

1/5 L 2

T H E
R E A S O N I N G
O F

C H R I S T and his Apostles

V I N D I C A T E D :

In Two P A R T S.

I. Being a Defence of
the Argument from
M I R A C L E S, prov-
ing the Argument
from P R O P H E C Y not
necessary to a ratio-
nal Defence of our
R E L I G I O N.

II. Being a Defence of
the Argument from
P R O P H E C Y, prov-
ing the C H R I S T I A N
S C H E M E to have a
rational Foundation
upon the *Prophecies*
of the *Old Testament*.

In A N S W E R to a Book intitled,

The Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered.

By T H O M A S B U L L O C K, M. A.

Rector of North-Creak in Norfolk.

L O N D O N :

Printed for R. K N A P L O C K, at the *Bishop's Head*
in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1728.



THE
CONTENTS.

THE Introduction. Page 1

PART. I.

THE Argument from Miracles defended.

CHAP. I.

*THE Fundamental Article of Christianity,
and the Proper Method of establishing it,
considered.* P. 15

CHAP. II.

*THE Claim of JESUS, That he was the
MESSIAS of the Jews predicted in the
Old Testament, stands upon the same Foot
with all the other Articles of Christianity,
and needs not to be distinctly proved any
more than they.* P. 28

A 2

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

T H A T it lies upon our Adversaries to disprove the Claim, which J E S U S made to the Messiahship and not upon us to prove it by Arguments adapted to this Claim in particular. p. 35

C H A P. IV.

T H A T the Claim of J E S U S to the Messiahship cannot be disproved, and consequently our Foundation remains unshaken. p. 40

P A R T. II.

T H E Argument from Prophecy defended.

C H A P. I.

S O M E Reflections upon the Argument itself, and the Opinion of our Adversary thereupon. p. 63

C H A P. II.

O F the State and Circumstances of the Jews to whom the Prophecies of the Old Testament were delivered. p. 67

C H A P. III.

A G E N E R A L View of clear Prophecies of the Old Testament, relating to important Events,

The CONTENTS.

v

Events, which were accomplished in and through JESUS CHRIST, and him only.

P. 73

CHAP IV.

A VINDICATION of the Prophecies cited in the preceding Chapter, proving, That according to rational and just Construction, they relate to JESUS CHRIST, and to him only.

p. 101

SECT. I.

Containing a Vindication of,

Psalm xxii. 27— lxxxvi. 9. — cii. 15. 18.

p. 104

Isaiah xlv. 22, 23.

p. 105

Jeremiah x. 11.

p. 106

Zephaniah ii. 11.

p. 107

Malachi i. 11.

p. 108

SECT. II.

Containing some general Observations on the Prophecy of Isaiah,

p. 115

And a Vindication of the following particular Prophecies,

Isaiah ii. 2, 3.

p. 121

lx. 1, &c.

p. 127

xli. 27. xlii. 1, &c.

p. 136

xlix.

p. 139

lii. 13, 14, 15.

p. 144

liii.

p. 149

xi. 10.

The CONTENTS.

xi. 10.	p. 156
lv. 3, 4, 5.	p. 157

S E C T. III.

Of Prophecies cited from the Psalms,

Psalms lxxxix.	p. 161
lxxii.	p. 164
ii. 8.	p. 167
cx.	p. 168

S E C T. IV.

Containing these Prophecies

Micah v. 2.—5.	p. 171
Zechariah ix. 9, 10.	p. 175

S E C T. V.

Containing the Prophecies of,

Haggai ii. 6—9.	p. 177
Malachi iii. 1, &c.	p. 180

S E C T. VI.

Proving the Book of Daniel to be genuine.

p. 184

And the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks to relate to CHRIST.

p. 196.

S E C T. VII.

Containing these Prophecies,

Jeremiah xxxi. 31, 32.	p. 219
Deuteronomy xviii. 15—19.	p. 220

C H A P.

CHAP. V.

THE Argument from Prophecy *summed up: The Conclusiveness of it, and some Exceptions to it, considered.* p. 273

CORRIGENDA.

Page	Line	for	read
4	ult.	is to	may seem to
17	Ref.	(d) 201.	(d) 102.
18	Ref.	(g) 131.	(g) 331.
Ib.	Ref.	(b) 132.	(b) 332.
20	Ref.	(n) xvii.	(n) vii.
21	Ref.	(u) xxvi.	(u) xvi.
91	28	Beginning of this	preceding
102	7	tell	tells.
129	27	Ver. 1.	Ver. 8.
144	1, 2	it is	is it.
213	Ref.	(s) 4.	(s) 14.
215	Ref.	(c) 193.	(c) 196.

THE



T H E

INTRODUCTION.

AS I am not of a Temper apt to look upon things in the worst light, I have been able, without any great Disturbance of Mind, to reflect upon several bold Attacks upon Christianity: Persuading myself that, though they have an ill Effect upon careless, ill-disposed flashy Minds, which relish a Jest better than a solid Argument; yet among serious Persons they awaken Attention, promote Search, put them upon considering and reconsidering their Religion and the Evidences of it: They know thereby the utmost Strength of their Adversaries, as well what can be said against as for it; whereupon they are able to make a more exact Comparison, and upon that Comparison perceive more certainly on which side Truth lies, which ought always to prevail.

B

IN

IN the present Controversy, wherein our Adversary pretends to attack Christianity with its own Weapons, and to propagate Infidelity by expressing himself in the Words of Christian Writers; to which End he has not only raked together the unguarded Expressions of ingenious Men, but by altering, adding to and curtailing Passages refer'd to, and by other disingenuous Methods, unbecoming a Man of Honour and Sincerity, has wrested them to Purposes apparently opposite to their true Import: Even from hence I cannot but hope that some good Effects will follow, both to the Credit of Christianity, and the Confirmation of all sincere Inquirers in their Belief of it.

THE Charge, at the worst, is in my Opinion no more than this, That CHRIST and his *Apostles* did in some Instances argue inconclusively: Not that Jesus wanted sufficient Proof of a divine Mission, sufficient in this Author's Judgment (a) to have determined Men to believe in him, as a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD; but that he put his Cause upon a certain Issue, (b) which cannot well be supported, and attempted to establish it by Arguments, which will not bear the Stress that is laid upon them.

THIS

(a) *Scheme*, &c. p. 321. (b) p. 322.

THIS Charge, I persuade myself, is not true; though perhaps some Handle may have been given thereto, by the Manner in which this Subject has been sometimes treated. Well-meaning Men, thinking they could never make a Building to last for ever strong enough, may have cumber'd it with Pillars in Places that did not need them, and run some Hazard of crushing it in by overloading it with Buttresses from without. Not content with a Set of Arguments, which carry Weight and Clearness along with them, which are as easy to be understood, as they are hard to be answered; they have run out into the plausible, caught at Appearances, built upon Conjectures, and by insisting too much upon this precarious kind of Proof given Occasion to our present Sceptick, who seems to have Leisure, and Application, and Ill-nature enough to collect and put together and dress up in a ridiculous Light Instances of this kind, to insinuate to the World, that these, and of this sort are all the Proofs by which Christianity is supported. Others again over cautious to avoid this extreme have, it is to be feared, fallen into another opposite to it, and been too forward in giving up, what did not appear to them at first blush satisfactory and conclusive. No doubt some Errors have been committed on both Sides, which will often happen, where Men endeavour to account for every thing upon the same Hypothesis,

INTRODUCTION.

and confine themselves too closely to one particular Scheme:

THE Extremities of both these Hypotheses have by our Adversary been brought together, who has play'd them so dextrously one against another, as to make them both at first View look ridiculous and indefensible, being supplied with plausible Objections on either side, against every thing advanced in favour of the other. But in this View, I look upon him only as serving the Purpose of a *Sieve*, which throws up the Chaff upon the Surface of the Wheat, that lies covered under it. Now none but a Fool would throw the whole away, supposing it to be all Chaff, because nothing else appears upon the Surface: But a prudent Man will endeavour with a skilful Hand to separate them, which by lessening the *Quantity* increases the *Value* of it.

FOR my own part I do not pretend to that skilful Hand, which can undertake in the present Case to make an exact Separation; nor do I think it can be attempted to the Satisfaction of every Man. For besides that *various Arguments* carry various Degrees of Probability along with them, we find that Men according to their different Capacities are differently affected with the *same Arguments*; so that it often happens, among the lower degrees of Probability especially, that what seems to one to be of Weight and Moment is to another trifling
and

and impertinent. And this is never more observable, than in the Interpretation of *dead Languages*, which has given Occasion to those numberless Volumes of Comments, which have been wrote upon Authors, *profane* as well as *sacred*.

It is very possible therefore, that the Reasoning of CHRIST and his *Apostles*, which in many Instances depends upon the Interpretation of Books, the Language whereof Men were then better acquainted with than we are at present, may not every where appear to us in its proper Light, and even now less conclusive to some than to others, according to their different Talents and Capacities. What then? Laying these disputable Proofs aside, how does the Case stand? Is there *sufficient* Reason without them to determine a sincere impartial Mind to believe in JESUS CHRIST, as a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD? If *no*, does it become me to cavil for want of *Redundancy*, or because that redundant Proof does not exactly hit my Taste and lie level to my Capacities? Shall I reject Arguments, otherwise cogent and conclusive, even according to my own Judgment, because joyned with others which I cannot perfectly comprehend? No; a wise Man *cannot* do it, an honest Man *will not*.

It is not *necessary* therefore (however serviceable it might be) in order to a *just* Vindication of our Religion, that every

Argument alledged by CHRIST and his *Apostles* should be set in a clear convincing Light. It is enough, if it can be justified by such Rules, as impartial Reason would direct us to observe in examining Doctrines pretended to be of God. I did endeavour in my *Answer to the Grounds, &c.* to discover what those Rules are, and to prove that Christianity is justified thereby. Nay, the Author of *Scheme, &c.* allows in general the Validity of this Reasoning in Confirmation of a *New Religion.* (c) But pretends there is something *peculiar* to Christianity, which requires a *peculiar* Kind of Proof to establish it. I purpose therefore at present to examine what he has advanced upon this Head, having first given the Reader a short View of the Charge against Christianity, as it stood in *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, and compared it with the Charge, as it now stands in *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy*; that he may see what has been already done, what still remains to be done, in order to clear up this Controversy.

THE Charge against Christianity, as it stands in *Grounds, &c.* is this, “Christianity is founded on Judaism, and the *New Testament* on the *Old*; and JESUS as MESIAS of the *Jews only*, claims the Obedience and Submission of the World. Accordingly, it is the Design of

(c) *Scheme, &c.* p. 321.

INTRODUCTION.

7

“ of the Authors of the *New*, to prove all
“ the Parts of Christianity from the *Old*
“ *Testament* (d); it being wholly revealed
“ in the *Old Testament*, and having its di-
“ vine Authority from thence (e). *Conse-*
“ *quently*, it is not properly a New Law,
“ but Judaism explained and set in a due
“ Light, Jews and Christians having one
“ and the same Canon of Scripture (f),
“ (the *Old Testament*) which is yet the sole
“ true Canon of Scripture (g): That the
“ Truth of Christianity depends, as it
“ ought, on ancient Revelations, which are
“ contained in the *Old Testament* (h), it be-
“ ing a necessary Method for new Revela-
“ tions to be built and grounded on prece-
“ dent Revelations (i): That JESUS and
“ his Apostles grounded Christianity on
“ Proofs from the *Old Testament* (k), which
“ should seem to be destitute of other or
“ external Arguments (l). But these
“ Proofs taken out of the *Old*, and urged
“ in the *New Testament*, being sometimes,
“ either not to be found in the *Old*, or
“ not urged in the *New* according to the
“ literal and obvious Sense, are therefore
“ not Proofs according to Scholastick Rules
“ (m). Yet the Authors of the Books of
“ the *New Testament* always argue absolute-
“ ly from the Quotations they make out
“ of the Books of the *Old Testament* (n)
“ with

B 4

“ with

(d) *Grounds*, &c. p. 4. (e) *Ib.* p. 91. (f) p. 15.
(g) *Grounds*, &c. p. 13. (h) p. 25. (i) p. 20.
(k) p. 27. (l) p. 31. (m) p. 39. (n) p. 79.

“ with *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*: To both
 “ whom therefore they reasoned allegori-
 “ cally (*o*): That St. *Paul* seems to dis-
 “ claim all other Methods of arguing be-
 “ sides the allegorical (*p*): That all other
 “ Methods of reasoning were wholly dis-
 “ carded, and the allegorical reasoning set
 “ up (by the Apostles,) as the true and
 “ only reasoning proper to bring all Men
 “ to the Faith of Christ (*q*).

IT is some Satisfaction to observe; that
 a good Part of this Charge is given up.
 Since we will not tamely surrender our Ca-
 non, we are left in the quiet Possession of
 the better Part of it, *the New Testament*.
 We are no longer required to prove all the
 Parts of Christianity from the *Old Testa-
 ment*, it being since thought sufficient to
 prove what is called *the Grand fundamental
 Article* thereby, “ That JESUS was the
 “ MESSIAS of the *Jews* predicted in the
 “ Old Testament”. JESUS is no longer
 represented as a mere Commentator upon
 the *Old Testament*, or a Setter-forth of an
old Doctrine in a *new Light*. It is not in-
 sisted on as necessary, That new Revela-
 tions should be built and grounded upon
 precedent Revelations; (*r*) but only that
 it is requisite in the Case of Christianity:
 Because JESUS claimed a Character foretold
 by the Prophets, therefore “ the Argu-
 ment

(*o*) p. 80. (*p*) p. 92. (*q*) p. 94.
 (*r*) *See also*, &c. p. 321, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

“ from Prophecy becomes necessary to
“ establish this Claim of the Gospel ”.
Whereas before we were told, That JESUS
and his *Apostles* grounded Christianity on
Proofs from the *Old Testament*, as destitute
of other Arguments ; this glaring Falshood
has since been soften'd into such Expressions
as these ; “ Our blessed LORD laid a great
“ stress upon Prophecy ” (s) and “ the
“ Prophecies of the Old Testament were
“ urged — as Proofs of his being the
“ MESSIAS (t) ”. Since other Arguments
have been named and appealed to, as fre-
quently made use of by CHRIST and
his Apostles, it has been thought prudent
to recede from that bold Assertion, That
“ all other Methods of arguing were whol-
“ ly discarded, and allegorical Reasoning
“ set up, as the true and only Reasoning
“ proper to bring all Men to the Faith of
“ CHRIST ”.

WE seem therefore to have gained some
Ground, though not sufficient to discour-
age a second Attack. If the Reader should
ask, Upon what does the Controversy turn
at present ? I must refer him for Satisfac-
tion to the *ninth Chapter* (which in my
Opinion ought to have been the *first*) of
The Scheme of Literal Prophecy. Where the
Author says, “ Since JESUS claims to be
“ the Son of GOD, or MESSIAS of the
“ *Jews* foretold by the Prophets, it is re-
“ quisite

(s) p. 326.

(t) p. 329.

INTRODUCTION.

“quisite that Claim should be made out”
 (u) it being the fundamental Article of
 Christianity, “That *Article*, which made
 “way for the embracing all the other
 “Articles, the Passage to all the rest.”
 (x) And “the said Claim ought to be
 “made out by appealing to the Books of
 “the *Old Testament*, to the Law, the Pro-
 “phets, and the Psalms (y): JESUS and
 “his *Apostles* appealed to them (z): And
 “it appears from the manner of citing and
 “applying the Prophecies of the *Old Te-*
 “*stament* in the *New*, that they were ur-
 “ged. — as Proofs of JESUS being
 “the MESSIAS — as direct Proofs, as
 “absolute Proofs in themselves, and not
 “mere Proofs *ad hominem* to the *Jews*”
 (a). Yet “it does not appear, that JESUS
 “CHRIST or his *Apostles* ever pretended to
 “give us the *literal* Sense of the *Old Testa-*
 “*ment*, but most probably always intend-
 “ed to give us the *mystical* Sense thereof
 (b): Their Application of them was wholly
 “*typical* (c): In no one Case can we find
 “one Prophecy *literally fulfilled* (d). This
 is the Substance of what is alledged against
 us in this *last Performance*, the rest of the
 Book being an Induction of Particulars in
 Confirmation of this general Charge; where
 he undertakes to prove, That those Pas-
 sages of the *Old Testament*, which we say
 were

(u) *Scheme*, &c. p. 322. (x) p. 324.
 (y) p. 325. (z) p. 326.
 (a) *Scheme*, &c. p. 329. (b) p. 328.
 (c) p. 352. (d) p. 351.

INTRODUCTION.

were *primarily* fulfilled in JESUS CHRIST, were applicable to him in a *secondary* or *typical* Sense only.

IN Answer whereto, I think it proper to inquire somewhat more carefully, What is THE *grand fundamental Article of Christianity*, and what the proper Methods of establishing it. From whence I hope to prove,

1. THAT the Claim, which JESUS made to the *Messiaship* does not properly come under that *Denomination*, but has itself *another Foundation* prior to it, and is (equally with other Articles of Christianity) capable of being supported thereby.

2. THAT, as the Claim, which JESUS made, of being the MESSIAS of the *Jews* predicted in the *Old Testament*, stands upon the same Foot with all other Articles of Christianity, it needs not to be distinctly proved any more than they.

3. THAT it lies upon our Adversaries to *disprove* the Claim, which JESUS made to the *Messiaship*, and not upon us to *prove* it by Arguments adapted to this Claim in particular.

4. THAT the Claim of JESUS to the *Messiaship* cannot be *disproved*, and consequently that our *Foundation* remains unshaken.

AND

AND though this might suffice to justify Christianity against the Attacks of our present Adversary ; yet I shall proceed further, and in Compliance with his strict Demands undertake to shew, That there are *Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, which do directly and distinctly *prove* the Claim which JESUS made from thence. To which End I shall give the Reader,

1. A GENERAL View of *clear Prophecies* of the *Old Testament* relating to important Events, which were accomplished in and through JESUS CHRIST, and him only.

2. I SHALL enter into a particular Examination of those *Prophecies*, proving, That according to *rational* and *just Construction* they do relate to those Events, and those only, to which I have applied them.

IF this be done to purpose ; I hope it will be allowed, that the chiefest Point in Controversy is fairly settled, which I take to be this, Whether there are *Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, to which CHRIST, and his *Apostles* on his Behalf, could fairly appeal in Justification of his Mission. For if the main End and Design of his Coming, and in a good Measure the particular Manner and Circumstances of it, were expressly revealed by the Prophets under the *Old Testament* ; if their *Prophecies* present us with

a Scheme of things totally inconsistent with the *Jewish* Oeconomy, and speak of a Person employed therein distinguished in his Character and Circumstances from all that flourished under that Oeconomy; if JESUS the Author of our Religion was peculiarly remarkable for *that* Character and *those* Circumstances, and if *that* new Scheme of things was pursued and promoted and did at length take Effect under the Influence of his Doctrine; then CHRIST and his *Apostles* might justly appeal to the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* for the Conviction of Persons believing those Scriptures to have been given by Inspiration, and insist upon the *Argument from Prophecy*, as a rational Justification of the Scheme they were pursuing. And this I hope to make appear in the Sequel of this Discourse.





T H E
R E A S O N I N G
 O F
C H R I S T and His Apostles
 Vindicated.

P A R T I.

The Argument from Miracles defended.

C H A P. I.

*The Fundamental Article of Christianity, and the
 proper Method of establishing it, considered.*



IN a Dispute about the Truth and Divinity of the Christian Religion, it is very necessary, That the Fundamental Article thereof should be first clearly stated. For before one can write to any Purpose about *Proofs* and the Validity of them, the *Point to be proved* ought
 to

PART to be agreed upon and certainly known ;
 I. not till then can any one judge, Whether
 the Proof comes up to the Point or not.
 Accordingly, the Author of *Grounds, &c.*
 (a) did, at setting out, lay down *this*, as
 the grand and fundamental Article of Christi-
 anity, “ That JESUS of Nazareth was
 “ the MESSIAS of the Jews, predicted in
 the *Old Testament* ; ” having said before,
 (b) That “ as MESSIAS of the Jews ONLY
 “ he claimed the Obedience and Submission
 “ of the World ”. I thought myself obli-
 ged to take some notice of this Position,
 for Reasons, which I hope will appear as
 clear to my Reader, as they have to my-
 self. I would not however be thought to
 question the Importance of this Article ;
 I allow it to be a *fundamental one*, an Ar-
 ticle, which CHRIST and his *Apostles* in
 their Disputes with Jews, much insisted
 upon, and which no consistent Christian can
 deny. I question only the *Preference* he
 gives it, when he calls it, *The grand fun-
 damental Article of Christianity*, and my Ob-
 servation upon it was (c), “ Our Author’s
 “ State of the Case is not strictly true.”
 But knowing the Use he made of it, I was
 sensible he would not easily give it up, and
 therefore I offered my Reasons for differ-
 ing from him. I observed, that the Belief
 of this Article could not be a Foundation
 for Mankind to receive the Christian Doc-
 trine

(a) *Grounds, &c.* p. 12.
 (c) *Serm.* p. 101.

(b) p. 4.

upon. The strictest Harmony between the *Old and New Testament*, could not engage any one to admit the *latter* who looked upon the *former* as an Imposture, which was the Case of the *Gentiles*, for whom the Gospel was intended, as well as for the *Jews* (d). Sensible of this Failure, he endeavoured to supply it by a Contrivance purely his own, That *Gentiles* ought to be converted first to *Judaism*, to put them in “equal Condition with *Jews* of being converted” to Christianity upon his Principles (e). But we are well assured, that the *Apostles* of the *Gentiles* did not take this Method, and consequently, that they did not begin to build with them upon this Foundation.

I THINK his own Definition of *the Fundamental Article* sufficient to confute him, “That Article, which makes way for the embracing all the other Articles, the Passage to all the rest (f).” Had a *Gentile* been applied to in this Manner, JESUS is the MESSIAS of the *Jews* predicted in the *Old Testament*; he would have put it off with a Scoff, “What is the *Old Testament* to me? “Your Prophets I look upon as Impostors, and so I esteem those that claim Authority under them.” This Method in my Opinion would rather have stopt, than opened

C

a

(d) Serm. p. 201. Pref. p. 19.

(e) *Grounds*, p. 95.(f) *Scheme*, p. 324.

PART a *Passage* to all the other Articles of Christianity: And it is certain the *Apostles* did not follow it.

“ BUT let the Fact be so ; ” replies our Author (g), “ still first or last, the *Gentiles* must have the Point of the *Messiaship* cleared up to them. ” And for Proof of this observes (b), That *Luke, Mark, Barnabas, and Paul*, particularly in his *Epistle* to the *Romans*, reasoned with *Gentile Converts* from the *Old Testament*. This I think is giving up the Question, under Colour of defending it. The Question was, What Methods the *Apostles* used to make *Converts*, what *Foundation* they built upon, whether with *Gentiles* they began with the *Messiaship* and the Proof thereof from the *Old Testament*? His Answer is, First or last they did ; and proves it by Instances of the *Apostles* Reasoning with them *after Conversion*, i. e. First or last they began with them, if nothing went before, to make *Converts* of them after they were converted, and to lay the *Foundation* upon the *Top* of the *Building*. Such a notable Proof of his Point, as this, might make another Man blush that differed from him: But for my own Part, I must confess, if this be the best Defence it is capable of, that I cannot assent to it, though it should appear, that “ no Christian before
“ fore

(g) Scheme, p. 131.

(b) 132.

“fore and besides Mr. B---- ever denied P A R T
“it.” I.



NEVERTHELESS, Mr. B---- must not despair of Conviction. For “to confute
“this *fundamental Error*, that runs through
“his Book, (i) *our Author* refers him to
“the *New Testament*, and to the Books of
“Christians of all *Communities* that have
“ever treated of this Matter.” Mr. B---
has a great Regard for the *New Testament*,
and particularly for those Things wherein
Christians of all *Communities* agree. But
how will they confute him? CHRIST and
his *Apostles* did indeed insist much upon it
in their Disputes with *Jews*, That JESUS
was the MESSIAS OR CHRIST; they offer-
ed many Proofs to convince them of it, and
among other Methods, frequently appealed
to the *Old Testament* thereupon. Christians
of all *Communities* insist upon this Article,
as very necessary to be believed, and I ac-
knowledge, that no consistent Christian can
dispute the Truth of it. But what then?
It will not follow therefore, That this is
the grand or fundamental Article of Christi-
anity; that Article which made way for em-
bracing all the other Articles of Christianity,
which was the Passage to all the rest, and
which served this Purpose universally with
Gentiles as well as *Jews*. It is allowed,
That the Men, whom *Paul* converted at
Athens (k), had not this Article proposed to
C 2 them


(i) Ibid. p. 325.

(k) Acts xvii. 34.

PART them (l). And many other Instances might
 I. be given; but allowing this is giving up
 the Point, and I will not trouble my Reader farther than is needful.

THE *fundamental Article* of Christianity (as appears by the Definition of it, in which we both agree) must be such as directly and necessarily supposes, That the Author of it acted by divine Commission and Appointment in publishing it to Mankind. And this is evidently implied in that Article I proposed (m), That JESUS was a Prophet, a Teacher come from GOD, speaking the Words of GOD, to whom GOD had given his Spirit without Measure. I do not however confine it to these very Words; the Thing intended will admit of great variety of Expression, as we may observe in Scripture. CHRIST states the Point in Debate between him and the Jews, who questioned his Authority, thus (n), *Whether his Doctrine was of GOD, or whether he spake of himself?* And he often asserted his Authority in such Expressions as these, *The Father (meaning GOD) hath sent me* (o). *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me* (p). *He that sent me is true, and I speak to the World those Things which I have heard of him* (q). *I proceeded forth and came from GOD; neither came I of myself,*

(l) Scheme, p. 331. (m) Pref. p. 19.
 (n) John xvii. 17. (o) v. 36. (p) vii. 16.
 (q) viii. 26.

self, but he sent me (r). I have not spoken PART
of myself; but the Father who sent me, he I.
gave me a Commandment, what I should say; 
and what I should speak (s). The Word
which you hear is not mine, but the Father's
who sent me (t). Accordingly we find his
Disciples, who believed in him, expressing
their Faith thus, *We believe that thou cam-*
est forth from GOD (u). JESUS approved
the Form, and expressed his Satisfaction
therein to GOD by Prayer, saying (x),
They have known surely that I came out from
Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst
send me: And he goes on to pray, That
the World might have the same Faith in
him (y), *That the World may believe that*
Thou hast sent me.

FROM these Passages therefore I hope
it will be allowed; That to believe in JESUS
as a Person sent with a Revelation
from GOD, was an Article proposed to, and
necessary to be believed by all Men in
order to their being Christians. And then
I must add, Put the strictest Sense you
can upon the Words, *fundamental Article,*
this Article will come up to it. Can
there be an opener Passage, a readier
Way to the embracing all other Articles of
Christianity, than this of believing, "That
" JESUS came from GOD, and spake to
" the World those Things, which he receiv-
" ed

C 3

(r) John viii. 42. (s) xii. 49. (t) xiv. 24.
(u) xxvi. 30. (x) xvii. 8. (y) xvii. 21.

PART. "ed from him?" As I said before (z),
 I. "No Man can deny, let him be Jew or
 W. "Gentile, Deist or Freethinker, the Vali-
 "dity of it. This Foundation is of itself
 "sufficient to support every other Article
 "of Christianity." He that admits the
 Truth of this Article, must admit all others,
 he cannot dispute any one Doctrine found-
 ed thereupon.

I ADD farther, That no Article what-
 soever, which does not express, or at least
necessarily imply as much, can be deemed,
the fundamental Article. Nothing will justify
 me, in receiving every Doctrine for the
 Sake of the Teacher, but the Suppositi-
 on of his acting therein by a divine Com-
 mission. In this respect, I allow St. Paul's
 Article, (a) to believe in JESUS, *that*
 GOD hath raised him from the Dead, to
 be called *the fundamental Article*: So like-
 wise believing *him to be the Lamb of GOD,*
the Son of GOD, the CHRIST of GOD,
 or CHRIST the Son of GOD: because
 these Characters necessarily, and at first
 hearing suggest a divine Commission and
 Authority. My Author aware of this,
 has cunningly changed that defective Arti-
 cle (b), at which I took Exception, by
 adding

(z) Pref. p. 19. (a) Rom. x. 9.

(b) In *Grounds*, &c. it stood thus, *Jesus of Nazareth was the Messias of the Jews predicted in the Old Testament*, p. 12. In *Scheme*, &c. it is thus altered, *The SON OF GOD, or Messias of the Jews foretold by the Prophets*, p. 322. This indeed stands at some di-
 stance

adding one of these Characters to it: But PART
 takes no Notice of the Change, offers no I.
 Plea to justify it, leaves his Reader to sup-
 pose, that I had excepted against it in the
 Terms it now stands, and then laughs at
 me, as singular, for denying that which he
 gave me no Opportunity of denying, and
 which he knows I should not have denied,
 had it been proposed to me. Whether this
 be Logical Honesty or not, I leave the
 Reader to judge.

BUT to put an End, if possible, to all
 Cavil about Words, let me ask, What do
 we dispute about? Is not this the End of
 our Inquiry, “Whether the Christian Re-
 “ligion be of divine Institution, or not?”
 If it be; I ask again, Is it not a proper
 Step, Is it not laying a good *Foundation* (if
 such *Foundation* can be laid) to prove,
 That JESUS, the Author of it, *came from*
 GOD, and was sent by him on Purpose to
 teach us that Religion? This Article be-
 ing established, my Author himself must al-
 low; That the whole Christian Doctrine,
 every other Article is established with it.

C 4

Nay,

stance from his Attack upon me; yet the Reader may
 easily perceive the Connexion. But when he comes to
 confute me, he acts with more Caution: For citing
 the Words of St. *John* xx. 31. against me, *These are*
written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ,
 he suppresses Part of the Sentence, *the Son of God,* lest
 the Reader should immediately perceive the fallacy. But
 I must tell him, That *without* those Words, *Son of God,*
 it is no Citation, and *with* them it is no Confutation.

PART I. Nay, it is a Foundation capable of supporting *his* Foundation; for if he came from GOD, and what he taught us was by his Appointment, it will necessarily follow, that he was, what he stiled himself, the CHRIST or MESSIAS of the *Jews*, this being Part of the Doctrine taught by him.

How then could I be guilty of a *fundamental Error*, when I laid the *Foundation* of Christianity on so sure a Principle, so effectual for the Establishment of every Article of it? My whole Book was intended to prove, and to justify Men in the Belief of, this important Article; I could not therefore *err fundamentally*, though I might possibly *err* in the *Proof* of it. But I have good Reason to think I did not *err in that*, having my Adversary on my Side to justify the Method, wherein I undertook to prove it. It is past Dispute, That JESUS CHRIST came into the World, as a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD. One Text, out of the many cited above (c) to this Purpose, will satisfy every Reader. *I have not spoken of myself, but the Father who sent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak (d)*. It is also evident, That this was intended as a Revelation of a *new* Religion: Because none then subsisting was allowed to be true, but the *Jewish*; and that was disannulled (e) as insufficient, the *Christian* being called a *New* (f), a

(c) Page 20. (d) John xii. 49. (e) Heb. vii. 18.

(*f*); a *Second* (*g*); a *better Covenant* (*b*), PART I.
 in Contradistinction to it. Since JESUS therefore pretended to this, Let our Author say, what was proper or necessary to justify him in it. His Words are, (*i*) “Had
 “ JESUS CHRIST come into the World,
 “ as a Person sent with a Revelation from
 “ GOD of a new Religion, and had he performed Miracles as the Credentials of his
 “ Mission, he would have had a Right to
 “ have been attended to, and *tryed* on that
 “ Foot. And if his Doctrines and Precepts had been consistent with Reason,
 “ consistent with one another, and all tending to the Honour of GOD and good
 “ of Men, his Miracles with those Circumstances, ought to have determined Men
 “ to have believed in him.” This is the Opinion of an Adversary, and yet herein we joyn Issue with him, we desire no better Terms; but submit it to the Judgment of every Man, Whether JESUS be not justified according to those Rules which he has prescribed.

IF what I have said already, has not cleared me of that *fundamental Error*, with which I am charged by the Author of the *Scheme*, &c. I now begin to hope, that I shall be justified out of his own Mouth. For that very Proof, which he says, “ought to determine Men to believe in JESUS, as a
 “ Person

(*f*) Heb. viii. 13.
 (*i*) *Scheme*, p. 321.

(*g*) viii. 7: (*b*) viii. 6.

PART “ Person sent with a Revelation from God,”
 I. was the very Proof that I offered in my *Sermons*, in Defence of JESUS and his Doctrine. I did at setting out submit it to be tryed by those Rules, which he has prescribed. Nay, I did insist upon those Rules, as necessary to a prudent Tryal of it (k). Accordingly, I undertook the Defence of it, as a Doctrine agreeable to Reason, worthy of GOD to offer, and Man to accept, as visibly tending to their Welfare and Perfection (l). And whereas it had been suggested, that a false and unreasonable *Claim* was made a part of that Doctrine, I undertook (m) to justify this Claim from the Exceptions made against it. I proceeded also farther, to prove, (n) That this Doctrine so qualified, was confirmed by Miracles, more and greater than any other Revelation could pretend to. Consequently, I took the proper Method (according to our Author’s Judgment) to convince Men, that JESUS was a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD.

PERHAPS he may tell me, This is not the Point to be proved, *viz.* “ That JESUS was a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD.” But he must give me leave to laugh at this, as egregious trifling. Admit this single Point to be proved, and I am entirely satisfied. He may call what pleases him *fundamental*; for my own Part,
 I

(k) Serm. I.
 (n) III, IV.

(l) II.

(m) V, VI, VII.


I think this *Foundation* sufficient, sufficient P. A R T
 to justify me in embracing Christianity, and I.
 every Article of it; without Scruple or Ex-
 ception. And I believe every reasonable
 Man thinks as I do.

NEVERTHELESS, he could not charge me, upon his own Principles, with a *fundamental Error*, that runs through my whole Book. For I did not only pursue his general Method in proving, “ That JESUS CHRIST
 “ was a Person sent with a Revelation from
 “ God;” but I took particular notice of his Exception: I considered the Claim which JESUS made of being the MESSIAS of the *Jews* predicted in the *Old Testament*, I undertook to justify it, and in that Method which he prescribes, by Proofs from the *Old Testament* (o): So that my Book was apparently drawn up according to his whole Prescription.

(o) SERM. V, VI, VII.

THE *Claim of JESUS*, “ That he was
“ the MESSIAS of the *Jews* predicted
“ in the *Old Testament*, ” stands upon
the same Foot with all the other Articles
of Christianity, and needs not to be distinctly
proved any more than they.

IT appears from what has been hitherto
observ'd, That if JESUS was a Person sent
with a Revelation from GOD, we have a suf-
ficient Foundation to build our whole Chri-
stianity upon. No Article taught by such
a Person can be disputed; but by question-
ing the Truth of the Doctrine, you questi-
on his divine Commission in teaching it.
But yet it appears from the Rules prescrib-
ed, and agreed upon between us for the
Tryal of such a Person, that his Doctrine
must be subject to Examination; because
we are partly to judge of him by his Doc-
trine, by the Reasonableness and good Ten-
dency of it, whether he be of GOD or not;
and we both allow, that if any Thing taught
by him appear to be false or unreasonable,
unworthy of GOD, or prejudicial to Men,
he ought not for that Reason to be received,
as a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD.
It is not therefore the Article of the *Messia-
ship* only, or that in particular above any
ether Article, which is subject to this Tryal,
whether

whether it be reasonable and consistent with P A R T
 Truth or not; but every Article of Chri- I.
 stianity is subject to the like Examination, 
 and if any one of them appear to be false,
 the Mission of the Teacher is as liable to be
 disputed upon that Account, as if his Claim
 to the *Messiaship* were false.


BUT our Author seems to make a Dif-
 ference, and to suggest, that something par-
 ticular is to be done in Vindication of *this*
Article above any other. He introduces it
 as an Exception to his general Rule, as if
 Christianity would not admit of the same
 Defence, it would have done, if this Arti-
 cle had not been added. For having de-
 clared thus, (b) “ If JESUS had performed
 “ Miracles as Credentials of his Mission,
 “ and if his Doctrine and Precepts had been
 “ consistent with Reason and one another,
 “ tending to the Honour of GOD, and
 “ Good of Men, his Miracles with those
 “ Circumstances, ought to have determined
 “ Men to believe in him; ” he adds, “ But
 “ since he claims to be the *Messias* of the
 “ *Jews*, foretold by the Prophets, it is re-
 “ quisite that *Claim* be made out. ” But
 why must this Claim in particular above any
 other be *made out*? Consistent with Truth
 it ought to be; for otherwise the Rule a-
 greed upon between us would exclude him;
 one Condition whereof, is, That his Doc-
 trine be consistent with Reason, which that
 Doc-

(b) Scheme, &c. p. 321; 322.

PART Doctrine cannot be, which is not consistent
 I. with Truth: But if this and his other Doctrines
 be consistent with Truth and Reason, and
 of good Tendency, Miracles, without any
 other *making out*, ought, by his own Con-
 fession, to determine our Belief.

JESUS certainly did, among other Cha-
 racters, lay Claim to that of being the
 MESSIAS of the *Jews*, predicted in the *Old*
Testament: And I readily allow without
 Reserve or Scruple, if this was a false Claim,
 “ If the Scriptures do not testify of him, if
 “ neither *Moses* nor the *Prophets* ever spoke
 “ a Word about him,” that then he was
 a false Teacher, “ wanted Honesty, Truth
 “ and Sincerity (b),” and ought therefore
 to be rejected notwithstanding his Miracles.
 “ The *Jews* could admit no Person as their
 “ promised *Messias*, who did not answer
 “ the Characters of their *Messias*, plainly
 “ delivered by their *Prophets* (c). If the
 “ prophetic Characters of the *Messias*, be
 “ not applicable to him, Miracles cannot
 “ give a Man a Claim to be received as
 “ such (d). Or, if the *Prophets* have not
 “ spoken of *Christ*, all the Miracles in the
 “ World will not prove they have spoken
 “ of him ” (e). I heartily and willingly
 put the Dispute about Christianity upon this
 Issue. Let our Author, or any Man else,
 prove the Claim which JESUS made to be
 false,

(b) Scheme, p. 322. (c) p. 324.
 (d) p. 326. (e) Ibid.

false, either that *the Scriptures never said a* P A R T
Word about a MESSIAS, or if they did, that I.
the Characters were not applicable to JESUS, 
 I will give up the Cause of Christianity to
 Infidels, and renounce that Religion which
 I now embrace. But if his Claim cannot
 be *disproved, made out* to be false; then I
 appeal to all that know what Reasoning is,
 Whether the Miracles which JESUS wrought
 in Confirmation of a Doctrine, chargeable
 with nothing that appears to be false or
 unreasonable, but tending in general to the
 Honour of GOD and Good of Men, ought
 not, by our Author's own Confession, to
 determine Men to believe in him (*f*).

AND herein you may perceive of what
 Weight Miracles were to convince Men,
 that JESUS was the MESSIAS of the *Jews.*
 There are many Things very consistent with
 Reason, which yet cannot be made out by
 Reason; which may be true, yet perhaps
 we cannot clearly prove them so; or per-
 haps capable of a just Proof, which every
 Capacity cannot comprehend. In Cases of
 this Nature, Miracles are of Use, they are
 I think by all reasonable Men admitted in-
 stead of Proof. If this be not granted, they
 are of no Use at all, it is trifling to alledge
 them upon any Occasion. Many Articles
 we receive, as consistent with Reason, which
 cannot be proved thereby; we are allowed
 to do it; it would be ridiculous to dispute
 it:

(*f*) Schmee, p. 322.

PART it: It being one great End of Revelation
I. to discover and confirm such Truths to us.

and in this Respect the Article of the *Messiahship* is as capable of being confirmed by Miracles, as any other Article of Christianity. If that, or any other Article can be proved to be false, no Miracles (of what Kind soever) will prove it to be true. JESUS made other Claims, besides that of being MESSIAS of the *Jews*: He claimed the Character of being our LORD here, and our JUDGE hereafter, If either of these Claims can be proved to be false, he ought to be rejected upon that account, notwithstanding his Miracles, and for the very same Reason that he ought to be rejected, if his Claim to the *Messiahship* appear to be false: Because no Miracles can prove a Proposition to be true which is false, GOD cannot be the Patron of Falshood and Imposture, and we are assured, that whosoever is guilty of either, let his Credentials be what they will, has not his Commission. But if he can be charged with nothing inconsistent with Truth and Reason, if his Doctrine in general tends to the Honour of GOD, and Good of Men; then every Article taught by him, (though every Article cannot be clearly *made out* by self-convincing Proofs, distinct from that of Miracles) ought to be received as true. His Miracles, with those Circumstances, ought to determine Men to believe in him (says our Author (g), and
confe-


(g) Scheme, p. 325.

consequently to believe every Thing taught by him. PART
I.

You will urge, “ That the Claim of
 “ the *Messiahship* is, from the Nature of the
 “ Claim itself, to be tryed and examined
 “ by the *Old Testament* (g). ” Claiming a
 Character described in the *Old Testament*, is
 appealing to the *Old Testament*; and there-
 fore the Writings of the *Prophets* appealed
 to are to be searched upon that Occasion.
 True. There does an Appeal lie to the *Old
 Testament*, and to all other rational Methods
 of trying, whether his Claim be consistent
 with Truth or not. But in this the Arti-
 cle, “ That JESUS was the MESSIAS of the
 “ *Jews*, ” differs nothing from any other
 Article of Christianity. For since one ne-
 cessary Condition of all, is, That they be
 consistent with Truth and Reason, without
 which, Miracles signify nothing; it fol-
 lows, that an Appeal will lie concerning
 every Article of Christianity to all rational
 Methods of trying and judging, whether it
 be consistent with Truth or not. Our Bles-
 sed LORD himself allows of such an Appeal
 with respect to his Doctrine in general, ask-
 ing the *Jews* that opposed him, (b) *Which of
 you convinceth me of Sin? And if I say the
 Truth, (if you cannot disprove what I say)
 why do ye not believe me?* A plain Appeal to
 the Understandings of Men, and as plain a
 Concession, That, if any Article taught by
 D him,

(g) Scheme, .p. 325.

(b) John viii. 46.

PART him, did appear upon fair Tryal to be false or
 I. unreasonable, unworthy of GOD, or preju-
 dicial to Men, they would be justified in re-
 jecting him, notwithstanding his Miracles. And as the *Old Testament* was admitted to be true, containing the Oracles of GOD, as well by CHRIST and his *Apostles*, as by the *Jews*, That also, as well as the Principles of Reason, was an allowed Measure to try his Doctrine by. The *Jews* did, and were permitted to raise Objections from thence, as well against any other Article, as against that of the *Messiahship*, and CHRIST and his *Apostles* thought themselves obliged to answer them. For which Reason we allow, should an Article of Christianity so clash with any Doctrine or Precept of the *Old Testament*, as that GOD could not be the Author of both, then the Gospel (which admits the Truth of the *Old Testament*) would be inconsistent with itself, and consequently unjustifiable. E. g. Had GOD by the *Old Testament* appointed *Moses* to be *Lord* of all Men here, and *Judge* hereafter; then JESUS's Claim of being their *Lord* and *Judge*, exclusive of *Moses*, had been inconsistent with Truth, and for that Reason he ought to have been rejected. And so in general, let it be made appear, that he claimed any Character from which the *Old Testament* precluded him, or any Character from thence, for which there is no Foundation therein, or that he taught any Doctrine inconsistent with the Supposition of the Truth of those Oracles; such

such Conduct, we say, no Credentials will P A R T
 justify. Let the *Old Testament* therefore be I.
 searched, let the *Prophets* be examined, let
 Reason be consulted, and all rational Ways
 of judging be applied; if by any of them
 any Character he claimed can be *disproved*,
 any Doctrine taught by him, *made out to*
be false, we allow the Foundation of Chri-
 stianity to be shaken, and that Miracles
 will not support it.

C H A P. III.

T H A T *it lies upon our Adversaries to dis-*
prove the Claim, which JESUS made to
the Messiahship, and not upon us to prove
it by Arguments adapted to this Claim in
particular.


I THINK it of some Consequence in this
 Debate, to be well satisfied on which
 Side the Proof lies. We both agree, That
 an Appeal to the *Old Testament* in this Case,
 is very reasonable. But the Question is,
 Whether we, who admit this Claim, be-
 cause made by One that had the proper
 and usual Credentials of a divine Commis-
 sion, are notwithstanding obliged in Strict-
 ness by other self-sufficient Arguments to
 justify it? Or, Whether they who dispute
 a Claim so well attested, are not for that

PART Reason obliged by very clear, solid Arguments to *disprove* it. The Question seems to me to answer itself. We have alledged our Proof, *viz.* JESUS had the proper Credentials of a divine Commission, therefore he claimed nothing but what he had a Title to. Let this Argument have what Force it will, we may certainly rest here till it be invalidated.

You will say perhaps, it has been invalidated, it having been urged, That “if JESUS is not the Person prophesied of as the MESSIAS, his Miracles will not prove him to be so (i).” But I say, this is no Answer at all, it is taking the Point in question for granted. I may go on to prove, and you may answer eternally in the same Manner, and to as much Purpose. Nay, a Child may invalidate every Demonstration in *Euclid*, this Way, and as solidly. Since therefore these argumentative *If*'s, are of no Avail, our Argument will still stand good, till something more be done to invalidate it. And what is that? Instead of saying, *IF his Claim be false*, directly to *prove* it false. Therefore it appears, that we are to call upon them *to disprove*, and not they upon us *to prove* this Claim from the *Old Testament*.

I INSIST the more upon this, because the *Reasoning* of CHRIST and his *Apostles* is

(i) *Grounds, &c.* p. 37.

is concerned therein, whose *Reasoning* I PART
 am engaged to *Vindicate*. For they actual- I.
 ly proceeded in this Way, even with *Jews*, 
 who had certainly a better Title than other
 Men to insist upon Proofs out of the *Old*
Testament. We read (k), That several of
 them came to JESUS pressing to be satisf-
 fied on this Head, and said to him, *How*
long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be
the CHRIST, tell us plainly. And the Ar-
 gument used to convince them, was this,
 and this only: *The Works that I do in my*
Father's Name, they bear Witness of me. He
 did not look upon himself obliged to justi-
 fy his Claim by other direct Proofs from
 the *Old Testament*. They had brought no
 Objection against it from the *Old Testament*;
 and till that was done, he thought the
 Works he did in his Father's Name, a
 sufficient Justification of it. Nevertheless,
 he allowed and required them to search the
Old Testament thereupon; he gave them Li-
 berty to argue from thence, and if they
 could, to *disprove* his Claim thereby: But
 if they could not, he thought *that*, as well
 as other consistent Articles taught by him,
 sufficiently justified by his Miracles only.
 Many of his Converts thought the same;
 who, *when they had seen the Miracle that*
JESUS did, said, This is of a Truth that Pro-
phet that should come into the World (l):
 And it was a Miracle, not pretended to be
 prophesied of in the *Old Testament*.

D 3

AND

(k) John x. 24, &c.

(l) *Ib.* vi. 14.

PART

I.

AND it does farther appear, That his Claim ought to have been presumed to be true, antecedently to the Completion of those Prophecies, wherein the Character of the MESSIAS is supposed to be contained; because the Conversion of many was prerequisite to the Completion of them, which I have already made appear (m) by Arguments as yet unanswered. His Miracles therefore ought to have been admitted as a sufficient Confirmation of his Claim, till some solid Objection could be raised against it: Consequently, it lay upon his Adversaries to *disprove*, and not upon him *to make it out*, by direct Proofs from the *Old Testament*.

I THINK our Author's own Concession, sufficient to determine this Point effectually, (n) "Miracles, with these Circumstances," (of a Doctrine consistent with Reason, &c.) "ought to determine Men to believe in JESUS, as a Person sent with a Revelation from GOD." This is the Foundation we build upon, he allows the Validity of it; Why then should we quit it? He objects against the Claim of the *Messiahship*. But this is only Surmise, till it be *disproved*; and he cannot expect I should quit a valid Foundation, upon mere Surmise. I think his Doctrine in general, and this Article in particular, is consistent with

(m) Serm. p. 122, &c.

(n) Scheme, p. 322.

with Reason, &c. Therefore I want no PART farther Proof; but am obliged, for the fore- I. mentioned Reasons, to believe in him. Here I may, and ought to rest, till it can be *made out* by direct convincing Proofs, that he taught what was false, or claimed a Character that did not belong to him. If nothing false or unreasonable can be proved upon him, I am allowed to stand upon a good Bottom; I will therefore first see it proved, before I quit it, and think myself obliged so to do; and my Author (if he would be consistent with himself) must think the same.

I would have the Reader perfectly satisfied in this Case; for it is of Consequence: I desire therefore he would use his utmost Attention thereupon. For my own Part, I have considered and reconsidered it, and tryed it in various Lights, and in every Light I have yet viewed it, it has appeared to me incumbent upon our Adversary to *disprove* the Claim, which JESUS made to the *Messiaship*. If it be not false, we have by his own Concession a valid Foundation, such Proof as ought to determine us to believe in him. Ought I then to quit this Foundation, till it be shaken? Does it not remain unshaken, till this Claim appear to be false? And if so, does not the Proof in Equity lie on his Side, who maintains the Falsity of it? Had I no other Proof of his being a Teacher

PART sent from GOD, but what arises from the
 I. Supposition of his being the MESSIAS,
 then the Article of the *Messiahship* would be
 my sole Foundation, and that Foundation
 ought to be well established, it ought to
 be *made out* by clear convincing Proofs,
 before I can safely build upon it. But if
 I have a sufficient Foundation, a Founda-
 tion, which nothing can shake, but some
 unreasonable Position, some false Claim to
 a Character that did not belong to him;
 then I am to keep to that Foundation and
 rest upon it, till that Charge can be *made*
out and clearly proved. For if his Claim
 be not false, I am allow'd to have Proof
 enough; consequently I must yield to the
 Force of that Proof, till his Claim appear
 to be false.

C H A P. IV.

THAT *the Claim of JESUS to the Messia-*
ship cannot be disproved, and consequently
our Foundation remains unshaken.

SINCE it cannot be denied, That
 “ JESUS came into the World, as a
 “ Person sent with a Revelation from GOD,
 “ of a new Religion ” ; and it is not dis-
 puted, but that “ he performed Miracles
 “ as the Credentials of his Mission ” ; and
 since

since it is allowed, that, “ if his Doc- P A R T
 “ trines and Precepts be consistent with I.
 “ Reason, with one another, and tend to
 “ the Honour of GOD and Good of Men,
 “ his Miracles with those Circumstances
 “ ought to determine Men to believe in
 “ him ” ; we have nothing else to do, but
 to guard his Doctrine against any Charge
 of Falshood, Inconsistency, or evil Ten-
 dency: That done, our Defence is allowed
 to be compleat, and we are justified in our
 Belief.

THE Doctrine now called in Question is,
 that “ JESUS was the MESSIAS of the *Jews*
 “ predicted in the *Old Testament* ”. This
 is censured as a false and groundless Claim
 which has no Foundation on the *Old Testa-*
ment. We are therefore to stand upon our
 Defence in this Case; if we are able to re-
 fute the Arguments, whereby our Adverfa-
 ries pretend to support the Charge, it is
 sufficient.

BUT it must be observed, That we have
 been attacked upon this Head two Ways:
 First by the *Jews*, who did allow their
 Scriptures to speak of a MESSIAS, an ex-
 traordinary Person to come into the World,
 but alledged, That JESUS did not an-
 swer the Characters given of him by the
 Prophets. But now after Seventeen hun-
 dred Years Mistake of *Jews* and *Christians*,
 who have been always conversant in those
 Writings of the Prophets, it is discovered,
 That

PART That they never spoke a Word of such extraordinary Events, as were fulfilled in *JESUS CHRIST*; but all was intended of, and performed by, particular Kings and Prophets under the *Jewish* State, long before the Appearance of *CHRIST* our LORD. We acknowledge that, either of these Allegations being made good, our Foundation is shaken. We are obliged therefore to stand upon our Defence, ready to hear and to answer all that can be said in Favour of either by *Jews* or *Free-thinkers*. We willingly joyn Issue with them in appealing to the *Law* and the *Prophets*, and especially with the latter, in desiring, that *Tradition* and *mere Authority* may have nothing to do in the Case; but that the Rules of common Sense and good Criticism may be our Guide in interpreting those Scriptures.

I. THE Objections of the *Jews* against *JESUS*, as not answering the Characters of the *MESSIAS* described in their *Prophets*, are of no great Consequence. One of the first we read of was this, *Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth (a). Out of Galilee ariseth no Prophet (b). Shall CHRIST come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, That CHRIST cometh of the Seed of David, and out of the Town of Bethlehem, where David was? (c)* This Objection we know was founded in Ignorance

(a) John i. 46. (b) vii. 52. (c) vii. 41, 42.

ance of Fact; for JESUS did not arise P A R T
 out of some obscure Family in *Galilee*, as I.
 they imagined, but was, according to the
 Scripture cited, of the Seed of *David*, and
 born in the Town of *Bethlehem*, where
David was.

ANOTHER Objection was, *We know this
 Man whence he is; but when CHRIST
 cometh, no Man knoweth whence he is (d).*
 Upon what Scripture this Objection was
 founded is not certain: But this is certain,
 That it directly contradicts those Scriptures
 upon which the former Objection was
 founded, and is clearly obviated there-
 by.

ANOTHER Objection with the *Jews*,
 That JESUS was not the CHRIST, was,
 That *Elias* was not come when He appear-
 ed; founded upon these Words of *Mala-
 chi*, (e) *Behold I will send you Elijah the
 Prophet, before the Coming of the great and
 terrible Day of the LORD.* To remove this
 Objection I ask, Is it inconsistent with
 Truth, or the usual and rational Methods
 of Interpretation, to understand this Pas-
 sage of a Person appearing in the Spirit
 and Power of *Elias*, or must we necessa-
 rily suppose the very *Elias*, who lived in
 the Days of the Kings of *Israel*, to be the
 Person here intended? Reason will justify
 us in avoiding the *latter*, if the Words will
 bear

(d) John vii. 27.

(e) iv. 5.

PART bear it; because it was unreasonable to expect, that *Elias* should appear again in Person: And the Words will certainly admit the former Interpretation, it being a *Figure of Speech* known to all Languages, to call one Person by the Name of another whom he resembles. The *Jews* were not unacquainted with the *Figure*, nor did they want Capacity to discover it in other places of the *Old Testament* (f), however they came to blunder here. A Blunder, I must call it, not an Objection; for nothing but Ignorance, or Obstinacy can allow it any Weight. I am surprized therefore to see it insisted on by our Author, who has made himself very merry upon the Occasion, and asks, “Is it not a most pleasant *literal* Interpretation to make *Elias* signify not *Elias* (g)?” But at whose Expence is this Mirth? In my Opinion a double Share of it belongs to him, that has Confidence and Inconsistency enough to tell you in another place (b), “The *literal Sense*, in this Controversy, signifies the Sense intended by the Writer, — which *literal Sense* may be signified as well and as obviously by a *figurative*, as by the most simple or *literal Expression*.” But let him consult his own Favourite prophecy cited from *Seneca*, and tell us, whether *John the Baptist* may not as properly be signified by the Name of *Elias*, as the Discoverers of *America*

(f) Jer. xxx. 9. Ezek. xxxiv. 23. — xxxvii. 24. Hof. iii. 7. (g) Scheme, p. 127. (b) p. 251.

rica and *Greenland* were by the Name of *Typhys*. However, if the Words will bear the Sense we put upon them, it is enough. It does not lie on us to *prove* it was the Sense intended by the Writer; it lies on them to *disprove* it.

PART
I.


THE *Jews* objected likewise to his low Circumstances, as inconsistent with the Character of the *MESSIAS*, from those Passages of Scripture, which speak of him as a *Leader and Commander of the People* (b), to whom *Kings and Nations should bow down, and do him Service* (i), who should have *the Heathen for his Inheritance, and the uttermost Parts of the Earth for his Possession* (k). Therefore they ridiculed him, saying, *Is not this the Carpenter's Son, &c. and they were, upon that account, offended in him* (l). And this Offence was increased by his ignominious Death, upon hearing whereof, they said (m), *We have heard out of the Law, that CHRIST abideth for ever: And how sayest thou, then, The Son of Man must be lifted up?* This very probably was founded upon those Words of *David* (n), *Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchizedek.* To which we answer, That the Event has perfectly reconciled his low Circumstances, and his Death, to the full and obvious Sense of those Passages

(b) *Isaiah* lv. 4. (i) *Psalms* lxxxii. 11.
 (k) ii. 8. (l) *Matth.* xiii. 55, &c.
 (m) *John* xii. 34. (n) *Psalms* cx. 4.

PART pages referred to. For none of them say, I. that he should live on Earth for ever, or enjoy there the outward State of temporal Princes. But what they do say, has been fully accomplished in him: Kings and Nations were made subject to him; and he is still our Priest, *appearing in the Presence of GOD for us.* If they can clearly make it appear, That those Passages will not bear this Interpretation, we are answered; but otherwise our Foundation remains unshaken. We also alledge other Passages of Scripture, (o), which signified beforehand the Sufferings and Death of the MESSIAS: It lies upon them therefore by convincing Arguments to satisfy us, that the Application of these Passages to him, is false and groundless; which they have not yet attempted to any purpose.

THEY were offended likewise with JESUS and his Doctrine, because it was proposed to make the *Gentiles* equal Partakers with them in the Benefits of it; imagining that those Passages which speak of the MESSIAS's ruling over the *Gentiles*, did imply a Conquest of them by external Force, and making them Tributary to the *Jewish* People. But these we say were only fond Prejudices, conceived without Foundation, inconsistent with the Character of him, who was to rule over the *Gentiles*, and with the Blessings promised to the *Gentiles* through him,

(o) Serm. VI.

him, (p). And if this were less apparent PART
 than it is, we ought not to give it up, but I.
 persist in it, till they can prove it to be
 unreasonable and absurd. 

THEY urge likewise, the Inconsistency of the Christian Law with the *Old Testament*, and the Law established thereby. But it lies upon them to *prove*, That the Law of *Moses* did not admit of any Alteration, that it was not to be superseded by another Covenant different from it. Unless they can do this, it will be no Justification of them to say, (q) *We know that God spake unto Moses: As for this Fellow we know not from whence he is.* For *Moses* gave them no Proof of his Commission, which *Jesus* did not equal, and greatly exceed. He was justified by all the Rules, that *Moses* ever gave them to try a Prophet by: Therefore, unless they are able by clear convincing Arguments to make it appear, that some Doctrine taught, or Claim made, by him was unreasonable, false, or groundless, they are obliged to acknowledge his Mission, nay, they are self-condemned if they reject it.

2. So well able are we to justify ourselves against our *Jewish* Adversaries, who alledged, That the Characters of the *Messias* delivered in the Writings of their *Prophets* were not applicable to, or fulfill-
 ed

(p) Serm. VII.

(q) John ix. 29.

PART ed in, JESUS CHRIST. And so far only
 I. is the Reasoning of CHRIST and his *Apo-*
 stles concerned in this Dispute: For they
 had *Jews* to deal with; Persons, that ac-
 knowledged a *Messias-Scheme* to be carried
 on, and kept in View throughout the *Old*
Testament; with whom the main Point in
 Controversy was, not what Prophecies re-
 lated to the MESSIAS, but whether Pro-
 phecies, allowed on both sides to relate to
 him, had been, or were like to be, ful-
 filled in CHRIST JESUS. In this respect
 they did clearly and solidly answer the Ob-
 jections of their Adversaries, consequently
 they did all that the State of the Contro-
 versy at that time required.

BUT our new Adversaries have quite
 changed the State of the Case; they pre-
 tend to have started a Difficulty, which was
 then never thought of, and brought that
 in Question, which was granted as indispu-
 table. It will not therefore seem strange
 to a Man of Judgment, that knows what
 Reasoning is, if the Defence made by the
Apostles against *Jews* of old should not
 exactly answer some new-raised Difficulty,
 never thought of in the *Apostles* Days. It
 was never so much as question'd *then*, (which
 is *now* made the Point in Dispute) Whether
 the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* spake of
 an extraordinary Person of *Jewish* Extract,
 who should rule over the *Gentiles*. And it
 is easy to perceive, that Cases so widely dif-
 ferent require a quite different Defence.

H A D

HAD the *Messias-Scheme* been questioned, and its Foundation upon the *Old Testament* disputed, it would have been necessary to have pointed out particular Prophecies, to have ranged them in an exact Order, to have insisted chiefly on the clearest and most important, descending from these to other less distinguishing Parts of the MESSIAH'S *Character*, proving their Relation to the same Event, by Unity of Character and Circumstances, and other like critical Observations, which are used to illustrate Passages of doubtful Meaning, or difficult Interpretation. But in this the *Apostles* were prevented, the Work was needless: For the *Jews* allowed their *Prophets* did speak of a MESSIAS, but questioned whether JESUS answered the Character given of him. They had therefore no Occasion to appeal to the *Old Testament*, but in Cases, where the *Jews* represented JESUS as unqualified for the Office he claimed; they were to defend themselves where they were attacked, not regarding which Prophecies did most clearly bespeak a MESSIAS, but which the *Jews* founded their Objections upon, and which served to remove their Objections.

As this Observation is a just one, so I think it ought to be well considered: Because one cannot make a true Judgment of Mens Reasoning, and the Conclusiveness of it, till the Point in Dispute be well understood.

PART I. derstood. If that be mistaken or misrepresented, the best Defence in the World may appear ridiculous. This is an Artifice frequently made use of by our candid Adversary; who has oftentimes represented the *Apostles* as *proving Christianity, proving JESUS to be the MESSIAS* (r), by Citations from the *Old Testament*, though they have been confessedly speaking to Believers, who needed not a Proof of either. But a cautious Reader will not easily be caught in this Snare. He will distinguish what is said to *Believers*, from that which is urged against *Unbelievers*. He will also consider, what kind of Adversaries the *Apostles* had to deal with, what was the Point in dispute between them, and not apply what was said in Answer to *Jews* of old, as intended to remove a Difficulty they never thought of.

HOWEVER, though the *Reasoning* of CHRIST and his *Apostles*, be not at all affected by this new-started Difficulty, yet Christianity is; and we are obliged for that Reason, to take Notice of it. For if the *Messias-Scheme* has no Foundation in the *Old Testament*, then JESUS made a false Claim, and he ought for that Reason to be rejected. But I hope the Reader will keep in Mind on which Side the Proof lies; not on ours: For if his Claim be but *consistent with Truth*, if there be any Colour for it in the *Old Testament*, if the Passages cited for that

(r) *Grounds*, p. 11:

that Purpose, *might probably* relate to him, PART
 we are obliged, for Reasons already given, I.
 and allowed by our Author, to admit the Truth of it. It lies upon our Adversaries
 to prove; That none of those Passages referred to, could have any Relation to JESUS, as a Messenger of GOD. It is not starting a little Cavil here and there about a Word, that must confute us; we are not to close presently with every new Interpretation, that the Author of *Scheme* shall coin for us; nor ought we to submit merely because *Grotius* says the same. No; It ought to be *made out* to us, *proved* to be the true, the sole Intention of the Passage, exclusive of all Relation to CHRIST our LORD. But this is a crabbed Piece of Work, which our Author (notwithstanding he is obliged thereto by his own Principles) would willingly decline.

INSTEAD of this, what has he done? Some Passages, which we think give great Countenance to the *Messias-Scheme*, he has not meddled with; some he has laid aside because of their Ambiguity; and some he says are expressed in Terms *too general and indeterminate*, to be applied to any particular Person. If a Passage will barely admit of another Interpretation, than what we put upon it, he looks upon it as a rare Discovery; or if it be applicable to some King or Prophet before JESUS, then it is evident to a Demonstration, that it could not relate to the MESSIAS. Then he has

PART excellent Skill at *paring* a distinguishing
 I. Character, to make it fit *Hezekiah, Zoroba-*
bel, or Jeremiab. And if this Art fails him,
 and he meets with a Character which he
 cannot decently dispose of, then after a Ca-
 vil or two at our Interpretation of it, tells
 us very wisely, That we “ write against
 “ Adversaries, who require Proofs from
 “ us—— who think themselves not obliged
 “ to find Meanings for such difficult Books,
 “ and who particularly think themselves
 “ not at all concerned to find out Events
 “ fulfilling their Prophecies (s)” What
 our Adversaries may require of us, I know
 not ; but this I have long since known, that
 they are too apt to require of us more than
 in Equity and Reason they ought.

NEVERTHELESS, I have some Hopes,
 that in the present Case they will abate a
 little of their Demands for our Author’s
 Sake, who is their Advocate. He allows,
 “ If CHRIST’S Doctrine be *consistent* with
 “ Reason, &c. Miracles ought to deter-
 “ mine Men to believe in him.” Conse-
 quently we are not obliged to make out
 any Article distinctly, if we are able to
 defend every Article against any Charge of
 Falshood, Inconsistency, or evil Tendency,
 it is sufficient, Miracles will oblige us to
 admit the Truth thereof. I hope therefore
 our Adversaries upon Reading *Scheme, &c.*
 will be better informed, and perceive, that
 they are obliged, not only to find out
 some

(s) *Scheme, p. 147.*

some other rational Construction of those PROPHECIES, upon which we build the *Messias-Scheme*, but also to prove *that*, and not *ours*, to be the intended Meaning thereof; That they are obliged, not only to shew, *how they might be applied* to other Persons and Events; but also to prove, that *they were intended* of those Persons and Events, and had no Relation to JESUS, or Events occasioned by him. For if Prophecies be applicable to him according to some rational Construction, and be but as applicable to him as to any other Person, it will then be probable, that they might relate to him; and if they might relate to him, his applying them to himself, will be at least *consistent with Reason*; and its being *consistent with Reason*, is allowed to be sufficient for our Purpose.

LET us, by way of Tryal, consider one Prophecy attacked by our Adversaries, and judge from thence, how well able they are to *disprove*, or to charge with any Inconsistency or Impropriety, the Application of it to CHRIST our LORD. And because there is one, which the *Scheme*, &c. distinguishes from all the rest, calling it, (*t*) *the very Corner-stone of the literal Prophetick Scheme*, that shall be the Instance. It is the Promise made by GOD to *Abraham* (*u*), *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.* I need not say what Construc-

E 3

tion


(*t*) *Scheme*, p. 133.(*u*) Gen. xxii. 18.

PART I. tion we put upon this Promise; it is that easy obvious Sense, which every Capacity takes at once, That from *Abraham* should arise a *Seed*, which should be a Blessing or Benefit, not to the *Jews* only, but to other Nations. Accordingly we find it accomplished in *JESUS*, and him only: He was of the Seed of *Abraham*, and he was a Blessing or Benefit to the Nations of the Earth; this therefore was making good the Promise, That in *Abraham's* Seed the Nations of the Earth should be blessed. It matters not, whether this Blessing be conveyed by one or by many Instruments: If by one only, and him descended from *Abraham*, it is equally true, that the Nations derive the Blessing from *Abraham's* Seed.

I CANNOT therefore but laugh at that impertinent Question, (x) “How comes “*Seed* here, to signify a single Person? “What Proof is there of that?” Miserable Cavilling! *Seed* signifies one or more Persons, just as the Subject treated on shall determine. If I say, these Nations are now blessed in the Seed of *Henry VII*, every body knows I mean a single Person. If I say they have been blessed for near Forty Years past in his Seed, I should immediately be understood to speak of more than one. But if any thing be said of a *future Seed* by way of Prophecy, the Event must determine, whether one or more be intended.

The

(x) Scheme, p. 131.

The Event has clearly determined it in the P A R T
 Case before us. For apply it to the Po- I.
 sterity of *Abraham*, (as our Author does) 
 and you will find they had not the least Con-
 cern in it: No; not if you should under-
 stand the Blessing promised, according to
 his Interpretation thereof. For the Poste-
 rity of *Abraham* were for many Ages an
 obscure People; known but to a few neigh-
 bour Nations, and by them generally hated,
 despised and oppressed. So far were the
 Nations of the Earth from using this or the
 like Form of Blessing, GOD *bless you, as he*
did the Israelites, or Seed of Abraham (y),
 that, generally speaking, they would have
 looked upon it as a Curse rather than a
 Blessing.

PERHAPS I shall be told, (z) “ That
 “ I write against Adversaries, who— think
 “ themselves not at all concerned to find
 “ out Events fulfilling the Prophecies of
 “ the *Old Testament.* ” But what is that to
 me or my Argument? I urge the strict
 Completion of a Prophecy, expressed in
 the plainest Words. My Adversaries there-
 fore *need not* be concerned to find out an
 Event fulfilling it, the Work is done to
 their Hands. Nevertheless, if my Adver-
 saries will *make* Meanings, determine that
 which the Prophecy has left undetermined,
 I think they ought to find out Completions

E 4

too.

(y) Scheme, p. 132.


(z) Ib. 147.

PART too. But I leave them to their own Discretion, and proceed to their next Exception:

IT seems we mistake the *Blessing*, or rather look for one, where there was none intended, and are asked, “What Proof do we give, that the *Seed* mention’d was to be a *Blessing to all Nations* (a)? Why do they not ask, What Proof we give, that Two and Three make Five? Had the *Seed* mention’d been intended to be a *Blessing to all Nations*, could it have been expressed in plainer Words than these, *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed?* Is it easy to imagine, that such a full, positive Promise as this, delivered without Explanation or Limitation, should mean only, (b) “That when Men *blessed* one another, they should use this or such like Form of Blessing, *God bless you as he did the Israelites?*” Or that a Promise, which seems in the plainest manner to bespeak some real Benefit and Advantage to the *Nations of the Earth*, should mean no more than, what *St James* explodes (c) as utterly unprofitable, mere empty Wishes, which Men should bestow upon one another?

BUT it is said, (d) “This appears to be the Sense of the Phrase from its Use every

(a) Scheme, p. 131. (b) Ibid. (c) Jam. ii. 16.
 (d) Scheme, &c. p. 132.

“every where”. This is said at a ven- P A R T
 ture: For upon search, it does not appear I.
 to me to be the Sense of the Phrase *any* 
where; but on the contrary, *to be blessed*
in a Person, or Thing, supposes the Person
blessed to receive some Benefit thereby (e).
 The only Instance given is, (f) “What
 “*Jacob* says on his Death-bed to his two
 “Grand-children, *Ephraim* and *Manas-*
 “*seh.*” And indeed our *English Transla-*
tion does favour our Author in this one In-
 stance: For what is there render’d (f), *In*
thee shall Israel bless, saying, GOD make thee
as Ephraim and as Manasseh, is render’d
 in the *Septuagint*, Ἐν ὑμῖν εὐλογηθήσετ’ Ἰσραὴλ,
 &c. i. e. *In you shall Israel be blessed, &c.*
 From whence it is concluded, That *Jacob’s*
 Words do not signify any *real Blessing* or
 Benefit, which *Israel* should receive by their
 Means; but a *verbal Blessing*, a Form of
 Words only, in which the *Israelites* should
 express their good Wishes one to another.
 Now in my Opinion both were intended,
 That from *Ephraim* and *Manasseh* should
 arise Persons remarkable for their great
 Services to the Children of *Israel*; so re-
 markable, that the *Israelites*, in expressing
 their good Wishes one to another, should
 usually say, *GOD make thee as Ephraim*
and Manasseh, i. e. GOD make thee an
 useful

(e) Blessed shalt thou be in the City and blessed shalt
 thou be in the field, *Deut.* xxviii. 3, &c. does not sig-
 nify, “Men shall wish thee Peace and Plenty”, but
 “Thou shalt actually enjoy those Blessings”.

(f) *Gen.* xlviii. 20.

PART I. useful Man, a Blessing to thy People, like such a one of the Tribe of *Ephraim* or *Manasseh*. And in Confirmation hereof it ought to be observed, That the Words are not, “GOD *blefs* or *prosper thee*, as he “did them”, but, “GOD *make thee* “such as they were”, which respects personal Qualifications rather than outward Circumstances.

BESIDES we find the Event answered this Interpretation of the Prophecy. For was not *Joshua* of the Tribe of *Ephraim* in the most remarkable manner a Blessing to them, who led them out of a barren and dry Wilderness, brought them into a Land flowing with Milk and Honey, drove out their Enemies before them, under whose Conduct they had continual Victory and Success, till they were settled there in Peace? And in Process of Time, when this plentiful Land was made as a Wilderness to them, by the Oppressions of the *Midianites* who destroyed the Increase of the Earth — and left no Sustenance to Israel, neither Sheep, nor Ox, nor Ass (g): Out of these sad Circumstances did *Gideon* of the Tribe of *Manasseh* deliver them, and restored them again to the Enjoyment of those Blessings, which they first enter'd upon under the Conduct of *Joshua*, and which they were afterwards deprived of for many Years by the Ravages of the *Midianites*.
And

(g) Judges vi. 4.

And the *Israelites* thought themselves so P A R T
blessed in this Seed of *Manasseh*, that they I.
 made him an Offer, which they never made
 to any one of their *Judges* besides, (b) *Rule*
thou over us, both thou, and thy Son, and thy
Son's Son also: for thou hast delivered us
from the Hand of Midian. These Events,
 as they confirm our Interpretation of the
former part of *Jacob's* Prophecy, so they
 afford us a good Reason (which otherwise
 would be wanting) for the Completion of
 the *latter part*. For what better Wish could
Israel bestow on one they valued, than,
 " GOD make thee like Persons so remar-
 " kably distinguish'd for their publick Ser-
 " vices ".

THE only Pretence, for restraining the
 former part of *Jacob's* Words, *In you shall*
Israel be blessed, to mere good Wishes, is a
 Supposition, that the Words which follow
 were intended as an Explanation thereof.
 But this Supposition has plainly no manner
 of Foundation; for the Sense of the whole
 is more proper and rational and better ju-
 stified, according to our Interpretation
 thereof.

BUT admit, that the latter Words were
 intended, as an Explanation of the former;
 and consequently, that in this Place, *In you*
shall Israel be blessed, means no more than,
 " *Israel* shall use this Form of Blessing,
 " GOD

(b) Judges viii. 22.

PART I. *“ GOD bless you, as he did Ephraim and Manasseh. ”* Will it therefore follow, That the same Phrase ought to be understood in the same limited Sense, where no such Limitation is added? No; It should seem rather, that being used absolutely, it ought to be understood absolutely, in that easy obvious Sense in which it is generally taken: Especially, when we find, that Providence has in an extraordinary Manner brought to pass, what is here supposed to have been promised by him.

BUT admit, That the Limitation ought to be applied to the Promise made to *Abraham*, signifying, that the *Nations of the Earth* should use this Form of Blessing, *“ GOD make you as the Seed of Abraham, ”* (for that is the Limitation, not *“ GOD bless or prosper you, &c. ”*) the Prophecy will still belong to JESUS CHRIST, and to him only. For the Nations converted to him, constantly used this Form of Blessing, *“ The Grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST be with you; His Spirit rest upon you: May you follow his Example, tread in his Steps. ”* Such Prayers as these, all true Christians offer to GOD in Behalf of themselves and all Mankind. So likewise the Interpretation of *Hammond* and *Le Clerc*, make the Christian Scheme absolutely necessary to the Completion of this Prophecy; though our Author would fain have his Reader believe (*i*), that they had

(*i*) Scheme, p. 133.

had put a Sense upon it, in which JESUS PART
 was unconcerned. In short, There is not I.
 any Way of interpreting this Prophecy, in
 which it was not accomplished in and
 through JESUS CHRIST; nor any Way,
 in which it can be made applicable to any
 other Person or Persons whatsoever. So
 that if this *be the Corner-stone of the Lite-
 ral Prophetic Scheme*, I have good Hope
 that it has yet, and will still remain im-
 moveable.

IF after all my Adversary should have
 the Assurance to tell me, That though it
 was fulfilled in JESUS CHRIST and him
 only, yet thereby “ is meant, that the
 “ *Israelites* should be so blessed, or made
 “ so remarkably happy and successful in
 “ their affairs by GOD, that Men should
 “ use this Form of Blessing, GOD *blefs*
 “ *you as he did the Israelites*” (k), I will
 leave it to somebody of equal Assurance to
 answer him, and save myself the Trouble:
 Appealing to every impartial Judgment,
 Whether the Application of this Prophe-
 cy to JESUS CHRIST be not consistent
 with Reason; if it be, then his Claim from
 thence cannot be *disproved*; and if it can-
 not be disproved, then our Foundation re-
 mains unshaken. For it is allowed, That
 Miracles, with this Circumstance of a
 Doctrine consistent with Reason, &c. ought
 to

(k) Scheme, p. 132.

PART to determine Men to believe in JESUS as
I. a Teacher come from GOD. I flatter my-
self, that the Application of this Prophecy
to JESUS CHRIST appears to be some-
what more than *consistent with Reason*. But
I will not urge that Consideration here,
intending to insist upon Prophecy as a di-
stinct Argument in Vindication of JESUS
and his Doctrine.





PART II.

The Argument from Prophecy defended.


CHAP. I.

SOME Reflections upon the Argument itself, and the Opinion of our Adversary thereupon.



WOULD not have any one imagine, from what has been hitherto observed concerning the fundamental Article of Christianity and the necessary Proof of it, that I have a Mind to decline all Defence of Christianity from the *Old Testament*, and leave it entirely upon our

PART our Adversaries to *disprove* from thence the
 II. Claim which JESUS made to the *Messiahship*,
 which they are certainly in all Equity and Reason obliged to do, if they would overthrow it. No: As in my former Essay on this Subject, I did undertake, as well from Prophecy, as from other Topicks, to justify Christianity and the Author of it: So I still insist upon Prophecy and the Argument arising from thence, as of great Weight and Moment in this Case. For if it be a just Prejudice in Favour of a Person pretending to be divinely inspired, That several remarkable parts of his Character, several great Events brought about by his Means, had been expressly foretold long before by some ancient Prophecy; I am satisfied, that Christianity has whereof to boast in this respect. The Records of the *Old Testament* are allowed to have subsisted long before the Appearing of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST: To them we appeal and to the Prophecies contained therein, and not to any *unwritten Tradition*, which the *Jews* may pretend to have received from their Forefathers. We appeal to that Meaning thereof, which common Sense and just Rules of Criticism will justify, in Opposition to the mistaken Meanings of *Jews* and their corrupt Traditions. And we insist on these Prophecies, taken in their natural and proper Sense, as foretelling, clearly foretelling, not trifling Circumstances, no ordinary Occurrences, which frequently happen in the Course of things,

Things; but great, important, unusual PART
 Events, which had their Completion in and II.
 through JESUS CHRIST, and him only. 
 We think therefore, that Christianity will
 admit of a good Defence from this Topick,
 especially against *Jews*, who allow those
 Scriptures, to which we appeal, were given
 by Inspiration of GOD.

BUT we ought not therefore to lay the
 whole Strefs of our Religion; and the Vindi-
 cation of it upon this single Point: The
Reasoning of CHRIST and his *Apostles* on
 this Head, consists of several Branches, eve-
 ry one of which ought to be well consider-
 ed, if we would take a full, and not a par-
 tial View of their Reasoning. We can see
 no Reason to allow such far-fetched, il-
 logical Consequences as these; Because
 CHRIST and his *Apostles* did reason from
 the *Old Testament*, therefore they used no
 other Argument to convince Men; Because
 they sometimes used an Allegory to illus-
 trate one Case by another parallel to it,
 therefore they did nothing but allegorize
 the *Old Testament*, and, *set up allegorical*
Reasoning, as the true and only Reasoning pro-
per to bring all Men to the Faith of CHRIST.
 These are such gross Impositions, so easily
 seen thro' by one that has but dipped into the
New Testament, that I still wonder how any
 Man pretending to the least Degree of Can-
 dour could dare to vent them; or conceive,
 that Weakness itself could be deceived there-
 by. Miracles were wrought and appealed

PART to by CHRIST and his *Apostles*, in Confirmation of their Mission. He that is not II. obstinately blind, must see it. Our Adversary himself allows (a), That a Doctrine consistent with Truth and Reason, worthy of GOD, and beneficial to Men, is capable of being confirmed thereby. CHRIST and his *Apostles* did; and we do, insist, That the Christian Doctrine is such; therefore till the contrary be proved, which this Author has not yet attempted, the Miracles we appeal to are a valid Proof; we have his Leave to say so.

BUT he urges (b), to what purpose I know not, “That Prophecies are a more plain and convincing Evidence than Miracles.” The Arguments used to establish this Notion, are the same in Substance with what had been urged in the *Discourse of the Grounds*, which I have already answered, *Serm. IV. p. 129, &c.* and I will not trouble my Reader with a Repetition. Besides, I do not think the nice Determination of this Point, to be of any great Consequence, nor should I be at all disturbed, if all my Readers were of my Adversary’s Opinion. Therefore I will not contend with him any more about the Comparison. He shall have it his own Way. It is no Disadvantage to Christianity, having an allowedly good Proof to establish it, to hear that it has a better still. It is some Encouragement to spend a little Time and Pains upon an Argument,

(a) Scheme, p. 322. (b) Ib. p. 334.

ment, which is allowed to give so much P A R T
 Weight to the Cause that is supported by II.
 it. And I shall the more willingly under-
 take it for our Author's Sake, who has not
 only in general declared a good Liking to
 it, but says (c), " That a *Prophecy fulfilled,*
 " is a real Miracle; and that one such pro-
 " duced, to which no Exceptions could
 " justly be made, would go a great Way
 " in convincing all reasonable Men." I
 hope to produce more than one, as clear
 and unexceptionable as the *Standard* he has
 set us (d), and relating to Events, more
 unlikely to come to pass than *that was.*

C H A P. II.

*Of the State and Circumstances of the Jews,
 to whom the Prophecies of the Old Testa-
 ment were delivered.*

I N Order to a clearer and more satisfac-
 tory Account of the Prophecies I shall
 appeal to on this Occasion, it may be pro-
 per to give some Account of the *Jewish*
 People, their State and Circumstance, when
 these Prophecies were delivered to them.
 They were the Descendants of *Abraham*;
 from whose Time down to the Coming of
 JESUS CHRIST, it is hard to say, when
 or where (the *Jewish* State excepted) *Poly-*
 F 2 *theism*

(c) *Scheme*, p. 275.

(d) *Ib.* p. 276.

PART *theism* and *Idolatry* did not prevail in the
 II. grossest Manner. *Abraham* had preserved
 himself in a peculiar Manner untainted there-
 with, and distinguished himself for his stea-
 dy Belief in the One True GOD, which he
 testified by a ready Obedience to his Will
 in all Things. Upon which Account,
 GOD promised to have a peculiar Regard
 to him and his Family, to make of him
 a great Nation, and to give his Seed the
 Land of *Canaan* for their Inheritance. To
 confirm these Promises, GOD entered into
 Covenant with him and his Seed after him,
 engaging to be in a peculiar Manner their
 GOD, and appointed *Circumcision* as a To-
 ken of the Covenant between Him and
 them. Whilst this Family continued but
 few in Number, they sojourned about from
 Place to Place, till at last they settled in
Egypt; where they grew and multiplied ex-
 ceedingly, and thereby became qualified in
 Point of Number to inherit the *Promised
 Land*. By divine Appointment therefore
 they left *Egypt*, under the Conduct of *Mo-
 ses*, and came to the Wilderness of *Sinai*;
 where GOD detained them some Years, gi-
 ving them Statutes, and Ordinances, and
 Judgments, for their better Conduct and
 Government, when they came into the
Land of Promise.

THIS Institution of Religion given them
 by *Moses*, (as will appear upon due Exami-
 nation) was never intended to be gene-
 ral, the *Gentile* World was not at all re-
 garded

garded in the Constitution of it. There is PART
II.
 not once a Supposition made of their being
 converted to it, or that they should ever
 partake of the Benefits of this Covenant
 with the *Israelites*. On the contrary, it is
 declared to be a Covenant between GOD
 and them, as a *peculiar People*. The En-
 gagement on GOD's Part of the Covenant,
 constantly runs in such Terms as these:
*If ye will obey my Voice indeed, and keep my
 Covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar Trea-
 sure unto me above all People (e), A People
 of Inheritance (f), whom the LORD hath
 chosen to be a special People unto himself,
 above all People that are upon the Face of
 the Earth (g), to be a peculiar People unto
 himself, above all the Nations that are upon
 the Earth (h).* And Moses rehearsing the
 Covenant between GOD and them, expres-
 ses himself thus: (i) *Thou hast avouched
 the LORD this Day to be thy GOD, and to
 walk in his Ways—— And the LORD hath
 avouched thee this Day to be his peculiar
 People, as he hath promised thee, and that
 thou shouldst keep all his Commandments.*

It may be observed farther, That in-
 stead of any Directions given them to com-
 municate this Covenant to the *Heathen*, or
 to invite them to be joynt Partakers with
 them in it, they were strictly enjoined to
 have no Communication with them; but

F 5

to

(e) Exod. xix. 5. (f) Deut. iv. 20. (g) Ibid;
 vii, 6. (h) Ib. xiv. 2. (i) Ib. xxvi. 17, 18.

PART to avoid all Intercourse, as much as possible, and to keep themselves separate.

II. *(k) Thou shalt make no Covenant with them, nor with their Gods. They shall not dwell in thy Land, lest they make thee sin against me. (l) Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a Covenant with the Inhabitants of the Land whither thou goest, lest it be for a Snare in the midst of thee. Nay, so much Care and Caution was used to keep up this Separation, and to oblige the Israelites to a strict Observance of it, that several Laws and Injunctions were given them purely with this View, To render all Familiarity with them the more impracticable. Ye shall not cut your selves, nor make any Baldness between your Eyes for the Dead; for thou art an holy People unto the LORD thy GOD, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a peculiar People unto himself (m). I am the LORD your GOD, which have separated you from other People; ye shall therefore put Difference between clean Beasts and unclean — and ye shall be holy unto me: for I the LORD am holy, and have severed you from other People, that ye should be mine (n). The Neglect of these Laws of Separation, and the Consequences of not observing them, are represented as Causes of GOD's Displeasure (o). They were mingled among the Heathen, and learned their Works; and they served their Idols, which were*

(k) Exod. xxiii. 32, &c.

(l) Deut. xiv. 1, &c.

(o) Psal. cvi. 35, &c.

(l) Ibid. xxxiv. 12, &c.

(n) Lev. xx. 24, &c.

were a Snare unto them. — Therefore was **PART**
 the Wrath of the **LORD** kindled against his **II.**
 People. (p) Therefore thou hast forsaken thy
 People the House of Jacob, because they be
 replenished from the East, and are Soothsayers,
 like the Philistines, and they please themselves
 in the Children of Strangers. For as fre-
 quent Intercourse between People of diffe-
 rent Sentiments, usually makes Profelytes
 from one to the other Side, **GOD** would
 not suffer any Intimacy to be contracted by
 his People with the *Heathen*, upon Prospect
 of their Conversion; but gave the strictest
 Charge against it, lest his People should be
 corrupted by them. Which evidently shews,
 That **GOD** had Regard to that single Peo-
 ple only (exclusive of the *Gentiles*) in the
 Constitution of the Covenant made with
 them by *Moses*, and did not at all intend
 their Conversion and Reformation by it.
 Their Prophets and Wise Men were very
 sensible of this, and made their Boast of
GOD's peculiar Regard to them therein.
 (q) *In Jewry is GOD known, his Name is*
great in Israel. (r) *He shewed his Word*
unto Jacob, his Statutes and his Judgments
unto Israel: He hath not dealt so with any
Nation, and as for his Judgments, they have
not known them. Nay, **GOD** himself up-
 braids them with it, as a great Aggravation
 of their Ingratitude, (s) *You only have I*
known of all the Families of the Earth.

F 4

IT

(p) *Isaiah* ii. 6.(q) *Psal.* lxxvi. 1.(r) *Psal.* cxlvii. 19, 20.(s) *Amos* iii. 2.

PART

II.



IT appears therefore from the very Nature and Constitution of the *Jewish* Religion, and also from manifest Declarations concerning it, That the *Gentile* World was not regarded therein, that it never was intended as a Means of their Conversion; but calculated purely for the Children of *Israel*, as a separate People, and even with a Design to keep them separate: Not that they should be the Instruments of converting other Nations, but that they should be a *peculiar People*, preserving the Knowledge and Worship of the One True God, and not be swallowed up in that otherwise universal Deluge of Idolatry, which overspread the Face of the Earth.

THIS was unquestionably the Design of the Covenant, which God made with them by his Servant *Moses*. Let us see then, Whether this was always intended to be the Case, or whether the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* gave them any just and clear Grounds to expect another State of Things? Whether the *Israelites* were taught to believe, that the Knowledge of God and his Laws should always be confined to them and their Nation, or whether their *Prophets* had signified beforehand the Design of God to make himself known to the *Gentile* World, and to take them also into Covenant with him. I say, The peculiar Choice of the Children of *Israel*, is not more evident, or more fully expressed, than the

the future Calling and Conversion of the PART
Gentiles, That great Event, which in and II.
 through JESUS CHRIST, was most re-
 markably fulfilled.

C H A P. III.

A GENERAL *View of clear Prophecies of the Old Testament, relating to important Events, which were accomplished in and through JESUS CHRIST, and him only.*

PSALM xxii. 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.

Psal. lxxxvi. 9. All Nations whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O LORD, and shall glorify thy Name.

Psal. cii. 15. The Heathen shall fear the Name of the LORD, and all the Kings of the Earth thy Glory.

Ver. 18. This shall be written for the Generations to come, and the People which shall be created, shall praise the LORD.

Isaiab xiv. 22. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the Ends of the Earth: for I am GOD, and there is none else.

Ver.


Ver. 23. I have sworn by myself, the Word is gone out of my Mouth in Righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every Knee shall bow, every Tongue shall swear.

Jeremiab x. 11. Thus shall ye say unto them, The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, even they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens.

Zephaniab ii. 11. The LORD will be terrible unto them: For he will famish all the Gods of the Earth, and Men shall worship him, every one from his Place, even all the Isles of the Heathen.

Malachy i. 11. From the rising of the Sun even unto the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the *Gentiles*, and in every Place Incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering: For my Name shall be great among the *Heathen*, saith the LORD of Hosts.

IF these Passages relate to the Conversion of the *Gentiles* from their idolatrous State to the Worship of the True GOD, (and I think they do in so clear a Manner, that it must puzzle a Man of Skill and Inclination to give them another Turn;) if they had no Completion but in CHRIST, and they were by his Means accomplished: Then let the Reader compare them with the *Standard-Prophecy* set us by our Author,
and

and consider, Whether the Event foretold, PART
 be not more important and surprizing, and II,
 withall, whether it be not more clearly 
 foretold, than is *the Discovery of America
 and Greenland in Seneca the Tragedian*
 (t).

Venient annis.

*Secula seris, quibus Oceanus
 Vincula rerum laxet, & ingens
 Pateat tellus, Tiphysq; novos
 Detegat orbis, nec sit terris
 Ultima Thule.*

IF I were disposed to examine this Prophecy in our Author's cavilling Way, I might tell him, that by those Words, *Oceanus vincula rerum laxet, & ingens pateat tellus;* the Poet supposed, that the Ocean should contract its Bounds, and a great Tract of Land appear in after-Ages, which in his Time was covered with Water. I might also, after his Example in the Case of *Elias* (u), insist, that the Poet speaks of the very *Tiphys*, who was Pilot to the *Argonauts*, that he should appear again and be instrumental in the Discovery.--- But I would not knowingly trifle, or be inconsistent upon a serious Subject.--- I willingly admit *Seneca's* Meaning was, *Large Countries unknown to us, MAY hereafter be discovered.* He spoke like a judicious Man, that knew something of *Geography* and of
 the

(t) Scheme, p. 275.

(u) Ib. 125, &c.

PART the *Globe*. From whence he could not but
 II. imagine, that there were large Tracts of
 Land unknown in his Time. He knew that
 Discoveries of that kind had been made,
 and might therefore with good Reason suppose,
 as the Art of *Navigation* improved, that farther
 Discoveries would be made in after-Ages. And, to do him Justice, he is not positive, he does *but suppose* it.

I THINK the Subject of the above cited Prophecies was somewhat more worthy of Divine Interposition, and the Event foretold therein more unlikely to come to pass. For when those Prophecies were delivered the *Jews* were, and had been for many Ages, the only People that preserved the Knowledge of the true GOD; they had found no Encouragement to attempt the Conversion of other Nations; They saw the Corruptions of Polytheism and Idolatry continually increasing: Nay they had themselves an almost unconquerable Disposition thereto; it often stole in among them, and had it not been prevented by frequent Interpositions of Providence, they must inevitably have been overwhelmed thereby. Yet while the Circumstances of Mankind were such, so very ill-disposed to a general Reformation, were these positive, clear, undoubted Prophecies delivered concerning the Conversion of the *Gentiles*; not of some few Profelytes coming over to the *Jews* out of Neighbour-nations, nor of some few Neighbour-nations only; but of the
 Generality

Generality of Mankind, who forsaking the idolatrous Customs they had been bred up in, should acknowledge and adore the **GOD** of *Israel*. Considering therefore the Circumstances of Mankind, when those Prophecies were delivered, a more unexpected and surprizing Event could not have been foretold; and the Words wherein they are expressed are free from all Ambiguity and difficult Construction.

PART
II.

BUT to proceed. *Seneca* does not pretend to guess, by whom, or by what Means the Discovery he speaks of should be made; what Nation should have the Credit of it; much less out of what Family he should arise, who should have the Conduct and Direction of the great Undertaking. We find these Circumstances very plainly and positively determined in the *Old Testament* speaking of that surprizing Event, The Conversion of the *Gentile World*. That the Means of their Conversion should proceed from the *Jewish Nation* appears to have been foretold from the following Citations.

ISAIAH ii. 2. 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.

Ver.



Ver. 3. 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*.

Isa. lx. 1. Arise, shine, [speaking to *Israel*] for thy Light is come, and the Glory of the LORD is risen upon thee.

Ver. 2. For behold, the Darknes shall cover the Earth, and gross Darknes the People: but the LORD shall arise upon thee, and his Glory shall be seen upon thee.

Ver. 3. And the Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and Kings to the Brightness of thy Rising.

Ver. 4. Lift up thine Eyes round about, and see; all they gather themselves together, they come to thee, thy Sons shall come from far, and thy Daughters shall be nursed at thy Side.

Ver. 5. Then thou shalt see and flow together, and thine Heart shall fear and be enlarged, because the Abundance of the Sea shall be converted unto thee, the Forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee.

Ver. 11. Therefore thy Gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut Day nor Night, that Men may bring

bring unto thee the Forces of the *Gen-* P A R T
tiles, and that their Kings may be II.
 brought.


Ver. 14. The Sons of them that afflicted thee; shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the Soles of thy Feet; and they shall call thee, The City of the LORD, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.

THESE Prophecies, it is true, are delivered in a lofty, poetic Style, and several Points therein are *figuratively* expressed. Nevertheless the general Drift and Design of them is very obvious and intelligible. They give us a very determinate Sense with Respect to the Point they are alleged to prove, That GOD intended in an extraordinary Way to enlighten his People the *Jews* by Revelation, that the *Gentiles* should be made acquainted with it and be converted thereto: And this appears to be intended, not only of a few of them, but of many Nations, of the Generality both of Rulers and People. Regard you see is had to the same Event in these, as in the former Passages. The Conversion of the *Gentiles* is still the Subject, which is here plainly foretold with the Addition of this remarkable Circumstance, That the Means of effecting it should proceed from the *Jewish* People.

BUT

PART

II.


 BUT the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* are still more particular, in telling us, That there should be a special Messenger employed by GOD for this Purpose; that by his Doctrine the *Gentile* World should be enlightened, that to his Law they should become obedient, and by his Means be admitted into Covenant with GOD.

ISAIAH xli. 27. I will give to *Jerusalem* one that bringeth good Tidings.

Ibid. xlii. 1. Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my Soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth Judgment to the *Gentiles*.

Ver. 4. He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, till he have set Judgment in the Earth: and the Isles shall wait for his Law.

Ver. 6. I the LORD have called thee in Righteousness, and I will hold thine Hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a Covenant of the People, for a Light of the *Gentiles*.

Ver. 7. To open the blind Eyes, to bring forth the Prisoners out of Prison, and them that sit in Darkness out of the Prison-house.

Ibid. xlix. 5. And now saith the LORD that formed me from the Womb to be his Servant, to bring *Jacob* again to him, Though *Israel* be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the Eyes of the LORD,

and my GOD shall be my Strength. P A R T

Ver. 6. And he said, It is a light II.
 thing that thou shouldst be my Ser-
 vant to raise up the Tribes of *Jacob*,
 and to restore the Preserved of *Israel*:
 I will also give thee for a Light to
 the *Gentiles*, that thou mayst be my
 Salvation unto the End of the Earth.

Ver. 7. Thus saith the LORD the
 Redeemer of *Israel*, and his holy One,
 to him whom Man despiseth, to him
 whom the Nation abhorreth, to a
 Servant of Rulers, Kings shall see and
 arise, Princes also shall worship, be-
 cause of the LORD that is faithful,
 and the holy One of *Israel*, and he shall
 choose thee.

Ver. 11. I will make all my Moun-
 tains a Way, and my high Ways
 shall be exalted.

Ver. 12. Behold, these shall come
 from far: and lo, these from the
 North and from the West, and these
 from the Land of *Sinim*.

Ver. 18. Lift up thine Eyes round
 about, and behold: all these gather
 themselves together and come to thee:
 as I live, saith the LORD, thou shalt
 surely clothe thee with them all, as
 with an Ornament, and bind them on
 thee as a Bride doth.

Ver. 19. For thy waste and thy de-
 solate Places, and the Land of thy De-
 struction, shall be even now too nar-
 row by reason of the Inhabitants.



Ver. 22. Behold, I will lift up mine Hand to the *Gentiles*, and set up my Standard to the People: and they shall bring thy Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters shall be carried upon their Shoulders.

Ver. 23. And Kings shall be thy nursing-Fathers, and their Queens thy nursing-Mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their Faces toward the Earth, and lick the Dust of thy Feet, and thou shalt know that I am the LORD.

THE Event foretold in this xlixth Chapter, is evidently the same with that foretold Chapter lx, before-cited. The extraordinary Conversion of the *Gentiles* is the Subject of both. And from these last-cited Passages it does appear, That a special Messenger was to be employed by GOD for that Purpose, by Means of whose Doctrine that great Event should be accomplished. And it does also farther appear from other parallel Places, speaking of the same Event, out of what Stock or Family this great Minister of the *Gentiles* should arise.

Isaiab xi. 10. In that Day there shall be a Root of *Jesse*, which shall stand for an Ensign of the People; to it shall the *Gentiles* seek, and his Rest shall be glorious.

Ibid.

Ibid. lv. 3. I will make an everlasting P A R T
Covenant with you, even the sure II.
Mercies of *David.*

Ver. 4. Behold, I have given him for
a Witness of the People, a Leader
and Commander to the People.

Ver. 5. Behold, thou shalt call a
Nation that thou knowest not, and
Nations that knew not thee shall run
unto thee, because of the LORD thy
G O D, and for the holy One of *Israel*;
for he hath glorified thee.

IN the first of these Passages you have it
expressly said, That the Person intended
for the Call and Conversion of the *Gen-
tiles* should descend from *Jesse*; nay, and
from *David* in whom the Family of *Jesse*
took Root, and was established in the Go-
vernment of *Israel*. In the latter you have
the Conversion of the *Gentiles* promised, as
the Effect of God's performing some known
Covenant, some sure Mercy engaged for to
his Servant *David*. This Covenant with
David, is very particularly described in
the Book of *Psalms*, and will serve as a
just and rational Comment upon the last
cited Passage.

Psalms lxxxix. 28. My Mercy will I keep
for him for evermore, and my Cove-
nant shall stand fast with him.

Ver. 29. His Seed also will I make
to endure for ever, and his Throne as
the Days of Heaven.

Ver. 34. My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the Thing that is gone out of my Lips.

Ver. 35. Once have I sworn by my Holiness, that I will not lye unto *David*.

Ver. 36. His Seed shall endure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me.

Ver. 37. It shall be established for ever as the Moon, and as a faithful Witness in Heaven.

I THINK it cannot be disputed, but this must be the Covenant, the sure Mercies of *David*, intended in *Isaiab's* Prophecy. From whence it will necessarily follow, That the Person promised in the next Verse to be *a Witness of the People, a Leader and Commander to the Nations*, must mean one of *David's* Seed. And accordingly we find *David* himself speaking of one of his Seed, who should have Rule over the *Gentiles*, in whom they should trust, and by whom they should be blessed.

Psalms lxxii. 8. He shall have Dominion also from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of the Earth.

Ver. 9. They that dwell in the Wilderness shall bow before him: and his Enemies shall lick the Dust.

Ver. 10. The Kings of *Tarshish* and of the Isles shall bring Presents; the Kings

Kings of *Sheba* and *Seba* shall offer P A R T
Gifts. II.

Ver. 11. Yea, all Kings shall fall down before him, all Nations shall serve him.

Ver. 17. His Name shall endure for ever: his Name shall be continued as long as the Sun: and Men shall be blessed in him; all Nations shall call him Blessed.

HE speaks also in another Place, of one of the Royal Line of *Israel* to the same Effect, expressing himself in the Words of GOD, saying,

Psalms ii. 7. Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.

Ver. 8. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the uttermost Parts of the Earth for thy Possession.

Ver. 12. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the Way, if his Wrath be kindled but a little: blessed are all they that put their Trust in him,

IT will easily be observed from most of the fore-cited Passages, that an Extraordinary Person of *Jewish* Extract, was to arise, who should bear Rule over the *Gentiles*, who should be a Blessing to them, by being the Instrument of their Conversion: They do therefore indisputably confirm the obvious

PART and literal Interpretation of GOD's Promise first made to *Abraham*, and afterwards repeated to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, by determining strictly what is meant by the *Seed*, and what the *Blessing* which through that *Seed* should be conveyed to all Nations. And it is very remarkable, That though the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* do so frequently bespeak GOD's future Blessing of the *Gentiles*, in their Conversion and Reformation; yet they never once give us the least Room to suspect, that the Instrument to be employed by GOD for that Purpose, should be of any other *Nation*, than that descended from *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, or of any other *Tribe*, than that of *Judah*, or of any other *Family*, than that of *David*. Which is a very rational Presumption, that all these Passages so exactly agreeing in Circumstances as well as in Substance, relate to the same Event. But it ought to be observed farther, That in the fore-cited Passages, you have not only the great distinguishing Character of that Extraordinary Messenger of GOD, His Conversion of, and Rule over the *Gentiles*; not only his Country, Descent and Family determined; but you have likewise his moral Character several Times very particularly described.

Isaiab xi. 2. The Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge

Knowledge, and the Fear of the LORD. PART II.

Ver. 3. And shall make him of quick Understanding in the Fear of the LORD, and he shall not judge after the Sight of his Eyes, neither reprove after the Hearing of his Ears:

Ver. 4. But with Righteousness shall he judge the Poor, and reprove with Equity for the Meek of the Earth, and he shall smite the Earth with the Rod of his Mouth, and with the Breath of his Lips shall he slay the wicked.

Ver. 5. And Righteousness shall be the Girdle of his Loyns, and Faithfulness the Girdle of his Reins.

Ibid. xlii. 2. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his Voice to be heard in the Street.

Ver. 3. A bruised Reed shall he not break, and the smoking Flax shall he not quench: He shall bring forth Judgment unto Truth.

His outward Circumstances in Life are likewise particularly described by the same Prophet, which are very remarkable; not such as usually attend a successful Warriour, exalted in worldly Fame and outward Dignity, but quite the Reverse. In one of the Prophecies before-cited, God describes him thus:

Isaiab xlix. 7. Him whom Man despiseth,
him whom the Nation abhorreth, a

Servant of Rulers, Kings shall see and arise, Princes also shall worship.

AND Unity of Character with other Circumstances will oblige us to acknowledge, that the same Servant of the LORD is spoken of,

Isaiab lii. 13. Behold, my Servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.

Ver. 14. As many were astonished at thee (his Visage was so marred more than any Man, and his Form more than the Sons of Men)

Ver. 15. So shall he sprinkle many Nations, the Kings shall shut their Mouths at him: For that which had not been told them shall they see; And that which they had not heard shall they consider.

Ibid. liii. 2. He shall grow up before him as a tender Plant, and as a Root out of a dry Ground: He hath no Form nor Comeliness: and when we shall see him, there is no Beauty that we should desire him.

Ver. 3. He is despised and rejected of Men, a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief.

Ver. 7. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his Mouth: He is brought as a Lamb to the Slaughter, and as a Sheep before

fore her Shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his Mouth. PART II.



AND these Circumstances of him that was to bear Rule over the *Gentiles*, are likewise taken Notice of by *David* in one of the *Psalms* before-cited.

Psalms ii. 1. Why do the Heathen rage, and the People imagine a vain thing?

Ver. 2. The Kings of the Earth set themselves, and the Rulers take Counsel together against the LORD, and against his Anointed.

THESE Scriptures are yet more particular, in declaring the End, for which this extraordinary, chosen Messenger of God should be thus afflicted, and even put to a violent, ignominious Death.

Isaiab liii. 5. He was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our Iniquities: the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his Stripes we are healed.

Ver. 6. All we like Sheep have gone astray: we have turned every one to his own Way, and the LORD hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all.

Ver. 8. He was cut off out of the Land of the Living: for the Transgression of my People was he stricken.

Ver. 10. When thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin, he shall see his



his Seed, he shall prolong his Days, and the Pleasure of the LORD, shall prosper in his Hand,

Ver. 11. By his Knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many; for he shall bear their Iniquities.

Ver. 12. Therefore will I divide him a Portion with the Great, and he shall divide the Spoil with the Strong: because he hath poured out his Soul unto Death: and he was numbered with the Transgressors, and he bare the Sin of many, and made Intercession for the Transgressors.


AND with this Description of a perfectly innocent Person, made a Sacrifice for our Sins, agrees that Character which *David* gives of a *Priest* of a different Order from that of *Aaron*.

Psalms cx. 4. Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of *Melchizedek*.

AND in this Account of his low and suffering Condition, the Offence which the *Jews* should take thereat, is particularly foretold, and expressed in Terms as clear and plain as possible,

Isaiab liii. 1. Who hath believed our Report? and to whom hath the Arm of the LORD been revealed;

Ver.

Ver. 3. We hid as it were our Faces P A R T
from him ; he was despised, and we II.
esteemed him not. 

Ver. 4. We did esteem him stricken,
smitten of GOD, and afflicted.

THIS clear Account of his mean and despicable Appearance, is the more remarkable, as it should seem inconsistent with the principal Part of his Character, His Conversion of, and Rule over the *Gentiles*.

It farther appears from the forecited Passages, That the *Jews* were to be no longer GOD's peculiar People ; but that the *Gentiles* likewise were to be taken into Covenant ; and consequently, that there would be a new Covenant, suited to this new State of Things. The going forth of a Law out of Zion, and the Word of the LORD out of Jerusalem, is spoken of as the Means whereby the *Gentiles* should be converted. And it is said of the Messenger employed for that Purpose, That the *Isles* should wait for his Law. And indeed the Event foretold should seem to require a new Law for the Accomplishment of it. For many of the *Jewish* Laws and Ordinances (as I observed in the Beginning of this Chapter) were given to the *Jews* as a separate People, and with an Intent to keep them separate : Which Laws therefore could not be continued in that new State, where *Jew* and *Gentile* were to be united together in one Covenant,

PART II. Covenant, and to be accounted equally the People of God. It appears likewise, that the *Priesthood*, and the Method of making Atonement for Sins, were to be altered; consequently, the Laws and Ordinances relating thereto must of Necessity be altered likewise. It is also to be observed, That the old ritual Way of Worship was confined to a certain Place, which could not possibly be continued, when all Nations should turn to the LORD. GOD had expressly signified as much by his Prophet *Malachy*, saying, *In every Place Incense shall be offered to my Name, and a pure Offering.* But GOD's Intention to alter the Law given by *Moses*, was revealed under the *Old Testament* in Terms as clear and positive as possible.

Jeremiah xxxi. 31. Behold, the Days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new Covenant with the House of *Israel*, and with the House of *Judab*:

Ver. 32. Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the Day that I took them by the Hand to bring them out of the Land of *Egypt* (which my Covenant they brake, although I was an Husband unto them, saith the LORD.)

NAY, *Moses* himself, by whose Ministration the *Jews* received the Law, gave them Reason to expect a new Law, and ano-

another Lawgiver, by whom it should be P A R T
 established. II.



Deut. xviii. 15. The LORD thy GOD will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.

Ver. 16. According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy GOD in *Horeb*, in the Day of the Assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the Voice of the LORD my GOD; neither let me see this great Fire any more, that I die not.

Ver. 17. 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.

Ver. 19. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my Words which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him.

A N O T H E R Circumstance taken Notice of by the Prophets under the *Old Testament*, relating to this great Event, *The Conversion of the Gentiles*; is the *Time*, when the Extraordinary Messenger of GOD to be employed therein, should appear in the World. Many of the Prophecies before-cited, which were delivered before the *Babylonish Captivity*, plainly speak of it as an Event which should come to pass after the Restoration

PART Restoration of the *Jews* from that Captivity.
 II. The Prophets after the Captivity concur therein, and are somewhat more particular than the former Prophets concerning the Time of his Coming. *Haggai* and *Malachy* bespeak his Coming during the Continuance of the second Temple: But *Daniel* fixes a certain compass of Time from the Restoration of the *Jews*, in which they should expect him.

Haggai ii. 6. 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:

Ver. 7. 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.

Ver. 8. The Silver is mine, and the Gold is mine, saith the LORD of Hosts.

Ver. 9. The Glory of this latter House shall be greater than of the former, saith the LORD of Hosts: and in this Place will I give Peace, saith the LORD of Hosts.

Malachy iii. 1. Behold, I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the Way before me: and the LORD whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple: even the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in: behold,

hold, he shall come, saith the LORD PART
of Hosts. II.

Daniel ix. 24. 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.

Ver. 25. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the Commandment to restore and to build *Jerusalem*, unto the MESSIAH the Prince, shall be Seven Weeks, and Threescore and two Weeks the Street shall be built again, and the Wall even in troublous Times.

Ver. 26. 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.

Ver. 27. And he shall confirm the Covenant with many for one Week; and in the midst of the Week he shall cause the Sacrifice and the Oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of Abominations, he shall make it desolate, even untill the Consummation
and

and that determined, shall be poured upon the Desolate.

AND as the *Time* of his Coming, so the *Place* of his Birth, is likewise particularly taken notice of in the *Old Testament*.

Micah v. 2. But thou *Bethlehem Ephrata*, though thou be little among the thousands of *Judah*, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in *Israel*: whose Goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

Ver. 3. Therefore will he give them up, until the Time that she that travaileth hath brought forth: then the Remnant of his Brethren shall return unto the Children of *Israel*.

Ver. 4. And he shall stand and feed in the Strength of the LORD, in the Majesty of the Name of the LORD his GOD, and they shall abide: for now shall he be great unto the Ends of the Earth.

Ver. 5. And this Man shall be the Peace.

THESE Prophecies are, I hope, in Number sufficient, express, positive, and circumstantial enough, to justify a Christian, if they are to his Purpose, in appealing to this Argument in Vindication of his Religion. The principal Event foretold thereby, is a very extraordinary, and a very important

important one, *A general Conversion of the* P A R T
Gentile World from the grossest Idolatry, to II.
the Worship of the One True God. The

Passages relating to it are many, and the Terms in which it is expressed very obvious and intelligible.--- Let the Reader examine them, and be Judge.--- And if he be satisfied herein, Let him keep this great Event in View, and search those Scriptures on, and see if any where there be any extraordinary Messenger promised by GOD to be employed in this important Work. If he find Instances of this Kind, let him compare them together, and observe carefully the Character and Description given of the Person to be employed therein. Let him remark particularly, whether it be any where suggested, that any Messenger designed for this Purpose, was to be of any other *Family* than that descended from *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, or of any other *Tribe* than that of *Judah*, or of any other *House* or *Lineage* than that of *David*. Let him go on and search, if there be any Passage signifying the Place where such Messenger should be born, and try, if he can fix it any where but at *Bethlehem*. Let him also consider, whether the Prophecies relating to this grand *Affair* agree together in Point of Time, so that one and the same Person may fairly be supposed to be designed thereby. Lastly, Let him consider, examining carefully all such Prophecies, Whether they suggest, that the Conversion of the *Gentile*

PART II. World was to be brought about upon the Foot of the *Mosaic* Institution, or whether they give any just Grounds to expect a new Law, or Institution of Religion for that Purpose.

IF after an impartial Inquiry, nothing does appear in any of those Prophecies, but what is fairly applicable to one and the same Event, to a particular extraordinary Messenger employed therein, appearing within a certain Compass of Time; if the different Characters and Circumstances of the different Prophecies will very well hang together, and being united, make up an entire, consistent Scheme; such Unity of Character and Coincidence of Circumstances, is, I think, a fair, rational, and just Presumption, that they all relate to the same Person, and were intended of the same Event. This allowed, (and I think it cannot be disputed) how easy, how natural, how necessary will the Application be of all those Prophecies to JESUS CHRIST, to the Work in which he was employed, and which, in a very short Time, was surprizingly accomplished by Means of his Doctrine.

FOR if upon a careful Search into History, it does appear, that no Event, like that foretold by these Prophecies, ever happened, or was in any wise attempted before the Coming of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST; it will necessarily follow,

follow, that no one before him could be PART
 the Person designed by these Prophecies II.
 for the Accomplishment of it. And it is
 certain and undeniable, that no remarkable
 Conversion was wrought among the *Gentiles*
 by Means of *Solomon, Hezekiah, Isaiab, Zo-*
robabel, or any other Prince or Prophet
 before JESUS: It is therefore equally cer-
 tain, that none of these Prophecies, which
 bespeak a Person to be employed in this
 great Undertaking, and by whose Means
 it should be accomplished, had any Rela-
 tion to them. It is in no wise true of any
 of them, that they had *the Heathen for their*
Inheritance, and the uttermost Parts of the
Earth for their Possession (a), that they were
a Light unto the Gentiles, and for Salva-
tion unto the Ends of the Earth (b). And
 nothing can be more ridiculous or arbi-
 trary, than to apply Predictions concern-
 ing so remarkable an Event, to Persons
 that had not the least Concern in the Ac-
 complishment of it,

To do these Prophecies Justice, it is but
 reasonable, That in the first Place, we
 search History, and consider, whether the
 grand Event, so frequently and expressly
 spoken of, had any Completion, or not.
 When we have found an Event answering
 to some rational and just Construction of
 these Prophecies, then it will be Time
 enough, and not till then, will it be just or
 reasonable,

H 2

reasonable,

(a) Psal. ii. 8.

(b) Isa. xlix. 6.

PART II. reasonable, to look for the Person, by whose Means it was to be accomplished, And if upon Inquiry we should find a Person successfully employed therein, whose Country, Descent and Family, the Place of his Birth, the Time and Manner of his Appearing, his Moral Conduct, and outward Circumstances in Life, all agree with the Character and Description of the Person spoken of in those Prophecies; then I think we may with strictest Reason apply them to him; nay, we are obliged in Equity so to do.

HAVING made these Observations, I might safely leave the before-cited Prophecies to the Judgment of every impartial Reader, to determine, Whether the grand Event foretold thereby, ever had any Accomplishment, but in and through JESUS CHRIST; and whether the Character and Circumstances of that same JESUS, did not exactly answer the prophetic Description of the Person by whom it was to be accomplished. But because our Adversaries do not readily agree with us in the Construction we put upon some of those Prophecies, but have attempted to give them a different Turn, I shall endeavour in the following Chapter to vindicate them, and to prove, *That according to rational and just Construction they relate to JESUS CHRIST, and to him only.*


CHAPTER IV.

A VINDICATION of the Prophecies cited in the preceding Chapter, proving, That according to rational and just Construction, they relate to JESUS CHRIST, and to him only.

THE Design of *this Chapter* being to vindicate the Sense and Construction put upon several Prophecies of the *Old Testament* cited in the *preceding Chapter*; I would willingly execute it in such a Manner, as might not be liable to so much Cavil and Sophistry, as the Author of *Scheme, &c.* has bestowed upon some former Attempts of this Kind.

HE calls upon us for a *literal* Interpretation of the Prophecies we make use of to establish a *Messias-Scheme*. But what he means by a *literal* Interpretation, is not easily discovered. For sometimes he would tie us down to the *mere Letter* (a), without allowing us to suppose, that the Prophets ever made use of any *Figure of Speech* in expressing themselves upon any Occasion. At another Time, when the simple, *literal* Expression seems to favour us, he cries out (b),--- “ Mere figurative Phrases, that do
H 3 not

(a) *Scheme, &c.* p. 127, 388. (b) *Ib.* p. 296.

PART II.  “not according to the Dialect of the *Jews* import what we interpret them to signify; who mistaking Language, give *European literal* Interpretations of an *Oriental* Author, who *literally* intended common Matters by very swelling Expressions;” And tell us (c), That the *literal* Sense in this Controversy, signifies the Sense intended by the Writer, the *primary Sense*, in Opposition to a *typical* or *allegorical* or *secondary Sense*; which *literal* Sense may be signified as well, and as obviously, by a *figurative*, as by the most simple or *literal* Expression.” Let him keep to this, we ask no more. We will suppose with him and *Grotius* (d), “The Holy Scriptures, like all other Writings, to have a Sense conformable to the common Use of Words and Expressions, and to the Circumstances and Connection of the Discourse. Nor will we be led by the *Authority* of any *Jews*, or by the *Example* of any *famous Authors*, in the Interpretation of a Text, against the Rules of common Sense, that is, against the *Rules* of *Grammar* and *Criticism* (e).” We will suppose the Prophets to have had one determinate View; will examine, by the usual Methods made use of in interpreting other Authors, what that View was, and will keep to that single Sense, which, according to this Method of Inquiry,

(c) Scheme, p. 251.

(d) Ibid. p. 388.

(e) Ib. p. 267.

Inquiry, shall appear most agreeable to the PART
 Intention of the Writer. This is, what I II.
 call *rational and just Construction*; and ac-
 cording to such Construction, I undertake
 to prove, That the Prophecies before-cited
 relate to JESUS CHRIST and the Events
 of his Doctrine, and to no other Person
 or Event whatsoever,

S E C T. I.

AND First, I shall begin with those
 Passages I have alledged to prove, That
 the Prophets under the Old Testament had
 in View, *a general Conversion of the Gen-
 tile World from their idolatrous State, to
 the Worship of the One True God.* For
 this, I suppose to be the principal Part
 of the MESSIAH'S Character, that which
 distinguishes him from *Moses*, and all the
 preceding Prophets and Rulers in the *Jewish*
 State. If therefore the Event itself be clear-
 ly foretold by the Prophets, we may be al-
 lowed without Exception, to apply such
 Prophecies to the Christian Scheme, by
 which alone they were accomplished.

AND I think no Passages can be clearer,
 or carry a more obvious, plain, determi-
 nate Sense along with them, than those I
 have cited for this Purpose: If one were
 to search for Words, to express in the
 clearest, strongest Manner such an Event,

PART II. those which *David* uses (f), would appear as proper as any; when he says, *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 again (g), All Nations whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O LORD, and shall glorify thy Name.* Passages so plain as these, need no Comment; *Grotius* himself lets them pass, without attempting to explain them away upon a few Strangers settling among the *Jews*, and becoming Profelytes to their Religion. And the *Jewish Church* flourished as much, and was in as great Reputation among their Neighbours in the Days of *David* and *Solomon*, as ever it was afterwards; yet it is not supposed that *David* had a View to his own, or his Son's Times, when he expressed himself in that Manner. There is another Passage in the *Psalms*, which speaks of it as an Event at some Distance, where it is ordered to be recorded for the Information of future Times (b) *The Heathen shall fear the Name of the LORD, and all the Kings of the Earth thy Glory.---- This shall be written for the Generation to come, and the People which shall be created shall praise the LORD.*

It may be said perhaps, that this *Psalms* was not penned by *David*, but some other Prophet after him. Be it so: This will help

(f) Psal. xxii. 27. - (g) Ibid. lxxxvi. 9.
 (b) Psalm cii. 15, 18.

help to confirm what I am going to ob- P A R T
 serve, That the self-same Event spoken of II.
 by *David*, is still kept in View, and also
 as clearly, and positively insisted on by all
 the succeeding Prophets down to *Malachy*.
 None of them speak of it as a Thing which
 ever had been accomplished. The Accounts,
 which they all give, both of the State of
 the *Jewish* Church, and of the *Gentile* World
 in their Times, are utterly inconsistent with
 such a Supposition. They speak of it as
 an unusual Event, as the Effect of a very
 extraordinary Interposition of Divine Provi-
 dence hardly to be credited, it appearing
 at the Time of foretelling it, so very unlike-
 ly to come to pass.

THE next great Prophet after *David* was
Isaiab. That he had the same Event in
 View, is evident from almost every *Chap-*
ter of his Prophecies. At present I shall
 mention but one, wherein GOD speaks by
 his Prophet in the solemnest Manner, con-
 firming the Word with most weighty Affe-
 verations, supposing it would with Diffi-
 culty be credited, and says, (i) *Look unto*
me and be ye saved all the Ends of the Earth:
for I am GOD, and there is none else. I
have sworn by myself, the Word is gone out
of my Mouth in Righteousness, and shall not
return, that unto me every Knee shall bow,
and every Tongue shall swear. That these
 Words are addressed to the Nations of the
 Earth

(i) *Isa.* xlv. 22, 23,

PART II. Earth, as distinguished from the *Jews*, is out of Dispute. And we allow with *Grotius*, (k) That the *Context* shews, that they ought not to be understood in their utmost Latitude. But nothing can be more unreasonable, than to explain a Passage, expressed in Terms of so great Latitude, of a few Profelytes coming over to the *Jews* out of neighbour Nations, and Worshiping God in the *Court of the Gentiles*. For what is spoken in such general Terms of *whole Nations* cannot, with any Propriety, be understood of a *few Refugees*, leaving those Nations and joyning themselves to another People. Nothing less than a general Conversion, wrought among the Nations themselves, can be supposed to answer the rational Construction of such a Prophecy.

AND this will appear yet more evidently to have been the Sense of the Prophets under the *Old Testament*, if we descend to *Jeremiah*, who prophecied in the next Reign after the Death of *Isaiab*. This Prophet foreseeing the near Approach of the Captivity of his People, gave them Directions concerning their Behaviour under it, and put this Prophecy in their Mouths with a strict Charge to publish it among the Nations, whither they were to be carried Captives, and in the *Chaldee Language*, that it might not suffer by Translation (l),
 Thus

(k) Grotius in Locum.

(l) Jer. x. 11.

Thus shall ye say unto them, The Gods that **PART**
 have not made the Heavens and the Earth, **II.**
 even they shall perish from the Earth, and
 from under these Heavens. It is evident past
 Dispute, That a few Profelytes leaving
 those Nations, and settling among the Jews,
 and worshipping with them the GOD of
 Israel, could never answer the Intent of
 this Prophecy: Because while the Nations
 themselves remained Idolaters and continued
 to worship the same Gods, it could not
 be truly said, that those Gods were pe-
 rished from the Earth, and from under the
 Heavens.


ZEPHANIAH was contemporary with
Jeremiah. He foresaw the same Event,
 and expresses it (if possible) in a fuller
 manner (m), *The LORD will be terrible un-*
to them: for he will famish all the Gods of
the Earth, and Men shall worship him, every
one from his Place, even all the Isles of the
Heathen. This must not be understood of
 particular Persons, leaving their own Coun-
 try, to joyn in Worship with those of ano-
 ther Nation; but of the Nations them-
 selves forsaking the Gods they had former-
 ly worshipped, and setting up the Worship
 of the one true GOD among them, in-
 stead of their former idolatrous Supersti-
 tions.

BUT

(m) Zeph. ii. 11.

PART

II.


 BUT this great Event, so clearly foretold by the Prophets before the *Babylonish* Captivity, had no Accomplishment under, nor immediately after it. The Captivity was restored, the *Jews* resettled in their own Country; but the Nations round about them still continued in their idolatrous State. Nevertheless the Prophets after the Captivity still persevered in their Expectation of a general Conversion to be wrought among the *Gentiles*, which they expressed in stronger Terms, than had been used by their Predecessors before the Captivity. *Malachi*, the last of all the Prophets, instead of pretending an Accomplishment thereof in, or before, his own Times, makes use of God's future Intention in that Respect, as a Means to provoke the *Jews* to Jealousy, telling them in the Words of God, (n) *From the Rising of the Sun even unto the Going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every Place Incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering: For my Name shall be great among the Heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts.*

WHAT tolerable Construction can Men put upon such Expressions as these, which give us repeated Assurances of so great an Event, in such strong Terms, to make them

(n) Mal. i. 11.

them answer any Event, which came to pass in the Days of *David, Solomon, Hezekiah, or Zorobabel*? Will they say, that nothing more was intended by such Expressions as these, but that a few Profelytes should come over to the *Jews* now and then out of Neighbour-Nations, and settle among them, and become Partakers of their Religion? Can this with any Propriety of Speech be stiled a Conversion of *Nations and Kingdoms*? Was this all that was intended by the *perishing of false Gods from off the Earth*? Would you call this a *Famishing of all the Gods of the Heathen*? How then was *the Name of GOD great among the Gentiles, every Man worshipping him from his Place, and not only at Jerusalem, but in every Place offering to GOD a pure Offering*? Or will they say these Prophecies were accomplished in a more proper Sense, “ in or near the “ Times of their Delivery; and that if “ this is not perceived, it is for Want of “ History? ” (o) This also is utterly groundless. The *Old Testament* furnishes us with the History of all those Times, wherein those Prophecies were delivered: And it cannot be imagined, that so remarkable an Event, more for the Honour of the *Jewish Nation*, than any thing recorded in all their History, would have been passed over in Silence, had it happened within the Compass of that History:

Josephus

(o) Scheme, p. 226.

PART II. *Josephus* took great Pains in collecting the ancient History of his own Nation, and was very careful to let slip nothing that redounded to its Honour: Yet in neither of these Histories do we find any Event, which bears the least Resemblance to the Prophecies we have been speaking of. Nay had there been any Accomplishment thereof, between the Time of *David* and *Zorobabel*, (where we ought to look for it, if the Opinion of our Adversary be a true one,) *profane* as well as *sacred* History must unavoidably have given us some Intimations of it. There could never have been such a Change wrought in the Religions of the World, such an Overthrow of Idols, and Dereliction of their Temples, as these Prophecies plainly suggest, but we must have met with some Accounts thereof in the Writings of those Times, when it came to pass. But these very Writings assure us of the contrary; by representing from Time to Time the Customs, Manners, Worship of the Heathens universally, in quite another Light, than was consistent with the Accomplishment of these Prophecies.

BESIDES, it were enough to our Purpose to observe only, how all the Prophets successively keep the same Event in View, not one of them suggesting, that it had been accomplished according to the Prediction of his Predecessor; but every one speaking of it as a Thing still future,

as

as an unusual Event, of which there had PART
 been no Experience, which yet GOD would II.
 certainly accomplish to the Manifestation
 of his Glory. ~~~~~

ALL this considered, it is ridiculous to look for a Completion of these Prophecies in the Time of *David, Solomon, Hezekiah, or Zorobabel,* or at any Time before the Coming of our Saviour CHRIST. Then indeed History begins to present us with a State of Things agreeable to the proper Sense and Import of those Predictions. Bigotted Pagans express their Jealousy for their Gods, complain that their Temples were every Day less frequented, that their Altars would be quite forsaken, if the Civil Power did not interpose to crush the growing Sect of Christians. And yet 'tis well known, notwithstanding the utmost Severities were used to discountenance and suppress them, that they increased and gained Ground prodigiously, beyond all Expectation and Example, till the Worship of the One True GOD, became the prevailing Religion of all the civilized Parts of the Earth. Then it proved true in Fact, That the Gods of those Nations, where the *Jews* were scattered in their first Captivity, *did perish from off the Earth, and from under these Heavens,* according to the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*: This was, in the only proper Sense of *Zephaniah's* Words, *a famishing of the Gods of the Heathen*: Then the GOD of *Israel* was worshipped, not
 only

PART only at *Jerusalem*; but in every Place, and
 II. his Name, which before (p) was great in
 ~~~~~ *Israel* only, was great among the Heathen,  
 as the LORD had spoken by his Prophet  
*Malachy*.

I HOPE it will be acknowledged, that in the Interpretation of these Prophecies, I have not deviated (as we are charged) (q), from the Rules of common Sense, viz. of *Grammar and Criticism*; and that the Construction I contend for, is not calculated (r) to subvert the clear and undoubted Meaning of the Prophets,--- or to introduce any chimerical Meaning,--- contrary to the common Sense of their Words and to the Connexion of their Discourse. Nor can it be denied, but those Prophecies (contrary to the Censure of our Adversary) (s) do literally and primarily (not typically, allegorically, enigmatically, or secondarily) foretell that important Event, to which I have applied them. They are in my Opinion, indisputably clear from every Exception, which the Author of *Scheme*, &c. has pretended to make to Prophecies produced on this Occasion. His Exceptions are these (t):

I. THAT some did not *undoubtedly exist before the Events, which we suppose fulfilled them.*

(p) Psal. lxxvi. 1.      (q) *Scheme* p. 270.  
 (r) *Scheme*, p. 119.      (s) *Ibid.* p. 8.  
 (t) *Ib.* p. 273.

*them.* But I insist, That no Exception of PART  
 this kind has been made to any of those II.  
 Books of the *Old Testament*, from whence  
 these Prophecies are cited, nor to any of  
 the Passages I have cited from them.

2. THAT some are *so obscure, as not to have their literal Meaning determined with Certainty.* The contrary to this is most manifestly true of the Prophecies now under Consideration. For if one were *now* to chuse Words, whereby to express that Event, to which they are applied, it would be difficult to invent a plainer and more intelligible Way of expressing it, than in the very Words of those Prophecies.

3. THAT some *have most apparently another literal Meaning, if considered in the Context from whence they are taken.* But we appeal to the Context, and to the Occasion upon which these Prophecies were delivered as a farther Confirmation of the Sense and Construction we put upon them? and I may venture to say, Let them be considered with, or without their *Context*, they will not bear any other tolerable Construction.

4. THAT some *are general and indeterminate in Circumstances, and relate to such common Events, as must some Time or other, and some of them often, come to pass.* Nothing like this can be said of the Prophecies before us. For considering the Circumstan-

PART II. ces of the World at the Time of their Delivery, nothing could be less expected, than the Accomplishment thereof. There never had been any Instance thereof: The Appearances of Things had a quite contrary Aspect, and humanly speaking, the Probability was much greater, that a single People, of themselves prone to Idolatry, and beset with idolatrous Neighbours, should at length be swallowed up in their prevailing Superstitions, than that all the Nations round them should forsake the Gods they had served for Ages immemorial, and devote themselves to the GOD of *Israel*.

I HAVE insisted the longer upon these Prophecies, (longer than may seem needful, considering how clearly they are expressed) not only because they give us a general Draught of the *Messias-Scheme*, which extends itself to all Mankind without Respect to Persons or Nation, in Opposition to the *Mosaic-Scheme*, which respected the *Israelites* only as a peculiar People; but also because they may serve as a Foundation for the surer Interpretation of several Passages of the *Old Testament*, which some Men have imagined were accomplished in *David*, *Solomon*, *Hezekiah*, or *Zorobabel*, in which they were no more concerned, than *Moses* was in the Conversion of the *Gentile* World to Christianity. I must desire the Reader therefore, if he be satisfied these Prophecies suit the Purpose to which they are



are applied, to keep them in Mind, and P A R T  
 look upon it henceforward as an established II.  
 Point, That the Scriptures of the *Old Testa-*  
*ment* had in View a general Conversion of the  
 Gentile World from their idolatrous State, to the  
 Worship of the One True God. For it will  
 serve as a Confutation of that groundless  
 Notion, That all the Prophecies contained  
 therein, relate immediately and literally to the  
 Jewish Nation and their Affairs, in or near  
 the Times when these Prophecies were deli-  
 vered; and also as a Key to explain several  
 other Prophecies, which bespeak the same  
 Event, but are yet more particular as to  
 the Person and Time, when and by whom  
 it was to be accomplished.

## S.E.C.T. II.

HAVING proved, that the great Con-  
 version wrought among the *Gentiles*, by  
 Means of CHRIST and his Doctrine, was  
 clearly and expressly revealed by the Pro-  
 phets under the *Old Testament*: I shall  
 now proceed to the Consideration of some  
 other Prophecies, which bespeak the same  
 Event, but with the Addition of several  
 Circumstances relating to the Accomplish-  
 ment of it. And because *Isaiab* seems to  
 me to be more particular, than any of the  
 other Prophets, in specifying the *Circum-*  
*stances* of that great Event, I propose to  
 consider next the Prophecies cited from him

PART in the *preceding Chapter*, and to justify the  
II. Use I have made of them.

BUT before I speak to the particular Prophecies referred to, it may not be amiss to make some Reflections upon the whole Prophecy, and the Occasion of it. The Tribes of *Israel* in the Time of *Isaiab* were frequently attacked, and often very grievously oppressed by their *Heathen* Neighbours. GOD thought fit therefore to acquaint them by his Prophet, That their great Iniquities, their Ingratitude to him, and their unconquerable Propensity to Idolatry, were the Causes of it. Therefore *thou hast forsaken thy People, the House of Jacob, because they be replenished from the East, and are Soothsayers like the Philistines, and they please themselves in the Children of Strangers* (u). And we find the Prophet from Time to Time adding, to his Re-proofs of them for their Iniquities, severer Threatnings still of Invasions, and Oppressions, and Ravages and Devastations to be expected from the *Heathen* round about them, till their Country should be quite laid waste, and their whole Nation carried into Captivity.

BUT lest this miserable Prospect of Things set before them by the Prophet, and confirmed by the growing Greatness of their neighbour States, should quite dispirit

(u) *Isaiab* ii. 6.

spirit the Sincere and Well-disposed among them, and tempt them to say in their Hearts, “ To what Purpose do we stand  
 “ out, and strive in vain to preserve a Re-  
 “ ligion, the Reverse of that which is prac-  
 “ ticed by all the Nations round us, and  
 “ by Reason whereof we are envied, and  
 “ continually oppressed by them? We  
 “ are but a Handful of Men, in Compa-  
 “ rison with the idolatrous States and Na-  
 “ tions, which look upon us with an invi-  
 “ dious Eye, and continually lie in wait for  
 “ our Ruin. First or last therefore, we  
 “ must submit, or be totally extirpated.  
 “ Why then should we draw upon our-  
 “ selves, and entail upon our Posterity,  
 “ such a Scene of Miseries, for the Sake  
 “ of a Religion, which we can never be  
 “ able to maintain against such potent  
 “ Adversaries? We must either quit our  
 “ Religion, or utterly perish in our At-  
 “ tempts to defend it.” I say, Lest this  
 sad Prospect should tempt the Sincere and  
 Well-disposed to renounce their Religion  
 in utter Despair of preserving it; GOD was  
 pleased to soften his Threatnings with com-  
 fortable Assurances of his Protection, and  
 Support of the Upright in their greatest  
 Extremities; that, notwithstanding Idolatry  
 had overspread the Earth, and the Wor-  
 shippers of the One True GOD, were but  
 few in Number, yet they should never be  
 swallowed up in the overspreading of Ido-  
 latry; but Idolatry itself, should in time  
 give Way to the Worship of the GOD of

PART *Israel.* Nay, though GOD did intend for a  
 II. Time to give up his People into the Hands  
 of their Enemies, who should lay all their  
 Country waste, and carry them away Cap-  
 tives into a strange Land; yet he would  
 not only restore them again to their Coun-  
 try, and to the quiet Enjoyment of their  
 Religion in their own Land, but would al-  
 so make himself known among the *Heathen*,  
 who should be converted from dumb Idols  
 to serve Him the Living and True GOD:  
 So that contrary to their Expectation, in-  
 stead of Idolatry prevailing against his Wor-  
 ship, his Worship should prevail and spread  
 itself over all the idolatrous Nations round  
 about them.

THIS is the Substance of the whole Pro-  
 phesy. And I think it cannot but be ob-  
 served from thence; That this Prospect  
 of the MESSIAS'S Days, (wherein that  
 great Conversion, spoken of by the Pro-  
 phet, was wrought among the *Gentiles*)  
 though a very distant one, was yet very  
 well suited to his Purpose, and was very  
 proper to support the sinking Spirits of  
 GOD'S People at that Time; who might  
 otherwise very justly have conceived, from  
 what they had suffered, and were like to  
 suffer through the overspreading of Ido-  
 latry, that their Religion must quick-  
 ly have sunk under the Weight of it,  
 and that it would be next to impossible  
 for them to maintain it against a World  
 of



of Idolaters, that seemed bent upon its Ruin. PART. II.



AND this Observation may serve effectually to remove a Difficulty, the Appearance whereof seems to have misled the great *Grotius* in interpreting several Parts of this Prophecy, and put him upon looking out for Events in or near the Time of the Prophet, answering to those Passages, which in the clearest, fullest Manner bespeak the Conversion of the *Gentile* World. But his Attempt manifestly failed of Success: For if we compare those Passages with the Events to which he has applied them, there is scarcely any Resemblance to be found between them. Nay, sometimes, we are obliged to depend upon his mere Imagination only, that there were such Events, there being not the least Intimation given of them in History. And it appears in several Instances (*x*), that *Grotius* himself was sensible, that *Isaiab's* Words could not without Impropriety and Constraint, be made to answer the Purposes to which he has applied them, acknowledging, that they do more *plainly, simply,*  
I 4 *and*

(*x*) Sed in Christo hæc & quæ præcedunt habent significationem multo ut augustiorem ita & *planior*, Grot. in Isa. ix. 7. --- verbis à Deo sic directis, ut *simplicius limpidiusque* in res Christi, quam in illas quas primo significare *Esaias* voluit, convenirent. Id. in Isa. xl. See also his Notes on Chap. liii.



PART and clearly answer Events which were accomplished through CHRIST.  
II.

To what Purpose then are those Endeavours, to find out Events nearer the Prophet's Time, which yet, without great Violence used, will not tally with the Prophet's Words? Is the Connection of the Prophecy rendered more easy and natural thereby? No: For supposing the Prophet to have had Respect to Events, which were not to be accomplished till the Times of the MESSIAS, it would notwithstanding effectually have served his Purpose; which was to support the sinking Spirits of the true *Isaraelites*, who had great Reason to apprehend, that their Religion would be swallowed up by Idolatry: And in such Circumstances nothing could be a greater Comfort and Encouragement to them to persevere in the Worship of the True GOD, than an Assurance by his Prophet, that he would not only protect them therein, but in process of Time, would cause that Worship to prevail among those very idolatrous Nations, who then seemed bent upon the Extirpation of it?

THE two first *Chapters* of *Isaiab*, I do not doubt, will confirm this Observation. The Prophet in the beginning of the *first Chapter* having drawn up a heavy Charge against his People of Ingratitude, and the vilest Iniquity, subjoyns a very heavy Threatning thereto, *ver. 7, 8. Your Country*

*is desolate, your Cities are burnt with Fire, your Land Strangers devour it in your Presence, and it is desolate as overthrown by*



*Strangers: And the Daughter of Zion is left as a Cottage in a Vineyard, as a Lodge in a Garden of Cucumbers, as a besieged City.* Suppose now a true *Israelite* reflecting seriously upon this State of Things, considering on the one Hand the very great Corruption of the Generality of his Brethren in Principles and Morals, on the other Hand GOD highly incensed therewith, and threatening to give them over to the Will of their Enemies, and withal the Nations round about them ready at all Times, as Opportunity served, to make a Prey of them; what less could he conceive from this View of Things, but that his Religion must quickly have an End, and that all Hopes of maintaining it long in such Circumstances were groundless? How seasonably therefore to dispell this melancholy Apprehension, does the Prophet in the Beginning of the *second Chapter* foretell the future great Encrease of the Worshippers of the true GOD, by the Conversion of the *Gentile Nations!* As if he had said, “ Be  
 “ not afraid of the utter Extirpation of  
 “ your Religion; for though Idolatry does  
 “ greatly prevail and is yet like to pre-  
 “ vail, and though many of your Brethren  
 “ have been foolishly deceived thereby;  
 “ yet in Times to come your GOD shall  
 “ so manifest himself by Revelation to the  
 “ World, that those very Nations that are  
 “ now

PART II. “ now wholly given to Idolatry, and are  
 “ zealous to propagate it, shall forsake  
 “ it and be turned unto the LORD, and  
 “ voluntarily devote themselves to his Wor-  
 “ ship and Service ”. The Prophet’s  
 Words are, *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 Zion shall  
 go forth the Law, and the Word of the LORD  
 from Jerusalem.*

THE Note of *Grotius* upon this Place will not, I believe, be of any great Weight against us, when it is well considered. He says, (y) “ This Prophecy has Respect to  
 “ that Time, when the City of *Jerusalem*  
 “ was delivered from the Siege laid against  
 “ it by *Rezin* King of *Syria* and *Pekah*  
 “ King of *Israel* ”. I think he could not have fixed upon a more unlucky Point of Time, wherein to have sought for an Event, in any wise agreeable to the Prophet’s Words. It was in that very wicked Reign of *Abaz*, that idolatrous Prince, who absolutely rejected the God of *Israel*, and gave himself up to the worst Abomi-  
 nations

(y) *Grotius* in locum.

nations of the *Heathen Nations* round him, PART  
and continued therein to the Day of his II  
Death. It is very likely that in such a  
Reign as this, the Worship of GOD at  
*Jerusalem* appeared to the neighbouring  
States in such an amiable Light, as to en-  
gage them to forsake their own Religions to  
joyn with the *Jews* in theirs!

By what Event then does *Grotius* say  
this Prophecy was fulfilled? “Many of  
“ the People (says he) who were Enemies  
“ to the *Syrians*, betook themselves to  
“ *Jerusalem*, as the safest Place of Refuge,  
“ and there worshipped GOD in the Court  
“ of the *Gentiles*.” (z). Is there any Hi-  
story for this? In *Josephus*, in the *Books of*  
*Kings and Chronicles* there is not any distant  
Intimation of it; not any Ground to sus-  
pect, that any People out of neighbouring  
States fled for Refuge to *Jerusalem* at that  
Time.

BUT admit they did; what is this to  
the Purpose? The Prophet does not speak  
of a few Refugees out of adjacent Nations,  
but of the Nations themselves, *i. e.* the  
Generality of the People belonging to  
them: He does not speak of Persons act-  
ed by any civil or temporal Motives, or  
upon a View of Self-preservation; but  
upon a religious View, joyning themselves  
to the Worshipers of the true GOD for  
the

(z) *Grotius in locum.*



PART the Sake of their GOD and their Religion.

II. The Prophet expresses the Motive upon which they should act; thus: *And he shall teach us of his Ways, and we will walk in his Paths.*

BUT suppose there were no Difficulty about the Motive upon which they acted, I will be bold to say, That it is utterly groundless and contrary to History to suppose, that there were any Profelytes, made in the Reign of *Abaz*, who came and settled at *Jerusalem*, and worshipped GOD in the *Court of the Gentiles*. *Abaz* reigned many Years after the Siege was raised; but it appears (a), that he was not the least reformed thereby. He devoted himself rather more to Idolatry than before: For he cut in Pieces the Vessels of the House of GOD, and shut up the Doors of the House of the LORD, and he made him Altars in every Corner of *Jerusalem*: And in every several City of *Judah* he made high Places to burn Incense to other Gods (b). *Grotius* sure did not consider this, or otherwise he would never imagined a great Number of Profelytes coming over to *Jerusalem*, and worshipping GOD in the *Court of the Gentiles*, at a Time, when the Temple was pillaged; the Service thereof totally discontinued, and the Place itself seemed wholly to be given to Idolatry. I am far from suspecting

*Grotius*

(a) 2 Kings xvi. 2. 2 Chron. xxviii.

(b) Ib. ver. 24, 25.



*Grotius* of any ill Intention in any of his Writings : Yet from this and several other Instances of like Kind, he seems to me to have been very WILLING to *invent double Meanings* of the Prophecies, having in this Place, for the Sake of *two*, made *one* the most unaccountable that ever was invented.

PART  
II.

HAVING sufficiently refuted the supposed *primary Sense* of this Prophecy given by *Grotius*, I might infer from thence, that the Application of it to the MESSIAH'S Days (whereto *Grotius* himself allows it does agree) is not *typical* or *secondary*, but conformable to the proper Sense and intended Meaning of the Prophet. Nevertheless, because a Part of it is *figuratively* expressed, it may be proper to explain it according to *the common Method of interpreting Books* (c), and to shew the exact Accomplishment of it through CHRIST.

WHEN the Prophet says, *The Mountain of the LORD'S House shall be established on the Top of the Mountains, and exalted above the Hills*, every body I believe will acknowledge, that he speaks by a *Figure*, that he never meant,  
 “ That the very Mountain upon which the  
 “ Temple stood, should be moved out of  
 “ its Place, and raised to such an Emi-  
 “ nence, by being placed upon the Top of  
 “ other

(c) Scheme, &c. p. 389.

PART “ other high Mountains, as to become  
II. “ visible to distant People and Nations.”

~ The *Figure* is a common one, and easy of Solution: the *Place* usually frequented by the Worshippers of the True GOD, is put for the *People frequenting* it. And then the Meaning of the Prophecy will be this: “ The Church, or People of GOD, in the  
“ last Days shall be so remarkably distin-  
“ guished by Divine Favour, that distant  
“ Nations shall hear of it, and be engaged  
“ thereby to quit their former Superstiti-  
“ ons, and voluntarily devote themselves  
“ to the Worship of the GOD of *Israel*,  
“ desiring to be taught his Ways, and to  
“ walk in his Paths.” Nay, the Prophet declared in plain Words, what that extra-ordinary Favour was, which GOD intended his People, and by Means whereof the *Gentiles* should be converted unto him: *For*, saith he, *out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the LORD from Jerusalem.*

THIS to me seems the plainest and most natural Construction we can put upon the Prophet's Words in this Place, neither am I aware that they are capable of any other tolerable Construction: The grand Event foretold thereby, is no other, than what I have already proved the Prophets under the *Old Testament* had certainly in their View: I have also observed, how, and for what End, the Prophet *Isaiab* in particular might rationally be supposed to have Respect to  
that

that Event: So that I cannot conceive any PART one possible Exception to be made, either II. to our Interpretation of the Prophecy, or to the Application of it to the Times of the MESSIAS. For then a Law did go forth out of Zion, and the Word of the LORD from Jerusalem, i. e. GOD did at that Time reveal himself to his People in so remarkable a Manner, that distant Nations and Countries soon became acquainted with it, and were engaged thereby to change their Way of Worship, and to adore the GOD of Israel.

WE find the same Event largely insisted on in the 1xth Chapter of this Prophecy. It abounds with *poetical Figures* in describing the several Nations to be converted, and the Manner of their Conversion: Yet I think it very plain and determinate as to the main Point, and should judge it hardly possible to be suspected, but that the Prophet must have had in View a general Conversion of the *Gentile* World to be wrought by some extraordinary Means, which should arise out of the *Jewish* Nation.

THE Prophecy is addressed to the *Jews*, foretelling some extraordinary Light, which should arise among them, whilst all the Nations round them were in Darkness. *Arise, shine, for thy Light is come, and the Glory of the LORD is risen upon thee. For behold, the Darkness shall cover the Earth, and gross Darkness the People: but the LORD shall*

PART shall arise upon thee, and his Glory shall be  
 II. seen upon thee. The Words *Light* and *Dark-*  
 ~~~~~ *ness*, are without doubt *figuratively* used in  
 this Place; and they are known *Metaphors*,
 signifying, sometimes *Prosperity* and *Adver-*
sity, but more frequently *Knowledge* and *Ig-*
norance. Now *Grotius* is of Opinion, that
 the *Light* here promised to the *Jews*, is
 that of *Prosperity*: (d) Consequently, the
Darkness, which is said to cover the Earth,
 must mean *Adversity* and great *Affliction*.
 We are to enquire therefore, whether (ac-
 cording to this Opinion of *Grotius*) the
 Affairs of the *Jews* were ever in such a
 flourishing Condition, as to have all the
 Nations round them at their Beck: For
 admitting his Interpretation of the *first Part*,
 that must be the Construction of the *Sequel*,
 where it is said, *The Gentiles shall come to*
thy Light, and Kings to the Brightness of thy
Rising. The Abundance of the Sea shall be
converted unto thee, the Forces of the Gen-
tiles shall come unto thee. Therefore thy
Gates shall be open continually, they shall not
be shut Day nor Night, that Men may bring
unto thee the Forces of the Gentiles, and that
their Kings may be brought. Grotius in in-
 terpreting these Passages, has confined him-
 self to no one Period of Time, nor to any
 Series of Events, to prove the Accomplish-
 ment of the Prophecy according to his
 own Scheme; but reels from one End of
 the *Jewish History* to another to pick up
 similar

(d) *Grotius in locum.*

similar Events, pretending one Verse has P A R T
Respect to the Time of *Zorobabel*, and the II.
next to the Times of the *Maccabees*.

AND then to what insignificant Events, compared with the Words of the Prophecy, does he refer them? *Ver. 3. Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and Kings to the Brightness of thy Rising*, does not signify any Benefit the *Gentiles* should receive by their *Light*, according to his Interpretation; but the Congratulations only of some neighbouring States, upon their Restoration from Captivity. *Ver. 5. The Abundance of the Sea shall be converted unto thee, the Forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee*, is interpreted of the Trade the *Jews* had with the *Tyrians* after their Restoration, in which the *Tyrians* shewed them no more Favour, than they were willing to shew to all People that would trade with them. *Ver. 5, 6.* which speak of several Nations coming to them, bringing Gold and Incense, shewing forth the Praises of the LORD, and ministring to them and their GOD, he refers to a defensive Alliance with the *Nabathites* and some other *Arabians*, in the Time of *Judas Maccabeus*. *Ver. 1, 9, 10.* he refers back again to their Restoration from Captivity. And in the next Verse, he descends again to *Judas Maccabeus*. *Ver. 11, 14.* which plainly speak (as the whole Chapter, nay, and the whole Prophecy does) of a voluntary Submission of the *Gentiles*, he interprets of *Edom* and *Moab*, who were compelled to
K submit,

PART *submit*, being worsted in Battel, by Judas
II. *Maccabeus*.



IN short, this whole Prophecy, which plainly bespeaks some extraordinary Favour of GOD towards his peculiar People, which should have a remarkable Influence upon all the States and Nations round them, is explained away upon a few trifling, independent Incidents, the like whereof may well be supposed to have happened, within the same Compass of Time, to them, or any other People whatsoever. I will not deny but that the Prophets do frequently bring together very distant Events, and speak of them in the same Prophecy without Distinction of Time: But then you may observe, that the Matters treated of are of a very extraordinary or important Nature; and such Prophecies are to be considered as an *Epitome*, or short Collection of the most remarkable Events, which should befall them in the latter Days; whereas common Occurrences will not bear to be so treated, either in Way of History, or Prediction.

THERE being therefore such good Reason to reject the Interpretation of *Grotius*, let us examine this Prophecy with a View to the MESSIAS'S Days, and consider, whether according to *rational Construction*, and the *common Method of interpreting Books*, it will bear to be so applied.

LIGHT

LIGHT being a known and common *Metaphor*, signifying *Knowledge* or *Illumination* of the Understanding, it cannot be thought an improper or strained Construction of the Prophet's Words, speaking to a People who had frequently been *enlightened* by Divine Revelation, to interpret them thus: *Viz.*

ISAIAH IX.

1 *Arise, shine, for thy Light is come, and the Glory of the LORD is risen upon thee.*

Exert thyself, let the World see thy Light; for GOD has enlightened thee, and in a glorious manner revealed himself to thee.

2 *For behold, the Darkness shall cover the Earth, and gross Darkness the People: but the LORD shall arise upon thee, and his Glory shall be seen upon thee.*

For Ignorance shall prevail over all the Earth; and the gross Folly of Idolatry and Superstition shall overwhelm the People thereof: But the LORD shall teach thee better, and in a miraculous manner reveal himself to thee.

3 *And the Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and Kings to*

So that idolatrous Nations shall hear thereof and be converted

PART *the Brightness of thy*
II. *Rising.*



*4 Lift up thine Eyes
round about, and see:
all they gather them-
selves together, they
come to thee, thy Sons
shall come from far,
and thy Daughters
shall be nursed at thy
Side.*

verted thereby; e-
ven their Kings as
well as People shall
embrace that heaven-
ly Doctrine revealed
unto thee.

The Influence
thereof shall not ex-
tend itself to one or
another Nation only,
but to all the Nations
round thee; even di-
stant Nations shall
become as thou art;
worship the same
GOD with thee, and
be accounted as thy
Sons and thy Daugh-
ters.

HITHERTO the Prophet speaks of the
Conversion of the Nations in general. In
the following *Verses* particular Nations are
specified, Maritime Places being described
by their Shipping and Merchandizes; o-
ther People by the Cattel and Product
peculiar to their Country, others again are
distinguished by their Enmity to GOD's
People; and all are supposed, by Means
of that *Light* or Revelation to be commu-
nicated to GOD's People, to be converted,
and to *shew forth the Praises of the LORD,*
Ver. 6.

It may be objected, That v. 10. *The Sons of Strangers shall build up thy Walls,* &c. plainly, respects the Return of the Jews from Captivity, and the Rebuilding of their City. But I answer, That the Building here spoken of does signify the Church or People of GOD, *They shall call thee, The City of the LORD, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel,* ver. 14. We have already observed a like Instance in this Prophecy (e); where *the Mountain of the LORD's House,* evidently signifies the Church or People of GOD. And according to the same Figure must those Words of the Prophet be interpreted, (f) *Behold, I will lay thy Stones with fair Colours, and lay thy Foundations with Sapphires, and I will make thy Windows of Agates, and thy Gates of Carbuncles, and all thy Borders of pleasant Stones.* For had the Prophet been speaking of a material Building, he would hardly have represented the most precious Stones as laid in the Foundation. And this Sense of the Passage in Dispute is yet farther confirmed by what immediately follows, *Therefore thy Gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut Day nor Night, that Men may bring unto thee the Forces of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought;* which has no manner of Resemblance to the State of the Jews upon the Rebuilding of their City (g): But is

K 3 exactly

(e) Isaiah ii. 2. (f) Ibid. liv. 11, 12.

(g) Nehem. vi. 16. vii. 3.

PART exactly true of the Church of GOD, when
 II. miraculously enlightened by the Revelation
 of the Gospel.

BUT the main Hinge, upon which the Interpretation of this Prophecy depends, is a right understanding of that extraordinary *Light* promised to GOD's People, which should influence the Nations of the Earth. For if it means enlightening of them by Revelation; then it will follow, that the Influence thereof upon the *Gentile* World must mean their Conversion thereby. And in Confirmation hereof I cannot but observe, that this Construction does but render the Prophecy agreeable to, and of the same Import with, several other Prophecies of the *Old Testament* already cited, and proved to have Respect to the same Event. I add further, that the self-same Event, which is here attributed to the Influence of some extraordinary *Light* to be communicated to the *Jews*, is by this very Prophet in another place spoken of and attributed (as I have already proved, (b) to the *Going forth of a Law out of Zion, and the Word of the LORD from Jerusalem*. Nothing therefore can be more reasonable, more agreeable to the common Method of interpreting Books, than to suppose the *Light* spoken of in the one place to signify the same with the *Word of the LORD* in the other; especially when we consider, that

Light

(b) Upon *Isai. ii. 3.*

Light is not only a common *Metaphor* signifying *Knowledge* or better Information, but also that the *Law* or *Word* of GOD is in the *Old Testament* (i) frequently called a *Light*, and said to *enlighten* Men. But as an irrefragable Argument confirming the Sense of the *Word* in this disputed Place, let it be observed, that wherever this Prophet speaks of a *Light*, which should influence the *Gentiles*, he means some Revelation by which they should be converted, as will appear from other Passages of this Prophecy yet to be considered.

FROM these Prophecies it does appear, That the *Means* of that great Conversion to be wrought among the *Gentiles*, so clearly foretold by most of the Prophets under the *Old Testament*, was to arise out of the *Jewish Nation*. I shall now proceed to other parts of this Prophecy, which still keep the same Event in View, which further discover GOD's Intention of sending a special Messenger for that Purpose; where we shall also find a Character and Description of the Person to be employed therein.

GOD having expressly foretold the Captivity of his People in the latter part of the xxxixth Chapter, proceeds in the following Chapters to comfort them with gracious

K 4


ous

(i) P^sal. xix. 8. cxix. 105, 130. Prov. vi. 23.

PART II. **P**ARTOUS Assurances of Restoration from that Captivity, and with a glorious Prospect of future great Mercies they should receive upon their Resettlement in their own Land. *Grotius* himself acknowledges, that those Prophecies relate to Events at so great a Distance, that the Generation to whom they were delivered could not be supposed to be personally concerned therein. It cannot therefore seem strange, in a prophetic Account of things at so great a Distance, to find some Notice taken of an Event the most remarkable in all the *Jewish* History, *viz.* the Coming of the MESSIAS and the Consequences of it. There are Passages in the latter part of this Prophecy which by the Confession of *Grotius* do more plainly and clearly agree thereto; than to any other Event; though he has endeavoured, (but I am persuaded without Reason) to explain them otherwise.

CHAP. xli. 27. GOD tells his People, *I will give to Jerusalem one that bringeth good Tidings,* and in the Beginning of the next Chapter adds this Character of him, *He shall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles, ---- and the Isles shall wait for his Law.* I need not say how easy and obvious the Application of this Character is to CHRIST: Yet we are told (*k*) “ That there is not
“ the least Colour to understand [it of him],
“ but quite another Person whom *Grotius*
“ under-

(*k*) Scheme, p. 137.

“ understands to be the *Jewish People*, and PART
 “ our judicious Commentator *White* to be II.
 “ *Cyrus.* ” A notable Confutation this! 
 We must not understand it of CHRIST,
 because there are two Commentators, who
 have endeavoured to explain it otherwise,
 but cannot agree on whom to fix it! My
 Reply therefore is, Just as *Grotius* and
White confute us, so *Grotius* confutes *White*
 and *White* *Grotius*: And what are we the
 wiser for this fine Chain of Reasoning!

BUT after all our Adversary grossly mis-
 takes one of his *Authorities*: For *Grotius*
 does not understand this Prophecy of the
Jewish People, but of *Isaiab* himself (1).
 So very willing is he to take any thing
 for Truth, upon any Authority, even with-
 out Examination; provided it gives no
 Countenance to the Christian Scheme. He
 is forward enough to tell us on other Oc-
 casions, that the Appeal does not lie to
this or *that*, or *any Commentator*; but to
 the Prophets themselves, and to that Mean-
 ing of their Words, which is to be found out
 by the *common Method of interpreting Books*,
viz. the Rules of Grammar and Criticism.

I APPEAL therefore to the Prophecy
 itself against both his *Commentators*. That
 it is not to be understood of *Cyrus* or of any
 other warlike Prince, appears plainly from
 this Character in it, *He shall not cry, nor*
lift

(1) *Grotius in locum.*

PART lift up, nor cause his Voice to be heard in
 II. the Street. A bruised Reed shall be not
 break, and the smoking Flax shall be not
 quench. Besides it is the Character of one
 inspired by GOD to teach his Ways unto
 the Gentiles; I have put my Spirit upon him,
 he shall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles:
 For the Word Judgment in this Prophecy
 usually signifies Knowledge, or true Discre-
 tion. By his Means this Judgment should
 be established in the Earth; even very
 distant Nations should embrace it, Coun-
 tries divided by Sea from that Continent to
 which Judea belonged should comply with
 it: For so we are to understand the Word
 Isle, according to the Language of the Old
 Testament, (m) when it is said, *The Isles
 shall wait for his Law.* This is the prin-
 cipal distinguishing Character of the whole
 Prophecy, and the Person signified thereby
 is therefore called, ver. 6. *A Light to the
 Gentiles.*

THIS Character will no more fit *Isaiab*
 than it does *Cyrus*. For *Isaiab's* Commis-
 sion extended to the *Jewish* People only:
 His Doctrine was delivered to them, with-
 out any Measures taken, or Instructions
 given to publish it among the *Gentiles*. It
 does not appear, neither is there the least
 Reason to suspect, that any *Heathen* Nation
 was enlightened or converted by Means
 thereof; but the same gross Ignorance and
 Super-

(m) See Gen. x. 5. Jer. ii. 10. 1 Mac. i. 1.

Superstition in religious Matters, which PART II. prevailed among the *Gentiles* in this Prophet's Time, continued to prevail among them for many Ages afterwards. It is certain, that the Event foretold in this, and several other parts of this Prophecy, did not take Effect till the Publication of the Christian Doctrine: Consequently the Person here represented, as principal Actor therein, must mean the Author of that Doctrine, to whom every Character of the Prophecy does exactly agree, which therefore renders the Application of it to him every way just and reasonable.

BUT it will appear to be yet more necessary, if you add to it another Prophecy (*Chap. xlix.*) which speaks to the same Effect, and gives you the Character of a Prophet, who should be remarkably instrumental in the Conversion of the *Gentiles*; but a Character which will in no wise fit *Isaiab*, or any other Prophet before CHRIST. The Person spoken of is introduced *ver. 1*, calling upon the *Isles* and the People at a great Distance to hearken to him, and urging the Unsuccessfulness of his Endeavours towards his own People, as the Reason for it, *ver. 4. I have laboured in vain, I have spent my Strength for nought and in vain, yet surely my Judgment is with the LORD, and my Work with my GOD.* But he is comforted with the Resolution GOD takes thereupon, which is recited, *ver. 5, 6. And now saith the LORD that formed*

PART formed me from the Womb to be his Servant,
 II. to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel
 be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the
 Eyes of the LORD, and my GOD shall be
 my Strength. And he said, It is a light thing
 that thou shouldst be my Servant to raise up
 the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the Pre-
 served of Israel: I will also give thee for a
 Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my
 Salvation unto the End of the Earth.

How can these Words with any Colour or Shadow of Reason be understood as spoken of *Isaiab*? who, neither by himself, nor by any subordinate Minister appointed by him, ever attempted the Conversion of the *Gentile* World? It is true (as *Grotius* observes (n), that *Isaiab* had many Revelations communicated to him concerning the *Gentiles*, and what should be wrought among them in future Times: But he had no Revelation directed to them, neither can it be supposed that his Doctrine had any Influence upon them, like that which is here spoken of. For admit that a considerable Number of Profelytes were made to the *Jewish* Religion from among the *Gentiles*, and many of them by Means of *Isaiab*'s Prophecies; yet it must be supposed, when this happened, that the State of Religion among the *Jews* was in a flourishing Condition, and the People generally very careful and zealous in observing it: So that
 the

(n) *Grotius* in locum.

the Influence thereof upon the *Gentiles*, must have been at best, but inconsiderable, in Comparison with the Influence it had upon the *Jews*. But in this Prophecy the Supposition is quite reversed; the Prophet signified thereby is represented as complaining of a great Failure and Ill-success among his own People, and makes the extensive Influence of his Doctrine among the *Gentiles* his greatest Glory. This was in Fact the Case, when CHRIST appeared. Though his Doctrine met with great Opposition from the *Jews*, and was embraced but by Few among them; yet among the *Gentiles* it prevailed and spread itself in a most surprizing Manner, and not till then was there any Prophet, who might with any Propriety of Speech be said, to be a *Light to the Gentiles, and for Salvation to the End of the Earth.*

THE Sequel of the Prophecy is a noble Description of that great Conversion to be wrought among the *Gentiles*. All Obstacles to their Conversion are said to be removed, *ver. 11. I will make all my Mountains a Way, and my high Ways shall be exalted.* In Consequence whereof, it is added, *ver. 12. Behold, these shall come from far, and lo these from the North and the West, and these from the Land of Sinim.* Grotius would understand these and the like Passages of the *Jews* returning from their Captivity. But how inconsistently with the former Part of the Prophecy, which speaks of the *Jews* as restored,

PART restored, *ver.* 6. and speaks of them as an
 II. inconsiderable Part of GOD'S People compared with those who should be converted to him from among the *Gentiles*? The Supposition of *Grotius*, is no less inconsistent with what follows, *ver.* 19, 20. *Thy waste and thy desolate Places, and the Land of thy Destruction, shall even now be too narrow by Reason of the Inhabitants.---- The Children which thou shalt have after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine Ears, The Place is too strait for me, give Place to me that I may dwell.* How can this be applied to the Circumstances of the *Jews* upon their Restoration? Was the Land of *Canaan* then, or at any Time afterwards, till the Times of the *MESSIAS*, too strait and narrow for GOD'S People? Does not the Question, *ver.* 21. *Who hath begotten me these?* plainly suggest a great Addition of Strangers, not of the natural Seed of *Abraham*? And does not the Answer given, *ver.* 22. *Thus saith the LORD GOD, Behold, I will lift up mine Hand to the Gentiles, and set up my Standard to the People: and they shall bring thy Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters shall be carried upon their Shoulders,* as plainly declare, that this great Increase of GOD'S People should be owing to the Conversion of the *Gentiles*, who upon that Account, should be reckoned as *Sons and Daughters*, i. e. the true Seed of *Abraham*?

THIS Prediction of the wonderful Increase of GOD's Church by the Conversion of the *Gentiles*, immediately following, and indeed depending upon the Promise of a Person to be a Light to the *Gentiles*, plainly proves that *Isaiab*, who had no Concern in the Event, could not be the Person intended, and that we ought first to find out the Event, before we can fix upon the Person by whose Influence, it should be accomplished.

BUT there is another Character in this Prophecy, which will in no wise fit *Isaiab*, ver. 7. *Thus saith the LORD, To him whom Man despiseth, to him whom the Nation abhorreth, to a Servant of Rulers, Kings shall see and arise, Princes also shall worship.* How far the abject part of the Character may suit *Isaiab*, I will not dispute: But I am sure there is no Foundation for applying the latter part to him, nor can any thing be more unreasonable than to suppose, as *Grotius* does, that nothing was intended thereby, but the Respect shewed to *Isaiab* by King *Hezekiab*, and *Eliakim* who was over his Household. That a *Jewish* Prophet should be well treated by a *Jewish* King and his first Minister was nothing strange, though it had sometimes happened otherwise. Besides it is to be supposed, that *Isaiab* had experienced, and been well assured of, the Favour of *Hezekiab* and *Eliakim*, at the Time when this Prophecy was

PART was delivered. How ridiculous therefore it is to suppose, that a Thing so well known should be made the Subject of divine Revelation, and be introduced in that pompous Manner, *Thus saith the LORD, the Redeemer of Israel?* But if we consider the Words as a Continuation of that Person's Character promised in the *preceding Verse* to be *a Light to the Gentiles and for Salvation to the End of the Earth*, we shall naturally be lead to understand the *Kings and Princes* here spoken of, as signifying *Gentile Kings and Rulers*, who by the Influence of that Light and Knowledge communicated to them by this extraordinary Messenger of GOD, should be engaged to reverence him, and submit themselves to the Doctrine revealed by him.

THIS seemingly inconsistent Character of one greatly despised and humbled, and yet held in great Esteem and Reverence by Kings and Potentates of the Earth, as it cannot but be applied (considered with the rest of the Prophecy) to CHRIST the Author of our Religion; so it will serve as a Key to explain another Prophecy at no great Distance from it, where we have exactly the same Character enlarged upon and more fully expressed. Chap. lii. 13, 14, 15. *Behold my Servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled and be very high. As many were astonished at thee (his Visage was so marred more than any Man, and his Form more than the Sons of Men)*

Men) so shall he sprinkle many Nations, the Kings shall shut their Mouths at him: For that which had not been told them shall they see, and that which they had not heard shall they consider. Here you have plainly (as in the former Prophecy) a Servant of the LORD, represented in a very low and abject State, and yet by his Ministration influencing the Nations of the Earth, and commanding the Attention and Regard of the Rulers thereof. If therefore Unity of Character and Circumstances be a rational Ground for applying divers Prophecies to the same Person or Event, there is the greatest Reason for doing it in this Case; because the Prophecies in Comparison, convey the very *same Ideas*, with only *different Words*: And this admitted, I am sure they cannot be so properly applied to any one as to CHRIST. our LORD.


NEVERTHELESS, *Grotius* has thought fit to divide these two Prophecies, wherein there is such an exact Uniformity of Character, between two different Persons, applying the *former* to *Isaiab*, *this* to *Jeremiab*. But the *former* Application, I have already proved to be unreasonable and groundless, and *this* will appear to be more so.

FOR *Grotius* is inconsistent with himself in supposing any thing to be said of *Jeremiab* in this Place; having told us in his *Prefatory Note* to the xl and following *Chapters* of this Prophecy, That the “ Predictions
L “ con-

PART II. “ contained therein, look forward to a
 “ great Distance of Time, speaking of
 “ Events which should happen from the
 “ Time of the Captivity, for a long Time
 “ afterwards.” And accordingly he him-
 self interprets what goes before, and what
 immediately follows, this supposed Prophecy
 concerning *Jeremiah*, of Events subsequent
 to the Restoration of the *Jews* from their
 Captivity. Nay, he allows (o), the Begin-
 ning of *Chap.* liv. to be a Continuation of
 the same Subject the Prophet had been
 speaking to in the Beginning of *Chap.* lii,
 the Connection whereof he would suppose
 to be broken by the Interposition of a Pro-
 phesy concerning *Jeremiah*, whose Charac-
 ter had no manner of Relation to the Pro-
 phet’s Subject, even according to his own
 Interpretation thereof. Can any thing be
 more unreasonable than such a Supposition !

BUT farther, as the *Context* has confessed-
 ly nothing in it to countenance the Applica-
 tion of this Prophecy to *Jeremiah* ; so the
 Prophecy itself totally discountenances it, as
 will appear by that violent Abuse of Words
 and Language committed by *Grotius* to
 make it fit him. Some Parts of the Pro-
 phesy we allow will fit *Jeremiah*, or any
 other suffering Prophet : But the principal
 Characters will in no wise fit him ; and
 therefore *Grotius* himself acknowledges,
 “ That in many Instances they are ac-
 “ cording

(o). *Grotius* in *Locum*.

“ according to the Letter more applicable P A R T
 “ to CHRIST. and rather belong to him II.
 “ than *Jeremiah* ” (p). 

How can it be imagined, that a Prophecy concerning *Jeremiah* should be introduced in this pompous Manner, *Chap. lii. 7. How beautiful upon the Mountains are the Feet of him that bringeth good Tidings, that publisheth Peace, that bringeth good Tidings of Good, that publisheth Salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy GOD reigneth!* If there was ever a Prophet among the *Jews*, who might more properly than another be called a Messenger of *bad Tidings*, it was *Jeremiah*. The whole Course of his Ministry, was almost one continued Denunciation of Vengeance, and a Threatning of the greatest Evils that ever had befallen them. It is true, as *Grotius* observes, he did foretell that after Seventy Years those Evils should have an End. What then? Did this intitle him to be called in such a peculiar Manner the Publisher of *Peace* and of *good Tidings*? To tell a Man he must undergo a long and grievous Fit of Sickness, of which at length he should recover, would hardly be thought an agreeable Message, or serve to make the Messenger welcome.

BUT to leave the Introduction and proceed to the Character and Circumstances

L 2

of

(p) *Grotius* in locum.

PART of the Messenger, *ver. 13.* *Behold my Servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled and be very high.* This was never true of *Jeremiah*, nor any thing like it. For till the Captivity, he was continually opposed and oppressed, and a great part of that Time he spent in a Prison and a Dungeon. When the City was taken, the Captain of the *Chaldean* Guards set him at Liberty, and gave him his Choice, whether he would go to *Babylon*, or remain in *Judea*. He chose the latter, where he lived some Time privately, without having any Power over the poor Remains of the People that were left there, till he was carried by Force into *Egypt*: Where, as Historians conjecture, he was ill-used till the Day of his Death. And is this the Man, that was to be *exalted and extolled and made very high*? Is it thus, that *Grotius* makes *Isaiab* speak of Persons about his own Time, *with a perfect historical Conformity*? (q) Take this Liberty, and you may make any Prophecy serve any Purpose.

AFTER the same Manner, *ver. 15.* is explained away upon the same Person. *He shall sprinkle (or purify) many Nations, Kings shall shut their Mouths at him; i. e. attend and pay Regard to the Doctrine delivered by him.* The Conversion of the Nations is a Subject frequently insisted upon by *Isaiab*; and no doubt the several parts

(q) Scheme, &c. p. 389.

parts of this Prophecy, which speak there- P A R T
of, have Respect to the same Event: But II.
we must not look for an Accomplishment
of it in, or about, the Time of *Jeremiah*;
for never was there less Appearance of Re-
formation, either in *Judea*, or in other
Countries. Nor is there any Room to ima-
gine, (as *Grotius* pretends) that *Nebucha-*
donosor or *Necho* paid any Regard to the
Words of *Jeremiah*. *Nebuchadonosor* had
not the Curiosity to see him when he was
at *Jerusalem*. He ordered him indeed to
be treated civilly, because he had not been
in the rebellious Scheme of his Brethren:
But that he paid any Regard to him, as
a Prophet of GOD, can hardly be suspect-
ed. As for *Necho*, it is more than proba-
ble, if ever he heard his Prophecies, that
he despised them; and Historians are in-
clined to think, that he used him ill upon
that Account, because he foretold the De-
struction of *Egypt*. So far was it from be-
ing true, that Kings and Nations were
particularly attentive to what was spoken
by *Jeremiah*, that it seems to have been
in a peculiar manner his Fate, to be ne-
glected by all to whom he prophesied.

BUT *Grotius* has taken the most intole-
rable Liberty with one of the plainest Pas-
sages in all the Prophecy, Chap. liii. 5.
He was wounded for our Transgressions, he
was bruised for our Iniquities, the Chastise-
ment of our Peace was upon him, and with
his Stripes we are healed. It is certain, that

PART II. the Jews in *Jeremiab's* Time suffered all the Evil GOD had threatned them with in the greatest Extremity. Neither his Admonitions, nor his Sufferings, nor Perseverance in admonishing them notwithstanding his Sufferings, could engage them to flee from the Wrath that was coming, but it came upon them to the uttermost. How then could his Sufferings be called *the Chastisement of their Peace*; when their Peace depended upon their hearkening to, and treating him respectfully as a Prophet; when by his Chastisement their Crimes were aggravated, and the Punishment thereof became greater and more inevitable? Could they be said to be *healed by his Stripes*, whose Wounds by that very Means became more incurable? They *might* have been healed thereby, says *Grotius*! But I say they might rather have been healed without them: Forasmuch as he who embraces the Means of his Recovery, is more likely to do well, than he who spurns at and abuses them. In short, if to *make his Soul an Offering for Sin*, ver. 10. to be *stricken for the Transgression* of others, ver. 8. if to *bear the Sin of many*, ver. 12. *the Chastisement of their Peace*, the LORD *having laid on him the Iniquity of us all*, ver. 6; all which Expressions have a plain Allusion to the Manner of making Atonement for Sins by Sacrifice; if these must be explained away upon a Person suffering by the ill Usage of others, without any good Effect in reconciling Men to GOD; which was the
 very

very Case of *Jeremiab*; then *the Rules of* P A R T
Grammar and Criticism have nothing to do II.
 in determining the Sense of Scripture; but
 we are to prefer the most arbitrary Mean-
 ing, that any Commentator can put upon
 it.

ANOTHER Circumstance in this Prophecy grossly abused by *Grotius*, is *ver. 8.* *He was cut off out of the Land of the Living.* The obvious Sence of these Words, which are commonly understood to signify a *violent Death*, did not please *Grotius* upon a double Account; because it does not appear that *Jeremiab* met with a violent Death; and because the Sufferings of the Person spoken of, and even his Death, (if that be foretold) must be supposed according to the Scope of the Prophecy to precede his Exaltation and the Success of his Ministry. How therefore to dispose of these Words, which in all Languages signify *Death*, is the Difficulty. To remove it he observes, that *Jeremiab* was cast into Prison, and afterwards into the Dungeon, where perhaps there was no *living Soul* besides himself. And thus *he was cut off out of the Land of the Living!* But to be *in the Land of the Living* is a Phrase which frequently occurs in Scripture, and always signifies the State of the *Living* in Opposition to that of the *Dead.* *Hezekiab*, speaking his Sentiments upon that Sentence of Death sent to him by the Prophet *Isaiab*,
 L 4 expresses

PART expresses himself thus (r), *I shall not see the*
 II. LORD, *in the Land of the Living, I shall*
 see Man no more with the Inhabitants thereof.
 The Conspiracy of the Men of *Anathoth* against *Jeremiah*, to take away his Life by Violence, is expressed in these Words (s), *Let us destroy the Tree with the Fruit thereof, and let us cut him off from the Land of the Living.* Where the very self-same Words with those we have now under Examination, are used to express the *Murder* of a Person by Violence.

HITHERTO therefore you have the Sufferings and Death of the Person, who is the Subject of the Prophecy, and the End of both plainly revealed in Terms by no Means applicable to *Jeremiah*. And in Consequence thereof, even of his Death, you have an Account of his Exaltation, and the Success of his Ministry, which cannot therefore belong to *Jeremiah*. Ver. 10, 11, 12. *When thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, he shall prolong his Days, and the Pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his Hands. He shall see of the Travail of his Soul, and shall be satisfied. Therefore will I divide him a Portion with the great, and he shall divide the Spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his Soul unto Death.* If this Success and Satisfaction in his Ministry had not been so often

(r) *Isaiah xxxviii. 11.*(s) *Jer. xi. 19, 21.*

often and plainly mentioned as the Consequence of his Death: Yet *Jeremiah* must have been out of the Question. For he never lived to see the least Success of his Labours; the People in the very Teeth of Ruin were always averse to his salutary Counsels; even when the City was taken, and all the Evils he had been for a long Time pronouncing against it had taken Effect, still they would not hearken to him, but rushed violently into Measures, which he told them would be attended with the worst Consequences. And then, where was his *Portion with the great*, and how did he *divide the Spoil with the strong*? *Grotius* most ridiculously supposes this was fulfilled, when the Captain of the Guard gave him *Victuals and a Reward, and let him go* (t). Thus every *Beggar* may be said to have his *Portion with the great*; and the *Captive*, that is *spoiled*, may be said to *divide the Spoil with the strong*, when relieved by the Bounty of his Conqueror. But sure this is not interpreting Scripture according to the *Rules of common Sense*, nor the *obvious Meaning of Words*, nor the *Connection of the Discourse*, nor yet according to Scripture itself; where the obvious Meaning of the Phrase is (u) to be great, to be successful, to prevail over Enemies.

Do

(t) Jer. xl. 5.
Isaiah ix. 3.

(u) Exod. xv. 9. Prov. xvi. 19.

PART
II.

Do I need to say more to prove the Impropriety, the Unreasonableness, and the utter Absurdity of applying this Prophecy to *Jeremiah*? Having been so long in confuting this groundless Application of the Prophecy, and having upon another Occasion (x) urged the *Necessity*, as well as the *Propriety*, of applying it to CHRIST our LORD; I shall not detain my Reader any longer, but while I take Notice of a few peculiar Exceptions made by the Author of *Scheme*, &c. which have not been already considered.

UPON Chap. lii. 13, he says (y) “The Words, *exalted and extolled very high*, speak only of an earthly Exaltation, which does not agree to JESUS”. But it will easily be observed, that no Reason can be given from the *Text* to confine the Words to an *earthly Exaltation*. A *real Exaltation* certainly was intended; and if he can prove, as he formerly hinted (z), that none can be *real*, but an *earthly* or *temporal* one, we are answered. I think it a *real Exaltation* that the Nations of the Earth submitted to him, acknowledged him for their LORD, professing the highest Reverence and Obedience to be due to him.

UPON

(x) Serm. VI. (y) *Scheme*, &c. p. 209.
(z) *Grounds*, &c. p. 33.

UPON these Words, *He made his Grave with the Wicked and with the Rich in his Death*, he observes, that *White* has discovered some Difficulty in the Construction thereof. From whence he concludes, (a) That it is “an obscure Place, on which nothing ought to be built, while it is so obscure.” Let this be granted, I desire to build nothing upon it, the rest of the Prophecy is sufficient for our Purpose without it. But I can see no Difficulty in it, nor any Occasion for such a *Transposition of Words*, as *White* speaks of. For it is true of JESUS, *that he made his Grave with the Wicked* (respecting the Circumstance which brought him to his Grave) *and with the Rich* (respecting the Place of his Burial).

THERE are several other Exceptions made by our Adversary, taken from the Notes of *Grotius* upon this Prophecy, whose Interpretation thereof I have already confuted, and thereby obviated the Objections borrowed from thence. I shall therefore leave the Reader to reflect upon the different Interpretations of the Prophecy in Dispute, and to judge, which seems most “calculated to subvert the clear and undoubted Meaning of the Prophecy flowing from the Terms and Connexion, and to introduce the most chimerical Meaning,

(a) Scheme, p. 218.

P - A R T II. “ ing, contrary to the common Sense of
 II. “ the Words and the Connexion of the
 Discourse (b).

THE Prophecies cited hitherto, speak of a general Conversion of the *Gentiles*, of an extraordinary Messenger to be employed by GOD for that Purpose, in which we have several Accounts of his Character and Circumstances. To which therefore I shall add others, which speak of his *Family*, Thus *Chap. xi. 10. In that Day there shall be a Root of Jesse; which shall stand for an Ensign of the People; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his Rest shall be glorious.* As in the *second Chapter* it was *figuratively* said, that *the Mountain of the LORD's House* should be *so exalted*, as to draw all Nations to it: so here it is said, that a Person of *David's Line* should become so conspicuous in the Earth, that as an *Ensign* set up to gather Men together, so should he be to the Nations of the Earth. To him they should seek and have Recourse, acknowledge him for their Ruler and Governor, and submit themselves to be guided by his Directions. This Prophecy therefore does not so *plainly mean*, as our Adversary would suggest (c) upon the Authority of *Grotius*, “ That
 “ many of the *Gentiles* being converted to
 “ the true GOD shall seek and have Re-
 “ course to *Hezekiab*”. For there is nothing in the Prophecy, or the Context, to
 limit

(b) Scheme, p. 119.


(c) Ib. p. 137.

limit the Event to *Hezekiah's* Days; nor is there any thing in the History of his Reign, that can tempt one to suspect an Accomplishment thereof in him. PART II.

IN this Prophecy there is an evident Agreement in Character, with several others cited from this Prophet: Where there is a Person spoken of, whose Mission should have a very remarkable Influence upon the *Gentile* World, to whom Kings and Nations should attend and pay Homage, and *whose Law the Isles* (very distant Parts of the World) *should wait for.* Such agreeing Characters to be met with in the same Author, ought in Equity to be brought together, and diligently compared; and if no Inconsistency can be found between the one and the other, it is but reasonable to suppose they were delivered upon the same View; especially when the Truth of them cannot be so well accounted for upon any other Scheme, which is the very Case in the Instance now before us.

AND in Confirmation hereof, I shall add another Prophecy, containing the same Character, which must also be applied, as the former was, to one of *David's* Line, *Chap. iv. 3, 4, 5.* *I will make an everlasting Covenant with you, even the sure Mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a Witness to the People, a Leader and Commander to the People. Behold, thou shalt call a Nation that thou knowest not, and Nations that know*


PART II. *know not thee, shall run unto thee, because of the LORD thy GOD, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee.* How it could ever enter into the Head of Grotius to interpret this Place of *Jeremiah*, is to me inconceivable. There is not in the *Context* a Syllable relating to the Times of *Jeremiah*, nor in the *Text* any the least Resemblance of his Character. For how was he a Witness to, a Leader and Commander of the Nations? The Influence he had over his own People was inconsiderable, no Prophet ever had less, his Instructions were as constantly disobeyed, as they were given. But the Prophecy speaks of One who should be acknowledged by other Nations for their Ruler and Commander, which no body can suspect to have been the Case of *Jeremiah*. Admit the Character would fit him: Yet it should seem to me, that the *Text* very plainly fixes it upon a Person of a quite different Family. *Behold, I have given him for a Witness, &c.* Here is a plain Reference to some *Antecedent*; and upon examining the *Context*, that *Antecedent* must be allowed to be contained in these Words, *The sure Mercies of David*. Whether therefore the Reference be to a Person called by the Name of *David*, or to one signified by that Character; *The sure Mercies of David*; either Way, according to rational Construction, we must suppose one of *David's* Line was intended, and consequently *Jeremiah* must be excluded. And I hope to make it appear in the Sequel of this Discourse, that the
sure

sure Mercies of David, spoken of in this **PART II.**
Place, have Respect to some Covenant made with *David* concerning his Seed (d). 

From whence it will be rational to conclude, That the *Root of Jesse*, promised *Chap. xi. 10.* which should stand for an *Ensign of the People*, to whom the *Gentiles* should seek, and the Person here promised to be a *Witness to, a Leader and Commander of the Gentiles*, must mean the same Person: Because the Characters of both Prophecies exactly agree in Substance and Circumstances with one another.

THESE Characters are applicable to none of the Seed of *David* but **JESUS CHRIST**; for the *Gentiles* had Recourse to none but Him, Him only did they acknowledge for their *Leader and Commander*. And this will yet more certainly appear, if we consider the Consequence of his being appointed their *Leader*, mentioned, *ver. 5.* of this Prophecy: *Behold, thou shalt call a Nation that thou knowest not, and Nations that knew not thee, shall run unto thee, because of the LORD thy GOD, and for the Holy One of Israel? for he hath glorified thee.* This must be understood of very distant Nations, People that were not known to, that knew nothing of, the People of God in the Prophet's Time; that they should joyn themselves to the Worshipers of the True God, and worship the same GOD with them. Now it is utterly groundless

(d) Psalm lxxxix

PART groundless to suppose, that this Event had
 II. any Accomplishment, till the *Christian-*
 *Scheme* took Effect; and therefore it is
 equally groundless to suppose, that this *Lea-*
der and *Commander* of the *Gentiles* could be
 any other Person, than JESUS the Author
 of that *Scheme*.

I HAVE now done with the Prophecies
 cited from *Isaiab*, and my Vindication of
 them. Wherein I have been careful to ob-
 serve, that the Passages referred to are not
 only properly applicable to CHRIST, and
 the Events of his Doctrine; but also that
 they cannot properly be applied to any
 other Person or Event whatsoever. And I
 hope I have also given a rational Account,
 How it came to pass that Events at so great
 a Distance should be foretold by *Isaiab*:
 Observing, that the distant Prospect of
 those Events, was just Matter of Encou-
 ragement to the true *Israelites*, to persevere
 in their Religion, notwithstanding the un-
 happy Circumstances they were then fallen
 into, and the much greater Evils which were
 like to befall them upon that account.

S E C T. III.

FROM *Isaiab*, I shall proceed to the
Psalms, and the Prophecies cited from
 thence: There being, as I think, not on-
 ly express mention made of the same Cha-
 racters and Events, but also an evident
 Con-

Connexion between the Prophecies of the P A R T
one and the other.

II.

WHEN *Isaiab* spake of *the sure Mercies of David*, without mentioning the particular Mercies referred to, it is natural to suppose, that he had Respect to some known Promise, or Assurance made to *David* of future Mercies still to be looked for, even in *Isaiab's* Time. It is therefore reasonable to have Recourse to the Book of *Psalms* for a more full and determinate Description of those *sure Mercies*. Accordingly we find in *Psalms* lxxxix, a particular Account of Mercies engaged for to *David* in the strongest and most solemn manner. Where the Faithfulness of GOD in the Performance is so frequently repeated, that the *Psalms* is made remarkable by that very Circumstance. It is called, *ver. 2. Mercy to be built up for ever, Faithfulness established in the very Heavens*: A Covenant, upon which GOD says, *I have sworn unto David my Servant, ver. 3; My Faithfulness and Mercy shall be with him, ver. 24. My Mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my Covenant shall stand fast with him, ver. 28. My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips. Once have I sworn by my Holiness, that I will not fail David, ver. 34, 35.* And what is the Subject, upon which all these repeated, strong Assurances were given to *David*? *To establish his Seed for ever, and to build up his Throne to all Generations, v. 4.*

M

To

PART II. *To make his Seed to endure for ever, and his Throne as the Days of Heaven, ver. 29. And again, ver. 36, 37. His Seed shall endure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the Moon, and as the faithful Witness in Heaven.*

MAY not this then very properly be called, *the sure Mercies of David*; where the Oath and Faithfulness of GOD are so frequently repeated to confirm the Mercy promised? Can there be a plainer Reference in the Words of one Prophet, to a Promise made to another than this is? Can there be a surer Comment therefore upon *Isaiab's* Words, than that which this *Psalms* affords us?---- But what do we infer from this? The Inference is plain; since it appears from this *Psalms*, that *David's* Seed is the Subject of *the sure Mercies* engaged for to David; therefore when GOD, speaking afterwards by his Prophet of *the sure Mercies of David*, adds, *I have given him for a Witness to, a Leader and Commander of the Gentiles*, He must be understood to speak of a Seed of *David*, that he should be *a Witness to, a Leader and Commander of the Gentiles*. Which not only confirms the Interpretation I had given of that Place in *Isaiab*; but also discovers an indisputable Relation between these two Prophecies, and proves them to have Respect to the same Person.

AND this will be the more readily granted, when it is observed, That the principal
Facts

Facts insisted on in both these Prophecies PART
 had, and still appear to have, their Ac- II.
 complishment in CHRIST; that these *sure*
Mercies of David, were fulfilled in him on-
 ly. For according to *Isaiab*, the *Gentiles*
 have acknowledged Him for their *Leader*,
 even distant Nations, formerly unknown to
 GOD's peculiar People; and they still con-
 tinue to profess Obedience and Subjection
 to him as their Lord and Governor. Ac-
 cording to the *Psalmist*, the Throne of *Da-*
vid, the Government of GOD's People, is
 devolved upon this Seed of *David*: In Him
 it has remained for many Ages, and is con-
 tinued *as the Days of Heaven*; and we have
 no Reason to doubt, but it *shall endure for*
ever as the Sun, be established for ever as
the Moon, and as the faithful Witnesses in
Heaven.

THERE is, I remember, a smart Remark
 upon this Way of explaining one Prophet
 by another, upon which it has been asked
 (e); “How comes *Isaiab*'s supposed Expli-
 “cation of *David*, to be an Argument
 “against our Adversaries? They very
 “probably think *David*'s Sense ought to
 “be determined by *David*'s own Words,
 “and not by the Interpretation of an Au-
 “thor, to whom they pay no Regard,
 “and who, if he intends to interpret *Da-*
 “*vid*, they think, mistakes him.” To
 which I answer, That I am not arguing

(e) Scheme, &c. p. 137.

PART *ad hominem*, but *ad rem*. There may be a
 II. Sett of Men, who think differently from
 ~~~~~ the rest of Mankind, and may value them-  
 selves for so doing: But I am not obliged  
 to admit all their Notions as true, nor to  
 argue always from their Principles. I think  
 I may reasonably suppose two Authors of the  
 same Nation, Language and Religion, to have  
 in many Respects the same Views and Senti-  
 ments of Things; and when they treat of  
 the same Subject, I may expect some Light  
 from the one, for the better understanding  
 of the other: And if the *sacred Writers* may  
 be allowed the same Quarter, that *profane*  
*Authors* meet with, I would suppose *Isaiab*  
 to understand *David* better, than any of our  
*Modern Wits*, as I would suppose *Quintilian*  
 to understand the Language and Sentiments  
 of *Cicero* better than *Toland*. But if I should  
 consider the two Prophets I have appealed  
 to, as *inspired Writers*, and upon that Ac-  
 count capable of understanding, the one the  
 other, more certainly than other Authors,  
 I should think myself excusable; because  
 the different Facts foretold by them, speak-  
 ing of the same Subject, were exactly ac-  
 complished in the same Person.

TURN to another *Psalms* (lxxii.) and we  
 shall find both these Circumstances of the  
*Extensiveness* and *Perpetuity* of his Dominion,  
 which I have collected from two different  
 Prophets, united, and foretold by *David*  
 of the same Person, even one of his own  
 Seed. The Perpetuity of his Dominion is  
 expressed,



expressed, *ver. 5. They shall fear thee as PART*  
*long as the Sun and Moon endure, throughout II.*  
*all Generations. The Extent of it, ver. 8. W*  
*He shall have Dominion also from Sea to*  
*Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of*  
*the Earth, i. e. His Dominion should be*  
*not only over that Continent where Judea*  
*stood, but also from the Waters bound-*  
*ing that Continent to the Ends of the Earth.*  
*It is added therefore, ver. 9. They that dwell*  
*in the Wilderness shall bow before him, and*  
*his Enemies shall lick the Dust, ver. 10. The*  
*Kings of Tarshish and of the Isles (Places di-*  
*vided from that Continent by Sea) shall*  
*bring Presents, the Kings of Sheba and Seba*  
*shall offer Gifts, ver. 11. Yea, all Kings shall*  
*fall down before him, all Nations shall serve*  
*him. And it is not said, that his Dominion*  
*should be thus extended by Conquest, but*  
*by reason of the good Influences of his*  
*Government, as appears from the follow-*  
*ing Verses. Upon which it is said, ver. 17.*  
*All Nations shall be blessed in him, and shall*  
*call him blessed. Is it not therefore most*  
*ridiculous to suppose, “ that the Words*  
*“ signify manifestly, what Grotius says, that*  
*“ it shall be a Saying among all Nations;*  
*“ Let your Reign be like his (f);” when the*  
*whole Context plainly fixes and confirms the*  
*obvious Meaning, to be the true Meaning of*  
*the Place, by representing the Nations of*  
*the Earth, not only as submitting to, but*  
*also partaking of the good Influences of his*  

M 3
Govern-

(f) Scheme, p. 136, 137.

PART Government, and upon that Account shewing  
II. forth his Praises, *ver.* 15.



HERE then let me re-assume the Consideration of the Promise made to *Abraham* (g), *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed*, which was renewed to *Isaac* (b), and repeated again to *Jacob* (i), and is in this *Psalms* limited to one of *David's* Seed. Is there any one parallel Place of Scripture, which countenances the Interpretation of our Adversaries, That it should be made a proverbial Form of Blessing among the *Gentiles*, “God bless you, as he did the Seed of *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or David?*” Do the Prophets any where suggest, that the *Jews*, as a *peculiar People*, should ever be so remarkably happy and successful, that the Nations of the Earth should make *their* Happiness the Object of their Wishes, and the Measure of that Happiness which they wished might be bestowed on those they loved? Why then must Words so plain, be wrested to a Sense, which has no other Place of Scripture to confirm it, and in which Sense they never were accomplished?

TAKE them in their obvious Meaning, and you may find frequent Instances of Scripture speaking to the same Purpose. All the Prophecies hitherto produced, signify

(g) Gen. xxii. 18.  
(i) Ibid. xxviii. 14.

(b) Ibid. xxvi. 4.


nify GOD's gracious Intentions towards the PART  
*Gentile* World, of revealing himself to them, H.  
of recovering them out of a State of Ig-  
norance and Superstition, and taking them  
into Covenant with him. This was the  
*Blessing* intended them, and I am not a-  
shamed to call it a *real Blessing*. Then  
most of those Prophecies prove, that this  
*Blessing* was to be conveyed to them by  
Means of the Seed of *Abraham*; that out  
of the People descended from him should  
arise a Prophet to be a Light to the *Gen-  
tiles*, and for Salvation to the Ends of the  
Earth; and that this Person to whom *the  
Gentiles should seek*, for whose *Law the Isles  
should wait*, should be of the House and  
Lineage of *David*. What need I say more  
to justify the obvious Meaning of a Pas-  
sage, which is confirmed by so many pa-  
rallel Places of Scripture, that bespeak the  
same Thing, which we suppose intended  
by that plain Promise made to *Abra-  
ham*.

BUT to proceed. The *second Psalm*  
must be understood of the same Seed of  
*David* with the *Psalm* last-cited. Where  
GOD promises to the Person who is the  
Subject of it, *Ask of me and I shall give  
thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and  
the uttermost Parts of the Earth for thy Pos-  
session*. It has been thought, but very ab-  
surdly; that *the uttermost Parts of the Earth*  
may mean the utmost Bounds of the pro-  
mised Land; and so the *Psalm* may be

PART applied to *David*. But it ought to be observed, that when the uttermost Parts of the Earth are spoken of, in Consequence of something said concerning the Heathen, the Words will not (according to rational or scriptural Construction) bear that Limitation. The same Words have occurred in some of the Places already cited, and they are likewise to be met with in several Places in the Book of *Psalms*, but in none of those Places will they admit of that limited Construction. All Attempts therefore to apply them to *David*, or *Solomon*, or any one of the Seed of *David*, but CHRIST our LORD, must be fruitless.

I would observe farther, That the Character of the Person spoken of in this Psalm, taken all together, entirely agrees with the Character of the Servant of the LORD given by *Isaiab*, chap. lii, liii. It is the Character of a Person greatly despised and oppressed, yet rising out of that abject State into a State of Glory and Greatness, Kings and Nations being made subject to, and obeying him.

AND as *Isaiab* in that Prophecy foretells the End of his Sufferings, that he should make *his Soul an Offering for Sin*, and *justify many by bearing their Iniquities*, and *make Intercession for Transgressors*, which are Characters belonging to the Priestly Office: So *David*, Psalm cx, speaks of a Person highly favoured of GOD, appointed by him

him to be a *Priest for ever after the Order* P A R T  
*of Melchizedeck.* And there is good Rea- II.  
 son for applying both these Prophecies to   
 the same Person and Event; because they  
 both speak of an extraordinary Priest, pe-  
 culiar in his Character, and different from  
 those of *Aaron's* Order. *Isaiab's* Priest is  
 not supposed to offer Gifts and Sacrifices  
 according to the Law, but to offer him-  
 self to GOD for us: *David's* Priest could  
 not be supposed to offer those Sacrifices,  
 because he was of a different Order from  
 that of *Aaron*, to whom the Offering of  
 those Sacrifices was expressly limited by  
 the Law. And since the Priesthood was to  
 be changed, according to *David*, it was rea-  
 sonable to think that the Method of Atone-  
 ment should be changed likewise; and the  
 rather, because it seemed improbable that  
*the Blood of Bulls and of Goats should take*  
*away Sins.* The Prophecy of *Isaiab* there-  
 fore might be looked upon, as an addi-  
 tional Discovery made to what had been  
 foretold before by *David*; as it relates the  
 Manner in which that extraordinary Priest  
 should make Atonement for Sins. I shall  
 only add, that this Prophecy has escaped  
 the Attacks of our Adversary, and is, I  
 think allowed by all Commentators to re-  
 late only to JESUS the Author of our  
 Religion.

I HAVE now finished my Vindication of  
 the Prophecies cited from the *Psalms*;  
 which I shall conclude with observing,  
 That



PART II. That there appears to be a great Harmony between the Prophecies of *David*, and *Isaiab* relating to the MESSIAS. And there are very plain Indications, that *Isaiab* was sensible his Prophecies related to the same Person, who had been prophesied of before by *David*. The only Difference in their Characters, seems to me to be this, That *David* insists chiefly on the Character of the MESSIAS as King, *Isaiab* on his Character as Prophet: And as the MESSIAS was to sustain both Characters, this Difference is easily accounted for.


#### SECT. IV.

THERE is another Circumstance relating to the MESSIAS, revealed in the *Old Testament* which very well agrees with the Circumstance of his *Family* just now insisted on, *That is the Place of his Birth*, which is foretold by the Prophet *Micab*. This Prophet prophesied in the same Reigns that *Isaiab* did; and his Prophecy is in Substance much the same with that of *Isaiab*, only shorter, and consequently less particular. He also reproves the People for their Iniquities; foretells the Desolation of their Country, and the Captivity of the People: But to comfort them under that sad Prospect, he foretells their Return from that Captivity, adding likewise some of the most remarkable Events, which should befall them after their Restoration. Among which

we

we find *the general Conversion of the Gentile* P A R T  
*World* spoken of, in the very Words of a II.  
 Prophecy cited from *Isaiab*, which I have  
 already considered, Chap. iv. 1, 2. *In the*  
*last Days it shall come to pass, that the Moun-*  
*tain of the House of the LORD, shall be esta-*  
*blished in the Top of the Mountains, and it*  
*shall be exalted above the Hills, and People*  
*shall flow unto it. And many Nations shall come*  
*and say, Come, and let us go up to the Moun-*  
*tain of the LORD, and to the House of the*  
*God of Jacob, and he will teach us his*  
*Ways, and we will walk in his Paths: For*  
*the Law shall go forth out of Zion, and the*  
*Word of the LORD from Jerusalem. Soon*  
 after we have a Character of the Person,  
 by whose Means and Influence this Effect  
 should be wrought among the *Gentiles*,  
 Chap. v. 2. *But thou Bethlehem Ephratah,*  
*though thou be little among the Thousands of*  
*Judah, yet out of thee shall be come forth un-*  
*to me, that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose*  
*Goings forth have been from of Old, from*  
*everlasting.--- ver. 4. For now shall he be*  
*great unto the Ends of the Earth. Ver. 5.*  
*And this Man shall be the Peace.*

THIS Prophecy, it is said, was intended  
 of *Zorobabel*; but in my Opinion there is  
 not one Character in it that fits him. *Beth-*  
*lehem* is there fixed to be the Place of his  
 Birth, as *Grotius* proves from parallel Places  
 of Scripture, where the Word, rendered  
*come forth*, signifies *to be born*: Consequent-  
 ly, *to come forth out of Bethlehem*, signifies  
 to

PART *to be born at* Bethlehem ; which was confessedly not the Case of *Zorobabel*. Besides, II.  is it not a gross Abuse of the Prophecy to make it say, that *Betlehem* should become famous through a Person, who was neither born there, nor (as far as we are able to judge) ever resided there? And then, how is the next Character applied to *Zorobabel*, *Whose Goings forth have been from of Old, from everlasting?* “ Because, say they (k), he “ had his Origin from an illustrious House “ of old, and a royal Family of Five hundred Years standing. ” This Interpretation is a very strained one, and I think must disappoint the Reader, instead of satisfying him. They may call it an “ Oriental swelling Expression, signifying a “ common Matter : ” But I am sure they can find no parallel Instance in the *Old Testament* to justify it.

BUT I do not urge the Prophecy upon this Account. I insist chiefly upon that peculiar Character in it, which runs through, and distinguishes most of the Prophecies already considered, *ver. 4. He shall be great unto the Ends of the Earth.* To apply this Character to one, who was no otherwise remarkable, than as he was chosen Leader of a Captive People, upon their Return to their own Land, who having put their Affairs in some Order returned, and died in the Place of his Captivity, is utterly unjustifiable.

.. (k) Scheme, &c. p. 201.

justifiable. And indeed our Adversary has wisely declined meddling with this Character, having no Pretence for applying it to *Zorobabel*.

PART  
II.

IT is added, *ver. 5. And he shall be the Peace.* Of what? Of the Earth; for that is the proper *Antecedent*. And accordingly the *Septuagint* renders the Place, *Καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆ εἰρήνη.* And thus interpreted the Prophecy is exactly parallel to, and expresses the same thing with, another Prediction of a later Prophet concerning the MESSIAS (1). *He shall speak Peace unto the Heathen: And his Dominion shall be from Sea to Sea, and from the River to the Ends of the Earth.*

BUT our Adversary objects (and it is his only Objection against the Application of this Prophecy to JESUS) saying (m), This “Application of it is in the fullest Manner confuted by the *Context*, which describes the Ruler in Terms perfectly inconsistent with the Character of JESUS, and particularly when it says, *He shall be the Peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our Land, &c.* — Which Words are so plain as not to need the least Comment, to shew them to be inapplicable to the peaceable Times, and to the Person of JESUS”. Upon which I observe, that this seemingly strong Objection

(1) Zech. ix. 10.


(m) Scheme, p. 201.



PART II. *jection is founded upon a manifestly wrong Pointing of the Place, whereby two Characters are confounded and blended together. The Character of the Ruler to be born at Bethlehem ends with these Words, And he shall be the Peace. The Words which follow will appear, by barely reading them, to belong to other Persons; When the Assyrian shall come into our Land, and when he shall tread in our Palaces, then shall we raise against him seven Shepherds and eight principal Men. And they shall waste the Land of Assyria with the Sword, and the Land of Nimrod in the Entrances thereof. Can these Words be disjoyned, When the Assyrian shall come into our Land, and when he shall tread in our Palaces? Would you, upon due Reflection, tack part to one Sentence, and part to another? Is there not evident Reason for keeping them together? If so, then let the Text say what was to be the Consequence, when that should happen, Then shall we raise against him seven Shepherds, and eight principal Men; and they should be avenged upon him, as the next Verse declares, for that Invasion of the Land. A plainer Case I think there cannot be. Let the Reader consult the Prophet himself; and let him observe likewise, that this must be the Case, even upon Supposition the Ruler to be born at Bethlehem signified Zorobabel.*

HAVING removed this only Objection against applying Micah's Prophecy to  
CHRIST,



CHRIST, I shall endeavour to defend a- P A R T  
 another parallel Prophecy, which I alledg- II.  
 ed in Confirmation of it, *Zech. ix. 9, &c.* 

*Rejoyce greatly O Daughter of Zion, shout  
 O Daughter of Jerusalem: Behold thy King  
 cometh unto thee; he is just and having Sal-  
 vation, lowly and riding upon an Ass, and  
 upon a Colt the Foal of an Ass. And I will  
 cut off the Chariot from Ephraim, and the  
 Horse from Jerusalem, and the Battle-bow  
 shall be cut off; and he shall speak Peace to  
 the Heathen, and his Dominion shall be from  
 Sea to Sea, and from the River to the Ends  
 of the Earth.*

“THESE Personal Characters (says our  
 “Adversary (n), Righteous One, Saviour,  
 “lowly, and riding upon an Ass, seem too  
 “general and indeterminate to ground our  
 “Interpretation upon.” Admit they are:  
 Why then has he taken Notice of them,  
 (since they do not exclude JESUS) and  
 overlooked that very distinguishing Charac-  
 ter of the MESSIAS, that peculiar Mark,  
 so constantly fixed upon him by almost all  
 the Prophets, than which, none could more  
 effectually distinguish him from any Jewish  
 King or Ruler, His Rule and Influence  
 over the Gentile World? If he thought this  
 Character applicable to Zorobabel, why has  
 he not told us, when, and how, and by  
 what Authority he *spake Peace to the Hea-  
 then*; what Sort of Dominion that was,  
 which

(n) Scheme, &c. p. 144.

PART which he had over so great a Part of the  
II. Earth, and by what Means it was acquired?

~ This Task is so ill performed by *Grotius*, that he might justly think it better omitted, than repeated.

BUT it is said (o), “ That the Words  
“ of *Zechary* related originally to *Zorobabel*,  
“ or some Person who came from *Babylon* ; ”  
because the Word, which in our Translation is rendered *having Salvation*, signifies in the *Hebrew*, *saved*. This Objection had been obviated, Men of the best Skill in the Original having observed, That *passive Particles*, when used as Nouns, have an *active Signification*. In Consequence whereof the *Chaldee*, the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate* and all *Versions* have rendered the Word *actively*. But still it ought to be rendered *passively* ! And why ? Because Mr. S--- says so ; whose Authority sufficiently destroys the Foundation on which the Bishop, and all other Translators have proceeded (p). Was there ever such an Answer ! Could a Man, that in almost every Page decries Authority, and calls aloud for observing the Rules of *Grammar* and *Criticism*, write thus without Blushing to himself ! But this was all he had to urge against the Application of this Prophecy to CHRIST : And in my Opinion, such Objections as these help to confirm it.

S E C T.

(o) *Scheme*, &c. p. 145.

(p) *Ib.*

SECT. V.

I HAVE now done with those Prophecies, which relate chiefly to the Character and Circumstances of the MESSIAS, and to the great Event to be accomplished through him. I shall therefore now proceed to other Prophecies, which relate more immediately to the *Time* of his Appearance. Many of the Prophecies already produced, which were delivered long before the Captivity, plainly signify, that it should not happen till after their Restoration; but how soon, or how long after, they do not determine. The Prophets after the Captivity, circumscribe the Time a little more, and by Circumstances fix a Period, within which Men might expect his Coming.


Thus the Prophet *Haggai* speaks (*Chap. ii. 6, 7, 8, 9*) in the Words of GOD: *Yet once, it is a little while,--- and I will shake all Nations, and the Desire of all Nations shall come, and I will fill this House with Glory-- The Silver is mine, and the Gold is mine--- The Glory of this latter House shall be greater than of the former,--- and in this Place will I give Peace, saith the LORD of Hosts.* The Christian Interpretation of this Place, is very well known, *viz.* That during the Continuance of the second Temple, which was then building, GOD would send the MESSIAS, called in the Text, the  
N Desire

PART II. *Desire of all Nations*, who by his Presence should fill that House with Glory, by which it should exceed in Glory the former House built by *Solomon*.

It is worth observing, with how much Art and Sophistry, our Adversary has stretched his Dissertation on this Place to a very great Length, without ever attempting to give us a different Interpretation of it, or offering any Objection against the Interpretation which had been given, except one already obviated, contained within the *Five last Lines* of his Remarks (q). A very Learned and Judicious Writer upon this Subject, besides several critical Observations upon the *Text*, proving it to be properly applicable to the MESSIAS, had urged in Confirmation of it, many parallel Places of Scripture, speaking of a Person, whose Ministry should have a very beneficial Influence upon the *Gentile World*, one to whom *the Gentiles should seek*, whose *Law the Isles should wait for*, and who should be a *Blessing to the Nations of the Earth*; concluding (as he very justly might) that such a Person might very properly be called, by a subsequent Prophet, *the Desire of all Nations*. This gave our Adversary a Handle to leave the *Text* in Dispute, which he knew not how to dispose of, and to amuse his Reader with a great many little Cavils at those parallel Places, which were but barely hinted at, till

(q) Scheme, &c. p. 142.



till he should be imperceptibly diverted P A R T  
 from attending to a *Text*, which carries II.  
 more Weight with it, than the Author of   
*Scheme*, &c. will ever be able to remove.

BUT to bring this Dispute to a short Issue, and if possible, to confine our Adversary to the Question in hand, I would ask him a few Questions: Whether a Person intended to be a *Benefit*, or *Blessing* to the Nations of the Earth, by converting them from dumb Idols to serve the Living and True God, may not very properly be signified by this Expression, *The Desire of all Nations*? Whether that *Expression*, considered either in Comparison with other Places of Scripture, or in Comparison with any subsequent Event, can otherwise be so properly applied? Whether the Coming of such a Person during the Continuance of the second Temple, his being presented in it, and frequently honouring it with his Presence, may not as properly be said, to fill that House with Glory, with greater Glory than the former, as *Bethlehem Ephrath*, the least among the Thousands of *Judab*, is said to be glorified above the other Cities of *Judab*, by being the Birth-place of a Ruler, who should *be great unto the Ends of the Earth* (r)? If therefore JESUS was a Person, whose Ministry and Doctrine had such Beneficial Influence upon the Nations of the Earth; if he did appear in the

(r) Micah v. 2---4.



PART II. World during the Continuance of the second Temple, and did frequently honour it with his Presence; whether the Prophecy in Dispute, be not fairly and strictly applicable to him; so strictly, that it cannot properly be applied to any other Person or Event whatsoever?

THERE is one Objection, as I observed before, made against it, which is this: (s)  
 “ That this Prophecy was to be accomplished in a *little while* after it was delivered, which seems a Phrase not very applicable to a Fact *Four hundred Years* after. ” To which I answer, That the Phrase *a little while*, does not relate to the Coming of *the Desire of all Nations*: For there were first to be great intermediate Events, great Revolutions and Changes in the States and Kingdoms of the Earth; and after this *shaking of all Nations*, then *the Desire of all Nations* should come. Accordingly, there did happen very great Revolutions of States and Empires; and soon after the full Settlement of the last great Empire in *Augustus Cæsar*, CHRIST was born.

ANOTHER Prophecy which signifies a Time, within which the MESSIAS should appear, in much the same manner with the former, is, *Mal. iii. 1. Behold, I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the Way before*

(s) Scheme, &c. p. 142;

fore 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. In this, as in the former Prophecy, the Advent of an extraordinary Person is promised during the Continuance of the second Temple; as in the former, he is called, *the Desire of all Nations*, in this, he is called *the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in*. And no doubt the Jews, who had long groaned under the Oppressions of the Heathen, had great Delight in the Expectation of a Person to arise among them, who should have Rule and Influence over the Heathen World; Which gave Occasion to that great Exultation in Zechary, *Rejoyce greatly, O Daughter of Zion; shout O Daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh,--- and he shall speak Peace to the Heathen, and his Dominion shall be from Sea to Sea, &c.* (t).

PART  
II.  
~~~~~

OUR Adversary nevertheless, after some Cavils about Jews and their Opinions in this Case, and after having put in his Claim of Rights on Behalf of Deists, &c. That they are not obliged to find out the Meaning of the Prophets, or Completions for their Prophecies, or to embrace Meanings and Completions found out to their Hands (u), yet, out of his great Condescension and Goodness, “being inclined to do Justice

N 3

(t) Zech. ix. 9.

(u) Scheme, &c. p. 116.

PART II. “Justice to the Jewish Writings (x),” has thought fit in the present Case to waive his Privilege, and undertakes to prove, “That the whole Context of *Malachy* is inconsistent with our Explication, and also to assign the true Meaning of *Malachy* (y). Which true Meaning of *Malachy*, as he calls it, is one gross Heap of Sophistry and Forgery.

“THE Second Messenger in *Malachy*, is to come to his Temple as Lord and Proprietor thereof.” True. “That is, to dwell and preside there, to give Oracles, and to set up the Jewish Forms of Worship” (z).--- All Invention! The Text says nothing like it.--- “Is to come suddenly or immediately,”--- But in Respect to what? To the Messenger sent to prepare the Way before him; so CHRIST immediately succeeded John Baptist. --- “Is styled the Messenger of the Covenant.” --- Allowed. But of what Covenant? --- “The Jewish Covenant, the Covenant made with Levi, the Covenant made with the Fathers.” --- Mere Fiction against all Probability! For Moses was the Messenger of that Covenant, whom the Jews never expected again. --- “And is to purify the Sons of Levi.” --- This was the Result of the Covenant made by CHRIST: for it is said (a), That a great Company of the Priests were obedient to the Faith;

(x) Scheme, p. 119. (y) Ibid. p. 120.
 (z) Ibid. (a) Acts vi. 7.

Faith. But the Addition of our Author,— P A R T
 “ That they may duly perform the *Jewish* II.
 “ Ceremonies *as of old,* ”— is an Inter-
 polation of his own, which has nothing in
 the Prophecy to support it.— “ And
 “ for a farther Description of this *Messen-*
 “ *ger,* we have God’s Threatning, that
 “ when this *Messenger* comes, he will ex-
 “ act Obedience to his Ordinances, from
 “ which the *Jews* had swerved. ”— Down-
 right Equivocation! For by *Ordinances,* he
 would have you understand the *Ceremonial*
 Part of the *Jewish* Law. Whereas the
 Place referred to to, *ver. 5.* exacts Obe-
 dience to Laws purely *Moral,* to which
 Obedience is strictly required by the Go-
 spel.— “ God also says on this Occasion,
 “ that he *changes not.* ”— A Continuation
 of the same Cheat! Whereby he would re-
 present God purposing never to *change* the
 Ceremonial Law.— “ And he promises
 “ that they [the *Jews*] shall live in their
 “ own Land. ” True: Upon Condition,
 that they keep his Statutes, and observe
 his Laws. “ And he afterwards bids them,
 “ *remember* or keep *the Law of Moses.* ”—
 And who doubts, but they were obliged to
 keep the Law of *Moses,* till some other Law
 or Covenant should be substituted in its
 Room?

THUS ends this famous Comment! A
 Comment purely his own; which discovers
 itself not to have been borrowed from *Grotius,*
 or any other serious Writer! But after all

PART II. this Descant to assign the true Meaning of Malachi, he seems to have failed us in two material Points, Who was the *First*, Who was the *Second* Messenger promised. Of the *First* he says nothing. And he is not clear as to the *Second*; unless by these Words, “All which plainly relates to “GOD,” (c) he means GOD was that *Second* Messenger. And if this be his Meaning, I shall not endeavour to confute him, till he has told us, (upon Supposition GOD was that Messenger) Who it was that sent him,

S E C T. VI,

I AM now come to that famous Prophecy of the *Seventy Weeks* in the Book of *Daniel*; “which, says our Adversary, “(d) seems to be the Sheet-Anchor of the “Cause, and therefore merits a very particular Examination.” And for this Reason he has doubled his Endeavours (I might add his dishonest Tricks and Shifts in Controversy too) to wrest it from us: For not content with giving us a new and whimsical Interpretation of the Prophecy, *new* even to himself (having in *the Discourse of the Grounds*, &c. laid hold on another;) he endeavours here to represent the *Book* itself, from whence it is taken, as spurious, and forged by some *Jezes* long after the
Time

(c) Scheme, &c. p. 121.

(d) p. 173.

Time of *Daniel*. I must confess I am not P A R T
 at all concern'd at this; because it will II.
 serve to discover the Folly of such At-
 tempts, and the Wickedness of them that
 attempt it.

OUR Adversary begins his Dissertation with this Remark (e), "That the famous
 " *Daniel*, mentioned by *Ezekiel*, could not
 " be the Author of the Book of *Daniel*,
 " — For *Ezekiel*, who prophesied in the
 " *fifth* Year of *Jeboiakim* King of *Judah*,
 " implies *Daniel* at that Time to be a
 " Person in Years. Whereas the Book of
 " *Daniel* speaks of *Daniel* at that Time
 " as a Youth". Here is a Falsification
 of History, in which every Reader is able
 to confront him. *Daniel* was carried cap-
 tive to *Babylon* about the fourth Year of
Jeboiakim. He was then a Youth, not
 much less than twenty Years old; accord-
 ing to the Representation of the Book of
Daniel: For he was then chosen by *Ash-*
penaz, out of the Children of *Israel*, as one
skilful in all Wisdom, and cunning in Know-
ledge, and understanding Science (f), and
 he gave upon that Occasion a very notable
 Instance of his Integrity, Piety and Dis-
 cretion. When then does *Ezekiel* speak of
Daniel? In the very next Year, according
 to *Scheme*, &c. in the *fifth* Year of *Jeboia-*
kim, in the *fourth* of whose Reign *Daniel*
 was carried Captive. But if you will be-
 lieve

(e) *Scheme*, &c. p. 149. (f) *Dan.* i. 4, &c.

PART lieve *Ezekiel* himself, if you will believe
 II. *Usher* and *Grotius* (whose Authority this
 Author has the Confidence to appeal to
 on this Occasion) and all that have wrote
 upon this Subject, it was at least *Twelve*
Years afterwards, when *Ezekiel* spoke of
Daniel. For *Jeboiakim*, in the *fourth* of
 whose Reign *Daniel* was carried to *Babylon*,
 reigned *Seven* Years afterwards (g). He was
 succeeded by *Jeboiakin*; in the *fifth* Year
 of whose Captivity *Ezekiel* began to pro-
 phecy (h). *Ezekiel* had prophesied for some
 Time, before he mentioned *Daniel*; so that
Daniel must have been upwards of *Thirty*,
 when *Ezekiel* spake of him,

NOR does *Ezekiel* say any thing of him,
 but what was very consistent with his Cha-
 racter at those Years. For he was particu-
 larly famous for an early Piety, great Sted-
 fastness in Religion, and an immoveable
 Adherence to the Law of his GOD. And
 this rendered him the more acceptable to
 GOD; because even in his younger Years,
 the Temptations of a Court could not di-
 vert him from it. And for that Reason he
 is reckoned a Third with *Noah* and *Job*,
 whose Intercession was of great Avail in the
 Sight of GOD (i). He was likewise be-
 fore that Time by Divine Assistance become
 famous for Wisdom, above all the wise Men
 of *Babylon*, and by the King preferred be-
 fore

(g) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5.
 (i) Ezek. xiv. 14, 20.

(h) Ezek. i. 2.

fore them (*k*). Upon which Account he is P A R T
reckoned by *Ezekiel* (*l*) as famous for his II.
Wisdom, to a Proverb. There is there-
fore a perfect Agreement between the Book
of *Daniel*, and the Prophecy of *Ezekiel* in
this Matter: Consequently the Objection
founded upon a supposed Disagreement is
groundless; groundless even in the Opinion
of the Objector, who to give some Colour
to it, found it necessary to have Recourse to
a most notorious Falshood.

W H A T is said of *Daniel* by *Ezekiel*, may
serve to take off the Force of another Ob-
jection, That “*Daniel* is omitted among
“ the *Prophets* recited in *Ecclesiasticus*;
which our Author thinks would not have
been (*m*) “ had the Book under his Name
“ been received as a Canonical Book by the
“ *Jews*, when *Ecclesiasticus* was published.”
To which I answer, That the Author of
Ecclesiasticus did not intend to give a List
of Canonical Books or their Writers; and
therefore there is no mention of the Book
of *Job* or its Author. His Design was to
praise famous Men, that excelled in any
Kind (*n*) among their Fathers, Rulers as
well as Prophets. And this appears to
have been done with no great Exactness;
but as they occurred to Memory; some
being mentioned in improper Places, and
the

(*k*) Dan. ii. 48.

(*l*) Ezek. xxviii. 3. (*m*) Scheme, &c. p. 152.

(*n*) Ecclef. xlii. 1, &c.

PART the particular Praises of some that were
 II. very famous being omitted. The Objec-
 tion therefore, if it proves any Thing,
 proves too much, and particularly that
 there was no such famous Man as *Daniel*
 among their Tribes: Whereas it appears
 from *Ezekiel*, that there was such a Per-
 son, exceedingly famous in his Genera-
 tion.

ANOTHER Objection is, That “ by
 “ the unanimous Consent of the *Jews* the
 “ Book of *Daniel* was reckoned among
 “ their *Hagiographa*, and not among the
 “ Writings of their Prophets.” (o) This
 I allow, and from thence I argue the *Ge-
 muiness* of it: Because their *Hagiographa*
 were not a Collection of Books spurious or
 doubtful; but were always reckoned a Part
 of their genuine Canonical Scriptures, which
 they divided into three Branches, the *Law*,
 the *Propbets*, and the *Hagiographa*. I allow
 also with the Learned *Reland* (p), that the
 Reason of their placing him among the *Ha-
 giographers*, was not, because he foretold so
 clearly the Coming of the MESSIAS. But
 then I insist likewise, that it was not because
 they looked upon him as an uninspired Wri-
 ter: For they have put the *Psalms* of *Da-
 vid* likewise in the same Class. And the
 Reason they give for it is, That neither
David nor *Daniel* lead a prophetic Life,
 both of them having spent the greatest Part of
 their

(o) Scheme, &c. p. 153.

(p) p. 154.

their Time in Courts. They allow in particular, that *Daniel* had divine Revelations communicated to him, but not in the prophetic Way, reckoning Revelations by Dreams and Visions to be more imperfect, and below the prophetic Manner: That is, they allow him to have foretold Things to come, and they allow the Predictions attributed to him to be genuine; this is as much as we desire, we are not concerned about the whimsical Distinction they have made between a Prophet, and one that spake by Revelation from GOD.

PART
II.

WHAT then can our Author gather from his Observation, (q) “That *Jonathan*, who --- made the *Chaldee Paraphrases* we now have on the *Books of the Prophets*, has omitted *Daniel*?” Is there not a Sort of Equivocation in saying, *he has omitted Daniel*, when *Daniel* was not reckoned among the Prophets, but the *Hagiographers*? Had *Jonathan* made his *Paraphrases* upon the *Hagiographa*, and omitted *Daniel*, there had been some Weight in the Objection: But as the Case stands, it is like saying, A certain Commentator, who has wrote upon the *Gospels*, has omitted *St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans*!

OUR Author says farther, (r) “It does not appear, that the Book of *Daniel* was translated into *Greek*, when the other
“ Books

(q) Scheme, &c. p. 153. (r) p. 151.

PART II.
 ~~~~~  
 “ Books of the *Old Testament* were, which  
 “ are attributed to the *Seventy*; the pre-  
 “ sent *Greek Version* --- being taken from  
 “ *Theodotion's Translation.*” But it does  
 appear, that there was a *Greek Version* of  
 the Book of *Daniel* according to the *Sep-*  
*tuagint* (s), but that it was become faulty  
 and imperfect; for which Reason the Church  
 took *Theodotion's Version* into their *Greek*  
 Bibles instead of it.

It is added, (t) That “ the *Jews* were  
 “ great Composers of Books under the  
 “ Names of their renowned *Prophets*, to  
 “ do themselves Honour, and particularly  
 “ under the Name of *Daniel*; to whom  
 “ there are several Pieces falsely attributed.”  
 And what then? Will it follow, that there  
 can be no *genuine* Writings of an Author,  
 to whom any Thing *supposititious* has been  
 attributed? Are there no Rules to distin-  
 guish between Books *spurious* and *genuine*?  
 If there are, let the Book before us be try-  
 ed by those Rules, and not condemned by  
 an Argument, which admitted, in the Man-  
 ner is here urged, would prove even *ge-*  
*nueine* Books to be *spurious*.

OUR Author has attempted something  
 in this critical Way; and says, (u) “ That  
 “ Part of *Daniel* which is written in *Chal-*  
 “ *dee*, is near the *Style* of the old *Chaldee*  
 Para-

(s) Hieron. Præf. ad Dan. (t) Scheme, p. 154.  
 (u) Ibid,

“ *Paraphrases*— composed many Hundred P A R T  
 “ Years after *Daniel’s* Time.— And there- II.  
 “ fore that Part could not be written at a  
 “ Time very remote from the Date of the  
 “ eldest of those *Chaldee Paraphrases.*” In  
 Confirmation of this Criticism he alledges  
 the Authority of *Prideaux*, who says no such  
 thing. That learned Author, in examining  
 which of the two *Targums* is oldest, that  
 of *Jonathan*, or that of *Onkelos*, argues for  
 the greater Antiquity of the latter in this  
 Manner (x): “ That Part of *Daniel* and  
 “ *Ezra* which is in *Chaldee*, is the truest  
 “ Standard, whereby to try the Purity of  
 “ the *Chaldee* Language. Adding, that the  
 “ farther any *Chaldee* Writing differs from  
 “ that ancient Standard, the later certainly  
 “ it is; and the nearer it comes to it, the  
 “ ancients it is. But no *Chaldee* Writing  
 “ now extant comes nearer to the Style of  
 “ what is written in that Language by  
 “ *Daniel* and *Ezra*, than the *Targum* of  
 “ *Onkelos.*” Is it not therefore a great  
 Abuse both of *Prideaux* and his Reader,  
 to infer from hence, that the *Chaldee* Part  
 of *Daniel* is near the Style of the old *Chal-*  
*dee Paraphrases*? There may be a prodi-  
 gious Difference in Style, and yet the *Tar-*  
*gum* of *Onkelos* be nearer *Daniel’s* Style,  
 than any other *Chaldee* Writing.

ANOTHER critical Remark, is (y),  
 “ That *Daniel* lived chiefly at the Courts  
 “ of

(x) Prid. Con. Vol. II. p. 535. (y) Sch. p. 150.

PART “ of the Kings of *Babylon* and *Persia*:—  
 II. “ And yet the Names of the several Kings  
 “ of his Time, are all mistaken in the *Book*  
 “ of *Daniel*; and particularly the *Darius*  
 “ so often mentioned, is supposed by some  
 “ to be *Cyaxares* II, King of *Persia*, and  
 “ by others to be *Nabonidus*, King of *Chal-*  
 “ *dea*.” We allow that the *Darius* spoken  
 of by *Daniel* was the same with *Cyaxares* II  
 of *Media*. But how does it follow, that  
*Daniel* therefore mistook his Name? Might  
 he not be called *Darius* too? Is it not  
 very probable, that it was a Name of Di-  
 stinction he had upon his Conquest of *Ba-*  
*bylon*? For it well suited that great Action  
 of his Life, signifying (as *Herodotus* ex-  
 plains it) *The Compeller*. And then it was  
 very proper for *Daniel* to call him by that  
 Name, who first came acquainted with him  
 through that remarkable Circumstance of  
 his Life. I take no Notice of that confi-  
 dent Expression, *The Names of the several*  
*Kings of his Time are ALL mistaken*: *The Hy-*  
*perbole* is a *Figure*, which our Author makes  
 frequent Use of.

HIS next Objection will afford us ano-  
 ther Instance of the same *Figure*; where he  
 he says (z), “ That *Daniel*— cannot be  
 “ supposed to be the Author of this *Book*;  
 “ which A B O U N D S with *Derivations* from  
 “ the *Greek*; which was a Language un-  
 “ known to the *Jews* for a long while af-  
 “ ter

(z) Scheme, &c. p. 151.

“ter the Captivity.” This *abounding with* P A R T  
 Greek *Derivations*, amounts to no more II.  
 than Five Instances according to his own  
 Way of Reckoning; and one of them *He-*  
*rodotus*, that great Master of the *Greek*  
 Language, disowns, thinking it to be of  
*Persian* Extract: The other Four are Names  
 of Musical Instruments, which Instruments  
 might very probably have been first invent-  
 ed in *Greece*, and afterward carry their  
 Names along with them into *Chaldea*.

THIS Objection, if it has any Weight,  
 must be founded upon a Supposition, That  
 the *Chaldee* Language in the Time of *Daniel*  
 was so pure, that it had no Words origi-  
 nally *Greek* intermixed along with it: For  
 if it had, which *Grotius* proves to be not  
 only possible, but very probable; then the  
 Author of the Book of *Daniel* writing in  
*Chaldee*, might use Words derived from the  
*Greek*, and yet have known nothing of the  
*Greek* Language, much less have lived *till*  
*the Grecian Empire prevailed*.

BUT the shrewdest Objection of all is,  
 (a) “The Author of the Book of *Daniel*  
 “appears plainly, from the *last Chapter* of  
 “his Book, to be a Writer of Things past  
 “after a propheticall Manner. — There,  
 “after he has most clearly spoken of the  
 “miserable Times of the *Jews* under *An-*  
 “*tiochus Epiphanes*, adds, *But go thou thy*  
 O “*Way,*

(a) Scheme, p. 155, 156.



PART II. *“ Way, till the End be, for thou shalt rest  
 “ and stand in thy Lot at the End of the  
 “ Days: [that is, thou thyself shalt live  
 “ and be an Eye-witness, and see an End  
 “ of these things.”]* Egregious Blunder! Can any one imagine, if this Book had been forged in *Daniel’s* Name, by a Person living after the Time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, that the Forger of it would have made his *Daniel* promise himself in a prophetic Manner to live till that Time, whom he knew to have been dead Three hundred and fifty Years before? A strange Way of *writing of things past after a prophetical Manner*, to make the supposed Prophet survive the whole Scene, who died before it began! Methinks our Author has not done the most credulous Part of his Readers Justice, in offering such crude indigested Stuff by Way of Argument, which in Spite of Prejudice and Prepossession, cannot but appear to every Man in a most ridiculous Light.

THERE are two more Arguments, urged against the Genuineness of the Book of *Daniel*, which being brought together will pull one another to Pieces, and therefore need no other Confutation. He says (*b*), “ *Divers Matters of Fact are spoken of in the Book of Daniel, in the Way of Prophecy, with the Clearness of History, from Daniel’s Time to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes.* ” And he supposes the Prophecies

(*b*) Scheme, p. 151.



phesies contained in it to look no farther: P A R T  
 Yet tells you in another Place (c), “ That II.  
 “ the whole Book is written in a *dark em-*  
 “ *blematical, enigmatical, symbolical, parabo-*  
 “ *lical and figurative Style*; which has thrown  
 “ *Jews and Christians* into the greatest Va-  
 “ riety of Interpretations.” And yet it  
 relates *Facts with the Clearness of History!*


HE adds (d), “ That the Way of re-  
 “ presenting large Scenes of Affairs, by  
 “ such *Images and Symbols* as are used  
 “ therein, is entirely unlike the Books of  
 “ the other Prophets, and is agreeable to  
 “ the Turn of Writing the *Jews* took up  
 “ with, when they had been new formed  
 “ in the *Schools of the Greeks.*” To which  
 I answer, That the Way of representing  
 Things by *Images and Symbols*, is frequent-  
 ly to be met with in the Prophecies of  
*Ezekiel* and *Zechariah*, two Prophets co-  
 temporary with *Daniel*; and therefore this  
 Argument, if it proves any thing, proves  
 the Book of *Daniel* to have been wrote a-  
 bout the Times of *Ezekiel* and *Zechariah*,  
 in whose Times *Daniel* lived; whom we  
 may now conclude, notwithstanding all the  
 Objections of our Adversary, to have been  
 the real undoubted Author of those pro-  
 phetic Writings, which we receive under  
 his Name.

(c) Scheme, p. 157.

(d) Ibid.

## PART

## II.


 HAVING discovered the Falshood, the Sophistry, the Inconclusiveness of the Arguments alledged to prove, that the Book of *Daniel* was forged about the Times of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, by one that wrote of Things past in a prophetic Manner: I shall now proceed to consider the Prophecy of the *Seventy Weeks* cited from it, and to justify the Application of it according to the Christian Scheme. From whence also I hope it will appear to have been wrote by a Person divinely inspired: For it is out of Dispute, that it was penned long before the Time of CHRIST; if therefore it speaks of his Coming and the Consequences of it properly and truly, we are sure it must be by a Spirit of Prophecy, and therefore it was not forged by any one about the Times of *Antiochus Epiphanes* with a View to those Times.

To do this the more clearly and distinctly, I shall *first* give the Reader their Interpretation of the Prophecy, who would make it terminate with the Times of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and prove it to be utterly inconsistent with all tolerable Sense and just Construction of the Prophecy. 2. I shall consider the Objections made against the Christian Interpretation of it, and prove it to be fairly and strictly applicable to the Coming and Death of CHRIST, and to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, which followed afterwards.

THEIR

THEIR Interpretation, who would make the Prophecy terminate with the Times of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, is this (e). “ *Seventy*  
 “ *Weeks of* [or Four hundred and ninety]  
 “ *Years are determined upon* [that is, are  
 “ shortened to an indefinite Number with  
 “ Respect to] *thy People, and 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 Com-*  
 “ *mandment to restore and to build Jerusa-*  
 “ *lem* [that is, the Word of GOD to *Je-*  
 “ *remiah* declaring and promising a Re-  
 “ turn from Captivity and a Rebuilding  
 “ of *Jerusalem*] unto MESSIAS the Prince  
 “ [Cyrus] shall be seven Weeks, and [from  
 “ the same Word of GOD to *Jeremiah*, to  
 “ MESSIAS the Prince *Judas Maccabeus*]  
 “ threescore and two Weeks the Street shall  
 “ be built again, and the Wall even in trou-  
 “ blous Times. And after threescore and  
 “ two Weeks shall MESSIAS [or Priest-  
 “ Messias, that is *Onias* the High Priest]  
 “ be cut off, but not for himself [he shall  
 “ have no one to help him.] And the  
 “ People of the Prince that shall come [that  
 “ is the Army of *Antiochus Epiphanes*] shall  
 “ destroy the City and the Sanctuary; and

O 3

“ the

(e) Scheme, p. 175, &amp;c.

PART II. *“ the End thereof shall be with a Flood, and  
 “ unto the End of the War Desolations are  
 “ determined. And he [Antiochus Epipha-  
 “ nes] shall confirm the Covenant with many  
 “ for one Week ; and in the midst of the Week  
 “ he shall cause the Sacrifice and the Oblation  
 “ to cease, and for the overspreading of Abomi-  
 “ nations shall make it desolate, and that deter-  
 “ mined shall be poured upon the Desolate.”*

THIS is their Interpretation, which will appear to be exceedingly arbitrary, inconsistent with the Text, and founded upon a great many unreasonable Suppositions. For first according to them, *Seventy Weeks* do not mean *Seventy Weeks* of [or Four hundred and ninety] Years, but some indefinite Number less than *Seventy*; which they would contract arbitrarily without any Rule to go by, and without any Instance of a like Way of Computation. They say that *Seventy Weeks abbreviated* (for so they will understand the Place) must mean a Number less than *Seventy*. But then I say the Place has no Meaning at all; you may reduce them to what Number you please: There being no more Reason to suppose that they signify *Sixty three*, than that they signify *Sixty*, or any Number less than that. This renders the Computation of the Weeks utterly precarious, and gives every Man a Liberty to compute as he pleases.

BESIDES there is no Manner of Grounds for this whimsical Imagination. For suppose the  
 the



the *Word* in the Original, which we render P A R T  
*to determine*, signifies *scindere, concidere*, that II.  
 is, *to cut off*; yet *Seventy Weeks cut off* will  
 not signify a less Term than *Seventy Weeks*,  
 but a Term contracted or limited to that  
 certain Compass. For Measure of *Time* is  
 often expressed in the same Manner with  
 Measure of *local Distance*; and therefore  
 Time, like a corporeal extended Substance  
 is said to be *cut-off* at such a certain Length.  
 And thus if you read the Prophecy, *Seventy  
 Weeks are cut off* with Respect to thy Peo-  
 ple for the Performance of GOD's Purpo-  
 ses there mentioned, it will plainly signify  
 no more than this, That GOD had limit-  
 ed the Time for the Performance of those  
 Purposes to *Seventy Weeks*, the Term for  
 their Performance was *cut off* at that cer-  
 tain Length, and should not be extended  
 any farther.

THIS will appear yet more plainly by  
 observing, That the Prophet, going on to  
 explain himself in the Sequel of the Pro-  
 phesy, does actually account for the whole  
 Term by dividing it into three several Por-  
 tions of *Seven Weeks, Threescore and two  
 Weeks*, and *one Week*, which added together  
 make the exact Number at first defined.  
 And when the Division so punctually agrees  
 with the whole Sum at first proposed, can  
 it with any Probability be supposed, that  
 the Parts thereof are co-incident Terms and  
 not different Portions of the same whole  
 Term? When it is plainly said, that from



PART one Event to another shall be *Seven Weeks*;  
 II. *and Threescore and two Weeks*, how can I  
 suppose the *Seven Weeks* to be included in  
 the *Threescore and two Weeks*? Or, how can  
 I suppose *Seven* and *Sixty-two*, to signify but  
*Sixty-two*, those two Sums to be equal to  
 the latter only, the Whole to one Part?

To get over this Difficulty, observe another most unreasonable Abuse of the *Text*. Where one *Messias-Prince* is promised, and One only, they would suppose Two to be promised without the least Intimation given of it. The Words are, *From the going forth of the Commandment, unto the MESSIAS the Prince shall be Seven Weeks, and Threescore and two Weeks*. It is not said, *unto the Messias-Princes shall be Seven and Threescore and two*; it is not said, *unto a Messias-Prince shall be Seven Weeks, and unto another Messias-Prince shall be Threescore and two Weeks*: Upon what then can this most arbitrary Notion be founded? They say we cannot account for the Use of Two Numbers to express the Time of his Coming, if only one Person were intended. Suppose we could not. Will a Division of Time infer a Multiplication of Persons? One Person promise', will signify but one Person, tho' the Time assigned for his Coming should be divided into Fifty Parts.

As their Computaion of the *Weeks* is altogether chimerical and groundless; so the Beginning they assign to them, is inconsistent

consistent with the Prophecy, and all rational Construction of it. The Prophet reckons *from the going forth of a Commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem.* This Commandment, they say, was the Word of God to *Jeremiah* signifying (Seventy Years before-hand) the Return of the *Jews* from Captivity, and the Building of the City. Upon which I observe, That the Commandment here spoken of, signifies a Word or Command *causing to return and rebuild the City, Sermo ad reverti faciendum,* as *Pagninus* renders it from the Original. There is a good deal of Difference between a Prophecy concerning a Thing to be done, and a Word causing it to be done. A Word causing it to be done, must signify an Order or Decree for the doing of it: And then I am sure the Prophecy of *Jeremiah* concerning it, Seventy Years before it was attempted, could not be intended in this Place.

BESIDES, Can it be supposed when a Prophet says, *Seventy Weeks* are limited or defined upon a People, that he should mean a Term whereof a considerable Part was then expired? Or, could Seventy Weeks be said to be defined upon a City, which City for a great Part of that Time was not in Being? Or, How can we account for that prophetic Direction, Compute from the going forth of the Commandment—*Seven Weeks,* if those *Seven Weeks* had been elapsed long before the Direction was given!

Or,

PART OF, What Reason can be given for dating  
 II. a Prophecy concerning Events to come,  
 almost Seventy Years before the Time it  
 was delivered?

IT is said, that the Word rendered *Commandment*, always signifies a *divine Prediction* or *Promise* (f). Than which nothing could be said more notoriously false; it being used in Scripture in the utmost Latitude, signifying any thing that is spoken, either by way of Petition, Reply, Advice, Declaration, or Decree: And that it is used there to signify a *Royal Decree*, does appear from what *Joab* said, upon *David's* Decree to have the People numbered (g), *Why doth my Lord the King delight in this Thing, or Commandment; for this Thing,* plainly refers to *David's* Decree, and it is expressed in the *Original* by the same Word, which in *Daniel's* Prophecy is rendered *Commandment*: And it is repeated again in the next Verse, *Notwithstanding, the King's Word [Commandment] prevailed against Joab.* There is nothing therefore in this Criticism to prove, that *the Commandment to restore, and to rebuild Jerusalem,* signifies a *divine Prediction* or *Promise*.

BUT it is urged (b), That if *the Commandment to restore, &c.* signified some Royal Decree to be granted afterwards, then  
 Daniel

(f) Scheme, &c. p. 177. (g) 2 Sam. xxiv. 3, 4.  
 (b) Scheme, &c. p. 178.

Daniel himself knew not the Beginning nor the P A R T  
 End of the Weeks. And what if he did II.  
 not? Might not GOD be supposed without  
 any Absurdity to reveal to him, what Term  
 he had allotted for the Performance of his  
 good Purposes towards his People, after  
 they should be restored to their pristine  
 State, without discovering to him the pre-  
 cise Time when that Term should com-  
 mence? Though the Prophecy was no Rule  
 to *Daniel*, who did not live to see an E-  
 dict, reinstating the *Jews*, established; yet  
 it was a Rule to them that did, who were  
 chiefly concerned in it, to judge pretty  
 nearly when to expect a Performance of  
 GOD's good Purposes concerning them, and  
 when to look for a greater and more last-  
 ing Desolation than the former.

ANOTHER inexcusable Abuse of the  
 Prophecy is in feigning Three *Messiahs*  
 spoken of, when it is as evident as Words  
 can make it; that the Prophecy speaks but  
 of One. They would make *Two*, where  
 the Name *Messias* is but *once* mentioned,  
*unto the Messias the Prince shall be Seven*  
*Weeks and Threescore and two Weeks.* If there  
 be more than one Person spoken of here, I  
 despair of understanding one of the plainest  
 Things in the World, a *singular* from a  
*plural.* And when it is added in the next  
*Verse, And after Threescore and two Weeks*  
*shall Messias be cut off,* they would suppose  
 a *third* intended, though there be as plain  
 a Reference as can be to the *Messias* spo-  
 ken

PART ken of in the preceding *Verse*: And yet  
 II. this is done with all the Confidence in the  
 World, without pretending the least Mark  
 or Shadow of a Distinction, which can lead  
 one to suspect, that *Messias* in the one  
 Place does not mean the same Person with  
*Messias* in the other.

BESIDES, *Ver.* 24. “ Which, says our  
 “ Author (*i*), seems to be the general in-  
 “ troductory Proposition, wherein the An-  
 “ gel gives the Substance of the whole Pro-  
 “ phesy,” had effectually guarded against  
 the Supposition of more than one *Messias*,  
 or anointed Person, to be spoken of af-  
 terwards, by saying, *Seventy Weeks are de-*  
*determined upon thy People* (among other  
 good Purposes) *to anoint the most Holy*. It  
 is evident therefore, that there was but One  
 anointed Person to be spoken of, and what  
 is said afterwards of a *Messias*, or anointed  
 Person, must be understood of this most  
 Holy Person, who was to be anointed.

AND it will appear farther from this  
 single Title, given to the Anointed Person  
 here spoken of, *Most Holy*, or *Holy of Ho-*  
*lies*, that neither *Cyrus*, nor *Judas Macca-*  
*beus*, nor *Onias* could be the Anointed Per-  
 son intended in this Prophecy. For though  
 our Adversary tells us upon his own Autho-  
 rity, which is not to be trusted (*k*), That  
 “ the *Hebrew* Words translated in our Bible  
 “ *Most*

(*i*) Scheme, &c. p. 176.

(*k*) Ibid.



“ *Most Holy*, are the common Appellation P A R T  
 “ for the *High Priest* among the *Jews* ; ” II.  
 yet I must tell him, that the Title is never  
 once given in Scripture to the *High Priest*,  
 or to any anointed Person whatsoever. The  
*Jews* had their *most holy* Place, and other  
*most holy* Things : But most holy Persons  
 they had none ; no Place or Dignity inti-  
 tled Men to this Appellation ; it is denied  
 to all GOD’S Anointed but one, the Person  
 spoken of in this Prophecy, who in Respect  
 to all holy Persons separated for the Ser-  
 vice of GOD, is called by Way of pecu-  
 liar Eminence the *Most Holy*. This single  
 Consideration I think sufficient to overthrow  
 all Attempts to explain this Prophecy of  
 any other Person, than THE MESSIAS pe-  
 culiarly so called.

I HAVE said enough already to convince  
 any reasonable Person, that an Interpreta-  
 tion of a Prophecy which requires so many  
 scandalous Suppositions, so much gross Mis-  
 construction of Words and Phrases to sup-  
 port it, ought not to be admitted. And yet,  
 allowing them all their Suppositions, even  
 then the Prophecy, thus mangled and abu-  
 sed to serve a Turn, will not answer the  
 Events to which they have applied it.

FOR if we suppose *Cyrus* to be the a-  
 nointed Prince promised at the End of *Se-*  
*ven Weeks*, from the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*  
 in the Fourth Year of *Jeboiakim* ; then rec-  
 koning *Seven Weeks* from that Prophecy  
 will

PART will bring us either to the Birth of *Cyrus*,  
 II. or to his Coming into a Capacity to act as  
 ~~~~~ GOD'S Anointed on Behalf of his People  
 the *Jews*, when the Empire of the *Chaldeans* to whom the *Jews* were Captives fell into his Hands. But the Calculation will greatly fail us both Ways: For from the Prophecy of *Jeremiab* to the Birth of *Cyrus* was not above *one Week*, and from thence till he had it in his Power to relieve the *Jews* was *Ten Weeks*; and to reckon to any other intermediate Circumstance of the Life of *Cyrus* is arbitrary and unjustifiable. Had any *Jew* been to make a Reckoning of Time, from the Prophecy of *Jeremiab* to *Cyrus* as their *Messias* (which is the only Capacity he could be considered in, if this Prophecy concerns him) he would certainly have reckon'd *Ten Weeks* of [or *Seventy*] Years; it being the most noted and indisputed Period in all their Accounts of Time. And therefore to suppose a *Jew* forging this Prophecy of *Cyrus* after so noted an Event, and yet so inconsistently with it, is exceedingly ridiculous.

AND as their own Calculation will not justify their Supposition, that *Cyrus* was the anointed Prince to be looked for at the End of *Seven Weeks*; so neither will it agree to their second *Messias*, *Judas Macca-beus*, supposed to be promised at the End of *Threescore and two Weeks* from the Prophecy of *Jeremiab*. For if you reckon *Threescore and two Weeks* of [or *Four hundred*
 dred

dred and thirty four] Years from the Date P A R T
of *Jeremiah's* Prophecy, it will not bring II.
you so low as the high Priesthood of *Judas*
Maccabeus by several Years. Till he was
High Priest he could not be called *Messias*,
or the Anointed of the LORD: And our
Adversary allows (1) the *Threescore and two*
Weeks ought to be reckoned to *Judas Mar-*
cabeus, when he was “supposed to have
“flourished in the Office of *High Priest.*”
Now according to *Harduin*, who is the Pa-
tron of this Hypothesis, from the Fourth
Year of *Jehoiakim* to the high Priesthood
of *Judas Maccabeus*, were *Sixty three Weeks*
of [or Four hundred forty one] Years.
This then is a palpable Inconsistency with
the Prophecy, according to their own In-
terpretation of it; and therefore it ought
to be rejected.

BESIDES it is evident past all Contra-
diction, that if a *Messias* was to be expect-
ed at the End of *Threescore and two Weeks*,
he was to appear in that Character before
the *Cutting off* of the *Messias* and the De-
struction of *Jerusalem* mentioned in the
following Verse: For it is said, *Unto the*
Messias the Prince shall be Seven Weeks and
Threescore and two Weeks. And AFTER
Threescore and two Weeks shall Messias be
cut off. And the People of the Prince that
shall come, shall destroy the City and Sanctu-
ary. But after Judas Maccabeus. was come
in

(1) Scheme, p. 180.

PART in the Character of *Messias*, or Anointed,
 II. there was no *Messias* cut off, no Destruction
 of the City and Sanctuary, but all this had
 happened before, and *Judas* being made
Higb Priest restored Things to their former
 State.

ON the other Hand, if you admit *Ju-
 das Maccabeus* to be the *Messias* promised
 at the End of *Sixty two Weeks*, then *Onias*
 could not be the *Messias* to be cut off af-
 terwards; because it is notorious and in-
 disputable, that *Onias* was cut off long
 before *Judas Maccabeus* was anointed, and
 appeared in the Character of a *Messias*.

AND for the self-same evident Reason
 the Ravages committed by *Antiochus Epi-
 phanes* at *Ferusalem*, could not be the De-
 struction threatened in this Prophecy: For
 that also was to happen *after* the Coming
 of the *Messias* supposed to be promised at
 the End of *Sixty two Weeks*. But if *Judas
 Maccabeus* was the Person there intended, the
 Ravages made by *Antiochus* at *Ferusalem*
 did not happen after, but before, he was
 anointed; and therefore this could not be
 the Destruction spoken of in the Pro-
 phesy.

IT is also evident from the Prophecy,
 that the Destruction threatened was not to
 happen within the *Seventy Weeks*, or Term
 fixt by GOD upon his People. That Term
 was fixt (as appears v. 24.) for the Per-
 formance

formance of GOD's good Purposes con- P A R T
cerning them; *To finish the Transgression,* II.
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. But our Adversaries have di-
rectly inverted this Order of Things, have
brought the Destruction threatned within
the Compass of Time limited for the Per-
formance of GOD's good Purposes, and
then pretend to tell you, how his good Pur-
poses were performed afterwards. Where-
as it is palpably evident from the Prophecy;
that their Destruction concludes the Scene,
and there is not the least Intimation given
of any farther good Purpose or Design
concerning them.

I THINK I have said more than enough
to expose the ridiculous Application of this
Prophecy to the Times of *Antiochus Epi-*
phanes; which of itself may serve to con-
fute itself, so inconsistent are the several
Parts of it, that to suppose the Truth of
one Part, necessarily infers the Falsity of
another. I shall now endeavour to justify
the Application of it to JESUS and his
Times against the Objections of our Ad-
versary; who says (*m*), "JESUS cannot
" be found here, without doing the utmost
" Violence to the *Text* in every Part."
I suppose he means the *utmost Violence* to
P F.

(*m*) Scheme, &c. p. 189.

PART II. *F. Harduin's* Interpretation of it. For his two first Objections are founded upon that *Jesuit's* chimerical Notion of *Seventy Weeks* enigmatically curtailed, and dated Seventy Years before the Prophecy was delivered. And if these may be called Objections they are already answered.

HE adds (n); “ Thirdly, the Matters
 “ to be accomplished within the Compass
 “ of the *Seventy Weeks*, viz. *to finish the*
 “ *Transgression*, &c. visibly relate to the
 “ setting up and Continuance of the *Jewish*
 “ State and Polity”. This is said *gratis*,
 and upon so little Grounds, that I believe
 he will be obliged to enlarge upon it and
 make it a little more *visible*, before his
 Readers will be able to see it. In my Opi-
 nion, these *Matters to be accomplished* do so
 exactly agree with those good Purposes,
 which CHRIST undertook to execute, and
 this has been so often proved already, that
 it would be impertinent to say more, till
 our Adversary has attempted to confute
 what has been already said, upon that Oc-
 casion.

HE urges (o); “ Fourthly, the *City and*
 “ *Sanctuary* were not *destroyed* by any Ar-
 “ my under JESUS.” True: And he
 knows very well, that according to his own
 Way of interpreting the Prophecy, there is
 no Occasion to suppose it; and therefore
 the

(n) Scheme, &c. p. 189. (o) p. 190.

the Inference he draws from it is a Self- P A R T
 contradiction. He adds (p), “ Nor can II.
 “ it relate to the *Destruction* of the City
 “ *and Sanctuary* by the *Romans*, Seven and
 “ thirty Years after *JESUS’s* Death; be-
 “ cause the *Seventy Weeks* must have been
 “ expired eight and twenty Years before
 “ that Time.” How does this follow? It
 is very plain from the Prophecy, that the
Seventy Weeks were not fixed for the Ruin
 of the *Jews*, but for the Performance of
 GOD’s gracious Purposes concerning them.
 He had himself mentioned, but a little be-
 fore, “ the Matters to be accomplished
 “ within the Compass of the Seventy
 “ Weeks”, among which there is nothing
 like *Destruction* hinted at: It is certain
 therefore the *Destruction* threatened was not
 to be expected, till the *Seventy Weeks* were
 expired. The Prophecy therefore does not
 fix a certain Time for it any otherwise, than
 by speaking of it as a Consequence of Cut-
 ting off the *MESSIAS*; it being intended
 as a Punishment of the *Jews* for that grie-
 vous Crime. And it happened Time enough
 for that Purpose; Time enough to fulfil
 that heavy Curse, which his Murderers cal-
 led upon themselves, *His Blood be upon us*
and upon our Children. This, instead of be-
 ing an Objection, I look upon as a great
 Confirmation to our Application of the
 Prophecy.

PART

II.


NEVERTHELESS he will persist (q),
 “ This Destruction in the Prophecy cannot
 “ be that *Destruction* by the *Romans*; be-
 “ cause the *Destruction* mentioned in the
 “ Prophecy was to be followed with *Ven-*
 “ *geance* on the *Destroyers* or *Desolators*,
 “ and a Restoration of the *Jewish Affairs*.”

To which I can only say, That the Prophecy speaks, neither of *Vengeance* on the one, nor of *Restoration* to the other. Nor does it say the *Destroyers* should *fix an Idol on the Battlement of the Temple*; - upon which Supposition he has raised another Objection. But why he should be offended, *because the Romans levelled the Temple to the Ground*, I know not; since by that Act they did most punctually fulfill that part of the Prophecy, which says, *They shall destroy the City and Sanctuary, and the End thereof shall be with a Flood*. Perhaps the true Reason of the Offence may be, That he would not this part of the Prophecy should be more properly fulfilled by the *Romans*, than it was by *Antiochus Epiphanes*.

HIS *Fifth* and *Sixth* Objections are (r), That *JESUS cannot be said to have confirmed the Covenant for one Week*; and *did not* cause the Sacrifice and Oblation to cease. To which I answer, That *JESUS did confirm the Covenant*, that Covenant he came to establish, in that *one* or last *Week* of

(q) Scheme, &c. p. 190.

(r) p. 191.

of the *Seventy*: And in the *half* of that PART
Week (for so it should be rendered) mean- II.
ing the latter part of it, he did by his 
Death annul and cause to cease the Ob-
ligation to *Sacrifice* and other legal *Ob-*
lations; as appears from *St. Paul*, who
says, he *blotted out the Hand-writing of Or-*
dinances, that was against us, which was con-
trary to us, and took it out of the Way, nail-
ing it to his Cross (s). Nor does *St. Paul's*
Adherence to the Jewish Ceremonies prove the
contrary, as our Adversary would suggest;
for he did it to avoid giving Offence to
the *Jews*, and not as one obliged to ob-
serve them; of which he makes a plain
Declaration to the *Corinthians*, saying (t),
To the Jews, I became as a Jew, that I
might gain the Jews. Causing a Law to
cease does not infer an intire Discontinuance
of the Action required by it. Thus much
we know by frequent Experience, that a
Practice may lawfully be continued, after
the Law requiring it is repealed.

It is objected (u), Seventhly, “ Those
“ who begin the *Weeks*, either from the
“ *Seventh* or the *Twentieth* of *Artaxerxes*
“ *Longimanus*, are obliged to understand
“ the *restoring and building of Jerusalem*
“ figuratively. For if these Words are to
“ be understood *literally* they can be appli-
“ cable to no other *restoring and building of*
P 3
Jeru-

(s) Colos. ii. 4.

(t) 1 Cor. ix. 20.

(u) Scheme, &c. p. 191.


PART II. “Jerusalem than that which was decreed
 II. “and commanded by Cyrus. But (x) a
 W “Computation of the *Seventy Weeks*, or
 “Four hundred and ninety Years, cannot
 “begin from the Date of Cyrus’s Decree.”
 Suppose the *Restoring and Building Jerusalem*
 be understood *figuratively*. It may be not-
 withstanding, according to his own Con-
 struction, *the Literal Sense*; (y) “Which
 “*literal* Sense may be signified as well,
 “and as obviously, by a figurative, as by
 “the most simple or *literal* Expression.”
 But I do not insist upon this. I say that
 all the *four* Decrees, that granted by Cyrus,
 that of *Darius*, and the *two* of *Artaxerxes*
Longimanus, did relate to the *Restoring and*
Building Jerusalem in the *strictly literal* Sense.
 The Decree of *Cyrus* related more immedi-
 ately to the Return of the People into
 their own Land, and to the Rebuilding of
 the Temple. The Decree of *Darius* con-
 firmed the Decree of *Cyrus*, and conse-
 quently related to the same Thing. The
 Decree granted in the *Seventh* Year of *Ar-*
taxerxes gave further Power to the People
 to return, as appears from the Copy of it,
 (z) *I make a Decree, that all they of the*
People of Israel, and of his Priests and Le-
vites in my Realm, which are minded of their
own free Will to go up to Jerusalem, go with
thee. This Decree likewise restored them
 to their ancient Constitution and Polity (a);
 which

(x) Scheme, p. 193. (y) p. 251.
 (z) Ezra vii. 13. (a) ver. 25.


which is in the most proper Sense a Re- P A R T
 storing of a People and City. By Vertue II.
 of all these Decrees it must be supposed
 they went on rebuilding *Jerusalem*; for send-
 ing a People back to their own Habitation,
 is allowing them to rebuild it; and this
 Work we know was finished by Vertue of
 the last Decree, granted in the *Twentieth*
 Year of *Artaxerxes*. Therefore every one
 of the *Four* Decrees may very strictly and
 properly be called a *Commandment to restore*
and rebuild Jerusalem: Consequently, if the
 Computation will hold good from any one
 of these Decrees; (for the Prophecy itself
 does not determine which of the *Four* was
 intended;) then our Application of this
 Prophecy will be *literal*, just and proper.
 And I say it does hold good, reckoning
 from that granted in the *Seventh* Year of
Artaxerxes Longimanus.

BUT it is objected *Tenthly* (c), That the
Artaxerxes who granted this Decree was not
Artaxerxes Longimanus, but another *Artax-*
erxes, Cotemporary with *Darius*, who grant-
 ed the second Decree. This is another Chi-
 mera of *F. Harduin*; who supposes, purely
 upon the Strength of his own Imagination,
 That the Empire of the East, upon the
 Death of *Cyrus* was divided; of which he
 pretends *Darius* had *Media* only, and at the
 same Time one *Artaxerxes* had *Persia* and
Chaldea; and that this *Artaxerxes* granted
 P 4 the

(c) Scheme, p. 193.

PART the Decree to *Ezra*. I could load this Hypothesis with Absurdities; but I do not think it worth while. He that believes it, —
 II.  Let him believe it.

THE *Eighth*, *Ninth*, and *Eleventh* Objections, affect only a particular Hypothesis, which I do not think myself obliged to defend: And the *Twelfth* has been already answered in the Remarks upon the *Fourth*. I have therefore nothing more to do, than to obviate an Objection, which may arise from a Concession I have made, That the Prophecy itself did not strictly determine which of the *Four* Decrees was intended; because they all tended to serve the Purpose mentioned in it, of *Restoring and Building Jerusalem*. From whence it may be argued, That a Person, living before the Completion of the Prophecy, must have been under great Uncertainty in his Computation of the *Seventy Weeks* not knowing which of the four Decrees to reckon from. But allowing the greatest Uncertainty imaginable in this Respect; yet thus much was certain, That the *Seventy Weeks* could not commence *before the first*, nor *after the last* Decree. It was also certain, That the *Jews* were to reckon *Seven and Sixty-two Weeks* of [or *Four hundred eighty-three*] Years from the Decree intended, to the Coming of the MESSIAS. In Consequence whereof it was also certain, reckoning even from the *first* Decree granted by *Cyrus* in the Year of the *Julian Period* 4178, That the MESSIAS could

could not be expected before the Year of P A R T
 the *Julian Period* 4661. And so likewise II.
 reckoning from the *last Decree*, granted 
 by *Artaxerxes* in the Year of the *Julian*
Period 4269, it was certain, That the
 MESSIAS was to come, and to be cut off
 within *Seventy Weeks* of [or *Four hundred*
and ninety] Years, which must be before the
 Year of the *Julian Period* 4759.

ALLOWING therefore, That they who
 lived before the Completion of the Prophe-
 cy, were under the greatest Uncertainty
 imaginable in determining, which of the *Four*
Decrees was intended by it; yet this they
 might certainly have gathered from it, That
 MESSIAS should come and be cut off; be-
 tween the Year ————— 4661
 and the Year ————— 4759.
 So that the Prophecy evidently limited his
 Coming, and being cut off to the Compass
 of *Ninety-eight Years*. In which Compass
 of Time, there did arise among the *Jews*
 a *most Holy Person*, under the Character of
 their MESSIAS, who was also cut off by
 Violence. The professed Design of his Ap-
 pearance was, *To make Reconciliation for Ini-*
quity, and to bring in everlasting Righteous-
ness: And to justify himself in this Under-
 taking, he gave them all (and more than)
 the usual Signs of a Divine Commission.
 So that the *Jews* must be inexcusable in re-
 jecting a Person, so extraordinary and un-
 exceptionable, who came to them within a
 certain Compass of Time, fixed upon by an
 ancient

PART ancient Prophecy delivered above Five hundred Years before.

II.

AND if this Matter be considered attentively, it will appear, that the Prophecy need not have been more determinate in Point of Time, to satisfy any reasonable Person. For in this latitude of Construction, which is not subject to any Cavil or Exception, it would necessarily have led him to fix upon CHRIST and him only, as the promised MESSIAS. Indeed, had there been nothing extraordinary in the Person, who claimed the Character; had Two or more appeared within that Compass of Time, with Pretensions equal, or very near alike, to the same Character; then a more strict Limitation of Time would have been necessary. But the Prophecy having clearly pointed out a certain Period of Time, wherein a Person of unsuspected Character did appear, countenanced by extraordinary Means, and taking the proper Methods to accomplish the Purposes of the Prophecy, and no Pretence being made of any other Person appearing in that Time for those Purposes; upon these Considerations I say, The Prophecy taken in the Latitude I have mentioned (and in a greater Latitude it could not be taken) was determinate enough to convince Men, that JESUS must, and that no one else could be, the MESSIAS signified by it.

S E C T.

SECT. VII.



THERE yet remains one Circumstance to be considered, relating to the grand Affair, the Conversion of the *Gentile* World; whether it was to be brought about upon the Foot of the *Mosaic* Institution; or whether a *new* Law and Institution of Religion was to be expected for that Purpose. The latter, if it had never been revealed, should have seemed most probable: Because the *Mosaic* Law was adapted to the particular Circumstances of the *Israelites*, considered as a separate People, and was given with Design to keep them separate from the *Gentile* World, during their corrupt, idolatrous State; the Continuance therefore of such a Law should seem unreasonable, when the *Gentiles* also were to be taken into Covenant with God, and made Partakers with them of the same common Blessings. This is also confirmed by several of the Prophecies already considered, which speak of that great Event, as the Effect of a Law to go forth out of Zion, and say, that the Person to be employed for that Purpose, should be for a Covenant of the People, that God would make an everlasting Covenant by him, and that the *Isles* should wait for his Law.

BUT the Prophecy of *Jeremiab* (Chap. xxxi. 31, 32.) determines this Matter beyond

PART yond Dispute, declaring in this clear positive manner: *Behold the Days come, saith the LORD, that 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, in the Day that I took them by the Hand to bring them out of the Land of Egypt, which my Covenant they brake, although I was an Husband unto them, saith the LORD.* The Application of this Prophecy to our Purpose is so very obvious and intelligible, and I have already said so much in Defence of it (c) in a Discourse on this Subject, which has yet met with no Reply, that I need say no more at present, either to explain it, or to justify the Use we make of it.

ANOTHER Prophecy to the same Effect is that of *Deut. xviii. 15, &c.* Where *Moses* saith, *The LORD thy GOD will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy GOD in Horeb, in the Day of the Assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the Voice of the LORD my GOD; neither let me see this great Fire any more, that I die not. And the LORD said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. 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

(c) Serm. V.

unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not bearken unto my Words which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him. These Words were understood by St. Peter (*d*) as a Prophecy concerning CHRIST our Lord; and this Application of them I endeavoured to justify (*e*), as founded upon the true Sense and Interpretation of the Place. Others however have understood them, as spoken and intended of a *Succession of Prophets*, to be raised up among the *Jews* after *Moses*. This Sense has been insisted on by the Author of *Grounds*, &c. and is still insisted on in *Scheme*, and with much greater Shew of Argument and Reasoning, than he has bestowed upon any one Prophecy besides. I must therefore beg the Reader's Patience, while I examine his Arguments distinctly, and endeavour to confute them.

I WAS very sensible, when I first wrote on this Subject, that a great deal of Trash had been raked together, to expose, rather than to explain, the Passage in Dispute. But I was not willing to re-publish it to the World, partly from a Persuasion that it did not need a Confutation; and partly with Hopes, that a solid Defence of the true Meaning of the Passage would suffice to discountenance all that idle Stuff, which I thought had been intended for Snear, rather than

(*d*) Acts iii. 22.(*e*) Sermon at *Norwich*.

PART II. than for Argument. But seeing it still insisted on as material, pressed again and again with a great deal of Confidence, as expressing the true Intent of the Prophecy; I will lay it before my Reader, as it is urged by the Author of *Grounds and Scheme*: Not doubting but I shall make it appear, that this Gentleman has overshot the Mark, and exposed that Sense of the Passage, which he contends for, to such a Degree, that the *literal* Interpretation of it will appear to be, not only more eligible, but also unquestionable.

THE Author of *Scheme*, in Case the Application of *this Prophecy* to a *Succession of Prophets* should fail, hath it seems made a prudent Reserve of another, which will equally serve his Purpose. Thus he begins his Dissertation upon the Passage in Dispute, (f) “ These Words are supposed by many
 “ Learned Men, *Jews* and *Christians*, to
 “ be spoken of *Joshua*: — Others under-
 “ stand them to be a Promise of a Suc-
 “ cession of Prophets. — And one or o-
 “ ther of these seems plain to me to be
 “ the certain Meaning of the Place.” An odd Expression from one that seems divided between two inconsistent Interpretations: For to the Degree that *one* is *probable* or *certain*, the *other* must be *uncertain* and *improbable*. But why one of these two Interpretations rather than any other? “ From
 “ this

(f) *Scheme*, p. 238.

“ this Consideration, that *Moses* is giving P A R T
 “ the *Jews* Directions of immediate Use, — II.
 “ and therefore — must intend an imme-
 “ diate Prophet.” I refer the Reader to
 the last Direction given by *Moses* in the
preceding Chapter, ver. 14, &c. concerning
 a King, and leave him to judge of the
 Weight of this Argument.

HOWEVER he is not so equally divided
 between those two *plain, certain* Interpreta-
 tions, but that he is able to make a Choice,
 and has offered his Reasons for applying it
 to a *Succession of Prophets* (g). Where, he
 takes it for granted, That there is a *Con-*
nexion between the *Prophecy* in Dispute, and
 a preceding *Prohibition* against hearkening
 to *Diviners* and *Enchanters*, &c; and that
 “ the raising up a Prophet, to whom the
 “ *Jews* should hearken, is the Reason gi-
 “ ven, why the *Jews* should not hearken
 “ to Diviners ” (h). From whence he ar-
 gues, That not only an *immediate Prophet*,
 but also a *Succession of Prophets*, was in-
 tended; (i) because “ one single Prophet
 “ to be raised up immediately who might
 “ soon die, could not be a Reason, why
 “ the *Jews* should not hearken to Divi-
 “ ners.” Upon this Supposition much is
 said to shew the Clearness of his Interpre-
 tation, and the Absurdity of the contrary:
 But not a Word to prove this *supposed Con-*
nexion,

(g) Scheme, p. 241.

(h) p. 242.

(i) p. 243.

PART *nexion*, as if it were indisputable. Where-
 II. as he could not be ignorant, that they,
 who *urge this Prophecy, as relating literally*
 to JESUS, allow of no such Connexion,
 and would expect some Proof before they
 admitted it. I say therefore, the Supposi-
 tion, upon which this Argument is found-
 ed, not only wants to be proved, but far-
 ther it is intirely groundless. Is there any
connecting Particle, which might lead a Man
 to expect, or look for some Connexion be-
 tween the *Prohibition* and the *Prophecy*? as
 our Author would insinuate by his Expla-
 nation, (k) “ Do not hearken to a Divi-
 “ ner: FOR the LORD will give you a
 “ Prophet.” Where of his own Head he
 has thrust in a connecting Particle, and
 then laughs at the Absurdity of their In-
 terpretation, who allow of no such Con-
 nexion, nor can find any Shadow of a Rea-
 son for supposing any. Is the whole Book
 of *Deuteronomy* such a continued Discourse,
 that no one Passage besides this can be
 found, which has not some Relation to,
 or Connexion with what goes before it? So
 far from it, that Transitions from one Sub-
 ject to another are most frequent. Is the
Prohibition relating to *Diviners* imperfect,
 taken separately from the Prophecy in Dis-
 pute? No. You find the same Prohibition,
Lev. xix. 26. and again, *ver. 31.* without
 any Mention or Intimation given of any
 Prophet to supply their Place. Lastly, if

(k) Scheme, p. 242.

a Reason were necessary to inforce the *Prohibition*, there are the strongest Reasons imaginable to inforce it, taken seperately from the subsequent Prophecy, *viz.* That the *Thing prohibited* was notoriously wicked in itself, *an Abomination to the LORD*; that for such *Abominations he drove out the Canaanites before them*, and would *not suffer them so to do.* After such Reasons as these, need we to look for more? Or does it become a fair Interpreter, where both Passages are perfect and intire taken seperately, to screw them together by forceably applying a connecting Particle, in such a needless Case?

BUT this is not all. The Text itself must be tortured to countenance this supposed Connexion. Take the Words in their plain and obvious Sense, they will not admit of such a Connexion; and you must admit their Interpretation to be true, before there will be any Colour for it. The *Scheme* shews you the Absurdity over and over again of reading them in Connexion, if you put any Sense upon them different from his own; consequently nothing but his Interpretation will support the Supposition of a Connexion. And is not this a monstrous Way of Reasoning, to prove an Interpretation by a supposed Connexion, which Connexion has nothing to support it, but the Supposition of the Truth of that Interpretation? See now, in what this mighty Argument, upon which there is so much Triumph, upon which we

Q

are

PART are ridiculed, as taking independent Passages
 II. for Sound-fake without Regard to the Con-
 W text, ends! Why truly, if his Interpretation
 be just there is a Connexion; and if there be
 a Connexion his Interpretation must be true.
 If he would first shew me the Necessity of
 such Connexion and from thence infer the
 Truth of his Interpretation; or if he would
 shew me the Necessity of his Interpretation
 and from thence infer a Connexion, I should
 hearken to him. Till one of these be prov-
 ed independently of the other, the Passages
 must stand, in the Condition the Writer has
 left them, unconnected; it is not in the
 Breast of every Interpreter to thrust in a
connecting Particle, as he pleases. The Con-
 nexion must first be proved, to make the
 one Passage a Guide to us in the Interpre-
 tation of the other. Nothing like this has
 been attempted, and therefore we look up-
 on all Arguments drawn from thence as fri-
 volous and impertinent.

I PROCEED therefore to the Arguments
 drawn from the subsequent Context, to
 prove that the *Prophet to be raised up* must
 be understood of a *Succession of Prophets*.
 There we allow a *Connexion*, the proper
connecting Particles are to be met with, and
 a Reader of an ordinary Capacity may per-
 ceive, that from *ver. 15.* to the *End* is a
 Continuation of the same Subject. Where-
 upon our Author observes, That “the
 “ Rule laid down for the Tryal of the
 “ *promised Prophet is such*, as implies a
 “ Succession

“ Succession of Prophets was intended ” (l). P A R T II.
 He does not go about to prove this himself, but refers you to *Stillingfleet*: who says, (m) “ The Charge which follows against false Prophets, and the Rules to discover them — had not been so pertinent and coherent, if the Opposition did not lie between the Order of true Prophets, and the false Prophets which should rise up amongst them. ” It is past my Reach to find out this Incoherence. The subsequent Words are a Caution against false Prophets, and there is a Rule given for the Discovery of them. What then? If only one Prophet had been promised, might not many false Prophets arise notwithstanding? And if so, was not a Caution to guard against them necessary? And was it not very proper to give Rules for the Discovery of them? Where then is the Incoherence?

QUESTIONING the Strength of this Argument, to prove, that a Succession of Prophets was intended, the Author of *Scheme* urges, (n) That “ still JESUS will be excluded by [the subsequent Words] from being the Prophet intended. ” Why? “ Because he could not possibly be subject to Death for speaking in the Name of GOD what GOD had not commanded him to speak, or for speaking in the
 Q 2 “ Name

(l) *Scheme*, p. 243.
 Sacrae, l. 2. c. 4.

(m) *Stillingfleet's Orig.*
 (n) *Scheme*, p. 244.

PART II. “ Name of other Gods, and consequently, could not have this Rule laid down for him.” It is true, He could not possibly be subject to Death for the beforementioned Reasons, neither could the *Prophet promised*, nor any Prophet, who, having *Words put into his Mouth* by GOD, *speaks all that GOD commanded him*. But false Prophets might arise, speaking what GOD had not commanded, and speaking in the Name of other Gods; and a Caution to guard against, and a Rule to discover such, might be very requisite. What then could the Author mean by this Objection? What nobody else, I believe, ever meant or thought of besides himself; That the Caution given at the 20th *Verse*, is not against a *false Prophet* in Contradistinction to the *true*, spoken of in the *preceding Verses*, (upon which Supposition his last-cited Objection from *Stillingfleet* is founded) but that it respects the same true Prophet promised, whom he supposes capable of speaking in GOD’s Name what GOD had not commanded; nay, and of speaking in the Name of other Gods. As fond as our Author seems to be of this Argument, which he has thrice repeated, I should think it an Affront to my Reader to offer him a Confutation of it; I will therefore leave it, as I found it, to convince whom it can.

HAVING cleared the *Context* from favouring their Interpretation, who maintain, That by the *Prophet to be raised up*, is meant

meant a *Succession of Prophets*, I shall proceed to the Consideration of some other Arguments (o); the Substance whereof, I think, may be comprized under these two Propositions: That *it was requisite the Jews should have a Succession of Prophets to supply the Place of, and to answer the Purposes for which Application was usually made to, Diviners, &c. among the Heathen.* And, That *they actually had a Succession of such Prophets.* To which I answer, That if both these Allegations were true, it would not follow, that the Passage in Dispute was a Promise thereof. For Passages of Scripture must be explained by themselves and their *Context*, and not by what Men think GOD should, or might truly, have said instead thereof.

HOWEVER, upon Inquiry it will appear, that neither of these Allegations are true in the Sense intended. It was not *proper* or *necessary* that GOD should raise up a *Succession of Prophets* to serve those Purposes, for which *Diviners* were applied to. Allow, *the Jews by living among the Egyptians, extremely addicted to Enchantments, &c. were grown fond of these sublime Sciences:* Was it proper or fit they should be indulged in every Thing they grew fond of? They were notoriously fond of visible Gods, and of having the Object of their Worship represented by Idols; and for the same Reason

Q 3

son

(o) Scheme, p. 244.

PART II. son GOD should have prevented *Jeroboam's* Scheme, and allowed them some Idol-representation of himself, before that wicked King set up Calves at *Bethel*. The consulting Wizards and Inchanters, was a Thing wicked in itself, an *Abomination to the LORD*, who to discourage them from doing the like, told them, *For these Abominations the LORD thy GOD doth drive the Canaanites out before thee*, adding; *The LORD thy GOD hath not suffered thee so to do*. This was Reason sufficient, why they should not hearken to Diviners; “It is an Abomination to the LORD; do it at your peril of suffering in the same manner as the *Canaanites* did, whom GOD drove out before you because of such Abominations.” And yet, as if the going to Enchanters were lawful in itself, as if GOD in prohibiting it had debarred the *Jews* of some innocent Privilege, for which it was proper and equitable to make them Satisfaction in some other Way; a farther Reason must be squeezed out of the following Words, and a Promise wrested from them, That GOD, in Recompence, would raise them up a *Succession of Prophets*, with full Power to do from him, what *Heathen Diviners* pretended to do by *Art Magick*.

I SHOULD not have thought an Argument of this Kind worth Notice, if it had not been first used by *Origen*, and afterwards cited by *Stillingfleet* out of *Origen*, for the


the same Purpose. *If, says he (p), while P A R T
other Nations had Persons among them, who II.
foretold what was to come by the Flight and
Singing of Birds, &c. the Jews, (who had in
common with others a Curiosity to know fu-
ture Matters) had been forbid to take the be-
forementioned Methods, and had no Methods
of their own to be acquainted with Matters to
come, they would immediately have entertain-
ed mean Thoughts of their own Religion, &c.*
I will not dispute the Curiosity of the *Jews*,
nor disallow the ill Consequences that Cu-
riosity tended to, mentioned by *Origen*.
Nay, I acknowledge it to be Fact, That
their extravagant Curiosity did actually be-
tray them into those very Consequences,
To prefer *Pagan*, to their own Religion,
to have Recourse to *Heathen* Oracles, to
endeavour to establish such Oracles among
themselves, and to slight the Prophets after
Moses, because they did not undertake to
satisfy their Curiosity in the same manner
that *Heathen* Oracles and Diviners did. But
will any one therefore dare to assert, That
such Curiosity ought to be satisfied; that
Men, who have not Persons among them
inspired by GOD for that Purpose, may go
to Wizards; that, if the *Jews* had not a
constant Succession of such Men, *their own
Law warranted the Violation of its own Or-
dinances; and the abandoning the Service of
GOD, for the Worship of the Deities of foreign
Nations?* Where does it warrant them? In
the

Q 4

PART II. the disputed Passage before us? That is begging the Question, and for a Purpose, which will convince any rational Man, that their Interpretation of it is not a true one. But if it be not so, *How*, says Origen, could any that were zealous for the Jewish Law, reprove those that consulted Heathen Oracles; as we read *Elijah* did *Ahaziah*, saying, *Is it because there is not a GOD in Israel, that ye go to enquire of Baal-Zebub the God of Ekron? How? Monstrous Question! Do I need to answer it? Because it was abominably wicked in itself; because it had been as plainly and peremptorily forbidden by GOD, as any thing possibly could be upon peril of utter Extirpation; because it was a notorious Contradiction to the first Commandment, subverted the very Foundation of the the Jewish Religion, and could not be committed by one, that had any Regard to the GOD of Israel.*

THE Author of *Scheme*, urges on this Head (q), That *Elijah* voluntarily took upon himself the very Business of telling the Fate or Fortune of *Ahaziah*, in order, as it seems, to prevent Application to foreign Deities or Diviners about such Matters. True: He did tell *Ahaziah's* Fate, and did it to prevent Application to foreign Deities and Diviners; but not by Way of Encouragement to expect, that every Inquirer might have such Questions answered by him, or succeeding Prophets,

(q) *Scheme*, &c. p. 259.

Prophets ; but by way of absolute Discou- P A R T
 ragement from applying to *Heathen Ora-* II.
 cles on any Pretence whatsoever. *Abaziah's* 
 Fate is told, as the Consequence of his
 Sin in making such Application ; he is
 threatned with Death by way of Punish-
 ment for it, *Therefore thou shalt not come*
down from that Bed on which thou art gone
up, but shalt surely die, 2 Kings i. 6, 16.
 There is nothing in all this, but what a-
 grees with the *Prohibition* given by *Moses*
 against hearkening to Diviners, &c. *Deut.*
xviii. 9—14. taken separately from the sub-
 sequent Prophecy. Upon the Whole, you
 may as well argue, That it was *proper* and
necessary, GOD should allow the *Jews* some
 Emblematical Representation of himself, as
 that he should raise up a *Succession of Pro-*
phets to supply the Place of, and serve the
 Purposes for which Application was made
 to, *Heathen Diviners.*

BUT it is alledged, That the *Jews* ac-
 tually had “ a Succession of Prophets in
 “ Analogy to Heathen Diviners, who shew-
 “ ed their Inspiration in the Discovery of
 “ lost Goods, and in telling Fortunes,
 “ whereby the meanest Person in *Judea* had
 “ the Opportunity of having this Miracle
 “ wrought for him, whenever he had Occa-
 “ sion (r). The Difference between a Jewish
 “ Prophet and a Diviner *consisting in this.*
 “ The one supposed to be inspired, or to have
 “ Words

(r) *Grounds, &c.* p. 28.

PART II. “ Words put into his Mouth by GOD, the
 “ other to speak without Inspiration, either
 “ by some Dealings with familiar Spirits, or
 “ by magick Art (s). ” I hope the Reader
 will keep in mind this Explanation of the
 Word *Prophet*: For our Inquiry now is,
 Whether the *Jews* had a *Succession of Pro-*
phets, according to this Explanation of the
 Word; and nothing but a *Succession of*
such Prophets, will give any Countenance to
 the Supposition of a *Connexion* between the
Prophecy in dispute, and the preceding *Pro-*
hibition against hearkening to Diviners. Now
 in this Sense of the Word, I say, they were
 so far from having a *Succession of Prophets*,
 that they had no *such* Prophet. Where is
 that credulous Unbeliever, that will assert,
 that *Moses* served the Children of *Israel* in
 this Capacity of satisfying the Curiosity of
 every idle Inquirer, where he might find
 his *lost Goods*, or what remarkable Turns
 he should meet with, as a private Man, in
 future Life? All the Days of *Joshua*, who
 succeeded *Moses* as Governor and Leader of
 the Children of *Israel*, we read of no Prophet.
 And if he be reckoned first in the *Succe-*
ssion of Prophets, what Man of any Can-
 dour or Ingenuity can find the least Grounds
 to suspect, that he ever *told* any Person his
Fortune? Till a Hundred Years after his
 Death we read of no Prophet. About
 which Time *Deborah* arose, who foretold
 the Victory of the Children of *Israel* over
Jabin's

(s) Scheme, &c. p. 258.

Jabin's Army. But who ever imagined, P A R T
 that *the Children of Israel*, who *came up to* II.
her for Judgment, consulted her at any time
 about *lost Goods*, and where they should find
 them? After her, we read of a Prophet sent
 to reprove the People for their Backsliding
 and Ingratitude to GOD: And on this Ac-
 count he has the Title of a Prophet, though
 his Message had no Relation to Things fu-
 ture. In short, from *Moses* down to *Samuel*,
 you have not a single Instance, which gives
 the least Colour to suspect, that the *Jews*
 had any Prophet, much less a *Succession of*
Prophets, who undertook to answer Que-
 stions relating to the private Circumstances
 and Fortunes of Men.

AND indeed, the first Instance alledged
 for this Purpose, is that of *Saul* applying
 himself to *Samuel* about his Father's Asses
 that were lost; which you may plainly see
 was ordered by Providence to forward an
 Event of great Importance to the whole
 Nation, 1 *Sam.* ix. 16. The LORD told
Samuel, *To Morrow about this Time I WILL*
SEND thee a Man out of the Land of Benja-
min, and thou shalt anoint him to be Captain
over my People Israel. Both the other In-
 stances, 1 *Kings* xiv. 2, &c. 2 *Kings* viii.
 8, &c. appear to be of the same Kind,
 ordered by Providence to give his Pro-
 phets an Opportunity of foretelling to pro-
 per Persons Things of much higher Impor-
 tance, than what the Messengers came to
 the Prophets about. So that in about Six
 hundred

PART II. hundred Years, you have three single Instances, not of Prophets who made it their Business, as *Wizards* and *Fortune-tellers* did, to tell every idle Inquirer what should befall him in private Life; but one single Instance of each of those Prophets speaking to a Question of private Concern, when Purposes of a much more important Nature were evidently intended by Providence to be served thereby. And from these it is inferr'd, “ That the *Jews* had a *continued* “ *Succession of Propbets* in Analogy to *Hea-* “ *then Diviners*, who shew'd their Inspira- “ tion in the Discovery of *lost Goods*, and “ in *telling Fortunes*: Whereby the mean- “ est Person in *Judea* had the Opportunity “ of having this Miracle wrought for him, “ whenever he had Occasion.” This is Matter of Fact, the Proof whereof lies upon him that has asserted it. The Reader sees the Proof that is offered: If he think those three Instances are sufficient to prove, That the *Jews* had a *Succession of Prophets* in Analogy to *Heatben Diviners*; that Persons of all Ranks had thereby an Opportunity of having their *Fortunes told*, or *lost Goods discovered*; and that this Practice was so common among them, as to become an *indisputed Matter of Fact*; he has my free Leave to think with our Author, I will not pretend to dispute with, or to convince him.

I HAD almost overlooked one Argument, to prove a constant Succession of *in-*
spired

spired Fortune-tellers among the *Jews*. But I could not have failed my Reader in a Case, where he has less Occasion of Assistance, unless it be to understand upon what Grounds the Argument is framed. God in reprov-
 ing the idolatrous Disposition of his People by the Prophet *Isaiab*, puts them in Mind of the great Things he had done for them; with this Circumstance, to convince them they were done by him, and not by any strange Gods, because he had foretold them, and they came to pass accordingly: (t) *I have even from the Beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I shewed it thee: Lest thou shouldst say, Mine Idol hath done them, and my graven Image and my molten Image hath commanded them.* “Which
 “Words (u), says our Author, not only
 “imply, that the Business of the *Diviners*
 “among the *Heathen* and of the *Prophets*
 “among the *Jews* was much the same;
 “but also that the *Prophets* were raised up
 “in *Israel* to supply the Place of *Diviners*.”
 Now he that can find any thing relating to *Diviners*, or their Office in this Passage, has a Skill in discovering Scripture-meanings, which I cannot envy, because I do not understand it.

PART
 II.
 ~~~~~

THE judicious Reader perhaps will ask, Why in this Case the Author of *Grounds and Scheme* has so far out-stretched his Authorities? For not content to hold with  
*Stillingfleet*

(t) Isa. xlviii. 5.

(u) Scheme, p. 259.

PART II. *Stillingfleet* and *Grotius*, that the *Jews* had a constant Succession of Prophets, he ventures to take a large Step, and roundly asserts, That the great Employment of these Prophets was, to serve all those Purposes, for which Application was usually made to *Wizards* and *Fortune-tellers*. *Stillingfleet* gives us a quite different Account of them, (x) “ Their Work was to inform the People of their Duties, or to reprove them for their Sins, or to prepare them for the Coming of the MESSIAS. For the primary Notion of a *Prophet* doth not lie in foretelling future Events, but in declaring and interpreting to the World the Mind of GOD, which he receives by immediate Revelation. And from hence it is in Scripture that the *Patriarchs*, as *Abraham* and others, are called *Prophets*, not because of any Predictions uttered by them, but because of the Frequency of immediate divine Revelations among them. (y) ”

HERE is a wide Difference between our Author and his Authorities in their Notion of the Word *Prophet*: And the Reason for it will appear very plain, when it is observed, that any other Sense of the Word, besides that new invented one he has given us, will not serve the present Purpose. For they, who interpret the Passage in Dispute of a *Succession of Prophets*, are very sensible their great Strength lies, in a supposed Connexion

(x) Orig. Sacræ, l. 2. c. 4.

(y) Ib. c. 5.



nexion between it and the preceding *Prohibition* against hearkening to *Diviners*. But in *Stillingfleet's* Sense of the Word, what Connexion can there be? Could any thing be more ridiculous than to say, Do not hearken to *Wizards* and *Fortune-tellers*; for I will give you a Set of Men whose Employment it shall be “to inform you of your Duties, to reprove you for your Sins, and to prepare you for the Coming of the MESSIAS?” What Recompence could this be to inquisitive People debarred the Privilege of consulting *Soothsayers* and *Conjurers*? Or how could *Societies* established for *Spiritual Instruction* satisfy the Curiosity of a People grown fond of *Egyptian Enchantments*, and desiring continually to be informed, what should befall them in future Life?

OUR Author foreseeing this insuperable Difficulty, with which their main Argument would be embarrassed, unless he could find out another-guise Employment for his *Jewish* Prophets, has ventured with a modest Assurance to tell you, That they had a *Succession of Prophets of their own, to answer their Exigences*, and so qualified, that they need not to go to *Diviners*, when they wanted to have their *Fortunes told* or *lost Goods discovered*: For that even the *meanest Person* in *Judea* by Application to these Prophets, had the Opportunity of having this Miracle wrought for him, whenever he had Occasion, and the doing of it became a common *indisputed*



PART *undisputed Matter of Fact.* What Truth  
 II. there is in this, let the Reader judge. I  
 will however do the Author this Justice  
 to acknowledge, That if a Connexion must  
 be found out between the Prophecy in  
 Dispute and the preceding *Prohibition* a-  
 gainst hearkening to *Diviners*, he has IN-  
 VENTED an Interpretation, which alone  
 can suit the Purpose; but how he will be  
 able to support that Invention is his Con-  
 cern, not mine.

THEY to whom the Prophecy was spo-  
 ken could not understand it in this Sense:  
 For *Moses* never served the *Jews* in the  
 Capacity of a *Fortuneteller*, the People ne-  
 ver applied to him for the Discovery of  
 lost Goods, or to have their Fortunes told.  
 Whatever he foretold was of publick  
 Concern, and that not to satisfy the Cu-  
 riosity of People prying into the future  
 State of their public Affairs, but to in-  
 force Obedience to the Laws he gave them,  
 by Promises of future Blessings and Suc-  
 cess in Case of Obedience, and by Threat-  
 nings of the contrary in Case of Disobe-  
 dience. Those *Jews* therefore who had seen  
 and been acquainted with *Moses's* Conduct  
 could never imagine, that the Promise of  
 a *Prophet like to Moses* should signify a  
*Succession of Prophets*, to serve those Pur-  
 poses for which Application was usually  
 made to *Diviners* and *Fortune-tellers*, which  
 Purposes he had never served, nor given  
 any Countenance to. And if they could  
 have

have been so absurd as to imagine, that a *Prophet like to Moses* signified a Character which *Moses* never took upon him, never in any one single Instance pretended to; yet the Event must inevitably have convinced *them* and the succeeding *Jews* of their Mistake. For Three hundred Years after *Moses* did not produce one Prophet pretending to such a Character, not one Instance of any Person applying to a Prophet in those Days, for the *Discovery of lost Goods*, or for any of those Purposes for which Application used to be made to *Enchanters*, and *Wizards*, and *Diviners*; nor is any the least Intimation given, that the Prophets pretended to, or that the People expected such Services from them.

THUS much Ground therefore we have unquestionably got of our Opponents, That the Passage in Dispute cannot be understood of a Succession of *such* Prophets, as our Author speaks of; because *Moses* was no such Prophet, neither his immediate Successors; which both He and They must have been, according to that Interpretation. On the other hand, if you take *Stillingfleet's* Sense of the Word *Prophet*, then there cannot be any Connexion between the Passage in Dispute, and the preceding Prohibition against hearkening to Diviners, &c. the Supposition thereof is perfectly ridiculous, and consequently his Argument founded upon that Supposition, is totally groundless.

PART  
II.

THE only remaining Argument in *Stillingfleet* or *Scheme*, why the Passage in Dispute should be understood of a *Succession of Prophets*, amounts to no more than this; They both are at a Loss for a Text to serve an Hypothesis; from whence they conclude they have a Right to press this into their Service. “ There is (says *Stillingfleet* (z) no  
 “ other Place in the whole *Pentateuch*,  
 “ which doth expressly speak of a Succession of Prophets, if this be not understood of it.” For the self-same Reason, this ought not, any more than other Passages, to be so understood; because it is far from speaking *expressly* of a Succession. “ But, says *Stillingfleet*, it is improbable a Matter of such Consequence, should be wholly pretermitted, when we find it so exactly performed in the succeeding Ages of the *Jewish* Commonwealth, their immediate Rulers after *Moses*, like Dictators at *Rome*, being most raised up by immediate Incitation,—— and many of them inspired with a Spirit of Prophecy,—— and how should the *Jews* have expected or obeyed them, had not GOD foretold it to them. How fruitful of Meanings is this Word *Prophet*! All Offices and Employments, even those of the Camp and the Court not excepted, are comprehended by it. If the *Jews* wanted to know by what Commission

(z) *Origines sacrae*, Lib. II. cap. iv.

mission their *Generals* acted in the Field, PART  
 or by what Authority their *Judges* inter- II.  
 posed in Civil Affairs; this useful *Text*,  
*A Prophet shall the LORD your GOD raise*  
*up unto you*, gave them present Satisfaction.  
 If it should be urged, That these *Dictators*  
 of the *Jewish* Commonwealth, were not  
 only Rulers, but Prophets too, like *Moses*,  
 whereupon the Application of the Prophecy  
 to those Rulers is founded: I answer, That  
*Stillingfleet* himself supposes the contrary;  
 he will not allow that all, though he says,  
 “many of them were inspired with a Spirit of  
 “Prophecy.” Nor is this said truly. For out  
 of Fourteen that are said to have governed  
*Israel*, for the Space of Three hundred Years  
 after *Moses*, there is not the least Pretence,  
 that more than Three of them, *Joshua*,  
*Deborah* and *Gideon*, had a Spirit of Prophe-  
 cy. Therefore when *Stillingfleet* asks, “How  
 “should the *Jews* have expected these, or  
 “obeyed them when they appeared?” We  
 may safely answer, That if they *expected* them  
 by Vertue of *this Prophecy*, they were dis-  
 appointed; and if they *obeyed* them for that  
 Reason, they did it upon a wrong Foun-  
 dation. However, thus far I will allow,  
 That the self-same Reason, which is here  
 given, why the Passage in Dispute ought to  
 be interpreted of a *Succession of Prophets*, is  
 equally a Reason, why it ought to be in-  
 terpreted of a *Succession of Rulers and Dic-*  
*tators* in the Commonwealth; *viz. Because*  
*there is no other Passage in the whole Pen-*  
*tateuch which doth expressly speak of a Suc-*  
*cession*



PART II. *cession of Rulers or Dictators, if this be not understood of it.*



THE Author of *Scheme* seems to dislike *Stillingfleet's* Management of this Argument, which therefore he has altered thus: (a)  
 “ As the *Jews* had a Succession of Prophets  
 “ bred up and formed in Schools and Colle-  
 “ ges under Master-Prophets, it is reasona-  
 “ ble to think there should be some Re-  
 “ mains of the Institution, — in the *Pen-*  
 “ *tateuch*. — This is the sole Place  
 “ that seems to have any Relation there-  
 “ to, — it may imply such an Institu-  
 “ tion, — and therefore must be allowed to  
 “ have a direct Reference thereto.” Ob-  
 serve Reader, This Promise of GOD, *I will*  
*raise them up a Prophet, — and will put my*  
*Words in his Mouth*, implies an Institution  
 of Schools and Colleges (b), where the *Jews*  
*learned the Art of Propheying under Master*  
*Prophets*. Was there ever such a Charter  
 of Institution? Or could any thing but  
 mere Necessity (this being *the sole Place*  
*in all the Pentateuch that seems to have any*  
*Relation to such an Institution*) have engaged  
 an Author of so much Candour and good  
 Judgment, to allow, that the Promise in  
 Dispute, *has a direct Reference to that Insti-*  
*tution*. But if he had been disposed to fol-  
 low *Stillingfleet's* Opinion in this, as well as  
 in other Matters, he might have discovered,  
 even in the *Pentateuch*, some more plausi-  
 ble

(a) *Scheme*, p. 246. (b) *Grounds*, p. 28.



ble *Remains of that Institution*, than what PART  
 this disputed Passage will afford him: Not II.  
 indeed of *Schools*, where *Jews learned the*  
*Art of Prophecy* (for they had no such  
*Schools*) but of *Societies for Spiritual Instruc-*  
*tion*, which after *Samuel's Time* began to  
 be called *Schools of the Prophets*, because  
 GOD many times called his Prophets out  
 of those *Schools*, and because his chosen  
 Prophets usually presided over them.

STILLINGFLEET, speaking of the *Original*  
*and Institution of those Schools of the Pro-*  
*phets*, tells you (c), “The first Semina-  
 “ries or Places of Institution among the  
 “*Jews*, were the Cities of the *Levites*,  
 “which were dispersed up and down in  
 “the several Tribes of *Israel*.” Which  
 Dispersion was by GOD’s own Appoint-  
 ment; as you read, *Numb. xxxv.* for this  
 Reason, as is generally allowed, because  
 it was their Office to teach the People,  
 as it is expressed, *Lev. x. 11.* *To teach*  
*the Children of Israel all the Statutes which*  
*the LORD spake unto them by the Hand of*  
*Moses.* And it is said of them, *Deut. xxxiii.*  
*10.* *They shall teach Jacob thy Judgments,*  
*and Israel thy Law.* In Pursuance of which  
 Commission, Societies were established in  
 the several Cities, were they were distri-  
 buted among the other Tribes. “And  
 “thence (says *Stillingfleet*) we read not of  
 “these *Schools of the Prophets*, which were  
 R 3 Societies

(c) Orig. sacræ, Lib. II. cap. iv.

PART II. “ Societies for spiritual Instruction, till about  
 “ the Time of Samuel; when by Reason of  
 “ the great Degeneracy of the Priesthood,  
 “ there seemed almost a Necessity of re-  
 “ storing some Societies, who might have  
 “ a special Eye to the spiritual Part of  
 “ GOD’S Worship and Service.” I will  
 not vouch for this Account of *Stilling-  
 fleet*: But this we may safely insist upon,  
 That if these *Schools* did subsist from the  
 first Settlement of the *Jews* in the Land  
 of *Canaan*, they had their Original in the  
 Distribution of the *Levites* among the other  
*Tribes*, and consequently we need look no  
 farther for their Institution. But if, as  
 others think, they had not their Begin-  
 ning, till the Time of *Samuel*, then it is  
 unreasonable and absurd to search the *Pen-  
 tateuch* for the Grounds of that Institu-  
 tion.

I HAVE now gone through the several  
 Reasons offered, why the Promise of a *Pro-  
 phet to be raised up*, ought to be understood  
 of a *Succession of Prophets*: I do not know  
 that I have suffered the least Shadow or Ap-  
 pearance of an Argument on that Side to  
 pass unanswered. To which Answer, I beg  
 leave to subjoyn this Observation, That the  
 plainest and most obvious Meaning of any  
 Passage, ought to be preferred and taken  
 as the true Meaning thereof, unless it con-  
 tains something absurd, or improbable, or  
 impertinent, or inconsistent with its *Con-  
 text*; and That to have Recourse to Figure  
 and

and Idioms of Speech, in the Interpretation thereof, without any Pretence of this Kind, is not allowable. Now the Promise of a *Prophet*, ordinarily and in the common Acceptation of Words, denotes *One single Prophet*. Is there then the least Absurdity or Improbability in supposing, that God should promise the *Jews* some One extraordinary Prophet, to put Words into his Mouth, and by him to convey his Mind and Will to them; that he should require them to hearken to him, and threaten them with Punishment if they did not? Or was it at all improper or impertinent, to add to such a Promise a Caution, to beware of false Prophets and to give them a Rule, whereby those false Prophets might be discovered? This is the Substance of the disputed Passage with its Context; and this Interpretation of it is so very obvious, that no Reader can miss of it; nor was any Man ever tempted, but for the Sake of an Hypothesis, to look out for any other Construction. I desire the Reader to take the intire Passage, the whole Context from *ver. 15.* to the *end*, and upon reading it all together let him judge, whether, according to the strictly *literal* and grammatical Construction of every Sentence in it, it be not perfectly good Sense, unexceptionable, all the Parts thereof having a rational and just Coherence with one another. And if this be the Case, I must say; That to have Recourse to Figures and

PART Idioms of Speech to find out another  
 II. Meaning for no other Reason, but be-  
 cause a Text seems wanting to serve ano-  
 ther Purpose, cannot become a prudent  
 Interpreter. Indeed if the preceding  
 Prohibition against *hearkening to Diviners*  
 could be reckoned a Part of the Context,  
 and the two *Passages* could be proved  
 to have any Relation to, or Connexion  
 with each other; then the Promise of one  
 single Prophet only, to supply the Place  
 of those *Diviners* had not been very per-  
 tinent or satisfactory; and it had been al-  
 lowable in such a Case, to try what other  
 possible Meaning the Words would bear,  
 to render the Interpretation thereof more  
 consistent. But there is not one tolerable  
 Reason for supposing a Connexion; nei-  
 ther the *Matter*, nor the *Manner* in which  
 it is expressed can lead one to suspect any;  
 nay, the very Supposition thereof is attend-  
 ed with such Absurdities, as will convince  
 any rational Inquirer, that there could be  
 none intended. That *Prohibition* therefore  
 is not to be regarded as a Part of the  
 Context, and consequently ought to have  
 no Influence in the Interpretation of the  
 Passage in Dispute.

HENCE I was led to observe in my  
 Sermon on this Subject, That their In-  
 terpretation, who understood this Passage  
 of a Succession of Prophets, was *neither*  
*obvious nor literal: On the other Hand, the*  
*more strict and literal the Construction we*  
*put*



put upon the Words, the more unavoidably will they belong to CHRIST, and next to impossible it would be to make them applicable to any one but him. Not that I think the strictly literal and grammatical Sense of every Passage is always to be preferred, as the Sense intended by the Writer, or the primary Sense in Opposition to a typical, or allegorical, or secondary Sense. But this I believe will be allowed by every Body, That the strict grammatical Sense ought to be preferred to any other, provided it be equally rational and consistent with the Context. It was very proper and necessary therefore, in a Discourse intended to explain the true Meaning of that Passage, to take Notice, That the Interpretation thereof was not only very rational and consistent with the Context; but also that it was the only Sense, which according to strict grammatical Construction could be put upon it. Having therefore in that Discourse proved the strictly literal and grammatical Sense to be both rational and consistent with the Context; having now also confirmed the same by removing all Objections to the contrary; it follows, That there can be no Reason at all to have Recourse to Figures and Idioms of Speech to alter that Sense of the Words: Because consider'd, as standing in the Context, nothing hinders but they may be so understood, and consequently the immediate literal, or primary and obvious Sense of those Words


PART  
II.



PART Words, a *Prophet*, will be *one single Pro-*  
 II. *phet*, and not a *Succession of Prophets*.

I URGED farther, That the Passage in dispute could not be understood of a Succession of Prophets, because the Character given of the Prophet to be raised up (*like unto Moses*) is not applicable to the Succession of Prophets among the *Jews*; it being declared, *Deut. xxxiv. 10.* That under the *Jewish State there arose not a Prophet in Israel like unto Moses.* To which it is answered (*d*) That allowing a Dissimilitude between *Moses* and the succeeding Prophets in the Particulars there mentioned, *viz. That God conversed with Moses only Face to Face, and that Moses out-did all his Successors in Signs and Wonders;* yet there was Similitude enough to justify the Character and the Application of it to the Jewish Prophets. *Stillingfleet* says, “ That  
 “ between them and *Moses*, there was a  
 “ great Similitude, as to their Birth, Cal-  
 “ ling and Doctrine. *Grotius* urges, When  
 “ *Moses* says, *like unto me*, he does not  
 “ speak of his Legislative, but his Pro-  
 “ phetic Office; and that the Word *like*,  
 “ denotes a certain Agreement in Name  
 “ and Authority.” *Scheme* adds, “ The  
 “ Likeness between *Moses* and the Pro-  
 “ phets to be raised up, lay in having  
 “ equally the Character of Prophets in  
 “ being

(*d*) *Scheme*, &c. p. 249, 250.

“ being inspired and equally sent of GOD, PART  
 “ or in having the Words of GOD put II.  
 “ into their Mouths, and speaking   
 “ what GOD commanded.” Here is  
 a great Variety of Words used to ex-  
 press the *Likeness* between *Moses* and the  
*succeeding Prophets*. All which amount to  
 no more than this, That they were *like*  
*Moses* in *Birth* and *Office*. In answer where-  
 to I did observe in my Sermon, That the  
*Likeness* intended could not consist herein;  
 because both these Characters of the *Pro-*  
*phet to be raised up* had been expressed be-  
 fore, which would render the Words, *like*  
*unto Moses*, perfectly useless and insignifi-  
 cant, unless some further *Likeness* were in-  
 tended. The Promise of a Prophet is twice  
 repeated, in both Places *Birth* and *Office*  
 are particularly specified, and yet in both  
 Places the *Likeness* to *Moses* is expressly  
 mentioned. Ought not this therefore to be  
 looked upon as an *Additional* Character,  
 and to imply something more, than what  
 had been before expressed? I did lay some  
 stress upon this Question, and I thought  
 justly; yet no Notice is taken of it in  
*Scheme*, nor any thing like an Answer of-  
 fered. I will endeavour therefore to give  
 it a little more Weight, by making Tryal  
 of his Reasoning on this Head in a paral-  
 lel Case. I do not doubt but it would sur-  
 prize any Man to hear me assert, That all  
 the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* were like  
*David* and *Solomon*: But their Surprize would  
 be turned into Laughter, when I came to  
 explain

PART explain myself in the Manner this Author  
 II. explains the Passage before us, that the  
 ~~~~~ *Likeness* intended lay in having equally the  
Character of Kings, and in being alike and
equally with David and Solomon true Kings.
 If I say one *Man* is *like* another, every
 body would reckon me absurd and imper-
 tinent, if I meant no more than, that they
 are both *Men*. If I say one Prophet is
like another, I should be understood to
 mean something *proper* to those two, over
 and above what is *common* and *essential* to
 every Prophet. Therefore according to ra-
 tional, as well as grammatical Construction,
A Prophet of their Brethren like unto thee,
 must signify one single Prophet, in some
peculiar Sense like unto Moses, and cannot
 without charging the *Text* with repeated
 Impertinence, be understood of the Succes-
 sion of Prophets among the *Jews*.

I ADDED farther, That the following
 Words, “ *And I will put my Words in his*
 “ *Mouth, and he shall speak unto them all*
 “ *that I shall command him,* suppose an ex-
 “ traordinary Commission, bespeak a Pro-
 “ phet immediately sent from GOD with
 “ some new Revelation, &c. That the
 “ settled Order of Prophets among the
 “ *Jews* were not in *this* Sense, *like unto*
 “ *Moses*. They had no new Law, no new
 “ Institutes of Religion to publish: ———
 “ Their Business was to explain, and in-
 “ culcate the Practice of, the Law already
 “ given by *Moses*. Nor is it supposed,
 “ that

“ that they were infallibly directed even P A R T
 “ in this, &c.” Whereby I would be II.
 understood, that the promised Prophet was
 to be like *Moses* in his *Legislative Capacity*,
 and in the *infallible Execution* of it. To
 which the Answer in *Scheme* is (e), That
 “ the Words imply a common prophetic,
 “ and not an extraordinary Commission.
 “ For what is a Prophet, but a Person
 “ sent and inspired by GOD, and that
 “ has Revelations, or Words put into
 “ his Mouth by GOD? — *That Moses*
 “ *was not* infallible in all his Notions, —
 “ *and* that the Prophet to be raised up,
 “ who was to be like unto *Moses*, is
 “ supposed fallible by GOD himself in
 “ the Words following the Prophecy be-
 “ fore us, wherein he requires Men on-
 “ ly to *hearken to the Words which* that
 “ Prophet *should speak* in his *Name.* ”
 As to the Point of Infallibility, I answer,
 That *Moses* was, and the Prophet to be
 raised up is supposed to be, *infallible*; that
 is, strictly faithful in the Execution of
 their Commission; they delivered what was
 revealed to them by GOD, without any Al-
 teration, Addition, or Diminution; they
 neither spake in the Name of GOD, what
 GOD had not commanded, nor suppressed
 any Thing of what he had commanded
 them to publish. This is allowed to be
 true of *Moses*, by all that believe he was
 a Prophet; and in this the Prophet to be
 raised

(e) *Scheme*, &c. p. 253.

PART raised up was to be like him, *He shall speak*
 II. *unto them all that I shall command him;*
 which cannot but signify the strict Fidelity of the Prophet, in delivering exactly what had been revealed to him, cautious not to add to, as well as not to subtract from, what had been commanded him; it being of equal Moment to the People, to whom that Prophet should be sent, that he should speak nothing but the Truth, as that he should speak all the Truth. Nor does the following *Verses* suppose the contrary, as is suggested; which is barely a Threatning against them, who shall not hearken to GOD's Words, which that Prophet should speak in his Name. Nor is there any Supposition of a Prophet speaking in GOD's Name what GOD had not commanded, till *ver. 20.* who cannot be supposed to be the same Prophet, but another, a false Prophet spoken of in Contradistinction to the true one, promised and described in the preceding *Verses*, as will appear at first View to every Reader. Here then is one express Instance, wherein the Prophet to be raised up was to be *like unto Moses*, in which the Succession of Prophets were not like him. For it is observed of *many* of their Prophets, (not all, which this Author (*f*) falsely charges me with) that they *erred in Vision, and stumbled in Judgment.*

AND

(f) Scheme, &c. p. 254.

AND he was to be *like him* also in his Legislative Capacity, as will appear by considering well the Occasion of those Words, *I will put my Words into his Mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.* If, as *Scheme* asserts, they imply only a common prophetic, and not an extraordinary Commission, why were they added? A common prophetic Commission was necessarily included in the Promise of a Prophet. Must these also be superfluous Words, signifying nothing more, than had been expressed before? How easy is it at this rate to make any *Text* serve any Purpose? But instead of being insignificant Words, they will appear to be emphatical Words, designedly superadded to remove an Apprehension, which the Promise of a Prophet *like to Moses* was otherwise liable to. For it is to be observed, that the Promise of a *Prophet like to Moses* is twice repeated. At *ver. 15.* it is expressed thus, *The LORD thy GOD will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me.* Why is it again repeated? There was certainly some Mistake, some Misapprehension to be guarded against. What could that be? Was it a Mistake in Numbers, to prevent which, Care was taken to satisfy them, that by a *Prophet* was meant a *Succession of Prophets*? No. For then the Repetition would have signified so much in express Words. Was it to check any high Thoughts they might have conceived

PART II. conceived of the promised Prophet, from that Description of him, *Like unto Moses?* No. For upon Repetition of the Promise, that Likeness is still insisted on, and nothing added, but what serves to heighten, rather than to lessen their Expectations from him. What then could be the Reason of the Repetition? The Context doth furnish us with a clear unquestionable Answer. There was one Circumstance in *Moses's* Ministry, which had put the *Jews* in the utmost Consternation, *viz.* the very terrible and astonishing Manner, in which the Law had been delivered to them; which extorted from them this earnest Petition to GOD, *Let me not hear again the Voice of the LORD my GOD; neither let me see this great Fire any more; that I die not.* Lest therefore the Promise of a Prophet like to *Moses* should raise in them an Apprehension, that GOD intended to reveal his Will to them, in the same terrible Manner by that Prophet, *Moses* tells them, that GOD was not unmindful of their Petition, but approved it, and would take care, that the Ministration of the future Prophet promised should, notwithstanding his *Likeness to Moses*, be consistent with it. Therefore the Promise is again repeated *ver. 18.* with an Addition evidently suited to this Purpose, *I will put my Words into his Mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.* The unquestionable Meaning of the Place therefore is this: “ I will raise you up a Prophet like unto *Moses*: But be not afraid there-
“ fore

“ fore, that I will speak to you by him, P A R T
 “ in that terrible Manner I did by *Moses*. II.
 “ No, I remember your Petition and will
 “ not do it; but instead thereof I will put
 “ my Words in the Prophet’s Mouth,
 “ and he shall declare my Will to you.”

It is evident then, That the Promise of
a Prophet like to Moses might and would
 have raised in them an Apprehension (if
 it had not been checked,) That God in-
 tended them a *new Revelation* to be disco-
 vered in the *same manner* with the *former*.
 For there had not been the least Ground
 for such an Apprehension, but upon Sup-
 position the Prophet to be raised up should
 be like *Moses* in his *Legislative Capacity*:
 For God never revealed himself to them
 in that terrible Manner, but when he gave
 them the *Law* by *Moses*. Upon other par-
 ticular Occasions, when he was employed
 by God to foretell some future Event, to
 admonish or to reprove them, or to di-
 rect their Conduct upon some sudden E-
 mergency, they received the Divine Mes-
 sage from the Mouth of his Servant *Mo-*
ses. They heard the Voice of God, and
 saw the great Fire only, when the Law
 was delivered: Consequently nothing but
 the Apprehension of a new Law, could
 raise in them the Apprehension of being
 spoken to again in the same terrible man-
 ner. The Supposition therefore of his be-
 ing like *Moses*, in his *Legislative Capacity*,
 is made and taken for granted: For no-
 thing is said to check the Apprehension of

PART the *Thing itself*, but the *manner* of it.

II. They were still left to suppose they should
 ~~~~~ have a new Lawgiver, and a new Law under his Ministration; only with this Difference, that it should not be revealed in the same terrible Manner; but it should first be revealed to the Prophet, from whose Mouth the People should afterwards receive it. This I still think an irrefragable Proof, That the Prophet to be raised up, was to be like *Moses* in his *Legislative* Capacity, and that GOD intended his Promise should be so understood. And if so, it is allowed, that the Promise is not applicable to the *Sucession of Prophets* among the *Jews*, because they were not like *Moses* in this Respect.


I DID urge this Argument before, to which I have received an Answer. But when the Reader considers the Subtilty with which it is treated, the false Insinuations and Suggestions used to puzzle, not convince him; I am persuaded it will give him but a very indifferent Opinion of the Author and his Reasoning. (g) He tells me  
 “ my Inference has so little Foundation,  
 “ that the very contrary is exceeding plain.”  
 And thus he goes on to shew the Plainness of it. “ GOD promises to raise up  
 “ to the *Jews* a Prophet to prevent them  
 “ from going to Diviners: And he further  
 “ promises them, at their Request, that  
 “ the

(g) Scheme, &c. p. 256.



“ the Prophet should not speak to them P A R T  
 “ in so terrible a Manner, as was done at II.  
 “ Mount *Horeb*. The Desire therefore of  
 “ the *Jews*, and GOD’s Compliance with  
 “ them, confute our Author. For this De-  
 “ sire relating to the Prophet to be raised  
 “ up, who was to supply the Place of the  
 “ Diviners; and relating to a Prophet, who  
 “ was to be of immediate Use to the *Jews*,  
 “ who had not the least Imagination of  
 “ a new Law, and can be supposed only  
 “ to act herein from a Concern for them-  
 “ selves, and not for remote Posterity;  
 “ ought to be understood of such a Pro-  
 “ phet as I have supposed all along.” Now  
 can any one believe, but that it was the  
 Author’s Intention in this Harangue to in-  
 sinuate, That the *Jews* had directly peti-  
 tioned GOD for a Prophet, an immediate  
 Prophet, one that should supply the Place  
 of *Diviners*; and that the Promise of a Pro-  
 phet was given them in Consequence of  
 their Petition and in Compliance with it?  
 For does not he call their Desire, “ a De-  
 “ sire relating to the Prophet to be raised  
 “ up, relating to a Prophet who should  
 “ be of immediate Use,” and to one that  
 should “ supply the Place of Diviners?”  
 Where can we find any such Desire? Or  
 whence can it be gathered, that the *Jews*  
 ever offered a Petition to GOD for such  
 things? Forty Years before, when the Law  
 was delivered, when they heard the Voice  
 of GOD and the Mount burned with Fire,  
 they did petition, that they might not hear



PART the Voice again, nor see that great Fire  
 II. any more. But this Desire was purely *ne-*  
 *gative*, That GOD would not speak to them  
 again in the same terrible Manner; which  
 Desire had been fulfilled, if GOD had not  
 sent them any Prophet after *Moses*. The  
 Promise therefore of a Prophet is not found-  
 ed upon any Petition, but made by GOD  
 unasked, only qualified with an Assurance  
 (according to their *negative* Desire) that  
 though in other Respects he should be like  
*Moses*, yet he should not deal with them  
 in the same terrible Manner. Since there-  
 fore the *Jews* did not petition for, nor  
 GOD promise them, a Prophet to supply  
 the Place of Diviners, the Passage is not  
 to be understood of such a Prophet as our  
 Author supposes. And GOD's *complying*  
*and granting them a Prophet according to all*  
*they desired in Mount Horeb*, can signify no  
 more than, instead of speaking to them in  
 the Manner he did at *Horeb*, that he would  
 speak unto them by the Mouth of his Pro-  
 phet. It matters not then to whom the  
 Concern of those *Jews* extended, themselves  
 alone or Posterity, a new Law or not;  
 since the Promise (as to the positive part  
 of it) was made by GOD unasked, who  
 without Absurdity may be supposed to have  
 Regard to Posterity, and the Laws which  
 Posterity should be governed by.

IT is worth while to observe the egregi-  
 ous Sophistry, with which this Argument  
 is

is managed. What the *Jews* did not petition for is so artfully blended with what they did, that the Promise of a Prophet unasked seems to be a mere Compliance with a prior Petition: And Words are so dextrously put together, as to draw an unwary Reader into a Belief, that the *Jews* did directly ask a Prophet to supply the place of Diviners; and yet no room is left for the cautious Reader to charge him with any such Assertion. In short the whole Argument is drawn up in such a Manner, that he seems to assert nothing but what is notoriously true, and yet he is all along insinuating what is notoriously false: And his Conclusion, which at first View one would think had been drawn from Premises undeniably true, is actually built upon such as are really groundless.

I HAD urged farther, “ That the Prophet to be raised up, was to give some extraordinary Sign or Proof of his Commission, otherwise he was to be rejected, as appears, *ver. 22. When a Prophet speaketh in the Name of the LORD, if the Thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the Thing which the LORD hath not spoken; but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.* Now the settled Order of Prophets among the *Jews* had not constantly, nor were usually to have any such Credentials of a divine Commission.”

PART II. To which the Answer is (b), “ That  
 “ those Words relate only to the Prophet  
 “ in question, as a Foreteller of future  
 “ Events; and that he was to be tryed  
 “ and judged of, by those Events *coming*  
 “ or *not coming to pass*; which is so far  
 “ from an *extraordinary Sign*,—— that it  
 “ is the ordinary, natural and necessary  
 “ *Sign*, whereby to know whether any Pro-  
 “ phet foretelling future Things, speaks  
 “ from GOD, or not. For when he spoke  
 “ truly of Things future,—— he did  
 “ from the Nature of his Office, as a  
 “ Prophet, necessarily give the Sign re-  
 “ quired:—— And therefore the Sign re-  
 “ quired was an *ordinary*, and not an  
 “ *extraordinary Sign* of a Prophet’s Com-  
 “ mission.”

I MUST own, I was not aware of this Distinction, between an *ordinary* and an *extraordinary Sign* of a Prophet’s Commission, when I first wrote on this Subject: For I did then, and do still think, the foretelling of future Events, to be as *extraordinary* a Sign, as the working of Miracles. Nor need I be afraid to confess this to my Opponent, who at other Times has seemed inclined to prefer the former to the latter; and in *Scheme (i)*, calls Predictions *plain, miraculous Evidence, perpetual and standing Miracles*. I am sure, when I used

(b) Scheme, p. 255. (i) p. 334, 335.

used the Words *extraordinary Sign*, it was not my Intention to exclude the foretelling of future Events, or any other such apparent Instance of divine Interposition, to countenance a Prophet in the Execution of his Commission. I add therefore, That the settled Order of Prophets among the *Jews*, did not usually give this, or any other such Sign of their Commission. My Adversary should seem to be of a contrary Opinion, by suggesting, that the Office of a Prophet consisted in foretelling future Events, when he says, “ He did from the Nature of his Office, as a Prophet, give the Sign required, ” that is, foretell future Events. But the true Scripture Notion of a *Prophet*, doth not lie in foretelling future Events, (k) “ But in declaring and interpreting to the World the Mind of God, which he receives by immediate Revelation from himself. So that the receiving what he makes known by immediate Revelation, is that which *formally constitutes a Prophet*; but it is wholly *extrinsecal* and *accidental* what Time his Prophecy respects, whether past, present, or to come.— And from hence it is in Scripture that the Patriarchs and others, are called *Prophets*, ” (particularly the Prophet sent to the *Israelites* (l), when oppressed by *Midian*) “ not because of any Predictions uttered by

S 4

“ them,

(k) Stillingsfleet's Orig. sacræ, L. II. c. v.

(l) Judges vi. 8.

PART II. “ them, but because of the Frequency of  
 “ immediate Divine Revelations among  
 “ them.” Every Prophet therefore did  
 not *from the Nature of his Office*, foretell  
 future Events, which our Author would  
 suppose to be the *Sign required*. It is also  
 certain, that the *Jews* had not a *Succession*  
*of Prophets*, who did foretell future Events;  
 and therefore when a Prophet gave a Pre-  
 diction in Proof of his Inspiration, it was  
 not an *ordinary*, but an *extraordinary Sign*  
 of his Commission.

It ought to be observed farther, That  
 many of the *Jewish* Prophets, whose Pro-  
 phecies did respect Things future, did not  
 offer those Predictions by way of Sign, or  
 Proof of their Inspiration; but their Pro-  
 phecies concerning Things future, were the  
*Subject*, and not the *Sign* of their Commis-  
 sion: And they were to be believed and re-  
 garded upon their bare Declaration of the  
 thing, even before the Accomplishment, of  
 it. Consider only the Case of *Jonah*, the  
*Subject* of whose Prophecy was, the De-  
 struction of the *Ninevites*, in Case they did  
 not repent. Were the *Ninevites* to look  
 upon this Prophecy as a *Sign*, and to wait  
 the Accomplishment of it before they paid  
 any Regard to the Prophet? Just the con-  
 trary. They were to believe the Prophet  
 upon his Declaration, to repent, and so  
 prevent the Accomplishment of it. What  
 then was the Sign? For the Prediction was  
 not;



not ; to have received it as such had been P A R T  
exceedingly ridiculous. II.

THE chief Business of the Prophets among the *Jews*, which was to reprove them for their idolatrous Disposition, or for other gross Transgressions against the Law of Nature, or the Law of *Moses*, did not need a Sign to countenance the Prophet in the Execution of it. There was standing Proof sufficient, when God first chose them for his People and gave them his Laws, to justify a Prophet speaking to them on these Heads, without any immediate Interposition of Providence on Behalf of that Prophet in particular. Therefore the *Succession of Prophets* among the *Jews* had not usually any such Credentials of their Commission ; and consequently the *Sign to be required*, according to *Moses*, could not relate to them. But the Supposition of a new Revelation to be granted alters the Case, and renders the *giving of a Sign* necessary.

BUT our Author says, “ That these  
“ Words, *which require a Sign to be given*,  
“ relate only to the Prophet in Question,  
“ as a Fore-teller of future Events.” Why  
so? They should seem to relate to him in  
his general Capacity of speaking the *Words*  
which God had *put into his Mouth*, which  
Men were required to observe under this  
severe Penalty, *ver. 19. It shall come to pass,*  
*that whosoever will not hearken to my Words*  
*which*


PART *which he shall speak in my Name, I will re-*  
 II. *quire it of him.* And this Peril of not  
 hearkening to him is plainly the Reason of  
 that Question, *ver. 21. How shall we know*  
*the Word which the LORD hath not spo-*  
*ken?* As much as to say, There may  
 come false Prophets pretending to be that  
 true Prophet, and to have Words put into  
 their Mouths by GOD, teaching in the  
 Name of the LORD what the LORD hath  
 not spoken; How shall we distinguish in  
 this Case? Now to make the Answer ap-  
 plicable to the Question, the Meaning of  
 it must be this, *When a Prophet speaketh*  
*unto thee in the Name of the LORD, or*  
*teacheth any Doctrine from him, which thou*  
*canst not judge of by what has been alrea-*  
*dy revealed to thee; thou mayest expect*  
*a Sign from him, some Instance of divine*  
*Countenance: And if he pretend to give*  
*thee a Sign, and it follow not, nor come to*  
*pass; that, thou art sure, is a Thing which*  
*the LORD hath not spoken, consequently he*  
*must be a false Prophet, and thou shalt not*  
*be afraid of him, i. e. thou shalt pay no*  
*Regard to the Doctrine taught by him.*  
 But if “these Words relate only to the  
 “Prophet in Question, as a Fore-teller of  
 “future Events,” the Question in the most  
 material Respect would be left unanswered:  
 That is, *How should they know the Word,*  
*which the LORD had not spoken, when a*  
*Prophet spoke to them in the Name of the*  
*LORD, by way of Precept or Doctrine on-*  
*ly?* If then there be any Consistency be-  
 tween

tween the Question, and the Answer, and PART  
 the Occasion of both; the Words, *ver. 22.* II.  
 must be understood of some Sign to be gi-  
 ven on Behalf of the Prophet, to justify  
 him in the Execution of his Office, as a  
 Teacher having *Words put into his Mouth*  
*by GOD, and speaking in his Name what he*  
*had commanded.*


BUT the Folly and Absurdity of our  
 Author's Interpretation will appear more  
 evidently by observing, That the Rule, as  
 he has explained it, would have excluded  
 GOD's chiefest Prophets, from the Regard  
 that was due to them, and have frustrated  
 the very Purposes of their Mission. For  
 if it relates to them only "as Fore-tel-  
 lers of future Events; and they were  
 to be tryed and judged of by those  
 Events coming or not coming to pass;"  
 I would ask, What was to be done, when  
 a Prophet was sent with a Prediction of  
 some great future Calamity, wherein GOD  
 always reserved to himself a Power of Non-  
 Execution, in Case of Repentance. The  
 Intent of such Predictions certainly was,  
 that Men should believe the Prophet, re-  
 pent, and so prevent the Evil threatened  
 from *coming to pass.* But according to our  
 Author, they were to judge of the Prophet  
 by the Accomplishment of his Prediction;  
 and therefore were to wait the Execution of  
 the Evil, before they could justly give Cre-  
 dit to the Prophet.

## PART

## II.


 IF GOD had given the *Jews* such a Rule, as this, with respect to their Prophets, who foretold future Events, many of his chiefest Prophets could not have been believed in their own Generations; because their Predictions related to Things at a Distance, and many times had no Completion, till the Prophets were dead, as *Isaiab's* concerning *Cyrus*, the Prophet at *Bethel* concerning *Josias*, and the Prophecies concerning the Captivity and Deliverance from it. If the “ Fore-tellers of these Events were to “ have been tryed or judged of by their “ coming or not coming to pass, ” then the People to whom these Events were foretold must not have believed them till they were fulfilled; and the Fore-tellers of them, as such, must not have been believed at all. For when Predictions are accomplished they are no longer the Objects of *Faith* but *Sense*. And he that does not believe them till they are accomplished, pays no Regard to the Prophet or his Inspiration. He believes Things because they are Fact, and not because a Prophet foretold them. And where, I pray, is the Difference of having a Prophet, or no Prophet, a false, or a true one, if there be no Dependence upon what is foretold, till it be accomplished? A Man might as well sit at Home and guess by himself, as hearken to a Prophet: For his Guess will, or it will not come to pass; and he may judge by the Event, whether he guessed right or not. Just so much Satisfaction



Satisfaction and Reliance upon the Predic- P A R T  
 tions of their Prophets had the *Jews*, and II.  
 no more, according to our Author's Ac-   
 count of them. And thus the Promise of

a Prophet (which one would take at least  
 to signify some extraordinary Favour in-  
 tended the *Jews*;) according to our Au-  
 thor's Interpretation of it amounts to no  
 more than this, " I will raise them up  
 " a Succession of *Fore-tellers of future E-*  
 " *vents*, in Analogy to *Heathen Diviners* :  
 " But though they shall be inspired by me  
 " for that Purpose, yet they shall be fal-  
 " lible in their Predictions, so fallible; that  
 " you may not depend upon any one thing  
 " they foretell; till it be come to pass. "

Wonderful Promise truly ! Happy Disco-  
 very ! Who can sufficiently admire the Can-  
 dour, the Sagacity, the good Judgment,  
 and the other excellent Talents of him that  
 made it !

I HAVE now finished my Reply, and  
 must beg the Reader to observe ; How  
 this plain Passage of *Deuteronomy*, which  
 in its *literal* and *obvious Sense* is confi-  
 stent with the *Context*, subject to no Dif-  
 ficulties, or any thing that has the least  
 Colour of an Absurdity, and free from all  
 ill or suspicious Meaning, has been wrest-  
 ed from that well meaning and intelli-  
 gible Sense to a notoriously bad one, and  
 from a bad one to none at all. If such  
 arbitrary Methods as these are to be used  
 in interpreting Scripture; if such Violence  
 be



PART II. be allowable to make an Author speak, not in Sense, but Nonsense; and if that forced ridiculous Meaning may be imposed upon the World, as the *plain certain Meaning* of the Passage, *the Sense intended by the Writer, the primary Sense in Opposition to a typical, or allegorical, or secondary Sense*, I have then done defending Christianity from the *Old Testament*; knowing, that the Gospel, whereby it is revealed, has too much good Sense and just Reasoning in it to need, or find, Support by such Methods.

BUT if the plain and obvious Sense of the Passage, which compared with the *Context* is perfectly consistent with it, and intirely free from the least Shadow of an Absurdity, ought to be preferred to a *figurative Sense*, which renders some Parts thereof superfluous and insignificant; others absurd and ridiculous, and which nothing can countenance, but a Supposition, which is even scandalous to suppose; That GOD intended the *Jews* a *Succession of Prophets* to serve the Purposes for which Application was usually made to *Heathen Diviners*; then the Passage in Dispute ought not to be understood of a *Succession of Prophets*, nor can that Interpretation be reckoned the *Primary Sense* of the Words, or the *Sense intended by the Writer*.

THEY must therefore belong to some one extraordinary Prophet: Not to *Josua*; for his Office and his Appointment to it  
had

had been frequently signified in express P A R T. Words, in Words that bear no Resem- II. blance to the Passage in dispute: When read together, no one will pretend they contain an Identity of Character, or any thing that could lead one to suspect, that they were intended of the same Person.

*Numb. xxvii. 18. The LORD said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the Son of Nun, a Man in whom is the Spirit and lay thy Hand upon him, and set him before Eleazar the Priest, and before all the Congregation, and give him a Charge in their Sight, and thou shalt put some of thine Honour upon him, that all the the Congregation of the Children of Israel may be obedient. And he shall stand before Eleazar the Priest, WHO SHALL ASK COUNCEL FOR HIM, after the Judgment of Urim before the LORD: At his Word shall they go out, and at his Word shall they come in, both he and all the Children of Israel with him, even all the Congregation. Deut. iii. 28. Charge Joshua and incourage and strengthen him: For he shall go over before this People, and he shall cause them to inherit the Land which thou shalt see. Chap. xxxi. 7. And Moses called unto Joshua and said unto him in the Sight of all Israel, Be strong and of good Courage: For thou must go with this People unto the Land which the LORD hath sworn unto their Fathers to give them; and thou shalt cause them to inherit it. And the LORD, he it is that doth go before thee, he will be with thee, he will not fail thee, neither forsake thee: Fear not neither be dismayed.*

PART  
II.

*ed.* These Passages concerning *Joshua* contain a Character, not only very different from, but I think in one Circumstance inconsistent with, the Character of the promised Prophet.

IF then it ought to be understood of some one extraordinary Prophet, and not of *Joshua*; it will I hope be allowed, that in Strictness and Propriety of Speech it belongs to JESUS, and to him only. No Prophet before him ever applied it to himself, or claimed Attention in Vertue of it. JESUS did not only apply it to himself, but also justified himself therein, by a most exact and punctual Completion of every Part and Circumstance of it. He was a Prophet raised up to the Jews from among their Brethren: He was like to Moses, not only in Birth and Office, but also in all the remarkable Parts of his Character. In his Behaviour and Conduct, He plainly discovered as great Steadiness and Integrity, as great Meekness and Patience, as much Prudence and good Temper, as *Moses* did: As a Lawgiver, He did visibly, and in a Manner obvious to common Sense, greatly improve and perfect the Law given by *Moses*, and purged it from a great many corrupt Glosses put upon it by Jewish Interpreters. And in doing this, Regard was had to the Petition of the People in *Horeb*, saying, *Let me not hear again the Voice of the LORD, my GOD, neither let me see this*  
great

great Fire any more: For GOD put Words PART  
 into his Mouth, and He spake unto them all II.  
 that GOD commanded him. And it hap-  
 pened to them who would not hearken to  
 him, as GOD had threatned, saying, *Who-  
 soever will not hearken to my Words, which  
 he shall speak in my Name, I will require it  
 of him.* For that Generation which re-  
 jected him, suffered in the most lamenta-  
 ble and unheard of Manner; and their Po-  
 sterity, who still continue to reject him,  
 still lie under the same Curse. And for as  
 much as they required a Sign of him (as  
 the Prophecy had prescribed) to satisfy  
 them, that the LORD had spoken by  
 him; He gave them a Sign, a most asto-  
 nishing Sign, such as no Prophet ever gave;  
 and yet that Sign, unusual as it was, and  
 unlikely to come to pass, was exactly ve-  
 rified.

A PROPHECY, so very remarkable,  
 and in its *obvious Sense*, so strictly applica-  
 ble to CHRIST and his Doctrine, and  
 withal so incapable of any other Construc-  
 tion, without great Abuse, and even ren-  
 dering the *Text* ridiculous, may with great-  
 est Justice be alledged by a Christian in  
 Defence of his Religion, and especially a-  
 gainst *Jews*; for take it in what Sense  
 you will (*m*), they must be condemned  
 by it.

T

C H A P.

(*m*) Serm. at Norwich, p. 17, &c.



THE *Argument from Prophecy* summed up:  
The Conclufiveness of it, and some Ex-  
ceptions to it confidered.

I HAVE now done with the Prophecies cited, and my Vindication of them; where I have carefully observed all the Rules prefcribed by my Adverfary, more carefully, than he has observed them himfelf. I have fupposed the Scriptures, like other Writings, to have a Senfe conformable to the common Ufe of Words and Expreffions, and to the Circumftances and Connection of the Difcourfe (a). I have not been led by the *Authority* of any *Jews*, or by the *Example* of any *famous Authors*, nor have fuffered any *Authorities never fo great* to be of any Weight in the Interpretation of a *Text*, againft the Rules of common Senfe, that is, againft the *Rules of Grammar and Criticifm* (b). By thefe Rules I have endeavoured to difcover the *primary* Senfe of each Prophecy, the Senfe intended by the Writer, in oppofition to a *typical*, or *allegorical*, or *secondary* Senfe (c). And if I have not been greatly miftaken, the natural, plain, determinate Senfe of the Prophecies I have cited is this;

THAT,

(a) Scheme, &c. p. 388. (b) Ib. p. 267.

(c) Ib. p. 251.



THAT, though GOD had chosen the Children of *Israel* (to whom these Prophecies were delivered) out of an idolatrous World, to be a *peculiar People* to himself, and had in a Manner confined the Knowledge of himself and his Will to them; yet he had purposed in time to *make his Ways known upon Earth, his saving Health among all Nations.* That for this End a Law should go forth out of Zion, and the Word of the LORD (by which they were to be converted) from Jerusalem: Not intending by Force or Violence to compel them, but by rational Motives to induce them to *flow unto it,* or voluntarily embrace it: That this new Law or Revelation should be first communicated to the *Jews,* by a Prophet to be raised up among them like unto Moses; who should establish a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant made with their Fathers, when they were come out of the Land of *Egypt.* That yet the Influence of his Ministration upon the *Jews* should be inconsiderable, compared with the Influence it should have upon the *Gentile World:* Thus GOD declared his Intention of glorifying him; saying, *I will give thee for a Light to the Gentiles, That thou mayest be my Salvation unto the Ends of the Earth.* There is never the least Intimation given, of his attempting by Force to extort Obedience; but that *the Gentiles should seek to him;* that *the Isles should wait for his Law,* that in bringing forth Judgment to the *Gentiles,*

PART II. tiles, *he should not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his Voice to be heard in the Streets*: Hence he is called *the Desire of all Nations*, and it is said, *All Nations should be blessed in him*. But notwithstanding the Glory of his Undertaking and the perfect Innocence of his Life, that he should be greatly despised and oppressed, should be *numbered with Transgressors* and cut off by Violence; God intending to serve this gracious Purpose by it, of *making his Soul an Offering for Sin*, of *justifying many* by his bearing their Iniquities, that he being *wounded for our Transgressions*, *we by his Stripes might be healed*. That after this, he should *see of the Travail of his Soul and be satisfied*, and the *Work of the LORD should prosper in his Hands*: For he should *purify many Nations*, Kings should give Attention to him, Princes also should pay him Homage and Obedience; he should be *a Witness to, a Leader and Commander of the Gentiles*; He should *speak Peace to the Heathen*, and his *Dominion should be from Sea to Sea, and from the River to the Ends of the Earth*: In him also the *Throne of his Father David should be established for ever, and endure as the Days of Heaven*; for he was to be of the House and Lineage of *David*, and to be born at *Bethlehem* where *David* was. It was also revealed, that he should come during the Continuance of the second Temple, and that it should not be long afterwards before that Temple should be destroyed.

CONSIDER

CONSIDER now, how exactly all this agrees with the Christian Scheme, the Measures that were taken to establish it, and the Success it met with in the World. Could one reasonably expect a more particular Account to be given of it in the Way of Prophecy. Every minute Circumstance indeed is not mentioned, that had been to reveal Christianity before its Time: But there is a general Draught, as full and as particular, as any Man ever gave of a long projected Scheme, which he intended at some Distance of Time to put in Execution. The grand Design, the principal Means of accomplishing it, the Method in which it should be pursued, and the chief Instrument to be employed in it, together with the most remarkable Parts of his Character, Conduct and Circumstances, are so plainly revealed, that it was impossible an Impostor should counterfeit the Execution of it, and impossible it ever should be accomplished, in the Manner there proposed, without the immediate Countenance of GOD.

FOR consider the Nature of these Predictions. Could any Thing have been foretold more extraordinary, or more unlikely to come to pass, than that which is the principal Subject of them? Are they not very particular as to Circumstances, fixing upon a Person, of a certain Nation, of such a Family, to be born at such a  
T 3 Place,

PART II. Place, and to appear within such a Period of Time, to fulfill the Purposes of them; describing his Moral Character, and his outward Circumstances in Life, which were to be very despicable, and therefore rendered him more unlikely to have such prodigious Influence upon Mankind, as those Prophecies universally, and that Prophecy in particular, which says most of his low Circumstances, do so clearly foretell? Do you find in History any Tendency towards the Accomplishment of this great Event, when the Prophecies concerning it were delivered? Could it have been proposed to be done by more unusual or more unlikely Means? What Consideration therefore can be wanting, to convince any rational Inquirer, That these Things could not have been foretold so long before without a Spirit of Prophecy; and that the Person, who answered all these Characters, served all the Purposes mentioned in these Prophecies, must have been fore-ordained of God for that End?

WHAT Objection then remains against this *Argument from Prophecy*? You would insinuate (d), that we build too much upon *Jewish Traditions*, in interpreting the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*: Urging, that nothing can be less satisfactory, than explaining former Passages by modern Faith and Notions, which is leading the Reader by

a

(d) Scheme, &c. p. 63.



a false Light; and that to prove a Divine P A R T  
 Original of the Notion of a MESSIAS, II.  
 we are first to shew the Notion of a MES-  
 SIAS to be expressly contained in the *Old*  
*Testament* from the *Old Testament* itself.  
 To this I entirely agree; and am sensible,  
 that we have so little Reason to urge, or  
 depend upon, the *Tradition* of *Jews* in this  
 Matter, that I think we are obliged, in  
 Justice both to the Scriptures and our-  
 selves, to stand out against it, as the great-  
 est Corruption of Scripture imaginable. I  
 agree with *Josephus*, that the *Jewish* No-  
 tion of a MESSIAS was grounded on a  
 mistaken Sense of their own Scriptures:  
 And I think it an easy Matter to dissect their  
 Notion, and to shew what Part was bor-  
 rowed from Scripture, and what Opinions  
 they groundlessly built upon it, even in  
 direct Contradiction to the self-same Parts  
 of Scripture.

J O S E P H U S says, “ The Notion which  
 “ prevailed among them, was, That there  
 “ should one come out of *Judea*, who should  
 “ have the Command of the whole World;  
 “ which Prophecy they applied to one  
 “ of their own Nation.” And thus far  
 they had undoubted Prophecies on their  
 Side; and it appears they understood the  
 true Meaning of those Prophecies better than  
*Josephus*, when he said they were intended  
 of *Vespasian*, who was created Emperor in  
 Judea. For it is evident past Dispute, that  
 the Person promised to be great unto the



PART II. *Ends of the Earth* was to be born at *Bethlehem*; that he to whom *the Gentiles should seek*, who was to be a *Leader and Commander to the Nations*, should be of the *Seed of David*. *David* himself had expressly prophesied of one of his own *Seed*, that should *have Dominion from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of the Earth*; that *all Kings should fall down before him, and all Nations should serve him*. Thus far therefore they were right: But from hence they went on concluding too fast, without taking *Scripture* for their *Guide*. They concluded, that this *Dominion* should be obtained in the usual *Way*, by *Force of Arms and Conquest*; that therefore this *Ruler of the Nations* should be a *warlike Prince*, should lead them to *Victory and Triumph*, and compel the *Nations* to be subject to them. Whereas their *Scriptures* say, he should be in an especial *Manner a Blessing* to them, that he should *speak Peace to the Heathen*, and be unto them for a *Light* and for *Salvation*. Their *Submission* to him is constantly expressed in *Terms*, that signify the greatest *Freedom* and *Willingness*; there is not a *Word* of *Force* and *Compulsion*, which are inconsistent with his *Character* every where. Even those *Prophecies*, which speak of *Kings* and *Nations* being subject, and paying *Homage* and *Obedience* to him, represent his outward *Appearance* in *Life*, as exceedingly mean and despicable; and the *Exaltation* and *Dominion* intended him

him are expressly said to be the Consequence of his Death. *Therefore will I divide him a Portion with the Great, and he shall divide the Spoil with the Strong; because he hath poured out his Soul unto Death.*

PART  
II.

I CAN see no Reason therefore for all that Cavil and Stir you have made about the *Tradition* of a MESSIAS, in the four first *Chapters* of your Book. For you allow with us, and have proved, that the *Tradition* was originally founded upon Scripture; and we allow with you, that the *Jews* were mistaken in their *Tradition*; and I think it is easily seen, where their Mistake lay. From these Premises then I readily concur with you in your Conclusion (e) That the *express Word* of GOD ought to be the sole Foundation of all *Tradition* in this Matter. I have therefore made it my Business to search the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*, and to collect from thence the Notices they give us of a MESSIAS to come, and of the Scheme of Things to be introduced by him. And from hence it plainly appears, How far the *Jewish Tradition* of a MESSIAS, had its Foundation originally upon the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*; and likewise how far they had corrupted it with fond Notions and hasty Conclusions of their own, directly inconsistent with those very Passages of Scripture, from whence their *Tradition* had its

(e) Scheme, &c. p. 90.

PART its Rise. I think what you have said about  
II. *Tradition*, needs no other Reply.

You say in another Place (f), That we beg the Question in Dispute, by introducing our Scheme of a MESSIAS, as a Key to explain Prophecies, without producing any *literal* antecedent Ground for such Scheme in the Prophecies themselves. This Surmise appears plainly to be without Foundation. For that which effectually distinguishes the *Messias-Scheme* from the *Mosaic-Scheme*, is this, That the one was intended for the *Israelites*, as a *peculiar People*, separated from an idolatrous World, for the Service of GOD; the other has Respect to the *Gentile World* in common with them. Now this last *Scheme* of Things is as expressly revealed in the *Old Testament*, as any Thing possibly can be; and from Prophecies plainly relating to it, are collected all the other Circumstantials which make up our *Messias-Scheme*.

BUT you will urge perhaps; That there are many other Passages of the *Old Testament* cited and applied in the *New*, which I have not meddled with; Some of which, you say, are of very doubtful and difficult Construction; and some do not appear by their *Context* or the Connexion of the Discourse, to relate to the MESSIAS, though you do not know how to dispose of them  
other-

(f) Scheme, &c. p. 220.

otherwise ; and some are allowed in their **PART**  
*primary* Sense to relate to other Matters, **II.**  
 and can be applied to CHRIST in a *secon-*  
*dary* or *typical* Sense only. Granting all  
 this to be true : What do you infer from  
 thence ? Is it just or fair to conclude, as  
 you did at first, That the Notion of a  
 MESSIAS to come had no better Foun-  
 dation on the *Old Testament*, than what such  
 Passages as these afforded ? The contrary  
 does manifestly appear. The Prophecies I  
 have cited clearly foretell the Coming of an  
 extraordinary Person, whose Ministration  
 and Doctrine should have a very remarka-  
 ble and beneficial Influence over the *Gentile*  
 World ; they give us likewise a particular  
 Account of the Manner of his Appearing  
 and the Consequences of it. All these Pro-  
 phecies are very properly and strictly ap-  
 plicable to CHRIST, and the Event of his  
 Doctrine, and to no other Person or Event  
 whatsoever. The *Argument* therefore *from*  
*Prophecy* is sufficiently established by these,  
 though we should allow all others to be  
 as unsatisfactory and as little to the Pur-  
 pose, as you can imagine.

BUT upon this Supposition you will be  
 apt to ask, Why then were they cited and  
 applied ? A Question, which I think we are  
 not obliged to answer : For if the *Argument*  
*from Prophecy* be sufficiently conclusive with-  
 out them, the Use and Design of them  
 is, to us at least, Matter of Curiosity ra-  
 ther than of Necessity. And though we  
 could



PART could not see what Purposes were intended to be served by them, yet thus much we can plainly see, that they were not unfairly alledged to colour a bad Cause, or weakly substituted for Want of better Argument. I have observed formerly, and I believe you cannot disprove me, That no Difficulty was ever attempted to be solved, nor any disputed Point pretended to be determined, by Citations from the *Old Testament*, which are not very applicable to the Purpose. You may easily perceive, when St. *Matthew* applied those Words of *Hoseab*, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, to CHRIST'S Return out of *Egypt*, there was no Difficulty to be removed, no Objection to be obviated; and had the Words in the strictest Sense been applicable to CHRIST, nothing of Consequence could have been built upon them. There could be no Temptation therefore, one Way or other, to cite them unfairly, or to apply them impertinently.

NEVERTHELESS, I think we are able to satisfy the Curiosity of any reasonable Person in this Matter. As to Citations of Passages supposed to be of Difficult Construction; you will allow those difficulties, let them appear never so great to us at present, might be no Difficulties at all at the Time of citing them, when the Language in which they were wrote was much better understood, than it is at present. You cannot therefore fairly conclude



clude against the Propriety of a Citation P A R T  
made so long ago, where the seeming Im- II.

propriety depends entirely upon the present difficult Construction of the Passage cited. Besides, in such Cases much depends upon the Method of Solution. For if you pore upon a difficult Passage in any Author singly by itself, it is a great Chance if you discover its true Meaning: The proper, usual and allowed Way in such Cases is, to compare it with other Places, which bear any Resemblance to it, either in Words or Meaning, by which Means the Sense and Construction of difficult Passages have been cleared to Satisfaction. And in this you seem unwilling (g) to allow us that common Privilege, which all Men have a Right to, and are allowed to take in interpreting other Authors. You would tye us down to the Consideration of every single Citation by itself, without suffering us to illustrate and confirm the probable Sense of it, by other parallel Places, which speak to the the same Effect. And yet thus, I am persuaded, many of those Passages, which you say are intricate and of doubtful Construction, may be illustrated to the Satisfaction of an impartial Inquirer.

As to those Citations, which considered as they stand with their Context, you say should seem rather to relate to other Matters,

(g) Scheme, p. 137.

PART II. Matters, though you know not how to apply them otherwise; which Difficulty on your Side, you would account for by pretending a *Want of History* (b): Concerning such I would observe, That Prophecies thus circumstantiated may not be a good Foundation to begin upon, or be thought sufficient of themselves to bear the whole Weight of the *Messias-Scheme*. But that Scheme being once established; and it being first clearly proved, that the Prophets under the *Old Testament* had in View such a State of things, as was afterwards introduced by the Gospel; then I say we may fairly make Use of that *Scheme*, as a Key to unfold other doubtful Places of the Prophets: And if the Sense of those Places appear to be more natural and easy, interpreted according to that *Scheme*, than any other Way; then I think they may be justly alledged by a Christian, and joined with other clearer Prophecies will carry some Weight along with them.

OF Passages cited and applied to CHRIST in a *secondary* or *typical* Sense only, you say that no Argument can be drawn from them *according to Scholastic Rules*: And in this I agree with you. Nor do I find, that any Argument is drawn from such Citations in the *New Testament*. But then I hope you will agree with me, since it appears, that the *Mosaic* Institution was  
not

(b) Scheme, p. 226.

not intended to be perpetual, that GOD had declared his Design by his Prophets to establish another more perfect and lasting Covenant, in which *Gentiles* as well as *Jews* should be included; That it is not incongruous to suppose, that GOD might purposely order several of their temporary Institutions to bear some Resemblance and have a Respect to Events, which should come to pass, when that more perfect Institution should be introduced; and might order many precedent Events likewise to be so circumstantiated, and so expressed by his Prophets, as to bear a great Analogy to, and very fitly represent Things to be done by the MESSIAS; to whom the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* had an apparent View. And upon this Supposition it will follow, That the Apostles might very justly and properly say, that such things were *fulfilled* in CHRIST and Matters relating to him; and therefore do not need any Excuse to be made for them upon the Scheme of Accommodation.

WHETHER I have given a Solution of these Difficulties to your Satisfaction, I cannot say; nor indeed am I much concerned. Yet if I see Occasion I may hereafter enlarge upon these Observations, and apply them to particular Instances of Prophecies, supposed by you to be improperly or illogically applied in the *New Testament*. At present it may suffice to observe, That I have done all you require,

as

PART as necessary to establish this *Argument from*  
 II. Prophecy, and to render it conclusive. For  
 whatever you may determine concerning other Prophecies and the Manner of applying them, those I have cited and the Argument arising from them, cannot be affected by it: Because they come up to the Point to be proved, and are sufficient (exclusive of all others) to establish it. You say, Since JESUS claimed to be the MESSIAS of the Jews, foretold by the Prophets, it is requisite that *Claim* should be made out: And you add, that it ought to be made out, by appealing to the Books of the *Old Testament*, to the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Psalms*. Thither we have appealed. There we find his Character and Circumstances, the grand Design of his Coming, and the most remarkable Consequences of it, spoken of in Terms strictly and properly applicable to him, and also incapable of any other fair and rational Construction. So that if one were to suppose our Religion to have been built on this Foundation only, This Foundation only is sufficient to support it.

F I N I S.

