obtained it of God by intercession. And it is I confess strange to me, that what the Holy Ghost left the weight of our consolation and salvation on, should be no more but a word signifying that the power which Christ exerciseth in heaven for the good of his church, was not originally his own, but was conferred on him by God after his ascension into heaven.

§ 4. From what hath been discoursed, it is evident how great and wide the difference is between us about these things; which yet are the things wherein the life of our faith is concerned. And so resolved are they in their own sentiments, that they will not admit of such terms of reconciliation as may be tendered to them, if in any thing they intrench thereon; for whereas Grotius premised to his discourse on this subject, 'constat nobis ac Socino de voce Christi mortemuisse sacrificium expiatorium, id ipsum clare testante divina ad Hebræos Epistola; 'We are agreed with Socinus as to the name, that the death of Christ was an expiatory sacrifice, as is clearly testified in the Epistle to the Hebrews.' Crellius renounceth any such concessions in Socinus, and tells Grotius how greatly he is mistaken in that supposition, seeing both he and they do perfectly deny that the death of Christ was the expiatory sacrifice mentioned in that Epistle, cap. x. part 1. p. 472. Now it is evident that these things cannot be handled unto full satisfaction without a complete discussion of the true nature of the sacrifice of Christ. But this is not my present design, nor shall I engage in it in these Exercitations. The proper seat of the doctrine thereof is in the 9th and 10th chapters of this Epistle. If God will, and we live to arrive thereunto, all things concerning them shall be handled at large. Only there are some things which belong peculiarly to the office itself under consideration. These we shall separate from what concerns the nature of the sacrifice, and vindicate from the exceptions of our adversaries. And they are referred unto the ensuing heads.

1. The time and place when and where the Lord Christ entered on and principally discharged the office of his priesthood.

2. The immediate proper object of all his sacerdotal actions, which having been stated before must now be vindicated and further confirmed.

3. The special nature of his sacerdotal intercession, which consists in the moral efficacy of his mediation in procuring mercy and grace, and not in a power of conferring them on us.

§ 5. The first thing we are to inquire into is the time and place of the exercise of the priesthood of Christ; and the state of the controversy about them need only to be touched on in this place, as having been before laid down. Wherefore with reference hereunto we affirm.

1. That the Lord Christ was a high priest in the days of his flesh, whilst he was in this world, even as he was also the King and Prophet of the church. 2. That he exercised or discharged this office as to the principal acts and duties of it, especially as to the oblation of his great expiatory sacrifice upon the earth, in his death and the effusion of his blood therein. 3. We say not that the priesthood of Christ was limited or confined to this world, or to the time before his resurrection, but grant that it hath a duration in heaven, and shall have to the end of his mediation. He abideth therefore a priest for ever, as he doth the King of his church. And the
continuance of this office is a matter of singular use and consolation to believers, and as such is frequently mentioned. Wherefore, although he ascended not into heaven to be made a priest, but as a priest, yet his ascension, exaltation, and glorious immortality, or the power of an endless life, were antecedently necessary to the actual discharge of some duties belonging unto that office, as his intercession and the continual application of the fruits and benefits of his oblation.

The Socinians, as hath been declared, comply with us in none of these assertions. For whereas they judge that Christ is then and therein only a priest, when and wherein he offereth himself unto God, this they say he did not until his entrance into heaven upon his ascension, and that there he continueth still so to do. Whilst he was in this world, if we may believe them, he was no priest, nor were any of his duties or actings sacerdotal. But yet to mollify the harshness of this conceit, they grant, that by the appointment of God his temptations, sufferings, and death were antecedently necessary unto this heavenly oblation, and so belong unto his priestly office metonymically. These being the things in difference, how they may be established or invalidated is our next consideration.

Our first argument for the time and place of the exercise of the priesthood of Christ, shall be taken from the judgment and opinion of our adversaries themselves. For if the Lord Christ, whilst he was upon the earth, had power to perform, and did actually perform, all those things wherein they affirm that his sacerdotal office doth consist, then was he a priest at that time and in that place. For the denomination of the office is taken from the power and its exercise. And themselves judge that the priesthood of Christ consisteth solely in a right power and readiness to do the things they ascribe unto him. Neither can any difference be feigned from a distinct manner of the performance of the things so ascribed unto him. In heaven indeed he doth them conspicuously and illustriously; in the earth he did them under sundry concealments. For this altereth not the nature of the things themselves. Sacerdotal actions will be so, whatever various accidents may attend them in the manner of their performance. Now that Christ did all things on the earth which they assign as acts of his sacerdotal office, will appear in the ensuing instances.

1. On the earth he presented himself unto God as one that was ready to do his will, and as one that had done it to the uttermost in the last finishing of his work. This presentation they call his offering himself unto God. And this he doth Heb. x. 7, 'Lo I come to do thy will, O God.' That this was with respect to the obedience which he performed on the earth, is manifest from the place of the Psalmist whence the words are taken. For he so presents himself in them unto God, as one acting a principle of obedience to him in suffering and preaching the gospel. 'I come to do thy will; thy law is written in my heart,' Ps. xl. 8—10. Again, he solemnly offered himself to God on the earth upon the consideration of the accomplishment of the whole work which was committed to him, when he was in the close and finishing of it. And herewithal he made his request to God, that those who believed on him, or should so do to the end of the world, might have all the benefits which God had decreed and purposed to bestow on them through his obedience unto him: which is the full description of the oblation of Christ according to these men; see John xvii. 1—6, &c.

2. On the earth he had and exercised a most tender love and care for his whole church, both his present disciples and all that should believe on him through their word. This they make to be the principal property of this
office of Christ, or rather, from hence it is, namely, his tender care, love, and readiness to relieve, which we cannot apprehend in him under the notion of his kingly power alone, that he is called a high priest, and is so to be looked on. Now whereas two things may be considered in the love or care of Christ towards his church, 1. The evidencing fruits of it, and 2. Its effects; the former were more conspicuous in what he did in this life, than in what he doth in heaven, and the latter every way equal thereto. For, 1. The great evidencing fruit of the love of Christ and his care of his church was in this, that he died for it. This both himself and all the divine writers express and testify to be the greatest fruit and evidence of love; expressly affirming that greater love there cannot be, than what is so expressed, see John x. 14, 15, xv. 13; Rom. v. 6; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25; 1 John iii. 16; Rev. i. 5. If therefore Christ be denominated a high priest because of his love and care towards his church, as he had them in the highest degree, so he gave the greatest evidence of them possible, whilst he was in this world. This he did in dying for it, in giving his life for it, which, in what sense soever it be affirmed, is the highest fruit of love, and so the highest act of his sacerdotal office. 2. The effects of this priestly love and care, they say, consist in the help and aid which he gives to those that believe on him, whereby they may be preserved from evil. But that he did this also on the earth, besides those other instances which may be given thereof, himself also expressly affirms, John xvii. 12, 'Whilst I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept and none of them is lost.'

3. There belongs nothing more to the priesthood of Christ according to these men, but only a power to act what his love and care do incline and dispose him to. And this consists in the actual collation of grace, mercy, pardon of sin, and spiritual privileges on believers. But all these things were effected by him whilst he was in this world. For, 1. He had power on the earth to forgive, or to take away the sins of men, which he put forth accordingly, Matt. ix. 2; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20, vii. 48. And the taking away of sin effectually, is the great sacerdotal act which they ascribe unto him. 2. He conferred spiritual privileges upon them who believed on him. For the greatest thing of this kind and the fountain of all others, is adoption. And unto as many as believed on him 'he gave power to become the sons of God,' John i. 11, 12. 3. Whatever also Christ doth for us of this kind, may be referred either unto his quickening of us with life spiritual, with the preservation of it, or the giving of us right and title to eternal life. But for these things he had power whilst he was on the earth, as he himself expressly declares, John iv. 10, v. 22, vi. 40, x. 18, xi. 35, xiv. 6, xv. 5, xvii. 22. And with respect unto all these things doth he require that we should believe in him and rely upon him.

Besides these three things in general, with what belongs unto them, I do not know what the Socinians ascribe more to the sacerdotal dignity or power of Christ, or the exercise of it, nor what they would require more, but that the name and title of the high priest of the church, may be ascribed unto him in their way, that is, metaphorically. For although they set those things off with the specious titles of expiating or purging our sins, of the offering of himself unto God, of intercession, and the like names, as real sacerdotal acts, yet it is evident that no more is intended by them, than we have expressed under these heads. And if they shall say otherwise, let them give an instance of any one thing which they ascribe unto him as a priest, and if we prove not that it is reducible to one of these heads, 'we will forego
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this argument. Wherefore upon their own principles they cannot deny, but that the Lord Christ was as really and truly a priest whilst he was on the earth, as he is now in heaven.

§ 7. Secondly. Let it be farther remembered, that we plead only Christ to have been a priest, and offered sacrifice on the earth, quoad ἀποστολή, as to propitiation, or the expiation of sin; granting on the other side, that he is still so in heaven quoad ἐρωτισμόν, as to appearance and representation. Wherefore, whatever our adversaries do, or can ascribe to the Lord Christ as a priest, which in any sense, or by virtue of any allusion, can be looked on as a sacerdotal act, is by us acknowledged and ascribed unto him. That which is in controversy ariseth from their denial of what he did on the earth, or of his being a high priest before his ascension into heaven, which is now farther to be confirmed.

When and where he made reconciliation and atonement for us or for our sins, then and there he was a priest. I do not know that it is needful to confirm this proposition. For we intend no more by acting of the priest's office, but the making atonement for sin by sacrifice. He hath power and right so to do, is a priest by the call and appointment of God. And that herein principally consists the acting the sacerdotal power, we have the consent of the common sense of mankind. Nor is this expressly denied by the Socinians themselves. For it was the principal, if not the sole end, why such an office was ordained in the world, Heb. v. 1. But this was done by the Lord Christ whilst he was on the earth. For he made atonement for us by his death. Among other testimonies to this purpose, that of our apostle is irrefragable, Rom. v. 10. 'For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.' He distributes the mediatory actings of Christ on our behalf, into his death and his life. And the life which he intends is that which ensued after his death. So it is said 'He died, and rose, and lived again,' Rom. xiv. 9. 'He was dead and is alive,' Rev. i. 18. For he leads in heaven a mediatory life to make intercession for us, whereby we are saved, Heb. vii. 26. Upon this distribution of the mediatory actings of Christ, our reconciliation to God is peculiarly assigned to his death. When we were enemies we were 'reconciled to God by the death of his Son.' Reconciliation is sometimes the same with atonement, Heb. ii. 17; sometimes it is put for the immediate effects of it. And in this place the apostle declares, that our being reconciled, and receiving the atonement, are the same. Καταλλαγέντες, τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν, Rom. v. 10, 11. But to make atonement and reconciliation is the work of a priest. Unless this be acknowledged, the whole instructive part of the Old Testament must be rejected. For the end of the priest's office, as we observed, was to make atonement or reconciliation. And that this was done by the death of Christ the apostle doth here expressly affirm. He slew the enmity, made peace, reconciled Jews and Gentiles unto God in one body by the cross, Eph. ii. 15, 16. Our adversaries would have the reconciliation intended to be only on our part, or the reconciling us to God, not on the part of God, or his reconciliation to us. But as this is false, so it is also as to our present argument impertinent. For we dispute not about the nature of reconciliation, but the cause and time of making it. Whatever be the especial nature of it, it is an effect of sacerdotal actings. Nor is this denied by our adversaries, who plead that our conversion to God depends on Christ's offering himself to God in heaven, as the effect on the cause. And this reconciliation, whatever its especial nature be, is directly ascribed to the death of
Christ. Therein therefore, was he a priest and offered sacrifice. Besides the especial nature of the reconciliation made by the death of Christ is sufficiently declared. For we are so reconciled by Christ, as that our sins are not imputed to us, 2 Cor. v. 19, 21, and that because they were imputed to him, when he was made a curse for us, Gal. iii. 13, when he hung on the tree and bare our sins in his own body thereon, 1 Pet. ii. 24. And then he gave himself λυτρον 'a ransom,' Matt. x. 28, αυτελυτρον, 1 Tim. ii. 6, 'a price of redemption' for us; and his soul was made a sin-offering, Isa. lii. 10, that is, sacrificium pro reatu nostro, 'a sacrifice for the expiation of our guilt.' And this he did as the sponsor, or surety, or the mediator of the new covenant, Heb. ix. 15, and therefore he must do it either as the King, or as a Prophet, or as the Priest of the church, for within those offices, and their actings is his mediation circumscribed. But it is manifest that these things belong unto neither of the former. For in what sense can he be said to pay a price of redemption for us in the shedding his blood, or to make his soul an offering for sin, to make reconciliation by being made sin and a curse for us, as he was a King, or the Prophet. In like manner, and to the same purpose, we are said to have redemption in or by his blood, even the forgiveness of sin, Eph. i. 7, to be justified by his blood, Rom. v. 9; Col. i. 14; 1Pet. i. 18. Now redemption, forgiveness, and justification consisting, according to our adversaries, in our deliverance from the punishment due to sin, it is an effect, as they also acknowledge, of the sacerdotal actings of Christ. But they are all said to be by his blood which was shed on the earth. Besides it is in like manner acknowledged, that the Lord Christ was both priest and sacrifice; for as it is constantly affirmed, he offered himself, Eph v. 2; Heb. ix. 14. And he was a sacrifice when and wherein he was a propitiation. For propitiation is the end and effect of a sacrifice. So the apostle distributes his sacerdotal actings into propitiation and intercession, 1 John ii. 1, 2. His making oblation and being a propitiation are the same. And wherein God made him a propitiation, therein he was our propitiation. But this was in his death. 'For God set him forth to be a propitiation in his blood, Rom. iii. 25. Our faith therefore respecting Christ as proposed of God to be a propitiation, that is, making atonement for us by sacrifice, considers him as shedding his blood to that end and purpose.

§ 8. Thirdly. The Lord Christ entered into the holy place, that is, heaven itself as a High Priest, and that with respect to what, as a High Priest, he had done before. For when the apostle teacheth the entrance of Christ into heaven, by the entrance of the high priest into the sanctuary, as that which was a prefiguration thereof, he instructs us in the manner of it. Now the high priest was already in office, completely a high priest before his entrance into the holy place, and was not admitted unto his office thereby, as they pretend the Lord Christ to have been, by his entrance into heaven. Yea, had he not been a High Priest before that entrance, he would have perished for it; for the law was, that none should so enter but the high priest. And not only so, but he was not, on pain of death, at any time to go into the sanctuary, but with immediate respect to the preceding solemn discharge of his office. For he was not to enter into it, but only after he had as a priest slain and offered the expiatory sacrifice, some of the blood whereof he carried into the holy place, to complete and perfect the atonement. Now, if the Lord Christ were not a priest before his entrance into heaven, if he did not enter thereinto with respect unto, and on account of the sacrifice, which he had offered before without the holy place in his death and blood-
shedding, all the analogy that is between the type and the antitype, all that is instructive in those old institutions, is utterly destroyed, and the apostle illustrating these things one by another, doth lead us unavoidably into mis-apprehension of them. For whosoever shall read, that as the high priest entered into the holy place, with the blood of bulls and goats which he had sacrificed without, to appear in the presence of God; in like manner, Jesus Christ the High Priest of the church, called of God unto that office by the one sacrifice of himself, or by his own blood, entered into the holy place in heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us, will understand that he was a high priest, and offered his sacrifice before he so entered into the heavenly sanctuary, or he must offer violence to the plain open sense of the instruction given unto him.

§ 9. Fourthly. Other priests, who never entered into the sanctuary, were in their office and the execution of it, types of Christ, which if he were not a priest on earth, nor thereon offered his sacrifice or executed his office, they could not be. For nothing they did, represented the appearance of Christ in heaven. And this is evident in his principal type Melchisedec. For he did so eminently represent him above Aaron and his successors, as that he is peculiarly called a priest after his order. Now Melchisedec discharged his office entirely, and an end was put to his priesthood, before there was any sanctuary erected to be a resemblance of the holy place, whereunto Christ our high priest was to enter. And whereas our adversaries say that he is called a high priest, because of an allusion that was between what he doth for the church, and what was done by them, if his priesthood and sacrifice consisted in his entrance into heaven, and presenting or offering himself there in glory to God, there was no allusion at all between it, and what was done by him, whom the Scripture expresseth as his principal type, namely, this Melchisedec, who had no sanctuary to enter into, whereby there might be an allusion between what he did, and what was done by Jesus Christ. Moreover, all the priests according to the law, in all their sacrifices, especially those that were solemn and stated for the whole people, were types of Christ. For whereas the original institution of all expiatory sacrifices, or sacrifices to make atonement for sin, was merely with respect unto, and to presign the sacrifice which Christ was to offer, without which, they would have been of no use nor signification, nor had ever been instituted, as being a kind of worship no way suiting the divine nature, without this relation; and whereas the Lord Christ with respect to them is called the 'Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,' and a 'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' as I have proved elsewhere, the priests that offered these sacrifices must of necessity be types of him in his.

Crellius replies hereunto; 'Vult Socinus 1. publica et stata sacrificia, atque imprimit anniversarium, figuram fuisset sacrificii Christi; cetera vero sacrificiorum nostrorum spiritualium. 2. Nam et nos istiusmodi sacrificio, quibus intervenientibus, peecata expiantur, seu remissio peccatorum ex Dei benignitate obtinetur, offerimus, 3. Sacerdotem etiam summum esse verum Christi summii sacerdotis typum, 4. caeteros vulgares sacerdotes nobis qui etiam sacerdotes sumus, censet respondere; qua de re mirum est si quisquam dubitet,' cap. 10, ad Grot. part. 21, p. 413.

1. It is acknowledged, that other stated and solemn sacrifices besides the anniversary expiation, were types of the sacrifice of Christ. But these were offered by the ordinary priests, as Num. xxviii. 15, 22, 30, xxix. 5, 11, 16, 19, 22, and were completed without the holy place, no entrance into it ensuing thereon. For they consisted entirely in the death and blood-shedding
of the sacrifices themselves, with their oblation on the altar. How then could they typify Christ and his sacrifice, if that consisted not at all in his death and blood-shedding which they did represent; but in his entrance into heaven, and presenting himself there unto God, which they did not represent at all. This concession, therefore, that the sacrifice of Christ was typified by any sacrifices, whereof no part nor remembrance was carried into the sanctuary, destroys the whole hypothesis of our adversaries. 2. Nothing that we do is in any sense such a sacrifice as whereby sin is expiated. And although our faith is the means, whereby we are interested in the one sacrifice of Christ, by which our sins are expiated once for ever, and we thereby, according to God's appointment, obtain the forgiveness of our sins; yet no duties of ours are any where called sacrifices, but such as are fruits of gratitude for the pardon of sin received by virtue of that one sacrifice of Christ. 3. The high priest was a true real type of Christ, but not his only type; Melchisedec was so also; and so were all the ordinary priests of the house of Aaron, who served at the altar. 4. He is greatly mistaken in his last assertion, whereof he gives no other proof, but only 'qua de re mirum est si quisquam dubitet.' And this is, that the 'priests under the law were types of all Christians, and their sacrifices of ours; and that this belongeth unto the economy of the new covenant.' For I do not only doubt of it, but also expressly deny it, and that on such grounds as will leave no cause for admiration in any sober person. For, 1. All the priests of the house of Aaron, were of the very same office with the high priest. Aaron and his sons were at the same time called to the same office, and set apart in the same manner, Exod. xxviii. 1, xxix. 9. If, therefore, the high priest were in his office the type of Christ, the other priests in their office could not be types of us, unless we have the same office with Christ himself, and are made mediators with him. 2. The sacrifices offered by the other priests, were of the same nature with that or those which were offered by the high priest himself. For although the entrance once a-year into the holy place was peculiar unto him, yet he had no sacrifice of any especial kind, as burnt-offering, sin-offering, or trespass-offering, peculiar unto him, but the other priests offered the same. If, therefore, the sacrifice of the high priest, was a type of the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrifices of the other priests could not be types of ours, unless they are of the same kind with that of Christ, which is not yet affirmed. 3. The truth is, the whole people under the law were types of believers under the gospel, in the highest of their privileges; and therefore the priests were not so. We are now kings and priests; and the apostle Peter expressing this privilege, 1 Pet. ii. 5, doth it in the words spoken of the body of the people or church of old, Exod. xix. 6. Nothing, therefore, is more vain than this supposition.

Fifthly. The principal argument whereby we prove that Christ was a priest on the earth is taken from the nature of the sacrifice which he offered as a priest. But whereas this cannot be duly managed without a full consideration and debate of all the properties, ends, and concernsments of that sacrifice, which is not our present subject nor design, it must, as it was intimated before, be remitted to its proper place.

§ 10. It remaineth that we consider the pretences and pleas of our adversaries in the defence of their opinion. It is that, I confess, which they have no concern in for its own sake, being only a necessary consequent of their judgment, concerning the office of the priesthood itself. Wherefore, for that the most part they content themselves with a bare denial that he was a priest on the earth, the proof of their negation they mixed with the
description of the office, and its discharge. Wherefore, to show how little they are able to prove what they pretend to, I shall represent their plea in the words of one of the chief masters of that sect, that the reader may see what is the true state of the controversy between them and us in this matter, which they industriously endeavour to conceal, and then consider their proofs in particular. This is Valentinus Smalcis in his book de Regno Christ. cap. 23, which is, De Christi sacerdotio, whose words ensue.

‘Deinde considerandum etiam est 1. totam hanc rem, quae per sacerdotii vocabulum in Christo describitur, esse figuratum, qua scilicet explicantur ca que sub veteri fædere olim extabant.’ Quemadmodum enim sub veteri fædere Deus pontifices esse voluit 2. qui causam populi apud Deum agerent: sic etiam quia Jesus Christus causam populi divini in coelo agit, ideo ipse sacerdos, et hoc opus illius sacerdotium, appellantur. Potest hoc totum ex eo apparere si consideretur in sola quodammodo Epist. ad Hebr. Christi quatenus sacerdos est et sacerdotii ejus mentionem fieri; Et tamen impossibile est alios Apostolos in suis scriptis rei tam insignis, sine qua Christi dignitas consistere nequit, nullam mentionem facere.’

Answ. 1. It is not much that I shall observe on these words, and shall therein principally respect the perpetual sophistry of these men. It is somewhat plain, indeed, that all things spoken about the priesthood of Christ are figurative, and nothing real or proper. And, therefore, he speaks of it as a thing utterly of another nature that is intended, only in Christ it is described per sacerdotii vocabulum, ‘by this word the priesthood.’ But the sober Christian reader will judge, whether there be nothing but a mere occasional abuse of that word intended by the Holy Ghost, in that full, and large description which he hath given us of this office of Christ, its duties, acts, adjuncts, and exercise, with the importance of these things unto our faith and consolation. 2. Who would not think that those expressions, first concerning the high priest, qui causam populi apud Deum ageret, ‘who should deal with God on the behalf of the people;’ and that concerning Christ, qui causam populi divini in coelo agit, ‘who pleads the holy people’s cause in heaven,’ were so far equivalent, especially the one being produced in the illustration of the other, as that the thing signified should, if not be of the same kind, yet at least some way or other agree? But no such matter is intended. For in the first proposition, God is expressly asserted to be the immediate object of the sacerdotal actings of the high priest under the law, according to the Scripture; but in the latter, ‘causam populi in coelo agit,’ which is ascribed unto Christ, nothing is intended but the exercise of his love and power in heaven towards his people for their relief, which is a thing quite of another nature. By these contrary senses of seemingly equivalent expressions, all analogy between the old priesthood and that of Christ, is utterly destroyed. 3. It is falsely pretended, that this office of Christ is not formally mentioned by other divine writers, besides the apostle in this Epistle to the Hebrews. He is expressly called a priest in Old Testament prophecy, and all acts of this office are expressly mentioned and declared in sundry other places of the New Testament, which have been before produced. And although it becomes not us to call the Spirit of God to an account, or to expect an express reason to be assigned why he teacheth and revealeth any truth, more directly and expressly in one place of the Scripture than in another, it being an article of our faith that what he doth, he doth wisely, and on the most rational motives; yet we are not altogether in the dark as to the reason, why the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ
was more openly and plainly taught in this Epistle, than in any other place of Scripture. It was the prefiguration of it, and preparation for it, which the church of the Hebrews had received in their Mosaical institution, which was the occasion hereof. For whereas the whole economy of their priesthood and sacrifices had no other end or use, but to prefigure and represent those of the Lord Christ; upon his coming, and the accomplishment of what was typified by them, they were to cease and to be removed out of the church. But these Hebrews by the long use of them, had contracted an inveterate persuasion that they had an excellency, use, and efficacy in the worship of God upon their own account, and were therefore still to be continued and observed. On this occasion the declaration of the nature and use of the priesthood of Christ in the church, was not only opportune and seasonable, but necessary and unavoidable. It was so, that those Hebrews who did sincerely believe the gospel, and yet supposed that the old legal institutions were in force, and obligatory, might be delivered from so pernicious an error. And in like manner it was necessary with respect to them, who being satisfied in their cessation and removal, were to be instructed in what was the design of God in their institution, and what was their use; whereby they might at once discern, that they were not a mere burden of chargeable and useless outward observances, and yet how great and excellent a glory was exhibited in their stead, now under the gospel. Besides, whereas God was now giving up the whole Scripture to the use of the church, what better season or occasion could be taken, to declare the harmony and relation that is between the Old Testament and the New; the analogy between the institutions of the one and the other; the preparations that were made in the shadows of the one, for the introduction of the substance of the other; and so at once to present a scheme of divine wisdom and grace in both; than this of the instruction of this church of the Hebrews in their translation out of the one state into the other, which was peculiar to them, and wherein the Gentiles had no share. These things, I say, (with holy submission to the sovereign will and wisdom of the Holy Ghost) rendered this time and place most convenient, for the fixing and stating the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ in a peculiar manner.

But our author adds; 'Quod igitur ipse Christus cum adhuc mortalis esset, promisit, se futurum cum suis singulis diebus usque ad consummationem seculi; se eos non relicturum orphans, sed eis daturum os et sapientiam cujus nemo possit resistere. Et quod idem ex mortuis resuscitatus dixit Johanni, ne metuas, ecce vivo in secula seculorum; et divo Paulo, ne metuas sed loquere et non tace, quia ego tecum sum; quod denique apud Apostolos est, Jesum Christum caput esse Ecclesiae et Ecclesiam esse ejus corpus. Ecclesiam ab eo foveri, Christum nos liberare a futura ira, hoc est, autore Epistolae ad Hebraeos, Jesum Christum pontificem nostrum esse.' Add hereunto what he instructs us in a little afterwards. 'Ipse Christus et sacerdos factus est et oblatio; hoc est absque figuris loquendo; Quando Christus in coelum ascendens factus est immortalis, et cum Deo habitare cæpit in loco illo sanctissimo, cæpit nostræ salutis curam talem gerere, qualem se gesturum antea promiserat.'

Answ. This is in some measure plain dealing, and needful to the cause wherein these men are engaged. For although no great matter at first view seems to be contained herein, yet upon the truth of what he avers, depends all the opposition they make to the real sacrifice and satisfaction of Christ. Hence, therefore, it is evident, what is the true state of the controversy between these men and us, about the priesthood of Christ. It is not, in-
deed, about the nature of that office, nor about the time and place of its exercise, though they needlessly compel us to treat about them also. But the sole question is, whether Christ have any such office or not. For if this be all they grant, which this man asserts, as indeed it is, namely, 'that the Lord Christ, upon the account of some actings of his, which are no one of them properly or peculiarly sacerdotal, is only called an high priest figuratively, by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews,' then indeed he neither hath, nor ever had any such office at all. And this is the true state of our controversy with them, and with all by whom the satisfaction of Christ is denied, namely, whether Christ be the high priest of the church or not. And herein the Holy Ghost himself must answer for us and our profession.

This then is the substance of what they intend. The power, love, and care which the Lord Christ exerciseth in heaven towards his church, makes him to be figuratively called our high priest, and in the same manner to be said to offer himself to God. But whence then comes it to pass, that whereas, according to the notion and understanding that is given us in Scripture, of the nature of priest and sacrifice, suited to the apprehension of all mankind about them, and which they answer or they are nothing, there is no similitude or likeness between them and what Christ was and did, that they are expressed by these terms which are apt to lead unto thoughts of things quite of another kind, than, as it seems, are intended? Why this, saith Smalcius, was 'ex nimio figurate loquendi studio,' 'out of an excessive desire in the holy writers to speak figuratively;' an account which neither any wise man will, nor good man ought to be satisfied with. And yet, according to Smalcius, they much fail in their design. For whereas no wise man doth ever use figurative expressions, unless he judge them necessary to set off the things he intends to express, and to strengthen the apprehension of them, it has, if we may believe this author, unhappily fallen out otherwise with the writers of the New Testament in this matter. For instead of heightening or enlarging the things which they intended, by all their figurative expressions they do but lessen or diminish them. For so he informs us; 'Hoc tum ob alias causas, tum ob hanc etiam hic primum annotare voluimus, ut sciamus in istis figurate loquendi modis, quantumvis fortasse cuipiam videri possit, Christo summam in eis praestantiam tribui; tamen minus ei tribui quam res est.' No man certainly could ever have steered a more unhappy course. For no doubt they designed to express the excellency of Christ, and the usefulness of his mediation, in these things unto the church. But in the pursuit of it, they wholly omit those plain and proper expressions whereby they might have fully declared it, to the comfort of the church and the establishment of our faith; and betake themselves absolutely unto such figurative expressions, as whereby the dignity of Christ is diminished, and less is ascribed unto him than is due. Certainly men have been in the use of making very bold with the Scriptures and their own consciences, who can satisfy themselves with such imaginations.

But yet when all is done, all this, as hath been manifested before, will not serve the turn, nor disprove our assertion, that the Lord Christ was a priest whilst on the earth; for all the things which they thus ascribe to him, were then discharged by him. Wherefore we shall further consider what direct opposition they make hereunto.

§ 11. It is no matter at all whom we fix upon to call to an account herein. Their wits are barren in a peculiar manner on this subject, so that they all say the same things one after another, without any considerable
variation. The reader, if he please, may satisfy himself herein by consulting Socinus, Volkelius, Ostorodus, Smalcius, Moscorovius, Crellius, and Slichtingius, in the places before cited. I shall therefore confine myself to him who hath last appeared in the defence of this cause, and who seems to have put the newest gloss upon it. This is Lud. Woolzogen, in his Compend. Relig. Christianæ, Sect. 51, whose words ensue.

'Præterea etiam hoc nobis paucis attingendum est, quod sacerdotale Christi munus non bene intelligant illi qui statuunt, Christum sacrificium expiatorium pro peccatis nostris in cruce peregisse et absolvisse. Nam in vetei faedere, cujus (1) sacrificia fuere typi sacrificii Christi, non fuit factum sacrificium (2) expiatorium in maclatione victima seu pecudis, sed tantum fuit praeparatio quædam ad sacrificium. Verum in eo (3) consistebat sacrifìciun, quando Pontifex Maximus cum sanguine ingrediebatur in Sanctum Sanctorum, atque (4) eum Deo offerebat et sacrificabat. Sacrificare enim proprìe non est (5) mactare, sed offerre et Deo sacrare.'

Answ. 1. It is acknowledged, that the sacrifices under the Old Testament were types of the sacrifice of Christ, that is, all of them were so which were expiatory, or appointed to make atonement. Although therefore these men are wary, yet they stand in such an unstable and slippery place, as that they often reel and betray themselves. For if all expiatory sacrifices were types of the sacrifice of Christ, most of them being perfect and complete without carrying any of their blood into the sanctuary, that of Christ must be so before his entrance into heaven. 2. For what he affirms of the expiatory sacrifice, that is the anniversary sacrifice on the day of expiation, that it consisted not in the slaying of the sacrifice, which was only a certain preparation thereunto, is either sophistical or false. It is sophistical, if by 'mactatio pecudis' he intends only the single act of slaying the sacrifice; for so it is granted that was not the entire sacrifice, but only a part of it; the oblation of it on the altar was also required to its perfection. But it is false if he intend thereby all that was done in the offering of the beast, namely its adduction to the altar, its maclation, the effusion of its blood, the sprinkling thereof, the laying of the offering on the altar, the consumption of it by fire, all which belonged thereto. All these things, even all that preceded the entrance of the high priest into the holy place, are distinguished from what was done afterwards, and are to be considered under that head which he calls, the slaying of the victim. But then his assertion is false, for the sacrifice consisted therein, as we have proved. 3. That the expiatory sacrifice did not consist in the entrance and appearance of the high priest in the holy place, with the blood of the beast offered, is manifest from hence; because he was commanded to offer the beast in sacrifice before his entrance into the sanctuary, which was a consequent of the sacrifice itself, and represented the effects of it. 4. That the high priest sacrificed the blood unto God, as he affirms, in the sanctuary, is an assertion that hath no countenance given to it in the Scripture, nor hath it so from any common notion concerning the nature of sacrifices; and the atonement that is said to be made for the holy place by the sprinkling of the blood towards the mercy-seat, was effected by the sacrifice as offered before, whereof that ceremony was a sign and token. 5. That to sacrifice and to slay are the same in the original, so as that both those actions, that is, sacred and common slaying, are expressed ofttimes by the same word, 'I have before demonstrated. But withal I grant, that to a complete sacrifice, the ensuing oblation on the altar was also required. Hence was the sacrifice offered and consecrated to God.
But he endeavours to confirm his assertion with some testimonies of our apostle. 'Et hoc est quod ait autor Epistolae ad Hebraeos; (1) In secundum tabernaculum (id est in sanctissimum sacrarium) semel quotannis solus pontifex, non absque sanguine ingreditur, quem offert 'pro seipso et pro populi ignorantiiis, Heb. ix. 7, quibus verbis elucet Pontificem Maximum tum demum sacrificasse, et obtulisse, quando sanguinem intulit in Sanctissimum Sanctuarium, et cum eo coram Deo apparuit. Hic apparitio ac oblatio, demum (2) expiatio et redemption a, peccatis censenda est. Ita igitur in Christo quoque, qui et Pontifex Maximus et simul etiam victima esse debuit, maestatis corporis ejus in cruce nihil aliud quam praeparatio fuit ad verum sacrificium. Sacrificium autem ipsum peractum est tum, cum in Sanctuarium Cælestem ingressus est cum proprio sanguine suo, ibique Deo seipsum tanquam victimam obtulit et exhibuit, necon tanquam aeter-nus Pontifex pro nobis apud Deum intercedit, nostram expiationem pro-curat.'

Aansw. 1. I understand not the force of the proof from this testimony, to the purpose of our author. The high priest did enter into the holy place with the blood of the sacrifice. What will thence ensue? Had it been common blood before, and now first consecrated unto God, something might be collected thence in compliance with his design. But it was the blood of the sacrifice, which was dedicated and offered unto God before; the blood of the sacrifice that was slain, which was only carried into the most holy place and sprinkled there, as the representation of its virtue and efficacy. In like manner, Jesus Christ the Lamb of God that was slain and sacrificed for us, after he had, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself unto God, procuring thereby redemption for us in his blood, entered into heaven, there in the presence of God to represent the virtue of his oblation, and by his intercession (prefigured not by the offering, but by the sprinkling of blood) to make application thereof unto us. 2. Redemption did in no sense follow the appearance of the high priest in the most holy place typically, nor the entrance of the Lord Christ into heaven really; but it is constantly assigned to his death and blood-shedding, which invincibly proves that therein also there his oblation of himself did consist; see I Pet. i. 18, 19. Expiation may be considered either in respect of imputation or of application. In the first regard, it did not follow, but precede the entrance of the priest into the holy place; for the sacrifice was offered without to make atonement for sin; and the same atonement was made in sundry sacrifices, the blood of which was never sprinkled in the holy place. In the latter sense alone it may be said to follow it, which we contend not about.

His next testimony is from Heb. ix. 11, 12, the words whereof he only recites, without attempting any improvement or application of them. 'But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.'

Had he attempted any proof from these words, he would have found himself at a loss where to have fixed the argument. Wherefore he contents himself with the bare sound of the words, supposing that may seem to favour his pretension. For it is plain from this text, 1. That Christ entered into heaven as our high priest, and not that he might become such; which is sufficient to scatter all his imaginations about this office of
his. 2. That he entered into heaven by his own blood, which was shed and poured out in his sacrifice before that entrance; for really he carried no blood with him, as the high priest did of old, but only was accompanied with the efficacy and virtue of that which was shed before. 3. He is said to have obtained eternal redemption before his entrance into heaven, that being expressed as past upon his entrance, which invincibly proves, that his sacrifice was antecedent thereto.

His last testimony is Heb. viii. 4, which most of them make use of as their shield and buckler in this cause. 'For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.' But the plain design and intention of the apostle allows them no relief from these words. He had proved invincibly, that the Lord Christ was to be a high priest; and had shown in some instances the nature of that office of his. Here, to confirm what he had so declared, he lays it down by the way of concession, that if there were no other priesthood but that which is earthly and carnal, or which belonged to the Judaical church, he could not have been a priest at all, which yet he had proved that it was necessary he should be. And the reason of this concession he adds, from the possession of that office by the priests of the house of Aaron, in a manner which was peculiar and exclusive, as ver. 5. Hence it unavoidably ensues, that he must have a priesthood of another kind, or different from that of Aaron, which he expressly asserts as his conclusion, ver. 6. A priest he must be: a priest after the order of them who offered gifts according to the law, he could not be; and therefore he had another and therefore a more excellent priesthood.

§ 12. Under these testimonies, which are commonly pleaded by them all, to deprive the Lord Christ of this office, at least whilst he was on the earth, I shall add the consideration of one with the argument from it, which I find not insisted on by any of them but Smalcius alone. De Reg. Chr. cap. 23. ‘Hanc Christi oblationem Autor Epistolae ad Hebræos volens innuere, et aperte demonstrare eam tum denuo esse perfectam cum Christus in celum ascendit, ait; talem decebat nos habere Pontificem, sanctum, labe carentem, impollutum, segregatum a peccatoribus, et excelsiorum coelis factum; et paulo infra ait; Jesum Christum semetipsum Deo immaculatum obtulisse per spiritum æternum; intelligens per ista epitheta, sancti, labe carentis, impolluti, segregati a peccatoribus, et innocentis, non Christi sanctitatem quoad mores; hac enim semper perfecte Christus fuit præditus, etiam, antequam pontifex noster factus est; sed eam sanctitatem quae Christi naturam respicit. Quæ Christi natura, quandiu in terris fuit, qui fratribus per omnia fuit assimilatus, infirmitati et mortalitati obnoxia fuit; nunc vero ab ea in omnem æternitatem libera est.’

Ansv. 1. These properties of holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, which the apostle ascribes unto our Lord Jesus as our high priest, Heb. vii. 26, as also his offering himself without spot, ch. ix. 14, this man ascribes to Christ as exalted in heaven, in contradistinction to what he was whilst on the earth, namely, because he was so holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, in heaven. Now, if it doth not hence follow, that he was impure, defiled, guilty, like other sinners whilst he was on the earth, yet it doth undeniably, and that is the matter contended for, that he was not holy, harmless, and undefiled, in the sense here intended by the apostle. How this can be freed from open blasphemy, I am not able to discern.

2. He is not secured by his ensuing distinction, that the Lord Christ was
before whilst on the earth perfectly holy as to his manners, but that the epithets here used respect his nature. For not to assign all these properties unto the nature of Christ from the instant of his conception, or to deny them to belong thereto, is no less contrary to the Scripture, and really blasphemous, than to deny him to have been holy with respect to his life and conversation. For he was the Holy Thing that was born of the Virgin, and as he was born of her by virtue of the miraculous creation and sanctification of his nature in the womb, whereof I have treated elsewhere at large.

3. Here is a supposition included, that all the difference between Christ and us, whilst he was in this world, consisted only in the use of his freedom unto the perfect obedience wherein we fail and come short. That his nature was absolutely holy and impeccable, ours sinful and defiled, is cast out of consideration; and yet to deny this difference between him and us, is no less blasphemous than what we before rejected.

4. Christ in this world was indeed obnoxious to sufferings, and death itself, as having a nature on that account like to his brethren in all things. To suppose that he was obnoxious to infirmity and mortality, because he was not yet holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, is injurious to his person, and derogatory from his love. For it was not from the necessity of his own condition in human nature, that he was exposed to sufferings or to death, but he became so by voluntary condescension for our sakes, Phil. ii. 5—8. We are obnoxious to these things on our own account, he only on ours.

5. In the death of Christ, when he shed his blood, he was αμνος αμωμος και ασπιλος, 'a Lamb without spot and without blemish,' 1 Pet. i. 19, as he is said to offer himself, αρμονον τη θεο, 'without spot to God,' Heb. ix. 14. He was therefore no less so before and in his death than after. It is indeed surprising, to be put by one professing himself a Christian, to the work of proving the Lord Christ to have been in his entire nature in this world, holy and harmless.

6. He doth not in the least relieve himself from those impieties, by his ensuing discourses on Eph. v. 26, 27, that he 'might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word; that he might present unto himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.' He contends that the making of the church holy and without blemish in this place, concerns its glorified state, because it is therewithal said to be a glorious church. In the same sense, therefore, as he affirmeth, is Christ said to be holy when he was glorified, and not before. But he adds herein to the weight and number of his preceding enormities. For in what sense soever the church is said to be made holy, or to be sanctified, whether it be in grace, or as instated in glory, it is so by being washed and cleansed from the spots, stains, and filth, which originally it had. But to ascribe such a sanctification or making holy to the Lord Christ, is the highest blasphemy imaginable.

We may, therefore, firmly conclude, with the whole church of God, according to the Scripture, and the nature of the thing itself, that the Lord Christ was a priest, and executed his priestly office whilst he was on the earth, even then when he offered up himself to God, with strong cries and supplications, at his death on the cross.

§ 13. That which yet remains, as belonging to our present design, is the consideration of the direct and immediate object of the sacerdotal actings of Christ, or the exercising his mediatory power by virtue of his priestly
office. This we have declared before, and proved, namely, that it is God himself. Our meaning is, that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the high priest of
the church, acts on its behalf with God, doing those things which are to be
done with him, according to the covenant before explained. As a king and
prophet, he acts in the name of God towards us; as a priest, he acts towards
God on our behalf. This, the whole economy of the Aaronical priesthood
doeth confirm, and the very nature of the great duties of this office, oblation
and intercession, do necessarily infer. Doth Christ offer himself in sacrifi-
cence unto God or unto us? Doth he intercede with God or us? It is no
small evidence of the desperate cause of our adversaries, that they are forced
to put uncouth and horrid senses on these sacerdotal duties, to accommodate
them to their sentiments. So, after that Smalcius had told us, that these
things were thus expressed in Scripture, 'ex nimio figure at loquendi studio,'
so traducing the wisdom and sobriety of the penmen thereof, he adds in the
explication of that figurative expression, as he would have it, of Christ's
intercession: 'Cum igitur de Christo dicitur eum pro nobis interpellare,
aliud nihil dicitur, quam eum potestia illa sua sibi data, curam nostrri gerere.'
It is not easily conceivable how a greater violence can be offered to a sacred
expression. By such interpretations, it is impossible to put an orthodox
sense on all the writings of Smalcius. But in the vindication of his expo-
sition of Christ's intercession, he adds, 'That the power which Christ exer-
ciseth in his care of the church, and all his actions towards it, he received
of God, and therefore, in the use of it, he is said to make intercession for
us;' that is, he doth one thing, and is said to do another. What he doth,
is not said, namely, that he acts in his power towards the church; and what
he doth not, that he is said to do, namely, to make intercession with God
for us. The arguments whereby we confirm the truth asserted, have been
before declared and confirmed. Wherefore, to put a close to this whole
disputation, and to give the reader a specimen of the subtilty and perpetual
tergiversation of our adversaries in this cause, wherein also, occasion will
be administered farther to explain sundry things relating unto this office of
Christ, I shall examine strictly the whole discourse of Crellius on this sub-
ject, and therein, give a peculiar instance of the sophistical ability of these
men, in evading the force of arguments and testimonies from the Scripture.

§ 14. Grotius proves, that the first actings of Christ as a priest, were
towards God, from Heb. v. 1, and ch. viii. 3, whereunto Crellius replies,
cap. 10, part 3, p. 474. 'Postrema hece verba ita sunt comparata, ut per
se Socini sententiae non repugnat, Grotium nil juvent. Fatetur enim
Socinus quoque et satis clare docet Auctor D. Heb. ii. 17, actionem Christi
qua sacerdos est, et sic ejus sacrificium expiatorium esse ex eorum numero
quae pro homine fiant apud Deum; ut alia hic deductione, cum de Christi
sacriiciio quaeratur, non fuerit opin. De sensu ergo quaeritur, cum de verbis
constat.'

Answ. 1. The agreement which he pretends between Grotius and himself
in this matter, as to the words of the apostle, is enough with sober men to
put an end to the whole controversy. The question is, whether Christ, as
a high priest, did act principally towards God, or towards us. Towards
God, saith the apostle, and Grotius towards him. We are agreed, saith
Crellius, about these words, all the question is about their sense. As how?
namely, whether they signify that Christ exerciseth this office towards God,
or towards us. For this is that which after a long tergiversation he comes to;
page 477, Talem hac in parte Christi actionem esse aperite indicat Apo-
sto\(\text{t}\)us quo circa nos primo versetur, non vero circa Deum. 'The apostle
intimateth plainly, that such is the (sacerdotal) actions of Christ in this matter, as is first exercised towards us, and not towards God.' Whatever, therefore, is otherwise pretended, that question between him and us, is about the words themselves, and their truth, and not about their sense and meaning. For if it be true that the Lord Christ, καθισταει ὑπερ άνθρωπον τα προς τον Θεον, is 'appointed as a priest for man, or on their behalf, in the things belonging unto God,' or to be done with God, Heb. v. 1, and that in an especial manner, εις το προσφερειν δομα τε και θυσιας, ch. viii. 3, 'to offer gifts and sacrifices to God,' the whole sense is granted which we plead for. If he is not so appointed, if he doth not do so, that is, if he were not ordained to act with God in the behalf of men, if he did not offer sacrifice for them, or for the expiation of their sins, then are not these words true, and it is in vain to contend about the sense of them. 2. I shall only further observe the sophistry of that expression, 'actionem Christi qua sacerdos est,' 'that action of Christ whereby he is a priest.' For he intends that Christ is only denominated a priest, for some action he doth perform; whereas, in truth he performs those actions by virtue of his priesthood, and could not perform them were he not a priest in office.

Having laid this foundation, Crellius enters upon a large discourse, wherein he doth nothing but perpetually divert from the argument in hand, and by a multitude of words, strive to hide himself from the sense of it. Take him when he supposeth himself out of its reach, and he speaketh plainly. So he doth, Lib. de Caus. Mort. Christi, page 7, 'Cum consideratur Christus ut sacerdos, eti similitudinem refert ejus qui Deo aliquid hominum nomine praestet, si tamen rem ipsam penitius specet, reprehendens cum talem esse sacerdotem qui Dei nomine aliquid nobis praestet. 'When Christ is considered as a priest, although he bears the likeness of one that doth something with God on the behalf of men, yet if you look more narrowly into the matter itself, you will find that he is such a priest, who acts towards us in the name of God.' If we may but hold him to this plain declaration of his mind, (which indeed he must keep to, or lose his cause,) the vanity and tergiversation that is in all his other evasions and pretences, will be evident.

§ 15. But, because we have resolved on a particular examination of all that can be pretended in this matter, on behalf of our adversaries, we may consider his plea at large, in his own words. 1. Grotius ita verba ea proculdubio intelligit, ac si dictum esset sacrificiis moveri Deum, ut hominibus benefaciat, et expiatoris quidem, ut remissione pecatorum iis concedere velit. 2. Hoc si in eam sententiam accipiatur, in quam alias Grotius hujusmodi verba in nostro negotio sumere solet, ut significet 3. Deum iratum ac peenas expetentem, ita tamen ut non averteretur omnes irae deponendae rationes, sacrificiis placari, et ad ignoscendum flecti, 4. non est id de omnibus sacrificiis expiatoris, etiam propriis dictis admittendum, imo de iis que propri ita appellatur 5. minus quam de alius ab homine profectis, precibus scilicet, penitentia, animi humilitate, seu cordis ac spiritus contritione. 6. Neque enim sub lege eo pacto Deum movebant sacrificia ab ipso præscripta preseríum semper. Sed cum Deus enim antea decresisset, se intervenientibus illis sacrificiiis delicta et lapsus velle condonare, iis oblatis, 7. vi decreti istius effectus ille apud Deum consequebatur, etiam si is actu non irasceretur, imo ideo potius offerebantur sacrificia, ne, si forte neglicerentur, irasceretur, quam ut jam iratus placaret. Quod si vocem movendi, et ceteras ei similes, eo modo hic accipias, quem nos alibi etiam explicamus, ut significent conditione praestita apud Deum efficere, ut vi decreti sui effectum hominibus benefaciat, et reatum
peccati deleat pœnæmque avertat, sive per se ut sub lege, sive per alium ut N. Fœderis tempore, id quod Grotius ait, tum de sacrificis legalibus, tum etiam de morte Christi. 8. Quam sacrificium, et quidem expiatorium esse fatemur, licet per se in hoc genere nondum perfectum, verum est.

Answ. 1. There was no need at all of this large and ambiguous repetition of the whole state of the controversy about the nature and use of sacrifices in this place, where the argument concerned only the proper object of Christ's sacerdotal acts. And he knew well enough the mind of Grotius as to the sense of what he asserted; only it was necessary to retreat into this long diversion, to avoid the force of the testimonies produced against him. 2. The sense which we plead for, as to the expiation of our sins by Jesus Christ is plain and evident. God was the Author and Giver of the law, and the sanction thereof; the supreme, righteous, holy Rector, Governor, and Judge of all persons and actions relating thereunto, the Dispenser of rewards and punishments, according to the sense and sentence of it. Man transgressed this law by sin, and did what lay in him thereby to cast off the government of God. This rendered him obnoxious to the sentence, curse, death, and punishment threatened in the sanction of the law, which God, as the righteous, holy, supreme Governor of all, was, on the account of his righteousness, authority, and veracity, obliged to execute. This respect of God towards the transgressors of his law, the Scripture represents, under the notion and expression of his anger against sin and sinners, which is nothing but the engagement of his justice to punish offenders. On this account God would not, and without the violation of his justice and veracity, could not forgive sin, or dismiss sinners unpunished, without an atonement made by an expiatory sacrifice, wherein his justice also was to be satisfied, and his law to be fulfilled. And this was done by the sacrifice of Christ, according to the tenor and compact between God and him before described. 3. The advantage that Crellius seeks from the words of Grotius, in the entrance of his discourse, of God's being 'angry with sinners, yet not so as to depose all thoughts of reconciliation,' will stand him in no stead; for he intended no more by them, but that, although God was provoked as the righteous Governor of his creatures, yet he determined not absolutely to destroy them, when he had found a ransom; that is, provided his justice were satisfied, his honour repaired, his law fulfilled, all which, his own holiness and faithfulness required, he would pardon sin, and take away the punishment from sinners. That whereby this was done, was the sacrifice of Christ, whose object, therefore, must be God himself; and consequently, he is the object of all his sacerdotal acts. 4. All expiatory sacrifices did in their way and kind, procure the remission of sins by the way of atonement, and not otherwise. Nor can Crellius give any one instance to the contrary; their first and principal design was to atone and pacify anger, or to turn away wrath and punishment, as due from the displeasure of God, and therefore, their first effect was towards God himself. 5. The means on our part for the obtaining of the actual remission of sin, and sense thereof in our consciences, as prayer, repentance, humiliation, contrition of heart and spirit, are not means of making atonement, wherein there is always the nature of compensation and satisfaction. If we apply ourselves unto God by them to any such purpose, or rest upon them to that end, we render them useless, yea, an abomination. Yea, they are all enjoined to us on supposition of atonement made for sin, in and by the blood of Christ, and so they were from the foundation of the world. From the giving of the first promise, wherein the Lord Christ was a Lamb slain, as to
the efficacy of his future oblation, God forgave sins for his sake, and not otherwise. And the duties enjoined us, in order unto actual remission, or a sense of it in our consciences, are all to be founded in the faith of that atonement, which is supposed, and is to be pleaded in them all. For in Christ alone it is that we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. But all this is a diversion from the present argument and inquiry, which concerns only the proper object of the sacerdotal acts of Christ, and not the nature of his sacrifice, which shall be spoken to elsewhere. And these very duties whereby we make application for actual remission or pardon upon the atonement made, have God for their object also, and so must every thing which hath an influence of any kind for the pardon of sin. 6. The account he gives concerning the interest of expiatory sacrifices in procuring the pardon of sin, is false and sophistical. That God, not being angry with sin, should decree, that upon the offering of sacrifices he would pardon it, and would have such sacrifices offered, not because he was angry, but that he might not be so, is a vain imagination. For all sacrifices were offered for sins that were past, and all applications we can make to God by the sacrifice of Christ for the pardon of sin, respects it as past. And, therefore were sacrifices instituted, to make atonement, that is, to avert and turn away wrath already deserved and due to the offender. To say this was done, not because God was angry at sin, but that he might not be so when it was already committed, is inconsistent with truth and reason. For God is angry with sin because it is committed; and if he be not so, he is never angry with it. That which we intend hereby is, that he forbids every sin, and hath annexed a threatening of punishment unto that prohibition: this is his anger. 7. That expression, 'vi decreti,' that God pardons sin by virtue of his decree, contains sundry secrets of these men's doctrine. For it is intimated that all which belongs to the expiation of sin by sacrifices, was a mere free constitution, nothing in them, nothing which they had any respect to, or in the atonement made by them, was any way necessary on the account of the righteousness or holiness of God. For this decree of God is nothing but a voluntary constitution of this order of things, that sacrifices should go before remission, and not contribute any thing thereto. There is, therefore, nothing in that discourse, 'Conditione praestita apud Deum efficere, ut vi decreti sui,' &c., but that sacrifices by God's appointment were an act of worship antecedent to the remission of sins. It is true, there is nothing done in the whole matter of the expiation of sin, but it depends on God's decree and appointment. But the things disposed of by virtue of that decree, have this relation one to another, that the sacrifice of Christ shall be, and is, the procuring cause of the pardon of sin. God may, therefore, be said to pardon sin, 'in decreto suo,' as the original disposing cause; but he doth it not without respect to the sacrifice of Christ, as the meritorious procuring cause. It is not, therefore, merely an antecedent condition, making way for the accomplishment of a voluntary decree, but it is a moral cause appointed of God, in his decree for the effecting of pardon. 8. I wonder with what confidence he here affirms, that the death of Christ was an expiatory sacrifice, when he knew himself that he did not believe it so to be. That Christ offered but one sacrifice, both they and we agree. That this was not in his death, that it was in heaven when he presented himself unto God, that indeed it consists in the power which he hath, as glorified and exalted, to free us from the punishment due unto sin, is the sum of what he pleads for in this part of his book. Both here and elsewhere he endeavours to prove, that Christ was not a priest whilst
he was on the earth, that his death was only a pre-requisite condition (and so was his life also) unto the offering of himself. But from all these open contradictions, he shelters himself by saying, that it was not as yet perfect in this kind. But why doth he say that it was not a perfect sacrifice, while he believes that it was none at all. Or if it be not a perfect sacrifice, was it a part of the perfect sacrifice that was afterwards completed in heaven? If it were so, then was Christ a priest whilst he was on the earth, then did he offer himself unto God in his death, then was God the object of that sacerdotal act, as we contend and plead: if these things belong not unto it, then it was neither a perfect sacrifice nor imperfect, neither complete nor incomplete, neither part of a sacrifice, nor the whole, which we shall find him granting in his next words.

§ 5. Sed si loquaris de (1) Sacrificio seu oblatione Christi expiatoria perfecta, quam in cœlis peragit, quamque D. Auctor ad Heb. explicat, et Gra-tius qui eam ostensionis appellat et agnoscit; de ea aliquid amplius dici debet. (2) Neque enim ea ad remissionem peccatorum intervenit tanquam nuda quaedam conditio, aut res ad alterum tantum, qui remissionem reipsa praestet, aliqua ratione impellendum comparata; sed potissimum tanquam vera causa efficient quam quæ in sua remissionem peccatorum nobis a Deo decre-tam prestat; et efficacia sua eorum vim quam ad nos dammandos et divinis suppliciis obnoxios redendos habent, exsinguì ac delict.

Answ. As the former discourse was a mere diversion from the present question and argument, so this is partly a begging of the question in general, and partly a concession of what he labours to avoid the inconvenience of. For, 1. It is a plain begging of the main question to say and suppose, that the perfect expiatory sacrifice of Christ consisted only in what he performed in heaven, the contrary whereunto we have sufficiently proved before, and which they shall never evince, whilst the Scripture is owned to be the word of God. 2. The latter part of his discourse plainly grants what he would seem to deny, but proves it not. He denies that the sacrifice of Christ respects God so much, as a condition pre-required unto the forgiveness of sin. But he will have it to be the efficient cause of pardon; that is, the Lord Christ being entrusted with power from God, to that end and purpose after his ascension into heaven, doth take away our sin, or free and deliver us from the punishment due to it. Now, though this be true, yet this is not the oblation or sacrifice of himself, nor can any man reconcile the notions of a sacrifice with this actual efficiency in delivering us from the punishment of sin, so as that they should be the same. Hereof it is granted that we, and not God, are the first and immediate object; but that the oblation or sacrifice of Christ consists herein, is wholly denied: nor doth he here attempt to prove it so to do. 3. What account on this supposi-tion can be given of the intercession of Christ, which is his second great sacerdotal duty? Doth this also consist in a powerful efficiency in us, of what God hath decreed concerning his pardoning, blotting out, and ex-tinguishing of sin? Is this the nature of it, that whereas God had de-creed freely to pardon sin, and to take away the punishment due to it, this intercession is his powerful taking away of that punishment, and his actual deliverance of us from sin? Is it possible, that an act and duty of this nature should be expressed by a word of a more opposite signification and importance? For my part I value not that use of right reason that these men so much boast of, which is exercised in giving a wrong signification to words, expressive of so weighty truths and duties? Who but they can possibly understand any thing by Christ's intercession in heaven at the
right hand of God, but his procuring from him grace, mercy, and pardon for us, by virtue of his antecedent oblation? And God is the object of his actions herein.

§ 17. But he proceeds to give countenance to what he hath asserted. (1) Itaque quemadmodum oblationis vox, ut infra clarius patebit, ad hanc Christi actionem (2) ob similitudinem cum legalibus sacrificiis transsuffert; ita et loquuntur lae (3) quod peragatur, vel fiat, apud Deum pro hominibus. (4) Similiter in eo est (5) quod quemadmodum legalia sacrificia ideo Deo offerebantur (6) et coram ipsius vultu perficiebantur, ut ipsis peractis (7) vi decreti ipsius homines, pro quibus offerebantur, remissionem peccatorum ab ipso obtinenter; ita (8) interveniente Christi oblatione, seu apparitione coram Dei vultu (9) per sanguinis fusionem facta, et cum summo salutis nostrae perficiendae desiderio conjuncta, (10) homines a Deo vi decreti ipsius, ipsiusque virtute, quam eum in finem Christo concessit, liberationem a poenis obtinunt. (11) Indicare nempe hae loquitur Spiritus Sanctus voluit remissionem peccatorum quam Christus in celcis apud Patrem de gens nobis præset, a Deo ejusque benignitate primo proficiisci, et quicquid ad eam in nobis perficiendam sit, id totum ipsius virtute et auctoritate Christo, qui ut eam adipisceretur, et sic nos a peccatorum poenis reipsa liberare posset, sanguinem suum fuderat, coque cum desiderio coelum fuerat ingressus, data perag. (12) Itaque ut id exprimat, non modo Christi in celos ingressum atque ad Deum accessum, per quem factum est ut ad dexteram ipsius consideret, et plenam peccata nobis remittendi potestatem obtineret, sed et perpetuum apud ipsum permansionem, cum salutis nostrae cura conjunctam ita consideret, ac si ab ea Deus aliqua ratione moveretur ad remissionem peccatorum nobis vi decreti sui concedendam. (13) Et sic inter hane et illam actus quidam ipsius Dei, propitium se nobis exhibentis, et nos a poena liberantis interveniaret; cum tamen ipse Christus potestate sibi, a Deo, et olim decreta, et in coelum ingresso donata, id totum, quod ad nos a poena liberandos pertinet, ejus nomine faciat.'

Answ. 1. The name of oblation and sacrifice is not applied at all to that action of Christ which this man intends, namely, his appearance in heaven, which, as to its efficacy on our behalf, belongs to his intercession, Rom. viii. 34; 1 John ii. 2. There is more also in the sacrifice of Christ, than the transferring the name of oblation to any action of his, which is not so indeed. These little artifices and insinuations, which, when discovered, are a mere begging of the thing in question, make up the principal parts of Crellius' defence. Wherefore, 2. The name of oblation is not transferred to that action of Christ, wherein his sacrifice did truly and really consist, namely, his death and blood-shedding, merely by an allusion taken from the legal sacrifices; but it is so called by the Holy Ghost because it is so indeed, as having the true proper nature of a sacrifice, so as that it was the pattern or idea in the mind of God of all other sacrifices which he appointed, and which therefore were ordained to no other end, but to prefigure the nature, and exhibit the efficacy thereof. 3. That expression of doing things 'apud Deum,' or doing for men the things that appertain unto God, cannot on the hypothesis of these men he ascribed to Christ out of a similitude to what was done by the priests of old. For whatever they did as priests, they did it unto God; but the Lord Christ, according to these men, did nothing as a priest unto God. And how can that which he doth towards us be called by the name of what the priests did of old towards God, because of its likeness hereto, seeing there is no likeness between these things? For what similitude is there between offering of a bloody sacrifice to God, thereby to make atonement for the guilt of sin, and the actual powerful deliverance of us
from the punishment due to sin? What such similitude, I say, is there between these things, as to warrant their being called by the same name, which answers to one of them properly, and to the other not at all? That therefore which is here pretended, amounts to no more than this; namely, that whereas he doth nothing in his offering with God, but with men, he is said to offer himself, by reason of a similitude in what he did, to what the priests did in their oblations, who did nothing with men therein, but with God. As therefore we know that the sacerdotal acting of Christ was not called an oblation, offering, or sacrifice, merely out of the similitude that was between it and the sacrifices of old, although we grant that indeed there was more than a mere similitude between them, even a typical relation, the one being designed to represent the nature and exhibit the virtue of the other, whence they are both properly called by the same name; yet according to the opinion of our adversaries, we deny that there is any such likeness or similitude between what Christ doth in taking away of sin, and what was done by the priests of old, as that any denomination could or ought thence to be taken, or any name assigned to it. As for the death of Christ, Crellius peremptorily denies it to have been Christ's perfect expiatory sacrifice. And for his offering himself in heaven, he affirms that whatever other appearance may be of it, yet indeed it is wholly conversant about us, and not about God. It is therefore in vain to inquire after reasons and grounds on which Christ may be said to do those things in his sacrifice quae sunt apud Deum peragenda, when it cannot be truly spoken at all, and is directly denied by them. 4. Let it therefore be observed, that the similitude that was between the sacrifices of the law and that of Christ, was not a bare natural or moral similitude, whence the one of them might be called by the name of the other, that name belonging to the one properly, to the other metaphorically; but whereas there is a generical identity between them, both of them agreeing in the same general nature of being proper sacrifices in their own special kind; the one of them, namely, those of the priests under the law, were instituted and ordained to represent the other, or the sacrifice of Christ, whence arose a similitude between them, as there was a real difference on many other accounts. And the relation that was between them, which these men would have to be a similitude, only arose from these three respects. 1. That the sacrifice of Christ was that pattern in heavenly things, according to the idea whereof, all legal sacrifices were appointed to make a representation. That is, God having designed his Son Jesus Christ to be the high priest of his church, and to expiate their sins by the sacrifice of himself, did appoint the legal priesthood and sacrifices, obscurely to delineate that design before its actual accomplishment. And indeed here lies the true difference between us and the Socinians in this matter. For they suppose that God having for certain ends instituted the office of priests and duty of sacrificing in the church of old, some things that were done afterwards, and are yet done by Christ, because of their allusion to, and some kind of likeness with, what was done in and by those institutions, are called by their names. We judge on the other hand, that God originally designing the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, that he might represent his purpose therein to be accomplished in the fulness of time, and grant an outward means or pledge to the church of an interest in the nature, efficacy, and benefit thereof, and for no other end, appointed the typical priesthood and sacrifice of the Old Testament, as hath been proved at large before. Wherefore, 2. Seeing they were types appointed of God to set out, teach, and prefigure the sacrifice of Christ, whatever was in them that did not arise from the natural and indispensable imperfections
of them by whom they were offered, and the nature of the offerings themselves, but was directly of divine institution, was in the mind and will of God instructive beforehand of the nature and use of the sacrifice of Christ. If therefore those priests offered sacrifices to God, so did Christ; if they made atonement by blood, so did Christ; if those sacrifices consisted in the slaying and oblation on the altar of the victim, so did Christ in his death and blood-shedding; if God were the principal immediate object of their sacerdotal actions, so he was of Christ's. 3. They were by God's ordinance figuratively communicative of the real virtue of the sacrifice of Christ; that is, God appointed them to this end, that the church making use of them in the faith of the promise concerning the future sacrifice of Christ, should through them be made partakers of the benefits thereof, they being means of exhibiting spiritually what they did carnally represent. Crellius thinks, that all sacrifices were only conditions required antecedently to the free pardon of sin, which he calls the pardoning of sin by virtue of God's decree; but that they had no influence to the procuring of the remission of sin; which is in effect, that they did no way make atonement for sin. But then no man living can give an account of their special nature, or why God did institute a condition of that kind, when any duties or acts of obedience of any other sort, would have served to the same end. It is plain, that all expiatory sacrifices did at least make a representation of commutation, satisfaction, pacification of wrath, turning away of evil, the procurement of mercy, reconciliation, and atonement; and if they did nothing of this nature, it is hard to find any reason of their institution. Wherefore the similitude invented by Crellius, is of no consideration in this matter, but is only found out on purpose to destroy the true analogy that is between the legal sacrifices and that of Christ. 5. There is indeed, according to the opinion of these men, no similitude between them; for the legal sacrifices did not consist in the representation of the beast sacrificed, much less in any exaltation and power that it had afterwards; but in the slaying and offering of it on the altar, to which there is not the least resemblance in that which they call the perfect expiatory sacrifice of Christ. 6. The offering of sacrifices coram Dei vultu, before the face of God, is true, but not in his sense; for he confines it to the presence of God in the sanctuary only; whereas that which was done at the altar, was also said to be done before God, and nowhere else were any sacrifices offered. 7. The use of legal sacrifices here granted by him is indeed none at all; for the decree of God, that is the free pleasure of God is made the only cause of the remission of sin, without respect to any procuring cause or means whatever. And if propitiatory or expiatory sacrifices had no influence into the remission of sin, if they made not atonement for it, they were of no use at all. Nor is there any thing found in the application of these things to Christ and his sacrifice. For, 8. The oblation or sacrifice of Christ was not the same with, nor did consist in his appearance in the presence of God in heaven, but was antecedent thereto. He offered himself, and afterwards appears in the presence of God for us, as is plainly expressed. 9. This oblation of Christ is said to be per sanguinis fusionem, 'by the shedding of his blood;' but how or in what sense? The words are used to keep unto some seeming compliance with the Scripture, wherein our redemption, forgiveness, freedom from wrath, all the effects of the sacrifice of Christ, are frequently and signaly ascribed to his bloodshed. But is there any intention to intimate, that effusion of blood had any interest or concern in his oblation? We know it had not, according to these men, but only as an antecedent condition to his exaltation, as was his whole
life and humiliation. 10. The manner of the expiation of sin by the sacrifice of Christ, here at large described by Crellius, is absurd, dissonant from reason, and contradictory to the Scripture in itself; and the manner of its declaration, sophistical. The words are to this purpose: 'That Christ as a priest offered himself unto God through the effusion of his blood, to obtain for us mercy, pardon of sin, and deliverance from punishment; but the meaning or sense intended is, that being exalted in heaven after his death, by the power that he had received from God, he pardons our sins, and delivereth us from the punishment due unto them.' But this is such a way of teaching things, as becometh neither the holy penmen of the Scripture, nor any man of common sobriety. And to increase the fondness of the story, Christ is said to do these things with God, or towards God, when men are the express object of what he doth; and this in his ensuing discourse he directly asserts and contends for. 1. This is that, it seems, which the Holy Ghost would intimate by these expressions of Christ's being a priest, of his offering himself to God an expiatory sacrifice, of our redemption thereon by his blood in the forgiveness of our sins; namely, 'That whatever Christ doth in heaven towards the pardon of sin, or the pardon of sin which he affords us, proceedeth in the first place from the kindness and benignity of God, because he hath given power unto him for that end and purpose.' But if no more be indeed intended in this expression, if the sacrifice of Christ did in no sense procure our redemption or pardon of sin, or deliverance from the punishment due unto it, no man can tell for what end the Holy Ghost should use these expressions. Why he should largely and particularly insist upon them and their explanation for our instruction, seeing the only thing intended by them, namely, that the pardon of our sins proceeds originally from divine benignity and grace, and that the Lord Christ, as Mediator, hath received all his power from God the Father, is taught and expressed a thousand times more plainly and clearly in other places and words, and whereas these things and expressions signify no such things as those intended, no man living can divine. Let him that can, assign a tolerable reason why the exercise of the power of Christ in heaven, because it is given him of God, should be called his offering, sacrifice, or oblation of himself, as the high priest of the church. All men freely acknowledge, that whatever power Christ hath as Mediator to forgive us our sins actually, to free us from the punishment deserved by them, he received it of God, who gave all things into his hand, because he laid down his life for his sheep; but that his priesthood consists in the exercise of this power, and that the exercise thereof with love and care is his oblation and sacrifice of himself, being indeed only a consequent thereof, and the means of the administration of its virtue and efficacy, is a fond imagination. 12. In the mention of those things whereby God should at least seem to be moved to grant to us the pardon and remission of sin, Crellius utterly omits the death of Christ, reckoning up only his entrance into heaven, his great desire of our salvation, his access unto God, and sitting at his right hand; wherein he seems not much to aim at a compliance with the Scripture, which every-where ascribes all these effects directly and immediately to the death and blood-shedding of Christ. 13. The sum of what remains of his discourse amounts to this, 'That although in what Christ did for us, there is an appearance, as though God upon the consideration of what was done by him, was moved to pardon sin, and free us from punishment, (which yet exclusively unto his death is not true,) yet indeed there is no such thing intended, but only this is so, that Christ doth all this by virtue of the power he received from God,
and in his name.' The sum of the whole is, that there is an appearance of Christ's being a high priest, an appearance of his offering himself a sacrifice to God for us, an appearance of his acting with God on our behalf, an appearance of his procuring redemption and pardon of sins for us; but in truth and really there is nothing intended, but that he hath received power from God after his humiliation to pardon our sins, and deliver us from punishment, which he exerciseth with love and tenderness. But yet all this while, he hath not directly denied, that Christ, in his offering himself as a priest, had first respect unto God, which was the only thing in question, and that because he had not long before granted that the Scripture in express terms affirms it: but he would make a show of reason, why, though the thing be not so indeed, yet it is mentioned as though it were; which is first to assign a falsehood to the holy writers, and then to excuse it. His ensuing discourse in this place, wherein he designs to prove that God is said to do something for Christ, which yet he doth himself (as the subduing of his enemies and the like,) by virtue of the power he hath received of God, is so exceedingly impertinent to the present occasion, as being designed only for a diversion from the cause in hand, as that I shall pass it by, and come to that part of his disputation, wherein he begins to speak his mind with more openness and freedom than before.

§ 18. Pag. 477. (1.) 'Interdum tamen D. ille Scriptor ad Heb. de Christ, sacerdotio et oblatione agens, et rem nudam ante oculos nobis ponere volens, neglecta aliquantum allusionis et comparisonis cum ritibus legalibus concinnitate, talen hac in parte Christi actionem esse aperte indicat, quae circa nos primo versetur, non vero circa Deum.'

Answ. 1. This is plain dealing, and to the purpose. To what end have we been led about by all the long discourse which we have examined? Grotius affirmed and proved, that the actings of Christ as a priest did in the first place respect God and not us. This Crellius durst not grant, lest he should prejudice his cause; nor at first deny, until he had endeavoured to cast a mist before the eyes of the reader. But now supposing him sufficiently entangled or engaged, he expressly denies what Grotius affirmed. Be it so then that we, and not God, are the immediate objects of Christ's sacerdotal actings, then did he offer himself to us and not unto God; and maketh intercession with us and not with God. For these are the only general sacerdotal actings of Christ, and if God be not the object of them, he did neither offer himself to God, nor intercede with him. But, 2. He supposeth that all which seems to be asserted to that purpose, proceeds from the neat fitting of these things, by way of allusion to the legal sacrifices, which when the apostle negligeth, he declares his intention to be quite otherwise. Let us consider the testimonies he produceth in the confirmation of this bold assertion.

'Docet id, ut supra vidimus, locus ipsius sub finem, cap. 2. atque imprimitur, ult. ubi modum explicat, quo Christus tanquam pontifici in iis quae apud Deum, peccata populi expiet. Modus vero iste est; in quo enim ipse passus est cum tentaretur potest iis qui tentantur auxiliari. Potest, inquit, h. e. ad id faciendum pronus est, aut id facere libenter solet. Idem docent verba, cap. 4. itidem sub finem quae eandem cum illis sententiam continent.'

Answ. 1. He is mistaken in supposing that the apostle, in the places alleged, doth omit or neglect the consideration of the analogy between the ancient priesthood and sacrifice, and those of Christ. For in the first place, ch. ii. 17, those words, πιστος αρχιερευς τα προς τον θεον, εις το λαοσκεσθαι
A faithful high priest in things pertaining unto God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,' doth respect both the office and whole work of the priests of old, in making atonement for sin by expiatory sacrifices. And in ch. iv. 14, the entrance of Christ into heaven is asserted, in opposition to the entrance of the legal high priest into the carnal sanctuary. 2. The help which the Lord Christ gives to us, expressed ch. ii. 18, is founded in, and proceedeth from, the reconciliation or atonement which he is affirmed to have made in the first place, ver. 17. 3. The question under consideration is, whether the oblation of Christ doth in the first place respect God or us; and to prove that it respects us and not God, he cites this testimony of ver. 18, wherein there is no mention of his oblation at all, and omits the preceding words, where his oblation is so described by its effects, as to prove unavoidably that it respected God in the first place. 4. The succour which Christ affords unto them that are tempted, is no act of his priestly office; but it is the act of him who is our priest, and who was, as enabled thereunto by virtue of the reconciliation he had made by his oblation as a priest, so in the discharge of that office he underwent and suffered those things, whereby he is disposed and inclined to put forth his power in our behalf. 5. In ch. iv. 15, 16, the apostle treats not of the oblation of Christ, but of his personal qualification fitting him for his office; and that which he hath a principal eye to, is his intercession, and the fruits of it; and we shall conclude that this is with God, at least until our adversaries can affix some other tolerable sense unto that expression, or make intelligible their new kind of intercession with God for us, by acting his own power and love towards us.

But he yet undertakes to prove, that what is here mentioned is the whole of what Christ doth as a priest for us, his discourse whereof, because it compriseth the substance of all that he hath to plead in this cause, I shall at large transcribe and examine.

§ 19. 4 Ad ea vero illustranda et confirmanda adhibentur ea a D. Auctore quae subjiciuntur initio cap. v. ut indicat particula enim, quae initium istud cap. v. cum fine capitis precedentis connectit. Quare ex illis constare potest quid D. Auctor sibi velit verbis, quatenus ea ad Christum accommodari debent, quae Grotius hic urget, eaque de causa totum locum adscribemus. Est autem hujusmodi: Non habemus pontificem qui non possit compati infirmitatibus nostris; sed tentatum per omnia secundum similitudinem absque peccato. Accedamus ergo cum fiducia ad thronum gratiae ut accipiamus misericordiam et gratiam ad opportunum auxilium. Omnis enim Pontifex ex hominibus acceptus pro hominibus constitutur in iis quo ad (vel apud) Deum, ut offerat dona et victimas pro peccatis; qui possit moderate condolere ignorantibus et errantibus siquidem etiam ipse circundatus est infirmitate, &c. Ubi vides illis cap. v. verbis, quod pontifex constitutur in iis quo ad Deum, ut offerat dona et victimas pro peccatis, nihil in praecedentibus respondere preter illa quod a Christo accepturi simus misericordiam et gratiam ad opportunum auxilium; quod sit cum nobis ten-tatis, ac vehementer trepidantibus succurrat et ne malorum pondere pressi tentationi succumbamus, ac peccatorum nostrorum peccam luamus, efficet; aut tunc cum impii suorum scelerum dant penas ipse nos tuerit, et ne cum illis una pernicie involvamur, potestate sua divina intercedit. Quod idem ut vidimus, cap. ii. indicatur in verbis illis ubi expiationis quam Christus apud Deum peragit modus explicatur. At hujusmodi actio circa nos primo versatur non vero circa Deum nisi impropriam loquamur.'

Answ. 1. I have at large transcribed this whole passage, that we may see what is the only foundation which he builds upon, or argument he hath to
prove, that the sacerdotal acts of Christ respect us in the first place, and not God. The whole of what he pleads issues from this single supposition, that the apostle in the beginning of the fifth chapter intends nothing but the confirmation of what he had delivered in the end of the fourth; and therefore that the offering of gifts and sacrifices for sin unto God, is only his giving help and succour unto us in our temptations, which is the most uncouth expression and explication of one thing by another, that ever was in the world. Now this supposition is apparently false; and the connexion of the discourse which he feigneth at pleasure, every way insufficient to force us unto such a fond and brainless exposition of the words. That which alone he pleads in justification of his assertion, is the introduction of this new discourse, by the causal particle yap, 'for,' as though it intimated, that the apostle designed no more but to give a reason of what he had before laid down, concerning the help and succour, which we have in all our temptations and sufferings from our high priest. This indeed he doth also in the description he gives us of the nature and duties of this office, wherein he doth not merely explain what he had before delivered, but adds other considerations also of the nature and acts of that office, confirming our faith and expectation therein; but his principal regard is to the whole subject-matter treated of, as being now to give his reasons, why he doth so industriously instruct them in the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. And this use of the same particle in his transitions from one thing to another, wherein it respects not so much what immediately went before in particular, as the relation of what ensues to his whole design, and is also sometimes redundant, we have manifested by sundry instances in our exposition. Wherefore the apostle having occasionally digressed from the priesthood of Christ, which he had proposed unto consideration in the end of the second chapter, through the third and unto the 14th verse of the fourth, he there returns again to his first design. And this he doth by declaring in general the glory of Christ as a priest, his eminency above those of the order of Aaron, and the spiritual advantage which we receive, not from his being a priest, but from his being such a person, so qualified in the discharge of his office, as he is there by him described. Having expressed this in the last verses of the 4th chapter, and thereby stirred up the Hebrews to a diligent attention to what he had to instruct them in with respect hereunto, in the beginning of the fifth, he lays the foundation of all his subsequent discourses about the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. This he doth by a general description of that office, and of its duties, with what belongs essentially thereto in all that are partakers thereof; adding some particular instances of the imperfections that attended it in the priests under the law, making application of the former to Jesus Christ, and discarding the consideration of the latter. As, therefore, in the end of the fourth chapter, he prepares the way to his intended declaration of the nature and duties of the sacerdotal office of Christ, by declaring in general the advantage we have, from the suspicion of that office by him who was the Son of God incarnate; so here, in the beginning of the fifth, he adds a description of the power, acts, and duties of that office, whence our benefits by it do originally arise. There is therefore no such coherence between these passages, as should warrant us to look on Christ's helping and assisting of them that are tempted, to be the same, with his offering gifts and sacrifices to God. Yea, suppose that the apostle in these words doth only give the reason of what he had before asserted, which is all that is pleaded by Crellius to impose this nonsensical sense upon us, yet thereby also his pretension would be everted. For the reason of any thing differs from the thing it-
self. And if he proves only that we may have help and succour from Christ as our high priest, on this ground, that every priest doth offer gifts and sacrifices for sin, it doth not follow, that his helping of us, and his offering of sacrifice, are the same, yea it follows that they are distinct and different, the latter being given in as one reason and cause of the former. 2. What is here farther discoursed, concerning our deliverance by the power and care of Christ from sin and destruction, even then when wicked and impenitent persons shall be utterly destroyed, is true; but yet it is not his offering of sacrifice unto God for sin, but it is a consequent thereof. The consideration of it is indeed a matter of great consolation and encouragement to believers, but it is not to be asserted to the exclusion of that, which is the fountain of all the benefits which we receive by his mediation. And now it may be considered whether any thing be here offered by this author, either to prove that we are the first object of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ, or in answer unto the testimonies alleged that God alone is so. But he hath yet somewhat more to add, and therefore proceeds.

'Animadverterendum autem est in loco utroque, sed apertius in posteriori ob (1) allusionem ad sacerdotium legale et similitudinem quandam quae Christo cum pontificibus Aaronicis intercedat, (2) ad Christum etiam accommodari infirmitatem, quae in pontificibus istis exstitit, quaque ii impelli debuerint ad aliorum infirmitates tanto promptius expiandas; cum tamen in Christo quipiam alterius generis infirmatibus illis, quae nihil aliud erant quam lapsus et ignorancea seu delicta ex infirmitate profecta, opponitur, nempe tentationes seu afflictiones ipsius, quorum memori, nobis tentatis atque afflictis succurrere tanto promptius soleat.

Answ. 1. This man seems to aim at nothing, but how he may evade the force of truth, and thereon lays hold of every appearing advantage, though indeed contradicting himself therein. For in the entrance of his production of these testimonies, he tells us, 'that they are such places as wherein the apostle, neglecting the allusion unto the priesthood of old, doth plainly and openly declare the nature of that of Christ.' But here, in pressing of those testimonies, he pleads the 'express mention of that allusion as the principal reason of his exposition.' 2. It is not true, that those infirmities of the priests of old, which consisted in their sins and ignorances, are any way accommodated unto Christ. The things here spoken of the nature of the priests' office and the discharge of it by them with whom it was intrusted, are distributed unto the subjects intended according to their capacity. In the priests of old there were such infirmities, as they had need to offer for their own sins also; in Christ there was no such thing, nor any thing that answered thereunto. But in all priests there were infirmities, such as inseparably attend our human nature in this mortal life, and these our high priest Christ Jesus was subject to, whence he was liable to be tempted and suffer. These the apostle doth not accommodate to Christ, but really ascribes unto him, see ver. 7, 8, with our exposition. 3. This one concession of Crellius, that Christ our high priest, that is, as our high priest, was subject to temptations and sufferings, which he must be, or there is no similitude between him and the high priests of old in this matter of infirmities, utterly overthrows his whole cause; for he was no way subject unto them, but as, and whilst he was in this world. His glorified nature in heaven is liable neither to temptations nor sufferings. If, therefore, any of these infirmities were found in him as our high priest, which the apostle expressly affirms, and Crellius acknowledgeth, he was our high priest whilst he was on the earth. But he adds,
' (1.) Ex quo appareat peccatis etiam illorum quos pontifices Aaronici expiare debebant, tentationes atque afflictiones nostras his locis respondere, quorum vis, (2) quam ad nos perdendos habent dum tollitur et ab iis nos auxilio Christi eripimur, peccata nostra expiari dicitur. (3) Itaque non mirum est caetera quoque que de Aaronicis Sacerdotibus dicitur, alio sensu ad Christum accommodari, et quaedam de illis, de Christo impro-prie præstantiori tamen sensu accipit."

Answ. 1. Where there is any mention made of the offering of Christ for us, it is constantly with respect to our sins, and not to our temptations and sufferings, at least not in the first place. What he is affirmed to do with respect to them, as to the aid, relief, and deliverance which he gives us, is all consequential to his once offering of himself to take away sin. 2. The foundation of the inference which is here made, we have already taken away; namely, that the sinful infirmities of the priests of old, were accommodated unto Christ with respect to natural infirmities, or obnoxiousness unto temptations and sufferings; which we have shown to be false. Yet hence he would infer that the sins of the people of old, for which the priests offered sacrifice, do correspond in this matter with our temptations and sufferings; that as they offered sacrifices for real sins, so Christ’s sacrifice is our relief from temptations and sufferings. The force of the reason pretended lies in this, that because the priests of the order of Aaron had sins themselves, therefore they offered sacrifices for the sins of the people, those which were truly and really so. But whereas the Lord Christ had no sins of his own, but only temptations and sufferings, therefore the sins offered for were temptation and sufferings. Nothing can be more absurdly imagined. For both those qualifications, that he had no sin, and that he was tempted, were necessary to his offering for us, and for our sins; being made sin for us, and sent in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, bearing our sins in his body on the tree. 2. Is this all, therefore, that the great discourses of Crellius concerning the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, his being a propitiation for our sins, his offering himself unto God for us, with the like magnificent expressions of sacerdotal actings, do amount unto; namely, that he frees us by his power from temptations and afflictions, with all the efficacy they have to destroy us? Is this, I say, to offer himself to God a true, perfect, complete expiatory sacrifice? Were it not much better wholly to deny that Christ was a high priest, or that he ever offered himself to God, than to put such strained and futilous sense in these expressions? And, 3. Because these men will have it so, all things must be spoken properly of the Aaronical priests, though they were ‘umbratile,’ typical, figurative, temporary, and liable to such infirmities as exceedingely eclipsed the glory of the office itself. But all things spoken of the Lord Christ to the same purpose, must be improper and metaphorical, and denote things of another nature, only called by the names of priesthood and sacrifice, in allusion unto them and to those things, who and which were appointed and ordained of God for no other end or purpose, but that they might prefigure him in the discharge of his office. And then to save the matter, the things so improperly assigned unto Christ, must be said to be more excellent than the things that are properly ascribed unto the Aaronical priests, when indeed they are not, nor to be compared unto them; and if they were, yet would not that prove but that Aaron, though not absolutely, yet as unto the office of the priesthood, was more excellent than Christ, as being properly a priest, whereas the Lord Christ was so only metaphorically, which is a diminution as to that particular.
He closeth his discourse: 'Istud adhuc antequam hinc aleamus notare libet, Paulum Rom. xv. 17, licet de munere suo apostolico loquatur, cujus vis circa homines primo versabatur et quod, ut cum Grotio loquamur, erat pro Deo aut Christo apud homines, tamen quia ad sacrificia sacerdotiumque alludit dicere, se habere gloriationem, seu quod glorietur in Christo Jesu τα προς θεον, in iis quae apud Deum.'

Answ. This observation doth no way impeach the force of the testimony produced by Grotius. He intended no more by that expression, τα προς τον θεον, but to declare in the words of the apostle, that God was the object of what was so performed, which certainly, unless some great reason be produced to the contrary, must be acknowledged to be the sense of the words. But Grotius proves his intention, from the matter treated of, which is sacrifices; and if they are not offered unto God, and that for men, they are not at all what they are called. And in compliance with this sense, the apostle respects the discharge of his conscience towards God in the work of his ministry, wherein he had immediately to do with him. For although men were the object of his ministry, yet he received it from God, and to him he was to give an account thereof. Wherefore he only declares, how he had acquitted himself sincerely in that whole work, which was in an especial manner committed unto him of God, and whereof he was to give unto him a peculiar account.

§ 18. I had sundry reasons why I chose to insist on a particular examination of these discourses of Crellius. For it is confessed, that none among our adversaries have handled those things with more diligence and subtlety than he. It was necessary therefore to give a specimen, as of his strength, so of his way and method, whereby he seeks to defend his opinions. And every impartial reader may see in the discussion of what he allegeth or pleadeth, that the whole of his defence is made up of tergiversations, equivocations, and plausible diversions from the cause under debate. Besides, I have had sundry opportunities hereby to declare many things belonging to the nature and discharge of the priesthood of Christ, which would not conveniently be reduced unto other heads. And I was willing also to cast these things into this place by themselves, to avoid all controversies as much as possible in the exposition itself, though I constantly detect the falsehood of this man's interpretations, as that of others who either follow him or comply with him. And hereby also perhaps some who are less exercised in the sophistry of these men, may learn somewhat how they are to be dealt withal.

**EXERCITATION XXXIV.**

§ 1. Prefigurations of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. § 2. The original, use, and practice of sacrifices before the law. Rabbinical conceits on Ps. lxi 32. Instances of the sacrifices of the patriarchs. Occasional, not stated. § 3. No office of priesthood from the beginning. Men bound to offer sacrifices every one for himself. § 4. Sacrifices in families; before the law, and afterwards among the heathen; and in the church. § 5. By whom those sacrifices were offered. § 6. This farther inquired into. § 7. The rights of primogeniture. What Jacob took from Reuben. Gen. xlix. 3. § 8. Jews' apprehension of the rights of the first-born. § 9. The right of sacrificing continued to particular persons before the law; and to fathers of families. § 10. The first rise of the priesthood
§ 1. Sundry things concerning the priesthood of Christ, and those the most material that relate thereunto, we have now passed through. But we know withal, that although the foundations hereof were laid in the eternal counsels of God, and although a revelation was made of them in the first promise, immediately upon the entrance of sin, yet the Son of God was not actually manifested in the flesh, for the execution of those counsels, and for the discharge of that office, until the fulness of time came, after the expectation of a multitude of ages. In the meantime, there were certain prefigurations of it instituted of God in the church, to keep up and direct the faith of mankind, unto what was to come, in sacrifices and a certain typical priesthood; with emanations from them into the practice of the nations of the world. Now what is worth our inquiry, with reference unto these prefigurations of the priesthood of Christ, may be referred to these four heads. 1. The state of things in general with respect unto priesthood and sacrifices in the church, before the giving of the law. 2. The peculiar priesthood of Melchisedec, which fell within that period of time. 3. The institution of the Aaronical priesthood at Mount Sinai, with the nature and duration of that office, the garments, sacrifices, laws, and succession of the high priests, in particular. 4. The rise, occasion, and usage of a priesthood among the nations of the world. From all these we may learn, both what God thought meet previously to instruct the church in, concerning the future glories of the priesthood of Christ, and what presumptions there were in the light of nature, concerning the substance of that work which he was to accomplish.

§ 2. Our first inquiry will be, as unto what monuments remain of either sacrifices or of the order of priesthood, from after the first promise and the institution of expiatory oblations, unto the solemn giving of the law in the wilderness, where all things were reduced into a methodical instructive order.

The first institution of sacrifices, and revelation of an acceptable worship of God in and by them, I have declared before, and elsewhere discussed and proved at large. Hereupon, as it is evident from many particular instances recorded in the Scripture, that sacrifices were offered before the law, it is highly probable, that Adam himself, after he had received the promise, which gave life and efficacy unto that kind of sacred service, did offer sacrifices unto God. And this some do suppose, and that not warrantably, that he did with the beasts with whose skins he was clothed, and that by the immediate direction of God himself. Hereby the whole of those creatures were returned to God, and not their carcases left to putrefy on the earth. And so the whole was an illustrious exemplification of the promise newly given; or a type and representation of Christ and his righteousness. For as he was to be our real sacrifice of atonement, to expiate our sins, so are we said to put him on, or to be clothed with his righteousness. So typically was our first father, after his receiving the promise, clothed with the skins of the beasts which were offered in sacrifice to make atonement. And therein was Christ a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. And these beasts seem rather to have been sheep or goats, than the greater cattle of the herd; their skins being most meet for clothing. The Jews supposed that Adam sacrificed an ox or a bullock. So in the Tar-
§ 3. It doth not appear, that there was as yet any peculiar office of priesthood erected or instituted. But the persons who enjoyed the revelation of the promise, and the institutions of sacrifices, may be considered two ways.

1. Personally. 2. As members of some society natural or political. Families are natural societies. Greater voluntary combinations for the preservation of human conversation unto all the ends of it, we may call political societies. Consider men in the first way, and every one was his own priest, or offered his own sacrifices unto God. Not that every one was instated in that office; for to make an office common to all is to destroy it. For it includes an especial privilege, faculty, power, and duty; which being made common, their being ceaseth. But every one was then to perform that duty for himself, which upon the erection of the priesthood was confined and limited.
§ 4. Secondly. As persons were united into any community natural or political, this worship was required of them in that community. For this is a prescription of the law of nature, that every society, wherein men do coalesce according to the mind of God, should own their dependence on him, with some worship common unto, and to be performed in the name of, the society. Especially is it so with respect of that society, which is the foundation of all others, namely, a household or family. So God gives to Abraham the testimony of sincerity, that he would order and take care of his worship in his family, Gen. xviii. 19. Hence there were sacrifices peculiar to families before the law, wherein it cannot be doubted, but the father of the family was the sacred administrator. So Job offered burnt-offerings for himself and his family, ch. i. 5. And Jacob for his, Gen. xxxv. Yet are they not hereon to be esteemed priests by office, seeing they had their warrant for what they did from the light and law of nature, but the office of the priesthood depends on institution. And such family sacrifices were famous among the heathens. An eminent instance hereof the Roman historian gives us in C. Fabius, who, when Rome was sacked by the Gauls, and the capitol besieged, upon the stated time of the solemn worship and sacrifices of the family of the Fabii, passed through the enemy’s camp to the Quirinal hill, and discharged the accustomed ‘sacra,’ returning to the capitol without disturbance or affront from the enemy, Liv. lib. 5. And the family ceremonies in the sacrifice of an ox unto Hercules, by the Potitii and Pinarii, were adopted by Romulus and Numa, for the use of the whole people, the posterity of those families being made as it were their public priests thereby. And after they had confirmed the administration of their ‘sacra,’ in public solemnities for the whole community, yet they left it free to single persons and families, to sacrifice for themselves as they saw good. For as they took up the former course, probably from the form and example of Mosaic institutions, so they retained the latter, from the original practice and tradition of the world. Even the meanest of the people continued their family libations. ‘Sacrima’ they called the wine which your countrymen offered to Bacchus, as Festus testifies; and ‘Carpar’ the vessel out of which they drew the wine whereof they made a libation to Jupiter. ‘Struferta’ and ‘Suovetaurilia,’ were the sacrifices of poor families. And something in resemblance of this original practice continued among the people of God after the giving of the law. So the family of Jesse had a yearly sacrifice, which was a free-will offering and a feast thereon, 1 Sam. xx. 6. But it may be, by the לְבַזְיָּם there intended, was only a feast, at which there was a slaughter of beasts. If a sacrifice be intended, the time and place were irregular. Or if the whole were pretended by David, yet is it hence
evident that such things were in common use at that time, or no pretence could have been made of it. And if it were a sacrifice it was offered by a legal priest, or the whole of it was an abomination. Philo. lib. 3. 'de vita Mosis,' admits all the people afresh to this duty at the passover. Νομον προστατεύει, συμπάν το εθνός ἵππαρτον τον κατα μερος ἐκαστον τας ύπερ αυτον θυσιας αναγοντος τοτε και χειρουργουντος. 'By the appointment of the law the whole nation sacrificeth,' (or is employed in sacred duties) 'whilst every one brings his own sacrifice and slays it.' But this saying of his is not without its difficulties, and deserves further inquiry.

§ 5. Persons united into greater societies for the end of human conversation, had, as we observed, the use of sacrificing among them as such, and which they were by the light of nature directed unto. So was it among the Israelites, when the twelve original families being multiplied into so many numerous tribes, were by common consent united into one people or nation, without any policy, rule, or order peculiarly accommodated unto the whole community. This was the condition of that people before the giving of the law, the bonds of this union being consanguinity, agreement in design, outward state in the world, with respect to other nations, all under the conduct of divine Providence unto a certain designed end. In this state there were some that offered sacrifices for the whole people, Exod. xxiv. 4, 5, 'Moses built an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel, and he sent young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord.' It is probable these young men were the same with those who are called the priests, ch. xix. 22, 24, when as yet the office of the priesthood was not erected.

§ 6. There hath been great inquiry who these priests were; or who they were who thus offered sacrifices for families or greater associations, and by what means they were invested with that privilege. By most it is concluded that they were the first-born of the families and tribes, and that the right of the priesthood, before the giving of the law, was a branch of the primogeniture. But whatever similitude there may be in what the light of nature directed to, and what was after sacredly appointed, yet this opinion will not easily be admitted by them, who judge it necessary to resolve the original of the priesthood, into a voluntary institution, as that which was to be typical and representative of the priesthood of Christ, which must be an immediate effect and emanation of divine wisdom and grace. Yet some suppose that this opinion may be confirmed by the example of Melchisedec, who first was called a priest of God, and whom they suppose to have been Shem, the eldest son of Noah. But the whole of this argument is composed of most uncertain conjectures. It is uncertain whether Shem were the eldest son of Noah, and most probable that he was not so; it is more uncertain whether Melchisedec were Shem or not, yea it is at the next door of the highest certainty, that he was not so. And it is absolutely certain that he was not a priest, on any account common to him with others, but by the immediate call or appointment of God; for had it been otherwise, when the Lord Christ was made a Priest according to the order of Melchisedec, he must have been so according to that common order whereof his priesthood was, which is contrary to his singular call to that office. And if an extraordinary instance may contribute any thing to satisfaction in this inquiry, that of Moses is express to the contrary. He was a priest unto God, Ps. xcvii. 6, 'Moses and Aaron among his priests;' and there is not any thing peculiar to a priest but he discharged it in his own person; yet was not he the
eldest son of Amram his father, but younger than Aaron by three years, who
was alive all the while that Moses executed his priesthood. But from these
extraordinary instances nothing certain in this case can be concluded.
Micah afterwards, when he fell off from the law of institution in setting up
a teraphim and graven image, consecrated מדרש מ하였י, one of his sons from
amongst them, which he thought meet, without regarding the primogeniture,
Judges xvii. 5. I have formerly thought, that the דודס חנ苄ש א talking in
Exod. ix. 22, 24, the 'priests which drew nigh to the Lord,' which, as was
now said, I still suppose and judge to be the same with the young men em-
ployed by Moses in the first solemn sacrifice in the wilderness, Exod. xxiv.
5, to have been the first-born of the families. But I now rather judge that
they were persons delegated by common consent, or immediate divine
designation, which in that extraordinary dispensation supplied the room
thereof, to act representatively in the name of the people. For the other
opinion is attended with many difficulties, and exposed to sundry exceptions
not to be evaded.

§ 7. The rise of this opinion, concerning the office of the priesthood, or
peculiar right of sacrificing for themselves and others, being annexed unto
the primogeniture, is usually taken from the words and fact of Jacob with
respect to Reuben his eldest son, Gen. xlix. 3, 4, 'Reuben, thou art my first-
born, my might and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity
and the excellency of power; unstable as water thou shalt not excel.' The
Targums make jointly this interpretation of the words. 'Thou hast a three-
fold right above thy brethren;' ברראים המואד, the primogeniture, the priesthood
and the rule. But seeing thou hast sinned, the primogeniture shall be
given to Joseph, the priesthood to Levi, and the rule or dominion to Judah.
But their authority, without farther evidence, is not sufficient to determine
this case. The priviledges of the first-born were certainly great from the be-
ginning. There was משמם בחרי a right of primogeniture founded in the
law of nature, determined in the Judicial law unto Israel, and generally
owned in some degree or other, among all nations in the world. The
foundation of it is expressed in these words of Jacob; יחרי ראתית אלוני 'My
might and the beginning of my strength;' that is, the spring unto all power
and excellency, that was to arise out of his posterity. In him it began, and
in him was the foundation of it laid. And the same reason is repeated in
the establishment of the law; והנה ראתית עלי משמם בחרי; 'He is the
beginning of his strength, his is the right of primogeniture,' Deut. xxi. 17.
Hence this right was confined unto the first-born of the father only, and not
to the first-born of the mother, if her husband had a son by another wife
before. And if a man had more wives at the same time, he that was the
first-born of any of them was to have the privilege of the birthright, against
all disadvantages on the mother's part, as if she were hated in comparison
of the others, which manifests that it was a law of nature not to be
transgressed, nor the right to be forfeited but by personal sin and dis-
obedience, as it was with Esau and Reuben, Deut. xxi. 15—17. There
was, indeed, a privilege that belonged unto the first-born of every mother,
by virtue of the special law about the רוחו יפתש him that opened the womb;
for every such an one was to be sanctified or separated according to the law,
Exod. xiii. 2, which among men was restrained to the male, Exod. xxii. 20,
'The first-born of thy sons thou shalt give unto me.' And, therefore, we
have added in way of exposition of this law in our translation, ch. xxxiv.
19, 'All that openeth the matrix is mine' (that is male.) And it was in-
stead of the first-born males only, that the Levites were taken in exchange,
Num. iii. 40—42. But this was a peculiar ceremonial law and privilege. There were two things that eminently belonged unto the πρωτοτοκία, or right of primogeniture, before the law, the one whereof was confirmed also under it. And this was the privilege 'in familia heriscunda,' or distribution of the estate and inheritance of the family; for whereas every son was to have ἡμέρας, Gen. xlviii. 22, one part or shoulder to bear the charge of his own especial family; so the first-born was to have ἐπαλή, ἐึงνέις, Deut. xxi. 17, that is ἐπαλή, or μηρος διπλον, a double portion of the inheritance. And this, evidently, Jacob took from Reuben and gave to Joseph, when he adopted his two sons, and gave each of them the inheritance of a tribe, Gen. xlviii. 5, 22. And there belonged hereunto civil preeminence and right unto rule. The first-born had a principal honour among his brethren, and when rule and dominion was erected without especial cause and alteration made by God himself, it belonged unto them. So do the words of God to Cain plainly signify. 'If thou dost well—unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him,' Gen. iv. 7. And when God transferred in prophecy the birthright from Esau to Jacob, he did it in these words, 'The elder shall serve the younger,' Gen. xxv. 23, which Isaac also in the confirmation of it so expresseth. 'Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee;' ch. xxvii. 29, and so he tells Esau afterwards, 'Behold I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given him for servants;' ver. 37. And this was by Jacob taken from Reuben and given unto Judah. Both these are expressly mentioned 1 Chron. v. 1, 2, 'Reuben was the first-born; but forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph, and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright; for Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler, but the birthright was Joseph's.' I confess the birthright here seems to be confined unto the double-portion only, and is therefore proposed as totally transferred to Joseph, and to have comprised all that was lost by Reuben. The matter of rule is introduced so, as that when God would erect it, he gave it to Judah without depriving any other of a right to it. I will not, therefore, be positive, that by the law of nature, or any previous constitution of God, right unto rule belonged unto the primogeniture; but suppose it might be disposed unto the most worthy, as the Roman Epitomator affirmeth, it was at the beginning of all governments. However, here is no mention of the priesthood which we inquire after.

§ 8. The Mishnical Jews in Massecheth Becaroth Peresh. 8. divide the rights of the primogeniture, in נֵכָדֶה and נַעַד, the inheritance and the priesthood, and thereon make many distinctions concerning them, who may be the first-born, or have the right of primogeniture, as unto the one, but not unto the other. But by the priesthood, they intend only the dedication of the first-born unto God, upon the law of opening the womb. Now this had no relation to the priesthood properly so called. As far as it had its foundation in the law of nature, it was an offering to God of the first-fruits of the family, all primitiae being due unto him; and hereby was the whole family made sacred and dedicated unto God. For if the 'first-fruits be holy, the whole lump is holy also,' Rom. xi. 16. The place, therefore, mentioned in Becaroth, intends not the priesthood; but in Bereshith Rabba, fol. 71, some of them do plainly ascribe the priesthood unto the primogeniture, and so doth Hierome from them, ad Gen. xvii. 27, Epistol. ad Evagri. and elsewhere, as do others also of the ancients. But in the whole law and order of the primogeniture, it is plain that God designed to shadow out the Lord Christ in his offices, when by his incarnation he became the
first-born of the creation: as to rule, Col. i. 15, 18; Rev. i. 5; Heb. i. 6; as to inheritance, Heb. i. 3; Eph. i. 10; and as to sanctifying the whole family, Heb. ii. 11.

§ 9. Yet all that hath been spoken, or that may farther be pleaded to the same purpose, doth not necessarily conclude that the right unto sacrificing by way of office, was inclosed to the first-born before the giving of the law; and afterwards we know how it was disposed of by divine institution. There was, therefore, in that state of the church no office of priesthood, but every one performed this duty and worship of sacrifice, 'ex communi jure' with respect unto himself. As all were obliged to attend to this worship of God, and express their faith in the promise thereby, so every one who was 'sui juris,' or had the free disposal of himself in all his moral actions, did in his own person attend to his own duty herein. As persons were united into families, and made up one body naturally political by God's appointment; the 'pater familias' had the duty of sacrificing for the whole committed unto him; herein it is probable he had the especial assistance of the first-born of the family, whereby he might be initiated into his future duty. Yet was it not afterwards confined to him. For Abel, who was the youngest son of his father, offered sacrifices for himself in his own person, his father and elder brother being yet alive. No way doubt but that all the persons on the patriarchal line before the flood, offered sacrifices to God; yet is it most uncertain whether they were all of them the first-born of their respective parents. Abraham, after the flood, offered sacrifice whilst the eldest son of Noah was yet alive, neither was he himself the first-born of his immediate parents. Afterwards, it is probable, that the order and solemnity of public sacrificing, went along in a peculiar manner with the birthright, not that it was a privilege thereof, but that the privilege of the birthright made what they did more extensive and illustrious. But this was continued only whilst a family continued by consent. When it divided, all things returned to their primitive right and practice. So was it when the younger sons of Noah were separated from the elder, they lost not the right of solemnizing the worship of God thereby. And in case the first-born was incapable through sin, idolatry, or apostasy from God, the right of the remainder was not prejudiced thereby, but every one might personally attend to the discharge of his duty herein, which after the giving of the law was not provided for. But this respected men only. Women were afterwards among the heathen admitted unto the office of the priesthood, especially in the idolatries of Juno. But there was no induction towards any such practice, in the light of nature or original tradition. For the 'head of the woman is man.' And the whole sex generally being supposed under the power of their parents or husbands, nothing remains on record, of their solemnizing sacred worship in their own persons, though some conjectures have been made about Rebekah's inquiry of God, upon her conception of twins.

§ 10. When greater political societies, being the products of the light of nature, acting by choice, and on necessity, were established, it was judged needful, or at least useful, not only that every one should offer sacrifice for himself that would, nor only that the head of each family should discharge that duty in the name of the whole family, which expressed the two first directions of the law of nature; but also that some one or more should offer sacrifice for the whole community, which had the solemn representation of a sacerdotal office. How these persons were originally designed to this work and office, is a matter left much in the dark, and obscure. The
ways whereby God erected this office, and constituted any in the possession and enjoyment of it, are plain and evident. For he did it either by an immediate call from himself, as it was with Melchisedec in one manner, and Aaron in another; or by the constitution of a legal succession of priests, as it was with all the posterity of Aaron, concerning both which we shall treat afterwards distinctly. Our present inquiry is, how or when this order of things came to pass in the world, namely, that some certain persons, under the name of priests, had the administration of sacred things in the behalf of political communities committed unto them. And these are the ways, that may be pleaded with good probability to this purpose. The first is, That the people or communities, judging the duty of public sacrificing and religious administrations to be their duty, and necessary for them as a community, did choose out from among themselves, either by lot or suffrage, the two original ways of all elections, such as they judged meet for that purpose. So Virgil would have Laocoon designed to be a priest to Neptune by lot.

Laocoon ductus Neptuno sorte sacerdos, Æneid. 2.

And in Statius it was by the choice of the people that Theodamus was made the priest of Apollo in the room of Amphiaraus; so he speaks to them, Thebaid. 1. 10.

——Non haec nostro de pectore voces;
Ille canit, cui me famulari et sumere vitas
Vestra fides, ipso non discordante, subegit.

And when among the Romans the care of sacred things had been devolved on their king, upon his removal the people by suffrage created priests from among themselves, and one under the name of Rex Sacrorum, that by the countenance of the name therein, the office might not in any thing be missed, the civil power being fully transferred unto the consuls. See Dion. Halicarnass. lib. 5. So Livy, ‘Rerum deinde divinarum habita cura, et quia, quaedam publica sacra per ipsos reges facta erant, nec ubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificum creant,’ lib. 2. And the king of the Sacra at Athens had the same original, as is manifest in Demosthenes. The Daecians so far improved this power, as that having at first made priests unto their gods, they at length made one of their priests to be their god.

And this I take to be one of the principal ways, whereby in the first coalescencies of human society, the order of priesthood came to be erected among them. Possibly in their elections, they might suppose themselves to have received guidance by some supernatural indication, of which afterwards; but it was consent and choice that gave them their authority and office.

§ 11. Secondly. Those who had by any means obtained the rule of the community, knowing that with their power over it, they had an obligation on them to seek its good, did take upon themselves, the care of sacrificing for it, and performed it in their own persons. And there seems to be a natural traduction of the power and right of this kind of priesthood from the fathers of families, unto the heads of political societies, which have a resemblance to them. And thence the heathen writers do generally grant, that the care of the administration of sacred things accompanied the supreme power, so that the kingdom and the priesthood amongst them for a season went together. So Aristotle informs us of the kings in the Heroical times, that is such of whom they had tradition, but no history, κυριον ἡσαν της ἐ
κατὰ πολεμὸν ἡγεμονίας, καὶ τῶν ἐνεσίων ὅσια μὴ οὐρανικαὶ, 'They were rulers of things belonging to the conduct of war, and had the ordering of sacrifices that were not in an especial manner reserved to the priesthood.' Of the reason of which exception I shall afterwards give an account. And again, στρατηγὸς ἡμ καὶ ἐκαστής ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πρὸς τὸς Θεους κυρίος. Aristot. Poli. lib. 3. 'The king was general, judge, and lord of things sacred.' And Cicero, 'Aput veteres qui rerum potiti erant, iidem auguria tenebant: ut sapere sic divinare regale tenebant,' de Legib. lib. 2. The truth is, the use of sacrificing among the Gentiles, by that time we meet with any probable records of things among them, was much restrained, and principally attended to in and with respect to war, or an apprehension of the approach of public calamities. Hence it came to pass, that they who had the chief command in war, had power of sacrificing also. But if it were so, that not only a right of sacrificing for the community occasionally in the times of danger, belonged unto him who presided therein, but that the supreme power and priesthood went together in any greater societies, as derived from the practice of families; it is evident that they were very quickly separated again and vested in divers persons; yet so as still to reserve to kings and generals in war, the privilege of sacrificing expiatory oblations, which they did sometimes by the death of beasts, sometimes of other persons, and sometimes of themselves. For the first mention we have of priests in the world, is distinct from kings in the same place. This was in Egypt, where we find the Cohanim or priests, an order of men by themselves under the power and care of their kings. How they came by that office originally, if we shall suppose that the right of sacrificing for the community went along with regal power and rule, I know not. It may be said, that kings grew weary of that employment, as their greatness, wealth, and empire increased, and so suffered others to be chosen unto it, or designed them thereunto by their own power. Or that ambition and luxury rendering them unfit for the discharge of that office, and negligent in it, the people provided for themselves as they could. Or it may be thought that some such things fell out in those early days of the world as did in latter ages among the Caliphs of the Saracens; for the world in all its varieties, varieth not from itself. These Caliphs being originally the successors of Mahomet, had all power civil and sacred in their hands. But through the sloth of some of them, military men, who had the power and charge of armies in their hands and disposal, took the civil power from them, and making themselves emperors, left only the pontificate to the Caliphs; the principal dignity remaining to them, being an allowance to wear those garments and colours, which they did as successors to Mahomet when they had all the power. See Elmalin. Histor. Saracen. lib. 3. cap. 2. It might have so fallen out with these priests of Egypt; being originally both princes and priests, they were confined to the sacerdotal function, by some of more heroic spirits who deprived them of rule and government, which alteration might constitute one of those changes in their dynasties, which are so much spoken of. And thence it may be (which Athenæus observes) the priests of Egypt did always wear kingly garments. But these things are only conjectures, and that about matters wrapped up in the greatest obscurity. I rather judge that there was never an ordinary concurrence of both these offices in the same persons; though it sometimes so fell out on extraordinary occasions. As

Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos.
And the most ancient reports among the heathen, both in the Eastern and Grecian traditions, mention these offices as distinctly exercised by divers persons. Homer hath his priests as well as his kings, though that which then was peculiar to them was divination, and not sacrificing.

§ 11. Thirdly. Priests among the heathen might have their origin from some extraordinary 'afflatus,' real or pretended. It was with respect to their gods that men had thoughts of sacrificing, or of the way of it. And the world was generally now become utterly at a loss, both as to the nature and manner of religious worship, though the light of nature kept them up to a persuasion that the Deity was to be worshipped; and some small remainders of original tradition, that sacrificing was an acceptable mode of religious worship, still continued with them. But how to exert these notions in practice, or how to express their impressions from tradition, they knew not. But yet they still had an apprehension, that the knowledge hereof dwelt with the gods themselves, and that from them they were to expect and receive direction. In this posture of the minds of men and their consciences, it is no wonder if some quickly pretended that they were divinely inspired, and were as easily believed. For men who are utterly destitute of all means of divine and supernatural direction, are given up to as great an excess in facile credulity, as they are to an obstinate unbelief of the most evident truths, by whom such light and direction hath been rejected. And as this latter frame, at this day discourageth wise and sober men in the proposal of sacred truths, upon the highest and most evident warrant, to the sceptical Atheism of rebels against the light; so the former encouraged crafty impostors to impose their pretended inspirations on the credulous multitude, so that they easily gave up to them the entire conduct of their religious affairs. And Satan himself was sure not to be wanting to so great an occasion of promoting his interest in the world: and therefore, as he had diverted the minds of men before, from the true and only object of all religious worship, entangling them in an endless maze of abominable idolatries, so to secure them to himself in those tormenting, disquieting uncertainties, whereinto he had cast them, he did actually intermix himself and all his power, in the minds and imaginations of some persons, whom he had designed for the guides of others, in their superstitions. And an appearance of his power and presence with them, was that which instated and fixed them in a peculiar office, of managing things esteemed sacred and religious. This was the certain and undoubted original of the stated solemn priesthood among the heathen, as will yet farther appear.

§ 12. To return therefore whence we have digressed; next to him who was the first priest in office in the world, and that by virtue of divine appointment, (of whom I must treat afterwards distinctly and by himself,) those first mentioned under that name are the priests of Egypt, Gen. xli. 45, xlvii. 22, 26. Concerning them therefore in the first place our inquiry shall be.

It is very probable, that the Egyptians began to have their stated 'sacra,' very early in the world. For they were the posterity of him who unquestionably made the first defection from true religion after the flood; and therefore most likely they first improved that superstition, which they embraced in the room hereof. And hence it came to pass, that having chosen both their Deities and the manner of their veneration in the times of barbarity and darkness, before mankind had leisure to improve the remaining light of nature by contemplation, and by arts and sciences, they in their superstition fixed on, and tenaciously adhered unto such observances as
were ridiculous and contemptible to all the world besides. In process of
time they received many customs and usages in sacred things from Abra-
ham and his posterity, whilst they dwelt amongst them; much, it may be,
peculiarly under the rule of Joseph, and more upon the fame and renown
of their glorious law, and divine order in religious worship. These customs
and usages being observed among them by some Grecian writers long after-
wards, divers of late are inclined to believe that the Israelites took them
from the Egyptians, and not on the contrary. I mean not any of those su-
perstitious and idolatrous customs, which that people learned from the
Egyptians, as weeping for Tammuz, even as they borrowed idolatries and
superstitions from all their neighbours round about them, as I have else-
where declared; but I refer to those institutions themselves, which Moses
gave them in the wilderness, and some that God had peculiarly given unto
Abraham. Whether a due reverence to divine revelations and institutions
hath been observed herein, I shall elsewhere, God willing, make inquiry.
In brief, the plainest state of the difference is this: God gives a law of di-
vine worship to his people in the wilderness, declares all the parts and observ-
ances of it to be of his own immediate appointment; and in the declaration
of his mind he allows not Moses the interposition of any one word or con-
ception of his own, but made him a mere 'intermittus' to make known
his express commands and will to the people; nor did he allow him to do
anything, but what he expressly and immediately ordained. In the mean-
time making known to the people, that all that they were enjoined was
from himself, he straitly forbids them to do any thing in his service, after
the manner whereby other nations served their idol gods. Yet notwithstanding
it appears afterwards, that sundry of the things which were so in-
stituted and observed amongst them, were observed also by the Egyptians.
Hereupon it is inquired, whether the Egyptians learned those things and
took up the practice of them from the Israelites, or whether Moses (who
indeed had no more to do with the intruding or appointing of those sacred
institutions, than hath the present reader whoever he be,) did not learn
them in Egypt, and prescribe them in the wilderness to the people. But
the inquiry ought to be, not what Moses might learn of and receive from
the Egyptians, but what God himself did so, for if we believe the Scripture
at all, they were all of his own immediate appointment, without the inter-
position, of the wit, invention or memory of Moses. And I shall say, that
if any learned man can produce any one evident testimony, (or but such a
one as whose pretence unto a probability of truth, I cannot make manifest
to be vain,) of the observation of any one sacred institution, belonging pe-
culiarly unto the system of Mosaical ordinances, among the Egyptians be-
fore the giving of the law, I will pass on among the captives in their
triumph, for so great an achievement. But certain it is, that men are ex-
ceedingly apt to take up with learned conjectures out of heathen writers,
though pressing hard on the reputation of sacred truth.

14. An instance whereof, if I mistake not, may be taken from that space
of time, and what sets out therein what we have now under consideration.
Josephus, in his discourses against Appion, lib. 1. reports somewhat of the
history of the Egyptians out of Manetho, a priest of Heliopolis, who wrote
his story in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 1600 years after Abra-
ham's being in Egypt. Out of this man's writings, and in his own words,
he give an account of a nation that was called Hycos, which in the
Egyptian language signifieth kingly shepherds. This nation, as he says,
entered Egypt and subdued it, holding it for about 500 years, erecting an
especial dynasty therein. By these shepherds and their kings, with Josephus, Manetho intended the Israelites and their abode in Egypt, although he mixed the story of it with many fabulous traditions. For under that name and character were they known to the Egyptians, and on account of that profession of life, whence they were so denominated, lived separately from them. This story, with allowances for the fabulous tradition and invention of the reporter, is for the substance of it fairly reconcilable to our sacred writings; yea, no other interpretation of it is consistent with them, as we shall manifest. But our late learned chronologers are generally of another mind. They will have a nation called by the Egyptians Hycos, leaving no memorial of any name of their own, nor ground of any tolerable conjecture from whence they came, nor what became of them in the issue, nor why the Egyptians gave them that name, being a composition of what they most adored and most abhorred, to have entered Egypt presently after the death of Joseph, and conquering the whole kingdom, or at least all the lower and principal parts of it, to have erected a kingdom of their own therein. These, they say, were they who oppressed the Israelites, as it is related in Exodus, and under their rule was the people delivered, as in the same story in the reign of Apophus, leaving them to rule in Egypt two or three hundred years after. Concerning this people the principal things observed out of Manetho, are, 1. That they invaded the country in the reign of one Timmaus, God being angry with the nation, and that they had no king of their own at their first entrance. 2. That after their entrance they made one from among themselves a king, whom they called Salatis. 3. That this Salatis took care about corn and its measures, with the stipends of soldiers. 4. That he and his successors endeavoured to root out all the Egyptians. 5. That they kept Abaris, (that is Peliumus) with a garrison of 240,000 soldiers, building of some other cities. Now, leaving to others the liberty of their own judgments, I cannot but declare that to me either this whole story is a mere coined fable, or it is the Hebrews alone that are intended in it; or that credit is not to be given to our sacred story, as I shall evidently demonstrate. For, 1. If the Hebrews and their abode in Egypt be not intended in this story, what credit is to be given to the writings of this Manetho, and the skill he pretended in the antiquities of his country, or the sacred record from whence he boasted to transcribe his commentaries? for if the state of the Israelites be not here expressed, it is apparent that he had not any notice of it. For Josephus, searching of him no doubt with diligence, to find what he could discover concerning the antiquity and affairs of his own nation, could find nothing in his book, concerning their coming into and departure from Egypt, but this passage only. For what he mentions afterwards about the lepers and mixed people, hath no consistence with the story of the Hebrews, but was a mere figment of the Egyptians designing their reproach. And if this Manetho was utterly ignorant, and had no tradition of what befell his country, in that terrible desolation and ruin, the like whereof never befell any nation under heaven, what reason have we to give the least credit to any of his reports? A man may soberly judge on such a supposition, that all his dynasties and kings, and what fell out under them in ancient times, were mere figments of his own brain, like the story of Geoffry of Monmouth, concerning the succession of kings in this island from the coming of Brutus, which in like manner is pretended to be taken from sacred monastical archives. 2. The Israelites were at that time known by the name of shepherds, as they professed to follow that course of life, whence they were so denominated; and as such they were an abomi-
nation to the Egyptians. These things concurring with the ruin that befel Egypt at their departure, issued in such a fame and tradition as might easily be fabled upon, by Manetho, an idolatrous priest, so long after. But that there should be two sorts of persons, two nations at the same time in Egypt, both strangers, both called shepherds, the one oppressing the other, the Egyptians as it were unconcerned in both, seems rather to be a dream, than to have any thing of real tradition or story in it. Besides, who the one sort of shepherds at that time were, is known to all; but as to the other sort none can imagine whence they came, nor what was the end that they were brought unto. 3. They are said by this Manetho to have come into Egypt without a king, but afterwards to have made one of themselves king, who 'in time of harvest ordered the measures of corn, and paid men their allowances,' (ενθα ετι κατα ζερειαν ηρξητο τα μεν στομετρων και μυσθοφορων παρεχομενοι) which things have so plain a respect to Joseph, that he must shut his eyes who sees him not therein; especially since the times agree well enough. 4. Joseph, who was one of the shepherds, had the exercise of all regal power committed to him, and made laws and statutes, yea, changed the whole political interest of Egypt, and the tenure of their laws, making the king the sole proprietor of the whole soil, leaving the people to hold it of him in a way of tenancy, at a certain rate by the way of acknowledgment and rent. This might well raise a fame of his being a king amongst them. And there is that herein, which overthrows the whole fabulous supposition of the invasion and conquest of Egypt at that time, by another nation. For Moses affirms that those laws of Joseph were in force, and observed in Egypt, unto the day of his writing that story, Gen. xlvii. 20, 23, 25, 26. Now this story supposeth, that immediately after the death of Joseph, a new nation came in, who utterly dispossessed the Egyptians of their country and whole interest therein, taking it into their own power, possession, and use. And can any man think it probable, that the laws made by Joseph about the rights of the king and the people, should be in force, and be observed by this new nation who had conquered the whole, and at first, no man knows for how long, had no king at all? For they were these Hycos, and not the Egyptians, who according to Manetho as interpreted by our chronologers, ruled in Egypt in the days of Moses. This, in my judgment, so long as men will acknowledge the divine authority of the writings of Moses, is sufficient to discard the whole story. For it is most certain, that things could not be at the same time as Moses and Manetho report, if the Hebrews be not intended by him. And setting aside such considerations, certainly, he who was a person renowned for wisdom and righteousness in the world, the ruler and conductor of a mighty nation, the first and most famous lawgiver on the earth, writing of things done in his own days, and under his own eyes, is to be believed before an obscure fabulous priest, who lived at least 1600 years after the things fell out, which he undertakes to relate. 5. The nation or people unto whom Abraham went down, was to afflict him and his posterity 400 years, and afterwards to be judged of God for their oppression, Gen. xv. 13, 14. Now this cannot be affirmed if they first went down unto one nation, and then were afflicted by another, as this story imports. 6. The people with whom the Israelites had to do from first to last in a way of kindness and oppression, are called Misraimites, or Egyptians, constantly. And although these Hycos should have been in Misraim or Egypt, yet if they were not of the posterity of Misraim, it could not be said in what they did, that it was done by the Misraimites. They were Egyptians who first
received them and kindly entertained them; Egyptians who oppressed them and were their taskmasters; an Egyptian it was that Moses slew for his cruelty; Egyptians whom the people spoiled at their departure, and so in all other instances: whereas, if this story be rightly applied unto another nation, they received nothing but kindness from the Egyptians, and were oppressed wholly by another people. 7. The places which Manetho reports these Hycos to have held peculiarly in garrison, were most probably those built by the Israelites, whilst oppressed by the Egyptians. It is generally agreed, that Pithon, which was built by them, Exod. i. 11, was the same with Pelusium; and this the same with Abaris, which the Hycos are said to maintain with 240,000 men; which great number are said afterwards to have been driven out of Egypt, and to have entered into Syria. He that shall reflect on the truth of the story in Moses, and withal considers the nature of the reports concerning the Hebrews leaving Egypt, in Trogus, Tacitus, and others, will not easily think that any but they are intended. 8. It is evident, that whoever ruled Egypt at the departure of the Israelites, both himself, his whole host, and all the strength of the kingdom, were utterly destroyed. If it be supposed, that those were the Hycos, and not the Egyptians, and withal as it is said, that the Egyptians in Thebadis, always waged war with these Hycos, and expected an opportunity to recover their liberty, can it be imagined that they would have let go the advantage now put into their hands, when there was no strength left to oppose them. But this, according to the story, they did no way make use of; but after their destruction and desolation, the Hycos continued to rule in Egypt 300 years. Wherefore this story, as it is framed by Manetho, and applied by some late learned chronologers, is inconsistent with the writings of Moses; and therefore, with those by whom their sacred authority is acknowledged, it can be no otherwise esteemed, but as a fabulous declaration of that obscure tradition, which the Egyptians had so long after, of the Hebrews being in their country, and the desolation which befell it thereby. 'Malum habitat in alieno fundo.' Had there not been somewhat of real truth in the business, there had been no occasion for this fabulous superstructure. The like account I shall give in its proper place of that other bold, and to speak plainly, false hypothesis, that many of the Mosaic religious institutions were taken from the usage and customs of the Egyptians in their sacred rites.

§ 14. But, to return; the סנהנים, or 'priests,' mentioned among the Egyptians, were probably princes of the people at the first. And translators are yet dubious whether they should render the word in these places, 'priests' or 'princes.' At first they were designed by common consent to take care of the 'sacra,' which belonged to the community, which grew into an hereditary office; nor can I give any other probable conjecture concerning them. Appointed they seem to have been to comply with the catholic tradition of sacrificing, or doing something in lieu of it, for the good of the community. And their function continued in principal reputation in after ages, increasing in popular veneration and esteem as superstition increased among them, which was fast enough, until it had even tired itself with its own extravagancies and excess.

§ 15. Besides these Cohanim, there were in Egypt at the same time other sorts of men, whom we call magicians and sorcerers, whose arts or delusions were afterwards generally followed by the priests of other nations; or it may be upon some neglect of the service of their gods, these men pretending to a familiarity and acquaintance with them, took the office upon themselves, promising supernatural effects in the execution of it. There seem
to be three sorts of them expressed, Exod. vii. 11. These are the מכסים, ‘Chacamim;’ and מיסים, ‘Mecashphim;’ and דמשקיה, ‘Chartumim.’ The Chacamim, which we render, wise men, are here distinguished from the Mecashphim, or sorcerers; but the Chartumim, or magicians, seem to comprise both the other sorts, the Chacamim and Mecashphim. ‘Now Pharaoh called the wise men and the sorcerers, now the magicians of Egypt, they did in like manner with their enchantments.’ But Gen. xli, i, the Chacamim, or ‘wise men,’ are distinguished from the Chartumim or ‘magicians,’ as they are here from the Mecashphim, or ‘sorcerers;’ and therefore we shall consider them distinctly.

The סימנים are constantly rendered by the LXX. σοφοι, and all other translations are compliant, the word being of a known obvious signification, and commonly taken in a good sense, ‘wise men.’ For they were the men who afterwards, when the contemplation of things secret and hidden first found acceptance and then applause in Greece, were called σοφοι and then Φίλοσοφοι. But the original of their studies seemed to have been in things magical, curious, and diabolical; in which arts philosophy made its last attempt in the world, under Apollonius and some other Pythagoreans, so, like an ‘ignis fatuus,’ expiring as it began. Wherefore these Chacamim, now of such reputation in Egypt, were such as had separated themselves to the study of curious arts, and the speculation of hidden things, into whose contemplation Satan had variously insinuated himself, giving them an esteem and honour among the common people, on the account of their skill in things to them unknown; they gratifying him on the other hand, in promoting his design by superstition and idolatry. This gave them the title of wise men, which yet possibly in the judgment of those who really were so, was confined to their trade and profession; for we hear not of their use on any other occasion, Exod. vii. 11. The LXX. render ש弭ים by σοφστα, ‘men subtle to deceive.’ Hence probably in the expression of what was done by their counsel, Luke useth κατασφισσάμενος, ‘dealt subtilly,’ Acts vii. 19.

Those joined in one place with these wise men, are the מיסים. The name is originally Hebrew, from חָסָם, ‘præstigias exercuit.’ The LXX. render it by φαρμακοι, ‘venefici;’ and the Targum by סָרָה, ‘præstigiator,’ ‘jugglers, impostors,’ and also ‘conjurers.’ They seem to have pretended unto the revelation or discovery of things secret and hidden; whence the Arabic חסם, signifies to uncover, to reveal, to make known. With such a sort of impostors the world was always pestered. Of old, they were in great reputation, though now they are the scorn of the multitude. Probably they had an access to the administration of things sacred, whence the word in the Syriac denotes ‘to pray,’ ‘to administer’ in things holy, and ‘to sacrifice.’ The Chartumim are those to whom all magical effects are peculiarly assigned. It doth not appear whether they were a peculiar sect, distinct from the other two, or some of them more eminently skilled in magical operations than the rest. The name is foreign to the sacred language, probably Egyptian, though in use also among the Chaldeans. by whom this diabolical skill and practice was imitated from Egypt. The LXX. render them, Gen. xlii. εξηγησαν, ‘interpreters,’ according to the matter in hand, it being the interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh which was inquired after, wherein also they boasted their skill; Exod. vii. 11, they render ποιασιοι, incantatores, ‘enchanters.’ The V. L. omits the nam, and to supply that omission, renders סָרָה, per in cantationes Egyptiacas, ‘by their Egyptian enchantments.’ Some render it by Genethliaci, which Aben
Ezra gives countenance to, on Dan. ii. calling them 'men skilled in casting nativities,' others by malefici, arioli, magi, necromantici, 'witches, conjurers, magicians.' Targum, םרֵא הַמְדִירִים: in the common translation, Gen. xli. 'magistri,' without any reason. It is plain and evident that they were a sort of persons who pretended unto a power of miraculous operation, and made use of their skill and reputation in opposition unto Moses. Their chiefs at that time were Jannes and Jambres, mentioned by our apostle, 2 Tim. iii. 8, as they are likewise spoken of in the Talmud, and are joined with Moses by Pliny, as persons famous in magical arts. It is not unlikely but that this sort of men might have been cast under some disgrace, by failing in the interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh, the knowledge whereof was of so great importance to the whole nation. This being done by Joseph, whose eminent exaltation ensued thereon, it is not improbable but that they bore a peculiar malice towards all the Israelites, being moreover instigated and provoked by the knowledge and worship of the true God that was among them. This made them vigorously engage in an opposition unto Moses, not only in compliance with the king, but, as our apostle speaks, ἀντεστησαν, 'they set themselves against him,' which includes more than a mere production of magical effects upon the command of Pharaoh, whereby they attempted to obscure the lustre of his miracles, implying also a sedulous, active, industrious opposition to his whole design. And besides, whereas they knew that Moses was skilled in all the learning of the Egyptians, and not perceiving at first any peculiar presence of divine power with him, they thought themselves sufficient for the contest, until they were forced by the evidence of his miraculous operations, to acknowledge the energy of a divine power, above what they could imitate or counterfeit. The name, as was said, is Egyptian, as was the art they professed. And it is not unlikely but that those which Moses calls, קָהֲנָי, 'Cohanim,' were in the Egyptian language called קָשְׁמַנֵים 'Chashmannim,' who are mentioned, Ps. lxviii. 31, which we render 'princes,' who are said to come out of Egypt, professing subjection to the kingdom of Christ; for the word is Egyptian, and nowhere else used.

§ 16. Unto these Egyptian artists, two other sorts were added among the Babylonians, Dan. ii. 2. Besides the Chartumim and Mecashphim, who managed these arts in Egypt, whence their skill and names were derived by the Chaldeans, there were among their wise men הבשׁים, 'Ashaphim,' and הבשׁים, 'Chasdim,' also. How these two sorts were distinguished between themselves, or from the other named with them, is altogether unknown. Strabo tells us that the astrologers, magicians, and philosophers among the Chaldeans, were called by various names: καὶ γὰρ Ὀρχηνον τινὲς προσαγορεύονται, καὶ Βαροιπτυγνοι, καὶ ἀλλοι πλείους, lib. 16. 'Some were called Orcheni, and some Borsippeni; as also there were other sorts of them.' Ashaphim are rendered philosophers, astronomers, astrologers, physicians, merely on conjecture, and not from any signification of the name, which is unknown. The Chasdim, or Chaldeans, seem to have been a sort of people that claimed their pedigree in an especial manner, from the the first inhabitants of those parts, being the posterity of Chessed, the son of Nahor. These probably, being overpowered by a confluence of sects of other men, betook themselves unto those curious arts, which afterwards were famous or infamous throughout the world under their name; for the prognostication of future events which they pretended to, is a thing that the world always despised, and yet inquired after. So Strabo describes them: Ἀφωριστό ὦ ἐν τῇ Βακτίου κατοικίᾳ τοῖς ἐπικήρυξις φιλοσοφοῖς, τοῖς Ἀχαλτίων προσαγορευομένοις.
'There is in Babylonia a peculiar place of habitation assigned to philosophers, born in, or deriving their race from the country called Chaldeans.' We may take a brief view of them all in their order expressed, Dan. ii. 2. The first are רודנים רודנים. They where those to whom all the magical operations in Egypt are ascribed; and the name itself is Egyptian, though some would have it to be of a Hebrew extract. R. Saadías would derive it from רוֹדָם, 'a hole;' and רׇדָן, 'shut' or 'closed,' supposing they gave their answers from a hole in the earth, as the oracle of Dodona out of an oak. Some deduce it from רוֹדָם, as Avenarius and Menasseh ben Israel; judging them a sort of persons who used a style, or gravning-tool, to cut characters and pictures to work their enchantments by; see Fuller Miscellan. lib. v. cap. 11. Hottinger, with most probability, conjectures the name to be taken from רוֹדָם, which, in the Persian language, still signifies 'to know,' 7 being changed into 6, as is usual. For all such impostors do always represent themselves as persons endowed with excellent skill and knowledge, and as such are they by the common people esteemed. They were a sort of people who pretended to supernatural operations by virtue of a hidden power present with them, that is, diabolical. The next mentioned are the Ashphim, distinguished from the Chartumim as another sort and sect, by Vau copulative. Aben Ezra renders them by רוֹדָנים רוֹדָנים, 'physicians.' Some would have the name the same with the Greek σοφοι, and so a general name for all professors of secret knowledge, and of the causes of things natural. In the Concordance of Rabbi Nathan, כֵּן is רוֹדָם, 'a seer, a prophet, a prognosticator.' The third sort are the Megashphim, from חָשֵׁש, 'to divine,' see 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; Deut. xviii.; Exod. xxii. 17. Maimonides, and many that follow him among the Jews, suppose these to have been such as framing images and pictures of things above, included such powers in them by incantation, as could intercept the influences of the heavenly bodies, and thereby produce rare and wonderful effects, but always hurtful and noxious. Of the Chasdim we have spoken before. He that would further satisfy himself in the nature of the arts they professed, may consult Maimonides in More Nebuchim, lib. iii. cap. 37; Polydor. Virgil de Rerum Incantor, p. 85; Rhodigni. Var. Lec. lib. 9, cap. 23; Sixtus Sinensis Biblioth. Tit. Curio sacrarum Artium libri Danavi de Prestigiatoribus; Kircher. Oed. Tom. ii. part 2, fol. 456; Bangius Celum Orientale; Perkins on Witchcraft. Delrio. Disquisit. Rerum Magicarum, lib. i. cap. 2, lib. ii. Pelan. in Daniel, cap. 2, ver. 2; Gierus in Daniel. Agrippa de Occulta Philosophia, &c. Strabo informs us, that in his time they had lost all their skill and arts, and that the remainders of them were only a kind of priests that attended to sacrifice, lib. 17, and says that one Chereemon, who went along with Ælius Gallus, the governor of Egypt, undertaking still to practise these arts, was ridiculous to all for his ignorance and arrogance.

I have diverted to the consideration of these sorts of men, as finding some of them in this space of time, before the giving of the law, looked on as those who had more than ordinary acquaintance and intimacy with the deities in common veneration, and were thereon esteemed as priests and sacred. But it is plain that they were such as the devil excited, actuated, and after a sort inspired, to draw off the minds of men from the knowledge and fear of the only true God, and his worship. Wherefore, notwithstanding their pretence of interposing between men and a divine power, (which Satan made use of) from thence to discover things hidden, and to effect marvellous operations; and although at length they became public sacrificers, yet
are they to be utterly excluded from all consideration in those prelibations and prefigurations of the priesthood of Christ, which from divine institution were diffused amongst mankind by catholic tradition.

NOTE.

Having finished the whole doctrinal parts of the sacerdotal office of Christ, which was my principal design in these Exercitations; and having made this entrance into what I had designed, concerning the Prefigurations of the Priesthood of Christ in the Church, and in the World; I find the full discussion of all things thereunto belonging, will require larger discourses than my present indisposition as to health will allow me to engage in.
PREFACE

TO THE

EXERCITATIONS CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

CHRISTIAN READER,

There are two great concerns of that religion whose name thou bearest; the profession of its truth, and the practice or exercise of its power. And these are mutually assistant to each other. Without the profession of faith in its truth, no man can express its power in obedience; and without obedience, profession is little worth. Whatever, therefore, doth contribute help and assistance to us in either of these according to the mind of God, is highly to be prized and valued. Especially it is so in such a season, wherein the former of them is greatly questioned, and the latter greatly neglected, if not despised. But if there be any thing which doth equally confirm and strengthen them both, it is certainly of great necessity in and to religion; and will be so esteemed by them who place their principal concerns in these things. Now, such is the solemn observance of a weekly day of rest, sacred unto God.

For, amongst all the outward means of conveying to the present generation, that religion which was at first taught and delivered to men by Jesus Christ and his apostles, there hath been none more effectual than the catholic, uninterrupted observance of such a day, for the celebration of the religious worship appointed in the gospel. And many material parts of it were unquestionably preserved by the successively continued agreement of Christians in this practice. So far, then, the profession of our Christian religion in the world at this day doth depend upon it. How much it tend to the exercise and expression of the power of religion, cannot but be evident to all, unless they be such as hate it, who are not a few. To others it will quickly appear, upon a sober and unprejudiced consideration; for no small part of the power of religion doth consist in the constant payment of that homage of spiritual worship which we owe to God in Jesus Christ; and the duties designed thereto are the means which he hath appointed for the communication of grace and spiritual strength, for the due performance of the remainders of our obedience. In these things consist the services of this day, and the end of its observance is their due performance to the glory of God, and the advantage of our own souls.

The Christian religion may be considered two ways: 1st. As it is publicly and solemnly professed in the world, whereon the glory of God and the honour of Jesus Christ, do greatly depend. And, 2dly. As it prevails and rules in the minds and lives of private men. In neither of these ways can it be maintained, without a due observance of a stated day of sacred rest. Take this away, neglect and confusion will quickly cast out all regard
to solemn worship. Neither did it ever thrive or flourish in the world from the foundation of it, nor will do so unto its end, without a due religious attendance to such a day. Any man may easily foresee the disorder and profaneness which would ensue, upon the taking away of that whereby our solemn assemblies are guided and preserved. Wherefore, by God's own appointment it had its beginning, and will have its end with his public worship in this world. And take this off from the basis whereon God hath fixed it; and all human substitutions of any thing in the like kind, to the same purposes, will quickly discover their own vanity. Nor, without the advantage which it affords, as it is the sacred repository of all sanctifying ordinances, will religion long prevail in the minds and lives of private men. For it would be just with God to leave them to their own weakness and decays, which are sufficient to ruin them who despise the assistance which he hath provided for them, and which he tenders to them. Thus, also, we have known it to have fallen out with many in our days, whose apostasies from God have hence taken their rise and occasion.

This being the case of a weekly sacred day of rest unto the Lord, it must needs be our duty to inquire and discern aright, both what warrant we have for the religious observance of such a day, as also what day it is in the hebdomadal revolution, that ought so to be observed. About these things there is an inquiry made in the ensuing discourses, and some determinations on that inquiry. My design in them was to discover the fundamental principles of this duty, and what ground conscience hath to stand upon, in its attendance thereunto; for what is from God in these things, is assuredly accepted with him. The discovery hereof I have endeavoured to make, and therewithal to set forth a safe rule for Christians to walk by in this matter; so that for want thereof they may not lose the things which they have wrought. What I have attained unto of light and truth herein, is submitted to the judgment of men learned and judicious. The censures of persons heady, ignorant, and proud, who speak evil of those things which they know not, and in what they naturally know corrupt themselves, I neither fear nor value. If any part of these discourses seem somewhat dark or obscure to ordinary readers, I desire they would consider, that the foundations of the things discoursed of, lie deep, and no expression will render them more familiar and obvious to all understandings, than their nature will allow. Nor must we in any case quit the strengths of truth, because the minds of some cannot easily possess themselves of them. However, I hope nothing will occur, but what an attentive reader, though otherwise but of an ordinary capacity, may receive and digest. And they to whom the argument seems hard, may find those directions which will make the practice of the duty insisted on, easy and beneficial.

The especial occasion of my handling this subject, is declared afterwards. I shall only add, that I have here no design of contending with any, of opposing or contradicting any, of censoring or reflecting on those whose thoughts and judgments in these things differ from ours. Even those by whom a holy day of rest under the gospel, and its services, are laughed to scorn, are by me left to God and themselves. My whole endeavour is, to find out what is agreeable unto truth, about the observance of such a day to the Lord; what is the mind and will of God concerning it: on what foundation we may so attend to the services of it, as that God may be glorified in us, and by us; and the interest of religion in purity, holiness, and righteousness, be promoted amongst men.
EXERCITATION XXXVI.

FIRST EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

Αρα ἀπολειπται Σαββατικός τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Heb. iv. 9.

§ 1. Trouble and confusion from men’s inventions. § 2. Instanced in doctrines and practices respecting the Sabbatical rest. § 3. Reason for considering these at present. § 4. Extent of the controversies about such a rest. § 5. A particular enumeration of them. § 6. Special instances of particular differences, upon an agreement in more general principles. § 7. Evil consequences of these controversies in Christian practice. § 8. Principles and rules proposed for the right investigation of the truth in this matter. § 9. Names of a sacred day of rest. § 10. Names of the heathen, ἵστοροι ἡσυχίας, ἤ ἦσομεν ἡσυχίας, Gen. ii. 3; Heb. iv. 4. § 11. Translation of this word into the Greek and Latin languages. § 12. All Jewish feasts called Sabbata by the heathen. § 13. Names of the weeks. § 14. Use of the names of the days of the week derived from the heathen of old. § 15. First day of the week. Lord’s day. Lord’s day Sabbath.

§ 1. Solomon tells us, that in his disquisition after the nature and state of things in the world, this alone he had found out, that is completely and unto his satisfaction; namely, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions, Eccles. vii. 29. And the truth hereof we also find by woeful experience, not only in sundry particular instances, but in the whole course of men in this world, and in all their concerns with respect to God and themselves. There is not any thing wherein and whereabout they have not found out many inventions, to the disturbance and perverting of that state of peace and quietness, wherein all things were made of God. Yea, with the fruits and effects of this perverse apostasy, and relinquishment of that universally harmonious state of things wherein we were created, not only is the whole world, as it lies in evil, filled, and as it were overwhelmed; but we have the relics of it to conflict withal, in that reparation of our condition, which in this life by grace we are made partakers of. In all our ways, actions, and duties, some of these inventions are ready to immix themselves to our own disturbance, and to the perverting of the right ways of God.

§ 2. An evident instance we have hereof, in the business of a day of sacred rest, and the worship of God therein required. God originally, out of his infinite goodness, when suitably thereto, by his own eternal wisdom and power, he had made all things good, gave unto men a day of rest, thus to express to them his own rest, satisfaction, and complacency in the works
of his hands, and to be a day of rest and composure to themselves, and a means of their entrance into, and enjoyment of, that rest with himself, here and for ever, which he had ordained for them. Hence it became unto them a principle and pledge, a cause, and means of quietness and rest, and that in and with God himself. So might it be still to the sons of men, but that they are in all things continually finding out new inventions, or immixing themselves in various questions and accounts: for so saith the wise man, 'themselves have sought out many computations.'

And hence it is, that whereas there are two general concerns of such a day, the doctrine, and the practice of it, or the duties to be performed unto God thereon, they are both of them solicited by such various questions, through the many inventions which men have found out, as have rendered this day of rest a matter of endless strife, disquietment, and contention. And whereas all doctrines of truth do tend unto practice, as their immediate use and end, the whole Scripture being αληθεία ἡ κατ' ἑνεσείαν, Tit. i. 1, 'the truth which is according unto godliness,' the contentions which have been raised about the doctrine of the holy day of rest, have greatly influenc'd the minds of men, and weakened them in that practice of godliness, which all men confess to be necessary in the observance of such a day of rest unto the Lord, if such a day of rest there be, on what foundation soever it is to be observed. For Christians in general, under one notion or other, do agree, that a day of rest should be observed in, and for the celebration of the worship of God. But whereas many controversies have been raised about the grounds of this observance, and the nature of the obligation thereto, advantage hath been taken thereby to introduce a great neglect of the duties themselves, for whose sakes the day is to be observed; whilst one questions the reasons and grounds of another for its observance, and finds his own by others despised. And this hath been no small nor ineffectual means of promoting that general profaneness and apostasy from strict and holy walking before God, which at this day are every-where so justly complained of.

§ 3. It is far from my thoughts and hopes, that I should be able to contribute much to the composing of these differences and controversies, as agitlated among men of all sorts. The known pertinacity of inveterate opinions, the many prejudices that the minds of most in this matter are already possessed withal, and the particular engagements that not a few are under, to defend the pretensions and persuasions which they have published and contended for, will not allow any great expectation of a change in the minds of many, from what I have to offer. Besides, there are almost innumerable eristical discourses on this subject in the hands of many, to whom, perhaps, the report of our endeavours will not arrive. But yet these, and the like considerations of the darkness, prejudices, and interests of many, ought not to discourage any man from the discharge of that duty which he owes to the truths of God; nor cause him to cry with the sluggard, 'There is a lion in the streets, I shall be slain in the way.' Should they do so, no truth should ever more be taught or contended for; for the declaration of them all, is attended with the same difficulties, and liable to the same kind of opposition. Wherefore an inquiry into this matter being unavoidably cast upon me, from the work wherein I am engaged, in the Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I could not on any such accounts wave the pursuit of it. For this discourse, though upon the desires of many, now published by itself, is but a part of our remaining Exercitations on that
Epistle. Nor am I without all hopes, but that what shall be declared and proved on this subject, may be blessed to a usefulness to them, who would willingly learn, or be established in the truth. An attempt also will be made herein, for the conviction of others, who have been seduced into paths inconsistent with the communion of saints, the peace of the churches of Christ, or opinions hurtful to the practice of godliness; and left unto the blessing of Him, who when he hath supplied seed to the sower, doth himself also give the increase. These considerations have prevailed with me to cast my mite into this sanctuary, and to endeavour the right stating and confirmation of that doctrine, whereon so important a part of our duty towards God doth depend, as it is generally confessed, and will be found by experience, that there doth on this concerning a day of sacred rest.

§ 4. The controversies about the Sabbath, (as we call it at present for distinction’s sake, and to determine the subject of our discourse,) which have been publicly agitated, are universal as to all its concerns. Neither name nor thing is by all agreed on; for whereas most Christians acknowledge, (we may say all, for those by whom it is denied are of no weight, nor scarce of any number,) that a day on one account or other in the hebdomadal revolution of time, is to be set apart to the public worship of God, yet how that day is to be called, is not agreed amongst them. Neither is it granted, that it hath any name affixed to it by any such means, that should cause it justly to be preferred to any other, that men should arbitrarily consent to call it by. The names which have been, and amongst some are still in use for its denotation and distinction, are the seventh day, the Sabbath, the Lord’s day, the first day of the week, Sunday; so was the day now commonly observed, called of old by the Grecians and Romans, before the introduction of religious worship into it. And this name some still retain, as a thing indifferent; others suppose it were better to let it fall into utter disuse.

§ 5. The controversies about the thing itself are various, and respect all the concerns of the day inquired after. Nothing that relates to it, no part of its respect to the worship of God, is admitted by all uncontended about. For it is debated amongst all sorts of persons; 1. Whether any part of time be naturally and morally to be separated and set apart to the solemn worship of God; or which is the same, whether it be a natural and moral duty to separate any part of time in any revolution of it, unto divine service. I mean, so as it should be stated and fixed in a periodical revolution; otherwise to say, that God is solemnly to be worshipped, and yet that no time is required thereunto, is an open contradiction. 2. Whether such a time supposed, be absolutely and originally moral, or made so by positive command, suited unto general principles, and intimations of nature. And under this consideration also, a part of time is called moral metonymically from the duty of its observance. 3. Whether on supposition of some part of time so designed, the space or quantity of it, have its determination or limitation, morally; or merely by law positive or arbitrary. For the observance of some part of time, may be moral, and the ‘quota pars’ arbitrary. 4. Whether every law positive of the Old Testament, were absolutely ceremonial, or whether there may not be a law moral positive, as given to, and binding on all mankind; though not absolutely written in the heart of man by nature; that is, whether there be no morality in any law, but what is a part of the law of creation. 5. Whether the institution of the seventh day Sabbath, was from the beginning of the world, and before the fall of man, or whether it were first appointed, when the Israelites came into the wil-
Differences. This in itself is only a matter of fact; yet such, as whereon the determination of the point of right, as to the universal obligation unto the observance of such a day, doth much depend; and therefore hath the investigation and true stating of it, been much laboured in and after, by learned men. 6. Upon a supposition of the institution of the Sabbath from the beginning, whether the additions made, and observances annexed unto it, at the giving of the law on mount Sinai, with the ends whereunto it was then designed, and the uses whereunto it was employed, gave unto the seventh day a new state distinct from what it had before; although naturally the same day was continued as before. For if they did so, that new state of the day, seems only to be taken away under the New Testament; if not the day itself seems to be abolished; for that some change is made therein, from what was fixed under the Judaical economy, cannot modestly be denied. 7. Whether in the fourth commandment, there be a foundation of a distinction between a seventh day in general, or one day in seven; and that seventh day, which was the same numerically and precisely from the foundation of the world. For whereas an obligation unto the strict observance of that day precisely, is, as we shall prove, plainly taken away in the gospel, if the distinction intimated be not allowed, there can be nothing remaining obligatory unto us in that command, whilst it is supposed, that that day is at all required therein. Hence, 8. It is especially inquired, whether a seventh day, or one day in seven, or in the hebdomadal cycle, be to be observed holy unto the Lord, on the account of the fourth commandment. 9. Whether under the New Testament all religious observance of days be so taken away, as that there is no divine obligation remaining for the observance of any one day at all; but that, as all days are alike in themselves, so are they equally free to be disposed of, and used by us, as occasion shall require. For if the observance of one day in seven, be not founded in the law of nature, expressed in the original positive command concerning it; and if it be not seated morally in the fourth commandment, it is certain that the necessary observance of it is now taken away. 10. On the other extreme, whether the seventh day from the creation of the world, or the last day of the week, be to be observed precisely under the New Testament by virtue of the fourth commandment, and no other. The assertion hereof supposeth, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, hath neither changed nor reformed any thing in or about the religious observance of a holy day of rest unto the Lord; whence it follows, that such an observance can be no part or act of evangelical worship properly so called, but only a moral duty of the law. 11. Whether on the supposition of a non-obligation in the law, unto the observance of the seventh day precisely, and of a new day to be observed weekly under the New Testament, as the Sabbath of the Lord, on what ground it is so to be observed. 12. Whether of the fourth commandment as unto one day in seven, or only as unto some part or portion of time, or whether without any respect unto that command as purely ceremonial. For granting, as most do, the necessity of the observance of such a day, yet some say, that it hath no respect at all to the fourth decalogical precept, which is totally and absolutely abolished with the residue of Mosaical institutions; others that there is yet remaining in it, an obligation unto the sacred separation of some portion of our time unto the solemn service of God, but indetermined; and some that it yet precisely requires the sanctification of one day in seven. 13. If a day be so to be observed, it is inquired, on what ground, or by what authority, there is an alteration
made from the day observed under the Old Testament, unto that now in use; that is, from the last to the first day of the week; whether was this translation of the solemn worship of God, made by Christ and his apostles, or by the primitive church. For the same day might have been still continued, though the duty of its observance might have been fixed on a new reason and foundation. For although our Lord Jesus Christ totally abolished the old solemn worship required by the law of commandments contained in ordinances, and by his own authority introduced a new law of worship according to institutions of his own, yet might obedience unto it in a solemn manner have been fixed unto the former day. 14. If this were done by the authority of Christ and his apostles, or be supposed so to be, then it is inquired, whether it were done by the express institution of a new day, or by a directive example, sufficient to design a particular day, no institution of a new day being needful. For if we shall suppose that there is no obligation unto the observance of one day in seven indispensably abiding on us, from the morality of the fourth command, we must have an express institution of a new day, or the authority of it is not divine; and on the supposition, that that is so, no such institution is necessary, nor can be properly made, as to the whole nature of it. 15. If this alteration of the day were introduced by the primitive church; then it is inquired, whether the continuance of the observance of one day in seven be necessary or not. For what was appointed thereby, seems to be no farther obligatory unto the churches of succeeding ages, than their concernment lies in the occasions and reasons of their determinations. 16. If the continuance of one day in seven, for the solemn worship of God, be esteemed necessary in the present state of the church, then, whether the continuance of that now in general use, namely, the first day of the week, be necessary or not; or whether it may not be lawfully changed to some other day. And sundry other the like inquiries are made about the original institution, nature, use, and continuance, of a day of sacred rest unto the Lord.

§ 6. Moreover, amongst those who do grant that it is necessary, and that indispensably so, as to the present church-state, which is under an obligation from whence-ever it arise, neither to alter nor omit the observance of a day every week for the public worship of God, wherein a cessation from labour, and a joint attendance unto the most solemn duties of religion, are required of us; it is not agreed, whether the day itself, or the separation of it to its proper use and end, be any part in itself of divine worship, or be so merely relatively, with respect unto the duties to be performed therein. And as to those duties themselves, they are not only variously represented, but great contention hath been about them, and the manner of their performances, as likewise concerning the causes and occasions which may dispense with our attendance unto them. Indeed herein lies secretly the μηδεν επιδεσια, and principal cause of all the strife that hath been, and is in the world about this matter. Men may teach the doctrine of a Sabbatical rest, on what principles they please, deduce it from what original they think good, if they plead not for an exactness of duty in its observance; if they enjoin not a religious careful attendance on the worship of God, in public and private, on the consciences of other men; if they require not a watchfulness against all diversions and avocations from the duties of the day; they may do it without much fear of opposition. For all the concernments of doctrines and opinions which tend unto practice are regulated thereby, and embraced or rejected, as the practice pleaseth or displeaseth that they lead unto.
Lastly. On a precise supposition that the observance of such a day is necessary upon divine precept or institution, yet there is a controversy remaining, about fixing its proper bounds as to its beginning and ending. For some would have this day of rest measured by the first constitution and limitation of time, unto a day from the creation; namely from the evening of the day preceding unto its own; as the evening and the morning were said to be "one day", Gen. i. 5. Others admit only of that proportion of time, which is ordinarily designed to our labour on six days of the week; that is, from its own morning to its own evening, with the interposition of such diversions as our labour on other days doth admit and require.

§ 7. And thus it has come to pass, that although God made man upright, and gave him the Sabbath or day of rest, as a token of that condition, and pledge of a future eternal rest with himself; yet through his finding out many inventions, that very day is become amongst us an occasion and means of much disquietment and many contentions. And that which is the worst consequent in things of this nature, that belong unto religion and the worship of God, these differences, and the way of their agitation, whilst the several parties litigant have sought to weaken and invalidate their adversaries' principles, have apparently influenced the minds of all sorts of men, unto a neglect in the practice of those duties, which they severally acknowledge to be incumbent on them, upon those principles and reasons, for the observance of such a day, which themselves allow. For whilst some have hotly disputed, that there is now no special day of rest to be observed to the Lord, by virtue of any divine precept or institution; and others have granted, that if it be to be observed only by virtue of ecclesiastical constitution; men may have various pretences for dispensations from the duties of it; and the whole due observance of it is much lost among Christians.

Neither is it a small evil amongst us that the disputes of some against the divine warrant for one day in seven being separated unto sacred uses; and the pretence of others, to an equal regard unto all days from their Christian liberty; together with a general manifest neglect of any conscientious care in the observance of it; have cast not a few unwary and unadvised persons to take up with the Judaical Sabbath, both as to its institution and manner of its observance. Now, whereas the solemn worship of God, is the spring, rule, and measure of all our obedience unto him, it may justly be thought that the neglect thereof, so brought about as hath been declared, hath been a great, if not a principal occasion, of that sad degeneracy from the power, purity, and glory of the Christian religion; which all men may see, and many do complain of at this day in the world. The truth is, most of the different apprehensions recounted, have been entertained and contended for, by persons learned and godly, all equally pretending to a love unto truth, and care for the preservation and promotion of holiness and godliness amongst men. And it were to be wished that this were the only instance whereby we might evince, that the best of men in this world do know but in part, and prophesy but in part. But they are too many to be recounted, although most men act in themselves and towards others, as if they were themselves liable to no mistakes, and that it is an inexpiable crime in others, to be in any thing mistaken. But as this should make us jealous over ourselves, and our own apprehensions in this matter; so ought the consideration of it to affect us with tenderness and forbearance towards those who dissent from us, and whom we therefore judge to err, and be mistaken.
But that which principally we are to learn from this consideration, is, with what care and diligence we ought to inquire into the certain rule of truth in this matter. For whatever we do determine, we shall be sure to find men learned and godly otherwise minded. And yet in our determinations are the consciences of the disciples of Christ greatly concerned, which ought not by us to be causelessly burdened, nor yet countenanced in the neglect of any duty that God doth require. Slight and perfunctory disquisitions will be of little use in this matter; nor are men to think that their opinions are firm and established, when they have obtained a seeming countenance unto them from two or three doubtful texts of Scripture. The principles and foundations of truth in this matter lie deep and require a diligent investigation. And this is the design wherein we are now engaged. Whether we shall contribute any thing to the declaration and vindication of the truth, depends wholly on the assistance which God is pleased to give or to withhold. Our part it is, to use what diligence we are able; neither ought we to avoid any thing more than the assuming or ascribing of any thing unto ourselves. It is enough for us, if in any thing, or by any means, God will use us, not as lords over the faith of men, but as helpers of their joy.

Now, for the particular controversies before mentioned, I shall not insist upon them all, for that were endless; but shall reduce them unto those general heads, under which they may be comprehended, and by the right stating whereof they will be determined. Nor shall I enter into any especial contest, unless it be occasionally only, with any particular persons, who of old or of late have eristically handled this subject. Some of them have, I confess, given great provocations thereunto, especially of the Belgic divines, whose late writings are full of reflections on the learned writers of this nation. Our only design is προτεμαν την αληθειαν. And herein I shall lay down the general regulating principles of the doctrine of the Scriptures in this matter; confirming them with such arguments as occur to my mind; and vindicating them from such exceptions, as they either seem liable unto, or have met withal. And in all I shall have respect to the declaration given of the doctrine and practice of the Sabbath in the different ages to the church, by our apostle, ch. iv. of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 8. The principles that I shall proceed upon, or the rules that I shall proceed by, are, 1. Express testimonies of Scripture, which are not wanting in this cause. Where this light doth not go before us, our best course is to sit still; and where the word of God doth not speak in the things of God, it is our wisdom to be silent. Nothing, I confess, is more nauseous to me than magisterial dictates in sacred things, without an evident deduction and confirmation of assertions from Scripture testimonies. Some men write as if they were inspired or dreamed that they had obtained to themselves a Pythagorean reverence. Their writings are full of strong authoritative assertions arguing the good opinion they have of themselves, which I wish did not include an equal contempt of others. But any thing may be easily affirmed, and as easily rejected.

2. The analogy of faith in the interpretation, exposition, and application of such testimonies as may be pleaded in this cause. 'Hic labor, hoc opus.' Herein the writer's diligence, and the reader's judgment, are principally to be exercised. I have been of late much surprised with the plea of some for the use of reason in religion and sacred things; not at all that such a plea is insisted on, but that it is by them built expressly on a supposition that it is denied by others, whom they reflect upon; whereas some probably in-
tended in those reflections have pleaded for it against the papists (to speak within the bounds of sobriety) with as much reason, and no less effectually, than any amongst themselves. I cannot but suppose their mistake to arise from what they have heard, but not well considered, that some do teach about the darkness of the mind of man by nature, with respect to spiritual things; with his disability, by the utmost use of his reasoning faculties, as corrupted, or unrenewed, spiritually and savingly to apprehend the things of God, without the special assistance of the Holy Ghost. Now, as no truth is more plainly or evidently confirmed in the Scripture than this, so to suppose that those by whom it is believed and asserted do therefore deny the use of reason in religion, is a most fond imagination. No doubt but whatever we do, or have to do towards God, or in the things of God, we do it all as rational creatures, that is, in and by the use of our reason. And not to make use of it in its utmost improvement in all that we have to do in religion or the worship of God, is to reject it, as to the principal end for which it is bestowed upon us. In particular, in the pursuit of the rule now laid down, is the utmost exercise of our reason required of us. To understand aright the sense and importance of the words in Scripture testimonies, the nature of the propositions and assertions contained in them, the lawful deduction of inferences from them to judge and determine aright of what is proposed or deduced by just consequence from direct propositions, to compare what in one place seems to be affirmed with what in others seems to be asserted to the same purpose or denied; with other instances innumerable of the exercise of our minds about the interpretation of Scripture, are all of them acts of our reason, and as such are managed by us. But I must not here farther divert unto the consideration of these things. Only I fear that some men write books about them because they read none. This I know, that they miserably mistake what is in controversy; and set up to themselves men of straw as their adversaries, and then cast stones at them.

3. The dictates of general and incorrupted reason, suitable to and explained by Scripture light, is another principle that we shall in our progress have a due regard to. For whereas it is confessed, that the separation of some portion of time to the worship of God is a part of the law of our creation, the light of nature doth, and must still on that supposition continue to give testimony to our duty therein. And although this light is exceedingly weakened and impaired by sin in the things of the greatest importance, and as to many things, truly belonging to it in our original constitution, so overwhelmed with prejudices and contrary usages, that of itself it owns them not at all; yet let it be excited, quickened, rectified by Scripture light, it will return to perform its office of testifying unto that duty, a sense whereof, and a direction whereunto, were concreated with it. We shall therefore inquire what intimations the light of nature hath continued to give concerning a day of sacred rest to be observed unto God; and what uncontrollable testimonies we have of those intimations, in the knowledge, confessions, and expressions of them, in and by those who had no other way to come to an acquaintance with them. And where there is a common or prevailing suffrage given amongst mankind to any truth, and that to free us from entanglements about it, declared to be such in the Scripture; this truth must be acknowledged to proceed from that light of nature which is common to all, though the actings of it be stifled in many.

4. The custom and practice of the church of God in all ages, is to be inquired into. I intend not merely the church of Christ under the gospel, but the whole church from the beginning of the world, in the various dis-
pensions of the will and grace of God, before the giving of the law, under the yoke of it, and since the promulgation of the gospel. And great weight may certainly be laid upon its harmonious consent, in any practice relating to the worship of God. Nay, what may be so confirmed, will thence appear not to be an institution peculiar to any special mode of worship that may belong to one season, and not to another; but to have an everlasting obligation in it, on all that worship God, as such, never to be altered or dispensed with. And if every particular church be the ground and pillar of truth, whose testimony thereto is much to be esteemed, how much more is the universal church of all ages so to be accounted. And it is a brutish apprehension to suppose that God would permit a persuasion to befal the church in all ages, with respect unto his worship, which was not from himself, and the expression of its practice accepted with him. This therefore is diligently to be inquired into, as far as we may have certain light into things involved in so much darkness, as are all things of so great antiquity.

5. A due consideration of the spirit and liberty of the gospel, with the nature of its worship, the reasons of it, and the manner of its performance, is to be had in this matter. No particular instance of worship is to be introduced or admitted contrary to the nature, genius, and reason of the whole. If therefore, such a Sabbatical rest, or such an observance of it be urged, as is inconsistent with the principles and reasons of evangelical worship, as is built upon motives not taken from the gospel, and in the manner of its observance interferes with the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, it discovers itself not to belong unto the present state of the worshippers of God in Christ. Nor is any thing to commend itself unto us under the mere notion of strictness or preciseness, or the appearance of more than ordinary severity in religion. It is only walking according unto rule, that will please God, justify us unto others, and give us peace in ourselves. Other seeming duties, that may be recommended, because they have λογον σοφίας εν θελοθρησκία και ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ αφειές σωματος, a pretence of wisdom in doing even more than is required of us, through humility and mortification, are of no price with God, nor useful unto men. And commonly those who are most ready to overdo in one thing, are prone also to underdo in others. And this rule we shall find plainly rejecting the rigid observance of the seventh day as a Sabbath, out of the verge of gospel order and worship.

6. The tendency of principles, doctrines, and practices to the promotion or hinderance of piety, godliness, and universal holy obedience unto God, is to be inquired into. This is the end of all religious worship, and of all the institutions thereof. And a due observation of the regular tendency of things unto this end, will give a great discovery of their nature and acceptance with God. Let things be urged under never so specious pretences, if they be found by experience not to promote gospel holiness in the hearts and lives of men, they discover themselves not to be of God. Much more when principles, and practices conformable unto them, shall be evidenced to obstruct and hinder it, to introduce profaneness, and countenance licentiousness of life, to prejudice the due reverence of God and his worship, do they manifest themselves to be of the tares sown by the evil one. And by this rule, we may try the opinion, which denies all divine institution unto a day of holy rest, under the New Testament.

These are the principal rules, which in this disquisition respecting a sabbatical rest, we shall attend unto. And they are such as will not fail to direct us aright in our course, if through negligence or prejudice we miss
not of a due regard unto them. These the reader is desired to have respect unto, in his perusal of the ensuing discourses; and if what is proposed or concluded be not found suitable unto them, let it be rejected. For I can assure him, that no self-assuming, no contempt of others, no prejudicing adherence to any way or party, no pretence of certainty above evidence produced, have had any influence into those inquiries after the truth in this matter, which Συν Θεω, we now address ourselves unto.

§ 9. In the first place, it will be necessary to premise something about the name whereby this day may be called. For that also among some hath been controverted. Under the Old Testament it had a double appellation; the one taken from the natural order of the day then separated with respect to other days, the other from its nature and use. On the first account it was called ‘my Sabbath,’ Gen. ii. 3. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.’ So also Exod. xx. 11. Upon its first institution, and on the re-introduction of its observance, it is so called. But it is a mere description of the day from its relation to the six preceding days of the creation, that is herein intended; absolutely it is not so called any where. Yet hence by the Hellenists it was termed η ἑβδομη, ‘the seventh’; and ἑβδομη, the ‘sacred seventh day.’ So is mention made of it by Philo, Josephus, and others. And our apostle maketh use of this name, as that which was commonly in use to denote the Sabbath of the Jews. ch. iv. 4, εἰρωκε γαρ Συν περι της ἑβδομης; ‘For he speaketh,’ or it is spoken ‘somewhere concerning the seventh.’ ὑπερας, is not added, because ἑβδομη, was used technically to denote that day. And he educeth the reason of this denomination, from Gen. ii. 3. Being, as was said, the day that ensued immediately after the six distinct days wherein the world was created, and putting a period unto a measure of time by a numeration of days, always to return in its cycle, it was called the seventh day. And from that course of time completed in seven days, thence recurring to its beginning, is the name of ἑβδομαι, ‘hebdomas,’ ‘a week,’ which the Hebrews call only יִבּוֹם, ‘a seven.’ And the same word sometimes signifies the ‘seventh day,’ or one day in seven; εἰς ην ἑβδομαδα, is ‘septimum Diem celebrare,’ ‘to celebrate the, or a seventh day.’ And the Latins use the word in the same manner, for seven days or one day in seven. But this appellation, as we shall see, the apostle casts out of consideration and use, as to the day to be observed under the New Testament. For that which was first so, is passed away, and another is instituted in the room thereof; which, although it be also יִבּוֹם, or a seventh day absolutely, or one in the revolution of seven, yet not being the seventh in their natural order, that name is now of no use, but antiquated.

§ 10. From its occasion, sanctification, and use, it was called יִבּוֹם, and יִבּוֹם, the ‘Sabbath,’ and the ‘Sabbath day.’ The occasion of this name is expressed, Gen. ii. 3. ‘God blessed the seventh day,’ because he rested (shabbath) that day. It is called rest, the rest, because on that day God rested. And in the decalogue, it is וְיָּשָׁב הָאָרֶץ, ‘the day of the Sabbath;’ or of God’s rest, and ours. And absolutely יִבּוֹם the Sabbath, Isa. lvi. 2, where also God from his institution of it, calls it ‘my Sabbath,’ ver. 4.

This being a thing so plain and evident, it were mere loss of time to insist upon the feigned etymologies of this name, after it came to be taken notice of in the world; I shall only name them. Appion the Alexandrian would have it derived from the Egyptian word ‘Sabbo,’ as Josephus informs us, Cont. App. lib. 2. and what the signification of that word is, the reader
may see in the same place. Plutarch derives it from 'Sabboi,' a word that used to be howled in the furious services of Bacchus; for his priests and devotees used in their bacchanals, to cry out, 'Evoi, Sabboi,' Sympos. lib. iv. c. 15, which things are ridiculous. Lactantius, with sundry others of the ancients, fell into no less, though a less offensive, mistake. 'Hic,' saith he, 'est dies Sabbati, qui lingua Hebraeorum a numero nomen accepit; unde septenarius numeros legimus et plenus est.' Institut. lib. 7. cap. 14. Procopius Gazæus on the Pentateuch, hath a singular conceit. Speaking of the tenth month Tiziri, termed Sabbaton Sabbat, he calls it, συλληψιν του προφήτου, ὅποι καὶ σαββατα σαββατων ἐφορη, καθ' ἡν ἐμελλεν ὅ της αφεσεως καὶ της μετανοιας καιρος ἀρχησα, απο της συλληψεως του προφήτου. οδον εστιν ὑπολαβην και την ετυμολογιαν του σαββατου. ότι σαβαχα καλειταλη αφεσις: αφαισι ἐστιν ἑαυτην ἑαυταν τω κυριω, ὅτι ἐβδομη εστι το εστι ςαβασ. He would have it the day of the conception of John Baptist the forerunner of Christ, when the remission and repentance that he preached began; and thence conjectures the etymology of the Sabbath to be from 'Sabacha' (that is the Syriac σαβαχα) which signifies remission; that day being remitted holy unto the Lord; being the seventh day which is 'saba,' that is שב. The vanity of which conjecture is apparent to all. For the reason and rise of this appellation is manifest.

Hence this was the proper and usual name of this day under the Old Testament, being expressive of its occasion, nature, and end. The word also hath other forms; as שב, Exod. xvi. 23, xxxv. 2, 'Sabbaton;' and משב, Lam. i. 7, 'Mishbat;' the signification of the word being still retained. Neither yet is this word peculiarly sacred as to what it denotes, but is used to express things common or profane; even any cessation, resting, or giving over. The first time it occurs, Gen. ii. 3, it is rendered in Targum, by כה, a common word to rest. See Isa. xiv. 4, xxiv. 8, and many other places. It is also applied to signify a week; because every week, or seven of days had a Sabbath or day of rest necessarily included in it, Lev. xxiii. 15, 'You shall count to yourselves,' שבעה שבועות ימים, 'seven complete Sabbaths;' that is weeks, each having a Sabbath in it for its close; for the reckoning was to expire on the end of the seventh Sabbath, ver. 16. And this place was expounded by Onkelos in his Targum of a week; Nachmanides says upon it, that if it be so (which he also grants and pleads) then היה שבעה ימים 'there will be two tongues in one verse;' or the same word used twice in the same verse with different significations; namely, that the word שבעה should denote both the holy day of rest, and also a week of days. And he gives another instance to the same purpose, in the word יריה, Judg. x. 4, 'Jair the Gileadite had thirty sons,' יריה עשרת עשרת משב情報を, where the word יריה signifies in the first place 'coils of asses,' and in the latter 'cities.' And the common number of seven is expressed by it, Lev. xxv. 8. Thou shalt number unto, יריה עשרת ימים, 'seven Sabbaths of years;' that is, as it is expounded in the next words, יריה עשרת ימים עשרים שערים, 'seven times seven years;' seven years being called a Sabbath of years, because of the land's resting every seventh year, in answer to the rest of the church every seventh day: (see the Targum, on Isa. viii. 13; Esth. ii. 9.) Moreover, because of the rest that was common to the weekly Sabbath, with all other sacred feasts of Moses' institution in their stated monthly or annual revolution, they were also called Sabbaths, as shall be proved afterwards. And as the Greeks and Latins made use of this word borrowed from the Hebrew, so the Jews observing that their Sabbath day had amongst them its name from Saturn, 'dies Saturni,' as
amongst us it is still thence called Saturday, they called him or the planet of that name, שַבָּתָי, 'Shabtai,' and שָׁבָּתָא, 'Shabbatai.' And even from hence, some of the Jews take advantage to please themselves with vain imaginations. So R. Isaac Caro, commending the excellency of the seventh day, says, 'that Saturn is the planet of that day, the whole being denominated from the first hour,' (whereof afterwards;) 'he therefore,' says he, 'hath power on that day, to renew the strength of our bodies, as also to influence our minds to understand the mysteries of God. He is the planet of Israel, as the astrologers acknowledge;' (doubtless,) 'and in his portion is the rational soul, and in the parts of the earth, the house of the sanctuary; and among tongues, the Hebrew tongue; and among laws, the law of Israel.' So far he; who, whether he can make good his claim to the relation of the Jews unto Saturn, or their pretended advantage on supposition thereof, I leave to our astrologers to determine, seeing I know nothing of these things. And on the same account of their rest falling on the day under that planetary denomination, many of the heathen thought they dedicated the day and the religion of it unto Saturn. So Tacitus, Histor. lib. 5. 'Alii honorem eum Saturno haberi. Seu principia religionis tradentibus Idaeis quos cum Saturno pulsos et conditores Gentis acceperimus; seu quod e septem sideribus quies mortales reguntur, altissimo orbe et precipua potentia stella Saturni feratur; ac pleraque celestium vim suam et cursum septimos per numeros conficiant.' Such fables did the most diligent of the heathen suffer themselves to be deluded withal, whereby a prejudice was kept up in their minds against the only true God and his worship. The word sometimes is also redoubled by a pure Hebraism, 1 Chron. ix. 32, יָבָת יָבָת, 'Shabbath, Shabbath;' that is, 'every Sabbath:' and somewhat variously used in the conjunction of another form, יָבָת, יָבָת, Exod. xvi. 23, xxxv. 2. And יָבָת יָבָת, Exod. xxxi. 15; Lev. xxv. 4. We render יָבָת by 'rest,' the 'rest of the Sabbath,' and 'a Sabbath of rest.' Where 'Sabbaton' is proposed at least, it seems to be as much as 'Sabbatulm;' and to denote the entrance into the Sabbath or the preparation for it; such as was more solemn when שְׁבָתָא, 'a great Sabbath,' a high day ensued. Such was the Sabbath before the passover, for the miracle, as the Jews say, which befell their forefathers on that day in Egypt. The time between the two evenings was the 'Sabbatulum.' This then was the name of the day of rest under the Old Testament; yet was not the word appropriated to the denotation of that day only, but is used sometimes naturally to express any rest or cessation; sometimes as it were artificially in numeration for a week, or any other season, whose composition was by, and resolution into seven; though this was merely occasional from the first limitation of a periodical revolution of time, by a Sabbath of rest; of which before.

§ 11. And this various use of the word was adopted among the Grecians and Latins also. As they borrowed the word from the Jews, so they did its use. The Greek σαββατον is merely the Hebrew יָבָת, or perhaps formed by the addition of their usual termination from יָבָת, whence, also our apostle frames his σαββατισμος. The Latin 'Sabbatum' is the same. And they use this word, though rarely, to express the last day of the week. So Suetonius 'in Tiber. Diogenes Grammaticus Sabbatis disputare Rhodi solitus.' And the LXX. always so express the seventh day Sabbath, and frequently they use it for a week also. And so in the New Testament νησεων δις του σαββατου, Luke xviii. 12. 'I fast twice on the Sabbath;' that is, two days in the week. And יָיֶרֶף תּוֹנִי σαβבָאֲתוֹ, Acts xiii. 14,
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'the day of the Sabbath,' is that day of the week which was set apart for a Sabbatical rest. Hence μια σαββατων, 'one day of the Sabbaths,' which frequently occurs, is the same with πρωτη ἑδομαδος, 'the first day of the week;' εἰς or μια being often put for πρωτς, πρωτη, the numeral for the cardinal.

§ 12. About the time of the writing of the books of the New Testament, both the Jews themselves and all the heathen that took notice of them, called all their feasts and solemn assemblies, their Sabbaths, because they did no servile work in them. They had the general nature of the weekly Sabbath in a cessation from labour. So the first day of the feast of trumpets, which was to be on the first day of the second month, what day soever of the week it happened to be on, was called a Sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 24. This Scaliger well observes, and well proves, Emendat. Tempor. lib. iii. Canon. Isagog. lib. iii. p. 213. 'Ommem festivitatem Judaicam, non solum Judei, sed et Gentiles Sabbatum vocant; Judæi quidem cum dicunt Tisri nunquam incipere a feria prima, quarta, sexta, ne duo Sabbata continuetur; Gentiles autem non alio nomine omnes eorum solennitates vocabant.' And this is evident from the frequent mention of the Sabbatical fasts of the Jews when they did not, nor was it lawful for them to fast on the weekly Sabbath. So speaks Augustus to Tiberius, in Suetonius. 'Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi, tam libenter Sabbatis jejunium servat, quam ego hodie servavi.' And Juvenal,

Observant ubi festa mero pede Sabbata reges.

And Martial,

Et non jejuna Sabbata lege premet.

Speaking in contradiction, as he thought, unto them. And so Horace mentions their Tricesima Sabbata, which were no other but their new moons. And to this usual manner of speaking in those days, doth our apostle accommodate his expressions, Col. ii. 16, 'Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in part of a holy day,' (any part of it, or respect to it,) 'or of the new moon, or of the Sabbaths;' that is, any of the Judaical feasts whatever, then commonly called Sabbaths. So Maimonides, Tract. de Sabb. cap. 29, speaking of their weekly feasts, says expressly, "יומיו טובים של שבתות, 'they are all Sabbaths to the Lord.'

And from this usage, some think to expound that vexed expression, of σαββατων ἐνευετριφρων, Luke vi. 1, which we render, 'the second Sabbath after the first.' So Suidas, σαββατων ἐνευετριφρων: επειδὴ ἐνευρὸν μὲν ἡν τον πασχα, πρωτον ἐν τον αὐτον ἐννυμων ἐν ουν σαββατων ἐιρηται μηθαυμασης σαβ- βατων γαρ πασαν ἑντην ἐκαλουν. 'It was the second day of the passover, and the first of unleavened bread. And wonder not that it is called a Sabbath; for they called every feast day a Sabbath.' Theophylact gives us another day, but on the same reason: Saith he, οἰ ιουδαῖοι πασαν ἑντην σαββατων ὠνυμαζον: ἀναπαύεις γαρ το σαββατων. πολλαις ουν απηνα ἐν ἑντην εν τῃ παρακευη, και εκαλουν την παρακευὴν σαββατων δια την ἑντην. ειτα το κυριος σαββατων ὠνυμαζον ἐνευετριφρων, ὡς ἐνευρὸν ον, προγησαιες αλλης ἑντης και σαββατον. 'The Jews call every feast a Sabbath, for Sabbath is as much as rest. Oftimes, therefore, there fell out a feast on the day before the weekly Sabbath; and they called it a Sabbath, because it was a feast. And, therefore, that which was the proper Sabbath at that time, was called the second Sabbath after the first; being the second from that which went.
before,' Chrysostome allows the same reason, Hom. xxxix. in Matt. Isidore Pelusiota fixeth on another day, but still for the same reason, Epist. 110, lib. 3, δευτεροπρωτον εἰρηται, επειδή δευτερον μεν ἐν τού ταυχα, πρωτον δὲ τον αὐτων. 'It is called the Deuteroproton, because it was the second day from the sacrificing of the passover, and the first day of unleavened bread; which he shows was called a Sabbath, upon the general account of all the Jewish feasts being so called. For so he saith, εἰ δὲ σαββατον εἰρηται μὴ θαυμαστε: σαββατον γαρ πασαν ισορ ην καλωσι. By the way, this is expressly contrary to the Scripture, which makes the day spoken of to be the proper weekly Sabbath, as it is called, without any addition, Matt. xii. 11, whereon depended the questions that ensued about its observance. But we are beholden to Scaliger for the true meaning of this expression, which so puzzled the ancients, and concerning which Gregory Nazianzen turned off Hierome, with a scoff scarce becoming his gravity, when he inquired of him what might be the meaning of it. Scaliger, therefore, conjectures that it is called σαββατον δευτεροπρωτον, 'because it was the first Sabbath,' απὸ τῆς δευτερας τῶν αὐτων, 'from the second day of unleavened bread.' For on that day, they offered the handful, or sheaf of new fruits; and from that day, they counted seven weeks unto Pentecost. And the Sabbaths of those weeks were reckoned, απὸ τῆς δευτερας τῶν αὐτων, 'and the first that followed was called δευτεροπρωτον. So he, both in his Emendat. Tempor. lib. 6, and Isagog. Canon. p. 218. And this is subscribed to by his mortal adversary, Dionysius Petavius, Animad. in Epiphani. N. 31, p. 64, who will not allow him ever to have spoken rightly, but in what the wit of man can find no tolerable objection against. But this calling of their feasts, Sabbaths, with the reason of it, is given us by all their principal authors. So Lib. Tzeror. Hammor. on Lev. p. 102. ὁ λειψαμονωτες καρας καρας της πρωτας, καταφεκτος τον δυο κοπην της αραμις των σαββατων του της πρωτας. 'Because all solemn days are called holy convocations, they are all called so from the Sabbath, which is called holy; wherefore, the Sabbath is the head of all solemn feasts, and they are all of them called by the name thereof, Sabbaths of rest;' whereof he gives instances.

§ 13. Some of the ancients Christians, dealing with the heathens, called that day which the Christians then observed in the room of the Jewish seventh day, ἡμεραν ἡλιου, or diem solis, 'Sunday;' as those who treat and deal with others must express things by the names that are current amongst them, unless they intend to be barbarians unto them. So speaks Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, την δὲ του ἡλιου ἡμεραν, κοινος παντες την συνελευσιν ποιομεθα. 'We meet, (for the worship of God) in common on Sunday.' Had he said on the Sabbath, the Gentiles would have concluded it to have been the Judaical Sabbath. To have called it to them the Lord's day, had been to design no determinate day: they would not have known what day he meant. And the name of the first day of the week, taken up signally by Christians upon the resurrection of Christ, was not in use amongst them. Wherefore, he called the day he intended to determine, as was necessary for him, by the name in use amongst them to whom he spake, Sunday. In like manner, Tertullian, treating with the same sort of men, called it diem solis, Apol. cap. 16. And Eusebius, reporting the edicts of Constantine for the observance of the Lord's day, as it is termed in them, adds that it is the day, which we call ἡμεραν ἡλιου, or Sunday.

But, yet among Christians themselves, this name was not in common use, but by some was rejected, as were also all the rest of the names of the days
used among the Pagans. So speaks August. in Ps. xiii. ‘Quarto Sabbatorem, quarta feria, qua Mercurii dies dicitur a Paganis, et a multis Christianis. Sed nolimus ut dicant, et utimam corrigatur ut non dicant.’ And Hierome, Epist. ad Algas. ‘Una Sabbati, dies dominica intelligenda est; quia Hebdomada in Sabbatum, ut in primam, et secundam, et tertiam, et quartam, et quintam, et sextam Sabbati dividitur; quam Ethnici idolorum et planetarum nominibus appellant.’ He rejects the use of the ordinary names to the heathens. And Philastrius makes the usage of them amongst Christians almost heretical, Num. 3.

All the eastern nations also, amongst whom the planetary denomination of the days of the week first began, have, since their casting off that kind of idolatry, rejected the use of those names, being therein more religious, or more superstitious, than the most of Christians. So is it done by the Arabians and Persians, and those who are joined unto them in religious observances. The day of their worship, which is our Friday, the Arabians, call ‘Giuma,’ the Persians ‘Adina.’ The rest of the days of the week, they discriminate by their natural order within their Hebdomadal revolution; the first, the second, the third; only some of them in some places have some special name occasionally imposed on them. The church of Rome, from a decree as they suppose or pretend, of Pope Sylvester, reckon all the days of the week, by Feria prima, secunda, and so onwards; only their writers, for the most part, retain the name of Sabbatum, and use Dies Dominica for the first day. And the Rhemists on Rev. i. 10, condemn the name of Sunday as heathenish. And Polidore Virgil before them, says, ‘Profecto pudendum est, simulque dolendum, quod non antehac data sunt istis diebus Christiana nomina: ne dix Gentium tam memorabile, inter nos, monumentum haberent.’ De Invent. Rer. lib. 6, cap. 5.

And indeed, among sundry of the ancients, there do many severe expressions occur against the use of the common planetary names. And at the first relinquishment of Gentilism, it had no doubt been well if those names of Baalim had been taken away out of the mouths of men, especially considering that the retaining of them hath been of no use nor advantage. As they are now riveted into custom and usage, claiming their station on such a prescription, as in some measure takes away the corruption of their use, I judge that they are not to be contended about. For as they are vulgarly used, their names are mere notes of distinction, of no more signification than first, second, and third; the original and occasional imposition of them being utterly amongst the many unknown. Only I must add that the severe reflections and contemptuous reproaches which I have heard made upon, and poured out against them, who it may be out of weakness, it may be out of a better judgment than our own, do abstain from the using of them, argue a want of due charity, and of that condescension in love, which become those who judge themselves strong. For the truth is, they have a plea sufficient at least to vindicate them from the contempt of any. For there are some places of Scripture, which seem so far to give countenance unto them, that if they mistake in their application it is a mistake of no other nature but what others are liable unto, in things of greater importance. For it is given as the will of God, Exod. xxiii. 13, ‘In all things, saith he, “that I have said, be circumspect; and make no mention of the names of other gods, neither let them be heard out of thy mouth.’ And it cannot be denied but that the names of the days of the week, were the names of gods among the heathen. The prohibition is renewed, Josh. xxiii. 7; ‘Thou shalt not make men-
tion of the names of their gods; which is yet extended farther, Deut. xii. 3, to a command, 'to destroy and blot out the names of the gods of the people,' which by this means are retained. Accordingly, the children of Reuben, building the cities formerly called Nebo, and Baal-Meon, changed their names, because these were the names of heathen idols, Num. xxxii. 38. And David mentioned it as a part of his integrity, that he would not 'take up the names of idols in his lips,' Ps. xvi. 4. And some of the ancients, as hath been observed, confirm what by some at present is concluded from these places. Saith Hierome, 'Absit ab ore Christiano dicere, Jupiter omnipotens, Mehercule, et Mecastor, et cetera magis portenta quam nomina,' Epist. ad Damas. Now, be it granted that the objections against the use of the planetary names of the days of the week from these places may be answered, from consideration of the change of times, and the circumstances of things: yet certainly, there is an appearance of warrant in them sufficient to secure from contempt and reproach, those who are prevailed on by them to use other names.

§ 15. But of a day of rest there is a peculiar reason. If there be a name given in the Scripture to such a day, by that name it is to be called, and not otherwise. So it was unquestionably under the Old Testament. God himself had assigned a name to the day of sacred rest, then enjoined to be observed by the church; and it was not lawful for the Jews to call it by any other name given unto it, or in use among the heathen. It was, and was to be called the Sabbath day, the Sabbath of the Lord. In the New Testament, there is, as we shall see afterwards, a signal note put on the first day of the week. So, thence do some call their day of rest or solemn worship, and contend that so it ought to be called. But this only respects the order and relation of such a day to the other days of the week, which is natural, and hath no respect unto any thing that is sacred. It may be allowed then, for the indigitation of such a day, and the discrimination of it from the other days of the week; but is no proper name for a day of sacred rest. And the first use of it, upon the resurrection of our Lord, was only peculiarly to denote the time. There is a day mentioned by John in the Revelation, which we shall afterwards consider, that he calleth, ἡμέραν κυρίαν, diem Dominicum, 'the Lord's day.' This appellation, what day soever is designed, is neither natural nor civil, nor doth it relate to any thing in nature, or in the common usage of men. It must, therefore, be sacred, and it is or must be, very comprehensive of various respects. It is the Lord's day, the day that he hath taken to be his lot, or special portion among the days of the week, as he took as it were possession of it in his resurrection. So his people are his lot and portion in the world, therefore, called 'his people.' It is also, or may be, his day subjectively, or the day whereon his business and affairs are principally transacted. So the poet,

——Tydeos illa dies,

That was Tydeus' day, because he was principally concerned in the affairs of it. This is the day wherein the affairs of the Lord Christ are transacted, his person and mediation being the principal subjects and objects of its work and worship. And it is, or may be called his, the Lord's day, because enjoined and appointed to be observed by him, or by his authority over the church. So the ordinance of the supper is called the supper of the Lord, on the same account. On supposition, therefore, that such a day of rest is
to be observed under the New Testament, the name whereby it ought to be called, is the Lord's day; which is peculiarly expressive of its relation to our Lord Jesus Christ, the sole author and immediate object of all gospel worship. But, whereas the general notion of a Sabbatical rest is still included in such a day, a superaddition of its relation to the Lord Christ will entitle it to the appellation of the Lord’s day Sabbath; that is, the day of sacred rest appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ. And thus, most probably, in the continuation of the Old Testament phraseology, it is called the Sabbath day, Matt. xxiv. 20, and in our apostle comes under the general notion of a Sabbatism, Heb. iv. 9.

EXERCITATION XXXVI.

SECOND EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

1. Of the original of the Sabbath; the importance of this disquisition. § 2. Opinion of some of the Jewish masters about the original of the Sabbath, that it began in Marah. § 3. The station in Marah, and the occurrences thereof. Tacitus noted. Exod. xvi. 25, 26. Exposition of it by the Jews. § 4. This opinion refuted by testimonies and reasons. § 5. Another opinion of the ancient Jews about the original of the Sabbath, and of the Mahometans. § 6. Opinions of Christians about the original of the Sabbath proposed. § 7. That of its original from the foundation of the world, asserted. The first testimonies unto it, Gen. ii. 2. vindicated. Exceptions of Heddigerus answered. § 8. What intended by sanctifying and blessing the seventh day. § 9. Other exceptions removed. The series and dependence of the discourse in Moses, cleared. The whole testimony vindicated. § 10. Heb. vi. 3, 4, vindicated. § 11. Observance of the Sabbath by the patriarchs, before the giving of the law. Instances hereof collected by Manasseh ben Israel. Further confirmation of it. § 12. Tradition among the Gentiles concerning it. Sacredness of the septenary number. § 13. Testimonies of the heathen collected by Aristobulus, Clemens, Eusebius. § 14. Import of these testimonies examined and vindicated. § 15. Ground of the hebdomadal revolution of time. Its observation catholic. § 16. Planetary denominations of the days of the week, whence. § 17. The contrary opinion of the original of the Sabbath in the wilderness, proposed and examined. § 18. First argument against the original of the Sabbath, answered, &c.

§ 1. Having fixed the name, the thing itself falls next under consideration. And the order of our investigation shall be, to inquire first into its original, and then into its causes. And the true stating of the former will give great light into the latter, as also into its duration. For if it began with the world, probably it had a cause cognate to the existence of the world, and the ends of it, and so must in duration be commensurate to it. If it owe its rise of succeeding generations, amongst some peculiar sort of men, its cause was arbitrary and occasional, and its continuance uncertain. For every thing which had such a beginning in the worship of God, was limited to some seasons only, and had a time determined for its expiration. This therefore is first to be stated. And indeed no concern of this day hath fallen under more diligent, severe, and learned dissertations. Very learned men have here adopted contrary opinions, and defended them with much learning and variety of reading. Summa sequar vestigia rerum; and shall briefly call the different apprehensions, both of Jews and Christians in this matter, to a just examination. Neither shall I omit the consideration of
any opinion, whose antiquity, or the authority of its defenders, did ever give it reputation, though now generally exploded; as not knowing in that revolution of opinions which we are under, how soon it may have a revival.

§ 2. The Jews, that we may begin with them, (with whom some think the Sabbath began,) are divided among themselves about the origin of the Sabbath, no less than Christians; yea to speak the truth, their divisions and different apprehensions about this matter of fact, have been the occasions of ours; and their authority is pleaded to countenance the mistakes of others. Many therefore of them assign the original, or first revelation of the Sabbath, unto the wilderness station of the people of Marah; others of them make it coeval with the world. The first opinion hath countenance given to it in the Talmud. Gemar. Babylon. Tit. Sab. cap. 9, and Tit. Sanedr. cap. 7. And the tradition of it is embraced by so many of their masters and commentators, that our learned Selden, De Jur. Gen. apud Heb. lib. iii. cap. 12—14, contends for it, as the common and prevailing opinion amongst them; and endeavours to answer all the instances or testimonies that are or may be urged to the contrary. And indeed there is scarce any thing of moment to be observed in all antiquity, as to matter of fact about the Sabbath, whether it be Jewish, Christian, or heathen; but what he hath heaped together, or rather treasured up in the learned discourses of that third book of his, De Jur. Gentium apud Hebraeos. Whether the questions of right belonging thereto, have been duly determined by him, is yet left to further inquiry. That which at present we are in the consideration of, is the opinion of the Jews about the origin of the Sabbath at the station of Marah, which he so largely confirms with testimonies out of all sorts of their authors, and those duly alleged according to their own sense and conceptions.

§ 3. Marah was the first station in which the children of Israel fixed in the wilderness of Shur, five days after their coming up out of the Red Sea. Before their coming hither, they had wandered three days in the wilderness without finding any water, until they were ready to faint. The report of this their thirst and wandering, was famous amongst the heathen, and mixed by them with vain and monstrous fables. One of the wisest amongst them put as many lies together about it, as so few words can well contain. 'Effigiem,' saith he, 'animalis, quo monstrante errorem situmque depulerant, penetrati sacravere,' Tacit. Histor. lib. 5. He feigns, that by following some wild asses they were led to waters and so made an end of their thirst and wandering, on the account whereof they afterwards consecrated in their temple the image of an ass. Others of them besides him say, that they wandered six days, and finding water on the seventh, that was the occasion and reason of their perpetual observance of the seventh day's rest. In their journey from the Red Sea to Marah, they were particularly pressed with wandering and thirst, Exod. xv. 22. But this was only for three days, not seven. 'They went three days in the wilderness and found no water.' The story of the ass's image, or head, consecrated amongst them, was taken from what fell out afterwards about the golden calf. This made them vile among the nations, and exposed them to their obloquy and reproaches. Upon the third day therefore after their coming from the Red Sea, they came to Marah, that is the place so called afterwards from what there befel them. For the waters which there they found 'being רָעָה 'bitter,' they called the name of the place רָעָה, or 'bitterness.' Hither they came on the third day. For although it is said, that they went 'three days in
the wilderness, and found no water,' Exod. xv. 22, after which mention is made of their coming to Marah, ver. 23, yet it was in the evening of the third day, for they pitched that night in Marah, Num. xxxiiii. 8. Here, after their murmuring for the bitterness of the waters, and the miraculous cure of these waters, it is added in the story, 'There the Lord made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them; and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to all his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of those diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee,' Exod. xv. 25, 26.

It is said, that he gave them שָׁבָתָּה, the words whereby sacred ordinances and institutions are expressed. What these statutes and judgments were in particular, is not declared. These therefore are suggested by the Talmudical masters. One of them, they say, was the ordinance concerning the Sabbath. About the other, they are not so well agreed. Some refer it to the fifth commandment of honouring father and mother; others to the ceremonies of the red heifer, with whose ashes the water of sprinkling was to be mingled; for which conjecture they want not such reasons as are usual amongst them. The two first they confirm from the repetition of the law, Deut. v. 14, 15. For there those words, 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee,' are distinctly added to those two precepts, the fourth and fifth, and to no other. And this could arise from no other cause, but because God had before given them unto the people in Marah, where he said he had given them בָּשָׁתָּה: that is, the ordinance and law of the Sabbath, and the judgment of obedience to parents and superiors. This is one of the principal ways whereby they confirm their imaginations. And fully to establish the truth hereof, Baal Hatturim, or the small gematical annotations on the Masoretical Bibles, adds, that in those words Deut. v. 16, נַעֵשׁ נַעֵשׁ הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה h of the name of the place where these laws were given. And this is the sum of what is pleaded in this case.

§ 4. But every one may easily see the vanity of these pretences, and how easy it is for any one to frame a thousand of them, who knows not how to spend his time better. Aben Ezra and Abarbinel both confess that the words used in the repetition of the law, Deut. v. do refer to the giving of it on Mount Sinai. And if we must seek for special reasons of the inserting of those words, besides the sovereign pleasure of God, reasons are not wanting which are far more probable than those of the masters. 1. The one of these commandments closing up the first table concerning the worship of God, and the other heading the second table concerning our duties amongst ourselves, and towards others, this memorial, 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee,' is on that account expressly annexed unto them, being to be distinctly applied unto all the rest. 2. The fourth command is as it were custos primae tabulae, 'the keeper of the whole first table,' seeing our owning of God to be our God, and our worship of him according to his mind, were solemnly to be expressed, on the day of rest commanded to be observed for that purpose; and in the neglect whereof they will sure enough be neglected; whence also a remembrance to observe this day is so strictly enjoined. And the fifth commandment is apparently custos secundae tabulae; as appointed of God to contain the means of exacting the observance of all the duties of the second table, or of punishing the neglect of them and disobedience unto them. And therefore, it may be the me-
memorial is not peculiarly annexed unto them on their own distinct account, but equally upon that of the other commandments whereunto they do refer. 3. There is yet a special reason for the peculiar appropriation of these two precepts, by that memorial unto this people. For they had now given unto them an especial typical concern in them, which did not at all belong unto the rest of mankind, who were otherwise equally concerned in the dialogue with themselves. For in the fourth commandment, whereas no more was before required, but that one day in seven should be observed as a sacred rest, they were now precisely confined to the seventh day, in order from the finishing of the creation, or the establishing of the law and covenant of the works, or a day answering thereunto. For in the decalogical law, the determination of the day in the Hebdomadal revolution, was added to the law of nature. And this was with respect unto, and in the confirmation of, that ordinance which gave them the seventh day Sabbath in a particular manner; that is, the seventh day after six days raining of manna, Exod. xvi. And in the other, the promise annexed unto it of prolonging their days, had peculiar respect unto the land of Canaan. There is neither of these, but is a far more probable reason of the annexing those words, 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee,' unto those two commandments, than that fixed on by the Talmudical masters. Herein only I agree with them, that both these commands were given alike in Marah, and one of them, I suppose, none will deny to be a principal dictate of the law of nature. For the words mentioned, אָאוֹרָת הָעָבְדֵּלָם, an ordinance and statute, the meaning of them is plainly expounded, ver. 26. God then declared this unto them as his unchangeable ordinance and institution, that he would bless them on their obedience, and punish them upon their unbelief and rebellion, wherein they had experience of his faithfulness to their cost. The reader may see this fiction farther disproved in Tostatus on the place, though I confess some of his reasons are inconstringent and frivolous.

Moreover, this station of Marah was occupied on or about the twenty-fourth day of Nisan or April. And the first solemn observance of the Sabbath in the wilderness, was upon the twenty-second of Jiar, the month following; as may easily be evinced from the journal of Moses. There were therefore twenty-seven days between this fictitious institution of the Sabbath, and the first solemn observance of it, which was at their station in Alush, as is generally supposed, certainly in the wilderness of Sin, after they had left Marah and Elim, and the coast of the Red Sea; whereunto they returned from Elim, Exod. xvi. 1, Num.xxxiii. 8—11. For they first began their journey out of Egypt on the fifteenth day of Nisan, or the first month, Exod. xii. 37; Num. xxxiii. 3. And they passed through the sea into the wilderness, about the nineteenth day of that month, as is evident from their journeyings, Num. xxxiii. 5—9. On the twenty-fourth of that month, they pitched in Marah; and it was the fifteenth day of Jiar, or the second month, before they entered the wilderness of Sin, where is the first mention of their solemn observance of the Sabbath, upon the occasion of the gathering of manna. Between these two seasons three Sabbaths must needs intervene; and those immediately upon its first institution, if this fancy may be admitted. And yet the rulers of the congregation looked upon the people's preparation for its observance as an unusual thing, Exod. xvi. 22, which could not have fallen out, had it received so fresh an institution.

Besides, these masters themselves, and Raski in particular, who in his comment on the place, promotes this fancy, grants that Abraham observed
the Sabbath. But the law and ordinances hereof, they say, he received on peculiar favour, and by special revelation. But be it so; it was the great commendation of Abraham, and that given him by God himself, that he 'would command his children and household after him to keep the way of the Lord,' Gen. xviii. 19. Whatever ordinance therefore he received from God, respecting any thing to be observed in his worship, it was a part of his fidelity to communicate the knowledge of it unto his posterity, and to teach them its observance. They must, therefore, of necessity on those men's principles, be instructed in the doctrine and observance of the Sabbath before this pretended institution of it. Should we then allow what the generality of the Jewish masters and Talmudical Rabbins do assert, that the law of the Sabbath was first given in Marah; yet, the whole of what they assert, being a mere curious conjecture, it may and ought to be rejected. Not what these men say, but what they prove, is to be admitted. And he who with much diligence hath collected testimonies out of them unto this purpose, hath only proved what they thought, but not what is the truth. And upon this foul imagination is built their general opinion, that the Sabbath was given only unto Israel, that it is the spouse of the synagogue, and that it belongs not to the rest of mankind. Such dreams they may be permitted to please themselves withal. But that these things should be pleaded by Christians, against the true origin and use of the Sabbath, is somewhat strange. If any think their assertions in this matter to be of any weight, they ought to admit what they add thereunto; namely, that all the 'Gentiles shall once a-week keep a Sabbath in hell.'

§ 5. Neither is the opinion, that the Sabbath was first instituted in Marah, universally received by them. Some of their most famous masters are otherwise minded. For they both judge that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise, and that the law of it was equally obligatory unto all nations in the world. Of this mind are Maimonides, Aben Ezra, Abarbinel, and others. For they expressly refer the revelation of the Sabbath, unto the sanctification and benediction of the first seventh day, Gen. ii. 2. The Targum on the title of Ps. xci. ascribes that Psalm to Adam, as spoken by him on the Sabbath day. Whence Austin esteemed this rather the general opinion of the Jews, Tractat. 20, in Johan. And Manassch ben Israel, Lib. de Creat. Problem 8, proves out of sundry of their own authors, that the Sabbath was given unto, and observed by the patriarchs, before the coming of the people into the wilderness. In particular, that it was so by Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, he confirms by testimonies out of the Scripture not to be despised. Philo Judæus, and Josephus, both of them more ancient, and more learned than any of the Talmudical doctors, expressly assign the original of the Sabbath to that of the world. Philo calls it, τον κοσμον γενεσον, 'the day of the world's nativity.' And ἐρημιν ον μιας πόλεως η χωρας αλλα του παντος, 'A feast not of one city or country, but of the whole world.' De Opificio Mundi; et de Vita Mos. lib. 2. To the same purpose speaks Josephus, lib. 2. cont. Appion. And the words of Abarbinel are sufficiently express in this matter: כְּפַר הָבָיִל לְכָּבוֹד לְגוֹנֵי אֲדָם, כְּפַר הָבָיִל לְכָּבוֹד לְגוֹנֵי אֲדָם, כְּפַר הָבָיִל Lְכָּבוֹד Lְגוֹנֵי Aדָם, כְּפַר Hבָיִל Lכָּבוֹד Lלְגוֹנֵי Aדָם, כְּפַר Hבָיִל Lלְגוֹנֵי Aדָם. He sanctified and separated the seventh day unto glory and honour, because on its approach the work of heaven and earth was perfected and finished— Even as a man when he hath performed an honourable work, and perfected it, maketh a banquet and a day of feasting.' And yet more evident is that of Maimon. Tract. Ridush. Hakkodesh. cap. 1.
OF THE ORIGINAL OF THE SABBATH.

The vision or sight of the moon is not delivered to all men, as was the Sabbath Bereschith, or in the beginning. For every man can number six (days) and rest on the seventh. But it is committed to the house of judgment (the Sanhedrim) (that is, to observe the appearances of the moon) and when the Sanhedrim declareth and pronounces that it is the new moon, or the beginning of the month, then it is to be taken so to be.' He distinguisheth their sacred feasts into the weekly Sabbath, and the new moons, or those that depended ἀπὸ τῆς φασιος τῆς σελήνης, upon the appearing of the new moon. The first he calls ἡβαραίνει, Sabbath Bereschith, the Sabbath instituted at the creation; for so from the first of Genesis they often express technically the work of the creation. This, he says, was given to every man; for there is no more required to the due observance of it in point of time, but that a man be able to reckon six days, and so rest on the seventh. But now for the observance of the new moons, all feasts that depended on the variations of her appearances, this was peculiar to themselves, and the determination of it left unto the Sanhedrim. For they trusted not unto astrological computations merely, as to the changes of the moon, but sent persons into sundry high places to watch and observe her first appearances, which if they answered the general established rules, then they proclaimed the beginning of the feast to be. So Maimon. Ri-
dush, Hakkodesh, cap. 2.

And Philippus Guadagnolus, Apol. pro Christiana Relig. part 1. cap. 8. shows that Ahmed ben Zin, a Persian Mahometan whom he confutes, af-
firmed, that the institution of the Sabbath was from the creation of the world. This indeed he reflects upon in his adversary with a saying out of the Alcoran, Azoar. 3, where those that sabbatize are cursed; which yet will not serve his purpose. For in the Alcoran respect is had to the Jewish Sabbath, or the seventh day of the week precisely: when one day of seven only is pleaded by Ahmed to have been appointed from the foundation of the world. I know some learned men have endeavoured to elude most of the testimonies which are produced to manifest the opinion of the most ancient Jews in this matter. But I know also that their exceptions might be easily removed, would the nature of our present design admit of a con-
test to that purpose.

We come now to the consideration of those different opinions concerning the original of the Sabbath, which are embraced and contended about amongst the learned, yea, and unlearned too, of the present age and church. And rejecting the conceit of the Jews about the station in Marah, which very few think to have any probability attending it, there are two opinions in this matter that are yet pleaded for. The first is, that the Sabbath had its institution, or the precept or warrant for its observance, in paradise be-
fore the fall of man, immediately upon the finishing of the works of crea-
tion. This is thought by many to be plainly and positively asserted, Gen. ii. 2, and our apostle seems directly to confirm it, by placing the blessing of the seventh day, as the immediate consequence of the finishing of the works of God from the foundation of the world, Heb. iv. 5, 6. Others re-
fer the institution of the Sabbath, to the precept given about its observance in the wilderness of Sin, Exod. xvi. 22—26. For those who deny its origi-
inal from the beginning, or a morality in its law, cannot admit that it was first given on Sinai, or had its spring in the decalogue, nor can give any peculiar reason why it should be inserted therein, seeing express mention is
made of its observance some while before the giving of the law there. These therefore make it a merely typical institution, given, and that without the solemnity of the giving other solemn institutions, to the church of the Hebrews only. And amongst those of this judgment, some contend, that in those words of Moses, Gen. ii. 3, 'And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his works, a prolepsis is to be admitted; that is, that what is there occasionally inserted in the narrative, (and to be read in a parenthesis,) came not to pass indeed, until above two thousand years after, namely, in the wilderness of Sin; where, and when, God first blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. And the reason given for the supposed insertion of the words in the story of Moses, is, because when it came to pass indeed, that God so blessed the seventh day, he did it on the account of what he was then relating of the works that he made, and the rest that ensued thereon. Others give such an interpretation of the words as that they should contain no appointment of a day of rest; as we shall see. They who assert the former opinion, deny that the precept, or rather the directions about the observance of the Sabbath given unto the people of Israel in the wilderness of Sin, Exod. xvi. was its first original institution; and affirm, that it was either a new declaration of the law, and usage of it unto them, who in their long bondage had lost both its doctrine and practice, with a renewed reinforcement of it, by an especial circumstance of the manna not falling on that day; or rather that it was a particular application of a catholic moral command, unto the economy of that church, unto whose state the people were then under a 'praeludium' in the occasional institution of sundry particular ordinances, as hath been declared in our former Exercitations. This is the plain state of the present controversy about the original of the Sabbath, as to time and place, wherein what is according unto truth, is now to be inquired after.

§ 7. The opinion of the institution of the Sabbath from the beginning of the world, is founded principally on a double testimony, one in the Old Testament, and the other in the New. And both of them seem to me of so uncontrollable an evidence, that I have often wondered how ever any sober and learned persons, undertook to evade their force or efficacy in this cause. The first is that of Gen. ii. 1—3, 'Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them; and on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.' There is indeed somewhat in this text, which hath given difficulty unto the Jews, and somewhat that the heathen took offence at. That which troubles the Jews is, that God is said to have 'finished his work on the seventh day.' For they feared that somewhat might be hence drawn, to the prejudice of their absolute rest on the seventh day, whereon it seems God himself wrought in the finishing of his work. And Hierome judged that they might be justly charged with this consideration. Aretabimus, saith he, Judæos, qui de otio Sabbati gloriabant, quod jam tunc in principio Sabbatum dissolutum sit; dum Deus operatur in Sabbato complems opera sua in eo, et beneficiens ipsi diei, quia in illo universa complevit. 'We will urge the Jews with this, who glory of their Sabbatical rest, in that the Sabbath was broken or dissolved from the beginning; whilst God wrought in it, finishing his work, and blessed the day, because in it he finished all things.' Hence the LXX. read the words by an open corruption, εν τῷ ημερήστῳ τῇ ικτῇ; 'on the sixth
day; wherein they are followed by the Syriac and Samaritan versions. And the Rabbins grant that this was done on purpose, that it might not be thought that God made any thing on the seventh day. But this scruple was every way needless. For do but suppose, that וְיָשָׁרָה, which expresseth the time past, doth intend the praeterpluperfect tense, as the praeterperfect in the Hebrew must do, where occasion requires, seeing they have no other to express that which at any time is past by; and it is plain that God had perfected his work, before the beginning of the seventh day's rest. And so are the words well rendered by Junius; 'Quum autem perfecisset Deus die septimo, opus suum quod fecerat.' Or we may say, 'Compleverat die septimo.'

That which the heathen took offence at was the rest here ascribed unto God; as though he had been wearied with his work. Hence was that of Rutilius, in his Itinerary;

Septima quaque dies turpi damnata vetera,
Ut delassati mollis imago Dei.

The sense of this expression we shall afterwards explain. In the meantime, it is certain that the word here used doth often signify only to cease, or give over, without respect either to weariness or rest; as Job xxxii. 1; I Sam. xxv. 9. So that no cause of offence was given in the application of it to God himself. However Philo, lib. de Opif. Mund. refers this of God's rest, to his contemplation of the works of his hands, and that not unmeeety, as we shall see. But set aside prejudices and preconceived opinions, and any man would think that the institution of the Sabbath is here as plainly expressed as in the fourth commandment. The words are the continuation of a plain historical narration. Having finished the account of the creation of the world in the first chapter, and given a recapitulation of it in the first verse of this, Moses declares what immediately ensued thereon; namely, the rest of God on the seventh day, and his blessing and sanctifying that day whereon he so rested. That day on which he rested, he blessed and sanctified; even that individual day in the first place, and a day in the revolution of the same space of time for succeeding generations. This is plain in the words, or nothing can be thought to be plainly expressed. And if there be any appearance of difficulty in those words, 'he blessed and sanctified it,' it is wholly taken away in the explication given of them by himself afterwards, in the fourth commandment, where they are plainly declared to intend its setting apart and consecration to be a day of sacred rest. But yet exceptions are put into this plain open sense of the words. Thus it is lately pleaded by Heddergerus, Theol. Patriarch. Exercitat. iii. sect. 58. 'Deus die septimo cessaverat facere opus novum, quia sex diebus omnia consummata erant. Et debo benedixit eo ipso quod cessans ab opere suo, ostendit, quod homo in cujus creatione quiuevit, factus sit propter nominis sui glorificationem; quod cum magus fuerit ceteris quae haecenus creati sunt, vocatur benedictio, eundum diem, cui ie benedixit, sanctificavit, quia et illo die, et reliquo toto tempore constituerat se in homine sanctificare tanquam in corona et gloria sui operis. Sanctificare enim est, cum qui sanctus est, sanctum dicere et testari. Dies igitur et tempus sanctum erat et agnocebatur, non per se, sed per sanctitatem hominis, qui in tempore se sanctificat, et cogitationes, et studia, et actiones suas Deo, qui sanctus est, vindicat et consecrat.' I understand not how God can be said to bless the seventh day, because man, who was created the sixth day, was made for the
glory of his name. For all things, as well as man, were made for the glory of God. "He made all things for himself," Prov. xvi. 4, and they all "declare his glory," Ps. xix. Nor is it said, that God rested on the seventh day from making of man, but from all the works that he had made. Grant man, who was last made, to have been the most eminent part of the visible creation, and most capable of immediately giving glory to God, yet it is plainly said, that the rest of God respected all the works that he had made, which is twice repeated; besides that the works themselves are summed up into the making of the heavens and earth, and all the host of them. And wherein doth this include the blessing of the seventh day? it may be better applied to the sixth, wherein man was made; for on the seventh, God did no more make man, than he did the sun and moon, which were made on the fourth. Nor is there here any distinction supposed between God's resting on the seventh day, and his blessing of it, which yet are plainly distinguished in the text. To say he blessed and sanctified it, merely by resting on it, is evidently to confound the things that are not only distinctly proposed in the text, but so as that one is laid down as the cause of the other. For because God rested on the seventh day, therefore he blessed it. Nor is the sanctification of the day any better expressed. "God," saith he, "had appointed on that day and always to sanctify himself in man, as the crown and glory of his work." I wish this learned man had more clearly expressed himself. What act of God is it, that can be here intended? It must be the purpose of his will. This therefore is given us as the sense of this place. God sanctified the seventh day, that is, God purposed from eternity to sanctify himself always in man, whom on the sixth day he would create for his glory. These things are so forced, as that they scarcely afford a tolerable sense.

§ 8. Neither is the sense given by this author, and some others, of that expression to sanctify, that is, to declare or testify any person or thing to be holy, being spoken by God, and not of him objectively, usual, or to be justified. In reference unto God, our sanctifying him or his name, is indeed to testify or declare his holiness, by our giving honour and glory to him, in our holy obedience. But as to men and things, to sanctify them is either really to sanctify them by making them internally holy, or to separate and dedicate them unto holy uses; the former peculiar to persons, the latter common to them with other things made sacred, by an authoritative separation from profane or common uses, unto a peculiar sacred, or holy use in the worship of God. And the following words in our author, that the day is sanctified and made holy, not in itself, but by the holiness of man, are not any more to the purpose. For as man was no more created on that day, than the beasts of the field, so that from his holiness no colour can be taken to ascribe holiness unto the day; so it is not consistent with what was before asserted, that the sanctification intended is the holiness of God himself as declared in his works; for now it is made the holiness of man.

The sense of the words is plain, and are but darkened by these circumlocutions. יבָרְךָ שׁנין זא וְיִשַׂרְיָא וַיָּבֹא נָא. The Jews do well express the general sense of the words, when they say of the day, that בָּרֵךְ מְכָר לָנוּ and מְכָר מְכָר חַסִּים, it was divided or distinguished from the common nature of things in the world; namely, by having a new sacred relation added unto it. For that the day itself is the subject spoken of, as the object of God's blessing and sanctification, nothing but unallowable pre-
judice will deny. And this to be the sense of the expressions, both the
words used to declare the acts of God about it do declare.

1. דב, 'he blessed it.' God's blessing as the Jews say, and they say
well therein, is מטסה מבור, an addition of good. It relates to something
that hath a real present existence, to which it makes an addition of some
farther good, than it was before partaker of. Hereof, as we said, the day
in this place was the direct and immediate object; God blessed it. Some
peculiar good was added unto it. Let this be inquired into what it was,
and wherein it did consist, and the meaning of the words will be evident.
It must be somewhat whereby it was preferred unto, or exalted above other
days. When any thing of that nature is assigned, besides a relation given
unto it to the worship of God, it shall be considered. That this was it, is
plain from the nature of the thing itself, and from the actual separation and
use of it to that purpose which did ensue.

The other word, קֹדֶשׁ, 'and sanctified it,' it is farther instructive in the
intention of God, and is also exegetical of the former. Suppose still, as
the text will not allow us to do otherwise, that the day is the object of this
sanctification, and it is not possible to assign any other sense of the words,
but that God set apart by his institution that day to be the day of his wor-
ship to be spent in a sacred rest unto himself. And this is declared to
be the intendment of the word in Decalogue, where it is used again to the
same purpose. For none ever doubted but that there the meaning of קֹדֶשׁ,
'and he sanctified it' is that by his institution and command he set it apart for a day of holy rest. And this significature of that
word is not only most common, but solely to be admitted in the Old
Testament, if cogent reason be not given to the contrary; as where it
denotes a dedication and separation to civil uses, and not to sacred, as
it sometimes doth, still retaining its general nature of separation. And
therefore I will not deny but that these two words may signify the same
thing, the one being merely exegetical of the other. He blessed it, by
sanctifying of it: as Num. vii. 1. כֹּדֶשׁ וְיָנַח אָדָם, 'And he anointed
them, and sanctified them; that is, he sanctified them by anointing
them; or by their anunction set them apart unto a holy use, which is the
instance of Abarbinel on this place. This then is that which is affirmed by
Moses. On the seventh day after he had finished his work, God rested or
ceased from working, and thereon blessed and sanctified the seventh day,
or set it apart to holy uses for their observance, by whom he was to be
worshipped in this world, and whom he had newly made for that purpose.
God then sanctified this day; not that he kept it holy himself, which in
no sense the divine nature is capable of; nor that he purified it, and made
it inherently holy, which the nature of the day is incapable of; nor that
he celebrated that which in itself was holy, as we sanctify his name, which
is the act of an inferior towards a superior; but that he set it apart to sacred
use authoritatively, requiring us to sanctify it in that use obedientially.
And if you allow not this original sanctification of the seventh day, the
first instance of this solemn, joint, national observance, is introduced with
a strange abruptness. It is said, Exod. xvi. where this instance is given,
'that on the sixth day the people gathered twice as much bread as on any
other day;' namely, two omers for one man, which the rulers taking notice
of, acquainted Moses with it, ver. 22. And Moses, in answer to the rulers
of the congregation who had made the information, gives the reason of it:
'To-morrow,' saith he, 'is the rest of the holy Sabbath to the Lord,' ver. 23.
Many of the Jews can give some colour to this manner of expression; for they assign, as we have shown, the revelation and institution of the Sabbath to the station in Marah, Exod. xv. which was almost a month before. So they think that no more is here intended, but a direction for the solemn observance of that day which was before instituted, with particular respect to the gathering of manna, which the people being commanded in general before, to gather every day according to their eating, and not to keep any of it until the next day, the rulers might well doubt whether they ought not to have gathered it on the Sabbath also; not being able to reconcile a seeming contradiction between those two commands of gathering manna every day, and of resting on the seventh. But those by whom the fancy about the station in Marah is rejected, as it is rejected by most Christians, and who will not admit of its original institution from the beginning, can scarce give a tolerable account of this manner of expression. Without the least intimation of institution and command, it is only said, ‘To-morrow is the Sabbath holy to the Lord;’ that is for you to keep holy. But on the supposition contended for, the discourse in that place, with the reason of it, is plain and evident. For there being a previous institution of the seventh day’s rest, the observance whereof was partly gone into disuse, and the day itself being then to receive a new peculiar application to the church state of that people, the reason both of the people’s conduct, and of the rulers’ doubt, and of Moses’ resolution, is plain and obvious.

§ 9. Wherefore, granting the sense of the words contended for, there is yet another exception put in, to invalidate this testimony as to the original of a seventh day’s sabbatical rest from the foundation of the world. And this is taken, not from the signification of the words, but from the connexion and disposition of them in the discourse of Moses. For suppose that by God’s blessing and sanctifying the seventh day, the separation of it unto sacred uses is intended, yet this doth not prove that it was so sanctified immediately upon the finishing of the work of creation. For, say some learned men, those words of Gen. ii. 3. ‘And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made,’ are inserted occasionally into the discourse of Moses, from what afterwards came to pass. They are not therefore, as they suppose, a continued part of the historical narration there insisted on, but are inserted into it by way of prolepsis or anticipation, and are to be read as it were in a parenthesis. For supposing that Moses wrote not the book of Genesis until after the giving of the law, (which I will not contend about, though it be assumed gratis in this discourse,) there being a respect had unto the rest of God when his works were finished in the institution of the Sabbath, upon the historical relation of that rest, Moses inserts what so long after was done and appointed on the account thereof. And so the sense of the words must be, that ‘God rested on the seventh day from all his works that he had made;’ that is, the next day after the finishing of the works of creation; wherefore, two thousand four hundred years after, God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, not that seventh day whereon he rested, with them that succeeded in the like revolution of time; but a seventh day that fell out so long after, which was not blessed nor sanctified before. I know not well how men learned and sober can offer more violence to a text, than is put upon this before us by this interpretation. The connexion of the words is plain and equal. ‘And the heavens, and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished. And God had finished on the seventh day all his work that he had made':
And he rested the seventh day from all his work that he had made: And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it God rested from all his work which he had created and made. You may as well break off the order and continuation of the words and discourse in any other place, as in that pretended. And it may be as well feigned that God finished his work on the seventh day, and afterwards rested another seventh day; as that he rested the seventh day, and afterwards blessed and sanctified another. It is true there may be sundry instances given out of the Scripture, of sundry things inserted in historical narrations by way of anticipation, which fell not out until after the time wherein mention is made of them. But they are mostly such as fell out in the same age or generation; the matter of the whole narration being entire within the memory of men. But of so monstrous and uncouth a prolepsis, as this which is supposed would be, no instance can be given in the Scripture, or in any sober author; especially where there is not the least notice given that such it is. And such schemes of writing are not to be imagined, unless necessity from the things themselves spoken of, compel us to admit them; much less where the matter treated of, and the coherence of the words, do necessarily exclude such an imagination, as it is in this place. For without the introduction of the words mentioned, neither is the discourse complete, nor the matter of fact absolved. And what lieth against our construction and interpretation of these words, from the arguments insisted on to prove the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, shall be afterwards considered.

§ 10. The testimony to the same purpose with the former, taken out of the New Testament, is that of our apostle, Heb. iv. 3, 4, 'For we who have believed do enter into rest; as he said, As I swear in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest; although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.' For he speaketh somewhere concerning the seventh day in this wise: And God rested on the seventh day from all his works. Having insisted at large on this place, and on the whole ensuing discourse, in our exposition of the chapter itself, I shall here but briefly reflect upon it, referring the reader for its full vindication to its proper place. The present design is to convince the Hebrews of their concernment in the promise of entering into the rest of God; namely, that promise and rest which yet remained, and were prophesied of, Ps. xcv. To this purpose he manifests, that notwithstanding any other rest of God that was mentioned in the Scripture, there yet remained another rest for them that did or would believe in Christ through the gospel. In the proof and confirmation hereof, he takes into consideration the several rests of God, under the several states of the church, which were now passed and gone. And first he fixeth upon the Sabbatical rest of the seventh day, as that which was the first in order, first instituted, first enjoyed or observed; and this he says ensued upon the finishing of the works of creation. This the order of the words, and coherence of them require: 'Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world; for he speaketh concerning the seventh day on this wise.' The works, and the finishing of them, did not at all belong to the apostle's discourse or purpose but only as they denoted the beginning of the seventh day's Sabbatical rest; for it is the several rests of God alone that he is inquiring after. The first rest mentioned, saith he, cannot be that intended in the Psalm, because that rest began from the foundation of the world; but this mentioned by David is promised, as he speaketh, so long a time after. And what was this rest? Was it merely God's ceasing from his own works? This the apostle had no concern in.
For he treateth of no rest of God absolutely, but of such a rest as men by faith and obedience might enter into. Such as was that afterwards in the land of Canaan, and that also which he now proposed to them in the promise of the gospel; both which God calleth his rests, and inviteth others to an entrance into them. Such therefore must be the rest of God here intended; for concerning his rest absolutely, or his mere cessation from working, he had no reason to treat. For his design was only to show, that notwithstanding the other rests that were proposed unto men for to obtain an entrance into them, there yet remained another rest to be entered into, and enjoyed under the gospel. Such a rest therefore there was instituted and appointed of God, from the foundation of the world, immediately upon the finishing of the works of creation; which fixeth immovable the beginning of the Sabbatical rest. The full vindication of this testimony, the reader may find in the exposition itself, whither he is referred; and I do suppose, that no cause can be confirmed with more clear and undeniable testimonies. The observance and tradition of this institution, whereby it will be farther confirmed, are next to be inquired after.

§ 11. That this divine original institution of the seventh day Sabbath, was piously observed by the patriarchs, who retained a due remembrance of divine revelations, is out of controversy amongst all that acknowledge the institution itself; by others it is denied, that they may not be forced to acknowledge such an institution. And indeed it has so fallen out with the two great ordinances of divine worship, before the giving of the law, the one instituted before the fall, the other immediately upon it, that they should have contrary lots in this matter, namely sacrifices and the Sabbath. Sacrifices we find constantly observed by holy men of old, although we read not of their express institution. But from the observance of them, we do, and may conclude that they were instituted, although that institution be not expressly recorded. The Sabbath we find expressly instituted, and therefore do and may justly conclude that it was constantly observed, although that observance be not directly and in terms recorded. But yet as there is such light into the institution of sacrifices as may enable us to justify them by whom they were used, that they acted therein according to the mind of God, and in obedience to his will, as we have elsewhere demonstrated; so there want not such instances of the observance of the Sabbath, as may confirm the original divine institution of it, for which we plead. This therefore I shall a little inquire into.

Many of the Jewish masters, as we observed before, ascribe the original of the Sabbath unto the statute given them in Marah, Exod. xv. And yet the same persons grant that it was observed by the religious patriarchs before, especially by Abraham, unto whom the knowledge of it was granted by peculiar privilege. But these things are mutually destructive of each other; for they have nothing to prove the institution of the Sabbath in Marah, but those words of ver. 25, יִנָשׂ מַת לְדֹק הַמִּשֶּׁשֶּׁשֶּׁשׁ מֹשֶׁשׁ מֶשׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ שׁ Sh, 'there he gave him a statute and a judgment.' And it is said of Abraham that he taught his household and children after him, to keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, Gen. xviii. 19. If then the observance of the Sabbath be a statute or ordinance, and was made known to Abraham, it is certain that he instructed his household and children all his posterity, in their duty with respect thereunto. And if so, it could not be first revealed unto them at Marah. Others therefore of their masters do grant, as we observed also, the original of the Sabbath from the creation,
and do assert the patriarchal observance of it upon that foundation. The instances, I confess, which they make use of, are not absolutely cogent, but yet, considered with other circumstances wherewith they are strengthened, they may be allowed to conclude unto a high probability. Some of them are collected by Manasseh ben Israel, lib. de Creat. Problem. 3. Saith he, 'Dico quemadmodum traditio creationis mundi penes Abrahamum et ejus posteros tantum fuit; ita etiam ex dictamine legis naturalis Sabbatum ab iis solis cultum fuisse. De Abrahamo dicit sacra Scriptura, observavit cultum meum, Genesis xxvi. 5. 'Quo loco custodia Sabbati intelligitur. De Jacobo idem affirmant veteres, ex eo loco quo dicitur venisse ad Salem, et castra posuisse e regione vel ad conspectum civitatis; 'De Sabbato Genesis xxxiii. 18. 'Quia enim Sabbatum, inquinat, instabat, non licebat ei ulterior proficisci, sed subsistebat ante urben. Idem asserunt de Josepho; quando dicitur jussisse servis suis ut maectarent et praepararent, id propter Sabbatum factum fuisse. Ad hoc referunt in sera et Rabba Mosem petisse a Pharaone in Ægypto, ut afficto populo suo permitteret uno die cessare a laboribus; eoque impetrato, ex traditione elegisse Sabbatum; ex his omnibus colligitur Sabbatum ante datam legem observatum fuisse.' So far he. Of the observance of the Sabbath by the light of nature, we shall treat afterwards. As to the instances mentioned by him, that concerning Abraham is not destitute of good probability. That expression, 'etiam praeclare, 'and kept my charge,' seems to have peculiar respect unto the Sabbath, called elsewhere, 'the charge of God.' Hence some of those amongst Christians, who contend for the original of the Sabbath in the wilderness, yet grant that probably there 'was a free observance of it among the patriarchs, from the tradition they had of the rest of God upon the creation of the world. So Torniellus, Annal. Vet. Test. Suarez. de Religione, lib. ii. cap. 1, s. 3. Prideaux Orat. de Sabbath. For as there is no doubt but that the creation of the world was one of the principal articles of their faith, as our apostle also asserts, Heb. xi. 3, so it is fond to imagine, that they had utterly lost the tradition of the rest of God upon the finishing of his works; and it may easily be conceived to what that would influence them, should you suppose that they had lost the remembrance of its express institution, which will not be granted. What therefore may be certainly judged or determined of their practice in this matter, shall be briefly declared.

That all the ancient patriarchs, before the giving of the law, diligently observed the solemn worship of God in and with their families, and those under their rule, or any way belonging to their care and disposal, both their own piety forbids us to question, and the testimony given them, that they walked with God, and by faith therein obtained a good report, gives us the highest assurance. Now, of all obedience unto God, faith is the principle and foundation, without which it is impossible to please him, Heb. xi. 6. This faith doth always, and must always, respect the command and promise of God, which gives it its formal nature. For no other principle, though it may produce the like actions with it, is divine faith, but what respects the command and promise of God, so as to be steered, directed, guided, and bounded by them. Unto this solemn worship of God, which in faith they thus attended to, some stated time is indispensably necessary; and therefore that some portion of time should be set apart to that purpose, is acknowledged almost by all, to be a dictate of the law of nature; and we shall afterwards prove it so to be. What ground have we now to imagine, that
the holy men of old were left without divine direction in this matter? That a designation and limitation of this time, was or could have been of great use and advantage unto them, none can deny. Considering therefore the dealings of God with them, and how frequently he renewed unto them the knowledge of his will by occasional revelation, it cannot be supposed that divine grace was wanting unto them herein. Besides, in what they did in this kind, they are expressly said to keep the way of the Lord, Gen, xviii. 19, and in particular, his charge, his commandments, his statutes and his laws, ch. xxvi. 5, which comprise all the institutions and ordinances of divine worship. That they did any thing of themselves from their own wisdom and invention in the worship of God, is nowhere intimated, nor are they any where commended on the account thereof: yea, to do a thing in faith, as they did whatever of this kind they did, and that as a part of the worship of God, is to do it upon the command of God. And the institution mentioned, upon the reason of God's rest joined with it, is so express, as that none can doubt that there was a practice conformable unto it, by all that truly feared the Lord, although the particulars of it should not be recorded.

§ 12. It was from no other original, that the tradition of the sacredness of the septenary number, and the fixing of the first period of time to a septenary revolution of days, was so catholic in the world. For next to that of night and day, which is absolutely natural, and which appears so to the senses, with the composition of the night and day into one measure of time, which was also from the original creation and conjunction of evening and morning into one day; the division of time by periods of seven days, has prevailed amongst nations in general, and particularly amongst individual persons, that were inquiring and contemplative. Not only that sort of philosophers who expressed their apprehensions mysteriously by numbers, as the Pythagoreans, and some of the Platonics, who from hence took the occasion of that way of teaching and instruction, esteemed the septenary number sacred; but those also did so, who resolved their observations into things natural or physical. For in all their notions and speculations about the Pleiades, and Triones in heaven, lunar changes, sounds of instruments, variations in the age of man, critical days in bodily distempers, and transactions of affairs private and public, they found a respect thereto. It must therefore be granted, that there is a great impression left on the whole creation of a regard to this number, whereof instances might be multiplied. The ground hereof was no other but an emanation from the old tradition of the creation of the world, and the rest that ensued on the seventh day. So say the ancient verses, which some ascribe to Linus, others to Callimachus:

Επτα δὲ παντα τετυκαι εν ουρανω αστεροεντι
Εν κυκλοι φανεντ' επετελλομενοις ενιαντοις.

'In seven all things were perfected, in the starry heavens which appear in their orbs, or circles, in the rolling or voluble years.' This was the true original of their notions concerning the sacredness of the number seven. But when this was obscured or lost amongst them, as were the greatest and most important sacred truths communicated to man in his creation, they, many of them, retaining the principle of the sacred number, invented other reasons for it of no importance. Some of these were arithmetical, some harmonical or musical notions. But were their reasons for it never so infirm, the thing itself they still retained. Hence were their notations
of this number: it was termed by them the virgin, and Pallas; and καυρος, which sacredly is, saith Hesychius, ο των επτα αριθμος, 'the number of seven.' It is hard to give any other account whence all these conceptions should arise, besides that insist on. From the original impression made on the minds of men, by the instruction of the law of creation, which they were made under, and the tradition of the creation of the world in six days, closed with an additional day of sacred rest, did these notions and obscure remembrances of the specialty of that number arise. And although we have not yet inquired what influence into the law of creation, as instructive and directive of our actions, the six days' work had with its consequential day of rest; yet all will grant, that whatever it were, it was far more clear and cogent to man in innocence, directly obliged by that law, and able to understand its voice in all things; than it could be to them who by the effects of it made some dark inquiries after it, who were yet able to conclude that there was somewhat sacred in the number of seven, though they knew not well what.

§ 13. Neither was the number of seven only in general sacred amongst them, but there are testimonies produced out of the most ancient writers amongst the heathens, expressing a notion of a seventh day's sacred feast and rest. Many of these were of old collected by Clemens Alexandrinus, and by Eusebius, out of Aristobulus, a learned Jew. They have by many been insisted on, and yet I think it not amiss here once more to report them. The words of Aristobulus, wherewith he prefaceth his allegation of them, are in Eusebius, Praepar. Evangel. lib. xiii. cap. 12, speaking of the seventh day, διασαβε Ομηρος και Τσιοδος μετεληφοτες εκ των ημερων βιβλων ἱερων ειναι. 'Homer and Hesiod, taking it out of our books, do openly affirm that it is sacred.' That what they affirm herein was taken from the Jewish books, I much question; nor do I think that in their time, when the law only was written, that the nations of the world had the least acquaintance with their writings; nor much, until after the Babylonish captivity. Then their writings began to be noticed, and the knowledge of them was principally diffused under the Persian empire, by their commerce with the Grecians, who inquired into all things of that nature, and that had an appearance of secret wisdom. But these apprehensions, whatever they were, they seem rather to have taken up from the secret insinuations of the law of creation, and the tradition that was in the world of the matter of fact. Out of Hesiod, therefore, he cites the following testimonies:

Πρωτον ενη, τετρας τε, και ἠδομον ἱερον ημαρ.

'The first, the fourth, and the seventh day, is sacred.'—Again,

'Εβδοματα ε' αντις λαμπρον φαος νελιοιο.

'The seventh again, the sacred or illustrious light of the sun.'

And out of Homer:

'Εβδοματα η πεtau κατηλυθεν ἱερον ημαρ.

'Then came the seventh day that is sacred.'—Again,

'Εβδομον ημαρ ενη και τω τετελεστο ἄπαντα.

'It was the seventh day, wherein all things were finished, or perfected.'—Again,
OF THE ORIGINAL OF THE SABBATH.

'Εβδοματη ε' ποι λαπομεν ροον εξ Αχεροντος.

'We left the flood of Acheron on the seventh day.

Whereunto he subjoins an ingenious exposition about the relinquishment of the oblivion of error, by virtue of the sacredness of the number seven.

He adds also out of Linus:

'Εβδομη ειν αγαθοις, και εβδομη εστι γενεθλη,
'Εβδομη εν πρωτοις, και εβδομη εστι τελειη.

'The seventh day, wherein all things were finished,'

Again,

'Επτα δε παντα τετυκται ειν ουρανω αστεροειντε
Εν κυκλοισ φαεντε επιτελλομενους ενιαντως.

'The seventh day among the best things, the seventh is the nativity of all things.'

'The seventh is amongst the chiefest, and is the perfect day.'

Again,

nor shall I plead the testimony of Lampridius, concerning the emperor Alexander Severus going into the capitol and the temples on the seventh

The same testimonies he repeats again in his next chapter out of Clemens, with an alteration of some few words not of any importance. And the verses ascribed to Linus in Aristobulus, are said to be the work of Callimachus in Clemens, which is not of our concernment. Testimonies to the same purpose may be taken out of some of the Roman writers; so Tibullus, giving an account of the excuses he made for his unwillingness to leave Rome,

Aut ego sum causatus aves, aut omina dira
Saturni sacra me tenuisse die.

'Either I laid it on the birds;' (he had no encouraging augury,) 'or that bad omens detained me on the sacred day of Saturn.' Lib. i. Eleg. 3.

§ 14. I shall not from these and the like testimonies contend, that the heathens did generally allow and observe one sacred day in the week. Nor can I grant on the other hand, that those ancient assertions of Linus, Homer, and Hesiod, are to be measured by the late Roman writers, poets, or others, who ascribe the seventh day's sacred feast to the Jews in way of reproach, as Ovid,

nec te peregrina morentur
Sabbata.

'Stay not' (thy journey) 'for foreign Sabbaths.' And

Culta Palæstino septima festa viro;

'The seventh day feast observed by the Jew.'

Nor shall I plead the testimony of Lampridius, concerning the emperor Alexander Severus going into the capitol and the temples on the seventh
day, seeing in those times he might learn that observance from the Jews, whose customs he had occasion to be acquainted with. For all ancient traditions were before this time utterly worn out, or inextricably corrupted. And when the Jews, by their conversation with the Romans, after the wars of Pompey, began to represent them to them again, the generality despised them all, out of their hatred and contempt of that people. And I do know, that sundry learned men, especially two of late, Gomarus and Selden, have endeavoured to show, that the testimonies usually produced in this case, do not prove what they are urged for. They have taken great pains, to refer them all to the sacredness of the septenary number before mentioned, or the seventh day of the month, sacred, as is pretended, on the account of the birth of Apollo, whereunto, indeed, it is evident that Hesiod hath respect in his ἦπειρον ἔρων ἤμαρ. But the authority of Aristobulus and Clemens is not to be despised. Something they knew undoubtedly of the state of things in the world in their own days, and those that went before. And they do not only instance in the testimonies before rehearsed, but also assert, that the sacredness of one of the seven days was generally admitted by all. And the testimonies of Philo and Josephus are so express to that purpose, that their force cannot be waved, without offering violence unto their words. The words of Philo we expressed before. And Josephus, in his second book against Appion, says positively, οὖν ἐστιν οὐ πολίς Ἔλληνων, οὐν τις οὖν οὐνε Βαρβαρός, οὐε ἐν ἑβυος, ἐνθα μη το της ἐβδομάδος, ἐν αργυρίῳ ἤμες, το εδο ου διαπέφατηκν. ‘There is neither any city of the Greeks nor Barbarians, nor any nation whatever, to whom our custom of resting on the seventh day is not come.’ And this in the words foregoing he affirmeth to have been ἐκ μακρον, from a ‘long time’ before, as not taken up by an occasional acquaintance with them. And Lucian, in his Pseudologista, tells us that children at school were exempted from studying, εν ταις ἐβδομαις, ‘on the seventh days.’ And Tertullian, in his Apology, cap. 16, tells the Gentiles of their Sabbaths or feasts on Saturday. But yet, as was intimated, I shall grant, that the observance of a weekly sacred feast, is not proved by the testimonies produced, which is all that those who oppose them do labour to disprove. But I desire to know from what origin these traditions were derived, and whether any can be assigned unto them, but that of the original institution of the Sabbatical rest. It is known that this was common amongst them; that when they had a general notion or tradition of any thing, whose true cause, reason, and beginning they knew not, they would feign a reason or occasion of it, accommodated to their present apprehensions and practices, as I have elsewhere evinced and cleared. Having, therefore, amongst them the tradition of a seventh day’s sacred rest, which was originally catholic; and having long lost the practice and observance of it, as well as its cause and reason; they laid hold on any thing to affix it unto, which might have any resemblance unto what was vulgarly received amongst them, or what they could divine in their more curious speculations.

§ 15. The hebdomadal revolution of time generally admitted in the world, is also a great testimony to the original institution of the Sabbath. Of old it was catholic, and is at present received among those nations, whose converse was not begun until of late, with any of those parts of the world, where there is a light gone forth in these things from the Scripture. All nations, I say, in all ages have, from time inmemorial, made the revolution of seven days to be the first stated period of time. And this observance is still continued throughout the world, unless amongst them, who in other
things are openly degenerated from the law of nature; as those barbarous Indians who have no computation of times, but by sleeps, moons, and winters. The measure of time by a day and night, is pointed out to sense, by the diurnal course of the sun. Lunar months, and solar years, are of an unavoidable observation unto all rational creatures. Whence, therefore, all men have reckoned time by days, months, and years, is obvious unto all. But whence the hebdomadal revolution, or weekly period of time, should make its entrance, and obtain a catholic admittance, no man can give an account, but with respect to some impressions on the minds of men from the constitution and law of our natures, with the tradition of a Sabbatical rest instituted from the foundation of the world. Other original, whether artificial and arbitrary, or occasional, it could not have. Nothing of any such thing hath left the least footsteps of its ever being in any of the memorials of times past. Neither could any thing of so low an original or spring, be elevated to such an height, as to diffuse itself through the whole world. A derivation of this observation from the Chaldaens and Egyptians, who retained the deepest tincture of original traditions, hath been manifested by others. And so fixed was this computation of time on their minds, who knew not the reason of it, that when they made a disposition of the days of the year into any other period, on accounts civil or sacred, yet they still retained this also. So the Romans, as appears by the fragments of their old calendars, had their Nundine, which were days of vacation from labour, on the eighth, or as some think the ninth days recurring, but yet still made use of the stated weekly period. It is of some consideration in this cause, and is usually urged to this purpose, that Noah observed the septenary revolution of days, in sending forth the dove out of the ark, Gen. viii. 10, 12. That this was done casually is not to be imagined. Nor can any reason be given, why, notwithstanding the disappointment he met with the first and second time, he should still abide seven days before he sent again, if you consider only the natural condition of the flood, or the waters in their abatement. A revolution of days, and that upon a sacred account, was doubtless attended unto by him. And I should suppose that he still sent out the dove the next day after the Sabbath, to see as it were whether God had returned again to rest in the works of his hands. And Gen. xxxix. 27, a week is spoken of as a known account of days or time. 'Fulfil her week,' that is, not a week of years, as he had done for Rachel, but fulfil a week of days in the festivals of his marriage with Leah. For בְּעָשָׁה can give no other sense, seeing בָּשָׁה, of the feminine gender, relates unto Leah, whose nuptials were to be celebrated, and not בָּעָשָׁה, a week, which is of the masculine. And it was the custom in those ancient times of the world, to continue the celebration of a marriage feast for seven days, or a week; as Judg. xiv. 12, 15, 17. 'The seven days of the feast,' is spoken of as a thing commonly known and in vulgar use.

§ 16. Let us, therefore, consider what is offered to weaken the force of this observation. It is pretended that the ancient heathen, or the contemplative persons amongst them, observing the unfixed, various motions of the seven planetary luminaries, as they used and abused it to other ends, so they applied their number and names unto so many days, which were thereby as it were dedicated unto them, which shut them up in that septenary number. But that the observance of the weekly revolution of time, was from the philosophers, and not the common consent of the people, doth not appear. For those observed also the twelve signs of the Zodiac, and yet made that no rule to reckon time or days by. Besides, the observation of
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the site and position of the seven planets, as to their height or elevation with respect unto one another, is as ancient as the observation of their peculiar and various motions. And upon the first discovery thereof, all granted this to be their order, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercury, Luna. What alteration is made herein by the late hypothesis, fixing the sun as in the centre of the world, built on fallible phenomena, and advanced by many arbitrary presumptions, against evident testimonies of Scripture, and reasons as probable as any which are produced in its confirmation, is here of no consideration. For it is certain that all the world in former ages was otherwise minded. And our argument is not taken in this matter from what really was true, but from what was universally apprehended so to be. Now, whence should it be, that, if this limiting the first revolution of time unto seven days, proceeded from the planetary denominations fixed to the days of the year arbitrarily, the order among the planets should be so changed, as every one sees it to be? For in the assignation of the names of the planets to the days of the week, the middle day is taken out first, and so the fourth in order inconclusive, falls to be next, until the whole cycle be finished. Some would take the reason hereof from the proportion of harmony, some from the diurnal ascension of the planets, which is ridiculous. So Dion Cassius, in the thirty-seventh book of his histories, the third of them that remain, treating of the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey on the seventh day of the week, when the people out of their superstitition made not their wonted resistance, inquires on that occasion, of the reason of the assignation of the planetary names to the days of the week, which he affirms to have had its origin from the Egyptians. And two reasons he tells us that he had heard for the special assignation of their several names unto the several days, in the order wherein they are commonly used. The first is, that it was taken from the harmony ἐν τεσσάρων, or the musical note of 'diatessaron.' For beginning, saith he, with Saturn in the highest sphere, and so passing unto the fourth in order, it is the sun, and so throughout, in the whole revolution. His other reason is, that taking the day and night, beginning with the first hour, and assigning the name of a planet to each hour, beginning with Saturn for the reason before mentioned, and the succeeding hours to the other planets in their order; so renewing the numerations to the end of the four-and-twenty hours, the first hour of the next day falls to the sun, and so of the day following to the moon, and the remainder to the other planets in the order commonly ascribed unto them. What there is in these conjectures I know not, but both of them give the precedency of the first days as they are fixed, unto that which in the true and natural order of the days is the last. There is a good account given us of this matter by Johannes Philoponus, ἁρμονία τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Κοσμοτόκως, or de Creation. Mund. lib. 7, cap. 14, εἶχεν ὅτε μὴν συμπερφονηται πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἐπὶ μοινας εἰναι ἡμέρας, αἰτίην εἰς ἑαυτάς ανακεκλουμέναι, τον ὀλὸν ποιοῦσι χρόνον. 'This,' saith he, 'is consented unto amongst all men, that there are only seven days, which by a revolution into themselves, compose the whole of the time; whereof we can assign no other reason, but that only which is given by Moses.' The Grecians indeed ascribe the seven days to the seven planets, the first to the Sun, the second to the Moon, the third to Mars, the fourth to Mercury, the fifth to Jupiter, the sixth to Venus, the seventh to Saturn; and hereby they first acknowledge that there are but seven days whereof all time consisteth; but farther they can give no reason why the days are so disposed of unto the planets. For why did they not rather constitute twelve days, from the twelve parts
of the Zodiac, through which the sun passing perfecteth the year? Nor can any reason be assigned from the motions of the planets, why any one of the days is inscribed to any of them. It is most likely, therefore, that the Gentiles, as they without just reason or cause dedicate the planets by the names of demons and heroes, so when they observed that there were seven days acknowledged by all, and that the planets were so many in number, they did, according to their pleasure in the two equal numbers, assign one day to one planet, another to another, to which he adds truly, μονός ὁπα τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ ἱδέωματίου τῶν ἡμερῶν αριθμὸν ἔσθεν ἐμπνεύσεως ὁ μεγάς των ἄνθρωπων αποδείκτης Μουσῆς. 'Only the great Moses being divinely inspired, hath delivered unto men the true reason of the septenary number of the days.' So far he. There seems to be some reason for assigning the conduct of time to the sun, or calling the first day by his name, as also of adjoining the moon unto him in the next place. For the succession of the sun, though created the fourth day, in point of use, unto that diffused light which was created the first day; with its being the instrumental cause and measure of every day; with the tradition of the appointment of 'sun and moon to rule and distinguish times and seasons;' with the sensible effects and operations of them, might easily give them the preeminence by common consent, in giving names unto the days of the week. The other names were added and applied, according to some prevailing fictions concerning the planets, and their respect unto men and their actions. But the hebdomadal period of time, was fixed long before the imposition of those names prevailed among the Grecians and Romans, which perhaps is not very anciently, as Dion thinks, though they derived them from the Chaldeans and Egyptians. And that the acknowledgment of seven days, gave occasion to fix unto them the names of the seven planets, and not that the observation of the seven planets gave occasion to compute the days of the world by sevens, is manifest from hence, in that many nations admitting of the hebdomadal revolution of time, gave the days of the week quite other names, as various reasons or occasions did suggest them unto them. In the ancient Celtic or German tongue, and in all languages derived from it, the sun and moon only, on the reasons before mentioned, giving names to the leading days of the week, the rest of the days are distinguished and signalized with the names of the conductors of their first great colonies, in the north-western parts of the world. For to fancy that Tuiso is the same with Mars, Wooden with Mercurey, Thor with Jupiter, and Frea with Venus, is to fancy what we please without the least ground of probability. Nor did the Celtae ever call the planets by those names, so that if their be any allusion in those names unto those of the Grecians and Romans, it was not taken from their natural speculation about the planets, but from the pleasing fictions about deified heroes, wherein they were imitated by most nations of the world. The English and Dutch have taken in Saturday from Saturn; other nations of the same extract retain their own occasional names. The observation, therefore, of the seven planets, gave neither rise, reason, cause, nor occasion to this original period of time in a hebdomadal revolution of days. And hence, Theophilus Antiochenus, lib. 2, ad Antolychum, affirms, that 'all mortal men agreed in the appellation of the seventh day,' whose testimony is of good force, though he mistakes the original of that appellation. For he tells us, that παρ' Ἐθραίως καλεῖται σαββάτον, ἐλληνικά έφυγεν ται ἱδέωμασ; by an error common to many of the ancients, who could not distinguish between שַבָּת and בַּשַּׁבָּת. It is also to this purpose observed by Rivet and Selden, from Salmasius, out
of Georgius Syncallus, in his Chronology, that the patriarchs reckoned the times, or distinguished them καθ ἐπομένας, by weeks only. This, therefore, is to me, no small evidence of the institution and observance of the Sabbath, from the foundation of the world. For, hence did this periodical revolution of time, prevail amongst the nations, even those who had not the least converse with, or knowledge of the Jews, or their customs, after the command and observance of it was renewed amongst them. Not that this evidence is of itself a sufficient testimony unto its original institution, nor that going before; but that the piety of the patriarchs, and traditions of the apostate Gentiles, do confirm the time of that institution, which is so expressly recorded.

§ 17. It remaineth that we take a view of the opinion advanced by many learned men, in opposition to what we have been pleading for. And that is, that the command concerning the Sabbath was peculiar to the Jews alone and that it was given unto them in the wilderness, and not at all before. Many of the Jews, as was declared, are of this judgment, and thence, call the Sabbath the bride of their nation, that which God gave to them as he did Eve to Adam, and to no other. Abulensis contends for this opinion, in his comment on Exod. xvi., who is followed by some expositors of the Roman church; and opposed by others, as Cornelius a Lapide, &c. The same difference in judgment is found among the Protestant divines. The dissertations of Rivet and Gomarus on this subject are well known. The controversy being of late renewed, especially some of the Belgic divines, I shall take under consideration the arguments of one of them who hath last of all defended this cause, and weigh of what importance they are; separating as much as we can, between the matter of our present dispute, which is the original of the Sabbath, and that of the causes of it, which we shall next inquire into.

§ 18. The design is to prove that the Sabbath was first given to the Jews, and that in the wilderness. And to this purpose, having first repeated the words of the fourth commandment, he adds, Quis vero dicere audebit, verba haec convenire in hominem ab initio creationis, sic ut hic statutur? (that is, by his adversary) an illi incumbebat opus et quidem servile, idque per sex dies? an ipsi erant servi et ancillae? an jumenta requietis indigentia? an peregrini inter portas ejus? quis non videt ad solum Israelitarum statum in toto illo precocepti respici? Ita Calvinus in Gen. ii. Postea in lege novum de Sabbato precoceptum datum est, quod Judæis et quidem ad tempus peculiare foret; fuit enim legalis ceremonia, spiritualèm quietem adumbrans, cujus in Christo apparuit veritas. Quo nihil efficacius dici poterat.

Hanc vero precocepti mentem esse patet ex aliis testimoniis Scripturae aperissime, in quibus Judæis tantum datum esse Sabbatum constanter docetur, Exod. xvi. 29. Videte quod Jehovam dedit vobis illud Sabbatum, idcirco dat vobis cibum bidui. Et Ezek. xx. 12, Sabbata dedi eis, ut essent signum inter me et ipsos ad scendendum me Jehovam sanctificare ipsos. Deuque, Neh. ix. 14, Sabbatum quoque sanctum notum fecisti eis; quum precocepta statutaque, et leges præciperæ eis per Mosem servum tuum. In quibus locis uniformiter docetur tanta cum emphasi, per Mosem Deum desisse Judæis Sabbatum, non ergo aliis gentibus datum fuit; aut ipsis etiam per Majores ipsorum ante illud tempus ab origine Mundi. Disquisit. cap. 2, p. 50.

Answ. It is by all confessed, that the command of the Sabbath in the renewal of it in the wilderness, was accommodated unto the pedagogical
state of the church of the Israelites. There were also such additions made unto it, in the manner of its observance, and the sanction of it, as might adapt its observance unto their civil and political estate, or to that theocratical government which was then erected amongst them. So was it to bear a part in that ceremonial instruction which God in all his dealings with them intended. To this end also the manner of the giving of the whole law, and the preservation of its tables in the Ark, were designed. And divers expressions in the explicatory part of the Decalogue, have the same reason and foundation. For there is mention of fathers and children to the third and fourth generation, and of their sins; of the land given to the people of God in the fifth; of servants and handmaids in the tenth. Shall we, therefore, say, that the moral law was not before given unto mankind, because it was given in a peculiar manner, for special ends and purposes unto the Jews? It is no argument, therefore, that this command was not for the substance of it, given before to mankind in general, because it hath some modifications added in the decalogue, to accommodate it to the present ecclesiastical and civil state of the Hebrews, as likewise had the fifth command in particular.

2 For those expressions insisted on, of work, servile work, work for six days, of servants and handmaids, of the stranger within the gates, they were necessary explications of the command in its application unto that people; and yet such as had a just proportion unto what was enjoined at the first giving of this command; occasioned from the outward change of the state of things amongst men, from what it was in the state of innocence. For in that state God designed man to work, and that in the tilling of the ground, whilst he abode in it, Gen. ii. 15. He put the man in the garden, לֻבְרֵד, to work in it; the same word whereby work is enjoined in the decalogue. And whereas God had sanctified the seventh day to be a day of rest, and thereon put man into the garden, לֻבְרֵד, to till it, by work and labour; he did virtually say unto him as in the command, "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work." Neither was this in the least inconsistent with the condition wherein he was created. For, man being constituted and composed partly of an immortal soul, of a divine extract and heavenly original, and partly of a body made out of the earth, he was a middle creature, between those which were purely spiritual, as the angels, and those which were purely terrestrial, as the beasts of the field. Hence, when God had made man, יָפֶר מִן הָאָדָם, "of dust from out of the earth," as all the beasts of the field were made; and had given him distinctly נשוא חיות, a breath of life in a distinct substance answerable to that of the angels above, whose creation was not out of any pre-existing matter, but they were the product of an immediate emanation of divine power, as was the soul of man; there was no meet help to be associated unto him in the whole creation of God. For the angels were not meet for his help and individual converse, on the account of what was terrene and mortal in him. And the beasts were much more unsuited to him, as having nothing in them to answer his divine and more noble part. And as his nature was thus constituted, that he should converse, as it were amphilobously, between the upper and inferior sort of creatures; so he was divided in his work and operations, suitably unto the principles of his nature and peculiar constitution. For they were partly to be divine and spiritual, partly terrene and earthly, though under the government of the sovereign divine principle in him. Hence it was required, that in this condition, being not absolutely fitted as the angels for constant con-
temptation, that he should work and labour in the earth, whilst he con-
tinued in it, and his terrene part not refined or made spiritual and heavenly. This made a certain time of rest necessary unto him, and that upon a double account, flowing from the principles of his own nature. For his earthly constitution could not always hold out to labour with its own satisfaction, and his intellectual and divine part was not to be always diverted, but to be furthered in and unto its own peculiar operations. This made a sacred rest necessary to him. And in that addition of sweat and travail which befell him in his labour afterwards, there was not a new course of life enjoined him, but a curse was mixed with that course and labour, which was originally allotted unto him. So then, although there is a different and a more necessary manner of working, supposed in the giving of the law, than was at the first institution of a Sabbatical rest, yet the change is not in the law or command for labour, but in the state or condition of man himself.

The same may be said concerning the addition about servants and hand-
maids. For in the state of innocence, there would have been a superiority of some over others, in that government which is economical or paternal. Hence all duties of persons in subordination, are built on the law of nature; and what is not resolved thereinto, is force and violence. And herein lies the foundation of what is ordained with reference unto servants and strangers, which is expressed in the fourth commandment, with an especial application to the state of the Judaical church and people. Wherefore although there should have been no such servants or strangers, as are intended in the decalogue, in the state of innocence, when we plead that the law of the Sabbath was first given; yet this proves no more, but that this precept in the renovation and repetition of it unto the Jews, was accommodated to the present state of things amongst them; that state being such as had its foundation in the law of creation itself.

The places adjoined of Exod. xvi. 29, xxxi. 17; Ezek. xx. 12, do prove sufficiently and undeniably, that in the Mosaical pedagogy, the observance of the seventh day, being precisely enjoined; there were additions of signification given unto it, that is to the seventh day precisely by divine institution, as amongst them it was to be observed. And therefore unto the utmost extent of the determination of the day of rest, unto the seventh day precisely, and all the significancy annexed unto it, to that people, we acknowledge that the Sabbath was absolutely commensurate to the church-state of the Jews, beginning and ending with it. But the argument hence educated; namely, that God gave the Sabbath, that is the law of it, in a peculiar manner unto the Jews, therefore he had not given the same law for the substance of it before, unto all mankind, is infirm. For God gave the whole law to the Jews in an especial manner, and enforced the observance of it with a reason or motive peculiar to them, namely, 'I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage;' and yet this law was before given unto them, who never were in Egypt, nor never thence delivered. And on account of this peculiar appro-
priation of the law to the Jews, it is spoken of in the Scripture in places innumerable, as if it had been given to them only, and to no others at all. So speaks the Psalmist, Ps. cxlvii. 19, מָצַז דֹּרֵי לְעֵ֑יֵב הָדָּרוֹם וְשֵׁמְטֵ֖ם, 'declaring his words unto Jacob, his statutes and judgments unto Israel.' Where only מְשָׁטְטֵם and לְעֵ֑יֵב are used, the ceremonial and judici-

1 נָתָנָ֑ה, 'he hath not done so unto any nation;' namely,
not in the same manner; for none will deny, but that nine precepts at least were given unto all mankind in Adam.

§ 19. It is added by the same learned author; 'Præterea (p. 51.) si quies septimis diei omnibus ab origine mundi hominibus injuncta fuisset, non autem solis Israelitis a tempore Mosis, Deus non solum Israelitas ob neglectum illius precepti sed et Gentiles, semel saltem, eadem de causa reprehendisset. Cum vero Israelitas ea de causa reprehendat seppissime, Gentiles tamen nusquam reprehendere hoc nomine legitur, qui propter peccata in legem naturalem commissa toties et tam acriter a Deo reprehendentur. Luculentum ejus rei exemplum est; Neh. xiii. Tyrrii afferunt Hierosolymas omnes res venales quas vendebant ipso Sabbato Judæis, et quidem Hierosolymis, ver. 16. Non tamen Nehemias peccati violati Sabbati reos arguit Tyrios sed Judæos, ver. 17. Tyrrii autem clausis portis pridie Sabbati a vespem usque urbe excludit, et ita compescit, et tandem a muris urbis abigit, ver. 19—21. Si vero Tyrrii hi una cum Judæis lege Sabbati communi præcepto fuissent obstricti nonne a viro sanctissimo ejus peccati nomine quoque reprehensii fuissent? quod tamen factum non apparet. Quum præterea Scriptura impia Gentilium festa graviter reprehendat, an sancti Sabbati neglectum, si id quoque ipsi observandum fuisset, tam constanti silentio dissimulasset?'

The force of this argument consists in this assertion, that whatever we find God did not reprove in the Gentiles, therein they did not sin, nor had they any law given unto them concerning it, no not in Adam: which will by no means be granted. For,

1. The times are spoken of, wherein God suffered them to walk in their own ways, and winked at their ignorance. Hence as he gave them no reproofs for their sins, by his revealed word, so those which he gave them by his providence, are not recorded. We may not therefore say, they sinned in nothing, but what we find them reproved for in particular.

2. Other instances may be given, of sins against the light of nature among the Gentiles, and that in things belonging to the second table; wherein that light hath a greater evidence accompanying it, than in that of the first, (the first precept only excepted,) which yet we find them not rebuked for. Such were the sins of concubinacy and fornication.

3. After the renovation, or giving of this command unto the Jews, it was the duty of the nations to whom the knowledge thereof did come, to take up the observance of it. For it was doubtless their duty to join themselves to God and his people, and with them to observe his statutes and judgments; and their not so doing was their sin; which, as is pretended, they were not reproved for, or God was not displeased with them on that account.

4. The publication of God's commands, is to be stated from his giving of them; and not from the instances of men's transgressing of them. Nor is it any rule, that a law is then first given, when men's sins against it are first reproved. For the instance insisted on, of Nehemiah and the Tyrians, with his different dealing with them and the Jews about the breach of the law of the Sabbath, Neh. xiii. it is of no force in this matter. For when the Tyrians knew the command of the Sabbath among the Jews, which was a sufficient revelation of the will of God concerning his worship, it was their duty to observe it. I do not say, that it was their duty immediately, and abiding in their Gentilism to observe the Sabbath according to the institution it had among the Jews; but it was their duty to know, own, and obey the true God, and to join themselves to his people, to do and observe all his
commands. If this was not their duty upon that discovery and revelation, which those had of the will of God who came up to Jerusalem, as they did concerning whom we speak, then was it not their sin to abide in their Gentilism; which I suppose will not be asserted. It was therefore on one account or other, a sin in the Tyrians to profane the Sabbath. It will be said, why then did not Nehemiah reprove them as well as he did the Jews? The answer is easy. He was the head and governor of the state and polity of the Jews, unto whom it belonged to see that things amongst them were observed and done according to God's law and appointment. And this he was to do with authority, having the warrant of God for it. With the Tyrians he had nothing to do; no care of them, no jurisdiction over them, no intercourse with them, but according to the law of nations. On these accounts he charged not them with sin, or a moral evil, which they would not have regarded to the true God, much less to his worship; but he threatened them with war and punishment, for disturbing his government of the people according to the law of God.

It is well observed, that God reproved the profane feasts of the heathens; and therein unquestionably the neglect of them that were of his own appointment. For this is the nature and method of negative precepts and condemning sentences in divine things, that they assert what is contrary to that which is forbidden, and recommend that which is opposite unto what is condemned. Thus the worship of God according to his own institution, is commanded in the prohibition of making to ourselves, or finding out ways of religious worship and honour of our own. For whereas it is a prime dictate of the law of nature, that God is to be worshipped according to his own appointment, which was from the light of it acknowledged among the heathen themselves, it is not any where asserted or intimated in the decalogical compendium of it, unless it be in that prohibition. It sufficeth then, that even among the Gentiles, God vindicated the authority of his own Sabbaths, by condemning their impious feasts and abominable practices in them.

§ 20. By the same learned writer, p. 52, the testimony of the Jews in this case is pleaded. They generally affirm, that the Sabbath was given unto them only; and not to the rest of the nations. Hence it is by them called the bride of the synagogue. Nor do they reckon the command of it amongst the precepts given to Noah, which they esteem all men obliged unto, and the observance of which they imposed on the proselytes of the gate, or the uncircumcised strangers that lived amongst them. Nay they say, that others were liable to punishment if they did observe it. For that part of the command, 'nor the stranger that is within thy gate,' they say intends no more, but that no Israelite should compel him to work, or make any advantage of his labour; but for himself he was not bound to abstain from labour, but might exercise himself therein at his own discretion for his advantage. These things are pleaded at large, and confirmed with many testimonies and instances by the learned Selden; and from him are they again by others insisted on. But the truth is, there is not any thing of force in the conceits of these Talmudical Jews, in the least to weaken the principle we have laid down and established. For,

1. As hath been shown, this opinion is not indeed catholic amongst them; but many, and those of the most learned of the masters, do oppose it; as we have proved already. And others may be added to them, whose opinion, although it be peculiar, yet it wanteth not a fair probability of truth. For, they say, that the first part of the precept, 'Remember the
Sabbath day to keep it holy, hath respect to the glorifying of God, on the account of his original work and rest. This therefore belongs unto all mankind. But as for that which follows about the six days labour, and the seventh day's cessation or quiet; it had respect unto the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and their deliverance thence, and was therefore peculiar unto them. So R. Ephraim in Keli Jacob. And hence it may be, the word, remember, hath respect unto the command of the Sabbath from the foundation of the world. And therefore when the command is repeated again, with peculiar respect to the church of Israel; as the motive, from the Egyptian bondage and deliverance, is expressed; so the caution of remembering is omitted, Deut. v. 12, and transferred to this other occasion; 'Remember that thou wast a servant,' ver. 15.

2. The sole foundation of it is laid in a corrupt and false tradition or conceit, of the giving of the law of the Sabbath in Marah, which we have before disproved, and which is despised as vain and foolish by most learned men.

3. The assertors of this opinion do woefully contradict themselves, in that they generally acknowledge that the Sabbath was observed by Abraham, and other patriarchs, as it should seem, at least four hundred years before its institution.

4. It is none of the seven precepts said to have been given to Noah; for they contain not the whole law of nature, or precepts of the decalogue, and one of them is ceremonial in their sense; so that nothing can thence be concluded against the original or nature of this law.

5. That an uncircumcised stranger was liable to punishment if he observed the Sabbath, is a foolish imagination, not inferior unto that of some others of them who affirm that all the Gentiles shall keep the Sabbath, one day in seven, in hell.

6. For the distinction which they have invented, that a proselyte of the gate might work for himself, but not for his master, it is one of the many whereby they make void the law of God through their traditions. Those who of old amongst them feared God, knowing their duty to instruct their households or families, that is, their children and servants, in the ways and worship of God, walked by another rule.

§ 21. It is farther pleaded by the same author, p. 53. 'That the Gentiles knew nothing of this Sabbatical feast, but that when it came to their knowledge they derided and exploded it as a particular superstition of the Jews.' To this purpose many instances out of the historians and poets, who wrote in the time of the first Roman Emperors, are collected by Selden, which we are again directed unto. Now it could not be, but that if it had been originally appointed unto all mankind, that they should have been such strangers unto it. But this matter hath been discoursed before. And we have shown that sundry of the first writers of the Christian church were otherwise minded; for they judged and proved, that there was a notion at least of the seventh day's sacred rest, diffused throughout the world. And they lived nearer the times of the Gentiles' practice, than those by whom their judgment and testimony are so peremptorily rejected. It is not unlikely, but that they might be mistaken in some of the testimonies whereby they confirm their observation; yet this hinders not, but that the observation itself may be true, and sufficiently confirmed by other instances which they make use of.

For my part, as I have said, I will not, (nor for the security of the principle laid down, need I,) contend, that the seventh day was observed as a
sacred feast amongst them. It is enough that there were such notices of it in the world, as could proceed from no other original, but that pleaded for, which was common unto all. The Roman writers, poets, and others, do speak of, and connote the Judaical Sabbaths, under which name they comprehended all their sacred feasts and solemn abstinencies. Hence they reproached them with their Sabbatical fasts; of which number the seventh day hebdomadal Sabbath was not one. But they never endeavoured to come to any real acquaintance with their religious rites, but took up vulgar reports concerning them, as did their historians also, who in the affairs of other nations are supposed to have been curious and diligent.

§ 22. Indeed, after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, when the people of the Jews began to be known among the Romans, and to disperse themselves throughout their provinces, they began every day more and more to hate them, and to cast all manner of reproaches on them, without regard to truth or honesty. And it may not be amiss here a little (by the way) to inquire into the reasons of it. The principal cause hereof no doubt, was from the God they worshipped, and the manner of his worship observed amongst them. For finding them to acknowledge and adore one only (the true) God and that without the use of any kind of images, they perceived their own idolatry and superstition to be condemned thereby. And this had been the condition of that people under the former empires, of the Chaldeans, Persians, and Grecians. God had appointed them to be his witnesses in the world, that he was God, and that there was none other. Isa. xliv. 8—10. 'Ye are my witnesses, is there a God beside me? there is no God, I know not any.' As also ch. xliii. 10—12, 'Ye are my witnesses, that before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be any after me; I even I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour; therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God.' This at length greatly provoked the Romans, as it had done other nations of old, as bidding defiance to all their gods, and to that worship of them, wherein they greatly boasted. For they thought that it was merely by the help of their gods, and on the account of their religion, that they conquered all other nations. So Cicero Orat. de Respon. Harusp. Quam volumus ipsi nos amemus, tam nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos, nec calliditate Ptolemaeos, nec artibus Graecos, sed pietate et religione, atque hac una sapientia, quod deorum immortalium numine omnia regi, gubernariique prosperius, omnes gentes nationesque superavimus. 'Let us love and please ourselves as we think meet, yet we neither exceed the Spaniards in number, nor the Gauls in strength, nor the Africans in craft, nor the Grecians in arts; but it is by our piety and religion, and by this wisdom alone, that we refer all to the government of the immortal gods, that we have overcome all countries and nations.' And Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Antiquit. Rom. lib. ii. having given an account of their sacred rites and worship, adds, that he did it ina tois auqouou tov Romawow envebeian, en oi anepse eperteseon, mu paratsekion bapan to pantas autois to kalistenon lazein tovns polemonos teiws. 'That those who knew not before the piety or religion of the Romans, might not now think it strange, that they should have success in all their wars.' To be judged and condemned in those things by the contrary witness of the Jews, they could not bear. This made them reflect on God himself, as the God which they worshipped. They called him 'incertum,' and 'ignotum,' affirning the rites of his worship to be absurd, and contrary to the common consent of mankind, as Tacitus expressly, Hist. lib. v. The
best they could afford when they spake of him was, ὅπερ ποτὲ οὕτος εστίν, ‘whoever he be.’ And Tully will not allow that it was any respect to their God, or their religion, which caused Pompey to forbear spoiling the temple, when he took it by force. ‘Non credo,’ saith he, ‘religionem impedimento prestantissimo Imperatori fuisse, quod victor ex illo fano nihil attigisset.’ Orat. pro Flace. Whereunto he adds as high a reproach of them and their religion as he could devise: Stantibus Hierosolymis, pacatisque Judaeis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum, a splendore hujsus imperii, gravitate nominis nostri, majorum institutis abhorrebat; nunc vero hoc magis, quod illa gens, quid de nostro imperio sentiret, ostendit armis, quan caris dis immortalibus esset, docuit quod victa est, quod elocata, quod servata. ‘Whilst Jerusalem stood (that is, in its own power) and the Jews were peaceable, yet their religion was unworthy the splendour of this empire, the gravity of our name, and abhorrent from the ordinances of our ancestors; how much more now, when that nation hath shown what esteem it hath of our empire by its arms; and how dear it is to the immortal gods, that it is conquered, and set out under tribute.’ The like reflections, yea worse, may be seen in Trogus, Tacitus, Plutarch, Strabo, Democritus, and Suidas, with others.

§ 23. Another ground of their hatred was, that the Jews, whilst the temple stood, gathered great sums of money out of all their provinces, which they sent to the sacred treasury. So the same person informs us in the same place: Cum aurum Judeorum nomine, quotamis ex Italia, et ex omnibus vestris provinciis, Hierosolymam exportari soleret, ‘Out of Italy, and all other provinces of the empire, there was gold wont to be sent by the Jews to Jerusalem;’ as now the European Jews do contribute to the maintenance of their synagogues in the same place: and this is acknowledged by Philo, Legat. ad Caium, and Josephus, Antiqui. lib. 14, cap. 11, to have been yearly a very great sum. But by his ‘Judeorum nomine,’ he seems not only to express that the returns of gold mentioned were made in the name of the Jews, but also to intimate, that it might be raised by others also, who had taken on them the profession of their religion. For this was the third and principal cause of their hatred and animosity; namely, that they drew over multitudes of all sorts of persons to the profession of the law of Moses. And a good work this was, though vitiated by the wickedness and corrupt ends of those who employed themselves therein, as our Saviour declares, Matt. xxiii. 15. This greatly provoked the Romans in those days, and on every occasion they severely complain of it. So Dion Cassius, speaking of them, adds, καὶ ἕττο καὶ παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τὸ γενός τούτο, κολασθὲν μὲν πολλακις, αὐξήθεν δὲ επὶ πλειστὸν ὡστε καὶ εῖς παρθένων τῆς νομίσεως μικησαί. ‘And this kind of men,’ that is, men of this profession, not natural Jews, ‘is found also among the Romans; which, though they have been frequently punished, yet have for the most part increased, so as to take the liberty of making laws to themselves.’ For their punishments, an account is given us in Suetonius in Domit. and others, of the inquisition and search made after such as were circumcised. And as to their making laws to themselves, he respects their feasts, Sabbaths, abstinences, and such like observances, as the Jews obliged their proselytes unto. In like manner complaineth Juvenal,

Romans autem soliti contemnere leges
Judaicam ediscunt, et servant ac metuunt jus
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.

‘Contemning the Roman laws, they learn the rites and customs of the
Jews, observing and learning the whole right or law delivered in the secret writing of Moses.’ Seneca is yet more severe. Cum interim usque eo sceleratissima gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit: Victi victoribus leges dederunt. ‘The custom of this wicked nation hath so far prevailed, that it is now received among all nations: the conquered have given laws to the conquerors.’ And Tacitus, ‘Pessimus quisque spretis religiombus patriis, tributa et stipes, illuc (that is to Jerusalem) congerebat.’ The like revengeful spirit appears in those verses of Rutilius, lib. 1. Itinérar, though he lived afterwards under the Christian emperors.

O utinam nunquam Judæa victa fuisset
Pompeii bellis, imperioque Titi;
Latius excisa pestis contagia serpunt
Victoresque suos natio victa præmit.

But it is not unlikely, that he reflects on Christians also.

§ 24. We may add hereunto, that for the most part the conversation of the Jews amongst them, was wicked and provoking. They were a people that had for many generations been harassed and oppressed, by all the principal empires in the world; this caused them to hate them, and to have their minds always possessed with revengeful thoughts. When our apostle affirmed of them, ‘that they pleased not God, and were contrary to all men,’ 1. Thess. ii. 15, he intends not their opposition to the gospel, and the preachers of it, which he had before expressed, but that envious contrariety to mankind in general, which they were possessed with. And this evil frame, the nations ascribed to their law itself. ‘Moses novos ritus contra- riosque cæteris mortalibus et gentibus indidit,’ saith Tacitus. But this most falsely; no law of man ever taught that benignity, kindness, and general usefulness in the world, as theirs did. The people themselves being grown wicked and corrupt, pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. Hence they were looked on as such, who observed not so much as the law of nature towards any but themselves; as resolving

Quassitum ad fontem solos diducere verpos.

‘Not to direct a thirsty person to a common spring if uncircumcised.’ Whence was that censure of Tacitus, Apud ipso fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu; adversus omnes alios, hostile odium. ‘Faithful and merciful among themselves, towards all others they were actuated with irreconcilable hatred; which well expresseth what our Saviour charged them with, as a corrupt principle among them, Matt. v. 43, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.’ Into which two sorts they distributed all mankind; that is, in their sense, their own countrymen and strangers.

Their corrupt and wicked conversation also made them a reproach, and their religion contemned. So was it with them from their first dispersal, as God declares, Ezek. xxxvi. 20, ‘When they entered unto the heathen whither they went, they profaned my holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the Lord.’ And their wickedness increased with their time; for they still learned the corrupt and evil arts, with all ways of deceit used in the nations where they lived, until for the crimes of many, the whole nation became the common hatred of mankind. And, that we may turn from this digression, this being the state of things then in the world, we may not wonder if the writers of those days were very supinely negligent, or maliciously envious, in reporting their ways, customs, and reli-
igious observances. And it is acknowledged that, before those times, by
the long course of idolatry and impiety wherein the whole world had been
engaged, the Gentiles had utterly corrupted and lost the tradition of a Sab-
batical rest. What notices of it continued in former ages, hath been before
declared.
§ 25. But it is further pleaded, p. 54, 'that indeed the Gentiles could be
no way obliged to the observance of the fourth commandment, seeing they
had no indication of it, nor any means to free them from their ignorance of
the being of any such law. That they had the knowledge of it, and that
they had lost it, in and by their progenitors, is rejected as a vain pretence.'
And so much weight is laid on this consideration, that a demand is made of
somewhat to be returned in answer, that may give any satisfaction unto
conscience. But I understand not the force of this pretended argument.
Those who had absolutely lost the knowledge of the true God, in and by
their progenitors, as the Gentiles had done, might well also lose the know-
ledge of all the concerns of his worship. And so they had done, excepting
only that they traduced some of his institutions, as sacrifices, into their own
superstition; and so had they corrupted the use of his Sabbaths into that of
their idolatrous feasts. But when the true God had no other acknowledg-
ments amongst them, but what answered the title of the unknown God,
is it any wonder that his ways and worship might be unknown amongst
them also? And it is but pretended that they had no indications of a Sab-
batical rest, nor any means to free them from their ignorance. Man's
duty is both to be learned and observed in order. It is in vain to expect,
that any should have indications of a holy rest unto God, before they are
brought to the knowledge of God himself. When this is obtained, when
the true God upon just grounds is owned and acknowledged, then that
some time be set apart for his solemn worship, is of moral and natural
right. That this is included in the very first notion of the true God, and
our dependence upon him, all men do confess. And this principle was
abused among the heathen, to be the foundation of all their stated annual,
or monthly sacred solemnities, after they had nefariously lost the knowledge
of the only object of all religious worship. Where this progress is made,
as it might have been, by attending to the directive light of nature, and
the impressions of the law of it left upon the souls of men, there will not
be wanting sufficient indicatives of the nearest season for that worship.
However these things were, and are to be considered and admitted in their
order; and with respect unto that order, is their obligation. The heathen
were bound first to know and own the true God, and him alone; then to
worship him solemnly; and after that, in order of nature, to have some
solemn time separated to the observance of that worship. Without an ad-
mission of these, all which were neglected and rejected by them, there is no
place to inquire after the obligation of a hebdomadal rest. And their
non-observance of it was their sin, not first, directly, and immediately, but
consequently, as all others are that arise from an ignorance or rejection of
those greater principles whereon they do depend.
§ 26. The trivial exceptions from the difference of the Meridians, is yet
pleaded also. For hence it is pretended to be impossible that all men
should precisely observe the same day. For if a man should sail round the
world by the east, he will at his return home have gotten a day by his con-
tinual approach towards the rising sun; and if he steer his course west-
ward, he will lose a day in the annual revolution, as it is gotten the other
way: so did the Hollanders, ann. 1615. And hence the posterity of Noah,
gradually spreading themselves over the world, must have gradually come to
the observance of different seasons, if we shall suppose a day of sacred
rest required of them, or appointed to them. Apoge nugas. If men might
sail eastward or westward, and not continually have seven days succeeding
one another, there would be some force in this trifle. On our hypothesis,
wherever men are, a seventh part of their time, or a seventh day, is to be
separated to the remembrance of the rest of God, and the other ends of the
Sabbath. That the observance of this portion of time shall in all places
begin and end at the same instants, the law and order of God's creation will
not permit. It is enough, that amongst all who can assemble for the wor-
ship of God, there is no difference in general, but that they all observe the
same proportion of time. And he who by circumnavigation of the world,
(such rare and extraordinary instances being not to be provided for in a
general law,) getteth or loseth a day, he may at his return, with a good con-
sience, give up again what he hath got, or retrieve what he hath lost, with
those among whom he fixeth. For all such occasional accidents are to be
reduced to the common standard. All the difficulty therefore in this ob-
jection relates to the precise observance of the seventh day from the creation,
and not in the least unto one day in seven. And although the seventh day
was appointed principally for the land of Palestine, the seat of the church of
old, wherein there was no such alteration of meridians; yet I doubt not,
but that a wandering Jew might have observed the foregoing rule, and re-
duced his time to order upon his return home. What other exceptions of
the like nature occur in this cause, they shall be removed and satisfied in
our next inquiry, which is after the cause of the Sabbath, and the morality
of the observance of one day in seven.

EXERCITATION XXXVII.

THIRD EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

§ 1. Of the causes of the Sabbath. § 2. God the absolute original cause of it. Dis-
tinction of divine laws into moral and positive. § 3. Divine laws of a mixed nature, partly
moral, partly positive. § 4. Opinion of some that the law of the Sabbath was purely
positive. Difficulties of that opinion. § 5. Opinion of them who maintain the observ-
ance of one day in seven to be moral. § 6. Opinion of them who make the observance
of the seventh day precisely to be a moral duty. § 7. The second opinion asserted. § 8.
The common notion of the Sabbath explained. § 9. The true notion of it farther inquired
into. § 10. Continuation of the same disquisition. § 11. The law of nature wherein it
No obliging authority in them formally considered. § 13. Uncertainty and disagree-
ment about the dictates of reason. Opinions of the Magi, Zeno, Chrysippus, Plato, Ar-
chelous, Aristippus, Carneades, Brennus, &c. § 14. Things may belong to the law of
nature, which are not discoverable to the common reason of the most. § 15. The law of
nature wherein it doth really consist. § 16. Light given unto a septenary sacred rest in
the law of nature. § 17. Farther instances thereof. § 18. The observance of the Sab-
bath on the same foundation with monogamy. § 19. The seventh day an appendage of
the covenant of works. § 20. How far the whole notion of a weekly sacred rest was of
the law of nature. § 21. Natural light obscured by the entrance of sin. § 22. The
sum of what is proposed. § 23. The inquiry about the causes of the Sabbath renewed.
§ 24. The command of it in what sense a law moral, and how evidenced so to be. § 25.
To worship God in associations and assemblies, a moral duty. § 26. One day in seven
required to solemn worship by the law of our creation. § 27. What is necessary to warrant the inscription of any duty to the law of creation. § 28. 1. That it be congruous to the known principles of it. § 29. 2. That it have a general principle in the light of nature. § 30. 3. That it be taught by the works of creation. § 31. 4. Direction for its observance, by superadded revelation, no impeachment of it. § 32. How far the same duty may be required by a law moral, and by a law positive. § 33. Vindication of the truths laid down from an objection. § 34. Other evidences of the morality of this duty. § 35. Required in all states of the church. § 36. These various states. § 37. Command for the Sabbath before the fall. § 38. Before, and at the giving of the law, and under the gospel. § 39. Whether appointed by the church. § 40. Of the fourth commandment in the Decalogue. § 41. The proper subject of it. § 42. The seventh day precisely, not primarily required therein. § 43. Somewhat moral in it granted by all. § 44. The matter of this command, a moral duty by the law of creation. § 45. The morality of the precept itself proved from its interest in the Decalogue by various instances. § 46. The law of the Sabbath only preferred above all ceremonial and judicial laws. § 47. The words of our Saviour, Matt. xxiv. 20, considered. § 48. The whole of the Decalogue established by Christ. § 49. Objections proposed. § 50. The first answered. § 51. The second answered. § 52. The third answered. § 53. One day in seven, not the seventh day precisely required in the Decalogue. § 54. An objection from the sense of the law. § 55. Answered. § 56, 57. Other objections answered. § 58. Col. ii. 16, 17, considered.

§ 1. We have fixed the original of the Sabbatical rest, according to the best light we have received into these things, and confirmed the reasons of it with the consent of mankind. The next step in our progress must be an inquiry into its causes. And here also we fall immediately into those difficulties and entanglements, which the various apprehensions of learned men, promoted and defended with much diligence, have occasioned. I have no design to oppose or to contend with any, although a modest examination of the reasons of some, will be indispensably necessary to me. All that I crave, is the liberty of proposing my own thoughts and judgment in this matter, with the reasons and grounds of them. When that is done, I shall humbly submit the whole to the examination and judgment of all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, their Lord, and ours.

§ 2. First. It is agreed by all that God alone is the supreme, original, and absolute cause of the Sabbath. Whenever it began, whenever it ends, be it expired, or still in force, of what kind soever were its institution, the law of it was from God. It was from heaven, and not of men; and the will of God is the sole rule and measure of our observance of it, and obedience to him therein. What may, or may not be done, in reference to the observance of a day of holy rest by any inferior authority comes not here under consideration. But whereas there are two sorts of laws, whereby God requires the obedience of his rational creatures, which are commonly called moral and positive, it is greatly questioned and disputed, to whether of these sorts doth belong the command of a Sabbatical rest. Positive laws are taken to be such, as have no reason for them in themselves, nothing in the matter of them is taken from the things themselves commanded, but do depend merely and solely on the sovereign will and pleasure of God. Such were the laws and institutions of the sacrifices of old; and such are those which concern the sacraments and other things of the like nature, under the New Testament. Moral laws are such as have the reasons of them taken from the things themselves, required in them. For they are good, from their respect to the nature of God himself, and from that nature and order of all things, which he hath placed in the creation. So that this sort of laws is but declarative of the absolute goodness of what they do
require; the other is constitutive of it, as unto some certain ends. Laws positive, as they are occasionally given, so they are esteemed alterable at pleasure. Being fixed by mere will and prerogative, without respect to any thing that should make them necessary, antecedently to their being enacted, they may by the same authority at any time be taken away and abolished. Such I say are they in their own nature, and as to any firmitude that they have from their own subject-matter. But with respect to God's determination, posi-
tive divine laws may become eventually unalterable. And this difference is there between legal and evangelical institutions. The laws of both are positive only, equally proceeding from sovereign will and pleasure, and in their own natures equally alterable. But to the former, God had in his purpose fixed a determinate time and season wherein they should expire, or be altered by his authority: to the latter, he hath attached a perpetuity and unchangea-
bleness, during the state and condition of his church in this world. The other sort of laws are perpetual and unalterable in themselves, so far as they are of that sort that is moral. For although a law of that kind may espe-
cially enjoin such circumstances as may be changed and varied, as did the whole Decalogue in the whole commonwealth of Israel, yet so far as it is moral, that is, as its commands or prohibitions are necessary emergencies, or expressions, of the good or evil of the things it commands or forbids, it is invariable. And in these things there is an agreement; unless sometimes, through mutual oppositions, men are chaffed into some exceptions or dis-
tinctions.

§ 3. Unto these two sorts do all divine laws belong, and unto these heads they may be all reduced. And it is pleaded by some, that these kinds of laws are contradistinct; so that a law of one kind, can in no sense be a law in the oth-
er. And this doubtless is true reduplicatively, because they have especial formal reasons. As far, and wherein any laws are positive, they are not moral, and as far as they are purely moral, they are not formally positive, though given after the manner of positive command. Howbeit, this hinders not but that some do judge that there may be and are divine laws of a mixed nature. For there may be in a divine law, a foundation in, and respect unto somewhat that is moral, which yet may stand in need of the super-addition of a positive com-
mand, for its due observance to its proper end. Yea, the moral reason of things commanded, which ariseth out of a due natural respect to God, and the order of the universe, may be so deep and hidden, as that God, who would make the way of his creatures plain and easy, gives out express posi-
tive commands for the observance of what is antecedently necessary by the law of our creation. Hence a law may partake of both these considera-
tions, and both of them have an equal influence into its obligatory power. And by this means sundry duties, some moral, some positive, are as it were compounded in one observance, as may be instanced in the great duty of prayer. Hence the whole law of that observance becomes of a mixed nature, which yet God can separate at his pleasure, and taking away that which is positive, leave only that which is absolutely moral in force. And this kind of laws which have their foundation in the nature of things themselves, which yet stand in need of farther direction for their due observance, which is added unto them by positive in-
sitution, some call moral positive.

§ 4. According to these distinctions of the nature of the laws, in and by which God expresseth his will, are men's apprehensions different about the immediate and instrumental cause of the Sabbatical rest. That God was the author of it, is, as was said, by all agreed. But, say some, the law
whereby he appointed it, was purely positive, the matter of it being arbitrary, stated and determined only in the command itself; and so the whole nature of the law, and that commanded in it, changeable. And because positive laws did, and always do respect some other things besides and beyond themselves, it is pleaded that this law was ceremonial and typical; that is, it was an institution of an outward present religious observance, to signify and represent something not present, nor yet come: such were all the particulars of the whole system of Mosaic worship, whereof this law of the Sabbath was a part and an instance. In brief, some say that the whole law of the Sabbath was, as to its general nature, positive and arbitrary, and so changeable; and in particular, ceremonial and typical, and so actually changed and abolished. But yet it has so fallen out, that they who are most positive in these assertions, cannot but acknowledge, that this law is so engraven into, and so closed up with somewhat that is moral and unalterable, that it is no easy thing to hit the joint aright, and make a separation of the one from the other. But concerning any other law expressly and confessedly ceremonial, no such thing can be observed. They were all evidently and entirely arbitrary institutions, without any such near relation to what is moral, as might trouble any one to make a distinction between them. For instance, the law of sacrifices hath indeed an answerableness in it to a great principle of the law of nature; namely, that we must honour God with our substance, and the best of our increase; yet that this might be done many other ways, and not by sacrifice, if God had pleased so to ordain, every one is able to apprehend. It is otherwise in this matter; for none will deny but that it is required of us in and by the law of nature, that some time be set apart and dedicated unto God, for the observance of his solemn worship in the world. And it is plain to every one, that this natural dictate is inseparably included in the law of the Sabbath. It will therefore surely be difficult to make it absolutely and universally positive. I know some begin to whisper things inconsistent with this concession. But we have as yet the universal consent of all divines, ancient and modern, fathers, schoolmen, and casuists, concurring in this matter. For they all unanimously affirm, that the separation of some part of our time to sacred uses, and the solemn honouring of God, is required of us in the light and by the law of nature. And herein lies the fundamental notion of the law now inquired after. This also may be farther added, that whereas this natural dictate for the observance of some time in the solemn worship of God, hath been accompanied with a declaration of his will from the foundation of the world, that this time should be one day in seven, it will be a matter of no small difficulty to find out what is purely positive therein.

§ 5. Others building on this foundation, that the dedication of some part of our time to the worship of God, is a duty natural or moral, as required by the law of our creation, (not that time in itself, which is but a circumstance of other things, can be esteemed moral, but that our observance of time may be a moral duty,) do add, that the determination of one day in seven, to be that portion of time so to be dedicated, is inseparable from the same foundation, and is of the same nature with it. That is, that the Sabbatical observance of one day's holy rest in seven, hath a moral precept for its warrant, or that which hath the nature of a moral precept in it; so that, although the revolution of time in seven days, and the confining of the day to that determined season, do depend on revelation, and a positive com-
mand of God for its observance, yet on supposition thereof, the moral pre-
cept prevails in the whole, and is everlastingly obligatory. And there are
some divines of great piety and learning, who do judge that a command of
God given to all men, and equally obligatory to all, respecting their manner
of living unto God, is to be esteemed a moral command, and that indispen-
sable and unchangeable; although we should not be able to discover the
reason of it in the light and law of nature. Nor can such a command
be reckoned amongst them that are merely positive, arbitrary and change-
able, all which depend on sundry other things, and do not first affect men,
as men in general. And it is probable, that God would not give out any
such catholic command, which comprised not somewhat naturally good and
right in it. And this is the best measure and determination of what is
moral, and not our ability of discovering by reason what is so, and what is
not; as we shall see afterwards.

§ 6. Moreover, there are some who stay not here, but contend, that the
precise observance of the seventh day in the hebdomadal revolution, lieth
under a command moral and indispensable. For God, they say, who is the
sovereign Lord of us and our times, hath taken by an everlasting law this
day unto himself for his honour and service. And he hath therein obliged
all men to a holy rest, not on some certain fixed and stated time, not on one
day in seven originally, as the first intention of his command, but on the
seventh day precisely, whereunto those other considerations of some stated
and fixed time, and of one day in seven, are consequential, and far from
previous foundations of it. The seventh day, as the seventh day, is, they
say, the first proper object of the command; the other things mentioned
of a stated time, and of one day in seven, do only follow thereon; and
by virtue thereof belong to the command of the Sabbath, and no otherwise.
Herein great honour indeed is done unto the seventh day, above all other
ordinances of worship whatever, even of the gospel itself; but whether
with sufficient warrant we must afterwards inquire. At present I shall
only observe, that this observance of the seventh day precisely, is resolved
into the sovereignty of God over us and our times, and into an occasion re-
respecting purely the covenant of works; on which bottoms, it is hard to fix
it an absolute unvariable station.

§ 7. It is the second opinion, for the substance of it, which I shall en-
devour to explain and confirm; and therein prove a sacred Sabbatical rest
unto God of one day in seven, to be enjoined unto all that fear him, by a
law perpetual and indispensable, upon the account of what is moral therein.
The reason, I say, of the obligation of the law of the Sabbath is natural,
and thence the obligation itself universal; however the declaration and de-
termination of the day itself depend on arbitrary revelation, and a law
merely positive. These things being explained and confirmed, the other
opinions proposed will fall under our consideration.

To obtain a distinct light into the truth in this matter, we must consider
both the true notion of the sacred rest, as also of the law of our creation,
whereby we affirm that fundamentally and virtually it is required.

§ 8. The general notion of the Sabbath is, a portion of time set apart
by divine appointment, for the observance and performance of the solemn
worship of God. The worship of God is that which we are made for, as
to our station in this world, and is the means and condition of our en-
joyment of him in glory, wherein consists the ultimate end, as unto us,
of our creation. This worship therefore is required of us by the law of
our creation, and it is upon the matter all that is required of us there-
by, seeing we are obliged by it to do all things to the glory of God. And therefore is the solemn expression of that worship, required of us in the same manner. For the end of it being our glorifying him as God, and the nature of it, consisting in the profession of our universal subjection unto him, and dependence upon him, the solemn expression of it is as necessary as the worship itself, which we are to perform. No man therefore ever doubted, but that by the law of nature we were bound to worship God, and solemnly to express that worship; for else wherefore were we brought forth in this world? These things are inseparable from our natures, and where this order is disturbed by sin, we fall into another, which the properties of God on the supposition of transgressing our first natural order, do render no less necessary unto his glory than the other, namely, that of punishment.

Moreover, in this worship it is required by the same law of our beings, that we should serve God with all that we do receive from him. No man can think otherwise; for is there any thing that we have received from God, that shall yield him no revenue of glory, or whereof we ought to make no acknowledgment unto him? Who dare once so to imagine? Among the things thus given us of God, is our time. And this falls under a double consideration in this matter: First. As it is an inseparable moral circumstance of the worship required of us, so it is necessarily included in the command of worship itself, not directly, but consequentially. Secondly. It is in itself a part of what is vouchsafed to us from God, for our own use and purposes in this world. So upon its own account, first and directly, a separation of a part of it unto God and his solemn worship, is required of us. It remains only to inquire what part of time it is that is, and will be accepted with God. This is declared and determined in the fourth commandment, to be the seventh part of it, or one day in seven. And this is that which is positive in the command, which yet, as to the foundation, formal reason, and main substance of it, is moral. These things are true, but yet do not express the whole nature of the Sabbath, which we must farther inquire into.

§ 9. And first, it must be observed, that wherever there is mention of a Sabbatical rest, as enjoined to men for their observance, there is still respect unto a rest of God that preceded it, and was the cause and foundation of it. In the first mention of it, God's rest is given as the reason of his sanctifying and blessing a day of rest for us, whence also it hath its name, Gen. ii. 2, 3. 'God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, because he sabbatted thereon himself.' And so it is expressed, and the same reason is given of it in the fourth commandment. God wrought six days, and rested the seventh: therefore we must rest, Exod. xx. 11. The same is observed in the new creation, as we shall see afterwards, and more fully in our exposition of Heb. iv. Now that God may be said to rest, it is necessary that some signal work of his do go before. For rest, in the first notion of it, includes a respect to an antecedent work or labour. And so it is everywhere declared. God wrought his works and finished them, and then rested. He made all things in six days, and rested on the seventh. And he that is entered into rest, ceaseth from his work. And both these, the work of God, and the rest of God, must in this matter be considered. For the work of God, it is that of the old and whole creation, as is directly expressed, Gen. ii; Exod. xx; which I desire may be borne in mind.

And this work of God may be considered two ways. First. Naturally or
physically, as it consisted in the mere production of the effects of his power, wisdom, and goodness. So all things are the work of God.

Secondly. Morally, as God ordered and designed all his works to be a means of glorifying himself, in and by the obedience of his rational creatures. This consideration, both the nature of it, with the order, and end of the whole creation, do make necessary. For God first made all the inanimate, then animate and sensitive creatures, in their glory, order, and beauty. In, and on all these, he implanted a teaching and instructive power; for the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy-work; Ps. xix. 1, 2, and all creatures are frequently called on to give praise and glory to him. And this expresseth that in their nature and order, which revealeth and manifesteth him, and the glorious excellencies of his nature, which man is to contemplate in their effects in them, and give glory unto him. For after them all was man made, to consider and use them all, for the end for which they were made; and was a kind of mediator between God and the rest of the creatures, by and through whom he would receive all his glory from them. This is that which our apostle discourseth about, Rom. i. 19, 20. The design of God, as he declares, was to manifest and show himself in his works to man. Man learning from them the invisible things of God, was to glorify him as God; as he disputes. The ordering and disposal of things to this purpose, is principally to be considered in the works of God, as his rest did ensue upon them.

Secondly. The rest of God is to be considered as that which completes the foundation of the Sabbatical rest inquired after; for it is built on God's working and entering into his rest. Now this is not a mere cessation from working. It is not absolutely so; for God worketh hitherto; and the expression of God's rest is of a moral, and not a natural signification, for it consists in the satisfaction and complacency that he took in his works, as effects of his goodness, power, and wisdom, disposed in the order, and unto the ends mentioned. Hence it is said, that upon the finishing of them, he 'looked on every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good,' Gen. i. 31, that is, he was satisfied in his works and in their disposal, and pronounced concerning them, that they became his infinite wisdom and power. And it is added, that he not only rested on the seventh day; but also, that 'he was refreshed,' Exod. xxxi. 17, that is, he took great complacency in what he had done, as that which was suited unto the end aimed at; namely, the expression of his greatness, goodness, and wisdom, to his rational creatures, and his glory through their obedience thereon; as on the like occasion he is said to 'rest in his love, and to rejoice with singing,' Zeph. iii. 17.

Now, in the work and rest of God thus stated, did the whole rule of the obedience of man originally consist; and therein was he to seek also his own rest, as his happiness and blessedness. For God had not declared any other way for his instruction in the end of his creation, that is, his obedience unto him, and blessedness in him, but in and by his own works and rest. This then is the first end of this holy rest. And it must always be borne in mind, as that without which we 'can give no glory to God as rational creatures, made under a moral law in a dependence on him; for this he indispensably requireth of us, and this is the sum of what he requireth of us, namely, that we glorify him according to the revelation that he makes of himself unto us, whether by his works of nature or of grace. To the solemnity hereof, the day inquired after is
necessary. To express these things, is the general end of the Sabbatical rest prescribed to us, and of our observance of it; for so it is said, ‘God wrought and rested,’ and then requires us so to do. And it hath sundry particular ends or reasons. First. That we might learn the satisfaction and complacency that God Hath in his own works, Gen. ii. 2, 3; that is, to consider the impressions of his excellencies upon them, and to glorify him as God on that account, Rom. i. 19—21. For hence was man originally taught to fear, love, trust, obey, and honour him absolutely; even from the manifestation that he had made of himself in his works, wherein he rested. And had not God thus rested in them, and been refreshed upon the completing and finishing of them, they would not have been a sufficient means to instruct man in those duties. And our observance of the evangelical Sabbath, hath the same respect to the works of Christ, and his rest thereon, when he saw the travail of his soul, and was satisfied; as shall afterwards be declared.

Secondly. Another end of the original Sabbatical rest was, that it might be a pledge to man of his rest in and with God. For in and by the law of his creation, man had an end of rest proposed unto him, and that in God. This he was to be directed to, and encouraged to look after. Herein God, by his works and rest, had instructed him. And by giving him the Sabbath, as he gave him a pledge thereof, so he required of him his approbation of the covenant way of attaining it, whereof afterwards. Hence Ps. xcii. whose title is, מִמְּלוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁמָ֑יִם, ‘A Psalm, a Song for the Sabbath day,’ which some of the Jews ascribe to Adam, as it principally consists in contemplation of the works of God, with holy admiration of his greatness and power manifested in them, with praises unto him on their account; so it expresseth the destruction of ungodly sinners, and the salvation of the righteous, whereof in that day’s rest they had a pledge. And this belonged to that state of man wherein he was created, namely, that he should have a pledge of eternal rest. Neither could his duty and capacity be otherwise answered, or esteemed reasonable. His duty, which was working in moral obedience, had a natural relation unto a reward. And his capacity was such, as could not be satisfied, nor himself attain absolute rest, but in the enjoyment of God. A pledge hereof therefore belonged unto his condition.

Thirdly. Consideration was had of the way and means, whereby man might enter into the rest of God proposed to him. And this was by that obedience and worship of God, which the covenant wherein he was created required of him. The solemn expression of this obedience, and exercise of this worship, was indispensably required of him and his posterity, in all their societies and communion with one another. This cannot be denied, unless we shall say, that God making man to be a sociable creature, and capable of sundry relations, did not require of him to honour him in the societies and relations whereof he was capable, which would certainly overthrow the whole law of his creation, with respect unto the end for which he was made, and render all societies sinful and rebellious against God. Hereunto the Sabbatical rest was absolutely necessary. For without some such rest, fixed or variable, those things could not be. This is a time or season, for man to express and solemnly pay that homage, which he owes to his Creator. And this is by the most esteemed the great, if not the only end of the Sabbath. But it is evident, that it falls under sundry precedent considerations.

§ 10. These being the proper ends and reasons of the original Sabbatical
rest, which contain the true notion of it, we may next inquire after the law whereby it was prescribed and commanded. To this purpose, we must first consider the state wherein man was created, and then the law of his creation. And for the state and condition wherein man was created, it falls under a threefold consideration. For man may be considered either, 1. Absolutely as a rational creature; or, 2. As made under a covenant of rewards and punishments; or, 3. With respect to the special nature of that covenant.

First. He was made a rational creature, and thereby necessarily in a moral dependence on God. For being endowed with intellectual faculties in an immortal soul, capable of eternal blessedness or misery, able to know God, and to regard him as the first cause and last end of all, as the author of his being and object of his blessedness, it was naturally and necessarily incumbent on him, without any farther considerations, to love, fear, and obey him, to trust in him as a preserver and recompenser; and this the order of his nature, called the image of God, inclined and enabled him to. For it was not possible that such a creature should be produced, and not lie under an obligation to all those duties, which the nature of God, and his own nature, and the relation of the one to the other, made necessary. Under this consideration alone, it was required by the law of man's creation, that some time should be separated unto the solemn expression of his obedience, and due performance of the worship that God required of him. For in vain was he endowed with intellectual faculties, and appointed unto society, if he were not to honour God by them in all his relations, and openly to express the homage which he owed him. And this could not be done, but in a time appointed for that purpose, the neglect whereof must be a deviation from the law of the creation. And as this is generally acknowledged, so no man can fancy the contrary. Here, then, do we fix the necessity of the separation of some time to the ends of a Sabbatical rest; even on the nature of God and man, with the relation of one to the other: for who can say, no part of our time is due to God, or so to be disposed?

Secondly. Man in his creation, with respect to the ends of God therein, was constituted under a covenant. That is, the law of his obedience was attended with promises and threatenings, rewards, and punishments, suited unto the goodness and holiness of God. For every law, with rewards and recompences annexed, hath the nature of a covenant. And in this case, although the promise wherewith man was encouraged to obedience, which was that of eternal life with God, did in strict justice exceed the worth of the obedience required, and so was a superadded effect of goodness and grace; yet it was suited to the constitution of a covenant meet for man to serve God in, unto his glory. And on the other side, the punishment threatened unto disobedience, in death and an everlasting separation from God, was such as the righteousness and holiness of God, as his supreme governor, and Lord of him and of the covenant, did require. Now this covenant belonged to the law of creation; for although God might have dealt with man in a way of absolute sovereignty, requiring obedience of him without a covenant of a reward infinitely exceeding it, yet having done so in his creation, it belongs to, and is inseparable from the law thereof. And under this consideration, the time required in general for a rest unto God, under the first general notion of the nature and being of man, is determined unto one day in seven. For as we shall find, that in the various dispensations of the covenant with man, and the change of its nature, yet so long as God is pleased to establish any covenant with man, he hath, and doth
invariably require one day in seven to be set apart to the assignation of praise and glory to himself; so we shall see afterwards, that there are indications of his mind to this purpose in the covenant itself.

Thirdly. Man is to be considered with especial respect to that covenant under which he was created, which was a covenant of works. For herein rest with God was proposed to him, as the end or reward of his own works, or of his personal obedience to God, by absolute strict righteousness and holiness. And the peculiar form of this covenant, as relating to the way of God's entering into it upon the finishing of his own works, designed the seventh day from the beginning of the creation, to be the day precisely for the observance of a holy rest. As men, then, are always rational creatures, so some portion of time is by them necessarily to be set apart to the solemn worship of God. As they are under a covenant, so this time was originally limited unto one day in seven; and as the covenant may be varied, so may this day also, which under the covenant of works, was precisely limited to the seventh day; and these things must be further illustrated and proved.

§ 11. This was the state and condition wherein man was originally created. Our next inquiry is after the law of his creation, commonly called the law of nature, with what belongeth thereunto, or what is required of us by virtue thereof. Now, by the law of nature, most understand the dictates of right reason, which all men, or men generally, consent in and agree about. For we exclude wholly from this consideration the instinct of brute creatures, which hath some appearance of a rule unto them. So Hesiod of old determined this matter, speaking of them:

Εσθειν ἀληθοὺς, ετει οὐ δικη ἐστιν ετ' αυτοῖς.

'They devour one another, because they have no right or law amongst them.'—Hence the prophet, complaining of force and violence amongst men, with a neglect of right, justice, and equity, says, 'Men are as the fishes of the sea, as creeping things that have no ruler over them, Hab. i. 14. They devour one another without regard to rule or right. As he in Varro:

Natura humanis omnia sunt paria.
Qui potes plus, urget; pices ut sape minitos
Magnu' comest, ut aves enecat accipiter.

Most learned men, therefore, conclude, that there is no such thing as jus, or lex nature, among irrational creatures; and consequently nothing of good or evil in their actions. But the consent of men in the dictates of reason, is esteemed the law of nature. So Cicero, Tusc. 1. Omni in re consensus omnium gentium, lex nature putanda est. 'The common consent of all nations in anything, is to be thought the law of nature.' And Aristotle also, Rhetoric, lib. i. cap. 14, calls it, νομον κοινον, 'a common law, unwritten,' pertaining unto all; whose description he adds, κοινον δὲ, τον κατα φυσιν, εστι γαρ ὁ μαντεωνται τι παντες φυσει κοινον εικαιουν αεικον, καν μηδειμα κοινωνια προς αληθοὺς ὑ, μηδε συνδηκη. 'That which is common, is according to nature; for there is somewhat which all men think, and this is common right or injustice by nature, although there should be neither society nor compact between them.' And this he confirms out of Empe-docles, that it is that ou τις μεν εικαιουν τις δε ou εκαιον, 'not which si just to some, and unjust to others.'
'But it is right amongst all, spread out with immense light by the broad ruling sky.' The like he affirms in his Ethics, lib. v. cap. 10, defining it to be, that which πανταχον την αυτην εχει δυναμιν, και ου τω δοκειν η μη, 'that which hath always, or every-where the same force or power, and doth not seem, or not seern, so to be.' This his expositors affirm to be, παρα τως πλειστως, και αεισφοροις και κατα φυσιν εξουσιν, 'amongst the most of men, who live according to the light of nature, with the principles of it uncorrupted.' This κατα φυσιν, is the same with μετα λογου, according to the dictates of reason. So λογος ὁ ὀρθος, 'right reason,' is the same with many, as jus nature, or naturale. Tully in his first Book de Legib. pursues this at large. Est unum jus, saith he, quo devineta est hominum societas; et quod lex constituit una. Quae lex est recta ratio prohibendi et imperandi. ‘There is one common right, which is the bond of human society, and which depends on one law. And this law is the right reason of forbidding and commanding.’ This, then, is generally received; namely, that the law of nature consists in the dictates of reason, which men sober, and otherwise uncorrupted, do assent unto, and agree in. But there are sundry things which will not allow us to acquiesce in this description of it. For,

§ 12. First. The law of nature is a constant and perfect law. It must be so, because it is the fountain and rule of all other laws whatever. For they are but deductions from it, and applications of it. Now, to a complete law it is required, not only that it be instructive, but also that it have a binding force, or be coactive. That is, it doth not only teach, guide, and direct what is to be done, persuading by the reason of the things themselves which it requires, but also it must have authority to exact obedience, so far as that those who are under the power of it can give themselves no dispensation from its observance. But thus it is not with these dictates of reason. They go no farther than direction and persuasion. And these always have, and always will have, a respect to occasions, emergencies, and circumstances. When these fall under any alterations, they will put reason on new considerations, of what it ought to determine with respect to them. And this the nature of a universal law will not admit. Whatever, then, men determine by reason, they may alter on new considerations, such as occasioned their original determination. I do not extend this unto all instances of natural light, but to some only, which sufficeth to demonstrate, that the unalterable law of nature doth not consist in these dictates of reason only. Suppose men do coalesce into any civil society, on the mere dictates of reason, that it is meet and best for them so to do; if this be the supreme reason thereof, no obligation ariseth from thence to preserve the society so entered into, but what is liable to a dissolution from contrary considerations. If it be said, that reason dictates and commands in the name of God, whence an indissoluble obligation attends it, it will be answered, that this introduceth a new respect, which is not formally included in the nature of reason itself. Let a man, indeed, use and improve his own reason without prejudice; let him collect what resolutions, determinations, instructions, and laws have proceeded from the reason of other men, it will both exceedingly advance his understanding, and enable him to judge of many things that are congruous to the light and law of nature. But to suppose the law of nature to consist in a system or collection of such instances and observations, is altogether unwarrantable.
§ 13. The event of things, in the disagreement of the wisest men about
the dictates of reason, utterly subverts this opinion. The law of nature, whatever it be, must in itself be one, uniform and unalterable, the same in
and unto all. For by these properties it differs from all other laws. But
if it have no higher nor more noble original to be resolved into, but mere
human reason, it will be found, if not in all things, yet in most, fluctuating
and uncertain. For about what is agreeable to reason in things moral, and
what is not, there have been differences innumerable from time immemorial,
and that amongst them who searched most diligently after them; and
boasted themselves to be wise upon their self-pleasing discoveries. This
gave the greatest occasion, to the two hundred and eighty-eight sects
of philosophers, as Austin reports them out of Varro, who was 'disertissimus
Nepotum Romuli;' lib. 19, de Civit. Dei. Yea, and some of the most learned
and contemplative authors, did not only mistake in many instances of what
natural light required, but also asserted things in direct opposition to what
is judged so to be. The saying produced out of Empedocles by Aristotle
before mentioned, is to prove that the killing of any living creature,
is openly against the universally prevailing law of nature. Others main-
tained such things to be natural, as the most did abominate. Incest in the
nearest instances, and sodomy, were asserted to be lawful by the Magi, and
by some of the most learned Greeks, as Zeno and Chrysippus. And it was
the judgment of Theodorus, that a wise man ought καὶ κλεψει τι καὶ
μοίχευει, καὶ ιεροσυλήσει εν καιρῷ, μηδὲν γαρ τοιοῦτω φύσι αισχρον ειναι, as
Hesychius Illustrius reports in his life, he thought that neither theft, nor
adultery, nor sacrilege, had any thing evil or filthy in them in their own
nature, so that a wise man ought to have respect unto them, according to
circumstances and occasions. Plato's promiscuous use of wives, was con-
ﬁrmed by law at Sparta. And Archelaus at once determined, καὶ το δίκαιον
ειναι, καὶ το αισχρον, ου φυσι, αλλὰ μορφι, as Diogenes, in his life, who like-
wise reports the same of Aristippus and Carneades. 'Naturally,' they
thought, 'nothing just or unjust, good or evil, but by virtue of some arbitrary
law.' And there are yet those in the world, partakers of human nature, in
common with us all, who know no other rule of their actions towards
others, but power, as the cannibals and those Indians, who suppose they
may justly spoil all that are afraid of them. Yea some who of late have
pretended to make a severe inquisition into these things, seem to incline
unto an opinion, that power and self-advantage, are the rule of men's con-
versation among themselves in this world. So it was the principle of
Brennus, in his time the terror of Europe, that there was no other law of
nature, but that 'the weaker should obey the stronger.' And the commander
of the Gauls who besieged the Roman Capitol, when he was on a compo-
sition to depart upon the giving to him such a weight of gold, threw in his
sword into the scale against it, giving no other reason for what he did, but
vae victis. Neither will another rule which they had, of assigning things to
the law of nature, hold firm, namely a general usage of mankind from time
immemorial. Thus Antigone pleads in Sophocles for her burying of
Polynices.

Οὐ γὰρ τῷ νῦν τε κάχθε, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ποτε
Ζη τοῦτο, κ' οὖδες οἴδειν εἰς ὤντο φανή.

'This' (right) 'arose not to-day nor yesterday, but was in force ever of old
nor doth any man know from whence it arose.' For all nations from
beyond the records of the original of things, had consented to practices
directly contrary to the light of nature, as is now acknowledged. And
hence were all the disputes of old, about the nature, bounds, and ends of
good and evil, duty and vice, honest and filthy, just and unjust, that could
never be determined. This Plato observing, affirms in his Phædo, that if
‘any one name either silver or iron presently all men agree, what it is that
is intended; but if they speak of that which is just and good, presently we
are at variance with others, and among ourselves.’ So great uncertainty is
there in human reason, under its best natural improvements, in its judgment
what doth or doth not belong to the principles and condition of our nature,
so far is it from being comprehensive of the whole law thereof.

§ 14. When, therefore, we plead any thing to belong unto, or to proceed
from the law of nature, it is no impeachment of our assertion, to say, that it
doth not appear so to the common reason of mankind, or that right reason
hath not found it out or discovered it, provided it contain nothing repugnant
thereunto. For it will never be universally agreed, what doth so appear to
the common reason of all, nor what is, hath been, or may be discovered
thereby. And although it should be true, which some say, that moral
and natural duties depend on, and have their formal reason from the nature
of God and man, yet it doth not thence follow, that we do, or may, by the
sole light of nature, know what doth so arise, with the due bounds and just
consequences of it. But there is, as we shall see, something yet farther re-
quired, in and unto the law of nature, which is the adequate rule of all such
duties. I shall not, therefore, endeavour to prove, that the mere dictates of
reason do evince a sacred hebdomadal rest; as knowing that the law
of nature, unto which we say it doth belong, doth not absolutely consist in
these dictates; nor did they ever since the fall steadily and universally, as
acted in men possessed of reason, either comprehend or express, all that be-
longs thereunto.

§ 15. By the law of nature, then, I intend, not a law which our nature
gives unto all our actions; but a law given unto our nature, as a rule and
measure unto our moral actions. It is ‘lex nature naturantis,’ and not
‘naturae naturante.’ It respects the efficient cause of nature, and not the
effects of it. And this respect alone can give it the nature of a law, that is
an obliging force and power. For this must be always from the act of a
superior; seeing par in parem jus non habet, equals have no right one over
another. This law, therefore, is that rule which God hath given unto
human nature, in all the individual partakers of it, for all its moral actions,
in the state and condition wherein it was by him created and placed, with
respect unto his own government of it, and judgment concerning it; which
rule is made known in them and to them, by their inward constitution and
outward condition, wherein they were placed of God. And the very heathens
acknowledged, that the common law of mankind was God’s prescription unto
them. So Tully, 2. de Legib. Hanc video sapientissimorum fuisse sen-
tentiam, legem neque hominum ingenios exegcitatem, neque scitum aliquot
fuisse populum, sed ætternum quiddam quod universum mundum regeret,
imperandì prohibendique sapientia. Ita principem legem illam et ultimam,
mentem dicebant omnìa ratione cogentis, aut vetantis Dei. Take this law,
therefore, actively, and it is the will of God commanding; take it passively,
and it is the conscience of man complying with it; take it instrumentally,
and it is the inbred notions of our minds, with other documents from the
works of God proposed unto us. The supreme original of it, as of all
authority, law, and obligation, is the will of God constituting, appointing,
and ordering the nature of things. The means of its revelation is the effect of the will, wisdom, and power of God, creating man and all other things wherein he is concerned, in their order, place, and condition. And the observance of it, as far as individual persons are therein concerned, is committed to the care of the conscience of every man, which naturally is the mind’s acting itself towards God as the author of this law.

§ 16. These things being premised, we shall consider what light is given unto this sacred duty from the law of our creation. The first end of any law is to instruct, direct, and guide them in their duty unto whom it is given. A law which is not in its own nature instructive and directive is no way meet to be prescribed unto rational creatures. What hath an influence upon any creatures of any other kind, if it be internal, is instinct, and not properly a law; if it be external, it is force and compulsion. The law, therefore, of creation comprised every thing whereby God instructed man in the knowledge of his own creation, and of that of the universe; to fit him for his works or obedience, and for his rest or reward. And, whatever tended unto that end, belonged unto that law. It is then, as hath been proved, unduly confined unto the ingrafted notions of his mind, concerning God, and his duty towards him, though they are a principal part thereof. Whatever was designed to give improvement to those notions, and to his natural light to excite or direct them, I mean in the works of nature, not superadded positive institutions, doth also belong thereunto. Wherefore, the whole instruction that God intended to give unto man, by the works of creation, with their order and end, is, as was said, included herein. What he might learn from them, or what God taught him by them, was no less his duty, than what his own inbred light directed him to, Rom. i. 18–20. Thus, the framing of the world in six days, in six days of work, was intended to be instructive to man, as well as the consideration of the things materially that were made. God could have immediately produced all out of nothing, τὸ λείπον, τὸ πρῶτον ὥσπερ οὐκ ἦσθι, in the shortest measure of time conceivable. But he not only made all things for himself, or his glory, but disposed also the order of their production unto the same end. And herein consisted part of that covenant instruction which he gave unto man in that condition wherein he was made, that through him he might have glory ascribed unto him, on the account of his works themselves, as also of the order and manner of their creation. For it is vain to imagine that the world was made in six days, and those closed with a day of rest, without a special respect to the obedience of rational creatures, seeing absolutely, with respect to God himself, neither of them was necessary. And what he intended to teach them thereby, it was their duty to inquire and know. Hereby then, in general, man was taught obedience and working before he entered into rest. For, being created in the image of God, he was to conform himself to God. As God wrought before he rested, so was he to work before his rest; his condition rendering working in him obedience, which in God was an effect of sovereignty. And by the rest of God, or his satisfaction and complacency in what he had made and done, he was instructed to seek rest with God, or to enter into that rest of God, by his compliance with the ends intended.

§ 17. And whereas the innate light and principles of his own mind informed him, that some time was to be set apart to the solemn worship of God, as he was a rational creature made to give glory unto him; so the instruction he received by the works and rest of God, as made under a covenant taught him, that one day in seven was required to that purpose,
as also to be a pledge of his resting with God. It may be, it will be said, that man could not know that the world was made in six days, and that the rest of God ensued on the seventh, without some special revelation. I answer, 1. That I know not. He that knew the nature of all the creatures, and could give them names suited thereto, upon his first sight and view of them, might know more of the order of their creation, than we can well imagine. For we know no more in our lapsed condition, to what the light of nature directed man as walking before God in a covenant, than men merely natural do know of the guidance and conduct of the light and law of grace, in them who are taken into a new covenant. 2. However, what God instructed him in, even by revelation, as to the due consideration and improvement of the things that belonged unto the law of his creation, that is, to be esteemed as a part thereof. Institutions of things by special revelation that had no foundation in the law or light of nature, were merely positive; such were the commands concerning the trees of life, and of the knowledge of good and evil. But such as were directive of natural light, and of the order of the creation, were moral, and belonged to the general law of obedience. Such was the special command given to man to till and keep the garden, Gen. ii. 15, or to dress and improve the place of his habitation. For this in general the law of his creation required. Now, this God did, both as to his works and his rest. Neither do I know that any one has as yet questioned, whether Adam and the patriarchs that lived before the giving of the law, knew that the world was created in six days. Though some seem to speak doubtfully hereof, and some by direct consequence deny it, yet I suppose that hitherto it passeth as granted. Nor have they, who dispute that the Sabbath was neither instituted, known, nor observed before the people of Israel were in the wilderness, once attempted to confirm their opinion with this supposition, that the patriarchs from the foundation of the world, knew not that the world was made in six days; which yet alone would be effectual unto their purpose. Nor, on the other side, can it be once rationally imagined that if they had knowledge hereof, and therewithal of the rest which ensued thereon, that they had no regard unto it in the worship of God.

§ 18. And thus the Sabbath, or the observance of one day in seven as a sacred rest, was fixed on the same moral grounds with monogamy, or the marriage of one man to one woman only at the same time; which, from the very fact and order of the creation, our Saviour proves to have been an unchangeable part of the law of it. For because God made them two single persons, male and female, fit for individual conjunction, he concludes that this course of life they were everlastingly obliged not to alter nor transgress. As, therefore, men may dispute that polygamy is not against the law of nature, because it was allowed and practised by many, or by most of those who of old observed and improved the light and rule of nature to the uttermost, when yet the very factum and order of the creation is sufficient to evince the contrary: so, although men should dispute that the observance of the sacred rest of one day in seven, is not of the light nor law of nature, all whose rules and dictates, they say, are of an easy discovery, and prone to the observation of all men, which this is not; yet the order of the creation, and the rest of God that ensued thereon, is sufficient to evince the contrary. And in the renewing of the law upon Mount Sinai, God taught the people not only by the words that he spake, but also by the works that he wrought. Yea, he instructed them in a moral duty, not only by what he did, but by what he did not. For he declares, that they ought to make no images of
or unto him, because he made no representation of himself unto them, 'they saw no manner of similitude, on the day that the Lord spake unto them in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire,' Deut. iv. 15, 16.

§ 19. But now, to shut up this discourse; whereas the covenant which man originally was taken into was a covenant of works, wherein his obtaining rest with God, depended absolutely on his doing all the work he had to do in a way of legal obedience; he was during the dispensation of that covenant, tied up precisely to the observance of the seventh day, or that day which followed the whole work of creation. And the seventh day, as such, is a pledge and token of the rest promised in the covenant of works, and of no other. And those who would advance that day again into a necessary observance, do consequentially introduce the whole covenant of works, and are become debtors unto the whole law. For the works of God which preceded the seventh day precisely, were those whereby man was initiated into and instructed in the covenant of works; and the day itself was a token and pledge of the righteousness thereof; or a moral and natural sign of it, and of the rest of God therein, and of the rest of man with God thereby. And it is no service to the church of God, nor hath any tendency unto the honour of Christ in the gospel, to endeavour a reduction of us unto the covenant of nature.

§ 20. Thus was man instructed in the whole notion of a weekly sacred rest, by all the ways and means which God was pleased to use in giving him an acquaintance with his will, and with that obedience to his glory which he expected from him. For this knowledge he had partly by the law of his creation as innate unto him, or concreated with the principles of his nature, being the necessary exsurgecy of his rational constitution; and partly by the works and rest of God thereon proposed unto his consideration, both confirmed by God's declaration of his sanctification of the seventh day. Hence did he know, that it was his duty to express and celebrate the rest of God, or the complacency that he had in the works of his hands, in reference unto their great and proper end, or his glory, in the honour, praise, and obedience of them, unto whose contemplation they were proposed for those ends. This followed immediately from the time spent in the creation, and the rest that ensued thereon, which were so ordered for his instruction; and not from any other cause or reason taken either from the nature of God, or of the things themselves; which required neither six days to make the world in, nor any rest to follow thereon. For that rest was not a cessation from working absolutely, much less merely so. Hence, did he learn the nature of the covenant that he was taken into; namely, how he was first to work in obedience, and then to enter into God's rest in blessedness. For so had God appointed, and so did he understand his will, from his own present state and condition. Hence was he instructed to dedicate to God, and to his own more immediate communion with him, one day in a weekly revolution, wherein the whole law of his creation was consummated, as a pledge and means of entering eternally into God's rest which from hence he understood to be his end and happiness. And for the sanctification of the seventh day of the week precisely, he had it by revelation, or God's sanctification of it, which had unto him the nature of a positive law, being a determination of the day suited unto the nature and tenor of that covenant wherein he walked with God.

§ 21. And by this superadded command or institution, the mind of man was confirmed in the meaning and intention of his innate principles, and other instructions to the same purpose in general. All these things, I say
the last only excepted, was he directed unto, in and by the innate principles of light and obedience, wherewith the faculties of his soul were furnished, every way suited to guide him in the whole of the duty required of him; and by the farther instruction he had from the other works of God, and his rest upon the whole. And although, it may be, we cannot now discern, how in particular his natural light might conduct and guide him to the observance of all these things, yet ought we not therefore to deny that so it did, seeing there is evidence in the things themselves, and we know not well what that light was which was in him. For although we may have some due apprehensions of the substance of it, from its remaining ruins and materials in our lapsed condition, yet we have no acquaintance with that light and glorious lustre, that extent of its directive beams, which it was accompanied withal, when it was in him as he came immediately from the hand of God, created in his image. We have lost more by the fall, than the best and wisest in the world can apprehend, whilst they are in it; much more than most will acknowledge, whose principal design seems to be, to extenuate the sin and misery of man, which issueth necessarily in an undervaluation of the love and grace of Jesus Christ. But if a natural or carnal man cannot discern how the Spirit or grace of the new covenant, which succeeds in the room of our first innate light, as unto the ends of our living unto God's glory in a new way, directs and guides those in whom it is, unto the observance of all the duties of it; let us not wonder if we cannot easily and readily comprehend the brightness and extent, and guidance of that light, which was suited unto a state of things that never was in the world since the fall, but only in the man Christ Jesus; whose wisdom and knowledge in the mind and will of God, even thereby, without his superadded peculiar assistances, we may rather admire, than think to understand.

§ 22. Thus, then, were the foundations of the old world laid, and the covenant of man's obedience established, when all the sons of God sang for joy; even in the first rest of God, and in the expression of it by the sanctification of a sacred rest, to return unto him a revenue of glory, in man's observance of it. And on these grounds, I do affirm that the weekly observance of a day to God for Sabbath ends, is a duty natural and moral, which we are under a perpetual and indispensable obligation unto; namely, from that command of God, which being a part of the law of our creation, is moral, indispensable, and perpetual. And these things, with the different apprehensions of others about them, and oppositions unto them, must now be farther explained and considered. For we now enter upon the consideration of the judgment and opinions of others about these things, with the confirmation of our own.

§ 23. In the inquiry after the causes of the Sabbath, the first question usually insisted on, is concerning the nature of the law, whereby its observance is commanded. This, some affirm to be moral, some only positive, as we have shown before. And many disputes there have been, about the true notion and distinction of laws moral and positive. But, whereas these terms are invented to express the conceptions of men's minds, and that of moral at least, includes not any absolute determinate sense in the meaning of the word; those at variance about them cannot impose their sense and understanding of them upon one another. For, seeing this denomination of moral applied unto a law, is taken from the subject-matter of it, which are the manners or duties of them to whom the law is given, if any one will assert that every command of God which respects the manners of men,
that is, of all men absolutely as men, is moral, I know not how any one
can compel him to speak or think otherwise, for he hath his liberty to use
the word in that sense which he judgeth most proper. And if it can be
proved that there is a law, and ever was, binding all men universally to the
observance of an hebdomadal sacred rest, I shall not contend with any how
that law ought to be called, whether moral or positive. This contest, there-
fore, I shall not engage in, though I have used, and shall yet further use,
those terms in their common sense and acceptation. My way shall be
plainly to inquire, what force there is in the law of our creation unto the
observance of a weekly Sabbath, and what is superadded thereunto by the
vocal declaration of the will of God concerning it.

§ 24. And here, in the first place, it is generally agreed, so that the oppo-
sition to it is not considerable, nor any way deserving our notice, that in and
by the light of nature, or the law of our creation, some time ought to be
separated unto the observance of the solemn worship of God. For be that
worship what it will, merely natural, or any thing superadded by voluntary
and arbitrary institutions, the law for its observance is natural, and requires
that time be set apart for its celebration; seeing in time it is to be performed.
When there was but one man and one woman, this was their duty; and so
it continued to be the duty of their whole race and posterity, in all the so-
cieties, associations, and assemblies whereof they were capable. But the first
object of this law or command is the worship of God itself; time falls
under it only consequentially and reductively. Wherefore the law of nature
doeth also distinctly respect time itself. For we are bound thereby to serve
God with all that is ours, and with the first-fruits of our substance in every
kind. Somewhat of whatever God hath given unto us, is to be set apart
from our own use, and given up absolutely to him as an homage due unto
him, and a necessary acknowledgment of him. To deny this, is to contra-
dict one of the principal dictates of the law of nature. For God hath
given us nothing ultimately for ourselves, seeing we, and all that we have,
are wholly his. And to have any thing whereof no part as such, is to be
spent in his service, is to have it with his displeasure. Let any one ende-
vour to assert and prove this position; 'No part of our time is to be set
apart to the worship of God and his service, in a holy and peculiar manner,'
and he will quickly find himself setting up in a full contradiction to the law
of nature, and the whole light of the knowledge of God in his mind and
conscience. Those who have attempted any such thing, have done it under
this deceitful pretence, that all our time is to be spent unto God, and every
day is to be a Sabbath. For whereas, notwithstanding this pretence, they
spend most of their time directly and immediately to themselves, and their
own occasions, it is evident, that they do but make use of it, to rob God of that
which is his due, directly and immediately. For unto the holy separation
of any thing to God, it is required, as well that it be taken from ourselves,
as that it be given unto him. This therefore the law of our creation requires,
as unto the separation of some part of our time unto God. And if this
doeth not at first consideration discover itself in its directive power, it will
quickly do so in its condemning power, upon a contradiction of it. Thus
far then we have attained.

§ 25. Moreover, men are to worship God in assemblies and societies, such
as he appoints, or such as by his providence they are cast into. This will
not be denied, seeing it stands upon as good, yea better evidence, than the
associations of mankind for ends political unto their own good by govern-
ment and order, which all men confess to be a direction of the law of nature.
For what concerns our living to God naturally, is as clear in that light and
close, as what concerns our living among ourselves. Now, a part of this
worship it is, that we honour him with what by his gift is made ours.
Such is our time in this world. Nor can the worship itself be performed
and celebrated in a due manner, without the designation, and separation of
some time unto that purpose; and thereby, secondly, this separation of
time becomes a branch of the law of nature, by an immediate, natural,
and unavoidable consequence. And what is so, is no less to be reckoned
among the rules of it, than the very first notions or impressions that it gives
us concerning the nature of any thing, good or evil. For whatever reason
can educe from the principle of reason, is no less reason, than those prin-
ciples themselves, from whence it is educed. And we aim no more from this
discourse, but that the separation of some time to the worship of God, accor-
ding to the ends before insisted on, is reasonable, so that the contrary in its first
conception is unreasonable and foolish. And this I suppose is evident to
all, I am sure by most it is granted. Could men hereupon acquiesce in
the authority and wisdom of God, indigitating and measuring out that por-
tion of time in all seasons and ages of the church, there might be a natural
rest from these contentions, about a rest sacred and holy. However, I can-
not but wonder at the liberty which some men take positively to affirm and
contend, that the command for the observance of the Sabbath, when or
however it was given, was wholly umbratile and ceremonial. For there is
that in it confessedly as its foundation, and that which all its concernsments
are educed from, which is as direct an impression on the mind of man from
the law of creation, as any other instance that can be given thereof.

§ 26. Upon this foundation therefore we may proceed. And I say, in
the next place, that the stated time directed unto for the ends of a sacred
rest unto God, by the light and law of nature; that is, God's command
impressed upon the mind of man in and by his own creation, and by the
creation of the rest of the works of God, intended for his direction in obe-
dience, is, that it be one day in seven. For the confirmation hereof, what
we have discoursed concerning the law of creation, and the covenant ratified
with man therein, is to be remembered. On the supposition thereof, the
advancement or constitution of any other portion of time in the stead and
to the exclusion thereof, as a determination and limitation of the time re-
quired in general in the first instance of that law, is, and would appear a
contradiction unto it. God having finished his works in six days, and
having rested on the seventh, giving man thereby and therein, the rule and
law of his obedience and rewards, for him to assign any other measure or
portion of time for his rest unto God in his solemn worship, is to decline
the authority of God, for the sake of his own inventions; and to assign no
portion at all unto that end, is openly to transgress a principal dictate
of the law of nature, as hath been proved. Neither this direction nor
transgression, I confess, will evidently manifest themselves in the mere
light of nature, as now depraved and corrupted. No more will sundry in-
stances of its authority, unless its voice be diligently attended unto, and its
light cultivated and improved in the minds of men, by the advantage of
consequential revelations, as given unto us for that purpose. For, by the as-
sistance of Scripture light, and rational considerations thence arising, we
may discover many things to be dictates of, and to be directed unto by the
law of nature, which those who are left unto the mere guidance and con-
duct of it could not discover so to be. This may be easily proved from the
open transgression of the law of nature in sundry instances, which they
lived and approved themselves in, who seemed most to have lived according unto it, and professed themselves to be wise in following the light and conduct of reason in all things, as was before at large discoursed. The Polytheism that prevailed amongst the best of the heathens, their open profession of living unto themselves, and seeking after their happiness in themselves, with many other instances, make this evident. And if revelation or Scripture light contributed no more to the discovery of the 'postulata,' of the law of nature, but by a removal of those prejudices, which the manner and fashion of the world amongst men, and a corrupt conversation received by tradition from one generation to another had fixed on, and possessed their minds withal; yet were the advantages we have by it unto this end, unspakeable. Let then this help be supposed, and let a judgment be made of the inunctions of the law of nature, rather by its condemning right and power, than by its directive light, (for that in our lapsed estate is a better επαμεινον of its commands, than the other,) and we shall find it manifesting itself in this matter. For on this supposition, let those who will not acknowledge that the observance of one day in seven, is to be separated unto God for the ends declared, allowing the assertion before laid down of the necessity of the separation of some stated time to that purpose, fix to themselves any other time in a certain revolution of days, and they will undoubtedly find themselves pressed, with so many considerations from the law of their creation, to the contrary, as will give them little rest, or satisfaction in their minds, in what they do.

§ 27. Farther to manifest this, we may inquire what is necessary unto any duty of obedience towards God, to evince it to be a requisite of the law of our creation. And here our diligence is required. For it must be said again expressly, what was before intimated, that it is a childish mistake to imagine, that whatever is required by the law of nature, is easily discernible, and always known to all. Some of its directions, it may be, are so, especially such as are inculcated on the minds of men, by their common interest and advantage. Such are 'neminem iadere,' and 'jus suum cuique tribuere.' But it is far from being true, that all the dictates of the law of nature, and requisites of right reason, are evident and incapable of controversy, as they would have been unto man had he continued in his integrity. Many things there are between men themselves, concerning which, after all helps and advantages, and continued observation of the course of the world unto this day, it is still disputed, what is the sense of the law of nature about them, and wherein, or how far, they belong unto it. The law of nations among themselves with respect unto one another, on which is founded the peace and order of mankind is nothing but the law of nature, as it hath been expressed in instances by the customs and usages of them, who are supposed to have most diligently attended unto its directions. And how many differences, never to be determined by common consent, there are in and about these things, is known. For there are degrees of evidence in the things that are of natural light. And many things that are so, are yet in practice accompanied with the consideration of positive laws, as also of civil usages and customs amongst men. And it is not easy to distinguish in many observances, what is of the law of nature, and what is of law positive, or of useful custom. But of these things we have discoursed before in general. We are now to inquire what is requisite to warrant the ascription of any thing unto this law.

§ 28. And 1. It is required that it be congruous unto the law of nature, and all the other known principles of it. Unto us it may be enjoined by
law positive, or otherwise made necessary for us to observe. But it must
in itself, or materially, hold a good correspondency with all the known in-
stances of the law of our creation, and this manifested with satisfying evi-
dence, before its assignation thereunto. It is of natural right that we
should obey God in all his commands; but this doth not cause every com-
mand of God to belong to the law of nature. It is, as was said, moreover
required thereunto, that it be in itself, and the subject-matter of it, congru-
ous unto the principles of that law, whereof there is nothing in things
merely arbitrary and positive; setting aside that general notion, that God
is to be obeyed in all his laws, which belongs not to this question. Now,
when this congruity to the law of nature, or right reason in the matter of
any law or command, is discovered and made evident, it will greatly direct
the mind in its inquiry after its whole nature, and manifest what is super-
added unto it by positive command. And this will not be denied unto the
Sabbath, its command and observation. Let the ends of it before laid
down be considered, and let them be compared with any other guidances or
directions which we have by natural light concerning our living to God, and
it will not only appear that there is a harmony amongst them, but also that
they contribute help and assistance to one another towards the same ulti-
mate end.

§ 29. 2. It is required that it have a general principle, in the light of
nature, and in the dictates of right reason, from whence it may be educated,
or from which it will necessarily follow, supposing that principle rightly
and duly improved. It is not enough that it be at agreement, or that it no
way interfere with other principles; it must also have one of its own, from
whence it doth naturally arise. So doth the second commandment of the
decalogue belong to the law of nature. Its principle lieth in that acknow-
ledgment of the being of God, which is required in the first. For therein
is God manifested to be of that nature, to be such a being, that it is, and
must be an absurd, unreasonable, foolish, and impious thing in itself, imply-
ing a renunciation of the former acknowledgments, to make any images,
or limited representations of his being, or to adore him any way otherwise
than himself hath declared. So is it here also. The separation of a stated
time unto the solemn worship of God, is so fixed in the mind of man by
its own inbred light, as that it cannot be omitted, without open sin against
it, in those who have not sinned away all the efficacy of that light itself.
However, that this is required of us by the law of our creation, may be
proved against all contradiction. Hence whatever guiding, directing, de-
terming positive law, may ensue, or be superadded about the limitation of
this time so to be separated, it being only the application of this natural and
moral principle, as to some circumstances of it, it hinders not, but that the
law itself concerning it, is of the law of nature, and moral. For the original
obligatory power of such a superadded law, lies in the natural principle be-
fore mentioned.

§ 30. 3. What all men are taught by the works of creation themselves, by
their order, harmony, and mutual respect to each other, with reference to
their duty towards God, and among themselves, is of the law of nature;
although an absolute distinct notion of it inbred in the mind, be not discover-
able. It is enough that the mind of man is so disposed, as to be ready and
fit to receive the discovery and revelation of it. For the very creation it-
self is a law unto us, and speaks out that duty that God requireth of us
towards himself. For he hath not only so ordered all the works of it, that
they should be meet to instruct us, or should contain an instructive power
towards rational creatures, made in that state and condition wherein man was created, which was before described, which hath in it the first notion of a law; but it was the will of God that we should learn our duty thereby, which gives it its complement, as a law obliging unto obedience. And it is not thus in general with respect unto the whole work of creation in itself; but the ordering and disposal of the parts of it, is alike directive and instructive to the nature of man, and hath the force of a law morally and everlastingly obligatory. Thus the preeminence of the man above the woman, which is moral, ensues upon the order of the creation, in that the man was first made, and the woman for the man, as the apostle argues, 1 Tim. ii. 12, 13. And all nations ought to be obliged hereby, though many of them, through their apostasy from natural light, knew not that either man or woman was created, but it may be, supposed them to have grown out of the earth like mushrooms; and yet an effect of the secret original impression hereof influenced their minds and practices. So the creation of one man and one woman gave the natural law of marriage; whence polygamy and fornication became transgressions of the law of nature. It will be hard to prove, that about these and the like things, there is a clear and undoubted principle of directive light in the mind of man, separate from the consideration of the order of creation. But therein a law, and that moral, is given unto us. not to be referred unto any other head of laws, but that of nature. And here, as was before pleaded, the creation of the world in six days, with the rest of God on the seventh, and that declared, gives unto all men an everlasting law of separating one day in seven unto a sacred rest. For he that was made in the image of God was made to imitate him, and conform himself unto him; God in this order of things, saying as it were unto him, ‘What I have done, in your station do ye likewise.’ Especially was this made effectual, by his innate apprehension that his happiness consisted in entering into the rest of God, the pledge whereof it was his unquestionable duty to embrace.

§ 31. 4. In this state of things, a direction by a revelation, in the way of a precept, for the due and just exercise of the principles, rules, and documents before mentioned, is so far from impeaching the morality of any command or duty, as that it completes the law of it, with the addition of a formal obligatory power and efficacy. The light and law of creation, so far as it was innate, or concreted with the faculties of our souls, and completed our state of dependence on God, hath only the general nature of a principle, inclining unto actions suitably unto it, and directing us therein. The documents also that were originally given unto that light from without, by the other works and order of the creation, had only in their own nature the force of an instruction. The will of God, and an act of sovereignty therein, formally constituted them a law. But now man being made to live unto God, and under his conduct and guidance in all things, that he might come to the enjoyment of him, no prejudice ariseth unto, nor alteration is made in the dictates of the law of creation, by the superadding any positive command for the performance of the duties that it doth require, and regulating of them, as to the especial manner and ends of their performance. And where such a positive law is interposed or superadded, it is the highest folly to imagine, that the whole obligation unto the duty depends on that command, as though the authority of the law of nature were superceded thereby; or that the whole command about it were now grown positive and arbitrary. For although the same law cannot be moral and positive in the same respect; yet the same duty may be required by a law
moral, and a law positive. It is thus with many observances of the gospel. We may, for example, instance in excommunication, according to the common received notion of it. There is a positive command in the gospel for the exercise of the sentence of it, in the churches of Christ. But this hinders not, but that it is natural for all societies of men, to exclude from their societies those that refractorily refuse to observe the laws and orders of the society, that it may be preserved unto its proper end. And according to the rule of this natural equity, that it should be so, have all rational societies amongst men, that knew nothing of the gospel, proceeded for their own good and preservation. Neither doth the superadded institution in the gospel derogate from the general reason hereof, or change the nature of the duty, but only direct its practice, and make application of it, to the uses and ends of the gospel itself.

§ 32. I do not plead, that every law that God prescribes unto me is moral because my obedience to it is a moral duty. For the morality of this obedience, doth not arise from, nor depend upon the special command of it, which it may be is positive and arbitrary; but from the respect that it hath unto our dependence in all things which we have to do, absolutely and universally on God. To obey God in all things, is unquestionably our moral duty. But when the substance of the command itself, that is, the duty required, is moral, the addition of a positive command doth no way impeach its morality, nor suspend the influence of that law, wherein its morality doth depend. It is therefore unduly pretended by some, that because there is a positive command for the observance of the Sabbath, supposing there should be such a command for the whole of it, which is nothing else but an explanation and enforcement of the original moral precept of it, (as in every state of the church something relating unto it, namely, the precise determination of the day itself in the hebdomadal revolution, depended on a law positive) that therefore the law of it is not moral. It is not so indeed, so far and in that respect wherein it is positive; but it is so from itself, for the substance of it, and antecedently unto that positive command. The whole law therefore of the Sabbath, and its observance, may be said to be moral positive, which expression hath been used by some learned divines in this case, and that not unduly. For a law may be said to be so on a double account. First, when the positive part of the law is declarative, and accumulative with respect unto a precedent law of nature, as when some additions are made to the duties therein required, as to the manner of their performance. Secondly, when the foundation of a duty only is laid in the law of nature, but its entire practice is regulated by a positive law. From all the instances insisted on, it is manifest that the law of the Sabbatical observance is moral, a branch of the law of nature, however it be enforced, directed: and that the special day in seven be limited and determined by positive commands.

§ 33. These things by many are denied. They will not grant, that there is any rule or direction in the law of creation, for a sacred rest unto God, on one day in seven. For they say that no such can be made to appear with that evidence, which the common anticipations of the minds of men are accompanied withal. But this objection hath been sufficiently obviated, by stating aright the meaning of the law of nature which is not to be confined to inbred natural anticipations only. And it is certain also, that some say the very same concerning the being of God himself, and concerning the difference between good and evil; namely, that there are no manifest and steadfast presumptions of them in the mind of man, which yet
hinders not, but that the acknowledgment of a divine being, as also of the difference that is between good and evil, is natural, and inseparable from the faculties of our souls. Hence Julian in Cyril, lib. 5, con. Jul. joins the first and fourth precept together: saith he, ποιον ἐθνός εστι, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, εἶξεν τὸν ὁ προσκυνήσεις θεος ἑτέρος, καὶ τὸν μηνασθῆναι τῶν σαββάτων, ό μὴ τὰς ἀλλὰς οἰεται χρῆναι φυλάσσειν εντολάς. 'He says,' and swears, 'that all nations judged that the commandments' of the decalogue 'ought to be kept, excepting the first, forbidding other gods, and the other of remembering the Sabbath to keep it.' The one may be rejected as well as the other.

Besides, the law of nature as to an obligatory indication of our duty, is not to be considered only by itself in this matter, no not in the extent insisted on as comprising the objective documents that are in the works and order of the creation; but is to be considered in conjunction with the covenant that it was the rule of. For whatever was required of man by virtue of that covenant, was part of the moral law of God, or belonged to the law of his creation. For all which the rest pleaded for to be moral doth arise. And considering the nature of this duty, with the divine positive direction whereby its first practice was regulated, as it was necessary that it should, when God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; and it is marvellous, that the remaining light of nature about it, should put forth itself by so many intimations, as it doth; and in so many instances to express the first impressions that it had from God in this matter. For I think we have manifested, that there are many such impressions, and those of such a nature as may be pleaded against any probability of contradiction. In a word, we may in all ages find the generality of mankind, feeling, and as it were groping in the dark, after a stated sacred rest to be observed unto God. And however the most of men destitute of divine revelation, missed the season, the ends, and the object of this rest, yet they were plainly influenced unto all their stated, sacred, or religious solemnities, both feasts and abstinences, by the remainders of an innate persuasion, that such a rest was to be observed. Besides, we know, that the present indications of nature as corrupt, are no just rule and measure of its original abilities, with respect unto living to God. And they do but woefully bewray their ignorance and impudence who begin to plead, that our minds or understandings, were no way impaired or worsted by the fall; but that the principles or abilities in them in reference unto God and ourselves, are the same as they originally were, and that unimpaired. Either such men design to overthrow the gospel and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, or they know not what they say, nor whereof they do affirm. But hereof we shall treat elsewhere by God's assistance. At present we know, that the light of nature is so defective, or so impotent in giving indications of itself, that many nations, left destitute of divine revelation, or wilfully rejecting it, have lived and approved themselves in open transgressions of the law of it, as hath been shown. The apostle gives sundry instances of that kind, amongst them who most boasted themselves to attend to the dictates of right reason, Rom. i. All idolaters, polygamists, fornicators, and those who constantly lived on spoil and rapine, approving themselves, or not condemning themselves in what they did are testimonies hereof. That alone then is not to be pretended to be of the law of nature, which all men acknowledge to be a part of it, nor is every thing to be rejected from having a place therein, which some have lived in a secure transgression of. And others say, that it gives no indications of itself; but that is to be understood to belong to the law of nature, which, by the diligent consideration of all means and advantages of knowledge, may be
found to be congruous to all the other known and allowed principles and
maxims of it and to have its foundation in it, being what originally God by
any means instructed our nature in, as that which belonged unto our living
to him. And it may be, a man may sooner learn what is natural duty to
God, in and from corrupted nature, by the opposition that it will make un-
to its practice, as it is corrupted, than by the light and guidance it will give
unto it, as nature. It is also, as we have observed, more discernible in its
judging and condemning what is done contrary unto it, than in directing to
what it did originally require.
§ 34. Having given evidence unto the morality of the Sabbath from the
indications of it, and directions unto it in the light and law of nature, which
will be found to be such, as not to be by any modest or sober man contemned;
we proceed to add those other consequential confirmations of the same truth
which God hath given us in the following revelations of his will about it.
And first, this gives no small countenance to an apprehension of an un-
changeable morality in the law of the Sabbath; that in all estates of the
church, from the foundation of the world, under the several covenants
wherein it hath walked with God, and the various dispensations of them,
there is a full evidence, that in them all God hath still required of his peo-
ple, the observance of a sacred rest unto himself, in a hebdomadal revolution
of time or days. A full confirmation hereof, with its proofs and illustrations
the reader will find at large in our exposition of the fourth chapter of the
Epistle to the Hebrews, so soon as God shall give an opportunity to have it
communicated to him. At present, I shall touch only on the heads of
things.
§ 35. That any religious observance hath been required through all estates
of the church, which had no foundation but only in arbitrary institution,
cannot be proved by any one single instance. The institutions of the state
of innocence, in the matters of the garden, with the trees of life, and of
the knowledge of good and evil, ceased, as all men confess, with that estate.
And although God did not, immediately upon the sin of man, destroy that
garden, no nor it may be until the flood, leaving it as a testimony against
the wickedness of that apostate generation, for whose sin the world was
destroyed; yet was neither it, nor the trees of it, of any use, or lawful to be
used as to any signification in the worship of God. And the reason is
because all institutions are appendages, and things annexed unto a covenant;
and when that covenant ceaseth, or is broken, they are of no use or signifi-
cation at all.
§ 36. There was a new state of the church erected presently after the fall,
and this also attended with sundry new institutions, especially with that
concerning sacrifices. In this church-state some alterations were made,
and sundry additional institutions given unto it, upon the erection of the
peculiar church-state of the Israelites in the wilderness, which yet hindered
not, but that it was in general the same church-state, and the same dispensa-
tion of the covenant, that the people of God, before and after the giving
of the law, enjoyed and lived under. Hence it was, that sundry institutions
of worship were equally in force both before and after the giving of the law
on mount Sinai; as is evident in sacrifices, and some other instances may
be given. But now, when the state of the church, and the dispensation of
the covenant, came to be wholly altered, as they were by the gospel, not
any one of the old institutions was continued, or to be continued, but they
were all abolished and taken away. Nothing at all was traduced over from
the old church-states, neither from that innocence, nor from that which en-
sued on the fall in all its variations, with any obligatory power; but what was founded in the law of nature, and had its force from thence. We may, then, confidently assert, that what God requireth equally in all estates of the church, that is moral, and of an everlasting obligation unto us, and all men. And this is the state of matters with the Sabbath, and the law thereof.

§ 37. Of the command of the Sabbath in the state of innocence, we have before treated, and vindicated the testimony given unto it, Gen. ii. 2, 3. It will, God assisting, be farther discoursed and confirmed in our exposition of the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. The observance of it by virtue of its original law and command, before the promulgation of the decalogue in Sinai, or the first wilderness observance of the Sabbath, recorded on the occasion of giving manna, hath also been before confirmed. Many exceptions, I acknowledge, are laid in, against the testimonies insisted on for the proof of these things; but those such as, I suppose, are not able to invalidate them in the minds of men void of prejudice. And the pretence of the obscurity that is in the command, will be easily removed, by the consideration of another instance of the same antiquity. All men acknowledge, that a promise of Christ for the object and guide of the faith of the ancient patriarchs, was given in those words of God immediately spoken unto the serpent, Gen. iii. 15, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise its heel.' The words in themselves seem obscure unto any such end or purpose. But yet there is such light given into them, and the mind of God in them, from the circumstances of time, place, persons, occasions, from the nature of the things treated of, from the whole ensuing economy, or dealing of God with men revealed in the Scripture, as that no sober man doubts of the promissory nature of those words, nor of the intention of them in general, nor of the proper subject of the promise, nor of the grace intended in it. This promise, therefore, was the immediate object of the faith of the patriarchs of old, the great motive and encouragement to, and of their obedience. But yet it will be hard, from the records of Scripture, to prove that any particular patriarch did believe in, trust, or plead that promise, which yet we know that they did, all and every one. Nor was there any need for our instruction, that any such practice of theirs should be recorded, seeing it is a general rule, that those holy men of God did observe and do whatever he did command them. Wherefore, from the record of a command, we may conclude unto a suitable practice, though it be not recorded; and from a recorded approved practice on the other side, we may conclude unto the command or institution of the thing practised, though nowhere plainly recorded. Let unprejudiced men consider those words, Gen. ii. 2, 3, and they will find the command and institution of the Sabbath, as clear and conspicuous in them, as the promise of grace in Christ is in them before considered, especially as they are attended with the interpretation given of them, in God's following dealings with his church. And therefore, although particular instances of the obedience of the old patriarchs in this part of it, or the observance of the Sabbath, could not be given and evinced, yet we ought no more on that account to deny that they did observe it, than we ought to deny their faith in the promised Seed, because it is nowhere expressly recorded in the story of their lives.

§ 38. Under the law, that is, after the giving of it in the wilderness, it is granted, that the portion of time insisted on, was precisely required to be dedicated to God, although, it may be, for some ages it will be hard to meet
with a recorded instance of its observance. But yet none dares take any countenance from thence to question whether it were so observed or not.

All, therefore, is secure to the great alteration that was made in instituted worship under the gospel. And to proceed to that season, there is no practice in any part of God's public worship, that appears earlier in the records of the New Testament, as to what was peculiar thereunto, than the observance of one day in seven for the celebration of it. Hereof more must be spoken afterwards. Some say, indeed, that the appointment of one day in seven, and that the first day of the week, for the worship of God, was only a voluntary agreement, or a matter consented to by the apostolical or first churches, merely ervaïas gratia, or to keep good order and decorum amongst them, without respect to any moral command of God to that purpose. This they say directly with respect to the first day of the week, or the Lord's day, and its religious observance. But those who appoint the first day of every week to be so observed, do without doubt appoint that that should be the condition of one day in seven. Now I could incline to this apprehension, if, besides sundry other invincible reasons that lie against it, I did not find that God had always before, in all states of the church from the foundation of the world, invariably required the observance of one day in seven; and I know no reason why what had been observed all along so far upon his own authority, he would have observed still, but no longer on his command, but on the invention and consent of men. Had the religious observance of one day in seven been utterly laid aside and abolished, it would and ought to have been concluded, that the law of it was expired in the cross of Christ, as were those of circumcision, the sacrifices, and the whole temple worship. But to have this observance, which had been continued by the whole church, in and under the approbation of God, whereof none ever doubted, now enjoined by the authority of the church, after God had taken off his own authority from it, is a most vain imagination.

§ 39. I dispute not of what the church may appoint for good order's sake, to be observed in religious assemblies. But this I dare say confidently, that no church, nor churches, not all the churches in the world, have power by common consent to ordain any thing in the worship of God, as a part of it, which God had once ordained, commanded, and required, but now under the gospel ceaseth so to do, as circumcision and sacrifices. But this is the state of the religious observance of one day in seven. None can deny, but that formerly it was ordained and appointed of God. And it should seem, according to this opinion, that he took off the authority of his own command, that the same observance might be continued upon the authority of the church. Credat Apella. Neither do the footsteps of the occasion of any such ecclesiastical institution appear any where on record in the Scripture, where all things of an absolutely new and arbitrary institution, whether occasional or durable, are taken notice of. There is, indeed, mention made, and that frequently, of the first day of the week to be set apart for the assembling of believers for the worship of God, and a solid reason is insinuated, why that especial day in particular ought so to be. But why one day in seven should be constantly observed to the purpose mentioned, no reason, no account is given in the New Testament, other than why men should not lie or steal. Nor hath any man a ground to imagine, that there was an intercession of a Sabbatical observance, by the interposition of any time, between the observation of the seventh day, and of the first of
the week, for the same ends and purposes, though not absolutely in the same manner. If there be any indications, proofs, evidences, that the first churches continued without the observance of one day in seven, after they desisted from having a religious respect to the seventh day, before they had the same regard to the first of the week unto this purpose I wish they might be produced, for they would be of good weight in this matter; but as yet no such thing is made to appear. For if the obligation of the precept for observing one day in seven, as a sacred rest to God, may be suspended in any change of the outward state and condition of the church, it cannot be esteemed to be moral. I speak not of the actual observance of the thing commanded, which for many causes may occasionally and temporarily be superseded, but of the obliging force and power in the command itself, which, if it be moral, is perpetual, and not capable of interruption. Now, testimonies we have that sundry persons, not sufficiently instructed in the liberty of the gospel, and the law of its obedience, observed both the days, the seventh and the first; yea, it may be, that for a while some observed the one day, and some the other; but that any Christians of old thought themselves, de facto, set at liberty from the religious observance of one day in seven, this neither is, nor can be proved. This practice, then, was universal, and that approved of God, as we shall see afterwards, and farther in another discourse, now more than once directed unto. Now, what can any man conceive to be the ground of this unvariableness in the commanded and approved observance of one day in seven in all states, conditions, and alterations in and of the church, but that the command for it is part of the moral unchangeable law? Hereby, therefore, it is confirmed unto us so to be. And, indeed, if every state of the church be founded in an especial work of God, and his rest thereon, and complacency therein, as a pledge or testimony of giving his church rest in himself, as elsewhere shall be fully confirmed; a Sabbathical rest must be necessary to the church in every state and condition. And although absolutely another day might have been fixed on under the New Testament, and not one in a hebdomadal revolution, because its peculiar works were not precisely finished in six days, yet that season being before fixed and determined by the law of creation, no innovation nor alteration would be allowed therein.

§ 40. There is yet remaining that which is principally to be pleaded in this cause, and which of itself is sufficient to bear the weight of the whole. Now, this is the place which the command for the observance of a Sabbath unto God, holds in the decalogue. Concerning this, we have no more to inquire, but whether it obtained a station therein, in its own right, or were on some other occasion advanced to that privilege. For if it be free of that society in its own right, or on the account of its origin and birth, the morality of it can never be impeached; if it had only an occasional interest therein, and held it by a lease of time, it may ere this be long since disseized of it. Now we do not yet dispute, whether the seventh day precisely be ordained in the fourth commandment, and do take up the whole nature of it, as the only subject of it, and alone required in it. Only I take it for granted, that the observance of one day in seven is required in the command, which is so, because the seventh day, or a seventh day in a septenary revolution, is expressly commanded.

§ 41. It is, indeed, pretended by many, that the command first and directly respecteth the seventh day precisely, and one day in seven, no otherwise than as it necessarily follows thereon. For where the seventh day is required, one in seven is so consequentially. And they who thus pretend
have a double design, the one absolutely contradictory to the other. For those do so, who from thence conclude that the seventh day precisely, comprising the whole nature of the Sabbath, that day is indispensably and everlastingly to be observed. And those do so, who, with equal confidence, draw their conclusion to the utter abolition of the whole Sabbath, and the law of it, in the taking away of the seventh day itself. Such different apprehensions have men of the use and improvement that may be made of the same principles and concessions. For those of the latter sort hope, that if they can prove the observance of the seventh day precisely, and not one of seven but only consequentially, to be the whole of what is intended in the fourth commandment, that by virtue of the apostle’s rule, Col. ii. 16, (to which purpose he often elsewhere expresseth himself,) they shall be able to prove that it is utterly abolished. Those of the other sort suppose, that if they can make this to be the sense of the commandment, they shall from thence prevail to fix a perpetual obligation on all men to the observance of the seventh day precisely, although the words of the apostle seem to lie expressly against it.

§ 42. But the supposition itself that both parties proceed upon, is not only uncertain, but certainly false. For the very order of nature itself disposeth these things into that series, and mutual respect, which can never be interrupted. The command is about the separation of time unto the service of God. This he tacitly grants, nor will deny, if he be pressed, who contends for the seventh day. Here, therefore, it is natural and necessary, that time be indefinitely considered and required, antecedently to the designation and limitation of the portion of time that is required. This the order of nature requireth; for if it be time indefinitely that is limited in the command to the seventh day, time indefinitely is the first object of that limitation. And the case is the same with reference unto one day in seven. This also hath, and must have, a natural priority to the seventh day; for the seventh day is one day of the seven. And these things are separable. Some part of time may be separated unto religious worship, and yet not one day in seven; but any other portion in a certain revolution of days, weeks, months, or years, if there be not a distinct reason for it. And one day in seven may be so separated, wherein the seventh day precisely may have no interest. And these things the very nature of them doth assert, distinguish, and determine. Whatever morality, therefore, or obligation to a perpetual observance, can be fancied by any to be in the command as to the seventh day, it is but consequential unto, dependent upon, and separable from, the command and duty for the observance of one day in seven. And this sufficeth as to our present purpose. For I do not yet treat with them, who contend for the precise observance of the seventh day, now under the gospel. It is enough, that here we prove, that the fourth commandment requirith the sacred observance of one day in seven, and that so far as it doth so, it is moral and unchangeable.

§ 43. All men, as we have often observed, do allow that there is something moral in the fourth commandment, namely, that either some part of it, or the general nature of it, is so. I do not, therefore, well understand them, and him of late, who hath pleaded that the seventh day only is required in that command, and yet that this seventh day was absolutely ceremonial and typical, being accordingly abolished. The consistency of these assertions doth not yet appear to me; for if the whole matter of the command be ceremonial, the command itself must needs be so also. For a relief against this contradiction, it is said, that the morality of this command
consists in this, that we should look after and take up our spiritual rest in God. But this will not allow, that it should be a distinct commandment of itself, distinguished from all the rest of the decalogue: indeed it would thus scarcely be distinguished from any one of them. For the primitive end of all the commandments, was to direct us and bring us unto rest with God; of the first table immediately, and of the second in and by the performance of the duties of it, among ourselves. And of the first precept this is the sum; so that it is unduly assigned to be the peculiar morality of the fourth, instead of the solemn expression of that rest, as our end and happiness. Neither is there any way possible to manifest an especial intention in, and of any law, that is not found in this. The words and letter of it, in their proper and only sense, require a day, or an especial season to be appointed for a sacred rest. And so doth the nature of religious worship, which undoubtedly is directed therein. The rest of God proposed in the command as the reason of it, which was on the seventh day after six days of working, requires the same intention in the words. So doth also the exact limitation of time mentioned in it, all in compliance with the order and place that it holds in the decalogue, wherein nothing in general is left unrequired in the natural and instituted worship of God, but only the setting apart, with the determination and limitation of some time to the solemn observance of it. Few, therefore, have ever denied, but that the morality of this command, if it be moral, doth extend itself unto the separation of some part of our time to the solemn recognising of God, and of our subjection to him; and this in the letter of the law is limited, on the reasons before insisted on, to one day in seven in their perpetual revolution. The sole inquiry, therefore, remaining is, whether this precept be moral or not, and so continue to be possessed of a power perpetually obligatory on all the sons of men. And this is that which we are now inquiring into.

§ 44. Here therefore we must have respect to what hath been discoursed, concerning the subject-matter of the precept itself. For if that be not only congruous to the law of nature, but that also, which by the creation of ourselves, and of all other things, we are taught and obliged unto the observance of, the law whereby it is required must be moral. For the descriptive, or distinctive term moral, doth first belong to the things themselves required by any law, and thence to the law whereby they are commanded. If then we have proved, that the thing itself required in the fourth commandment, or the religious observance of a sacred rest unto God for the ends mentioned, in the periodical revolution of seven days, is natural and moral, from the relation that it hath to the law of creation, then there can be no question of the morality of that command. What hath been performed therein, is left to the judgment of the sober and judicious reader. For no man can be more remote from a pertinacious adherence to his own sentiments or a magisterial imposition of his judgment and apprehensions upon the minds, thoughts, or practice of other men, than I desire to be. For however we may please ourselves in our light, knowledge, learning, and sincerity, yet when we have done all, they are not constituted of God to be the rule or measure of other men's faith, persuasions, apprehensions, and conversations. And others whom for some defects, at least so supposed by us, we may be apt to despise, may be yet taught the truth of God, in things wherein we may be out of the way. That then which we have to do in these cases, is first to endeavour after a full persuasion in our own minds then to communicate the principles of reason and Scripture testimony, upon which we ground our persuasion to others, labouring with meekness and
gentleness to instruct them, whom we apprehend to be out of the way; so submitting the whole to the judgment of all that fear the Lord, and shall take notice of such things. And these rules have I, and shall I attend to, as abhorring nothing more than a proud magisterial imposing of our apprehensions and inclinations on the minds and practices of other men. Indeed, I judge this to be far more intolerable in particular persons, than in churches and societies, though in both it is contrary to that royal law of love and liberty, which all believers ought to walk by. And therefore, as we have said, what hath been spoken on this subject, or shall yet farther be added, I humbly submit to the judgment of the sober and indifferent readers, only assuring them that I teach as I have learned, that I speak because I believe, and declare nothing of which I am not fully persuaded in my own mind.

§ 45. The nature of the decalogue, and the distinction of its precepts from all commands, ceremonial or political, comes now under consideration. The whole decalogue, I acknowledge, as given on Mount Sinai to the Israelites, had a political use, as being made the principal instrument or rule of the polity and government of their nation, as peculiarly under the rule of God. It had a place also in that economy or dispensation of the covenant, which that church was then brought under, wherein by God's dealing with them and instructing of them, they were taught to look out after a farther and greater good in the promise, than they were yet come to the enjoyment of. Hence the decalogue itself, in that dispensation of it, was a schoolmaster unto Christ. But in itself, and materially considered, it was wholly, and in all the preceptive parts of it, absolutely moral. Some indeed of the precepts of it, as the first, fourth, and fifth, have either prefaces, enlargements, or additions, which belonged peculiarly to the then present and future state of that church in the land of Canaan; but these special applications of it to them, change not the nature of its commands or precepts, which are all moral, and as far as they are esteemed to belong to the decalogue, are unquestionably acknowledged so to be. Let us therefore consider the plea for morality in the fourth command, upon the account of its interest in the decalogue, and the manifest evidences of that interest. As therefore the giving, writing, use, and disposal of the decalogue, were peculiar and distinct from the whole system of the rest of the laws and statutes, which being with it given to the church of Israel, were either ceremonial or judicial, so the precept concerning the Sabbath, or the sacred observance of one day in seven, hath an equal share with the other nine, in all the privileges of the whole. As,

1. It was spoken immediately by the voice of God, in the hearing of all the people, Exod. xix., whereas all the other laws, whether ceremonial or judicial, were given peculiarly to Moses, and by him declared to the rest of the people. What weight is laid hereon, see Exod. xix. 10, 11, 17, 18; Deut. iv. 33, xxxiii. 2. In the first whereof, the work itself is declared; in the latter, a distinguishing greatness and glory, above all other legislations, is ascribed unto it. And it is worth the inquiry what might be the cause of this difference. No other appears to me, but that God thereby declared, that the law of the decalogue belonged immediately and personally to them all, and every one, upon the original right of the law of nature, which it did represent and express; whereas all the other laws and statutes given to them by the mediation of Moses, belonged to that peculiar church state and economy of the covenant, which they were then initiated into, and which was to abide to the time of the reformation of all things by
Jesus Christ. And it may be remembered here, and so in all the ensuing instances, that we have proved that the matter of this command is first, the separation of some time indefinitely to the worship of God, and then the limitation of that time to one day in seven. For this it requires, or nothing at all which should be peculiar to a distinct precept is required in it, as we have before manifested. And this one consideration alone, is sufficient to evince its morality.

2. This command, as all the rest of the decalogue, was written twice by the finger of God in tables of stone. And hereof there was a double reason. First. That it was a stable renovation, and objective representation of that law, which being implanted on the heart of man, and communicated unto him in his creation, was variously defaced, partly by the corruption and loss of that light through the entrance of sin, which should have guided us in the right apprehension and understanding of its dictates, and the obedience that it required; partly through a long course of corrupt conversation which the world had in the pursuit of the first apostasy, and according to the principles of it, plunged itself into. God now again fixed that law objectively, in a way of durable preservation, which in its primitive seat and subject was so impaired and defaced. And hereof the additions mentioned, with peculiar respect to the application of the whole, or any part of it, to that people, were no impeachment, as acknowledged in the preface given to them all, containing a motive to their dutiful observance of the whole. And hence this law must necessarily be esteemed a part of the antecedent law of nature, neither can any other reason be given, why God wrote it himself, with those and only those that are so, in tables of stone. Secondly. This was done as an emblem, that the whole decalogue was a representation of that law, which by his Spirit he would write in the fleshly tables of the hearts of his elect. And this is well observed by the church of England, which after the reading of the whole decalogue, (the fourth command amongst the rest,) directs the people to pray, that God would write all these laws in their hearts. Now this concerneth only the moral law; for although obedience unto all God's ceremonial and typical institutions, whilst they were in force, was moral, and a part of the law written in the heart, or required in general in the precepts of the first table of the decalogue, yet those laws themselves had no place in the promise of the covenant, that they should be written in our hearts. For if it should be so, special grace would be yet administered for the observance of those laws, now they are abolished, which would not only be vain and useless, but contradictory to the whole design of the grace bestowed upon us, which is to be improved in a due and genuine exercise of it. Neither doth God bestow any grace upon men, but withal he requires the exercise of it at their hands. If then this law was written in tables of stone, together with the other nine, that we might pray and endeavour to have it written in our hearts, according to the promise of the covenant, it is, and must be, of the nature of the rest; that is, moral and everlastingly obligatory.

3. This commandment, like all the rest of the moral precepts, was preserved in the ark; whereas the law of ceremonial ordinances was placed in a book, written by Moses on the side of the ark, separable from it, or whence it might be removed. The ark on many accounts was called the ark of the covenant, whereof (God assisting) I shall treat elsewhere. One of them was, that it contained in it nothing but that moral law, which was the rule of the covenant. And this was placed therein, to manifest that it was to have its accomplishment in him, who was the end of the law, Rom.
x. 3, 4. For the ark, with the propitiatory, was a type of Jesus Christ, Rom. iii. 25. And the reason of the different disposal of the moral law in the ark, and of the ceremonial in a book on the side of it, was to manifest the inseparableness of the law from the covenant, and also the establishing, accomplishment, and answering of the one law in Christ, with the removal and abolishing of the other by him. For the law kept in the ark, which was the type of him, he was to fulfill in obedience, he was to answer its curse, and to restore it to its proper use in the new covenant; not that which it had originally, when it was itself the whole of the covenant, but that which the nature of it requires in the moral obedience of rational creatures, whereof it is a complete and adequate rule, when the other law was utterly removed and taken away. And if that had been the end whereunto the law of the Sabbath had been designed, had it been absolutely capable of abolition in this world, it had not been preserved in the ark with the other nine, which are inseparable from man's covenant obedience to God; but had been left with other ceremonial ordinances at the side of the ark, in a readiness to be removed, when the appointed time should come.

4. God himself separates this command from them which were ceremonial in their principal intention and whole subject-matter, when he calls the whole system of precepts in the two tables, by the name of the ten words or commandments, Deut. x. 4. ‘Those ten words which the Lord spake unto you in the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly. No considerate person can read these words, but he will find a most signal emphasis in the several parts of them. The day of the assembly is that which the Jews so celebrate, under the name of the station in Sinai, the day that was the foundation of their church-state, when they solemnly covenanted with God about the observance of the law, Deut. v. 24—27. And the Lord himself spake these words, that is, in an immediate and especial manner, which is still observed where any mention is made of them, as Exod. xx. Deut. v. & x. and, saith Moses, he 'spake them unto you;' that is, immediately unto all the assembly, Deut. v. 22: where it is added, that he spake, 'them out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness with a great voice, (that every individual person might hear it,) and he added no more.' He spake not one word more, gave not one precept more, immediately to the whole people; but the whole solemnity of fire, thunder, lightning, earthquake, and sound of trumpet, immediately ceased and disappeared. Then God entered on his treaty with Moses, wherein he revealed unto him, and instructed him in the ceremonial and judicial law, for the use of the people, who had now taken upon themselves the religious observance of what he should so reveal and appoint. Now, as the whole decalogue was hereby signalized, and sufficiently distinguished from the other laws and institutions which were of another nature; so in particular, this precept concerning the Sabbath, is distinguished from all those which were of the Mosaic pedagogy, in whose declaration Moses was the mediator between God and the people. And this was only upon the account of its participation in the same nature with the rest of the commands, however it may and do contain something in it that was peculiar to that people, as shall be shown afterwards.

5. Whereas there is a frequent opposition made in the Old Testament between moral obedience, and the outward observance of ordinances of a merely arbitrary institution, there is no mention made of a weekly Sabbath in that case, though all ceremonial institutions are in one place or other
It is true, Isa. i. 13, the Sabbath is joined with the new moons, and its observance rejected in comparison of holiness and righteousness. But as this is expounded in the next verse, to be intended principally of the appointed annual feasts or Sabbaths, so we do grant, that the Sabbath, as relating unto temple worship there intended and described, had that accompanying it, which was peculiar to the Jews and ceremonial, as we shall show hereafter. But absolutely the observance of the Sabbath is not opposed unto, nor rejected, in comparison of other, or any moral duties.

6. The observance of the Sabbath is pressed on the church, on the same grounds, and with the same promises, as the greatest and most indispensable moral duties, and together with them opposed unto those fasting which belonged to ceremonial institutions. To this purpose is the nature and use of it at large discoursed, Isa. lviii. 6—14.

§ 46. Now it is assuredly worth our inquiry, what are the just reasons of the preference of the Sabbath above all positive institutions, both by the place given to it in the decalogue, as also on the account of the other special instances insisted on. If you suppose the command of it to be ceremonial, then one of these two reasons, or both of them, must be alleged as the cause hereof. For this exaltation of it must arise, either from the excellency of it in itself and in its service, or from the excellency of its signification, or from both of them jointly. But these things cannot be pleaded or made use of to the purpose intended. For the service of it, as it was observed among the Jews, it is now earnestly pleaded, that it consisted in mere bodily rest, which is scarcely to be reckoned as any part of divine service at all. What is farther in it, is said to be only a mere circumstance of time, not in any thing better than that of place, which had an arbitrary determination also for a season. It cannot therefore be thus exalted and preferred above all other ordinances of worship upon the account of its service, seeing it is apprehended to be only a mere adjunct of other services, which were therefore more worthy than it, as every thing which is for itself, is more worthy than that which is only for another. And take it absolutely, place is a more noble circumstance than time in this case, considering that place being determined by an arbitrary institution in the building of the temple, became the most glorious and significant part of divine worship; yet had it no place in the decalogue, but only in the Samaritan corruption added to it. It must therefore be upon the account of its signification, that it was thus peculiarly exalted and honoured. For the dignity, worth, and use of all ceremonial institutions, depended on their significance, or their fitness and aptness to represent the things whereof they were types, with the especial worth of what they did peculiarly typify. And herein the Sabbath, even with the applications it had to the Judaical church-state, came short of many other divine services, especially the solemn sacrifices wherein the Lord Christ, with all the benefits of his death, was as it were evidently set forth crucified before their eyes. Neither therefore of these reasons, nor both of them in conjunction, can be pleaded as the cause of the manifold preference of the Sabbath above all ceremonial institutions. It remaineth therefore that it is solely on the account of its morality, and the invariable obligation thence arising unto its observance, that it is so joined with the precepts of the same nature; and such we have now, as I suppose, sufficiently confirmed it to be.

§ 47. I cannot but judge yet farther, that in the caution given by our Saviour unto his disciples, about praying that their flight should not be on the Sabbath day, Matt. xxxiv. 20, he doth declare the continued obligation
of the law of the Sabbath, as a moral precept upon all. It is answered by some, that it is the Judaical Sabbath alone that is intended, which he knew that some of his own disciples would be kept, for a season, in bondage to. For the ease, therefore, of their consciences in that matter, he gives them this direction. But many things on the other side are certain and indubitable, which render this conjecture altogether improbable. For, 1. All real obligation to Judaical institutions was then absolutely taken away; and it is not to be supposed that our Lord Jesus Christ would beforehand lay in provision for the edification of any of his disciples in error. 2. Before that time came, they were sufficiently instructed doctrinally in the dissolution of all obligation in ceremonial institutions. This was done principally by St. Paul in all his epistles, especially in that of the Hebrews themselves at Jerusalem. 3. Those who may be supposed to have continued a conscientious respect to the Judaical Sabbath, could be no otherwise persuaded of it, than were the Jews themselves in those days. But they all accounted themselves absorbed in conscience from the law of the Sabbath, upon imminent danger in time of war, so that they might lawfully either fight or flee, as their safety did require. This is evident from the decree made by them under the Hasmoneans. And such imminent danger is now supposed by our Saviour; for he instructs them to forgo all consideration of their enjoyments, and to shift merely for their lives. There was not, therefore any danger in point of conscience with respect to the Judaical Sabbath, to be then feared or prevented. But in general, those in whose hearts are the ways of God do know what an addition it is to the greatest of their earthly troubles, if they befall them in such seasons, as to deprive them of the opportunity of the sacred ordinances of God's worship, and indispensably engage them in ways and works quite of another nature, when they stand in most need of these ordinances. There is, therefore, another answer invented, namely, that our Lord Jesus in these words respected not the consciences of his disciples, but their trouble; and, therefore, joins the Sabbath day and the winter together, in directing them to pray for an ease and accommodation of that flight which was inevitable. For as the winter is unseasonable for such an occasion, so the law concerning the Sabbath was such, as that if any one travelled on that day above a commonly allowed Sabbath day's journey, he was to be put to death. But neither is there any more appearance of truth in this pretence. For, 1. The power of capital punishments was before this time utterly taken away from the Jews, and all their remaining courts interdicted from proceeding in any case, wherein the lives of men were concerned. 2. The times intended were such, as wherein there was no course of law, justice, or equity amongst them, but all things were filled with rapine, confusion, and hostility, so that it is a vain imagination, that any cognizance was taken about such cases as journeying on the Sabbath. 3. The dangers they were in, had made it free to them, as to legal punishments, upon their own principles, as was declared; so that these cannot be the reasons of the caution here given. It is at least, therefore, most probable, that our Saviour speaks to his disciples upon a supposition of the perpetual obligation of the law of the Sabbath, that they should pray to be delivered from the necessity of a flight on the day whereon the duties of it were to be observed, lest it falling out otherwise, should prove a great aggravation of their distress.

§ 48. From these particular instances, we may return to the consideration of the law of the decalogue in general, and the perpetual power of exacting obedience wherewith it is accompanied. That in the Old Testament it is
frequently declared to be universally obligatory, and hath the same efficacy ascribed to it, without putting in any exceptions to any of its commands or limitations of its number, I suppose will be granted. The authority of it is no less fully asserted in the New Testament, and that also absolutely without distinction, or the least intimation of excepting the fourth command, from what is affirmed concerning the whole. It is of the law of the decalogue that our Saviour treats, Matt. v. 17—19. This he affirms, that he came not to dissolve, as he did the ceremonial law, but to fulfil it; and then affirms, that not one jot or tittle of it shall pass away. And making thereon a distribution of the whole into its several commands, he declares his disapprobation of them who shall break or teach men to break any one of them. And men make bold with him, when they so confidently assert that they may break one of them, and teach others so to do, without offence. That this reacheth not to the confirmation of the seventh day precisely, we shall afterwards abundantly demonstrate. In like manner, St. James treats concerning the whole law, and all the commandments of it, ch. ii. 10, 11. And the argument he insists on for the observance of the whole, namely, the giving of it by the same authority, is confined to the decalogue, and the way of God's giving the same, or else it may be extended to all Mosaic institutions, expressly contrary to his intention.

§ 49. It is known that many things are usually objected against the truth we have been pleading for; namely, the morality of a sacred rest to God on one day in seven, from its relation to the law of creation, and the command for it in the decalogue. And it is known also, that what is so objected, hath been by others solidly answered and removed. But, because those objections or arguments have been lately renewed and pressed by a person of good learning and reputation, and a new reinforcement endeavoured to be given to them, I shall give them a new examination, and remove them out of our way.

§ 50. It is, then, objected in the first place, Disquisit. de Moralitate Sabbati, p. 7, 'That the command for the observance of the Sabbath is a command of time, or concerning time only; namely, that some certain and determinate time be assigned to the worship of God; and this may be granted to be moral. But time is no part of moral worship, but only a circumstance of it, even as place is also. Therefore, the command that requires them in particular, cannot be moral; for these, and the like circumstances must necessarily be of a positive determination.'

Answ. 1. The whole force of this argument consists in this, that time is but a help, instrument, or circumstance of worship, and therefore, is not moral worship itself, nor a part of moral worship, nor can so be. But this argument is not valid; for whatever God requires by his command to be religiously observed, with immediate respect unto himself is a part of his worship. And this worship, as to the kind of it, follows the nature of the law whereby it is commanded. If that law be merely positive, so is the worship commanded, although it be a duty required by the law of nature that we duly observe it when it is commanded; for by the law of nature God is to be obeyed in all his commands, of what sort soever they are. If that law be moral, so is the duty required by it, and so is our obedience unto it. The only way, then, to prove that the observance of time is no part of moral worship, is this: namely, to manifest that the law whereby it is required, is positive, and not moral; for that it is required by divine command, of the one sort or the other, is now supposed. And on the other side, from the consideration of the
thing itself naturally, as that it is an adjunct or circumstance of other things, no consequence ariseth to the determination of the nature of the law whereby it is required.

2. Time abstractedly, or one day in seven absolutely, is not the adequate object of the precept, or the fourth commandment. But it is a holy rest to be observed unto God in his worship on such a day. And this, not a holy rest unto God in general, as the tendency and end of all our obedience and living unto him, but as an especial remembrance and representation of the rest of God himself, with his complacency and satisfaction in his works, as establishing a covenant between himself and us. This is the principal subject of the command; or a stated day of a holy rest unto God in such a revolution of days or time. This we have proved to be moral from the foundation and reason of it, laid and given in the law of nature, revived and represented in the fourth command of the decalogue. Now, though place be an inseparable circumstance of all actions, and so capable of being made a circumstance of divine worship by divine positive command, as it was of old in the instance of the temple; yet no special or particular place had the least guidance or direction unto it in the law of nature, by any works or acts of God, whose instructive virtue belonged thereunto; and therefore, all places were alike free by nature; and every place wherein the worship of God was celebrated, was a natural circumstance of the actions performed, and not a religious circumstance of worship, until a particular place was assigned and determined by positive command for that purpose. It is otherwise with time, as hath been shown at large. And therefore, although any place, notwithstanding anything in the law of nature, might have been separated by positive institution unto the solemn worship of God, it doth not thence follow, as is pretended, that any time, a day in a monthly or annual revolution, might have been separated unto the like purpose, seeing God had given us indication of another limitation of it in the law of creation.

§ 51. It is farther objected, Disquisit. p. 8, 'That in the fourth commandment not one day in seven, but the seventh day precisely, is enjoined. The day was before made known unto the Israelites in the station at Marah, or afterwards at Alush; namely, the seventh day from the foundation of the world. This, in the command they are required to observe. Hence, the words of it are, that they should remember את ים השבת את same Sabbath day, or that day of the Sabbath which was newly revealed unto them. This command, therefore, cannot be moral as to the limitation of time specified therein, seeing it only confirms the observance of the seventh day Sabbath, which was before given unto the Hebrews in a temporary institution.' And this is insisted on as the principal strength against the morality of the command. I shall first give you in my answer in general, and then consider the special improvements that are made of it.

1. Instances may be given, and have been given by all writers concerning the Hebrew tongue, wherein the prefixed letters sometimes answering the Greek prepositive articles, are redundant; and if at all emphatical, yet they do not at all limit, specify, or determine, see Ps. i. 4; Eccl. ii. 14; Lev. xviii. 5. The observation, therefore, that י is prefixed to nefash, (which may possibly denote an excellency in the thing itself, but tends nothing to the determination of a certain day, but as it is afterwards declared to be one of seven,) is too weak to bear the weight of the inference intended. Nor will this be denied by any who ever aright considered the various use, and frequent redundancy of that prefix.
2. The Sabbath, or rest of a seventh day, was known and observed from the foundation of the world, as hath been proved. And, therefore, if from the prefix, we are to conclude a limitation, or determination to be intended in the words, 'remember the Sabbath day,' yet it respects only the original Sabbath, or the Sabbath in respect of its original, and not any new institution of it. For, supposing the observance of the Sabbath to have been before in use, whether that use were only of late, or a few days before, or of more ancient times, even from the beginning of the world, the command concerning it may be well expressed by דבון את יום השבת, 'Remember the Sabbath day.'

3. Suppose that the Sabbath had received a limitation to the seventh day precisely, in the ordinance given unto that people in the first raining of manna; then doth the observance of that day precisely by virtue of this command necessarily take place. And yet the command, which is but the revival of what was required from the foundation of the world, cannot be said to intend that day precisely in the first place. For the reason of, and in the original command for a Sabbatical rest, was God's making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh; which requires no more, but that in the continual revolution of seven days, six being allowed unto work, one should be observed a sacred rest to God. These words, therefore, 'Remember the Sabbath day,' referring to the primitive command and reason of it, as is afterwards declared in the body of the law, require no more but a weekly day of rest, whereunto the seventh day is reduced, as added by an especial ordinance. And the reason of this commandment from the works of God, and the order of them, is repeated in the decalogue, because the instruction given us by them, being a part of the law of our creation, more subject unto a neglect, disregard, and forgetfulness, than those other parts of it, which were wholly innate in the principles of our nature; it was necessary that the remembrance of it should be so expressly revived, when in the other precepts there is only a tacit excitation of our own inbred light and principles.

4. The emphatical expression insisted on, 'Remember the Sabbath day,' hath respect to the singular necessity, use, and benefit of this holy observance, as also to that neglect and decay in its observance, which partly through their own sin, partly through the hardships that it met withal in the world, the church of former ages had fallen into. And what it had lately received of a new institution with reference unto the Israelites, falls also under this command, or is reduced unto it, as a ceremonial branch under its proper moral head, whereunto it is annexed. And whereas it is greatly urged, that the command of the 'seventh day precisely is not the command of one day in seven; and that what God hath determined, as in this matter the day is, ought not to be indefinitely by us considered,' it may be all granted without the least prejudice unto the cause wherein we are engaged. For, although the institution of the seventh day precisely, be somewhat distinct from one day in seven, as containing a determinate limitation of that which in the other notion is left indefinite; yet this hinders not, but that God may appoint the one and the other; the one in the moral reason of the law, the other by a special determination and institution. And this special institution is to continue, unless it be abrogated or changed by his own authority, which it may be, without the least impeachment of the moral reason of the whole law, and a new day be limited by the same authority, which hath been done accordingly, as we shall afterwards declare.

§ 52. It is yet farther pleaded, (Disquisit. p. 9—12.), 'That no dis-
tion can be made between a weekly Sabbath, and the seventh day precisely. And if any such difference be asserted, then if one of them be appointed in the fourth commandment, the other is not. For there are not two Sabbaths enjoined in it, but one. And it is evident, that there never was of old but one Sabbath. The Sabbath observed under the Old Testament was that required and prescribed in the fourth commandment; and so, on the other side, the Sabbath required in the decalogue, was that which was observed under the old Testament, and that only. Two Sabbaths, one of one day in seven, and the other of the seventh day precisely, are not to be fancied. The seventh day, and that only was the Sabbath of the Old Testament, and of the decalogue. These things, I say, are at large pleaded by the formentioned author.

Amsw. 1. These objections are framed against a distinction used by another learned person, about the Sabbath as absolutely commanded in the decalogue, and as enjoined to practise under the Old Testament. But neither he, nor any other sober person, ever fancied that there were two Sabbaths of old, one enjoined unto the church of the Israelites, the other required in the decalogue. But any man may, nay, every prudent man ought to distinguish between the Sabbath, as enjoined absolutely in words expressive of the law of our creation, and rule of our moral dependence on God, in the fourth command; and the same Sabbath, as it had a temporary, occasional determination to the seventh day in the church of the Jews, by virtue of an especial intimation of the will of God, suited unto that administration of the covenant which that church and people were then admitted into. I see therefore no difficulty in these things. The fourth commandment doth not contain only the moral equity that some time should always be set apart unto the celebration of the worship of God; nor only the original instruction given us by the law of creation, and the covenant obedience required of us thereon, wherein the substance of the command doth consist; but it expresseth moreover, the peculiar application of this command by the will of God, to the state of the church then erected by him, with respect unto the seventh day precisely, as before instituted and commanded, Exod. xvi. Nor is there here the least appearance of two Sabbaths, but one only is absolutely commanded unto all, and determined unto a certain day for the use of some for a season.

§ 53. 2. That one day in seven only, and not the seventh day precisely, is directly and immediately enjoined in the decalogue; and the seventh only with respect unto an antecedent Mosaic institution, with the nature of that administration of the covenant which the people of Israel were then taken into; hath been evinced in our investigation of the causes and ends of the Sabbath preceding, and hath been cleared by many. And it seems evident to an impartial consideration. For the observance of one day in seven, belongs unto every covenant of God with man. And the decalogue is the invariable rule of man's walking before God, and living unto him; of what nature soever, on other reasons, the covenant be between them, whether that of works, or that of grace by Jesus Christ. The seventh day precisely belonging unto the covenant of works, cannot therefore be first, but only occasionally intended in the decalogue. Nor doth it, nor can it, invariably belong unto our absolute obedience unto God, because it is not of the substance of it, but is only an occasional determination of a duty, such as all other positive laws do give us. And hence there is in the command itself a difference put between a Sabbath day, and the arbitrary limitation of the seventh day, to be that day. For we are commanded to remember the Sab-
bath day, not the seventh day, and the reason given (as is elsewhere observed) is, because "God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath day;" (in the close of the command, where the formal reason of our obedience is expressed) not the seventh day. Nor is indeed the joint observance of the seventh day precisely unto all to whom this command is given, that is, to all who take the Lord to be their God, possible; though it were to the Jews in the land of Palestine, who were obliged to keep that day. For the difference of the climate in the world will not allow it. Nor did the Jews ever know whether the day they observed, was the seventh from the creation; only they knew it was so from the day wherein man was first given unto them. And the whole revolution and computation of time by days, was sufficiently interrupted in the days of Joshua and Hezekiah, from allowing to think the observance of the seventh day to be moral. And it is a rule to judge of the intention of all laws divine and human, that the meaning of the preceptive part of them is to be collected from the reasons annexed to them, or inserted in them. Now the reasons for a sacred rest that are intimated and stated in this command, do no more respect the seventh day, than any other in seven. Six days are granted to labour, that is in number, and not more in a septenary revolution. Nor doth the command say any thing, whether these six days shall be the first or the last in the order of them. And any day, is as meet for the performance of the duties of the Sabbath, as the seventh, if in a like manner designed thereunto; which things are at large pleaded by others.

§ 54. It hath hitherto been allowed generally, that the fourth commandment doth at least include something in it that is moral, or else indeed no colour can be given unto its association with them that are absolutely so in the decalogue. This is commonly said to be, that some part of our time be dedicated to the public worship of God. But as this would overthrow the pretension before mentioned, that there could be no moral command about time, which is but a circumstance of moral duties, so the limitation of that time to one day in seven is so evidently a perpetually binding law, that it will not be hard to prove the unchangeable obligation that is on all men to the observance of it, which is all, that for the substance is contended for. To avoid this it is now affirmed, (Disquisit. p. 14.) That, Morale quarti praecepti est, non unum diem sed totum tempus vitae nostrae quantum id fieri potest, impenden dumesse cultui Dei, quarendo regnum Dei et justitiam ejus, atque inserviendo edificationi proximi: quo pertinent ut Deo serviamus, ejus beneficia agnoscamus et celebremus, eum invocemus Spiritu, fidem nostram testemur confessione oris, &c. This is that which is moral in the fourth commandment, namely, that not one day, but as much as may be, our whole lives, be spent in the worship of God, in seeking his kingdom and the righteousness thereof, and in furthering the edification of our neighbour. Hereunto it belongeth, that we should serve God, acknowledge and celebrate his benefits, pray unto him in spirit, and testify our faith by our confession.'

§ 55. Answ. It is hard to discover how any of these things have the least respect unto the fourth commandment, much more how the morality of it should consist in them. For all the instances mentioned, are indeed required in the first precept of the decalogue, that only excepted, of taking care to promote the edification of our neighbour, which is the sum and substance of the second table, expressed by our Saviour by "loving our neighbour as ourselves." To live unto God, to believe and trust in him, to acknowledge his benefits, to make confession of him in the world, are all
especial moral duties of the first commandment. It cannot therefore be
apprehended, how the morality of the fourth commandment should consist
in them. And if there be nothing else moral in it, there is certainly nothing
moral in it at all. For these things and the like are claimed from it, and
taken out of its possession, by the first precept. And thenceunto doth the
general consideration of time, with respect to these duties belong, namely,
that 'we should live unto God, whilst we live in this world.' For we live
in time, and that is the measure of our duration and continuance. Some-
thing else therefore must be found out to be moral in the fourth command-
ment, or it must be denied plainly to have any thing moral in it.

§ 56. It is farther yet pleaded, that the 'Sabbath was a type of our
spiritual rest in Christ, both that which we have in him at present by grace,
and that which remains for us in heaven. Hence it was a shadow of good
things to come, as were all other ceremonial institutions. But that the
same thing should be moral, and a shadow, is a contradiction. That which
is a shadow, can in no sense be said to be moral, nor on the contrary. The
Sabbath therefore was merely ceremonial.'

Answ. It doth not appear, it cannot be proved, that the Sabbath, either
as to its first original, or as to the substance of the command of it in the deca-
logue, was typical or instituted to prefigure any thing that was future. Yea,
the contrary is evident. For the law of it was given before the first pro-
mise of Christ, as we have proved, and that in the state of innocence, and
while the covenant of works was in perfect force, wherein there was no re-
spect to the mediation of Christ. I do acknowledge, that God did so order
all his works in the first creation, and under the law of nature, as that they
might be suitable morally to represent his works under the new creation,
which, from the analogy of our redemption to the creation of all things, is
so called. And hence, according to the eternal counsel of God, were all
things meet to 'be gathered into an head in Christ Jesus.' On this account
there is an instructive resemblance, between the works of one sort and of the
other. So the rest of God, after the works of the old creation, is an-
swered by the rest of the Son of God, upon his laying the foundation of
the new heavens and new earth, in his resurrection. But that the Sabbath
originally, and in its whole nature, should be a free institution to prefigure, and
as in a shadow to represent any thing spiritual or mystical, afterwards to be
introduced, is not, nor can be proved. It was indeed originally a moral
pledge of God's rest, and of our interest therein, according to the tenor of
the covenant of works; which things belong unto our relation unto God, by
virtue of the law of our creation. It continueth to retain the same nature,
with respect to the covenant of grace. When it had annexed to it, what
applications it received to the state of the Mosaic Pedagogy, which were
temporary and umbratile, shall be declared afterwards.

§ 57. But it is yet pleaded from an enumeration of the parts of the
fourth commandment, that there can be nothing moral as to our purpose
in it. And these are said to be three. 'First. The determination of the
seventh day to be a day of rest. Secondly. The rest itself commanded
on that day. Thirdly. The sanctification of that rest unto holy worship.
Now neither of these can be said to be moral. Not the first, for it is con-
fessedly ceremonial. The second is a thing in its own nature indifferent,
having nothing of morality in it, antecedent unto a positive command.
Neither is the third moral, being only the means or manner of performing
that worship which is moral.'

: Answ. It will not be granted, that this is a sufficient analysis or distribu-
tion of the parts of this command. The principal subject-matter of it is omitted, namely, the observance of 'one day in seven' to the ends of sacred rest. For we are required in it to sanctify the 'Sabbath of the Lord our God,' which was a seventh day in a hebdomadal revolution of days. Supply this in the first place in the room of the 'determination of the seventh day to be that day,' which evidently follows it in the order of nature, and this argument vanishes. Now it is here only tacitly supposed, not at all proved, that one day in seven is not required.

2. Rest, in itself absolutely considered, is no part of divine worship antecedently unto a divine positive command. But a rest from our own works, which might be of use and advantage unto us, which by the law of our creation we are to attend to in this world, that we may attend and apply ourselves to the worship of God, and solemnly express our universal dependence upon him in all things; a rest representing the rest of God in his covenant with us, and observed as a pledge of our entering into his rest: by virtue of that covenant, and according to the law of it; such as is the rest here enjoined, is a part of the worship of God. This is the rest which we are directed unto by the law of our creation, and which by the moral reason of this command is enjoined unto us, on one day in seven; and in these things consists the morality of this precept, on account of which it hath a place in the decalogue, which on all the considerations before mentioned, could not admit of an association with one that was purely ceremonial.

3. Granting the dedication of some time, or part of time, to the solemn worship of God to be required in this command, as is by all generally acknowledged; and let a position be practically advanced against this, which we insist on, namely, that 'one day in seven' is the time determined and limited for that purpose, and we shall quickly perceive the mischievous consequents of it. For when men have taken out of the hand of God the division between the time that is allowed unto us for our own occasions, and what is to be spent in his service; and have cast off all influencing direction from his example of working six days, and resting the seventh; and all guidance from that seemingly perpetual direction that is given us, of employing ordinarily six days in the necessary affairs of this life; they will find themselves at no small loss what to fix upon, or wherein to acquiesce in this matter. It must either be left to every individual man to do herein as seems good unto him; or there must an umpirage of it be committed to others, either to the church or to the magistrate. And hence we may expect as many different determinations and limitations of time, as there are distinct ecclesiastical or political powers amongst Christians. What variety and changeableness would hence ensue, what confusion this would cast all the disciples of Christ into, according to the prevalence of superstition or profaneness, in the minds of those who claim this power of determining and limiting the time of public worship, is evident unto all. The instance of holydays as they are commonly called, will farther manifest what of itself lies naked under every rational eye. The institution and observance of them was ever resolved into the moral part of this command, for the dedicating of some part of our time unto God; but the determination hereof being not of God, but left to the church, as it is said, one church multiplies them without end, until they grow an unsupportable yoke unto the people; another reduceth this number into a narrower compass, a third rejects them all; and no two churches that are independent ecclesiastically and politically one on the other, do agree about them. And so will, and must the matter fall
out, as to the special day whereof we discourse, when once the determination of it by divine authority is practically rejected. As yet men deceive themselves in this matter, and pretend that they believe otherwise than indeed they do. Let them come once soberly to join their opinion of their liberty and their practise together, actually rejecting the divine limitation of one day in seven, and they will find their own consciences under more disorder than yet they are aware of.

Again, if there be no day determined in the fourth command, but only the seventh precisely, which is ceremonial, with a general rule that some time is to be dedicated to the service of God, there is no more of morality in this command, than in any of those for the observance of new moons, and annual feasts with jubilees and the like; in all which the same general equity is supposed, and a ceremonial day limited and determined. And if it be so, as far as I can understand, we may as lawfully observe new moons and jubilees, as a weekly day of rest, according to the custom of all churches.

§ 58. The words of the apostle Paul, Col. ii. 16, 17, are at large insisted on to prove that the Sabbath was only typical, and a shadow of things future. 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, (η ναβσαμων) or of the Sabbaths, or Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.' For hence they say it will follow, that there is nothing moral in the observance of the Sabbath; seeing it was a mere type and shadow, as were other Mosaical institutions; as also that it is absolutely abolished and taken away in Christ.

Answ: This place must be afterwards considered, I shall here only briefly speak unto it. And, 1. It is known and confessed, that at that time all Judaical observances of days, or the days which they religiously observed, whether feasts or fasts, weekly, monthly, or annual, were by themselves and by others, called their Sabbaths, as we have before evinced. And that kind of speech which was then in common use, is here observed by our apostle. It must therefore necessarily be allowed, that there were two sorts of Sabbaths amongst them. The first and principal was the weekly Sabbath, so called from the rest of God upon the finishing of his works. This being designed for sacred and religious uses, other days separated unto the same ends in general, came from their analogy thereunto, to be called Sabbaths also, yea, were so called by God himself, as hath been declared. But the distinction and difference between these Sabbaths was great. The one of them was ordained from the foundation of the world, before the entrance of sin, or giving of the promises, and so belonged to all mankind in general; the other were appointed in the wilderness, as a part of the peculiar church worship of the Israelites, and so belonged unto them only. The one of them was directly commanded in the decalogue, wherein the law of our creation was revived and expressed; the other have their institution expressly among the residue of ceremonial temporary ordinances. Hence they cannot be both comprised under the same denomination, unless upon some reason that is common to both sorts alike. So when God saith of them all, 'You shall observe my Sabbaths,' it is upon a reason common to them all, namely, that they were all commanded of God, which is the formal reason of our obedience, of what nature soever his commands are, whether moral or positive. Nor can both these sorts be here understood under the same name, unless it be with respect unto something that is common to both. Allow therefore the distinc-
tions between them before mentioned, which cannot soberly be denied, and as to what they agree in, namely, what is or was in the weekly primary Sabbath of the same nature with those days of rest which were so called in allusion thereunto, and they may be allowed to have the same sentence given concerning them. That is, so far the weekly Sabbath may be said to be a shadow, and to be abolished.

2. It is evident, that the apostle in this place dealeth with them who endeavoured to introduce Judaism absolutely, or the whole system of Mosaic ceremonies into the observance of the Christian church. Circumcision, their feasts and new moons, their distinctions of meats and drinks, he mentioneth directly in this place. And therefore he deals about these things so far as they were Judaical, or belonged unto the economy of Moses, and no otherwise. If any of them fell under any other consideration, so far as they did so, he designeth not to speak of them. Now, those things only were Mosaic, which being instituted by Moses, and figurative of good things to come, or the things which being of the same nature with the residue of his ceremonies, were before appointed, but accommodated by him to the use of the church which he built; such as sacrifices and circumcision. For they were all of them nothing else but an obscure adumbration of the things whereof Christ was the body. So far then as the weekly Sabbath had any additions made unto it, or limitation given of it, or directions for the manner of its observance, or respected the services then to be performed in it, and by all accommodated unto that dispensation of the covenant which the posterity of Abraham was then brought into, it was a shadow, and is taken away by Christ, * Therewith falls its limitation to the seventh day, its rigorous observance, its penal sanction, being a sign between God and that people; in a word, every thing in it, and about it, that belonged unto the then present administration of the covenant, or was accommodated to the Judaical church or state. But now if it be proved that the septenary sacred rest was appointed in paradise, that it hath its foundation in the law of creation, that thereon it was observed antecedently unto the institution of Mosaic ceremonies, and that God renewed the command concerning it, in his system of moral precepts manifoldly distinguished from all ceremonial ordinances; so far, and in these respects it hath no concern in these words of the apostle.

3. It cannot be said, that the religious observance of one day in seven, or a holy rest unto God, is abolished by Christ, without casting a great reflection of presumption on all the churches of Christ in the world, I mean that now are or ever were so; for they have all observed, and do so observe such a day. I shall not now dispute about the authority of the church to appoint days unto holy or religious uses, to make holydays. Let it be granted to be, whatever any yet hath pretended or pleaded that it is. But this I say, that where God by his authority had commanded the observance of a day to himself, and the Lord Christ by the same authority hath taken off that command, and abolished that institution; it is not in the power of all the churches in the world, to take up the religious observance of that day to the same ends and purposes. It is certain that God did appoint that a Sabbath of rest should be observed unto him, and for the celebration of his solemn worship on one day in seven. The whole command of God to this effect is now pleaded to be dissolved, and all obligation from thence unto its observance to be abolished, in and by Christ. Then say I, it is unlawful for any church or churches in the world to reassert this practice, and to impose the observance of it, on the disciples of Christ. Be it that the
church may appoint holydays of its own, that have no foundation in, nor relation to the law of Moses; yet doubtless it ought not to dig any of his ceremonies out of their grave, and impose them on the necks of the disciples of Christ. Yet so must it be thought to do by the constant practice and injunction hereof, on this hypothesis, namely, that the religious observance of one day in seven, is absolutely abolished by Christ, as a mere part of the law of commandments contained in ordinances, which was nailed to his cross and buried with him.

4. Herewith fall the arguments taken from the apostle's calling the Sabbath in this place a shadow. For it is said, that nothing which is moral can be a shadow. It is true, that which is moral, so far as it is moral, cannot be a shadow. We therefore say, that the weekly observance of a day of rest, from the foundation of the world, whereunto a general obligation was laid on all men unto its observance, the command whereof was a part of the moral law of God, was no shadow, nor is so called by the apostle, nor did typify good things to come. But that which is in its own nature moral, may in respect of some peculiar manner of its observance, in such a time or season, and by some adjuncts annexed to it, in respect whereof it becomes a part of ceremonial worship, be so far, and in those respects esteemed a shadow, and as such pass away. In brief, the command itself, of observing one day in seven as a holy rest unto God, hath nothing Aaronical or typical in it, but hath its foundation in the light of nature, as directed by the works of God and his rest thereon. For its limitation precisely to the last day of the week, with other directions and injunctions for and in the manner of its observance, they were Mosaic, and as a shadow are departed, as we shall manifest in our ensuing Exercitations.

§ 59. But yet neither can it be absolutely proved if we would insist thereon, that the weekly Sabbath is in any sense intended in these words of the apostle. For he may design the Sabbatical years which were instituted among that people, and probably now pressed by the Judaizing teachers on the Gentile proselytes. Nor will the exception put in from some of the Rabbins that the Sabbatical years were not to be observed out of the land of Canaan, from which Colosse was far enough distant, reinforce the argument to this purpose. For as men in one place, may have their consciences exercised and bound with the opinion of what is to be done in another, though they cannot engage in the practice of it whilst they are absent; so our apostle chargeth the Galatians, as far distant from Canaan as the Colossians, that when they began to judaize, they observed years as well as days, and months, and times, which could respect only the Sabbatical years that were instituted by the law of Moses.
EXERCITATION XXXVIII.

FOURTH EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.


§ 1. We have declared how the observance of a septenary sacred rest is required by the moral law, or the law of our creation. Now this is not absolutely and merely as it is a law; but as it contained a covenant between God and man. A law it might have been, and not have had the nature of a covenant, which doth not necessarily follow upon either its instructive or preceptive power. Yet it was originally given in the counsel of God to that end, and accompanied with promises and threatenings, whence it had the nature of a covenant. By virtue of this law as a covenant, was the observance of a Sabbath prescribed and required, as a token and pledge of God’s rest in that covenant, in the performance of the works whereon it was constituted; and of the interest of man in that rest, as also a means of entrance into it. On this ground it should have been observed in the state of innocence, wherein the law of it was given and declared. For it was no less necessary unto that state and condition, than unto any other wherein God requireth covenant obedience of men; nor, considering the nature and ends of a holy rest or Sabbath, can any reason be given, why it should be thought to be accommodated only to the administration of the covenant under the Old Testament after the giving of the law, whereunto by some it is appropriated.

§ 2. It is true, indeed, that in the fourth commandment, there is an explanation of the rest of the Sabbath, so far as it consisteth in a cessation from our own works, that are of use and advantage to the outward man in this life, suited as unto the state and condition of mankind in general since the fall, so unto the especial state of the Jews, at that time when the law was given; as there was also in the additional appendix of the first commandment. But for the substance of it, the same kind of rest was to be observed in the state of innocence, and was necessary thereunto, on the grounds before insisted on. Servile labour, with trouble, sweat, and vexation, was occasioned by the curse, Gen. iii. 17—19. The state also of
servants and handmaids, such as was then, and is still in use, followed on the entrance of sin, though merely to serve, be no part of the curse, 1 Cor. vii. 20, 21, as having its foundation in that subordination which is natural. And the government of servants ought not to be despotic, but paternal, Gen. xviii. 19. In these things there was some variation, supposed in the giving of the decalogue, as to their outward manner, from the original state of things amongst mankind. But there was also work required of man, or labour in the earth, with reference unto his natural life or subsistence in this world, in the state of innocence. For it is said expressly, that God put man into the garden, עַל עָרֵבָה וּלְמָמָר, Gen. ii. 15, to labour in it; and to preserve it by labour for his use. A cessation, therefore, from bodily labour was consistent with, and useful unto that condition, that men thereby might be enabled to give themselves, (in the season they were directed unto by the works and example of God,) wholly to the special ends of living unto him according to the covenant made with them.

There is nothing, therefore, in the fourth commandment, directing unto six days of labour, and requiring a seventh unto rest, that is inconsistent, or not compliant with the law of our creation, and the state of living unto God constituted thereby; although the manner of that work and labour be varied from what originally it was. Likewise in that state of mankind, there was to be a superiority of some over others. This the natural relation of parents and children makes manifest. And these latter were in the worship of God, to be under the government and direction of the other. And unto this natural equity, is all subjection to magistrates in subjects, and masters in servants, reduced in the fifth commandment. So then, the outward variations, which are in these things supposed in the fourth commandment, do not in the least impeach its morality, or hinder but that for the substance of it, it may be judged a law natural and moral, and a true representation of a part of the law of our creation.

§ 3. Seeing, therefore, that the moral law, as a covenant between God and man, required this sacred rest, as we have proved; we must inquire what place, as such, it had in the Mosaic economy, whereon the true reason and notion of the Sabbath as peculiarly Judaical, doth depend. For the Sabbath being originally annexed to the covenant between God and man, the renovation of the covenant doth necessarily require an especial renovation of the Sabbath, and the change of the covenant as to the nature of it, must in like manner introduce a change of the Sabbath. And we shall find, that the covenant of the law, or of works, had a twofold renovation in the church of Israel, in the framing and constitution of it. These rendered it their especial covenant, although it was not absolutely a new covenant, nor is it so called, but is every-where called the old; and hence the Sabbath became peculiarly theirs.

1. It was renewed unto them materially. It was originally written in the heart of man, or concreted with the faculties of his soul; where its light and principles being excited, guided, and variously affected with the consideration of the works of God, (proposed unto him with an instructive ability, for that end, whose directions concurred to the making up of the entire law of creation,) was evidently directive unto all the duties which God in the first covenant required at our hands. By the entrance of sin, with the corruption and debasing of the faculties of our souls, which ensued thereon, whereby the alteration in our natures, the principal seat and subject of this law was so great, as that we lost the image of God, or that light and knowledge into our duty with respect unto him, which was necessary
for us in that covenant; the law itself became insufficient, a lame and imperfect guide unto the ends of the covenant.

Besides, the aspectable creation, the outward medium of instructing man in the knowledge of the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, being for our sin brought under the curse, and the creature into bondage, the contemplation of it would not so clearly, distinctly, and perfectly represent him unto us, as formerly. Let men fancy what they please, and please themselves whilst they will with their fancies, all things both within and without, in the whole creation, were brought into such disorder and confusion by the entrance of sin, as that the law of nature was utterly insufficient to enable us to, or to guide us in our living unto God, according to the tenor of the first covenant.

There were, and are indeed general notions of good and evil indelibly implanted in the faculties of our souls, with a power of judging concerning our actions and moral practices, whether they are conformable to those notions, with respect unto the superior judgment of God. But besides the impairing of the principles of these notions before mentioned, they were of old variously obscured, perverted, and stifled, by customs, prejudices, and by the power of sin in the world, so that they were of little use as unto a due performance of covenant duties, indeed of none at all, in reference to any acceptance with God.

Wherefore God erecting his church, and renewing the knowledge of himself, and of man's duty towards him, in the posterity of Abraham, he gave unto them afresh, in the first place, the precepts of the law and covenant of nature, for the guide and rule of their obedience. And that this might now be permanent, he reduced the substance of the whole law unto ten words or commands, writing them in tables of stone, which he appointed to be sacredly kept amongst them. The law thus declared and written by him, was the same, I say, materially, and for the substance of it, with the law of our creation, or the original rule of our covenant obedience unto God. Yet in it, as thus transcribed, there was an innovation both in its form and principle of obligation. For as to its form or directive power, it was now made external and objective unto the mind of man, which before was principally internal and subjective. And the immediate obligation unto its observance among that people, was now from the promulgation of it on Mount Sinai, and the deliverance of it unto them thereon. Hence it was prefaced with motives peculiar to their state and condition, and its observance continually pressed on them afterwards, with arguments taken from their peculiar relation to God, with his love and benefits unto them. This gave it a new respect, because there was nothing originally in it, nor belonging unto it, but what was equally common unto all mankind. Now this alteration in the law and covenant of creation, as applied unto the church of the Israelites, did also affect the law of the Sabbath, which was a part of it. It was now no more to them a mere moral command only, equally regarding all mankind, but had a temporary respect given unto it, which was afterwards to be abolished and taken away. So was it with the whole law, and so was it with the Sabbath in particular. To take up, therefore, the observance of it, as appointed in the decalogue, not as a material transcript of the law of nature merely, but as under its renovation to the church of Israel, is a groundless and unwarrantable going over into a part of abolished Judaism. For,

§ 4. Secondly. The law was renewed as an ingredient into that economy under which God was pleased to bring his church at that time, before the
exhibition of the promise, or the accomplishment of it. And sundry things are to be observed herein.

1. That God did not absolutely bring that people under the covenant of works in all the rigour of it, according to its whole law and tenor, to stand or fall absolutely by its promises or threatenings. For although the law contained the whole rule of the covenant, and on the considerations to be afterwards mentioned, it is often called the covenant of God with that people, yet were they not absolutely tied up to it, and concluded by it, as to the eternal issue of living unto God. This arose from the interposition of the promise; for the promise of grace in Christ, being given upon the first entrance of sin for the relief and salvation of the elect, and being solemnly renewed to Abraham and his seed four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law to his posterity, there was a blessed relief provided therein against the curse and threatenings annexed to the first covenant, for all them that betook themselves to it, and made use of it. Notwithstanding, I say, this renovation of the first covenant materially unto them, they were so far freed from its covenant terms, as that they had a relief provided against what they could not answer in it, with the consequences thereof.

2. From the nature and tenor of the covenant of works, so renewed amongst that people, there was begotten in their minds such a respect unto the rigour of its commands, the manner of their observance, or of obedience unto them, with the dread of its curse awfully denounced amongst them, as brought a servile and bondage frame of spirit upon them, in all wherein they had to do with God, by virtue of the law and rule of that covenant. This frame of spirit, as that which stands in direct opposition to the freedom and liberty purchased for us by Jesus Christ, to serve God in righteousness and holiness without fear all our days, is much insisted on by the apostle Paul, especially in his epistles to the Romans and Galatians. And in their observance of the Sabbath in particular, they were under this bondage, filling them with many scrupulous anxieties, which arose not from the law of the Sabbath itself, as originally given unto man in the state of innocence, but from the accommodation of the law thereof unto them, after the entrance of sin. And hereby their Sabbath rest became to them a great part of their wearying burdensome yoke, which is taken off in Christ.

3. This law was yet proposed to that church and people in the manner and form of a covenant, and not only materially, as a law or rule. This it had from the promises and threatenings which it was attended withal. There was adjointed to it, 'Do this, and live;' and, the 'man that doth these things shall live in them;' as also, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them.' Not that it was hereby absolutely constituted a covenant, which eventually and finally they were to live or die by, (for, as we showed before, there was a relief provided against that condition in the promise,) but God gave the old covenant a special revival, though with respect to other ends than were originally intended in it. Hence this covenant-form given to it, rendered the obedience of that people in a great measure servile, for it gendered unto bondage.

4. The law being attended with various explanations, and many ordinances of judgment, deduced from the principles of moral right and equity contained in it, was made the rule of the polity and government of that people, as a holy nation under the rule of God himself, who was their king. For their polity for the kind of it was a theocracy, over which God in an especial manner presided, as their Governor and King. And hence he affirms, that when they would choose another king over them after the
manner of the nations, that they rejected him from reigning over them, though they resolved to adhere to his laws, and the manner of government prescribed to them. And this was peculiar to that people. Hence the Sabbath amongst them came to have an absolute necessity accompanying it, of an outward carnal observance, the neglect whereof, or acting any thing against the law of it, was to be punished with death.

5. Unto this renovation of the covenant in the manner, and for the ends expressed, there was added a typical church-state, with a great number of religious laws and ordinances, in themselves carnal and weak, but mystically significant of spiritual and heavenly things; and instructive how to use the promise that was before given, for their relief from the rigour and curse of the law or covenant now proposed unto them. And in all these things did the covenant of God made with that people in the wilderness consist. The foundation, matter, manner of administration, promises, and threatenings of it, were the same with the covenant of works; but they were all accommodated to their ecclesiastical and political estate, with especial respect unto their approaching condition in the land of Canaan, only there was, in the promise, new ends and a new use given to it, with a relief against its rigour and curse.

§ 4. On the account of the accessions that were thus made to the law, and especially to the observance of the Sabbath, is it often mentioned in the Scripture, as that which God had in a peculiar manner given to the Israelites, in whose special worship it had so great a place, many of their principal ordinances having a great respect to it; it being also the only means of keeping up the solemnity of natural worship in their synagogues among the people, Acts xv. 21. Thus God says concerning them, that 'he gave them his Sabbaths in the wilderness, to be a sign between him and them, Ezek. xx. 10—12. And it is said of the same time, Neh. ix. 14, that 'he made known unto them his holy Sabbath;' that is, in the manner, and for the ends expressed. Nor is there any need why we should say, that 'he gave them' intends no more but that he restored the knowledge of the Sabbath amongst them, the memory whereof they had almost lost, although that interpretation of the expression might be justified. For he says nowhere, that he then gave his Sabbaths, but that he then peculiarly gave them unto that people, and that for the ends mentioned. For the Sabbath was originally a moral pledge and expression of God's covenant rest, and our rest in God. And now was it appointed of God, to be a sign of the special administration of the covenant which was then enacted. Hence it is said, that he gave it them as a perpetual covenant, Exod. xxxi. 16, that they might know him to be the Lord that sanctified them, ver. 13, that is, their God according to the tenor of that covenant, which was to continue throughout their generations, that is, until the new covenant should be brought in and established by Christ. Thus was it peculiarly given unto them; and so far as it was so, as it was a sign of their covenant, as it was then first given, so it is now abolished. For,

§ 5. The renovation and change of the covenant must and did introduce a change in the rest annexed to it. For a Sabbath, or a holy rest belongs to every covenant between God and man. But as for the kind and nature of it, as to its ends, use, and manner of observance, it follows the special kind or nature of that covenant wherein we at any season walk before God. Now, the original covenant of works being, in this representation of it on Sinai, not absolutely changed or abolished, but afresh represented to the people, only with a relief provided for the covenanters against its curse and
severity, with a direction how to use it to another end than was first given to it, it follows that the day of the Sabbatical rest could not be changed. And therefore, was the observance of the seventh day precisely continued, because it was a moral pledge of the rest of God in the first covenant. For this, the instructive part of the law of our creation, from God's making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh, did require. The observance of this day, therefore, was still continued among the Israelites, because the first covenant was again represented to them. But when that covenant was absolutely, and in all respects as a covenant taken away and disannulled, and that not only as to its formal efficacy, but also as to the manner of the administration of God's covenant with men, as it is under the gospel, there was a necessity that the day of rest should also be changed, as I have more fully shown elsewhere. I say then, that the precise observance of the seventh day enjoined to the Israelites, had respect to the covenant of works, wherein the foundation of it was laid, as hath been demonstrated. And the whole controversy about what day is to be observed now, as a day of holy rest to the Lord, is resolved fully into this inquiry, namely, in what covenant we do walk before God.

§ 6. And that we may understand the whole nature of the Judaical Sabbath, it must moreover, be considered, that the law in general, and all the precepts of it, was the instrument of the polity of the people under the government of God, as we before observed. For all the judgments relating to civil things, were but an application of the moral law to their state and condition. Hence, was the sanction of the transgressions of it, to be punished with death. So was it in particular with respect to the Sabbath, Num. xvi. 35, partly, that it might represent to them the original sanction of the whole law as a covenant of works, and partly to keep that stubborn people by this severity within due bounds of government. Nor was any thing punished by death judicially in the law, but the transgression of some moral command. "the hand of heaven" is threatened against their presumptuous transgressions of the ceremonial law, where no sacrifice was allowed. 'I, the Lord, will set my face against that man, and cut him off.' This also made the Sabbath a yoke and a burden, wherein their consciences could never find perfect rest. And in this sense also it is abolished and taken away.

Again, it was made a part of their law for religious worship, in their typical church state, in which, and whereby the whole dispensation of the covenant which they were under, was directed to other ends. And so it had the nature of a shadow, representing the good things to come, whereby the people were to be relieved from the rigour and curse of the whole law, as a covenant. And on these reasons, new commands were given for the observance of the Sabbath, new motives, ends, and uses were added thereto, every way to accommodate it to the dispensation of the covenant then in force, which was afterwards to be removed and taken away, and therewithal the Sabbath itself, so far as it had relation thereto. For the continuation of the seventh day precisely, belonged to the new representation that was made of the covenant of works. The representation of that covenant, with the sanction given to it, amongst the judgments of righteousness in the government of the people in the land of Canaan, which was the Lord's, and not theirs, made it a yoke and burden; and the use it was put to amongst ceremonial observances, made it a shadow; in all which respects it is abolished by Christ. To say that the Sabbath, as given to the Jews is not abolished, is to introduce the whole system of Mosaic
ordinances, which stand on the same bottom with it. And particularly the
observance of the seventh day precisely, lieth as it were in the heart of that
economy. And these things will the more clearly appear, if we consider the
dealing of God with that people about the Sabbath from first to last.

§ 7. The Jews, some of them at least, as was before discoursed, would
have not only the first revelation of the Sabbath to them, or the renovation
of its command, but its first institution absolutely, to have been in their
station at Marah, Exod. xv. The vanity of this pretence we have before
sufficiently discovered. And, whereas this was the opinion of the Tal-
mudical masters of the middle ages since Christ, they seem to have em-
braced it on the same account wherein they have invented many other
fancies. For, observing that a Sabbath was in esteem amongst the Chris-
tians, in opposition to them, they began to contend that the Sabbath was,
as they called it, the bride of the synagogue, and belonged to themselves
alone, being given to them only as a peculiar people. The vanity of this
pretence we have before laid open, and so shall not again insist upon it.

§ 8. The first peculiar dealing of God with them about the Sabbath, was
evidently in their first station at Alush, Exod. xvi: The occasion of the
whole is laid down, ver. 4, 5. 'Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold I
will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather
a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in
my laws or no. And it shall come to pass, that in the sixth day they
shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as
they gather daily.' Here is no mention of the Sabbath, nor any reason
given why they should gather a double portion on the sixth day. This
command, therefore, must needs have seemed somewhat strange to them, if
they had before no notion at all of a seventh day's sacred rest They must
otherwise have been at a great loss in themselves, why they must double
their measure on the sixth day. However, it is apparent that either they
had lost the true day they were to observe, through that long bondage in
Egypt; or knew not what belonged to the due observance and sanctification
of it. For when the people had observed this command, and gathered a
double portion of manna, to keep one part of it for the next day, although
they had experience that if at another season it were kept above one day, it
would putrefy and stink, ver. 20, the rulers of the congregation, fearing
some mistake in the matter, go and acquaint Moses with what was done
amongst them, ver. 22. Hereon Moses replieth to them, ver. 23, 'This is
that which the Lord hath said: to-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath
unto the Lord, bake that which you will bake.'

This is the first express mention of the Sabbath to, and amongst that
people. And it sufficiently declares, that this was not the absolute original
of a Sabbatical rest. It is only an appropriation and application of the old
command unto them, for the words are not preceptive, but directive. They
do not institute any thing anew, but direct in the practice of what was
before. Hence it is affirmed, ver. 29, that God gave them the Sabbath;
namely, in this new confirmation of it, and accommodation of it to their
present condition. For this new confirmation of it, by withholding of
manna on that day, belonged merely and solely unto them, and was the
special limitation of the seventh day precisely, wherein we are not con-
cerned, who do live on the true bread that came down from heaven. In
those words, therefore. 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the
Lord,' there is a certain limitation of the day, a direction for its sanctifica-
tion, as confirmed by the new sign of withholding manna, all which belonged
to them peculiarly. For this was the first time that, as a people, they observed the Sabbath, which in Egypt they could not do. And into this institution, and the authority of it, must they resolve their practice, who adhere unto the observance of the seventh day precisely. For that day is no otherwise confirmed in the decalogue, but as it had relation hereto.

§ 9. The Jews in this place fall into a double mistake about the practical observance of their Sabbath. For, from those words, 'Bake that which you will bake, and seethe that which you will seethe; and that which remaineth, lay up for you to be kept until the morning,' ver. 23, they conclude it to be unlawful to bake, or seethe any thing on the Sabbath day, whereas the words have respect only to the manna that was to be preserved. And from the words of ver. 29, 'See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore, he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide you every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day,' they have made a rule, yea, many rules, about what motions or removals are lawful on the Sabbath day, and what not. And hence, they have bound themselves with many anxious and scrupulous observances, though the injunction itself do purely and solely respect the people in the wilderness, that they should not go out into the fields to look for manna on that day; which some of them having done, ver. 27, an occasion was taken from thence for this injunction. And, hereunto do some of the heathen writers ascribe the original of the Sabbatical rest among the Jews; supposing that the seventh day after their departure out of Egypt they came to a place of rest, in remembrance whereof, they consecrated one day in seven to rest and idleness ever after, whereunto they add other fictions of a like nature. See Tacit. Hist., lib. 5.

§ 10. Not long after ensued the giving of the law on Sinai, Exod. xx.

That the decalogue is a summary of the law of nature, or the moral law, is by all Christians acknowledged, nor could the heathens of old deny it: and it is so perfectly. Nothing belongs unto that law, which is not comprised therein, nor can any one instance be given to the contrary; nor is there any thing directly and immediately in it, but what belongs to the law: only God now made in it an especial accommodation of the law of their creation to that people, whom he was in a second work now forming for himself, Isa. xliii. 19—21, li. 15, 16. And this he did, as every part of it was capable of being so accommodated. To this purpose he prefaceth the whole with an intimation of his particular covenant with them, 'I am the Lord thy God,' and added thereto the remembrance of an especial benefit, that they, and they alone, were made partakers of: 'That brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,' which he did in the pursuit of his special covenant with Abraham and his seed. This made the obligation to obedience unto the law, as promulgated on Mount Sinai, to belong to them peculiarly; to us, it is only an everlasting rule, as declarative of the will of God, and the law of our creation. The obligation, I say, that arose unto obedience, from the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai, was peculiar to the Israelites; and sundry things were then and there mixed with it, that belonged to them alone. And, whereas the mercy, the consideration whereof he proposeth as the great motive to obedience, (which was his bringing them out of Egypt, with a view to his settling of them in the land of Canaan,) was a typical mercy, it gave the whole law a station in the typical church-state, into which they were now about to be brought. It altered not the nature of the things commanded, which, for the substance of them, were all moral; but it gave their obe-
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dience to it a new and typical respect, even as it was the tenor of the covenant made with them in Sinai, with respect to the promised land of Canaan, and their typical state therein.

§ 11. This in an especial manner was the condition of the fourth commandment. Three things are distinctly proposed in it. 1. The command for an observance of a Sabbath day, ver. 8, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.' This contains the whole substance of the command, the formal reason whereof is contained in the last clause of it. 'Wherefore, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' And because of the neglect of the observance of the Sabbath in former generations; and looking forward to the many difficulties that would arise among the people in the observance of it for the future; as also because the foundation and reason of it in the law of creation, being principally external in the works and rest of God that ensued thereon, were not so absolutely ingrafted in the minds of men, as continually to evidence and manifest themselves, as do those of the other precepts; there is an especial note put upon it for remembrance. And, whereas it is a positive precept, as is that which follows it, all the rest being negatives, it stood more in need than they of a particular charge and special motives, of which nature one is added also to the next command, being in like manner a positive enunciation. Secondly. There is an express determination of this Sabbath to be one day in seven, without which it was only included in the original reason of it, ver. 9, 10. 'Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.' And herein, the day originally fixed in the covenant of works, is again limited to this people, to continue to the time of the full introduction and establishment of the new covenant. And this limitation of the seventh day, was but the renovation of the command when given to them in the way of an especial ordinance, Exod. xvi., and belongs not to the substance of the command itself. Yea, take the command itself without respect to its explications elsewhere, and it expresseth no such limitation, though virtually, because of the precedent institution, Exod. xvi. it is contained in it. Hence, thirdly, There is a prescription for the manner of its observance, accommodated to the state and condition of that people; and that two ways, 1. In comprehending things spiritual under things carnal, when the carnal are of no consideration in the worship of God, but as they necessarily attend upon things spiritual. Hence, that part of the command which concerns the manner of the observance of the Sabbath to be kept holy, is given out in a prohibition of bodily labour and work, or a command of bodily rest. But it is the expression of the rest of God, and his complacency in his works and covenant, with the sanctification of the day in obedience to his commands, in and by the holy duties of his worship, that are principally intended in it. And this he farther intimates afterwards to them, by his institution of a double sacrifice to be offered morning and evening on that day. 2. In the distribution of the people into the capital persons, with their relations, servants, and strangers, that God would have to live amongst them, and join themselves unto them. In the whole, it appears that the Sabbath is not now commanded to be observed, because it is the seventh day, as though the seventh day were first and principally intended in the command, which, as we have shown, that neither the substance of the command, nor the reason of it, with which the whole of the precept is begun and ended, will admit of; but the seventh day is commanded to be observed, because, by an antecedent institution it was made to be the Sabbath to that people, Exod. xvi., (whence it came to fall
under the command, not primarily, but reductively,) as it had been on another account from the foundation of the world. 'The Sabbath, therefore, is originally commanded as one day in seven, to be dedicated unto a holy rest. And the seventh day, if we respect the order of the days, is added, as that especial day on which God had declared that he would have at that time his Sabbath to be observed.

Now, all these things in the law of the Sabbath are Mosaic, namely, the obligation that arose to its observance, from the promulgation of the law unto that people on Sinai; the limitation of the day to the seventh or last of the week, which was necessary to that administration of the covenant, which God then made use of, and had a respect to a previous institution; the manner of its observance, suited to that servile and bondage frame of mind, which the giving of the law on Mount Sinai did generate in them, as being designed of God so to do; the ingrafting it into the system and series of religious worship then in force, by the double sacrifice annexed to it; with the various uses in, and accommodations it had to, the rule of government in the commonwealth of Israel; in all which respects it is abolished and taken away.

§ 12. God having disposed and settled the Sabbath as to the seventh day, and the manner of its observance, as a part of the covenant then made with that people, he thereon makes use of it in the same manner, and to the same ends, with the residue of the institutions and ordinances which he had then prescribed to them. This he doth, Exod. xxxi. 13—17. ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it, shall surely be put to death; for whatsoever doth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from amongst his people. Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest holy to the Lord: whosoever doth any work on the Sabbath day, shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.’ This is the next mention of the Sabbath amongst that people, wherein all that we have before laid down is fully confirmed. God had now by Moses appointed other Sabbaths, that is monthly and annual sacred rests, to be observed to himself. With these he now joins the weekly Sabbath in allusion whereunto they have that name also given to them. He had sufficiently manifested a difference between them before; for the one he pronounced himself on Mount Sinai, as part of his universal and eternal law. The other he instituted by revelation to Moses, as that which peculiarly belonged to them. The one was grounded on a reason wherein they had no more concern or interest, than all the rest of mankind; namely, God’s rest from his works, and being refreshed thereon, upon the creation of the world, and the establishment of his covenant with man; the other, all built on reasons peculiar to themselves, and that church-state whereinto they were admitted. But here the Sabbaths of both these kinds are brought under the same command, and designed to the same ends and purposes. Now the sole reason hereof lies in those temporary and ceremonial additions which we have manifested to have been made to the original law of the Sabbath, in its accommodation to their
church-state, with the place which it held therein, as we shall see yet farther in particular.

§ 13. The occasion of this renovation of the command, was the building of the tabernacle, which was now designed, and forthwith to be undertaken. And with respect hereunto, there was a double reason for the repetition of this command. First. Because that work was for a holy end, and so upon the matter a holy work, and whereon the people were very intent; hence they might have supposed, that it would have been lawful for them to have attended to it on the Sabbath days. This therefore God expressly forbids, that they might have no pretence for the transgression of his command. And therefore is the penalty annexed to it, so expressly here appointed and mentioned. Secondly. As the tabernacle now to be built, was the only seat of that solemn instituted worship, which God was now setting up amongst them, so the Sabbath being the great means of its continuance and performance, this they were now to be severely minded of, lest by their neglect and forgetfulness thereof, they might come to a neglect and contempt of all that worship, which was as it were built upon it. And as we observed before more than once, the weekly Sabbath being inserted into the economy of their laws, as to the matter of works and rest, it is comprised in the general with other feasts called Sabbaths also. ‘Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep. And in this regard, they are all cast together by our apostle, Col. ii. 10, ‘or of the Sabbath days.’ And they who by virtue of this and the like commands, would bind us up to the Judaical Sabbath, do certainly lose both that, and all other ground for the observance of any Sabbath at all. For observe that in what respects it is joined with the other Sabbaths by Moses, in the same it is taken away with them by the apostle.

§ 14. There is a triple appropriation of the weekly Sabbaths in this place, made to the church of the Israelites. 1. In that the observance of it is required of them in their generations, that is, during the continuance of that church-state, which was to abide to the coming of Christ. For what was required of them in their generations, as it was required, was then to expire and be abolished. 2. That they were to observe it as a perpetual covenant, or as a part of that covenant which God then made with them, which is called everlasting, because it was to be so to them, seeing God would never make any other peculiar covenant with them. And whereas all the statutes and ordinances that God then gave them belonged unto, and altogether entirely made up that covenant, some of these, as this especial command for the Sabbath, and that of circumcision, are distinctly called the covenant, and ceased with it. 3. It was given unto them as an especial pledge of the covenant that God then made with them, wherein he rested in his worship, and brought them to rest therein in the land of Canaan, whereby they entered into God’s rest. Hence it is called a sign between them, Exod. xxxi. 13, 14, which is repeated and explained, Ezek. xx. 12. A sign it was, or an evident expression of the present covenant of God between them and him, not a sacramental or typical sign of future grace in particular, any otherwise than as their whole constitution, and their worship in general, whereof these means it was made a part, were so; that is, not in itself or its own nature, but as prescribed unto them.

And a present sign between God and them it was, upon a double account. 1. On the part of the people. Their assembling on that day for the celebration of the worship of God, and the avowing him alone therein to be their God, was a sign, or an evident express acknowledgment, that
they were the people of the Lord. And this doth not in the least impeach its original morality, seeing there is no moral duty, but in its exercise or actual performance may be so made a sign. 2. On the part of God, namely, that it was he who sanctified them. For by this observance, they had a visible pledge that God had separated them unto and for himself, and therefore had given them his word and ordinances, as the outward means of their further sanctification, to be peculiarly attended to on that day. And on these grounds it is, that God is elsewhere said to give them his Sabbaths, to reveal them unto them, as their peculiar privilege and advantage. And their privilege it was; for although in comparison of the substance and glory of things to be brought in by Christ, with the liberty and spirituality of gospel worship, all their ordinances and institutions were a yoke of bondage, yet considering their use, with their end and tendency, compared with the rest of the world at that time, they were an un-speakable privilege, Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20. However therefore the Sabbath was originally given before to all mankind, yet God now by the addition of his institutions to be observed on that day, whereby he sanctified the people, made an inclosure of it so far unto them alone. Lastly, Here is added a peculiar sanction, under the penalty of death. 'He that transgresseth it, shall surely be put to death,' Exod. xxxi. 14. God sometimes threateneth cutting off and extermination to persons, concerning whom yet the people had no warrant to proceed capitally against them; only he took it upon himself, as the supreme Legislator and Ruler of that people, to destroy them and cut them off, as they speak, by the hand of heaven. But wherever this expression is used, he shall surely be put to death, מנה תחת, dying he shall die, there the people, or the judges among them, are not only warranted, but commanded to proceed judicially against such an offender. And in this respect it belonged to that severe government which that people stood in need of, as also to mind them of the sanction of the whole law of creation as a covenant of works, with the same commendation of death unto all transgressors. In all these regards, the Sabbath was Judaical, and is absolutely abolished and taken away.

§ 15. The command is renewed again, Exod. xxxiv. 21, 'Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest, in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest.' Earing time and harvest are the seasons wherein those who till the ground are most intent upon their occasions, and do most hardly bear with intermissions, because they may be greatly to their damage. Wherefore they are insisted on, or specified to manifest that no avocation nor pretence can justify men in working or in labouring on that day. For by expressing earing and harvest, all those intervenings also are intended in those seasons, wherein damage and loss might redound to men, by omitting the gathering in of their corn. And it should seem on this ground, that on that day they might not labour, neither to take it away before a flood, nor remove it from an approaching fire. So some of the masters think, although our Saviour convinces them from their own practice, in relieving cattle fallen into pits on that day, Luke xiv. 5, and by loosing them that were tied, to lead them to watering, ch. xiii. 15, that they did not conceive this universally to be the intendment of that law, that in no case any work was to be done. And it seems that they were wiser for their asses in those days, than the poor wretch was for himself in latterages, who falling into the jakes at Tewkesbury on that day, would not suffer himself to be drawn out, if the story be truly reported in our Chronicles. In general, I doubt not but that this additional explanation in a way of severity, is
in its proper sense purely Judaical, and contains something more of rigi-
dness than is required by the law of the Sabbath as purely moral.

§ 16. It is mentioned again with a new addition, Exod. xxxv. 2, 3. 'Six
days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you a
holy day, a Sabbath of rest unto the Lord: whosoever doth work therein
shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations
on the Sabbath day.' Here again the penalties, and the prohibition of
kindling fire, are Mosaic; and so is, on their account, the whole command as
here renewed, though there be that in it, which for the substance of it is
moral. And here the seventh day precisely is made שֵׁם 'holiness' unto
them, (or שֵׁם חַסְדָּא, a 'convocation of holiness,' a holy convocation, as it
is expressed, Lev. xxiii. 2, where these words are again repeated) whose
profanation was to be avenged with death. The prohibition also added
about 'kindling of fire' in their habitations, hath been the occasion of many
anxious observances among the Jews. They all agree that the kindling of
fire for profit and advantage in kilns and oasts, for the making of brick, or
drying of corn, or for founding or melting metals, is here forbidden. But
what need was there that so it should be, seeing all these things are ex-
pressly forbidden in the command in general? 'Thou shalt do no manner of
work;' somewhat more is intended. They say therefore, that it is the
kindling of fire for the dressing of victuals; and this indeed seems to be
the intention of this special law, as the manna that was to be eaten on
the Sabbath was to be prepared on the 'parasceue.' But withal I say, this
is a new additional law, and purely Mosaic; the original law of the Sab-
bath making no entrenchment on the ordinary duties of human life, as we
shall see afterwards. Whether it forbade the kindling of fire for light and
heat, I much question. The present Jews in most places, employ Christian
servants about such works. For the poor wretches care not what is done
to their advantage; so they do it not themselves. But these and the like
precepts belonged unquestionably unto their pedagogy, and were separable
from the original law of the Sabbath.

§ 17. Lastly. The whole matter is stated, Deut. v. 15, where, after the
repetition of the commandment, it is added, 'And remember that thou
wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought
thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; there-
fore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.' The
mercy and benefit they had received in their deliverance from Egypt, is
given as the reason, not why they should keep the Sabbath, as it was
proposed as a motive unto the observance of the whole law in the preface
of the decalogue, but wherefore God gave them the law of it to keep and
observe. 'Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sab-
bath.' Now the reason of the command of a Sabbatical rest absolutely,
God had every-where declared to be, his making the world in six days, and
resting on the seventh. The mention whereof in this place is wholly
omitted, because an especial application of the law unto that people is in-
tended. So that it is evident, that the Mosaic Sabbath was on many ac-
counts, and in many things, distinguished from that of the decalogue, which
is a moral duty. For the deliverance of the people out of Egypt, which
was a benefit peculiar to themselves, and typical of spiritual mercies unto
others, was the reason of the institution of the Sabbath as it was Mosaic;
which it was not nor could be of the Sabbath absolutely, although it might
be pressed on that people as a considerable motive, why they ought to en-
deavour the keeping of the whole law.
§ 18. From all that hath been discoursed, it appears, that the observance of the seventh day precisely from the beginning of the world, belonged unto the covenant of works; not as a covenant, but as a covenant of works, founded in the law of creation. And that in the administration of that covenant, which was revived, and to certain ends reinforced unto the church of Israel in the wilderness, it was bound on them by an especial ordinance to be observed throughout their generations, or during the continuance of their church state. Moreover, that as to the manner of the observance required by the law, as delivered on Mount Sinai, it was a yoke and burden to the people, because that dispensation of the law gendered to bondage, Gal. iv. 23. For it begot a spirit of fear and bondage in all that were its children and subject to its power. In this condition of things, it was applied to sundry ends in their typical state, in which regard it was a shadow of good things to come. And so also was it in respect of those other additional institutions, and prohibitions which were inseparable from its observance amongst them, whereof we have spoken. On all these accounts I doubt not but that the Mosaic Sabbath, and the manner of its observance, is under the gospel utterly taken away. But as for the weekly Sabbath, as required by the law of our creation, reinforced in the decalogue, the summary representation of that great original law, the observance of it is a moral duty, which by divine authority is translated unto another day.

The ancient Jews have a saying which by the later masters is abused, but a truth is contained in it, that the Sabbath gives firmitude and strength to all the affairs of this world. For it may be understood of the blessing of God, on the due observance of his worship on that day. Hence it was, they say, that any young clean beast that was to be offered in sacrifice, must continue seven days with the dam, and not be offered until the eighth, Lev. xxii. 27. That a child was not to be circumcised until the eighth day, that there might be an interposition of a Sabbath for their benediction. And it is not unlikely that the eighth day was also signalized hereby, as that which was to succeed in the room of the seventh, as shall be manifested in our next discourse.

EXERCITATION XXXIX.

FIFTH EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

§ 1. A summary of what hath been proved, a progress to the Lord's day. § 2. The new creation of all things in Christ, the foundation of gospel-obedience and worship. § 3. The old and new creation compared. § 4. The old and new covenant. § 5. Distinct ends of these covenants. § 6. Supposition of the heads of things before confirmed. § 7. Foundation of the Lord's day on those suppositions. § 8. Christ the author of the new creation; his works therein. § 9. His rest from his works, the indication of a new day of rest. § 10. Observed by the apostles. § 11. Proof of the Lord's day from Heb. iv. proposed. § 12. The words of the text. § 13. Design of the apostle in general. § 14. His answer to an objection, with his general argument. § 15. The nature of the rests treated of by him. § 16. The church under the law of nature, and its rest. § 17. The church under the law of institution, and its rest. § 18. The church under the gospel,
and its rest. § 19. The foundation of it. § 20. Christ's works and his rest intended, "
Heb. iv. 10. § 21. This farther proved by sundry arguments. § 22. What were his works whereby the church was founded. § 23. His entrance into his rest, not in his death, but in his resurrection. § 24. The day of rest limited and determined hereby, § 25. The Sabbatism that remains for the people of God. § 26. The sending of the Holy Ghost. § 27. Church assemblies on the first day of the week. § 28. The Lord's day, Rev. i. 10. § 29. The sum of the preceding discourse. § 30. Necessity of the religious observance of one day in seven. § 31. Blessing of God on the church-worship on the first day. § 32. Of the seventh day Sabbath, Judaism restored in it. Of the Ebionites. § 33. Schisms perpetuated by the opinion of the seventh day Sabbath. § 34. Penalty of the law reinforced with it. § 35. The whole legal.

§ 1. How the creation of all things was finished, and how the rest of God and man ensued thereon, hath been declared. It hath also in part, and sufficiently as to our present purpose, been evidenced how the great ends of the creation of all in the glory of God, and the blessedness of man in him with the pledge thereof in a Sabbatical rest, were for a season as it were defeated and disappointed, by the entrance of sin, which brake the covenant that was founded in the law of creation, and rendered it useless to those ends. For the law became weak through sin and the flesh, or the corruption of our nature, that ensued thereon, Rom. viii. 5. Hence it could no more bring man to rest in God. But yet a continuation of the obligatory force of that law and covenant with the direction of it unto other ends and purposes, than at first given unto them, was under the Old Testament designed of God, and hath been declared also. Hence was the continuation of the original Sabbatical rest, in the church of Israel, with the special application of its command unto that people, insisted on in the preceding discourse. In this state of things, God had of old determined the renovation of all by a new creation; a new law of that creation, a new covenant, and a new Sabbatical rest, unto his own glory by Jesus Christ; and these things are now to be discussed.

§ 2. The renovation of all things by Jesus Christ, is prophesied of and foretold as a new creation of all, even of the heavens and the earth, and all things contained in them, Isa. lxv. 17, 18, lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13. Hence the state of things to be introduced thereby, was under the Old Testament called the world to come, Heb. ii. 5. So it is still called by the Jewish masters ס分かり ומלעב המא. So Kimchi, amongst other expositions of the title of Psalm xcii. 'A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath day,' adds this, as that which the most ancient Rabbins fixed on, יבג'הניר נלאת עגילשב ר' They interpreted it of the world to come, which shall be wholly Sabbath and rest, and these are the days of the Messiah. A spiritual rest it is they intend, and not a cessation of a Sabbath day in particular; seeing in the prophecy of the new temple, or church-state in those days, there is especial direction given for the service of the Sabbath day, Ezek. xlvi. 4.

And this renovation of all things is said to be accordingly accomplished in Christ, 2 Cor. v. 17, 18. 'Old things are passed away, behold all things are become new;' the old law, old covenant, old worship, old Sabbath, all that was peculiar unto the covenant of works as such, in the first institution of it, and in its renewed declaration on mount Sinai, all are gone, and antiquated. What now remains of them as to any usefulness in our living to God, doth not abide on the old foundation, but on a new disposition of them by the renovation of all things in Christ. 'For in the dispensation of the fulness of times, God gathered unto a head all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.' Eph. i. 10. The whole
old creation, as far as it had any thing in itself, or its order that belonged unto, or communicated any thing towards our living unto God and his glory, is disposed anew in Christ Jesus unto that end.

But this renovation of all, which is the foundation of all our acceptable obedience unto God, and of his present worship, consists principally in the regeneration of the elect, making them new creatures, and in the erection of a new church-state thereby to the glory of God. Now this new creation of all, must answer unto all the ends of the old, in reference to the glory of God and the good of them who are partakers of it; otherwise it would not be so rightly called, nor answer the declared end of it, which was to gather all things to a head in Christ Jesus. For what was lost by sin, as to the glory of God, in the old creation, in this, was to be repaired and recovered.

§ 3. We may then, as the foundation of our present discourse, consider how these things answer unto one another. First. The old creation comprised in it the law of the obedience of all creatures unto God: this was therein and thereby implanted in their natures, with inclinations, natural or moral, unto the observance of it. And thus must it be also in the new creation, as unto the subject of it, which is the church. This law of the old creation unto man, consisted principally in the image of God in him, and concreted with him. For hereby did he both know his duty, and was enabled to perform it, and was acquainted with his relation unto God, and dependence upon him, which rendered it necessary and indispensablc. But this law in the state of creation, fell under a double consideration, or had a double use, first as a rule, and then as a principle. As a rule, the light that was in the mind of man, which was a principal part of the image of God in him, acquainted him with his whole duty, and directed him in the right performance of it. As a principle, it respected the ability that the whole man was endowed withal, to live to God according to his duty. As this law as to its first use, was much impaired, weakened, and in a great measure made useless by sin; God was pleased to restore it in the vocal revelation of his will, especially in the decalogue, which with his own finger he wrote on tables of stone. In answer hereunto, a new law of obedience is introduced by the new creation in Christ Jesus. And this principally consisted in the renovation of the image of God in the new creatures, which was lost by sin; ‘For they are renewed in the spirit of their minds, and do put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,’ Eph. iv. 23, 24. This fully answers to the first law, as it was a principle of light, and power unto obedience. And it also in a great measure supplies the loss of it, as it was a rule. For there is a great renovation thereof, in God’s writing his law in our hearts, not here to be insisted on. But in this new creation God designed to gather up into one head in Christ all that was passed in the old creation and in the law thereof and in the continuation of it, by writing under the Old Testament. Wherefore he transfers to this state, the use of the first law, as renewed and represented in tables of stone, for a directive rule of obedience unto the new creature; whereby the first original law is wholly supplied. To this he makes an addition of what positive law he thinks meet, as he did also under the old law of creation, for the trial of our obedience, and for our furtherance in it. So the moral law of our obedience in each condition, the old and the new, is materially the same; nor is it possible that it should be otherwise. But yet this old law, as brought over into this new estate, is new also. For ‘all things are become new.’ And it is now the rule of our obedience, not merely and absolutely unto God as
the creator, the first cause and last end of all, but as unto God in Christ, bringing us into a new relation unto himself. In the renovation then of the image of God in our souls, and in the transferring of the moral law as a rule, accompanied with new distinct principles, motives, and ends, both the law of the new creation consist, and fully answer the law of the first, as it was a principle and a rule; each of them having their peculiar positive laws annexed unto them.

§ 4. Secondly, The law of creation had a covenant included in it, or inseparably annexed unto it. This we have before declared, as also what belonged thereunto, or ensued necessarily thereon. Thus therefore must it also be in the new creation, and in the law thereof. Yea, because the covenant is that which as it were gathered all things together, both in the works and law of God, and in our obedience, disposing them into that order which tendeth to the glory of God, and to the blessedness of the creatures in him; this is that which in both creations is principally to be considered. For without this, no end of God in his works or law, could be attained; nor could man be made blessed in a way of righteousness and goodness unto his glory. And the law of creation no otherwise failed, nor became useless as to its first end by sin; but that the covenant of it was thereby broken and rendered useless, as to the bringing of man into the enjoyment of God. This therefore was principally regarded in the new creation, namely, the making, confirming, and ratifying of a new covenant. And the doing hereof, was the great promise under the Old Testament, Jer. xxxi. 32, whereby the believers who then lived, were made partakers of the benefits of it. And the confirming of this covenant in and by Christ, is expressed as a part of the new creation, Heb. viii. 9, and it is indeed comprehensive of the whole work of it.

§ 5. Thirdly. The immediate end of the old covenant, was to bring man by due obedience unto the rest of God. This God declared in, and unto his inbred native light, by his works and his rest that ensued thereon; and by the day of rest which he instituted as a pledge thereof, and as a means of attaining it, by that obedience which was required in the covenant. This we have before declared, and this was the true original and end of the first Sabbatical rest. All these things therefore must have place also in the new covenant, belonging unto the new creation. The immediate end of it, is our entering into the rest of God, as the apostle proves at large, Heb. iv. But herein we are not absolutely to enter into God's rest, as a creator and a rewarder, but into the rest of God in Christ, the nature whereof will be fully explained in our exposition of that chapter. For obedience is now to be yielded unto God not absolutely, but to God in Christ, and with that respect therefore, we are to enter into rest. The foundation hereof must lie in the works of God in the new creation, and the complacency with rest which he took therein. For all our rest in God, is founded in his own rest in his works. For a pledge hereof, a day of rest must be given and observed; the reasons and necessity whereof we have explained and confirmed in our preceding discourses. This, as hath been shown, originally was the seventh day of the week. But, as the apostle tells us in another case, the 'priesthood being changed, there must also of necessity a change of the law ensue;' so the covenant being changed, and the rest which was the end of it being changed, and the way of entering into the rest of God being changed, a change of the day of rest must of necessity thereon ensue. And no man can assert the same day of rest precisely to abide, as of old, but he must likewise assert the same law, the same covenant,
the same rest of God, the same way of entering into it, which yet, as all acknowledgment, are changed. The day first annexed unto the covenant of works, that is, the seventh day, was continued under the Old Testament, because the outward administration of that covenant was continued. A relief indeed was provided against the curse and penalty of it, but in the administration of it, the nature, promises, and threatenings of that covenant, though with other ends and purposes, were represented unto the people. But now that covenant being absolutely abolished, both as to its nature, use, efficacy, and power, no more to be represented nor proposed unto believers, the whole of it, and its renewed administration under the Old Testament being removed, taken away, and disappearing, Heb. viii. 13, the precise day of rest belonging unto it, was to be changed also, and so it has come to pass.

§ 6. We must here suppose, what hath been before proved and confirmed, namely, that there was a day of holy rest unto God, necessary to be observed by the law and covenant of nature, or works. Indeed, neither of the covenants could be complete, without a day of holy rest; considering these covenants, as the rule and means of man's living unto God, and of his coming to the enjoyment of him. We must also suppose, that this day was in the innate right of nature, as directed by the works of God, designed and proposed unto it for that purpose, to be one day in seven. This was it to learn, and this it did learn, from God's creating the world in six days, and resting on the seventh; for God affirms every-where, that because he did so, therefore it was the duty of man to labour on six days, as his occasions do require, and to rest on the seventh. This therefore they were taught by those works and rest of God, or it could not be proposed as the reason of their suitable practice; and for this end did God so work and rest. The law, therefore, of his holy rest, he reneweth in the decalogue, amongst those other laws, which being of the same nature and origin, namely, branches of the law of our creation, were to be unto us moral and eternal. For God would no longer entrust his mind and will in that law, to the depraved nature of man, wherein, if he had not in the best, often guided and directed it by fresh extraordinary revelations, it would have been of little use to his glory; but committed it by vocal revelation to the minds of the people, as the doctrinal object of their consideration, and recorded it in tables of stone. Moreover, the nature of the first covenant, and the way of God's instructing man in the condition of it by his works and rest, had limited this holy day unto the seventh day, the observance whereof was to be commensurate unto that covenant, and its administration, however the outward forms thereof might be varied.

§ 7. On these suppositions we lay, and ought to lay the observance of the Lord's day under the New Testament, according to the institution of it, or declaration of the mind of Christ, who is our Lord and lawgiver concerning it. 1. A new work of creation, or a work of a new creation is undertaken and completed, Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22, 23; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxvi. 1; Rom. viii. 19, 20; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. 2. This new creation is accompanied with a new law, and a new covenant; or the law of faith, and the covenant of grace, Rom. iii. 27, viii. 2–4; Jer. xxxi. 32–34; Heb. viii. 8–13. 3. Unto this law and covenant a day of holy rest unto the Lord doth belong, which cannot be the same day with the former, no more than it is the same law, or the same covenant, which were originally given unto us, Heb. iv. 9; Rev. i. 10. 4. That this day was limited and determined to the first day of the week by our Lord Jesus Christ, is that
which shall now further be confirmed; only, I must desire the reader to consider, that whereas the topical arguments whereby this truth is confirmed, have been pleaded, improved, and vindicated by many of late, I shall but briefly mention them, and insist principally on the declaration of the proper grounds and foundations of it.

§ 8. As our Lord Jesus Christ, as the eternal Son and Wisdom of the Father, was the immediate cause and author of the old creation, John i. 3; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2, 10, so as Mediator he was the author of this new creation, Heb. iii. 3, 4, ‘He built the house of God;’ he built all these things, and is God. Herein he wrought, and in the accomplishment of it, saw of the travail of his soul and was satisfied, Isa. liii. 11, that is, he rested and was refreshed. Herein he gave a new law of life, faith, and obedience to God, Isa. xlili. 4, not by an addition of new precepts to the moral law of God, not virtually comprised therein, and distinct from his own positive institutions of worship, but in his revelation of that new way of obedience unto God in and by himself, with the especial causes, means, and ends of it, which supplies the use and end whereunto the moral law was at first designed, Rom. viii. 2, 3, x. 3, 4, whereby he becomes ‘the Author of eternal salvation unto all that do obey him,’ Heb. v. 9. This law of life and obedience he writes by his Spirit in the hearts of his people, that they may be willing in the day of his power, Ps. ex. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6; Heb. viii. 10, not at once, and in the foundation of his work actually, but only in the causes of it. For as the law of nature should have been implanted in the hearts of men in their conception, and natural nativity, had that dispensation of righteousness continued; so in the new birth of them that believe in him, is this law written in their hearts in all generations, John iii. 6. Hereon was the covenant established, and all the promises thereof, of which he was the Mediator, Heb. viii. 6. And for a holy day of rest, for the ends before declared, and on the suppositions before laid down, evincing the necessity of such a day, he determined the observance of the first day of the week. For,

§ 9. First. On this day he rested from his works in and by his resurrection; for then had he laid the foundation of the new heavens and new earth, and finished the works of the new creation, when all the stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. On this day he rested from his works, and was refreshed, as God rested from his works, and was refreshed. For although he worketh hitherto, in the communication of his Spirit and graces, as the Father continued to do in his works of providence, after the finishing the works of the old creation, though these works belonged thereto; yet he ceaseth absolutely from that kind of work whereby he laid the foundation of the new creation: henceforth he dieth no more. And on this day was he refreshed in the view of his works, for he saw that it was exceeding good. Now, as God’s rest, and his being refreshed in his work, on the seventh day of old, was a sufficient indication of the precise day of rest, which he would have observed under the administration of that original law and covenant, so the rest of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his being refreshed in and from his works on the first day, is a sufficient indication of the precise day of rest, to be observed under the dispensation of the new covenant, now confirmed and established.

And the church of Christ could not pass one week under the New Testament, or in a gospel state of worship, without this indication. For the Judaical Sabbath, as sure as it was so, and as sure as it was annexed unto the Mosaic administration of the covenant, was so far abolished, as not to oblige
really the disciples of Christ in conscience to the observance of it, whatever any of them might for a season apprehend. And if a new day was not now determined, there was no day or season appointed for an observance of a holy rest to the Lord, nor any pledge given us of our entering into the rest of Christ. And those who say, that it is required that some time be set apart unto the ends of a Sabbatical rest, but that there is no divine indication of that time, when, nor what it is, or shall be; if we consider what are the ends of such a rest, as before declared, must allow us to expect firmer proofs of their uncouth assertion, than any with which as yet we have met.

§ 10. Accordingly this indication of the gospel day of rest and worship, was embraced by the apostles, who were to be as the chief corner stones, and the foundation of the Christian church. For immediately hereon they assembled themselves on that day, and were confirmed in their obedience by the grace of our Lord, in meeting with them thereon, John xx. 19, 26. And it seems that on this day only he appeared unto them, when they were assembled together, although occasionally he showed himself to sundry of them at other seasons. Hence he left Thomas under his doubts a whole week, before he gave him his gracious conviction, that he might do it in the assembly of his disciples on the first day of the week. From which time forward this day was never without its solemn assemblies, as shall further be cleared afterwards.

§ 11. Now because I am persuaded that the substance of all that we have laid down and pleaded for, in all the preceding discourses, especially in what we have proposed concerning the foundation and causes of the Lord's day, is taught by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. iv. I shall here present the sum of his design and scope in that place, from verse 3, to verse 11, and I shall apply it to our present purpose, referring the reader for farther satisfaction, unto our full exposition of the chapter itself. For this place is touched on by all who have contended about the origin and duration of the Sabbatical rest, but it has not yet, that I know of, been diligently examined by any. I shall not fear to lay much of the weight of the cause wherein I am engaged upon it, and therefore shall take a view of the whole context, and of the design of the apostle therein.

§ 12. The words of the apostle are, 'For we which have believed do enter into rest; as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, If they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into my rest. Seeing, therefore, that it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief; (Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day, after so long a time; as it is said, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day. There remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he hath also ceased from his own works, as God did from his,) Heb. iv. 3—11.

§ 13. The design of the apostle in this discourse, is to confirm what he had laid down, and positively asserted in the beginning of the chapter. Now this is, 'That there is yet under the gospel a promise of entering into the rest of God, left or remaining unto believers; and that they do enter into that rest, by mixing the promise of it with faith.' This he declares, and the declaration was useful to, and necessary for the Hebrews. For he lets
them know, that notwithstanding their present and ancient enjoyment of the land of Canaan, with the worship and rest of God therein, which their forefathers fell short of by their unbelief, they were under a new trial, a new rest being proposed to them in the promise. This he proves by a testimony out of the xcvth Psalm, the words whereof he had insisted on at large, ch. iii. and doth so again in this. But the application of that testimony to his purpose, is obnoxious to a great objection. For the rest mentioned in that Psalm, seems to be a rest long since past and enjoyed, either by themselves or others. They therefore could have no new or fresh concern in it, nor be in danger of coming short of it. And if this were so, all the arguments and exhortations of the apostle in this place, must needs be weak and inelegant, as drawn from a mistaken and misapplied testimony.

§ 14. To remove this objection, and thereby confirm his former assertions and exhortations thereon, is the design of the apostle in this discourse.

To this end he proceeds to the exposition and vindication of the testimony itself, which he had cited out of the Psalms. And herein he shows, from the proper signification of the words, from the time when, and from the persons to whom they were spoken, that no other rest was intended in them, but what was now by him proposed unto them, as the rest of God and his people in the gospel.

The general argument which to this purpose he insists upon, consists in an enumeration of all the several rests of God and his people, which are mentioned in the Scriptures. For, from the consideration of them all, he proves that no other rest could be intended in the words of David, but only the rest of the gospel, whereinto they enter who do believe.

Moreover, from that respect which the words of the Psalmist have to the other foregoing rests of God and his people, he manifests that they also were appointed of God, to be representations of that spiritual rest, which was now brought in and established. This is the general design of this discourse.

In pursuit hereof, he declares in particular, 1. That the rest mentioned in the Psalm is not that which ensued immediately on the creation of all things. This he evinceth, because it was spoken of afterwards, a long time after, and that to another purpose, ver. 4, 5. 2. That it was not the rest of the land of Canaan, because that was not entered into by them to whom it was first proposed and promised, for they came short of it by their unbelief, and perished in the wilderness; but this rest which is now afresh proposed, is such as the people of God must and will enter into, ver. 6, 7. 3. Whereas it may be objected, that although the wilderness generation entered not in, yet their posterity did enter under the conduct of Joshua, ver. 8, he answers, that this rest in the Psalm being proposed and promised in David so long a time (above 400 years) after the people had quietly possessed the land whereinto they were conducted by Joshua, it must needs be that another rest, then yet to come, was intended in those words of the Psalmist, ver. 9. And, 4. To conclude his argument, he declares that this new rest had a new peculiar foundation, which the other had no interest or concern in, namely, his ceasing from his works, and entering into his rest, who is the author of it, ver. 10. This is his way and manner of arguing for the proof of what he had before laid down, and which he issueth in that conclusion, ver. 9, ‘There remaineth, therefore, a rest for the people of God.

§ 15. But we must yet further consider the nature of the several rests
here discoursed of by the apostle, which will give light and confirmation to what we have before discoursed. To this purpose will the ensuing propositions taken from the words conduce:

1. The rest of God is the foundation and principal cause of our rest. Hence, in general it is still called God's rest, 'if they shall enter into my rest.' It is on some account or other, God's rest before it is ours; not the rest only which he hath appointed, commanded, and promised unto us, but the rest wherewith himself rested, as is plainly declared on every head of the rest here treated of. And this confirms that foundation and reason of a Sabbatical rest, which we have laid down in our third Excercitation.

God's rest is not spoken of absolutely, with respect unto himself only, but with reference to an appointed rest that ensued thereon, for the church to rest with him in. Hence it follows that the rests here mentioned are as it were double, namely, the rest of God himself, and the rest that ensued for us to enter into. For instance, at the finishing of the works of creation, which is first proposed, 'God ceased from his works and rested.' This was his own rest, the nature whereof hath been before declared, he 'rested on the seventh day.' But this was not all, he 'blessed' it for the rest of man, a rest for us ensuing on his rest, an expressive representation of it, and a pledge of our entering into, or being taken into a participation of the rest of God.

3. The apostle proposeth the threefold state of the church to consideration. 1. The state of it under the law of nature or creation. 2. The state of it under the law of institutions and carnal ordinances. 3. That, then introducing under the gospel. Accordingly, have we distinguished our discourses concerning a Sabbatical rest, in our third and fourth, and this present Excercitation. To each of these he assigns a distinct rest of God, a rest of the church, entering into God's rest, and a day of rest as the means and pledge thereof. And withal, he manifests that the two former were ordered to be previous representations of the latter, though not equally, nor on the same account.

First. He considers the church, and the state of it under the law of nature, before the entrance of sin; and herein he shows first that there was a rest of God in it, for saith he, 'the works were finished from the foundation of the world, and God did rest from all his works,' ver. 3, 4. As the foundation of all, he layeth down first the works of God. For the church, and every peculiar state of the church is founded in the work, some especial work of God, and not merely in a law or command. 'The works,' saith he, 'were finished from the foundation of the world, τὰ ἐργα, the works, ἡ συνάρμολος, 'the work' that is of God, the effect of his creating power was finished or completed, ἀπὸ κατασκευῆς κοσμοῦ, from the foundation of the world; a periphrasis of the six original days wherein time and all things measured by it, and existent with it, had their beginning. This work of God, as hath been proved, Excercit. 3, was the foundation of the church in the state of nature, and gave to it the entire law of its obedience.

On this work, and the completing of it, ensued the rest of God himself, ver. 4, 'God rested the seventh day from all his works.' This rest of God, and the refreshment which he took in his works, as comprising the law and covenant of our obedience, have been explained already.

But this alone doth not confirm, nor indeed come near the purpose or argument of the apostle. For he is to speak of such a rest of God, as men might enter into, as was a foundation of rest unto them, or otherwise his discourse was not concerned in it; whereupon, by a citation of the words of
Moses from Gen. ii. 2, he tells us that the rest of God was on the seventh day, which God accordingly blessed and sanctified, to be a day of rest unto man. So that in this state of the church there were three things considerable: 1. The rest of God himself on his works, wherein the foundation of the church was laid. 3. A rest proposed to man to enter into with God, wherein lay the duty of the church. And, 3. A day of rest, the seventh day, as a remembrance of the one, and a means and pledge of the other. And, herewith we principally confirm our judgment of the Sabbath's beginning with the world. For without this supposition, the mentioning of God's work and his rest, no way belonged to the purpose of our apostle. For he discourseth only of such rests as men might enter into, and have a pledge of. And there was no such thing from the foundation of the world, unless the Sabbath were then revealed. Nor is it absolutely the work and rest of God, but the obedience of men, and their duty with respect unto these, which he considers. And this could not be, unless the rest of God was proposed to men to enter into, from the foundation of the world.

§ 17. Secondly. The apostle considers the church under the law of institutions; and herein he representeth the rest of the land of Canaan, wherein also the three distinct rests before mentioned do occur.

1. There was in it a rest of God. This gives denomina tion to the whole. He still calls it his rest, 'if they shall enter into my rest.' And the prayer about it was, 'Arise, O Lord, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength,' or the pledge of his presence and rest. And this rest also ensued upon his work, for God wrought great and mighty works, in bringing the Israelites into Canaan, and ceased from them when they were finished. And this work of his answered in its greatness to the work of creation, whereunto it is compared by himself, Isa. li. 15, 16, 'I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared, the Lord of hosts is his name, and have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered me in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundation of the earth, and say unto Zion, thou art my people.' The dividing of the sea whose waves roared, is put by a synecdoche for the whole work of God, preparing a way for the church-state of that people in the land of Canaan. And this he compares to the work of creation, in 'planting the heavens, and laying the foundation of the earth.' For, although those words are but a metaphorical expression of the political and church-state of that people, yet there is an evident allusion in them to the original creation of all things. This was the work of God, upon the finishing whereof, he entered into his rest, in the satisfaction and complacency that he had therein. For after the erection of his worship in the land of Canaan, he says of it, 'This is my rest, and here will I dwell.'

2. God having thus entered into his rest in like manner as formerly, two things ensue thereon: 1. That the people are invited and encouraged to enter into the rest of God. This the apostle treats concerning, in this and the foregoing chapter; and this their entrance into rest, was their coming by faith and obedience, into a participation of the worship of God wherein he rested, as a means and pledge of their everlasting rest in him. And, although some of them came short hereof, by reason of their unbelief, yet others entered into it under the conduct of Joshua. 2. Both these, his own rest, and the rest of the people, God expressed by appointing a day of rest. This he did, that it might be a token, sign, and pledge, not now, as given to this people absolutely of his first rest at the creation, but of his present rest in his instituted worship; and to be a means in the solemn observance
of that worship, to further their entrance into his rest eternally. Hence, had the seventh day a peculiar institution among the people, whereby it was made unto them a sign and token, that he was their God, and they were his people. And here lies the foundation of all that we have before dis- coursed concerning the Judaical Sabbath, in the preceding Exercitation.

It is true, this day was the same in order of the days with that before observed; namely, the seventh day of the week. But it was now re- estab- lished upon new considerations, and to new ends and purposes. The time of the change of the day was not yet come, for this work was but prepara- tory for a greater. And the covenant whereunto the seventh day was originally annexed, being not yet to be abolished, that day was not to be yet changed, nor another to be substituted in the room of it. Hence, this day now fell under a double consideration: First. As it was such a proportion of time as was requisite to the worship of God, and appointed as a pledge of his rest in his covenant. Secondly. As it received a new institution, with superadded ends and significations, as a token and pledge of God's rest in the law of institutions, and in the worship erected therein. So both these states of the church had these three things distinctly, a rest of God on his works for their foundation, a rest in obedience and worship for man to enter into, and a day of rest as a pledge and token of both the other.

§ 18. Thirdly. The apostle proves from the words of the Psalmist, that there was yet to be a third state of the church; an especial state under the Messiah which he now proposed unto the Hebrews, and exhorted them to enter into. And in this church-state, there is to be also a peculiar state of rest, distinct from them which went before. To the constitution hereof, there are three things required: First. That there be some signal work of God completed and finished, whereon he enters into his rest. This was to be the foundation of the whole new church-state, and of the rest to be obtained therein. Secondly. That there be a spiritual rest ensuing thereon, and arising thence, for them that believe, to enter into. Thirdly. That there be a new, or renewed day of rest, to express that rest of God, and to be a pledge of our entering into it. If any of these, or either of them be wanting, the whole structure of the apostle's discourse will be dissolved, neither will there be any colour remaining for his mentioning the seventh day, and the rest thereof. These things, therefore, we must farther inquire into.

§ 19. First. The apostle showeth, that there was a great work of God, and that finished for the foundation of the whole. This he had made way for, ch. iii. 4, 5, where he both expressly asserts the Son to be God, and shows the analogy that is between the creation of all things, and the build- ing of the church; that is, the works of the old and new creation. As then God wrought in the creation of all, so Christ who is God, wrought in the setting up of this new church-state. And, upon his finishing of it, he entered into his rest, as God did into his, whereby he limited a certain day of rest unto his people. So he speaks, 'There remaineth, therefore, a Sabbatism for the people of God. For he that is en- tered into rest, hath ceased from his works, as God did from his own.' A new day of rest accommodated unto this new church-state, ariseth from the rest that the Lord Christ entered into, upon his ceasing from his works. And as to this day we may observe, 1. That it hath this in common with the former days, that it is a Sabbatism, or one day in seven, which that name in the whole Scripture use is limited unto. For this portion of time to be dedicated to sacred rest, having its foundation in the light and law of
nature, was equally to be observed in every state of the church. 2. That although both the former states of the church had one and the same day, though varied in some ends of it, now the day itself is changed, as belonging to another covenant, and having its foundation in a work of another nature than what they had respect to. 3. That the observance of it is suited to the spiritual state of the church under the gospel, delivered from the bondage frame of spirit wherewith it was observed under the law. And these things must be farther confirmed from the context.

§ 20. The foundation of the whole is laid down, ver. 10, 'For he that is entered into his rest, is ceased from his works, as God from his own.' Expositors generally apply these words to believers, and their entering into the rest of God; whether satisfactorily to themselves and others, as to their design, coherence, scope, or signification of particular expressions, I know not. The contrary appears with good evidence to me; for what are the works that believers should be said here to rest from? Their sins, say some; their labours, sorrows, and sufferings, say others. But how can they be said to rest from these works, as God rested from his own? For God so rested from his, as to take the greatest delight and satisfaction in them, to be refreshed by them. 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed,' Exod. xxxi. 17. He so rested from them, as that he rested in them, and blessed them, and blessed and sanctified the time wherein they were finished. We have shown before, that the rest of God was not only a cessation from working, nor principally; but the satisfaction and complacency that he had in his works. But now, if those mentioned be the works here intended, men cannot so rest from them, as God did from his. But they cease from them, with a detestation of them, so far as they are sinful; and joy for their deliverance from them, so far as they are sorrowful. This is not to rest as God rested. Again, when are believers supposed to rest from these works? It cannot be in this world. for here we rest not at all from temptations, sufferings, and sorrows; and in that mortification of sin which we attain to, yet the conflict is still continued, and that with severity unto death, Rom. vii. 24. It must, therefore, be in heaven that they thus rest, and so it is affirmed accordingly. But this excludes the rest in and of the gospel, from the apostle's discourse, which renders it altogether unsuitable to his purpose. This I have so fully demonstrated in the exposition of the chapter, as that I hope it will not be gainsaid. Thirdly. There is no comparison in the whole discourse between the works of God, and the works of men, but between the works of God in the creation, and under the law on the one side, and those in and under the gospel on the other. And the whole comparison is summed up and closed in this verse.

§ 21. It appears therefore, that the subject of the apostle's proposition in this place hath been mistaken. It is another who is intended, even Christ himself, the Son of God, and his rest from his works, which is here compared with the rest of God from his, at the foundation of the world, to which end alone the mention of them was introduced, ver. 3, 4. For,

First. The conjunction γεγονότος, for, whereby he brings in his assertion, manifests that the apostle in these words gives an account whence it is that there is a new Sabbatism remaining for the people of God. 'There remains a Sabbath-keeping for the people of God; for he that is entered into his rest, hath ceased from his works.' Had there not been a work laying the foundation of the gospel church-state, and a rest of God in it, and ensuing thereon, there could have been no such Sabbatism for believers;
for those things are required to a Sabbath. He had proved before, that  
there could be no such rest, but what was founded in the works of God,  
and on his rest that ensued thereon; such a foundation therefore, he  
saith, this new rest must have, and it hath it. This must be, and is in  
the works and rest of him by whom the church was built, that is Christ,  
who is God, as it is expressly argued, ch. iii. 3, 4. For as that rest which  
all the world was to observe, was founded in his works and rest who made  
the world, and all things in it; so the rest of the church under the gospel  
is to be founded in his works and rest by whom the church was built,  
that is Jesus Christ. For he on the account of his works and rest, is  
also Lord of the Sabbath, to abrogate one day of rest, and to institute  
another.

Secondly. The apostle here changeth the manner of his expression from  
the plural absolutely, 'We who believe,' or virtually in the name of a mul-
titude, 'the people of God,' into that which is absolutely singular, ὥσπερ ἐστιν θεός,  
'He that is entered.' A single person is here expressed, with respect unto  
whom the things mentioned are asserted, and of this change of phrase there  
can be no other reason given.

Thirdly. The rest which this person is said to enter into, is called 'his  
rest' absolutely. As God speaking of the former rest, calls it 'My rest,' so  
this is the 'my rest' of another, namely, the rest of Christ; whereas when  
the entering of believers into rest is spoken of, it is called either 'God's rest,'  
'They shall enter into my rest;' or 'rest' absolutely, 'We that believe do  
enter into rest;' but not their rest, or our rest, for it is not our own abso-
lutely, but God's rest, whereinto we enter, and wherein we rest. But the  
rest here is the rest of him whose it is, and who is the author of ours.

Fourthly. There is a direct parallel in the words, between the works  
of the old creation, and those of the new, which are compared by the  
apostle. For,

1. There are the authors of them, which on the one side is said to be  
God, as God did from his own, that is God the Creator, or God as Creator;  
on the other, 'He,' αὐτος, the same with ὁ τὸν οὖς, ch. iii. 3, that is 'He' of  
whom we speak, as the apostle declares himself, ver. 13, for in these words  
a transition is made unto his treating of the person of Christ.

2. The works of the one and the other are expressed. The works of the  
creator are ἵνα ἐργα, 'his proper works,' his 'own works,' the works of the  
old creation, ὥσπερ ἐπεξεργάζετο τῶν ἵνα ἐργα ὅ τοις. And there are the works of him  
of whom he speaks, τα ἐργα αὐτον, 'his works,' those which he wrought in  
like manner as God did his own at the beginning, that is the work of build-
ing the church. For these works must answer each other, and have the  
same respect unto their authors, they must be good and complete in their  
kind, and such as rest and refreshment may be taken in, and on them. To  
compare the sins and sufferings of men with the works of God, our  
apostle did not intend.

3. There is the rest of the one and the other, and these also have their  
mutual proportion. Now God rested from his own works of creation, 1.  
By ceasing from creating, only continuing all things by his power in their  
order, and propagating them to his glory. 2. By his respect to them, and  
refreshment in them, as those which expressed his excellencies, and set  
forth his praise, and so satisfied his glorious design. So also must he rest  
who is spoken of. 1. He must cease from working in the like kind of  
works, he must suffer no more, die no more, but only continue the work of  
his grace and power in the preservation of the new creature, and the orderly
increase and propagation of it by his Spirit. 2. He takes delight and satisfaction in the works that he hath wrought, for 'he sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied,' and is in the possession of that glory which was set before him, whilst he was engaged in this work.

And these things sufficiently clear the subject here spoken of, namely, that it is Jesus Christ the Mediator.

§ 22. The works that the rest mentioned respects, have been sufficiently intimated, and I have so fully insisted on them in the exposition of the third and fourth verses of the third chapter of this Epistle, that I shall not here again repeat them. In brief, all that he did and suffered in and from his incarnation to his resurrection, as the Mediator of the covenant, with all the fruits, effects, and consequences of what he so did and suffered, whereby the church was built, and the new creation finished, belongs to these works. His rest that ensued on these works hath two parts: 1. A cessation from his works, which was eminent, and answered God's rest from his own. 2. Satisfaction in his work, and the glorious product of them, as those which had an impression on them of his love and grace, Ps. xvi. 7.

§ 23. It remains only that we inquire into his entrance into his rest, both how and when he did so, even as God entered into his on the seventh day; for this must limit and determine a day of rest to the gospel church. Now this was not his lying down in the grave. His body indeed there rested for a while, but that was no part of his mediatory rest, as he was the founder and builder of the church. For, 1. It was a part of his humiliation, not only his death, but his abode and continuance in the state of death, was so, and that a principal part of it. For after the whole human nature was personally united to the Son of God, to have it brought into a state of dissolution, to have the body and soul separated from each other, was a great humiliation. And every thing of this nature belonged unto his works, and not his rest. 2. This separation of body and soul under the power of death, was penal, a part of the sentence of the law which he underwent. And therefore Peter declares, that the 'pains of death' were not loosed but in his resurrection, Acts ii. 24. 'Whom God,' saith he, 'hath raised up, loosing the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.' Whilst he was held of it, he was under it penal. This therefore could not be his rest, nor any part of it. Nor did he in it enter into his rest, but continued in his work. Nor, 2dly, did he first enter into his rest at his ascension. Then indeed he took actual possession of his glory as to the full public manifestation of it. But to enter into rest is one thing, and to take possession of glory another. And it is placed by our apostle as a consequence of his being 'justified in the spirit,' when he entered into rest, 1 Tim. iii. 16. But this his entrance into rest, was in, by, and at his resurrection from the dead. For, 1. Then and therein was he freed from the sentence, power, and stroke of the law, being discharged of all the debts of our sins, for which he had undertaken to make satisfaction, Acts ii. 24. 2. Then and therein were all types, all predictions and prophecies fulfilled which concern the work of our redemption. 3. Then, therefore, his work was done, I mean that which answereth God's creating work, though he still continue that which answers his work of preservation. Then was the law fulfilled and satisfied, Satan subdued, peace with God made, the price of our redemption paid, the promise of the Spirit received, and the whole foundation of the church of God gloriously laid on his person, in his works and rest. 4. Then and therein was he 'declared to be the
Son of God with power; Rom. i. 4. God manifesting unto all, that this was he, concerning and unto whom he said, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' Acts xiii. 33.

§ 24. Thus did the author of the new creation, the Son of God, the builder of the church, having finished his works, enter into his rest. And this was, as all know, on the morning of the first day of the week. And hereby did he limit and determine the day, for a sacred Sabbatical rest under the New Testament. For now was the old covenant utterly abolished, and therefore the day which was the pledge of the rest of God and man, wherein, was to be taken away, and was so accordingly, as we have shown. As the rest from the beginning of the world, had its foundation from the works of God, and his rest which ensued thereon, which was determined unto the seventh day, because that was the day wherein God ceased from those works, which day was continued under the legal administration of the covenant by Moses; so the rest of the Lord Christ, the Son of God, is the foundation of our rest, which, changing the old covenant, and the day annexed unto it, he hath limited unto the first day of the week, whereon he ceased from his works, and entered into his rest. And hereby the apostle completes the due analogy that is between the several rests of God and his people, which he hath discoursed of in this chapter. In the beginning of the world, there was first, the work of God, and his rest thereon, which made way for his people to a rest in himself and in his worship, by the contemplation of his works that he had made, on whose finishing he rested. And in connection with this, a day was designed, determined, blessed, and sanctified, to express that rest of God. Hence, mention is made of those works in the command for the observance of that day, seeing the worship of God in and on it, consisted principally in the glorifying of him, by, and for those works of his. This day was also designed to be a means to further men in their entrance into eternal rest, whereunto all these things do tend. And at the giving of the law, there was a great work of God, and his rest thereon, in his establishing his worship in the land of Canaan, which made way for the people's entering into his rest in that worship and country; and a day of rest was enjoined unto them, to express the one and the other, as also to help them to enter finally into the rest of God. And now under the gospel there is a rest answering all these, in and by the instances which we have given.

§ 25. And this is that which the apostle affirms, as the substance of all that he hath evinced: namely, that there is a Sabbathism for the people of God, ver. 9, σαββατισμὸς. The word is framed by our apostle from a Hebrew original, with a Greek termination. And he useth it, as that which is comprehensive of his whole sense, which no other word would be. For he would show that there is a Sabbatical rest founded in the rest of God, remaining for the church; and therefore makes use of that word, whereby God expressed his own rest when he sanctified the seventh day, for a day of rest thereon. That day of rest being removed, and another, on a new foundation, namely, the rest of Christ upon his works introduced, he calls it a Sabbathism, or a Sabbath-keeping. He doth not do this only and separately, averring the necessity of a Sabbath-observance in the first place, distinctly from a spiritual rest in Christ, with an eternal rest ensuing thereon; but in the manner and order before laid down, wherein the necessity of such a day is included. And besides the evidence that ariseth from the consideration of the whole context, there are two things which make it undeniably evident, that our apostle asserts an evangelical Sab-
bath, or day of rest to be constantly observed in and for the worship of God under the gospel. For first, without this design, there can be no tolerable reason assigned, why he should mention the works of God from the foundation of the world, with his rest that ensued thereon, and refer us to the seventh day, which without respect unto another day to be introduced, doth greatly involve his whole discourse. Again, his use of this word, σαββατισμός, a Sabbathism, which is framed, and as it were coined on purpose, that it might both comprise the spiritual rest aimed at, and also a Sabbath-keeping, or observance of a Sabbath rest, manifests his purpose. When he speaks of our rest in general, he still doth it by κατάπαυσις, adding, that there was an especial day for its enjoyment. Here he introduceth σαββατισμός, a Sabbathism, which his way of arguing would not have allowed, had he not designed to express the Christian Sabbath. Add hereunto, that in the next verse he subjoins the special reason for observing such a day as we have declared. And here do we fix the foundation and reason of the Lord's day, or the holy observance of the first day of the week; the obligation of the fourth commandment unto a weekly sacred rest, being put off from the seventh day to the first, on the same grounds and reasons whereon the state of the church is altered from what it was under the law, unto what it is now under the gospel. And the covenant itself also is changed; whence the seventh day is now of no more force, than the old covenant, and the old law of institutions, contained in ordinances, because the Lord Christ hath ceased from his works, and entered into his rest, on the first day.

§ 26. Here we have fixed the foundation of the observance of the Lord's day, on the supposition of what hath been proved concerning our duty in the holy observance of one day in seven, from the law of our creation as renewed in the decalogue. The remaining arguments, evincing the change of the day from the seventh unto the first by divine authority, shall be but briefly touched on by me, because they have been lately copiously handled, and fully vindicated by others. Wherefore, 1. When the Lord Christ intended conspicuously to build his church upon the foundation of his works and rest, by sending the Holy Ghost with his miraculous gifts upon the apostles, he did it on this day; which was then among the Jews the feast of Pentecost, or of weeks. Then were the disciples gathered together with one accord, in the observance of the day signalized to them by his resurrection, Acts ii. 1. And by this doth their obedience receive a blessed confirmation, as well as their persons a glorious endowment with abilities for the work which they were immediately to apply themselves unto. And hereon did they set out unto the whole work of building the church on that foundation, and of promoting the worship which on that day was especially to be celebrated by the church.

§ 27. The practice of the apostles, and the apostolical churches, acknowledged the authority of Christ in this change of the day of sacred rest. For, henceforward, whatever apprehensions any of them might have of the continuance of the Judaical Sabbath, as some of them judged that the whole service of it was still to be continued, yet they observed this day of the Lord, as the time of their assemblies and solemn worship. One or two instances hereof may be called over, Acts xx. 6, 7, 'We came to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until mid-
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night.' I doubt not but in the seven days that the apostle abode there, he taught and preached as he had occasion in the houses of the believers; but it was the first day of the week, when they used, according to their duty, to assemble the whole body of them, for the celebration of the solemn ordinances of the church, synecdochically expressed by breaking of bread. This they did, without any extraordinary warning or calling together; for in answer to their duty they were accustomed so to do. Such is the account that Justin Martyr gives of the practice of all churches in the next age; τη του ἅλιου λεγομενη ἡμερα παντων κατα πολεις η ἀγρος μενοτων επι το αυτο συνελευς γινεται. 'On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly of all Christians, whether living in city or the country; and because of their constant breaking of bread on this day, it was called Dies panis,' August. Epist. 118. And Athanasius proved that he brake not a chalice at such a time, because it was not the first day of the week when it was to be used, Soerat. lib. v. cap. 22. And whosoever reads this passage without prejudice, will grant, that it is a marvellous, abrupt, and uncouth expression, if it do not signify that which was in common observance amongst all the disciples of Christ, which could have no other foundation but only that before laid down, of the authority of the Lord Christ requiring it of them. And I doubt not but that Paul preached his farewell sermon unto them which continued until midnight, after all the ordinary service of the church was performed. And all the objections which I have met withal against this instance, amount to no more than this; that although the Scripture says, that the disciples met for their worship on the first day of the week, yet indeed they did not so do.

1 Cor. xvi. 2, the same practice is exemplified; 'Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' The constant day of the churches' solemn assemblies being fixed, he here takes it for granted, and directs them unto the observance of an especial duty on that day. What some except, that here is no mention of any such assembly, but only that every one on that day should lay by himself what he would give, which every one might do at home, or where they pleased, is exceeding weak, and unsuitable unto the mind of the apostle. For, to what end should they be limited unto a day, and that the first day of the week, for the doing of that which might be as well, to as good purpose and advantage, performed at any other time, on any other day of the week whatever? Besides, it was to be such a laying aside, such a treasuring of it in a common stock, as that there should be no need of any collection when the apostle came. But if this was done only privately, it would not of itself come together at his advent, but must be collected. But all exceptions against these testimonies have been so lately removed by others, that I shall not insist farther on them.

§ 28. That from these times downwards, the first day of the week was solemnly observed in all the churches of Christ, whereby they owned its substitution in the room of the seventh day, applying the duties and services of a Sabbath unto it, hath also been demonstrated. And that this was owned from the authority of the Lord, is declared by John in the Revelation, who calls it the Lord's day, Rev. i. 10, whereby he did not surprise the churches with a new name, but denoted to them the time of his visions, by the name of the day which was well known unto them. And there is no solid reason why it should be so called, but that it owes its preeminence and observance unto his institution and authority. And no man
who shall deny these things, can give any tolerable account how, when, or from whence this day came to be so observed, and so called. It is \( \text{\textita{\textipa{\textit{y}m\textipa{\textit{\varepsilon}}ra k\textipa{\textit{v}ri\textipa{\textit{a}}\textipa{\textit{k}y}}} } \), 'the Lord's day,' the day of the Lord, as the holy supper is \( \text{\textita{\textipa{\textit{de\textipa{\textit{\varepsilon}}\textipa{\textit{\pi}\textipa{\textit{t}o\textipa{\textit{n}}}} k\textipa{\textit{v}ri\textipa{\textit{a}}\textipa{\textit{k}y}}} } \), 1 Cor. xi. 20, the Lord's supper, by reason of his institution. \( \text{\textita{\textipa{\textit{n\textipa{\textit{\nu}t}}} } \), 'the day of the Lord,' in the Old Testament, which the LXX. render \( \text{\textita{\textipa{\textit{y}m\textipa{\textit{\varepsilon}}ra k\textipa{\textit{v}ri\textipa{\textit{a}}\textipa{\textit{k}y}}} } \), nowhere \( \text{\textita{\textipa{\textit{y}m\textipa{\textit{\varepsilon}}ra k\textipa{\textit{v}ri\textipa{\textit{a}}\textipa{\textit{k}y}}} } \), signifies indeed some illustrious appearance of God in a way of judgment or mercy. And so also in the person of Christ, this was the day of his appearance, Mark xvi. 9. So was it still called by the ancient writers of the church. Ignatius in Epist. ad Trall. ad Magnes. &c. Dionysius of Corinth, Epist. ad Rom. in Euseb. Hist. lib. iv. c. 21, Theophilus Antioch. lib. 1. in 4. Evangel. Clemens Alex. Stromat. lib. vii. cap. 7. Origen, lib. viii. con. Cels. Tertul. de Coron. Milit. cap. 3. As for those who assign the institution of this day to the apostles, although the supposition be false, yet it weakens not the divine original of it. For an obligation lying on all believers to observe a Sabbath unto the Lord, and the day observed under the law of Moses being removed, it is not to be imagined that the apostles fixed on another day, without immediate direction from the Lord Christ. For, indeed, they delivered nothing to be constantly observed in the worship of God, but what they had his authority for, 1 Cor. xi. 23. In all things of this nature, as they had the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost, so they acted immediately in the name and authority of Christ, where what they ordained was no less of divine institution, than if it had been appointed by Christ in his own person. It is true, they themselves did for a season, whilst their ministry was to have a peculiar regard to the Jews, for the calling and conversion of the remnant that was amongst them, according to the election of grace, go frequently into their synagogues on the seventh day to preach the gospel, Acts xiii. 14, xvi. 13, xvii. 2, xviii. 4. But it is evident that they did so, only to take the opportunity of their assemblies, that they might preach to the greater numbers of them, and that at a season when they were prepared to attend to sacred things. Upon the same ground, Paul laboured if it were possible to be at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, Acts xx. 16. But we do not read that they at any time assembled the disciples of Christ on that day, for the worship of God.

§ 29. We may now look back, and take a view of what we have passed through. That one day in seven is by virtue of a divine law to be observed holy unto the Lord, the original of such an observance, Gen. ii. 2, the letter of the fourth commandment, with the nature of the covenant between God and man, do prove and evince. And hereunto is there a considerable suffrage given by learned men of all parties. The doctrine of the reformed divines on this subject, hath been largely represented by others. They also of the church of Rome, that is many of them, agree herein. It is asserted in the canon law itself, Tit. de Ferius cap. licet, where the words of Alexander the Third are, Tam veteris quam Novi Testamenti pagina septimum diem ad humanam quietem specialiter deputavit; where by septimum dies he understands one day in seven, as Suarez showeth, De Relig. lib. 2. cap. 2. And it is so by sundry canonists reckoned up by Covarriuas. The schoolmen also give in their consent, as Bannes in 2a. 2e. g. 44, a. 1. Bellarmine contends expressly, De Cult. Sanct. lib. iii. cap. 11, that Jus divinum requirebat ut unus dies hebdomadæ dicaretur cultui divino. So doth Suarez, De Dieb. Sac. cap. 1, and others might be added. We have the like common consent, that whatever in the institution and observance of the Sabbath under the Old Testament, was peculiar unto that state of the
church, either in its own nature, or in its use and signification, or in its manner of observance, is taken away by virtue of those rules, Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16, 17. Nor can it be denied, but that sundry things annexed to the Sabbatical rest, peculiar to that church-state which was to be removed, were wholly inconsistent with the spirit, grace, and liberty of the gospel. I have also proved, that the observance of the seventh day precisely, was a pledge of God's rest in the covenant of works, and of our rest in him, and with him thereby; so that it cannot be retained without a re-introduction of that covenant, and the righteousness thereof. And therefore, although the command for the observance of a Sabbath to the Lord, so far as it is moral, is put over into the rule of the new covenant, wherein grace is administered for the duty it requires, yet take the seventh day precisely as the seventh day, and it is an Old Testament arbitrary institution, which falls under no promise of spiritual assistance in, or unto the observance of it. Under the New Testament, we have found a new creation, a new law of creation, a new covenant, the rest of Christ in that work, law, and covenant, the limiting of a day of rest unto us on the day wherein he entered into his rest, a new name given to this day, with respect to his authority by whom it was appointed, and an observance of it by all the churches; so that we may say of it, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it,' as Ps. cxviii. 24.

§ 30. These foundations being laid, I shall yet by some important considerations, if I mistake not, give some farther evidence to the necessity of the religious observance of the first day of the week, in opposition to the day of the law, by some contended for. It is, therefore, first acknowledged, that the observance of some certain day, in and for the solemn public worship of God, is of indispensable necessity. They are beneath our consideration by whom this is denied. Most acknowledge it to be a dictate of the law of nature, and the nature of these things doth require it. We have proved also, that there is such a determination of this time unto one day in seven, as it must needs be the highest impudence in any person, persons, or churches, to attempt any alteration herein. And notwithstanding the pretences of some about their liberty, none yet have been so hardy from the foundation of the world, as practically to determine a day for the worship of God, in any other revolution of days or times, to the neglect and exclusion of one day in seven. Yea, the light hereof is such, and the use of it so great, that those who have taken up with the worst of superstitions, instead of religion, as the Mahometans, yet complying in general with the performance of a solemn worship to God, have found it necessary to fix on one certain day in the hebdomadal revolution for that purpose. And indeed, partly from the appointment of God, partly from the nature of the thing itself, the religious observance of such a day, is the great preservative of all solemn profession of religion in the world. To this the law of nature, to this the written word directs, and this experience makes manifest to all. Take away from amongst men a conscience of observing a fixed stated day of sacred rest to God, and for the celebration of his worship in assemblies, and all religion will quickly decay, if not come to nothing in this world. And it may be observed, though it be not evident whether it be the cause or the effect, that where, and amongst whom religion flourisheth in its power, there, and amongst them is conscience the most exercised, and the most diligence used, in the observance of such a day. I will not say absolutely that it is religion, or other principles, that teacheth men exact-
ness in the observance of this day; nor on the other hand, that a conscience made of this observance doth procure a universal strictness in other duties of religion. But this is evident, that they are mutually helpful to one another; and therefore, though some have laboured to divest this observance of any immediate divine authority, yet they are forced to supply such a constitution for the observing of one day in seven, as that they affirm, that none can in ordinary cases omit its observance without sin. Whether they have done well to remove from it the command of God, and to substitute their own in the room of it, they may do well to consider.

§ 31. Let, then, the state of things in reference to the first day of the week, with the presence of God in, and his blessing upon the worship of the church therein, be considered; and this is a consideration, as I think, by no means to be despised. It is manifest to all unprejudiced persons, that the apostles and apostolical churches, did religiously observe this day; and no man can with any modesty question the celebration of the worship of God therein in the next succeeding generations. In the possession of this practice are all the disciples of Christ at this day in the world, some very few only excepted, who sabbatize with the Jews, or please themselves with a vain pretence that every day is unto them a Sabbath. Nor is it simply the catholicism of this practice which I insist upon, though that be such, and hath such weight in things of this nature, as that for my part I shall not dissent from any practice that is so attested. But it is the blessing of God upon it, and on the worship on this day performed, which is pleaded, as that which ought to be of a high esteem with all humble Christians. On this day, throughout all ages, hath the edification of the churches been carried on, and that public revenue of glory been rendered unto God which is his due. On this day hath God given his presence to all his solemn ordinances, for all the ends for which he hath appointed them. Nor hath he by any means given the least intimation of his displeasure against his churches, for their continuance in the observance of it. On the other side, not only have the wisest and holiest men, who have complained of the sins of their several times and ages wherein they lived, which procured the pouring out of the judgments of God upon them, constantly reckoned the neglect and profanation of the Lord’s day among these sins; but such instances have been given of particular severities against them who have openly profaned this day, and that upon unquestionable testimonies, as may well affect the minds and consciences of those who profess a reverence of God, in the holy dispensations of his providence.

Nor can any of these things be pleaded, to give countenance to any other day, that should be set up in competition with the Lord’s day, or the first day of the week. What of this nature can be spoken concerning the seventh day now contended for by some, and which is grievous, by some who are holy and learned? Of what use hath it ever been to the church of God, if we set aside the occasional advantages taken from it by the apostles, of preaching the gospel in the synagogues of the Jews? What testimonies have we of the presence of God with any churches, in the administration of gospel ordinances and worship on that day? And if any lesser assemblies do at present pretend to give such a testimony, wherein is it to be compared with that of all the holy churches of Christ throughout the world in all ages, especially in those last past?

Let men in whose hearts are the ways of God, seriously consider the use that hath been made, under the blessing of God, of the conscientious observance of the Lord’s day, in the past and present age, to the promotion of
holiness, righteousness, and religion universally in the power of it. And if
they are not under invincible prejudices, it will be very difficult for them to
judge, that it is a plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted. For
my part, I must not only say, but plead whilst I live in this world, and
leave this testimony to the present and future ages, if these papers see the
light and do survive, that if I have ever seen any thing in the ways
and worship of God, wherein the power of religion or godliness hath been
expressed; any thing that hath represented the holiness of the gospel, and
of the author of it; any thing that hath looked like a prelude unto the ever-
lasting Sabbath and rest with God, which we aim through grace to come
to; it hath been there, and with them, where and amongst whom the Lord's
day hath been had in highest esteem, and a strict observance of it attended
to, as an ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. The remembrance of the
ministry, of the walking and conversation, of the faith and love of those who
in this nation have most zealously pleaded for, and have in their persons,
and families, and churches, or parishes, been the most strict observers of
this day, will be precious with them that fear the Lord, whilst the sun and
moon endure. Their doctrine also in this matter, with the blessing that at-
tended it, was that for which multitudes now at rest do bless God, and in
which many that are yet alive do greatly rejoice. Let these things be
despised by those who are otherwise minded, to me they are of great weight
and importance.

§ 32. Let us now a little consider the day that by some is set up,
not only in competition with this, but to its utter exclusion. This is
the seventh day of the week, or the old Judaical Sabbath, which some con-
tend that we are perpetually obliged to the observance of, by virtue
of the fourth commandment. The grounds wherein they proceed in their
assertion, have been already disproved, so far as the nature of our present
undertaking will admit, and such evidences given to the change of the day,
as will not easily be everted, nor removed. The consequences of the
observance of the seventh day, should the practice of it be re-assumed
amongst Christians, is that which at present I shall a little inquire into,
when we have summed up somewhat of what hath been spoken. 1. It was
not directly nor absolutely required in the decalogue, but consequentially
only, by way of appropriation to the Mosaic economy, whereunto it was then
annexed. The command is to observe the Sabbath day, and the blessing is
upon the Sabbath day: 'God blessed the Sabbath day.' And the mention
of the seventh day in the body of the command, fixeth the number of the
days in whose revolution a Sabbatical rest returns, but determines not
an everlasting order in them, seeing the order relating to the old creation is
inconsistent with the law, reason, and worship of the new. And if the
seventh day and the Sabbath, as some pretend, are the same, the sense of
the command in the enforcing part of it is, 'but the seventh day is the
seventh day of the Lord thy God,' which is none at all. 2. The state of the
church, and the administration of the covenant, whereunto the observance
of this day was annexed, are removed, so that it can now no more continue,
than a house can stand without a foundation. 3. The Lord Christ, who
was the Lord of the Sabbath, and by assuming that title to himself, mani-
fested his authority as to the disposal of the day wherein a Sabbatical rest
was to be observed, hath in his own rest from his works, limited unto us
another day of sacred rest, called from his appointment of it, the Lord's
day, his day who is the Lord of the Sabbath. 4. The day so introduced by
his authority, hath from the day of his rest been observed without inter-
ruption, or any such difference about it, as fell out among the churches of God about other feast days, whose observance was introduced among them, they knew not well how; as of the Pascha and the like. And whereas the due observance of it hath been enjoined by councils, edicts of emperors, kings, and princes, laws of all sorts, and hath been advised and pressed by the ancient writers amongst Christians; and whereas the practice of its observance hath been taken notice of by all who from the beginning have transmitted the record of the affairs of Christianity unto posterity, yet none of any sort pretend to give it any original, but all mediately or immediately refer it to Christ himself. The observance, then, of the seventh day first, is an evident judaizing, and a returning to those rudiments of the world, which the apostle so severely cautioneth us against. I know not how it has come to pass, but so it has fallen out, that the nearer Judaism is unto an absolute abolition and disappearance, the more some seem inclinable to its revival and continuance, or at least to fall back into its antiquated observances. An end it had put to it morally and legally long ago, in the coming, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. And we may now say of it what the apostle said of idols, when the world was full of idolatry, 'We know that Judaism is nothing in the world;' no such thing as by some it is esteemed. The actual abolition of it in the profession of the present Jews, by the removing of the veil from their hearts and eyes, and by their turning to God, we hope, is in its approach. And yet, as was said, there seems in many an inclination to their rites and servile observances.

It is apparent in the Acts and Epistles of the apostles, especially that to the Hebrews, that at the first preaching of the gospel, there were very many Jews who came over to the faith and profession of it. Many of these continued zealous of the law, and would bring along with them all their Mosaic institutions, which they thought were to abide in force for ever. In this weakness and misapprehension, they were forborne in the patience of God, and the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, guiding the apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ. In this state things continued until the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, when the chief cause of their contests was taken way. In the meantime, they carried themselves very variously, according to the various tempers of their minds. For it is apparent, that some of them were not content to be themselves indulged in their opinions and practices, but they endeavoured by all means to impose the observance of the whole Mosaic law, on the churches of the Gentiles. Their circumcision, their Sabbath, their feasts and fasts, their abstinences from this or that kind of meats, they were contending about, and thereby perverting the minds of the disciples. Some stop was put to the evil consequences hereof in the synod at Jerusalem, Acts xv. which yet determined nothing concerning the practices of the Jews, but only concerning the liberty of the Gentile believers.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the temple, these professing Jews fell into several distinct ways. Some of them, who, as is probable, had despised the heavenly warning of leaving the place, took up their lot amongst their unbelieving brethren, relinquishing the profession of the gospel which they had made, not, it may be, with any express renunciation of Christ, but with a disregard of the gospel, which brought them not those good things they looked for; of which mind Josephus the historian seems to be one. These in time became a part of that apostate brood which have since continued in their enmity to the gospel, and into whose new and old
supersitions, they introduced sundry customs, which they had learned among the Christians.

Some absolutely relinquished their old Judaism, and completely incorporated with the new Gentile churches, unto whom the promise and covenant of Abraham was transferred and made over. These were the genuine disciples of our great apostle. Others continued their profession of the gospel, but yet still thought themselves obliged to the observance of the law of Moses, and all its institutions. Hereupon they continued in a distinct and separate state from the believers and churches of the Gentiles, and that for some ages, as some say, to the days of Adrian. These, it may be, were they whom Eusebius out of Hegesippus calls μασβαθατοι, Masbothai, whom he reckons as a sect of the Jews, Histor. lib. iv. 21. The Jews call them בַּשָּׂבָתָיא, that is, Sabbatarians, which must be from some observance of the Sabbath in a distinct manner, or for different reasons from themselves. Buxtorf, and our late learned lexicographer, render this explanation. 'Qui secundum Christi doctrinam Sabbatum observabant;' by a mistake; for as they are reckoned to the Jews by Hegesippus, so those who followed the doctrine of Christ, did not sabbatize with the Jews, nor were ever called Sabbatarians by them. There was indeed a sort of persons among the Samaritans who are called Sabuei, whom Epiphanius makes the third sect of them. But these were so called, without any respect unto a Sabbatical observance. שֲבָאוֹוי, the Jews call them, that is, Septenarii, from שְּבָא, unless we shall think with Drusius, that they were so denominated from Sebaia, who came along with Dosthai to settle the new inhabitants of Samaria. Epiphanius says no more of them, but that they observed the feast of Pentecost in autumn, and the feast of tabernacles in the spring, at the time of the Jews' passover. But this gives no account why they should be so called. But they got this appellation from their observance of every day in the week, between the passover and the pentecost, that is for seven weeks, which was the same with the second day in the week of unleavened bread, whereon the Omer, or chief of first-fruits, was to be offered. But, to return: after this, many of them coalesced, and we hear no more of them. In the meantime, as there were great disputes and heats between the differing parties, whilst the occasion of their differences continued, so the Gentile believers did in many things either condescend unto those of the circumcision, or fell themselves in liking with their observances, and received them into practice. Hence it was that they embraced the Paschal solemnity, with some other festivals, and also in many other places admitted the sacredness of the seventh day Sabbath, though still observing, according to the institution of Christ and his apostles, the Lord's day also. And it is not improbable that they might be induced the rather to continue these observances, that they might thereby give a public testimony of their faith against the Marcionites, who began early to blaspheme the Old Testament, and the God thereof; which blasphemy they thought to condemn by this practice. And hence in those writings which are falsely ascribed to the apostles, but are suited to those times, Can. 66, and Constitut. lib. 7, cap. 24, the observance both of the Saturday and the Lord's day are enjoined.

Others of the Jews, about the same season, constituted a sect by themselves, compounding a religion out of the law and gospel, with additions and interpretations of their own. These the ancients call Ebionites. Circumcision, with all the Sabbaths, feasts, and rites of Moses, they retained
from the law. That the Messiah was come, and that Jesus Christ was he, they admitted from the gospel; that he was only a mere man, not God and man in one person, they added of their own, yet in compliance with the sense and expectation of the corrupt and carnal part of the church of the Jews, whereof originally they were. And this sect is that which in a long tract of time hath brought forth Mahometanism in the east. For the religion of the Mahometans, is nothing but that of the Ebionites, with a super-addition of the interests and fanatical brain-sick notions of the impostor himself.

And yet so it is, that some begin now to plead that these Ebionites were the only true and genuine believers of the circumcision in those days. These, they say, and these alone, retained the doctrine preached by the apostles to the Jews, for these were the same and no other with those which were also called Nazarenes. Thus do the Socinians plead expressly, and have contended for it in sundry treatises published to that purpose. This they do, hoping to obtain from thence some countenance to their impious doctrine about the person of Christ, wherein they agree with the Ebionites. But as to their sabbatizing with the Jews, and the rest of their ceremonial observances, they will have nothing to do with them, as not finding those things suited to their interest and design. But herein do they now begin to be followed by some among ourselves, who apparently fall in with them in sundry things condemned by our apostle, and on the account whereof they declined him, and rejected his authority, as others seem almost prepared to do, on other reasons not here to be mentioned. In particular, some begin to sabbatize with them, yea to outgo them. For Ebion, and his followers, although they observed the seventh day Sabbath with the Jews, yet they observed also the Lord's day with the Christians, in honour of Jesus Christ, as both Eusebius and Epiphanius testify: τας κυριακες μεμοριας ἕναν τα παραπλησια εις μνημην του Σωτηριου αναστασιως τελουν. 'They in like manner with us observed the Lord's day, in remembrance of the saving resurrection.'

How great a scandal these things are to Christian religion, how evidently tending to harden the Jews in their infidelity, is apparent unto all. For the introduction of any part of the old Mosaic system of ordinances, is a tacit denial of Christ's being come in the flesh, at least of his being the King, Lord, and Lawgiver of his church. And to lay the foundation of all solemn gospel-worship in the observance of a day, which as such, as the seventh day precisely, hath no relation to any natural or moral precept not instituted, not approved by Jesus Christ, cannot but be unpleasing to them who desire to have their consciences immediately influenced by his authority in all their approaches unto God. But Christ is herein supposed to have built the whole fabric of his worship on the foundation of Moses, and to have grafted all his institutions into a stock that was not of his own planting.

§ 33. Moreover, it is evident that this opinion concerning the necessary observance of the seventh day Sabbath, tends to the increasing and perpetuating of schisms and differences amongst the disciples of Christ; things in their own nature evil, and to be avoided by all lawful ways and means. It is known how many different opinions and practices there are amongst professors of the gospel. That they should all be perfectly healed or taken away, is not to be expected perhaps in this world; for the best know but in part, and prophesy but in part. That every good man, and genuine disciple of Christ, ought to endeavour to his utmost for their removal, none will deny. For if it be our duty, so far as it is possible, and as much as in
us lieth, to live peaceably with all men, in that peace which is the life of
civil society, doubtless it is much more so, to live with all believers in a
peaceable agreement in the worship of God. And therefore, of all differ-
ences in judgment which lead to practice, those are the worst and most per-
nicious, which occasion or draw after them any thing whereby men are
hindered from joining together in the same public solemn worship, whereby
they yield unto God that revenue of glory which is due unto him in this
world. And that many of these are found at this day, is not so much from
the nature of the things themselves about which men differ, as from the
weakness, prejudices, and corrupt affections of them who are possessed with
different apprehensions about them. But now, upon a supposition of an
adherence by any unto the seventh day Sabbath, all communion amongst
professors in solemn gospel ordinances is rendered impossible; for if those
of that persuasion do expect that others will be brought to a relinquishment
of an evangelical observance of the Lord’s day Sabbath, they will find
themselves mistaken. The evidence which they have of its appointment,
and the experience they have had of the presence of God with them in its
religious observance, will secure their faith and practice in this matter.
They, on the other hand, supposing that they are obliged to meet for all
solemn worship on the seventh day, (which the other account unwarrantable
for them to do, on the pretence of any binding law to that purpose,) and
esteem it unlawful to assemble religiously with others on the first day, on
the plea of an evangelical warrant, they absolutely cut off themselves from
all possibility of communion in the administration of gospel ordinances,
with all other churches of Christ. And whereas most other breaches as to
such communion are in their own nature capable of healing, without a re-
nunciation of those principles in the minds of men, which seem to give
countenance unto them, the distance is here made absolutely irreparable,
whilst the opinion mentioned is owned by any. I will press this no further
but only by affirming, that persons truly fearing the Lord, ought to be very
careful and jealous over their own understandings, before they embrace an
opinion and practice which will shut them up from all visible communica-
tion with the generality of the saints of God in this world.

§ 34. We have seen the least part of the inconveniences that attend this
persuasion, and its practice; nor do I intend to mention all of them which
readily offer themselves to consideration. One or two more may yet be
touched on. For those by whom it is owned, do not only affirm that the
law of the seventh day Sabbath is absolutely and universally in force, but
also that the sanction of it, in its penalty against transgressors, is yet
continued. This was, as is known, the death of the offender by stoning.
So did God himself determine the application of the curse of the law, unto
the breach of this command, in the instance of the man that gathered wood
on that day, and was stoned by his direction, Num. xv. 35. Now the
consideration of this penalty, as expressive of the curse of the law, influenced
the minds of the Jews into that bondage frame, wherein they observed the
Sabbath. And this always put them upon many anxious arguings how
they might satisfy the law in keeping the day, so as not to incur the penalty
of its transgression. Hence the questions among the Jews no less endless
than those about their genealogies of old, about what work may be done,
and what not, how far they might journey on that day, which when they
had with some indifferent consent reduced unto 2000 cubits, which they
called a Sabbath day’s journey, yet where to begin their measure, from
what part of the city where a man dwelt, from his own house, or the syna-
gogue, or the walls, or suburbs of it, they are not agreed. And the dread thereof was such amongst them of old, from the rigorous justice wherewith such laws with such penalties were imposed on them, that until they had by common consent in the beginning of the rule of the Hasmoneans, agreed to defend themselves from their enemies on that day, they sat still in a neglect of the law of nature, requiring all men to look to their preservation against open violence, and suffered themselves to be slain, to the satiety of them who chose to assault them thereon. And certainly, it is the greatest madness in the world for a people to engage in war, that do not think it at least lawful at all times to defend themselves. And yet they lost their city afterwards by some influence from this superstition. And do men know what they do, when they endeavour to introduce such a bondage into the observance of gospel-worship, a yoke and bondage upon the persons and spirits of men, which those before us were not able to bear? Is it according to the mind of Christ, that the worship of God, which ought to be in spirit and truth, now under the gospel, should be enforced on men by capital penalties? And let men thus state their principles: The seventh day is to be kept precisely a Sabbath unto the Lord, by virtue of the fourth commandment: for not one day in seven, but the seventh day itself, is rigorously and indispensably enjoined to be observed; and that the transgression of this law, not as to the spiritual worship to be observed on it, but as to every outward transgression, by journeying or other bodily labour, is to be avenged with death: undoubtedly in the practice of these principles, besides that open contradiction which they will fall into, to the spirit, rule, and word of the gospel, they will find themselves in the same entanglements wherein the Jews were and are. And as the cases that may occur, about what may be done and what not, what cases of necessity may interpose for relief, are not to be determined by private persons according to their own light and understanding, because they have respect unto the public law, but by them to whom power is committed to judge upon it, and to execute its penalties; so there will so many cases, and those almost inexplicable, emerge hereon, as will render the whole law an intolerable burden unto Christians. And what then is become of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free? and wherein is the preeminence of the spiritual worship of the gospel, above the carnal ordinances of the law?

§ 35. And this introduceth an evil of no less heinous importance than any of those before enumerated. The precise observance of the seventh day as such, is undoubtedly no part of the law, naturally moral. This we have sufficiently proved before, as I suppose. That law is written in the hearts of believers, by virtue of the covenant of grace, and strength is administered thereby unto them for the due performance of the duties that it doth require. Nor is it an institution of the gospel: none ever pretended it so to be. If there be not much against it in the New Testament, yet surely there is nothing for it. In the things that are so, we have ground to expect the assistance of the Spirit of Christ, to enable us to observe them aright to the glory of God, and to our own edification, or increase in grace. But it is a mere precept of the old law as such. And what the law speaks it speaks unto them that are under the law. In all its precepts, κατακυριευμένη, it exerciseth a severe dominion over the souls and consciences of them that are under it. And we have no way to extricate ourselves from under that dominion, but by our being dead unto its power and authority as such through the death of Christ; or an interest by faith in the benefits that
through his fulfilling and satisfying the law, do redound to the church. But what is required of any one, under the notion of the formal and absolute power of the law, is to be performed in and by that spirit, which is administered by the law, and, the strength which the law affords; and this indeed is great, as to conviction of sin; nothing at all, as unto obedience and righteousness. Do men in these things appeal unto the law? unto the law they must go. For I know not any thing that we can expect assistance of gospel grace in or about, but only those things which are originally moral, or superadded unto them in the gospel itself: to neither of which heads this observance of the seventh day, as such, can be referred. It is therefore a mere legal duty, properly so called, and in a bondage frame of spirit, without any special assistance of grace, it must be performed. And how little we are beholden unto those who would in any one instance reduce us from the liberty of the gospel, to bondage under the law, our apostle hath so fully declared, that it is altogether needless farther to attempt the manifestation of it.

______________________________

EXERCITATION XL.

SIXTH EXERCITATION CONCERNING THE DAY OF SACRED REST.


§ 1. It remains that something be briefly offered, which may direct a practice suitable unto the principles which we have laid down, and for which we have pleaded. For this is the end of all sacred truth, and all instruction therein. This that great rule of our blessed Saviour both teacheth us, and obligeth us to an answerable duty, ‘If you know these things, happy are ye if you do them,’ John xiii. 17, words so filled with his wisdom, that happy are they in whose hearts they are always abiding. The end, then, of our learning Scripture truths, is to obtain such an idea of them in our minds, as may direct us unto a suitable practice. Without this, they are to us of no use, or of none that is good; ἦ γὰρ ὁ φόρος τῆς σοφίας. Knowledge without practice puffeth, not buildeth up. For as Austin speaks with reference unto those words, Con. Faust. Man. lib. 15, cap. 8, ‘Multa quibusdam sunt noxia, quamvis non sint mala, ‘Things not evil, yea good in themselves, may be hurtful unto others.’ And nothing is useful, but as it is directed to its proper end. This practice is unto sacred truth.

§ 2. I confess our endeavours herein may seem less necessary than in the
foregoing discourses. For there are many treatises on this part of our present subject, extant in our own language, and in the hands of those who esteem themselves concerned in these things. With some they meet indeed with no other entertainment, than the posts did that were sent by Hezekiah through Ephraim, Manassah, and Zebulun, to invite them unto the pass-over; they are laughed to scorn and mocked at, 2 Chron. xxx. 10. But wisdom is justified of her children. Unto some they are of great use, and in great esteem. And for the most part, in the main of their design, they do agree. So that the truth in them is established in the mouths of many witnesses, without danger of dividing the minds of men about it. But yet I cannot take myself to be discharged hereby, from the consideration of this concern also of a sacred rest under the gospel, the nature of our design requiring it. And there are yet important directions for the right sanctifying of the name of God, in and by the due observance of a day of sacred rest, which I have not observed to have been insisted on by others; and whereas a due improvement may be expected of the peculiar principles before discussed, I shall go through this part of the work also.

§ 3. Besides, there are not a few complaints, and those managed, at least some of them, by persons of sobriety and learning, pretending also a real care for the preservation and due observance of all duties of piety and religion, that there hath been some excess in the directions of many, given about the due sanctification of the Lord's day. And there is no small danger of mistakes on this hand, whilst there is a pretence of zeal and devotion to give them countenance. Of this nature some men do judge some rigorous prescriptions to be, which have been given in this matter. And they say that a great disadvantage unto religion hath ensued hereon. For it is pretended that they are such as are beyond the constitution of human nature to comply withal; of which kind God certainly requires nothing at our hands. Hence it is pleaded, that men finding themselves no way able to come unto a satisfaction, in answer unto the severe directions for duties, and the manner of their performance, which by some are rigorously prescribed, have taken occasion to seek for relief, by rejecting the whole command; which if duly interpreted in such a condescension as they were capable of a compliance withal, they would have adhered unto. On this account men have found out various inventions, to colour their weariness of that strict course of duty which they were bound unto. Hence have some taken up a plea, that every day is to them a Sabbath, that so they might not keep any. Some, that there is no such thing as a sacred rest on any day, required of us by the authority of Christ, and therefore that all directions for the manner of the observance of such a day, are to no purpose. And many by degrees have declined from that strictness, which they could not come up unto a delight in until they have utterly lost all sense of duty towards God in this matter. And these things are true, only the reasons of them are not agreed on.

§ 4. And in things of this nature, those who are called to the instruction of others, are carefully to avoid extremes. For 'he that condemns the righteous, and he that justifieth the wicked, are both of them an abomination to the Lord.' And several instances there are of the miscarriages of men on the one hand and the other. On the one, lay the sin of the Pharisees of old. When they had got the pretence of a command, they would burden it with so many rigid observances, in the manner of its performance, as should make it a yoke intolerable to their disciples; getting themselves the reputation of strict observers of the law. But in truth they were not
so wanting unto their own ease and interest, as not to provide a secret dispensation for themselves. They would scarce put a finger to the burdens which they bound and laid on the shoulders of others. And this is the condition of all almost, that hath an appearance of religion or devotion in the papacy. And a fault of the same nature, though not of so signal a provocation, others may fall into unadvisedly, who are free from their hypocrisy. They may charge and press both their own consciences, and other men's, above and beyond what God hath appointed. And this they may do with a sincere intention to promote religion and holiness amongst men, by engaging them into the strictest ways of the profession of it. Now in the directions of the consciences of men about their duties to God, this is carefully to be avoided. For peace is only to be obtained in keeping steady and even to the rule. To transgress on the right hand, whatever the pretence be, is to lie for God, which will not be accepted with him.

§ 5. On the other hand, there lieth a rock of far greater danger. And this consists in the accommodation of the laws, precepts, and institutions of God, unto the lusts and present courses and practices of men. This evil we have had exemplified in some of late, no less conspicuously than the aforementioned was in them of old. A mystery of iniquity unto this purpose hath been discovered not long since, and brought forth to light, tending to the utter debauching of the consciences and lives of men. And in it lies the great contrivance, whereby the famous sect of the Jesuits have prevailed on the minds of many, especially of potentates and great men in the earth, so as to get into their hands the conduct of the most important affairs of Europe. And this abomination, as it is known, hath lately been laid open by the diligence of some, in whom at once concurred a commendable care of Christian morality, and a high provocation in other things, by them who endeavoured to corrupt it. A search hath been made into the writings which that sort of men have published, for the direction of the consciences of men in the practice of moral duties, or for the guidance of their disciples, upon confessions. And a man may say of the discovery, what the Poet said upon the opening of the house of Cacus:

Panditurn extemplo foribus domus atra revulsis,
Abstractaque boves, abjurataque rapinae
Celo ostenduntur.
Non secus ac si qua penitus vi terra dehiscens
Infernbs reseret sedes, et regna recludet
Pallida.

Such a loathsome appearance of vizards and pretences for the extenuating of sin, and countenancing of men in the practice of it, was never before represented unto the eyes of men. The main of their design, as is now manifest, hath been so to interpret Scripture laws, rules, and precepts, as to accommodate them all to that course of corrupt conversation, which prevails generally in the world, even among them who are called Christians.

——Gratun opus agricolis.

A work exceedingly acceptable and obliging to all sorts of men, who if not given up to open Atheism, would rejoice in nothing more, than in a reconciliation between the rule of their consciences and their lusts, that they might sin freely without trouble or remorse. To this end, having learned
the inclinations and temptations of men from their private confessions, and
finding it a thing neither possible in itself, nor at all conducing to their in-
terest, to endeavour their reformation by, and recovery unto the fixed stable
rule of truth and duty, they have by their false glosses, subtile distinc-
tions, and refined imaginations, made it to justify and countenance them
in the highest abominations, and in ways leading constantly to the prac-
tice of them. And there is nothing in their whole course, which faith-
ful interpreters of the mind of God ought more carefully to avoid, than
a falling in any instances into that evil, which these men have made it their
design to promote and pursue. The world indeed seems to be weary of the
just, righteous, holy ways of God; and of that exactness in walking accord-
ing to his institutions and commands, which it will be one day known that
he doth require. But the way to put a stop to this declension, is not by
accommodating the commands of God to the corrupt courses and ways
of men. The truths of God, and the holiness of his precepts, must be
pleaded and defended, though the world dislike them here, and perish
hereafter. His law must not be made to lackey after the wills of men, nor
be dissolved by vain interpretations, because they complain they cannot,
indeed because they will not comply with it. Our Lord Jesus Christ
came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them, and
to supply them with spiritual strength to fulfil them also. It is
evil to break the least commandment, but there is a great aggrava-
tion of that evil in them that shall teach men so to do. And this
cannot be done, but by giving such expositions of them, as by virtue
whereof, men may think themselves freed from an obligation unto that
obedience which indeed they do require. Wherefore though some should
say now as they did of old concerning any command of God, 'Behold
what a weariness it is, and what profit is it to keep his ordinances?' yet
the law of God is not to be changed to give them relief. We are there-
fore in this matter to have no consideration of the present course of the
world, nor of the weariness of professors in the ways of strict obedience.
The sacred truth and will of God in all his commands, is singly and sin-
cerely to be inquired after.

§ 6. And yet I will not deny but that there have been and are mistaken
in this matter, leaning towards the other extreme. Directions have been
given, and that not by a few, for the observance of a day of holy rest,
which either for the matter of them or the manner prescribed, have had
no sufficient warrant or foundation in the Scripture. For whereas some
have made no distinction between the Sabbath as moral and as Mosaical,
unless it be merely in the change of the day, they have endeavoured to
introduce the whole practice required on the latter into the Lord's day.
But we have already shown that there were sundry additions made unto the
command, as to the manner of its observance, in its accommodation unto
the Mosaic pedagogy; besides that the whole required a frame of spirit-
suited thereunto. Others again have collected whatever they could think of,
that is good, pious, and useful in the practice of religion, and pre-
scribed it all in a multitude of instances, as necessary to the sanctification
of this day; so that a man can scarcely in six days, read over all the
duties that are proposed to be observed on the seventh. And it hath
been also no small mistake, that men have laboured more to multiply
directions about external duties, giving them out as it were by number
or tale, than to direct the mind or inward man, in and unto a due per-
formance of the whole duty of the sanctification of the day, according to
the spirit and genius of gospel obedience. And lastly, it cannot be denied but that some, it may be measuring others by themselves, and their own abilities, have been apt to tie men up unto such long tiresome duties, and rigid abstinence from refreshments, as have clogged their minds, and turned the whole service of the day into a wearisome bodily exercise, that profiteth little.

§ 7. It is not my design to insist upon any thing that is in controversy amongst persons learned and sober. Nor will I now extend this discourse unto a particular consideration of the special duties required in the sanctification or services of this day. But whereas all sorts of men, who wish well to the furtherance and promotion of piety and religion in the world, on what reasons or foundations soever they judge that this day ought to be observed a holy rest to the Lord, do agree that there is a great sinful neglect of the due observance of it, as may be seen in the writings of some of the principal of those who cannot grant unto it an immediate divine institution; I shall give such rules and general directions about it, as by a due application of them will give sufficient guidance in the whole of our duty therein.

§ 8. It may seem to some necessary, that something should be premised concerning the measure or continuance of the day to be set apart a holy rest unto the Lord. But it being a matter of controversy; and to me on the reasons to be mentioned afterwards of no great importance, I shall not insist upon the examination of it, but only give my judgment in a word concerning it. Some contend that it is a natural day of twenty-four hours, beginning with the evening of the preceding day, and ending with the same of its own. And accordingly so was the church of Israel directed, Lev. xxiii. 32, 'From even unto even shall you celebrate your Sabbath;' although that doth not seem to be a general direction for the observance of the weekly Sabbath, but to regard only that particular extraordinary Sabbath, which was thus instituted; namely, the day of atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month, ver. 27. However, suppose it to belong also unto the weekly Sabbath; it is evidently an addition unto the command particularly suited to the Mosaic pedagogy, that the day might comprise the sacrifice of the preceding evening in the services of it, from an obedience whereunto we are freed by the gospel. Neither can I subscribe unto this opinion; and that because, 1. In the description and limitation of the first original seven days, it is said of each of the six, that it was constituted of an evening and a morning; but of the day of rest there is no such description; it is only called the seventh day, without any assignation of the preceding evening unto it. 2. A day of rest, according to rules of natural equity, ought to be proportioned unto a day of work or labour, which God hath granted unto us for our own use. Now this is to be reckoned from morning to evening, Ps. civ. 20—23, 'Thou makest darkness and it is night, wherein all the beasts of the forest do creep; (from whose yelling the night hath its name in the Hebrew tongue.)' The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their meat from God. The sun riseth, they gather themselves together, and lay them down in their dens. Man goeth forth to his work and his labour unto the evening.' The day of labour is from the removal of darkness and the night, by the light of the sun, until the return of them again; which allowing for the alterations of the day in the several seasons of the year, seems to be the just measure of our day of rest. 3. Our Lord Jesus Christ who in his resurrection gave beginning and being to the special day of holy rest under the gospel, rose not until the
morning of the first day of the week, when the beamings of the light of the sun began to dispel the darkness of the night; or when it dawned towards day, as it is variously expressed by the evangelists. This with me, determines the whole matter. 4. Mere cessation from labour in the night, seems to have no place in the spiritual rest of the gospel to be expressed on this day; nor to be any thing distinguished from the night of other days of the week. 5. Supposing Christians under the obligation of the direction given by Moses before mentioned; and it may entangle them in the anxious, scrupulous intrigues which the Jews are subject unto, about the beginning of the evening itself, about which their greatest masters are at variance, which things belong not to the economy of the gospel. Upon the whole matter, I am inclined to judge, and do so, that the observance of the day is to be commensurate unto the use of our natural strength, on any other day, from morning to night. And nothing is hereby lost that is needful unto the due sanctification of it. For what is by some required as a part of its sanctification is necessary and required as a due preparation thereunto. This therefore is our first rule or direction.

The first day of the week, or the Lord’s day, is to be set apart unto the ends of a holy rest unto God, by every one, according as his natural strength will enable him, to employ himself in his lawful occasions any other day of the week.—There is no such certain standard or measure for the observance of the duties of this day, as that every one who exceeds it, should by it be cut short, or that those who on important reasons come short of it should be stretched out thereunto. As God provided in his services of old, that he who was not able to offer a bullock might offer a dove, with respect unto their outward condition in the world; so here there is an allowance also for the natural temperaments and abilities of men. Only whereas if persons of old had pretended poverty, to save their charge in the procuring of an offering, it would not have been acceptable, yea, they would themselves have fallen under the curse of the deceiver; so no more now will a pretence of weakness or natural inability, be any excuse to any for neglect or profaneness. Otherwise, God requires of us, and accepts from us, according to what we have not. And we see it by experience, that some men’s natural spirits will carry them to a continuance in the outward observance of duties, much beyond, nay doubly perhaps to what others are able, who yet may observe a holy Sabbath to the Lord with acceptance. And herein lies the spring of the accommodation of these duties to the sick, the aged, the young, the weak, or persons any way distempered. God ‘knoweth our frame, and remembereth that we are dust;’ as also that that dust is more discomposed, and weakly compacted in some than others. As thus the people gathered manna of old, some more, some less, לְעַנֵּב; ‘every man according to his appetite,’ yet he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack,’ Exod. xvi. 16—18; so is every one in sincerity, according to his own ability, to endeavour the sanctifying of the name of God in the duties of this day, not being obliged by the examples or prescriptions of others, according to their own measures.

§ 9. Secondly. Labour to observe this day, and to perform the duties required in it, with a frame of mind becoming and answering the spirit, freedom, and liberty of the gospel. We are now to serve God in all things, ‘in the newness of the spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter,’ Rom. vii. 6, with a spirit of peace, delight, joy, liberty, and a sound mind. There were three reasons of the bondage servile frame of spirit, which was in the Judaical church, in their observance of the duties of the law, and consequently of the Sabbath.
First. The dreadful giving and promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai, which was not intended merely to strike a terror into that generation in the wilderness, but through all ages during that dispensation, to influence and awe the hearts of the people into a dread and terror of it. Hence the apostle tells us that 'Mount Sinai gendered unto bondage;' Gal. iv. 24, that is, the law as given thereon, brought the people into a spiritually servile state, wherein, although secretly on the account of the ends of the covenant they were children and heirs, 'yet they differed nothing from servants;' ch. iv. 1, 3.

Secondly. The renovation and re-inforcement of the old covenant, with the promises and threatenings of it, which was to be upon them during the continuance of that state and condition. And although the law had a new use and end now given unto it, yet they were so in the dark, and the proposal of them was attended with so great an obscurity, that they could not clearly look into the comfort and liberty finally intended therein. For 'the law made nothing perfect,' and what was of grace in the administration of it, was so veiled with types, ceremonies, and shadows, that they could 'not see to the end of the things that were to be done away,' 2 Cor. iii. 13.

Thirdly. The sanction of the law by death, increased their bondage. For as this in itself was a terror to them in their services, so it was designed to express, and to represent the original curse of the whole law, Gal. iii. 13. And hereby were they greatly awed and terrified, although some of them by special grace were enabled to delight themselves in God and his ordinances.

And in these things was administered a 'spirit of bondage unto fear,' which by the apostle is opposed to the 'spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father,' Rom. viii. 15. Where this Spirit is, there only is liberty: 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,' 2 Cor. iii. 17. And therefore, although they boasted that they were the children of Abraham, and on that reason free, and never in bondage; yet our Saviour lets them know, that whatever they pretended, they were not free 'until the Son should make them so.' And from these things arose those innumerable anxious scrupulosities which were upon them in the observance of this day, accompanied with the severe nature of those additions in its observance, which were made unto the law of it, as appropriated unto them for a season.

Now, all these things we are freed from under the gospel. For,

1. We are not now brought to receive the law from Mount Sinai, but are come to Mount Sion. So the apostle at large, Heb. xii. 18—24. 'For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched;' (that is, which naturally might be so by men's hands, though morally the touching of it was forbidden) 'and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness and darkness, and tempest. And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: (for they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake,) which it seems were the words he used, where it is on this occasion said of him, 'And Moses spake;' but nothing is added of what he said, Exod. xix. 19. These things are insisted on by the apostle to show the grounds of that bondage which the people were in under the law, whereunto he adds, 'But ye are come unto Mount
Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem; 'Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all,' Gal. iv. 26. That is, we receive the law of our obedience from Jesus Christ, who speaks from heaven, to be observed with a spirit of liberty.

2. The old covenant is now absolutely abolished, nor is the remembrance of it any way revived, Heb. viii. 13. It hath no influence into or upon the minds of believers. They are taken into a covenant full of grace, joy, and peace. 'For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' John i. 17.

3. In this covenant they receive the Spirit of Christ, or adoption to serve God without legal fear, Luke i. 74; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6. And there is not any thing more insisted on in the gospel, as the principal privilege thereof. It is, indeed, nothing to have liberty in the word and rule, unless we have it in the spirit and principal. And hereby are we delivered from that anxious solicitude about particular instances in outward duties, which was a great part of the yoke of the people of old. For,

1. Hence, we may in all our duties look on God as a Father. By the Spirit of his Son, we may in them all, cry, 'Abba, Father.' For, through Christ 'we have an access in one Spirit unto the Father;' Eph. ii. 18. To God as a Father, as one that will not 'always chide,' that doth not 'watch our steps' for our hurt, but 'remembereth that we are but dust.' One who teach us not up to rigid exactness in outward things, whilst we act in a holy spirit of filial obedience as his sons or children. And there is great difference between the duties of servants and children; neither hath a Father the same measure of them. The consideration hereof, regulated by the general rules of the Scripture, will resolve a thousand of such scruples as the Jews of old while servants were perplexed withal.

2. Hence, we come to know that he will be worshipped 'in spirit and in truth.' Therefore, he more minds the inward frame of our hearts wherewith we serve him, than the mere performance of outward duties, which are alone so far accepted with him, as they are expressions and demonstrations thereof. If then, in the observance of this day, our hearts are single and sincere in our aims at his glory with delight, it is of more price with him than the most rigid observance of outward duties, by number and measure.

3. Therefore, the minds of believers are no more influenced to this duty by the curse of the law, and the terror thereof, as represented in the threatened penalty of death. The authority and love of Jesus Christ are the principal causes of our obedience. Hence, our main duty lieth in an endeavour to get spiritual joy and delight in the services of this day, which are the special effects of spiritual liberty. So the prophet requires, that we should call the "Sabbath our delight, holy and honourable of the Lord," Isa. lviii. 13. As also, that on the other side we should not do 'our own pleasure, nor do our own ways, nor find our own pleasure, nor speak our own words.' And these cautions seem to regard the Sabbath absolutely, and not as Judaical. But I much question whether they have not in the interpretation of some, been extended beyond their original intention. For the true meaning of them is no more but this, that we should so delight ourselves in the Lord on his holy day, as that being expressly forbidden our usual labour, we should not need, for want of satisfaction in our duties, to turn aside to 'our own pleasures, and vain ways,' which are only our own, to spend our time and pass over the Sabbath, a thing complained of by many, whence sin and Satan have been more served on this day, that on all the days of the week beside. But I no way think, that here is a restraint...
laid on us from such words, ways, and works, as neither hinder the performance of any religious duties belonging to the due celebration of the worship of God on the day, nor are apt in themselves to unframe our spirits, or divert our affections from them. And those whose minds are fixed in a spirit of liberty to glorify God in and by this day of rest, seeking after communion with him in the ways of his worship, will be to themselves a better rule for their words and actions, than those who may aim to reckon over all they do or say, which may be done in such a manner, as to become the Judaical Sabbath much more than the Lord's day.

§ 10. Thirdly. Be sure to bring good and right principles to the performance of the duty of keeping a day of rest holy to the Lord. Some of these I shall name, as confirmed expressly in, or drawn evidently from the preceding discourses.

1. Remember that there is a weekly rest, or a holy rest of one day in the week, due to the solemn work of glorifying God as God.—Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy. We have had a week to our own occasions, or we have a prospect of a week in the patience of God for them. Let us remember that God puts in for some time with us. All is not our own. We are not our own lords. Some time God will have to himself from all that own him in the world. And this is that time, season, or day. He esteemeth not himself acknowledged, nor his sovereignty owned in the world without it. And, therefore, this day of rest he required, the first day as it were, that the world stood upon its legs; he hath done so all along, and will do so to the last day of its duration. When he had made all things, and saw that they were good, and was refreshed in them, he required that we should own and acknowledge his goodness and power therein. This duty we owe to God as God.

2. That God appointed this day to teach us that as he rested therein, so we should seek after rest in him here, and look on this day as a pledge of eternal rest with him hereafter. So was it from the beginning. This was the end of the appointment of this day. Now, our rest in God in general, consists in two things. 1. In our approbation of the works of God, and the law of our obedience, with the covenant of God therein. These things are expressive of, and represent to us the goodness, righteousness, holiness, faithfulness, and power of God. For these, and with respect to them, are we to give glory to him. What God rests in, he requires that through it we should seek for our rest in him. As this was the duty of man in innocence, and under the law, so it is ours much more. For God hath now more eminently and gloriously unveiled and displayed the excellencies of his own nature, and the counsels of his wisdom in and by Jesus Christ, than he had done under the first covenant. And this should work us to a greater and more holy admiration of them. For if we are to acknowledge that the 'law is holy, just, and good,' as our apostle speaks, although it is now useless as to bringing of us to rest in God, how much more ought we to own and subscribe to the gospel, and the declaration that God hath made of himself therein, that so it is. 2. In an actual, solemn compliance with his will, expressed in his works, law, and covenant. This brings us to present satisfaction in him, and leads us to the full enjoyment of him. This is a day of rest; but we cannot rest in a day, nor any thing that a day can afford, only it is a help and means of bringing us to rest in God. Without this design all our observance of a Sabbath is of no use or advantage. Nothing will thence redound to the glory of God, nor to the benefit of our own souls. And this they may do well to consider who plead for the ob-
servance of the seventh day precisely. For they do profess thereby that they seek for rest in God, according to the tenor of the first covenant. That they approve of, and that they look (by that profession) to be brought to rest by, though really and on the other principles, they do otherwise. Whatever then be the covenant wherein we walk with God, the great principle which is to guide us in the holy observance of this day, is, that we celebrate the rest of God in that covenant, approve of it, rejoice in it, and labour to be partakers of it, whereof the day itself is given us as a pledge. We must, therefore,

3. Remember, that we have lost our original rest in God by sin. God made us upright in his own image, meet to take our rest, satisfaction, and reward in himself, according to the tenor of the law of our creation, and the covenant of works established thereon. Hereof the seventh day was a token and pledge. All this we must consider that we have lost by sin. God might justly have left us in a wandering condition, without either rest or any pledge of it. Our reparation, indeed, is excellent and glorious, yet so as that on our part the loss of our former estate was shameful, and in the remembrance whereof we ought to be humbled. And, hence we may know that it is in vain for us to lay hold of the seventh day again, which is but an attempt to return into the garden after we are shut out, and kept out by a flaming sword. For although it was made use of as a type and shadow under the law, yet to us who must live on the substance of things, or not at all, it cannot be possessed with robbery, and is of no use when attained. For, we are to remember,

4. That the rest in God and with God, which we now seek after, enter into, and celebrate the pledge of, when we use the means for the further enjoyment of it, in the observance of this day, is a rest by a recovery, by a reparation in Jesus Christ. There is now a new rest of God, and a new rest for us in God. God now rests and is refreshed in Christ, in his person, in his works, in his law, in the covenant of grace in him: in all these things is his soul well pleased. He is the 'brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person;' making a far more glorious representation of him, than did the works of creation of old, which yet he had left such impressions of his goodness, power, and wisdom upon, as that he rested in them, was refreshed on them, and appointed a day for man to rest in his approbation of them, and giving glory to him for them. How much more is it so with him, with respect to this glorious image of the invisible God. This he now dealeth with us in. For as of old, he commanded light to shine out of darkness, whereby we might see and behold his glory which he had implanted, and was implanting on the work of his hands, so now he 'shines into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Jesus Christ,' 2 Cor. iv. 6. That is, enableth us to behold all the excellencies of his nature, made manifest in the person and works of Jesus Christ. The way also of bringing to him through Christ, those who had by sin come short of his glory, is that which he approveth of, is delighted with, and rested in, giving us a pledge thereof in this day of rest. Herein lies the principal duty of this day's observances; namely, to admire this retrieval of a rest with God, and of a rest for God in us. This is the fruit of eternal wisdom, grace, and goodness, love and bounty: this, I say, belongs to the sanctification of this day, and this ought to be our principal design therein; namely, in it to give glory to God for the wonderful recovery of a rest for us with himself, and an endeavour to enter by faith and obedience into that rest. And for those ends and purposes, are we to make use of
the sacred ordinances of worship, wherein and whereby this day is sanctified to the Lord.

5. That in the observance of the Lord's day, which is the first day of the week, we subject our consciences immediately to the authority of Jesus Christ, the Mediator, whose day of rest originally it was, and which thereby and for that reason is made ours. And hereby, in the observance of this day, have we 'fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.' Of old there was nothing appeared in the day, whilst the seventh day was in force, but the rest of God the Creator, and his sovereign authority intimated to us thereby, for the observing of a holy rest to him, according to the tenor of the first covenant. But now the immediate foundation of our rest on the Lord's day, is the Lord's rest, the rest of Christ, when upon his resurrection he 'ceased from his works as God did from his own.' This gives great direction and encouragement in the duty of observing this day aright. Faith truly exercised in bringing the soul into an actual subjection to the authority of Christ in the observance of this day, and directing the thoughts to a contemplation of the rest that he entered into after his works, with the rest that he hath procured for us to enter into with him, doth more thereby towards the true sanctification of this day than all outward duties can do, performed with a legal spirit, when men are in bondage to the commandment as taught to them, and dare not do otherwise. God, in several places instructs the Israelites, what account they shall give to their children concerning their observance of sundry rites and ceremonies that he had instituted in his worship, Exod. xiii. 14, 'And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out of the land of Egypt,' &c. It was in remembrance of such works of God amongst them, whereof those rites were a token and representation. And we have here a special observance in the worship of God, what account can we give to ourselves, and our children, concerning our observance of this day holy to the Lord? must we not say, nay may we not do so with joy and rejoicing. 'That whereas we were lost and undone by sin, excluded out of the rest of God, so far as that the law of the observation of the outward pledge of it, being attended with the curse, was a burden and no relief to us; our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God undertook a great work to make peace for us, to redeem and save us; and when he had so done and finished his work, even the erecting of the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, he entered into his rest, and thereby made known to us, that we should keep this day as a day of holy rest to him, and as a pledge that we have again given to us, an entrance into rest with God.'

6. We are then to remember, that this day is a pledge of our eternal rest with God. This is that whereunto these things do tend. For therein will God glorify himself in the full accomplishment of his great design, in all his works of power and grace. And this is that which ultimately we aim at. We do at best in this world but enter into the rest of God, the full enjoyment of it is reserved for eternity. Hence that is usually called our everlasting Sabbath, as that state wherein we shall always rest with God and always give glory to him. And this day is a pledge hereof on sundry accounts.

1. Because thereon God as it were calleth us aside out of the world, to an immediate converse with himself. Israel never had a more dreadful day than when they were called out of their tents, from their occasions, and all worldly concerns, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, in occurrsum Jenovae, 'to a meeting with the
Lord,' Exod. xix. God called them aside to meet and converse with him. But it was to mount Sinai that he called them, which was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended in fire, ver. 18. Hence, although they had been preparing themselves for it sundry days, they were not able to bear the terror of God's approach unto them. But under the gospel we are this day called out of the world, and off from our occasions, to converse with God, to meet him at Mount Sion, Heb. xii. Here he doth not give us a fiery law, but a gracious gospel; doth not converse us with thunder and lightning, but with the sweet still voice of mercy in Jesus Christ. And as this requireth due thoughts of heart in us to prepare for it, so it is in itself a great and unspeakable privilege, purchased for us by Christ. And herein have we a pledge of rest with God above, when he shall call us off from all relations, all occasions of life, all our interests and concerns in this world, and eternally set us apart to himself. And undoubtedly that it may be such a pledge to us, it is our duty to take off our minds and souls, as far as we are able, from all occasions of life, and businesses of this world, that we may walk alone with God on this day. Some indeed do think this a great bondage. But so far as they do so, and so far as they find it so, they have no interest in this matter. We do acknowledge that there are weaknesses attending the outward man, through the frailty and imbecility of our natures, and therefore have before rejected all rigid and tiresome services. And I do acknowledge that there will be repining and rebelling in the flesh against this duty. But he who really judgeth in his mind, and whose practice is influenced and regulated by that judgment, that he will be careful to attend to the segregation of a day from the world, and the occasions of it, and a secession unto communion with God thereon, is grievous and burdensome, and that which God doth not require, and that it is not useful to us, must be looked on as a stranger in these things. He to whom the worship of God in Christ is a burden or a bondage; who says, Behold what a weariness it is; that thinks a day in a week too much and too long to be with God in his special service, has much to seek, I think, of his duty. Alas! what would such persons do, if they should ever come to heaven, to be taken aside to all eternity to be with God alone, who think it a great bondage to be here devoted to him for a day? They will say it may be, Heaven is one thing, and the observance of the Lord's day is another; were they in heaven, they doubt not but that they should do well enough. But for this observance of the Lord's day, they know not what to say to it. I confess they are so; they are distinct things, or else one could not be the pledge of the other. But yet they both agree in this, that they are a separation and secession from all other things unto God. And if men have not a principle to like that in the Lord's day, neither would they like it in heaven, should they ever come there. Let us then be ready to attend in this matter to the call of God, and go out to meet him. For where he placeth his name, as he doth on all his solemn ordinances, there he hath promised to meet us. And so is this day unto us a pledge of heaven.

2. It is so in respect of the duties of the day, wherein the sanctification of the name of God in it doth consist. All duties proper and peculiar to this day, are duties of communion with God. Everlasting, uninterrupted, immediate communion with God, is heaven. Carnal persons would rather have Mahomet's paradise, than Christ's heaven. But this is that which believers aim at—eternal communion with God. Hereof are the duties of this day, in a right holy performance, an assured pledge; for this is that which in them all we aim at, and express according to the measure of our
light and grace. Hereon we hear him speak to us in his word; and we speak to him in prayers, supplications, praises, thanksgivings, in and by Jesus Christ. In all, our aim is to give glory to him, which is the end of heaven, and to be brought nearer to him, which is its enjoyment. In what God is pleased hereby to communicate to our souls, and in what by the sacred and invisible supplies of his grace and Spirit, he carries out our hearts to, lie and consist those first-fruits of glory, which we may be made partakers of in this world. And the first-fruits are a pledge of a full harvest: God gives them to us for that end, that they may be so. This then are we principally to seek after in the celebration of the ordinances of God, whereby we sanctify his name on this day. Without this, bodily labour in the outward performance of a multitude of duties, will profit little. Men may rise early, and go to bed late, and eat the bread of care and diligence all the day long; yet if they are not thus in the Spirit, and carried out unto spiritual communion with God in the services of the day, it will not avail them. Whatever there be either in the service itself performed, or in the manner of its performance, or the duration of it, which is apt to divert or take off the mind from being intent hereon, it tends to the profanation, rather than the sanctification of this day.

3. The rest of the day is also a pledge of our rest with God. But then this rest is not to be taken for a mere bodily cessation from labour, but in that extent wherein it hath before been at large described.

These are some of the rules which we are to have a respect to in our observance of this day. A due application of them to particular occasions and emergencies, will guide us through the difficulties of them. Therefore did I choose rather to lay them thus down in general, than to insist on the determination of particular cases, which when we have done all, must be resolved into them, according to the light and understanding of them who are particularly concerned.

§ 11. It remains that we offer some directions as to the duties themselves wherein the sanctification of this day doth consist. And this I shall do briefly. It hath been done already at large by others; so as that from thence they have taken occasion to handle the nature of all the religious duties, with the whole manner of their performance, which belong to the service of this day, which doth not properly appertain to this place. I shall therefore only name the duties themselves which have a respect unto the sanctification of the day, supposing the nature of them and the due manner of their performance, to be otherwise known.

Now, these duties are of two sorts: 1. Preparatory for the day; and 2. Such as are actually to be attended to in it.

§ 12. 1. There are duties preparatory for it. For although as I have declared, I do not judge that the preceding evening is to be reckoned to this holy rest as a part of it, yet doubtless it ought to be improved, to a due preparation for the day ensuing. And hereby the opinion of the beginning of the Sabbatical rest with the morning, is put into as good a condition for the furtherance of the duties of piety and religion, as the other about its beginning in the evening preceding. Now preparation in general is necessary,

1. On the account of the greatness and holiness of God, with whom in an especial manner we have to do. The day is his: the duties of the day are his prescriptions: the privileges of the day are his gracious concessions: he is the beginning and ending of it; and we observed before, on this day he calleth us aside unto a converse with himself. And certainly some
special preparation of our hearts and minds is necessary hereunto. This
belongs to the 'keeping of our foot when we go to the house of God,'
Eccl. v. 1, namely, to consider what we are to do, whither we are going, to
whom we make our approaches in the solemn worship of God. The rule
which he gives, Lev. x. 3, is moral, perpetual, or everlasting, 'I will be
sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be
glorified.' He loves not a rude careless rushing of poor sinners upon him,
without a sense of his greatness, and a due reverence of his holiness.
Hence is that advice of our apostle, Heb. xii. 28, 29. 'Let us have grace,'
be graciously prepared in our hearts and minds, 'whereby we may serve
God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming
fire.' And this will not be answered by mere bodily postures of veneration.
Hence there is a due preparation necessary.

2. It is so, from our own distractions and entanglements in the businesses
and occasions of life. I speak not of such who spend the whole week in
the pursuit of their lusts and pleasures, whose Sabbath-rest hath an equal
share in profaneness with all other parts of their lives. But we treat of
those who in general make it their design to live unto God. The greater
part of these I do suppose to be engaged industriously in some calling or
course of life. And these things are apt to fill their minds, as well as to
take up their time, and much to conform them to their own likeness. Much
converse with the world, is apt to beget a worldly frame in men, and earthly
things will taint the mind with earthliness. And although it be our duty,
in all our secular occasions also, to live to God, and whether we eat or
drink, to do all things unto his glory; yet they are apt to unframe the mind,
so as to make it unready unto spiritual things, and heavenly contem-
plations. There is a command indeed, that we should pray always,
which at least requires of us a readiness of mind to lay hold of all occasions
and opportunities for prayer; yet none will deny, but that there is a great
advantage in a due preparation for that, and all other duties of religion.
To empty therefore, and purge our minds of secular earthly businesses,
designs, projections, accounts, dependencies of things one on another, with
reasonings about them, as far as in us lieth, is a duty required of us in all
our solemn approaches unto God. And if this be not done, but men go
full of their occasions into religious services, these will by one means or
other return upon them, and prevail upon them to their disturbance. Great
care is to be taken in this matter; and they who constantly exercise them-
selves unto a good conscience herein, will find themselves fitted for the
duties of the day to a good success.

§ 13. For the preparatory duties themselves, I should refer them to
three heads, if the reader will take along with him these advertisements.

1. That I am not binding burdens on men or on their consciences, nor
demanding such a strict observance of these duties, that they are to consider
themselves as sinning if these are not precisely attended unto. Only I desire
to give direction, such as may be helpful unto the faith and obedience
of those who in all things desire to please God. And if they apply them-
selves to those ways in other instances which they find more to their own
edification, all is done that I aim at.

2. That I propose not these duties, as those which fall under an especial
command, with reference unto this season; but only as such which, being
commanded in themselves, may with good spiritual advantage be applied to
this season. Whence it follows,

3. That if we are by necessary occasions, at any time diverted from
attending unto them, we may conclude that we have lost an opportunity or advantage, not that we have contracted the guilt of sin, unless it be from the occasion itself, or some of its circumstances.

§ 14. These things premised, I shall recommend to the godly reader a threefold preparatory duty to the right observance of a day of holy rest to the Lord. 1. Of meditation. 2. Of supplication. 3. Of instruction, unto such as have others depending on them.

1. Of meditation; and this answers particularly the reasons we have given for the necessity of these preparatory duties. For herein are the minds of believers to exercise themselves to such thoughts of the majesty, holiness, and greatness of God, as may prepare them to serve him with reverence and godly fear. The nature of the duty requires, that this meditation should first respect God himself; and then the day and its services in its causes and ends—God himself, I say, not absolutely, but as the cause and author of our Sabbatical rest. God is to be meditated on with respect to his majesty, greatness, and holiness, in all our addresses to him in his ordinances. But a peculiar consideration is to be had of him, as the special author of that ordinance which we address ourselves to the celebration of, and so to make our access unto him therein. His rest, therefore, in Jesus Christ, his satisfaction and complacency in the way and covenant of rest for us through him, are the objects of a suitable meditation in our preparation for the observance of this day of rest. But especially the person of the Son, whose works and rest thereon, is the foundation of our evangelical rest on this holy day, is to be considered. It were easy to supply the reader with proper meditations on these blessed subjects for him to exercise himself in, as he finds occasion; but I intend only directions in general, leaving others to make application of them according to their ability.

Again, the day itself, and its sacred services, are to be thought upon. The privileges that we are made partakers of thereby, the advantages that are in the duties of it, and the duties themselves required of us, should be well digested in our minds. And where we have an habitual apprehension of them, yet it will need to be called over and excited. To this end those who think meet to make use of these directions, may do well to acquaint themselves with the true nature of a Sabbatical rest, from what hath been before discoursed. It will afford them other work for faith and thankfulness than is usually taken notice of by them who have no other notion of it, than merely a portion of time set apart to the solemn worship of God. There are other mysteries of God and his love, other directions for our obedience to God in it, than are commonly taken notice of. By these means, the ends of preparatory duties above mentioned, will be effected; the mind will be filled with due reverential apprehensions of God on the one hand, and disentangled on the other from those cares of the world, and other cumbersome thoughts, wherewith the occasions of life may have possessed it.

§ 15. Secondly. Supplication; that is prayer, with especial respect unto the duties of the day. This is the life of all preparation for every duty. It is the principal means whereby we express our universal dependence on God in Christ; as also work our own hearts to a sense of our indigent estate in this world, with all our especial wants, and the means whereby we obtain that supply of grace, mercy, and spiritual strength, which we stand in need of, with respect to the glory of God, with the increase of holiness and peace in our own souls. Special directions need not be given about the performance of this known duty. Only I say, some season for it, by way of preparation, will be an eminent means to further us in the due sanctification
of the name of God on this day. And it must be founded on thanksgiving for the day itself, with the ends of it, as an advantage for our converse with God in this world. His goodness and grace in this condescension and care, are to be acknowledged and celebrated. And in the petitionary part of preparatory prayer, two things are principally to be regarded: First, a supply of grace from God, the God and Fountain of it. And herein respect must be had, 1. Unto that grace, or those graces, which in their own nature are most immediately serviceable to the sanctification of the name of God in this ordinance. Such are, reverence of his authority, and delight in his worship. 2. Such graces in particular, as we have found advantage by in the exercise of holy duties, as it may be contriteness of spirit, love, joy, peace. 3. Such as we have experienced the want of, or a defect in ourselves as to the exercise of them on such occasions, as it may be diligence, steadfastness, and evenness of mind. Secondly, a removal of evils, or that God would not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from evil. And herein a regard is to be had, 1. Unto the temptations of Satan. He will be casting his fiery darts in such a season. He is seldom busier than upon our engagement into solemn duties. 2. To the inconstancy, wavering, and distraction of our own minds. These are, indeed, a matter of unspeakable abasement, when we consider aught the majesty of God with whom we have to do. 3. To undue, and unjust offences against persons and things, that we may lift up pure hands to God without wrath and without doubting. Sundry things of the like nature might be instanced in, but that I leave all to the great direction, Rom. viii. 26, 27.

§ 16. Thirdly, Instruction. This in such cases was peculiarly incumbent on the people of old; namely, that they should instruct their children and their families in the nature of the ordinances whereby they worshipped God. This is that which God so commended in Abraham, Gen. xviii. 19, 'I know Abraham,' saith he, 'that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment;' in which expression, the nature and observance of all ordinances is required. Thus is it incumbent on them who have others under their charge, to instruct them in the nature of this service which we observe unto the Lord. It may be this is not, this will not be necessary upon every return of this day. But that it should be so done at some appointed season, no man that endeavours to walk uprightly before God, can deny. And the omission of it hath probably caused the whole service amongst many to be built on custom and example only. Hereon hath that great neglect of it which we see, ensued. For when this is omitted, the power of their influence will not long abide.

§ 17. We have done with preparatory duties: we now proceed to the day itself, the duties whereof I shall pass through with an equal brevity. And they are of two sorts, 1. Public: 2. Private: whereof the former are the principal, and the latter subordinate unto them. And those of the latter sort are either personal or domestic.

§ 18. The public duties of the day are principally to be regarded. By public duties, I intend the due attendance unto, and the due performance of all those parts of the solemn worship of God, which he hath appointed to be observed in the assemblies of his people, and in the manner wherein he hath appointed them to be observed. One end of this day is to give glory to God in the celebration of his solemn worship. That this may be done aright, and unto his glory, he himself hath appointed the ways and means, or the ordinances and duties wherein it doth consist. Without this, we had been at an
utter loss how we might sanctify his name, or ascribe glory to him. Most probably we should have set up the calves of our own imaginations, to his greater provocation; but he hath relieved us herein, himself appointing the worship which he will accept. Would we, therefore, give full direction in particular, for the right sanctifying of the name of God on this day, we ought to go over all the ordinances of worship which the church is bound to attend to in its assemblies. But this is not my present purpose. Besides, somewhat of that kind hath been formerly done in another way. I shall, therefore, here content myself with giving some general rules for the guidance of men in the whole. As,

1. That the public and solemn worship of God, is to be preferred above that which is private. They may be so prudently managed, as not to interfere, nor ordinarily to intrench on one another. But wherever on any occasion they seem so to do, the private are to give place to the public. For one chief end of the sacred setting apart of this day, is the solemn acknowledgment of God, and the performance of his worship in assemblies. It is, therefore, a marvellous undue custom, on the pretence of private duties, whether personal or domestic, to abate any part of the duties of solemn assemblies. For there is in it a setting up of our own choice and inclinations against the wisdom and authority of God. The end of the day is the solemn public worship of God, and the end is not to give way to the most spurious helps and means.

2. Choice is to be made of those assemblies for the celebration of public worship, where we may be most advantaged as to the ends of them in the sanctification of this day, so far as it may be done without breach of any order appointed of God. For in our joining in any concurrent acts of religious worship, we are to have regard to helps suited unto the furtherance of our own faith and obedience. And also because God hath appointed some parts of his worship, as in their own nature, and by virtue of his appointment, are means of conveying light, knowledge, and grace, in spiritual supplies to our souls, it is certainly our duty to make choice and use of them, which are most meet so to do.

3. For the manner of our attendance on the public worship of God, with reverence, gravity, order, diligence, attention, though it be a matter of great use and moment, yet not of this place to handle; nor doth it here belong to us to insist on those ways whereby we may excite particular graces unto due actings of themselves, as the nature of the duties wherein we are engaged doth require.

§ 19. 4. Although the day be wholly to be dedicated to the ends of a sacred rest before insisted on, yet,

1. Duties in their performance drawn out to such a length as to beget wearisomeness and satiety, tend not to edification, nor do any way promote the sanctification of the name of God in the worship itself. Regard, therefore, in all such performances is to be had, 1. Unto the weakness of the natural constitution of some, the infirmities and indispositions of others, who are not able to abide in the outward part of duties, as others can. And there is no wise shepherd, but will rather suffer the stronger sheep of his flock, to lose somewhat of what they might reach to in his guidance of them, than to compel the weaker to keep pace with them to their hurt, and it may be their ruin. Better a great number should complain of the shortness of some duties, who have strength and desires for a longer continuance in them, than that a few who are sincere should be really discouraged by being overburdened, and have the service thereby made useless unto them.
I always loved in sacred duties, that observation of Seneca concerning the orations of Cassius Severus, when they heard him, Timebamus ne desineret: 'We were afraid that he would end.' 2. To the spiritual edge of the affections of men, which ought to be whetted, and not through tediousness in duties abated and taken off. Other things of a like nature might be added, which for some considerations I shall forbear.

2. Refreshments helpful to nature, so far as to refresh it, that it may have a supply of spirits to go on cheerfully in the duties of holy worship, are lawful and useful. To macerate the body with abstinences on this day, is required of none; and to turn it into a fast, or to fast upon it, is generally condemned by the ancients. Wherefore, to forbear provision of necessary food for families on this day, is Mosaic; and the enforcement of the particular precepts, about not kindling fire in our houses on this day, baking and preparing the food of it the day before, cannot be insisted on without a re-introduction of the seventh day precisely, to whose observance they were annexed, and thereby of the law and spirit of the old covenant. Provided always that these refreshments be, 1. Seasonable for the time of them, and not when public duties require our attendance on them. 2d. Accompanied with a singular regard to the rules of temperance; as, 1. That there be no appearance of evil. 2. That nature be not charged with any kind of excess, so far as to be hindered rather than assisted in the duties of the day. 3. That they be accompanied with gravity, and sobriety, and purity of conversation. Now, whereas these things are in the substance of them required of us in the whole course of our lives, as we intend to please God, and to come to the enjoyment of him, none ought to think an especial regard unto them on this day to be a bondage, or troublesome unto them.

3. Labour or pains for the enjoyment of the benefit and advantage of the solemn assemblies of the church, and in them of the appointed worship of God, is so far from intrenching on the rest of this day, that it belongs unto its due observance. A mere bodily rest is no part of religious worship in itself; nor doth it belong unto the sanctification of this day, any farther than as it is a means for the due performance of the other duties belonging to it. We have no bounds under the gospel for a Sabbath-day's journey, provided it be for Sabbath ends. In brief, all pains or labour that our station and condition in this world, that our troubles which may befall us, or any thing else, make necessary, as that without which we cannot enjoy the solemn ends and uses of this holy day of rest, are no way inconsistent with the due observance of it. It may be the lot of one man to take so much pains, and to travel so far for, and in the due celebration of the Lord's day, as if another should do the like without his occasions and circumstances, it would be a profanation of it.

4. Labour in works of charity and necessity, such as are to visit the sick, to relieve the poor, to help the distressed, to relieve or assist creatures ready to perish, to supply cattle with necessary food, is allowed by all, and hath been by many spoken unto.

5. For sports and such like recreations, and their use on this day, I refer the reader to laws of sundry emperors and nations concerning them. See of Constant. leg. omnes cap. de Feriis. Theodosius and Arcadius, ibid. and of Leo and Authemius in the same place of the Code; of Charles the Great, Capitular. lib. 1, cap. 81. lib. 5, cap. 183. The sum of them all is contained in that exhortation which Ephrem Syrus expresseth in his Serm. de diebus Festis. 'Festivitates Dominicas honorare studiose contendite, celebrantes
cas non panegyricum, sed divinum; non mundane, sed spiritualiter; non instar
Gentilium, sed Christianorum. Quare non portarum frontes coronemus; non
choreas ducamus, non chorum exornemus; non tibiis et citharis auditum
efflaeminemus, non mollibus vestibus induamur, nec cingulis undique au ro
radiantibus cingamur; non comissionibus et ebrietatibus dediti simus,
verum ista relinquamus eis quorum Deus venter est, et gloria in confusione
ipsorum."

§ 20. For private duties, both personal and domestic, they are either an-
tecedent or consequent to the solemn public worship, as usually for time it
is celebrated amongst us. These consisting in the known religious exercises
of prayer, reading the Scripture, meditation, family instructions from
the advantage of the public ordinances, they are to be recommended unto every
one's conscience, ability, and opportunity, as they shall find strength and
assistance for them.

Μοναὶ τῶν Θεών ὁσιᾶ.

END OF VOL. I.