

grand outline, vary a little in subordinate matters ; but this was at least nearly the case. The continuance of our Lord's ministry, till his crucifixion, is likewise differently computed : but, on every computation, he was crucified, during the continuance of the "last week," and after the end of the "sixty and two weeks."—The longer the part of the time is, which we allot to his ministry ; the less remains, for those events which took place soon after his resurrection. Some compute, that he expired on the cross, in the last year of the seventy weeks ; and some, that it was in the middle of the seventieth week ; induced by the clause "in the midst of the week, he "shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease:" but whether this, "He shall confirm the covenant with many for one "week," be understood of the term of John Baptist's ministry, and afterwards of our Lord's till his death : or whether it take in the first successes of the gospel, after his resurrection, we come nearly to the same point : and as near, as the purposed obscurity of prediction, previously to its completion, allows us to expect.

Mr. C. indeed thinks, and probably the Jews in general think, it incumbent on us to shew, that the seventy weeks reached to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple ; because *in fact* the oblation did not cease till that catastrophe : and then indeed we might be reduced to some expedient similar to the 'shortening the end of a thing ;' but we are under no necessity of having recourse to so desperate a measure. If Jesus be the Messiah, (and if this prophecy *relate to the Messiah*, that question is decided,) then our interpretation of its language must be taken from Christianity. Now Christians consider, and must consider, all the typical sacrifices and oblations as *virtually* abolished, when the one great Sacrifice for sin had been offered. They might be *tolerated*, and attended on by Jewish converts to Christianity, as a matter of expediency, and till they better understood their

Christian liberty: but they ceased to be "shadows of good things to come," instituted acts of worship, and 'means of grace.' *Commemoration* immediately succeeded to *prefiguration*: Christian ordinances to Jewish: and from the time, when Jesus expired on the cross, "when the veil of the temple "was rent from the top to the bottom," the dispensation of the Messiah superseded that of Moses. Sacrifice and oblation ceased, as required or accepted by God, from those who neglected the salvation of Christ, and the whole became as a cancelled bond.*

This was not, indeed, fully understood, for some time, even by the first preachers of Christianity; and if we adopt the opinion of those, who compute that the last week of the seventy reached till two or three years after the death of Jesus; till his gospel had been fully offered to the Jews as a nation, and rejected by them; or till the gentiles began to be admitted into the Christian church; our general conclusion will not be, in the least, affected. From this period, *according to Christianity*, the Jews, as such, ceased to be the people of God, who now "called his people by another name."† The nation was, from that time, left in the condition of a condemned criminal; yet "the long-suffering of God waited, as "in the days of Noah," that individuals "might save themselves from that untoward generation." Of this long-suffering many tens and hundreds of thousands availed themselves: but when the time predicted by our Lord arrived, before that "generation had passed away," the term of God's long-suffering being expired, he fulfilled the rest of Daniel's prophecy. "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 to the end of the war desolations are "determined." — "The overspreading of abomination shall "make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that

* Col. ii. 14.

† Isaiah lxxv. 15. Acts xi. 26.

“determined shall be poured upon the desolate.” Then the *virtual* abolition of the sacrifice and oblation became *actual*; yea, the observance of the law of sacrifices became impracticable, as it has now been for above 1700 years. But no date is in the prophecy explicitly fixed to any event subsequent to Messiah’s death, and the confirming of his covenant with many.

It would be wholly unsuitable to the object of this publication, to enter, critically and fully, into the expressions used by the angel Gabriel, in the twenty-fourth verse.* Perhaps to “finish the transgression,” means, the commission of that crime by the Jewish nation, as the counsel of their rulers, scribes and priests, adopted by the people, (when demanding the crucifixion of Jesus, they exclaimed, “His blood be “on us and on our children;†) by which the measure of their guilt was filled up: for the original word is not used by Moses for any of the legal sacrifices. “To make an end of “sin,” or sin-offering, (as the word is often used) evidently means, to abrogate the laws of sin-offerings. “To make “reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness,” can mean nothing less, than to offer that atonement, and finish that righteousness; by which all the people of the Messiah should be pardoned, reconciled to God, justified, made holy, and eternally saved. “To seal up the “vision and prophecy,” or “the Prophet,” means, to fulfil, and seal as accomplished, all the visions and predictions of the prophets concerning the Messiah, and to *seal* him as the Prophet of the new dispensation; “For him hath God the “Father sealed.”‡ “And to anoint the most holy,” either the ‘Holy One of God,’ or the true holy of holies; of which that of the tabernacle, consecrated by anointing, was a type

* Mr. C. in quoting Daniel’s prophecy, has wholly omitted three out of the five verses of which it consists.

† Matt. xxvii. 25.

‡ John vi. 27.

and shadow.* It is not material to our argument, whether the very best interpretation of each clause is here adopted, or not; and I am very willing that others should interpret some of them differently. But, however interpreted, they must all have had their fulfilment in the Messiah here predicted; for the time has long since expired: as also must the clause, "He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week," "and he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Mr. C. stops in his quotation at the end of the 26th verse; but the reader's attention must be called to the concluding verse: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week, he shall cause the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."† It is obvious to consider "Messiah the Prince," as the person spoken of, who would do all these things. JEHOVAH is not mentioned; and it is not easy to conceive in what sense the Roman emperor, of whom some would interpret it, could be said "to confirm the covenant with many for one week." But I here only draw the reader's attention to the language: the prophecy will come before us, on other topics, when some of the expressions will be more fully considered. At present we must keep to the main argument; namely, to prove that the Messiah was to come, before the destruction of the second temple.

Is then the Messiah, predicted by all the prophets, here intended, or is some other person? The words, "Messiah the Prince," are in fact more explicit, than those used in any other part of Scripture. Nothing can be more natural and easy, than the application of every clause to Jesus Christ, according to the New Testament: but if a Jew, (as he must, continuing a Jew,) reject this application; let him

* Ex. xxx. 23—26. xl. 9. Heb. ix. 22—25.

† Dan. ix. 27.

shew in whom not only one or two clauses may *seem* to have been fulfilled; but in whom, and in what events, each part and expression of the prophecy, without exception, received its accomplishment.

We may now close this part of the argument, by briefly adverting to what Mr. C. has advanced against the Christian interpretation. (P. 7. l. 21.) That which relates to the seventy weeks, and the time when Messiah should be cut off, has been fully considered. Jesus was crucified at the time predicted, and the several consequences followed, as foretold by the prophet.

P. 8. l. 19. *Not one of the apostles, &c.* The apostles adduced those parts of the Old Testament, which their argument required: but they never professed to bring forward every prediction of the Messiah contained in it. Several, even of those which the Jews allow to have been spoken of the Messiah, are not quoted: so that their silence is no proof that 'they could not have thought of such a thing.' But there might be special reasons for their conduct as to this prophecy. Nothing so irritated the minds of the Jews, in those days, as the declaration, that the temple would be destroyed, and its worship terminated, according to the predictions of the crucified Jesus.* No prophecy so clearly predicted these events, and so connected them with the "Messiah, "the Prince, being cut off," as this of Daniel: the apostles could alledge and expound prophecies in abundance to prove their point without it: it was their object to convince, not to exasperate; and most of the New Testament was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. This prophecy is however referred to in the gospels;† and it must be included in those prophecies, which Mr. C. afterwards mentions, as proofs

* Acts vi. 13, 14. xxi. 28.

† Comp. Dan. ix. 27, with Matt. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14. Luke xxi. 20.

that Jesus was not a prophet, but only repeated the prophecies of the Old Testament. (P. 67, 68.)

P. 8. l. 24. *We read, &c.* Whatever objection a Christian may have to the criticism of this passage, he can have none to the conclusion deduced; ‘Messiah, which means the king, “shall be cut off,” but not *to him*, לֹא יִסָּר; that is, he ‘shall have no successor.’ For the Messiah, when “cut off “out of the land of the living;” when JENOVAH made his soul an “offering for sin,” yea, “because he poured out his “soul unto death; saw his seed, and prolonged his days, “and the pleasure of the LORD prospered in his hands.”* Thus Jesus arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, reigns over all worlds, ‘has no successor;’ but “must reign till all “enemies be put under his feet.”† I do not think this the meaning of the clause; but, waving this, on Mr. C.’s interpretation, it clearly marks Jesus as the promised Messiah:— ‘By which is pointed out, that there shall be no more kingly ‘power in the Jewish nation.’—“The sceptre was departed “from Judah, and a lawgiver from between his feet; Shiloh “was come, and to him,” ever since, “the gathering of the “peoples has been.”

P. 8. l. 32. ‘This Messiah,’ &c. ‘Agrippa was of the ‘stock of Abraham, and king over Israel.’ (P. 9. l. 5.)—King Agrippa was a descendant of Herod, who was of ‘the stock ‘of Edom,’ but a proselyte to Judaism. At the death of his father Herod,‡ Judea became again a Roman province; but, after some years, the Emperor Claudius made Agrippa king of Chalcis; and afterwards gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias; namely, Ituræa, Trachonitis, and Abilene: all these regions were without the boundaries of the promised land. But Nero, along with some towns in Peræa, gave him part of Galilee. Agrippa also possessed some authority, as deputy of the Roman emperors, over the

* Is. liii. 8. 10. 12.

† 1 Cor. xv. 25.

‡ Acts xii. 23.

treasury of the temple, and the succession of the high priesthood: and he seems to have used this authority, in deposing and advancing the high priests, without regard to the law of God.—But Felix, and Festus, and other Roman governors, exercised the whole civil authority in Judea all the while. In what sense then was Agrippa, “of the stock of Abraham, “and king over Israel?” How could he be called “Messiah “the Prince,” by way of emphasis and distinction? Or how can the several parts of the prophecy be applied to him?

My scanty library does not give me the means of ascertaining, in what manner Agrippa was cut off; it seems from Josephus, that he was connected with the Romans and with their armies, in the beginning of that war, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem; but afterwards we read nothing concerning him. As to ‘his son Monves,’ I own I never before read his name. I cannot find it in the Roman historians, or in Josephus. I suspect, from the formation of the word, that it is taken from the Rabbinical writers; and I should be glad to be informed, on what authority this part of the narrative rests. It is clear, however, that both the death of Agrippa, and every thing relating to his son Monves, are almost overlooked by historians. If it had not been for Josephus, and for the writer of the Acts of the apostles, even king Agrippa would scarcely have been known to posterity. And can it be conceived, that such an obscure, petty, dependent prince, ruling by the courtesy of the emperors over a part of Galilee, and some adjacent regions inhabited by gentiles, (while Judea was ruled by Roman governors,) was “Messiah the Prince;” and that his obscure death, and that of his son, were the events intended by the Holy Spirit, in this prophecy, which was introduced with such solemnity, and concludes with such awful denunciations of judgments on the Jews? It does not even appear, that the slaughter of Agrippa had any *political* connection with these judgments: and being the

act of the Romans, could not be the *deserving cause* of them; before God.

Indeed, this (as far as I can learn) *new* interpretation, is a confession of the insuperable difficulties, to which Daniel's prophecy reduces all those, who refuse to own Jesus, as MESSIAH THE PRINCE.

P. 9. l. 7. *Thus far, &c.* It is not difficult or uncommon for men to boast of victories which they have not obtained; and with such evident complacency, as shews that they really think they have obtained them.

L. 9. *The coming of the Messiah, &c.* Mr. C. has, however, bestowed considerable pains in the subsequent pages, to ascertain this unknown mystery. In fact, scarcely any predictions in the scripture are so clearly *dated*, as those which relate to the coming of the Messiah. This has already been shewn. The reader must judge in what way the two texts, adduced in proof of this assertion, bear at all on the subject. In the first, (l. 12.) the Messiah returning from the slaughter of his enemies, represented by Edom, says, "for the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." He had had it long at heart to execute vengeance on his enemies, and to rescue his people, and the fixed time was at length arrived. Nothing is said of the coming of the Messiah, but of his victory over his enemies. Whatever God *determines*, whether revealed or concealed, is "in his heart:" and the time being come implies that it was no longer concealed.* In the second, (l. 15,) Daniel was 'longing to know,' not 'the coming of the Messiah,' as Mr. C. asserts, (l. 25,) of whom no mention is made; but when God "should have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people;"† that is, the time of the gathering of Israel from their dispersions, their conversion to Christ, their restoration, and the final triumphs of the

* Is. lxiii. 1—6.

† Dan. xii. 7, 8.

gospel: and even of these events, the prophet had received such clear revelations, as have been a clue and guide to the expositors of prophecy, in every subsequent age; though they could not fully understand every thing respecting it.

P. 9. l. 28. 'THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME. *We must look, &c.*' This whole passage (P. 9—11,) is a mixture of scriptural truth; of human traditions, which are not entitled to the least credit; and of inaccuracies of little consequence.

P. 10. l. 1. '*The third, &c.*'—The kingdom of the Messiah is afterwards stated to be 'absolutely earthly,' (P. 36—39,) and is such a kingdom, perfect, and to 'endure for evermore?'

L. 19. '*Angels could give no names, &c.*' Angels did not give names to the animals, for they were not directed to do it: but we have no reason to conclude from any thing revealed in the Old Testament, that man was ever superior to angels, or equal to them: man also was created with a material body, angels are immaterial spirits. Our main argument, however, is no ways affected by the opinion.—Again, we are not informed what Satan was when God created Adam: we only know, that, concealed in the serpent, he tempted and ruined our first parents, and all their posterity in them.

P. 10. last line, 11, first line. '*Six thousand years,—but no longer.*'—Mr. C. has then discovered 'the unknown mystery:' for 'this last period will commence with the coming of 'the Messiah.' (P. 9.) He will then come exactly at the end of the six thousand years from the creation: and it is not difficult to compute those years, principally from the Old Testament. The present is about 5818; and one hundred and eighty-two years, or about that time, will complete the six thousand years. Six thousand years, however, from the creation, either as the time of the coming of the Messiah, or to the millennium, is no where stated in scripture: yet many Christians have conjectured, that the millennium will begin at the end of six thousand years; and argued for it

with considerable plausibility.—But this has not the least relation to the coming of the Messiah; and is no more than a remote consequence of that event.

P. 11. l. 7. ‘*Of what use, &c.?*’—It must appear to every real Christian, that the coming of a Messiah, to establish an ‘absolutely earthly kingdom,’ can never be of much use to sinful dying men; but as Mr. C. repeats this question afterwards, I shall endeavour, once for all, to give it a distinct answer. Corruption admits of degrees; and it might be of some use for the Messiah to come, even if only to render the world far less corrupt than it otherwise would have been.

P. 11. l. 12. ‘*THE NEW WORLD will commence,*’ &c. It will commence at the end of 6000 years from the creation, and with the coming of the Messiah! On this ground, the time of the Messiah’s coming, so far from being unknown, never ‘told to any of the prophets,’ ‘never revealed;’ (P. 9.) is known beforehand with an unexampled certainty and exactness.

L. 16. ‘*Above the angels,*’—Some Christians have collected an opinion of this kind, from the relation in which the redeemed stand to Immanuel, and from the Revelation of St. John;* but not a hint of the kind is given in the Old Testament.—It does not appear, how this most exalted view of ‘the new world under the Messiah,’ can consist with his kingdom ‘being absolutely earthly,’ or with the view given in the subsequent pages, of the state of the gentiles, (that is, of an immense majority of the inhabitants of the earth,) under the reign of Messiah.

P. 11. l. 22. ‘*THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME. We are assured, &c.*’ Isaiah in the text referred to, says, “The Redeemer shall come to Zion; and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the LORD. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD, &c.” With

* Rev. iv. 4. v. 9–14.

whom? Not with Israel, as a nation, but "*with them that turn from transgression in Jacob.*"—But how will it be with those, who "do not turn from transgression in Jacob?" Let us, however, hear in what way the apostle quotes it from the Septuagint: "There shall come out of Zion, the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant with them, when I shall take away their sins."* When the Deliverer, or Redeemer, shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; then he will "take away their sins," by forgiveness, confirm his covenant with them, and so all Israel "shall be saved." But till ungodliness is taken away, this will not be the case. Thus, in coincidence with all the prophecies of Israel's restoration, that event is connected with their conversion from sin and ungodliness; not with the coming of the Messiah, which is *not once mentioned*, in connection with their restoration.† The subject on which the apostle was discoursing, shewed, that he had in prospect, Israel's receiving Jesus as their Messiah and Saviour: indeed, not the coming of the Messiah, but believing in him, is effectual for the blotting out of sin, either of Jew or Gentile: and how can the author persuade himself, or hope to persuade others, that the apostle meant by one line in a quotation, to contradict and disprove that fact, which he spent and ended his life, in unremitted labours and sufferings, to render universally credited, viz. that the Messiah was come, and that Jesus the Nazarene was the Messiah? Or how does all this accord with Mr. C.'s opinion, concerning the absolutely earthly kingdom of the Messiah, and that the Messiah will not forgive sins? (See, on 7.)

P. 12. l. 4. 'THAT THE MESSIAH, &c.' There is not one word in the quotation from Leviticus, or in the whole passage,

* Is. lix. 20, 21. Rom. xi. 26, 27.

† Lev. xxvi. 41, 42. Deut. iv. 29, 30. xxx. 1—10. Jer. xxxii. 39—41. Ez. xi. 17—20. xxxvi. 24—28. xxxvii. 23—28. Hos. iii. 4, 5. xiv. 1—8. Zech. xii. 10—12.

concerning the Messiah; so that nothing can be inferred from it respecting his coming. The crisis in the condition of Israel, is never stated to be "the coming of the Messiah;" but "their "uncircumcised hearts being humbled;" which implies their repentance and conversion, and their receiving in humble faith that Saviour, whom they have pierced. Could Christians produce no better proof, that the Messiah is come, than Mr. C. does that he is not come, their cause would be hopeless.

L. 18. '*Hear you may learn, &c.*' Whence may we learn these things? Not a word is said either about the first or the second temple, or even the tabernacle, or the coming of the Messiah, in any of the texts referred to. I suppose the word often referred to (מִקְדָּשִׁים) in our version rendered "sanctuaries," by Mr. C. translated *temples*, contains the *argument*; but it is used in the *plural*, when only one temple could be meant, if at all included;* of the sanctuaries of Tyre;† of the idol temples of the kingdom of Israel;‡ and in a variety of other senses.—Nothing therefore can be inferred from this single word. In fact, if the two temples exclusively had been meant, the dual number would most properly have been used.

Israel may "pine away in their iniquities," as well for the guilt of "crucifying afresh" from age to age, the promised Messiah, by impenitent unbelief and determined opposition, as for any other of their national sins: and, as the nation has not during many ages been guilty of gross idolatry, this seems an obvious reason of their long-continued abject situation. If this be the case, welcoming in penitent faith this long-rejected Saviour, must be the introduction to their restoration.—And if this be not the guilt, for which God so permanently contends with them, (as I am most fully convinced it is,) let them assign a more adequate and satisfac-

* Ps. lxxiii. 17. Ez. xxi. 2. *Heb.*

† Ez. xxviii. 18. *Heb.*

‡ Am. vii. 9. *Heb.*

tory reason, for the unprecedented dealings of the Lord with their favoured nation, for above seventeen hundred years.

P. 12. l. 23. '*The first covenant, &c.*' How does this agree with the words of the prophets? * '*The first covenant,*' however, was not that made at Mount Sinai, but that made with Abraham, "which the law which was four hundred and thirty years after could not disannul."† Mr. C. has indeed quoted the forty-fifth verse, which seems to refer to the Sinai-covenant;‡ but he has omitted several preceding verses, which should not be unnoticed. "If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they have trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me; and that I have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity: then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the land."‡— '*Christ could not be the Messiah:*'—that is, '*The anointed could not be the anointed!*'

P. 12. last line. '*How came the prophet to take notice of Edom?*' Answer,—The Edomites hated Israel, and exulted over the desolations of Jerusalem, and the miseries of the Jews, with mingled cruelty and scorn.§ It was, therefore, natural for Jeremiah, when mourning over these desolations and miseries, to think of the Edomites: and it pleased God to employ him to foretel, that judgment from the wrath of God, would ere long overtake these insulting foes, and that the Jews would soon return from captivity, and be reinstated in prosperity. Edom is indeed sometimes used, as a general

* Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Ez. xvi. 62.

† Gal. iii. 15—29.

‡ Lev. xxvi. 45.

‡ Lev. xxvi. 40—42.

§ Ps. cxxxvii. 7. Jer. xlix. 7—22. Ez. xxv. 8—14 xxxv.

Am. i. 11, 12. Obad. 1—16.

name, for the enemies of God's people: but whether it be in this place or not; it is certain, that not one word occurs in it concerning the Messiah, or the time of his coming. It is also obvious to remark, that if **EDOM** be the general name of the enemies of the people of God, of whatever nation; **ISRAEL** also is the general name of God's people, though of other nations. Mr. C. I suppose, considers *Edom* as the proper title of the Roman empire, in every form. If I misunderstand him, he must set me right. But, however this may be, or whether his reasonings concerning Israel remaining a prisoner, 'so long as Edom is master,' be logical and well-grounded or not; it is manifest, that a portion of scripture in which the Messiah is not hinted at, can prove nothing either way, concerning the time of his coming; except to those, who have *unscripturally* associated the ideas of his coming with 'the restoration of Israel:' and as fact proves that Israel is not restored, no further proof can be requisite *to such persons*: but 'an honest man,' (P. 13. l. 26.) having well considered this argument, may think with me, that it has no relation at all to the present argument.

P. 13. last line but one. '*Five hundred years before Christ.*' The Lamentations were written after the destruction of the first temple; the second was not destroyed till above seventy years after the birth of Jesus: yet Mr. C. in other places, computes that no more than 490 years occurred between the one and the other! (P. 65, 66.)

P. 13. last line. '*He could do no good to Israel.*' Jesus did good to many tens of thousands of Jews, personally and by his apostles: but what physician can do good to an obstinate patient, who not only rejects his advice and his medicines, but also—*Fit pugil, et medicum urget?—Becomes a pugilist, and fights his physician?*

P. 14. l. 11. '*PROOF FROM THE GOSPEL. &c.*' This is a vain attempt to make the gospel destructive of itself. It

would be indeed most wonderful, if Jesus, who before Caia-phas and Pontius Pilate avowed himself the Messiah, and who was crucified for that avowal, should be found just before to testify that he was not the Messiah! (l. 24.) But this is not the only instance, in which our Lord is introduced, as renouncing the claims, which he was crucified for advancing. Mr. C. has it fully settled in his own mind, that the coming of the Messiah, and the restoration of Israel, must occur at the same time: and thus he is every where led to assume as self-evident, the very point which he ought to prove.

Our Lord's claim to be a Prophet will come under consideration in another place. At present the expression, "until 'the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled,'" may require a brief consideration.

WHAT THEN ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND BY "THE TIMES 'OF THE GENTILES?'" Considerable weight is laid on these words; and Mr. C. takes for granted that they mean, 'until 'the measure of the iniquities of the Gentiles shall be full: (l. 28—31.) but they appear to me to admit of a very different interpretation.—*Ἀχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*; "Until the times of 'the nations shall be accomplished," or, "shall have been 'fulfilled." No expression, at all resembling this, occurs in the Old Testament; or even in the New, except that of the apostle, in the Epistle to the Romans: * *αχρις ἃ το πληρωμα των ἐθνῶν εἰσελθῃ*, "Until the time when the fulness of the nations shall come in." When the times shall arrive, for the fulness of the gentiles to be brought into the church; "the 'blindness," which "in part has happened to Israel," shall be removed, "and so all Israel shall be saved."† This, or somewhat to this effect, is the evident meaning of the apostle: and from his argument it may be concluded, at least with great probability, that, according to his views, the conversion and restoration of Israel will occur nearly at the time,

* Rom. xi. 25.

† Rom. xi. 25—31. 2 Cor. iii. 13—16.

when in the purpose of God, "the fulness of the nations" shall become the subjects of Jesus Christ: and, that the conversion of Israel, occurring at this crisis, shall introduce that grand display of the power, and truth, and mercy of God; and be "as life from the dead" to the nations of the world, and be one grand means of accomplishing it. Certainly the apostle meant the *conversion* of the nations; and there can be little doubt but that the words of our Lord had reference to the same.—Till that period shall arrive, "Jerusalem shall" continue "trodden under foot of the Gentiles."

I do not deny, that the restoration of Israel will be preceded, and attended, by most tremendous judgments on many nations. In this the prophecies both of the Old and New Testament agree.* 'The restoration of Israel' will, no doubt, be one grand part of the Messiah's triumph over the beast, the false prophet, and the old serpent.† Besides antichristian opponents, the Mohammedans and idolaters, in Canaan and in the east, will no doubt vehemently oppose the reinstatement of Israel in the promised land; as the Canaanites did in the days of Joshua, and with the same event. But these dreadful scenes will be of no very long duration, and will introduce "the times of the Gentiles;" or the conversion of all nations to Christianity. Among the converts to our holy religion, Israel will assuredly have a peculiar pre-eminence, as the nation through which God has blessed all other nations: not, as they vainly dream, by ruling over them with haughty dominion; which they will cease to desire, when they fully-experience the loving spirit of Christianity: but by the willing honour, and grateful deference, rendered them by their fellow Christians. Then they will understand, and enter into the apostle's meaning; "There is neither Jew nor Greek, "there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor "female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."‡

* Ez. xxxviii. xxxix. 1—16. Joel iii.

† Rev. xix. 11—21.

‡ Gal. iii. 26—29.

“The times of the Gentiles,” seem to signify the times, during which the Gentiles are permitted to keep possession of Jerusalem; namely, till the Jews be converted unto Christ: then their times will be fulfilled;—probably, the Jews will be restored to their own land, and vengeance will be executed on those who oppose their return. For these events seem to be predicted, introductory to the calling of the nations into the church. Or, the times appointed for the calling of the Gentiles, or all nations, into the church, may be meant. When this draweth nigh, the Jews will recover their holy city.’ (*Family Bible, Note, Luke xxi. 20—24.*)

Nothing can be more clear, than that such a time is foretold throughout the Old Testament. I shall not, in this place, anticipate a question, which will soon come under our consideration: but let the reader carefully consider the texts referred to below; and he must be convinced, I should think, that the times of the Gentiles in this sense may confidently be expected: for “the scripture cannot be broken.”* Whether this conversion of the nations, to the worship of the God of Israel, shall be by their being proselyted to Judaism, as the Jews sometimes appear to admit, or by their conversion to Christianity, may with many persons be a matter of doubt: but the predictions are undeniable; and the times when these shall be fulfilled, are “the times of the Gentiles;” and not the times when the Gentiles, at large, shall be destroyed, or crushed, which is no where foretold by the prophets. On the contrary, after several predictions of dreadful judgments on this, or the other, nation, it is added, “Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab, in the latter days.” The same is said of Ammon and of Elam.† The times are coming, not when Judah shall rule with iron rod over all nations; but when all nations shall be gathered to Judah’s SHILOH; receive from

* Gen. xii. 3. xxii. 18. Ps. xxii. 27. lxxii. 17. Is. ii. 1—4. xix. 24, 25; lx. Jer. xvi. 19. Mic. iv. 1—4. Mal. i. 11.

† Jer. xlviii. 47. xlix. 6. 39.

Judah “the oracles of God;” worship, and serve, and bless themselves, in the God of Israel; and honour and love Israel as the chief nation on earth, and the source of blessings to all other nations. And surely, it might be thought, that this would be more gratifying even to Jews, than their present expectations of lordly dominion: and certainly it will be so, when the Lord shall circumcise their heart, to love him with “all their heart.” Then pre-eminence in love, and gratitude, and honour, from all the happy partakers of their own Messiah’s reign, will be far more delightful to them, than any worldly superiority.

P. 15. l. 1. ‘*This declaration, &c.*’ The apostle, in the passage here in part quoted, is most undeniably speaking of the eternal judgment of individuals, whether Jews or Gentiles.* The Jew, “who is contentious, and does not obey the truth, but obeys unrighteousness;” will have the first and largest portion “of tribulation and anguish,” &c; but the believing and obedient Jews, the first and largest portion of glory and honour, “in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” This is the apostle’s express meaning; and the passage has nothing to do, in the least, with the state of Jews and Gentiles, as to this present world. The degree, whether of anguish or of glory, and not the priority in time, is intended; for both will be *eternal*.

P. 15. l. 11. ‘*You see, &c.*’ The texts referred to below, may shew how Jesus and his apostles understood his predictions on this subject.†

L. 25. ‘*Not one of, &c.*’ It is an attempt requiring no ordinary measure of *heroism*, for a man to undertake to prove, *from the New Testament*, that none but Jews would be the

* Rom. ii. 4—16.

† Matt. xxi. 33—46. xxiii. 34—39. xxiv. 15—22. Luke xix. 41—44. xx. 15—18. xxi. 20—24. Acts iii. 22, 23. iv. 10—12. 25—28. vii. 37—53. xiii. 40, 41. xxviii. 23—28. Rom. ix. 1—3. 24—33. 1 Thes. ii. 13—16. Jam. v. 1—6.

servants of God! The ancient Jews had no idea of an attempt of this kind. It is far from certain, that the Jewish converts are exclusively intended by the hundred and forty-four thousand, who were sealed as the servants of God, “out of all the tribes of the children of Israel;” it being improbable, in the highest degree, that there should be *exactly* the same number out of each tribe. The innumerable number “of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues,” who are afterwards mentioned, are not said to have been sealed, and so Mr. C. excludes them from the title, “the servants of God.”—It is, however, said in the subsequent verses, “these are they, which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.”† If we, poor sinners of the Gentiles, may attain such felicity as this, we shall need no other honour.

Much of what follows is *assertion*—Part we assent to, and part we dissent from. But the great point in controversy, concerning Jesus, (Whether he be the predicted Messiah, or some other is to be expected,) is not concerned in the interpretation, well or ill-grounded, of the texts adduced; and therefore I shall not further notice them.

P. 16. l. 3. ‘*Now when, &c.*’ The prophecy of Zechariah, here in part quoted, has been shewn, by the author of these remarks, to have had a *partial*, yet *illustrious*, fulfilment, in the days of the apostles, and in the succeeding ages:

* Rev. xxii. 2–4.

† Rev. vii. 9–17. Is. xxv. 6–8.

but, that it will have a still more enlarged and glorious accomplishment, when God shall restore Israel, and make the Israelites his willing instruments in converting the Gentile world.* An extract from this may here be properly introduced.—‘The conquerors and destroyers of the Jews have become the worshippers of the God of the Jews. JEHOVAH has superseded Jupiter, and all the other pagan deities, through the vast dominions of the Greeks and Romans; not to dwell on the utter extinction of the ancient idolatry of Chaldea, Persia, and Egypt. The Lord has “furnished all the gods of the earth; and men worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen.”† The God of the Jews, long unknown, except to that obscure and oppressed people, is now the professed Object of worship, throughout the mightiest and most distinguished nations on earth. This is a fact, that cannot be denied or doubted.’ ‘But in what way and by what means was it effected?’ “Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.” “Ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations; even shall take hold of the skirt of him who is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.” Compulsion was not one of the means employed: the conduct, of the persons here stated, was the effect of conviction.—‘The Redeemer was a Jew; all his apostles were Jews, all the seventy disciples, and all the first evangelists, or missionaries to the Gentiles; yea, and all the first converts to Christianity, who, dispersed into various parts of the world, carried among the Gentiles the word of salvation, were Jews!—At the lowest computation, each Jew, (converted to Christianity,) won over ten idolaters to “lay hold on his skirt, and to say, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you.”’

* Sermon preached before the London Society, entitled, ‘The Jews a blessing to the nations.’

† Zeph. ii. 11.

L. S. ‘*Where is the boasting, &c.*’ I believe no real Christian boasts or glories over the Jews: by the gospel, “boasting” is excluded,” compassion and good-will, yea, a kind of respect and gratitude to the Jews, as a nation, must spring from genuine Christianity: nor is the sentiment, of glorying over the Jews, common even among nominal Christians.

P. 16. 1. 10. ‘*BY THE WITNESS, &c.*’—‘*Here he appointed, &c.*’ L. 16. The question of the apostles to our Lord, which was grounded on some degree of misapprehension, involved three enquiries, 1. “When shall these things be?”—2. “What shall be the sign of thy coming?”—3. “And of the end of the world?” And his reply without noticing their misapprehension, gave distinct answers to each. The words, “This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled;” especially answers the question, “When shall these things be?” That is, When shall these buildings of the temple be so entirely destroyed, that “not one stone shall be left upon another?”* The answer, however, includes also, the total subversion of the Jewish constitution, ecclesiastical and civil. It is also evident, that by “the coming of Christ,” the apostles, at this time, understood his coming to judgment, which they supposed would be at “the end of the world.” Nothing could be further from their minds, than the coming of the Messiah, in the sense of Mr. C. and modern Jews: they believed, that Jesus was “the Messiah, the Son of the living God;” and consequently that, in this sense, the Messiah was come—But though Jesus did not see good, fully to rectify their mistakes on this head; leaving that to the times, when the Holy Spirit should be poured out upon them; he evidently distinguished between his coming, in the power of his providence, to execute vengeance on Jerusalem and the Jews; and his final coming to judgment. The one was so connected with the destruction of the temple; that it

* Matt. xxiv. 1—3. Mark xiii. 1—4. Luke xxi. 6, 7.

may be allowed to be comprised in the words, "This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled." But of the other he says, "Of that day knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, but my Father only."* If, indeed, we are called on to argue with Jews from the New Testament, we must explain one part of the New Testament by another: and no impartial man, reading the account of the three evangelists carefully, can doubt, but that the coming of Christ, in most parts of these chapters, is not spoken of, as *personal* and *visible*; but he came by the Roman armies, the instruments of his avenging justice. "As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even to the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be: for wheresoever the carcase is, there shall the eagles be gathered together."† A Jew may *consistently* treat the whole of the prophecy as uninspired, and so, inconclusive: but he can *with no consistency* deny this to be intended by Jesus, in what he spake to the disciples. In the sense intended, he came about A. D. 71.; within considerably less than forty years, after he delivered this prediction; and so before "that generation was passed away." This, therefore, can prove nothing, in the argument before us: for an entirely different subject was treated of.—Let it be noticed, that Mr. C. in order to render his arguments more plausible, selects two verses, one at the beginning, the other, near the end of the chapter, omitting all that intervene; but the whole read together leaves a far different impression on the mind.

P. 16. l. 23. THE MESSIAH, &c. 'When the Messiah, &c.' Answer.—Where does the writer learn, that when 'Messiah shall come, all the sons of Adam will be of one language?' Nothing is predicted concerning this in the Old Testament: the passage most like it runs thus, "Then will

* Matt. xxiv. 34–37. Mark xiii. 30–37.

† Matt. xvi. 28. xxiv. 27, 28. 30. 37. 39. Mark xiii. 26. Luke xxi. 30–36.

“I turn to the people *a pure language*; that they may all “call upon the name of the LORD, to serve him with one “consent.”* But not a word either precedes, or follows, concerning ‘the coming of the Messiah:’ and Christians expect, that during the days of the Messiah, (*but long after his coming,*) the prediction will have a most glorious accomplishment; and men “shall worship God, *every one from his “place*, even all the isles of the Gentiles.”† Thus all, both Jews and Gentiles, shall serve the God of Israel, not as of different religions, but “with one consent:” not in one place, but “every one from his place.”‡

Mr. C. seems here, however, to allow, that “the times of “the Gentiles” may mean the times, ‘when all of them shall ‘worship the true God.’ (l. 26.) This, however, he afterwards disallows, ‘Secondly, that all the Gentiles will not ‘worship the true God even to the last day.’ (P. 66. *last line but one.*)

L. 29. ‘*His coming was of no use, &c.*’ This assertion gives occasion to a very important enquiry;—namely,

WHAT HAVE BEEN THE EFFECTS OF THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST ON THE STATE OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING BOTH ISRAEL AND THE GENTILES?

Mr. C. repeatedly asks the question, ‘Of what use was ‘the coming of Christ?’ He here says, ‘His coming was ‘of no use, and therefore he could not be the Messiah.’ And he subjoins, that his having taught multitudes ‘the *true ‘worship*’ (which is supposing it to be ‘the true worship’) is ‘a poor defence, and without foundation:’ because Mohammed ‘established a *new religion, &c.*:’ as if the *true worship*, and a *new religion* were equivalent!—We, erring, sinful, and self-flattering mortals, are wholly incompetent judges of the plans, counsels, and purposes, of the infinite, eternal, and only wise God. To this day, some parts even of the structure of the

* Zeph. iii. 9. † Zeph. ii. 11. ‡ Mal. i. 11.

human body remain so little understood, that the most skillful anatomists differ in opinion, as to the functions performed by them: and some have been tempted to enquire, ‘Of what use are they?’ Yet God hath created them. If then we are so incompetent to understand the plan of God, in respect of our own bodies; how presumptuous must it be, to reject any part of revealed truth; because we do not see the use of it! or rashly pronounce it useless! I would recommend to all who venture on this kind of language, to consider well the texts referred to below.* I might easily enlarge, but let this hint suffice. It is manifest, that many things exist, as the work of the Creator, of which we cannot perceive the usefulness: and events occur, which, we might previously have supposed, would have been prevented. The very existence of sin and misery, which God, infinite in wisdom and power and goodness, could have prevented, yet did not; is one grand instance, equally conclusive to persons of every creed and nation; that man’s reasonings and imaginations are in no degree the measure, or standard, of the works and ways of God.†

The question, however, as it relates to the effects of the coming of Jesus Christ, admits of a satisfactory answer.—When Jesus was born at Bethlehem, the state of the Jews was extremely corrupt, according to the testimony of their own historian, Josephus; and was daily becoming more and more so. This might easily be proved in various ways; but I question, whether the Jews themselves, considering subsequent events, will be disposed to deny it.

The nations of the earth were generally sunk in gross idolatry, sensuality, and every species of enormous wickedness. The speculations of the few, who called themselves philosophers, terminated chiefly in a sort of practical Atheism:

* Job. xxvi. 14. xxviii. 28. xl. 8. Psalm cxxxix. 6. Isaiah xl. 13, 14.

† Prov. iii. 5—7. Isaiah v. 21.

and even their moral discussions had little effect, either on their own conduct, or that of other men. It would, indeed, be no laborious task, to prove from their own writers, that the apostle has by no means overcharged the picture of the gentile world, in the first chapter of Romans. Now there can be no doubt, that great numbers of the Jews were awakened from their formal and vicious lethargy, by the ministry of John Baptist, our Lord's forerunner, and by the preaching of Jesus and his apostles. Soon after the crucifixion of Jesus, several thousand Jews became his disciples, and, according to records, which no adversary ever ventured to accuse of falsehood, led most holy, harmless, and benevolent lives; and even "a great company (*πολυς οχλος*) of the priests became "obedient to the faith."*

Persecution, however, soon drove great numbers of the converted Jews into distant lands; but wherever they went, they made known the gospel to their countrymen, and in every place a remnant embraced it. These, in general, "walked in "the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost." Probably, at the time of Saul's conversion, there were ten times, perhaps a hundred times, more sober, righteous, and godly persons, among the Jews, than there were at the beginning of John Baptist's ministry; and immense numbers were added to them, before the desolations of Jerusalem. These were only "a remnant" compared with the whole nation: yet there can be little doubt, that this remnant amounted at least to the 144,000, seen by John in vision, sealed from the twelve tribes of Israel.† And was the turning of so many tens of thousands of formal Israelites, with their families, to the Lord their God, and bringing them into the way of peace and salvation, 'Of no use,' because the Jews as a nation rejected the Messiah?

Soon, however, the ministers of Jesus preached to the

* Acts vi. 7.

† Rev. vii. 4-8.

Gentiles also, “that men should repent and turn to God, and “do works meet for repentance:” and in a short time vast multitudes “turned to God from idols, to serve the living “and the true God;” (p. 15. l. 26;) whose pious, holy, and useful lives, rendered them as “lights” among their heathen neighbours. And, not to be prolix, the sacred leaven of the Christian doctrine, diffused its influence so rapidly among the nations, notwithstanding fierce and bloody persecution, that Christians abounded in all parts of the Roman empire: they soon were found in all their cities, and even in their courts and camps; millions were doubtless thus converted to ‘the *true worship*’ and a holy life; and at length, in about 300 years, Christianity became the established religion of all the nations, which had formed the idolatrous Roman empire: and it continues to be so, even to this day, in most parts of it; besides its extension far beyond the utmost boundaries of that empire, to the east and west, and north and south.

There always, indeed, have been far more nominal Christians, than real ones; as well as far more Jews and Israelites, than genuine children and imitators of Abraham and Israel: but who can deny, that, after every reasonable reduction has been made, immense multitudes have become in all successive generations, the spiritual worshippers and servants of God, “they and their children with them?” Will even a Jew deny, that everlasting salvation was the consequence of this conversion from idolatry and wickedness, to God and holiness? If he do, let him state the grounds on which he denies it. And is the everlasting salvation of millions of *no use*? Is the introduction of so many hundreds of thousands, nay, millions, of families, into the company of the true worshippers of God, which in many cases ensures “the oracles “of God” and the means of grace to succeeding generations, of *no use*?—Even among those, who we fear are only nominal Christians, Christianity has in every way produced most

salutary and important effects. It has fixed the standard and tone of morals far higher, than it ever was in the Pagan nations of old, or than it is among modern idolaters. It has terminated gladiatorial shews, the allowed and sanctioned murder of infants, and various other murders, as of slaves, females, and even old persons; with many more cruel and detestable practices and customs: or it has driven them, like wild beasts, into deserts and secret lurking places. Christianity has mitigated the horrors even of war: it is undermining slavery and mitigating its horrors: Christianity alone has built hospitals, and provided asylums for the aged and destitute. We might easily enlarge, but a hint must here suffice. Mr. C. allows, that the Jews receive better treatment in this country than in others: but he is not perhaps aware, that this is the effect of the superior knowledge of Christian principles and duties, which prevails in this favoured land, more than in most others in the world. Were these still more fully understood and practised; the Jews would meet with proportionably a more candid, equitable, and benevolent treatment, from the inhabitants in general; not affected, or as deeming their religious difference from us of subordinate consequence; but as springing from our principles and heart, and as the means of conciliating them to our holy and loving religion. Ere long, I trust that the Jews will more effectually know *the use* of the coming of Jesus, and of his having been “preached to the Gentiles,” by means of such institutions as ‘the London Society,’ and by the blessing of God, on our endeavours to communicate our holy religion to Israel, and being instrumental to their expected conversion and restoration. In short all the true religion, which has been for successive ages, in the whole world, or which exists at this day on earth, and we trust will soon diffuse its sacred influence among all nations, is the effect of the coming of Christ. If the Jews plead, that their nation, or part of it, is at least an

exception; without examining the validity of the plea, it must be allowed to be a solitary exception, and comprises a very small portion indeed of the whole human species.—But the meaning of Mr. C's. question and objection is evident: he judges nothing of use, so long as his own nation is excluded from the desired dominion over other nations. In every other view, the advantages of Christianity to mankind, even as to morals and temporal good, have been incalculable; and millions, yea, probably hundreds of millions, have through it obtained "salvation with eternal glory." Surely, then, Mr. C.'s objection is satisfactorily answered.

P. 16. last line. '*A man arose called Mohammed, &c.*' Leaving the consideration of several things advanced on this topick, till afterwards, I will here take occasion to investigate a subject of the highest importance in the controversy:—namely,—

THE TRIUMPHS OF JESUS, AS COMPARED, AND CONTRASTED, WITH THOSE OF MOHAMMED.

I am not competent to decide, whether 'Mohammed has now 'many more followers than Christ.' (p. 17. l. 2.) Mohammed has comparatively but few followers in Europe, probably none in America. We know very little of the interior of Africa; but it is likely, that continent has far more Mahomedan than Christian inhabitants. China, Japan, and many of the northern parts of Asia, contain few either Christians or Mohammedans. But, however that may be, the followers of Mohammed are doubtless very numerous; and the success of that impostor has been exceedingly extensive and permanent. But three things should be considered, in comparing his success with that of Jesus. 1. The state of those regions, in which the success of each was at the first obtained. 2. The nature of the religion, which each propagated: and 3. The means, by which the triumphs of each were acquired.

1. The state of those regions, in which the success of each was at the first obtained.

When our Lord entered on his ministry in Judea and Galilee, the inhabitants, though hypocritical, or immoral, to a very great degree, were not *illiterate* or *uncivilized*. Most of them could read, and were acquainted with the Old Testament, and there were many learned scribes among them. They were also extremely attached to the forms of religion, and to "the traditions of the elders," on the knowledge of which they highly valued themselves.

The Gentiles also, among whom the most signal and illustrious triumphs of Christianity were obtained, constituted in many respects the most civilized and learned part of the known world, as known at that time: and the gospel began its course, when learning was but little declined from its highest celebrity, immediately after the Augustan age. The Greeks and Romans, who called the rest of the world *barbarians*, were the very people, among whom the gospel obtained a vast proportion of its success, both at first and in subsequent ages. In the Roman colonies, and the Grecian cities, in Egypt and the northern coast of Africa, in Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and even Rome itself; the first Christian churches, out of Judea, were planted. In the heart of those renowned countries, not only addicted in a most haughty manner to their own customs and superstitions, and despising others, especially the Jews: but also comprising almost all the learning, which was then known in the world; Christianity, preached by converted Jews, acquired such a firm establishment, as to undermine both pagan idolatry and pagan philosophy, and to erect her throne on their ruins; and the effects continue to this day. This was accomplished, amidst the persecuting rage and cruelty of the Roman Emperors and other princes; and amidst the scorn and vain reasoning of the philosophers, of every sect and name!

No doubt Christianity triumphed also, in uncivilized and illiterate regions; and at an early period it was established in Britain; then the abode of rude and almost naked savages. But a veil seems purposely to have been cast over the history of Christianity in other parts of the world: and its triumphs in the seats of civilization, learning, philosophy, and authority, are almost exclusively recorded, at least in an authentick and satisfactory manner. Christianity scorned, so to speak, to shrink from the most acute and adequate investigation, or to take any advantage of men's ignorance and incapacity: it challenged the closest examination from all those, who were most competent to detect the fallacy, if there were any, and to judge of its claims. It challenged, I say, this examination: it stood the test, and it triumphed over every opponent, through succeeding generations; and it has triumphed over all to this very day!

Mohammed, on the contrary, arose among the Arabs, who, (except in a kind of astronomy, not much better than astrology), were extremely illiterate, as he himself also was. The time of his appearing coincided, not only with the deep corruption of Christianity, in various ways, but especially by the idolatrous worship of images, of saints, and angels; but also with a term in the annals of history, marked by the decay, and almost extinction, of literature; and only to be exceeded in ignorance, by the dreary ages which followed. The western empire had been subverted by the irruptions of the northern barbarians and others: and the eastern was so divided and enfeebled, that it was capable of making very feeble resistance. Even the Persian empire was enfeebled almost to helplessness. The eastern church, also, was torn in pieces by fierce contests, as well as corrupted by pestilent heresies and superstitions.

It is evident, that Mohammed by the teaching of some Jews, or, as others think, of a Nestorian Monk, had acquired

a confused knowledge of the Old Testament, and a superficial acquaintance with Christianity: and, taking advantage of the divided and corrupt state of the church, which had widely deviated from the scriptures, he professed to be the apostle of God, to rectify and perfect both the religion of Jesus, and that of the Jews, and to establish the religion of 'Abraham the orthodox,' THE HALTER, so the Arabick word signifies. Abraham, says he, was not a Christian, not associating any with God in worship; not a Jew, as not observing the Jewish ceremonies: but he *halted* between both, and so was *orthodox*. His plausible pretences, in this respect, among those, who just knew enough to see that the worship of images and of created beings, was idolatrous; but were too ignorant to discriminate on other matters with any accuracy; concurring with various other circumstances, gave him at length, and after many delays, considerable success among those of his own nation, and in the countries, which had formed the eastern empire and the Greek church; where the most deplorable ignorance prevailed, not only among the laity, but even among the clergy and bishops. In after times indeed his successors and followers cultivated learning; and, (which was easily effected,) added superiority in science, to the victorious power of their arms. Thus their triumphs were extended more and more widely; in Asia, Africa, and many parts of Europe: and the Turks, or Othmans, succeeding to the Saracens, the successes of Mohammedism continue to this day. But neither at first, nor afterwards, were they required, to exhibit their religion and its evidences, amidst keen, sagacious, learned, and philosophical opponents, possessed of superior rank and authority, and able to excite the arm of persecution, in aid of their exertions and reasonings, against the detested innovators; as the case had been, with those by whom Christianity was propagated. The triumphs of Mohammedism were in dark and illiterate ages, and in the

dark and illiterate regions, of the world : and, however it may have been in Africa and the east, the revival of learning, and the spirit of acute investigation, which accompanied the reformation of Luther and his coadjutors, stayed the progress of Mohammedism; in all countries to which the influence of that revolution in learning and publick opinion extended, and terminated its triumphs ; nay, reduced its dominion within more narrow limits. This leads us to consider,

2. The nature of that religion, which each of them, (Jesus and Mohammed,) propagated.

The religion of Mohammed, as far as doctrinal points are concerned, resembled in many respects that of modern Soci-nians or Unitarians, as they very *improperly* and *unfairly* call themselves. His great zeal was manifested against ASSO-CIATORS; or those who joined idols, or creatures, or Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit, with God in religious worship ; whom he condemns and anathematizes, and threatens with hell-fire, almost in every chapter of the Koran, and often repeatedly in the same chapter. He argued almost exactly in the same manner, against the idea of God's having a Son, as Mr. C. does. He attempted to divest Christianity, not only of its *corruptions*, but also of its *mysteries*; especially " the great Mystery of Godliness, God manifest in " the flesh : " and how palatable this is to the pride of self-wise man, we well know. " The offence of the cross," the doctrine of the atonement, and all ideas of *redemption*, are excluded from his system ; along with that of *regeneration*, and a new creation unto holiness. Consequently the doctrines of original sin, man's depravity as a fallen creature, his universal exposedness to the wrath of God, and his need of gratuitous mercy and salvation ; do not at all occur to affront the self-righteous and self-confident pride of the human heart.

In one particular indeed Mohammed wholly differed from modern Socinians; viz. that a state of future and eternal punishment is a prominent part of his system: but this, as he managed it, exceedingly forwarded his success among rude and ignorant barbarians and half Christians: for none but infidels, and associators, and apostates from his religion, were exposed to it. All, who believed in God and in his prophet Mohammed, and paid a kind of quit-rent of prayers, alms, and pilgrimages, without regard to the holiness or unholiness of their general conduct, were secured against this tremendous doom. A sort of purgatory was declared for such believers as were not wholly prepared for paradise, or deserving of it: and all zealous believers, especially such as fought for the faith, were secure of immediate admission into his sensual heaven. ‘The sword,’ says Mohammed, ‘is the key of heaven and hell, a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer. Whoever dies in battle, his sins are forgiven; and at the day of judgment, his wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion, and odoriferous as musk: and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels.’ I apprehend, that numbers of nominal Christians would feel much less aversion to the doctrine of future and eternal punishments, if thus limited and explained, with reference to the external profession of Christianity, and attachment to it. Besides the dread of so dire a destruction for themselves, and relatives, and connections, from which men shrink back; the idea that they are deserving of it for their rebellion against God, excessively tends to set them against it.

The doctrine of human merit, in general, and of works of supererogation in particular, were inculcated by Mohammed. ‘The two mountains, Sapha and Merva, are monuments of the sacred things of God. He, therefore, who shall go on pilgrimage to the house of God, and shall visit it, there shall

‘be no guilt upon him, if he surround them: and he who performs any good work, of his own accord, truly God will be grateful.’ Koran ch. 2. طوع 5 Conj. طاع *Suo libitu, et sponte, citra legis necessitatem aut dictamen boni quid fecit, deditve. Golius.* ‘Of his own accord, beyond the necessity or dictating of the law, shall give or do any good thing.’ Especially every exertion, contribution, or risk, by which the faith of Mohammed could be propagated, was not only meritorious, but entitled a man to *indulgences* and extra rewards.

It is generally said, that Mohammed held *predestination*: and this is in some sense true; but his sentiments on that subject neither fully accorded with heathen *fatalism*, nor with Christian *predestination*. Different from the heathens, he supposes, what we may call the *fatality* of events, to originate entirely from the decree of God: yet he by no means speaks of it, as the result of infinite wisdom, justice, goodness, and truth, fore-knowing and fore-appointing every thing in the best manner possible, for the display of his own glory, and the highest good of all obedient creatures, and of all the redeemed, and in general of his universal and eternal kingdom. He had just enough of that persuasion; that all events are decreed and must come to pass, which operated on his soldiers, in the very same manner, as notions of *lucky* and *fortunate*, do among our soldiers and sailors, to make them confident and fearless in every danger: but, in respect of human actions, he seems to make God the author alike of the good and of the evil.

Stated prayers, giving alms, chiefly a proportion of spoils taken in war, or of other gains, which Mohammed required as an oblation to God; fastings, for which very convenient and accommodating compensations are appointed, and pilgrimages, but especially ‘fighting in the path of God,’ form the substance of his practical religion. His moral precepts are

very thinly scattered in the Koran, and very vaguely expressed; and with much allowance to believers, even as much as the carnal heart can well desire. The "holy, just, good, " and spiritual law" of God, is as much left out, or thrown into the back ground, as the doctrines of redemption are. As much indulgence to the sensual passion, in respect of polygamy, and the concubinage of females taken in war, is granted, as human nature can wish for. It would be an outrage to common decency to quote the Koran on this subject; and still more its Mohammedan commentators, who generally make the text itself appear more filthy by their glosses, than it really is. All limitations, except men could not bear the expence, were merely nominal: a limited number of wives was connected with concubinage, in most cases; while Mohammed's own example greatly exceeded in licentiousness, the laws, however indulgent, which he prescribed to others.

He indeed, in some places, forbids the use of wine, but in others he seems to allow of it; or to consider the use of it only as unfavourable to his political designs: for delicious wines form one of the gratifications of his paradise. Not the least restraint was placed by his religion on pride, ambition, avarice, rapacity, or the malignant passions: nay, the whole of his system tended greatly to nourish and encourage them. —Here then was every thing congenial to depraved nature; every thing gratifying to one or other of the corrupt passions. Even paganism, at least the system of pagan moralists and philosophers, required far more self-denial, and fixed a far higher standard of morals, than Mahomedism does. To crown the whole, it proposed to the hopes of its votaries, a heaven of perpetual enjoyment of the most exquisite sensual delights, which the most voluptuous imagination could conceive, or heart desire:—"They will feed on the most delicious fruits, be ' clothed in the most splendid silken garments, refreshed with ' rivers of water, wine, milk, and honey, entertained with the

‘most delightful musick, and the ravishing girls of paradise, with black eyes, the enjoyment of whose company will be a principal felicity of the faithful.’

Mohammed is by many supposed to have maintained, that women had no souls. This, however, does not appear to be well-grounded: but as a new creation of most beautiful women, to continue for ever in youth and vigour, formed on purpose for the gratification of the faithful, was a most essential part of his heaven; it is plain that the women who were of his religion in this world could not well share the same felicity: yet he repeatedly speaks of believing women being admitted to paradise. Women, in his hateful system, were considered, as almost exclusively, the objects of men’s sensual indulgence; and were in other respects of so little consequence, and he was so little concerned to excite them, (who were in general the most abject slaves of the men,) to exertion in his cause; that he seems almost to have overlooked them in his views of a future world.

One further particular appears to belong to this part of the subject. The followers of Mohammed were fully entitled to all the spoil and captives taken from the vanquished, paying a small tax to him out of it: while the inhabitants of the countries among whom they went, had only the option of embracing the religion of the conquerors, and sharing their privileges, or of being either slain or made slaves. This excessively facilitated their success, when once begun: and though political wisdom afterwards, especially as to the Christians, modified this condition, yet the spirit of it prevailed to a very great degree. From this view of the religion of Mohammed, it is evident to all, who know human nature, and what suits the market, or coincides with the desires and imagined wants of men, that it was admirably adapted for the purpose. It had nothing, in the general constitution of fallen human nature, to oppose it, and much, very much

to recommend it. The powers of darkness had no interest in exciting opposition to it, but the contrary. Local prejudices, customs, and superstitions, with personal interests, formed a temporal obstruction. So would learning and philosophy also, had any been found in those dark times and regions; and the authority of princes; if any had been powerful enough to resist the torrent, but none were. Mohammed accordingly found difficulty, great difficulty, at first, in putting his machine in motion: but that once effected, there needed no immediate divine interposition to give it efficacy; no, not even what Mr. C. calls '*good fortune*:' an immediate divine interposition was as requisite to arrest and stop its progress, as to stop that of a tremendous conflagration, or of an impetuous torrent.

Having obtained a full establishment, the same causes added to its entire and inseparable union with the politicks and government of Mohammed's successors, and other princes of that religion, have prolonged its prevalence, in ignorant and despotick countries; and probably will do so, till the light of pure Christianity expose the whole to neglect and disgrace.

Few words may suffice for the contrast of the holy religion of Jesus, with the unholy system which we have delineated. The perfect law of "loving God with all the heart, and mind, and soul, and strength," and of "loving our neighbour as ourselves," explained, and applied to every circumstance and relation of human life. Man is uniformly considered, as a sinner deserving the wrath of God for his violations of this holy law; and by his proneness, arising from the carnal mind, to refuse subjection to it, he is represented as "a vessel of wrath, fitted for destruction;" inheriting fallen Adam's rebellious and apostate nature, and ready to imitate his disobedience. To him, in this ruined and wretched state, the most full, and suitable, and gracious, proposals of mercy, reconciliation, and recovery to

holiness are made: but in such a way, as never for a moment suffers him to lose sight of the dreadful and hateful nature of sin, and his just desert of final wrath and misery: and, in this proposal, through the righteousness and redemption, and intercession of Immanuel, "God manifested in the flesh;" the holy law is more especially honoured, both in its precept and in its awful sanction. Every doctrine of Christianity is diametrically opposite, nay, *designedly opposed*, to man's pride of self-wisdom, self-righteousness, self-confidence, and self-will. He must, in order to be saved, "become a fool, that he may be made wise;" and "receive the kingdom of God," not as a reasoning philosopher, but "as a little child."—He must seek mercy, as a self-condemned criminal, "submitting to the righteousness of God," and renouncing his own righteousness. He must come even "to the throne of grace," not in his own name, but in the name of his faithful and merciful High Priest; and seek forgiveness and grace, not for his own sake, or for the sake of any thing, which he has done or can do; but for the sake of the righteousness and atonement of his heavenly Advocate, and "through faith in his name:" nay, even "the spiritual sacrificēs of praise and thanksgiving," are only "acceptable, through Jesus Christ."* This repentance, and faith, and grace, and "things accompanying salvation," are all to be considered as "the gift of God;" and the whole glory given to him. His restoration to holiness, his moral capacity of serving God acceptably in this world, and enjoying his love in heaven, must be effected by "a new creation."—"We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Self-dependence and self-glorying, in every thing, are systematically and most carefully excluded. Every difference is ascribed to the grace of God. Even while we are called "to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling;" we are

* Phil. i. 11. Col. iii. 17. Heb. xiii. 15, 16. 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.

reminded, that "it is God who worketh in us to will and "to do of his good pleasure." Every thing is suited to give offence to all, except "the poor in spirit," and the humble in heart. Yet not the least allowance is given to any one of our corrupt inclinations. The mortification of those passions, which among men are in high estimation, is as absolutely required, as that of the most grovelling sensuality. Ambition and the love of human applause, and emulation of excelling others, and desire of power and pre-eminence, are even more decidedly proscribed, than drunkenness and licentiousness. "God resisteth the proud;" (*ὁ πρηφάνους ἀνίστασται.*) Christianity, again, makes no exceptions, in her impartial and holy requirements, in favour of the wealthy, the powerful, and the noble; no, not of kings and emperors: and so far from making more allowance to the zealous professors of her holy truths than to others, she considers sin in them as far more heinous, than in "those who know not God;" and denounces a doom on wicked professors of the gospel, more intolerable at the day of judgment, than even that of Sodom. No zeal, or labours, or endowments, though a man should "speak with the tongues of men and of angels," and should "give his body to be burned," after having preached as long and as successfully as the apostle Paul himself, is allowed as a compensation for "working iniquity:" and after all, if the preacher, or martyr, hath not "kept under his "body, and brought it into subjection," (what a contrast to Mohammedan licentiousness!) he himself will be "a cast-away."—

At the same time, the heaven proposed by Christianity, is one of perfect purity and holy love: a heaven of perfect conformity to God, and constant delight in him, and in his worship and service. Such a heaven, as no unholy man could endure. "Without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." In order to be "made meet for this inheritance of the saints

“in light,” from which the most honourable and lawful of our earthly comforts and satisfactions are excluded; “the flesh must be crucified with its affections and lusts;” the right hand, which causes to offend, must be cut off; and even our most lawful attachments and inclinations must be habitually subjected to the holy will of God. As to this world, nothing is set before us, but the prospect of self-denial and tribulation; except such supports and comforts, as come from God alone, and consist principally in the hopes and earnestness of heavenly glory and felicity. Food and raiment, with a contented mind, is the whole of that which is expressly promised. Instead of being allured, like Mohammed’s followers, by the hope of plunder, or power, of wealth and sensual pleasure; we are called on to “deny ourselves, and take up our cross,” and follow our suffering Saviour, forsaking all and prepared to “lay down our lives for his sake.”

Were all men *consistent* Mohammedans, all would be sensual, selfish, ambitious, deceitful, malignant, “having a form of godliness, but denying the power of it.” Were all men *consistent* Christians; all would be piety, purity, humility, integrity, disinterested, liberal, self-denying love. The earth would be full of happiness, approximating to that of heaven, and preparing for it: and, without any effort to induce them, men would every where, “beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and would learn war no more.”

But our divine religion wants a more able panegyrist; not as panegyrists in general, to ascribe to her undeserved honours, but to do her justice in any tolerable measure. This, however, may suffice to shew, that in such a world as this, a religion, which declared war against all vices, and all the proud virtues, all the ignorance and delusion, all the “science falsely so called,” all the irreligion, and all the religion,

of the whole world; which attempted not, like heathen moralists, to rule by balancing parties, and to prevail against grovelling vices, by sanctioning ambition and love of glory; but proscribed all, without exception: I say, that such a religion should become triumphant to the degree and extent, and in that durable manner, which it undeniably has; is an event unprecedented and astonishing, and which never could, in the prospect, have been imagined, except by those, who considered the power of Almighty God as engaged to render it successful. This may introduce the third part of our subject,

3. The means, by which the triumphs of Christianity, and those of Mohammedism were acquired.

The apostle might well say, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing, that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity, every thought to the obedience of Christ."* Jesus himself appeared as a poor man, "not having where to lay his head:" having been educated, not in the schools of learning, but in the cottage, nay the carpenter's shop of Joseph; without wealthy or powerful connexions; and despised and opposed by all those who possessed learning, authority, rank, or influence, and those who were invested with the priestly character. He chose his immediate followers, and the ministers of his spiritual kingdom, the commanders in this holy warfare, from the fisher-boats of Galilee, or the receipt of custom. He paid no court to the great and noble, but "preached the gospel to the poor;" which was an additional reason of the opposition of the Jewish rulers to his claims, and continues to be so to this day. "He went about doing good," in the midst of all kind of opposition, contempt, reproach, and con-

tradition : and when his numerous and stupendous miracles so affected the common people, that they wanted to make him a King, and to enlist under his banners, as a temporal leader ; he decidedly resisted or evaded their attempts. Having spent some years, in constantly preaching the word of life : exhibiting all the time a spotless example, performing innumerable miracles of mercy, patiently suffering all hardships and injuries, and employing his hours of retirement in fervent devotion ; he was at last, “ led as a lamb to the “ slaughter ;” nailed to the cross, as a deceiver and blasphemer ; and expired, amidst the cruel insults of rulers and people, the Jews and gentiles.

At this crisis, his cause appeared hopeless, and his followers almost despaired. But, behold ! in less than two months after his crucifixion, his apostles, unarmed, unlettered, and obscure men, began boldly to preach the crucified Jesus as the Messiah, the Saviour, and Judge of the world, “ the “ Lord of glory” and the “ Prince of life :” charging the rulers of the Jews with having wickedly murdered him ; attesting his resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven ; and calling on all to believe in him, as they would escape the wrath of God and obtain salvation ; and appealing to the ancient prophets, that “ thus it was written and “ thus it must be.”

In this most perilous, and apparently hopeless service, which could not but give intolerable offence to all the rulers, and priests, and teachers, who had condemned Jesus ; they had not the least protection, except from the power of God ; and as the miracles which they wrought, combined with their dignified and mild courage, to overcome their superiors, and impress favourably the multitude. They, however, stood their ground ; and did not so much as flee from Jerusalem, or shrink from the most publick testimony, after repeated imprisonments. It would be tedious to enter into a further detail. They engaged in what must have appeared to the wise men

of this world, a desperate attempt. They undertook, (going forth in the strength “ of JEHOVAH, and proclaiming his “ righteousness,”) to prevail against all the vice and proud virtue, the religion and irreligion, the ignorance, and learning, and philosophy of the whole world ; and all the rooted habits and customs, and interests of every nation ; with no other weapons than faithful, argumentative, persuasive preaching ; holy and exemplary lives ; fervent prayers ; patient and constant sufferings, even unto death ; and miracles of mercy and beneficence. If the reader would see a masterly delineation of their ministry, let him carefully consider the apostle’s description of his own conduct. “ Giving no offence in any “ thing, that the ministry be not blamed : but in all things “ approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much “ patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, “ in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in “ fastings ; by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by “ kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned : by the “ word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of “ righteousness on the right hand and on the left : through “ honour and dishonour ; through evil report and good report : as deceivers, and yet true ; as unknown, and yet “ well known ; as dying, yet behold, we live ; as chastened, “ but not killed ; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ; as poor, “ yet making many rich ; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.”*

To preach, as the Saviour and Judge of the world, and the Lord of all, the very person, whom Pontius Pilate, by the earnest request of the Jewish rulers, priests, scribes, and people, had crucified between two robbers ; to preach this, in an enlightened age, and among the most enlightened nations ; to preach this successfully and triumphantly : for such men as the apostles were, to accomplish this, to so great a degree

* 2 Cor. vi. 3—10.

as before their death, to fix the foundations of Christianity on so firm a basis, and to prepare the way for such future successes, by far inferior instruments: that Christianity should effect the revolutions which it has effected, and continue and prevail, during so many centuries, amidst such persecutions, and so many internal corruptions and traitors, even to this day, with clear and opening prospects of still greater triumphs: this, I say, is the grand wonder of the world! But it was "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the LORD of hosts." Every thing combined to crush Christianity in its infancy and childhood, except as protected and prospered by Omnipotence.—Its triumphs during those ages, when, being exposed to persecution, no weapons but those above described, were used, prepared the way for its subsequent successes. Other weapons, which were afterwards adopted, if they seemed to effect any thing, more than counterbalanced it, by disgracing the cause. To this day, all the valuable success of Christianity has been, and is effected, by the same weapons, (miracles excepted,) which the apostles, and primitive evangelists employed, and those exclusively. And in the same way, there seems an opening prospect of such increasing success, as shall fulfil the prophecy, of "the Stone cut out of the mountain without hands, becoming a Mountain, and filling the whole earth."—"When the enemy came in like a flood," in the late inundation of infidelity and atheism, "the Spirit of God lifted up a standard against him." The different Societies for promoting the cause of Christianity, are honoured as standard-bearers; but I must consider the British and Foreign Bible Society, as the principal standard-bearer of them all.

Now contrast the means by which Mohammed obtained his triumphs:—

The first step of Mohammed's emerging from obscurity was his marrying a rich widow, whose affairs he had successfully

conducted: and it appears, that when he aspired to the office and honour of a prophet, she was his first disciple; and then some of her relations joined his cause. But he laboured, by preaching, and other methods of that kind, with very discouraging success, for several years; and indeed was exposed to much opposition and persecution, from his idolatrous countrymen. He, at length, however, by paying court to the wealthy, who probably became sensible that his views might be rendered subservient to schemes of rapacity and ambition; of conquest, plunder, and dominion; acquired several powerful associates: and ere long he found himself placed at the head of an army, well appointed, and eager for conflict, victory, and rapine. The very nature of his religion, to those who really credited it, supplied powerful incentives to the carnal mind, to fight resolutely in promoting it: while the abundant acquisitions made by the surviving combatants, most powerfully allured numbers to combine with them. Still, however, almost every chapter in the Koran shews the immense difficulties, which he had to encounter, from his more sceptical followers, because he wrought no miracles in proof of his mission. He is compelled to use evasions, to make vain excuses, and to menace those, who persisted in demanding such divine attestations, with miracles of vengeance. As new difficulties arose, he added new chapters to his book, with a most imposing confidence: and when the new revelation contradicted any of those previously given, he did not scruple to say, that God had changed his mind; in direct contradiction to what has been called his belief of predestination! He also pretended to work miracles: but he very wisely performed them, either entirely in private, or among a few select friends; so that the *report* of them was the only proof to men in general of his mission. Every delusion was practised; and he seems fully to have entered into the spirit of the maxim, *Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur*. ‘After he had made himself master of Medina,

' he assumed in his new revelations, a fiercer and a more sanguinary tone.—He was now commanded to propagate his religion by the sword, to destroy the monuments of idolatry; and, without regarding the sanctity of days or months, to pursue the unbelieving nations of the earth. In the first months of his reign, he practised the lessons of this holy warfare: the martial apostle fought in person at nine battles and sieges; and fifty enterprizes of war were achieved in ten years, by himself and his lieutenants.'—' In the exercise of political government, Mohammed was compelled to abate of the stern rigour of fanaticism, and to comply, in some measure, with the prejudices and passions of his followers, and to employ even the vices of men, as the instruments of their salvation—The use of *fraud and perfidy*, of cruelty and injustice, were often subservient to the propagation of the faith: and Mohammed commanded and approved the assassination of the Jews and idolaters, who had escaped in the field of battle. By the *repetition of such acts*, the character of Mohammed must have been gradually stained; and the influence of such pernicious habits, would be poorly compensated by the practice of the personal and social virtues, which are necessary to maintain the reputation of a prophet, among his sectaries and friends. Of his last years, ambition was the ruling passion; and a politician will suspect, that he secretly smiled, (the victorious impostor,) at the enthusiasm of his youth, and the credulity of his followers.' In the support of truth, *the arts of fraud and fiction*, may be deemed less criminal; and he would have started at the foulness of the means, had he not been satisfied of the importance and justice of the end.'—(*Gibbon*.) The reader will know how to appreciate such a confession, as this from the infidel author of 'The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;' and how to allow for his base insinuations. Let the reader compare the apostle's words, "As we are slanderously reported,

“and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil, that good may come; whose damnation is just;”* and learn the principles of our holy religion, so opposite both to the conduct of Mohammed, and the insinuations of Gibbon.

After the death of Mohammed, many most absurd miracles were said to have been wrought by him: but if his successors had used no other “weapons of warfare,” than either his Koran, or his miracles, Mohammedism would soon have expired with its departed founder.

Such a sensual and worldly religion, however, enforced by the sword of numerous, victorious, and disciplined armies, full of enthusiastical devotees of their new faith, had little need of miracles to secure its success among the adjacent nations; considering their enfeebled and distracted state. Indeed, it must have been a most stupendous miracle, which could have arrested its progress: and it is most wonderful, that with such means, and such armies and commanders, it did not, as an overwhelming deluge, spread far more extensively its most destructive effects. But he who said to the ocean, “Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed,” limited and stopped its progress; exactly at the time, when, and as, it had been predicted by the apostle many ages before.† Since that period, the cause has at least been stationary for some ages: and there are at present (directly contrary to the prospects which Christianity presents, at a far later period of its existence,) many symptoms of its declining influence, and indications of its approaching ruin.

I shall rejoice, if this compendious statement may excite younger, and more learned men, who have access to books, which in my retired situation I have not, to investigate this subject more fully. For, though Christians have hitherto seemed little aware of it: Mohammedism, with the *superficial*, (that is, with a vast majority of mankind,) is the most

* Rom. iii. 5—8.

† Rev. ix.

specious and dangerous rival of Christianity on earth; and requires far greater study and labour to expose it, than have yet been employed. The most of what has been done, has been done by papists—But,

*Non tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget.*

Compare then the state of the nations, as to learning, policy, and religion, in which Christianity triumphed, and in which Mohammedism triumphed; the opposite nature of the holy religion of Jesus, and the unholy imposture of Mohammed; and the means by which each succeeded: and I trust, it must be allowed, that the success of Mohammedism does not afford so much as the shadow of an argument against the divine mission of the holy Jesus.

I believe, I might now leave the whole of what Mr. C. says on this subject, to its doom, as requiring no further answer, (P. 17, 18.) The doctrine of the Trinity, (P. 17. l. 10,) and that of antitrinitarians, cannot be disposed of, or the controversy settled, by such remarks. The Jew laughing at Christians and Turks; (l. 17,) the lawsuit; (l. 18,) the castle, &c; (l. 28,) are surely so stated as to be displeasing even to considerate Jews. It is indeed grievous, that in subjects of infinite importance, men can so egregiously trifle; and divert themselves and one another, in the great concerns of eternal salvation or damnation. In this lawsuit there is no *judge*; the *parties*, *witnesses*, and *deciders*, are all the same three companies; viz. the Jew, the Turk, and the Christian; and the Jew of course decides in his own behalf. But how will God decide at last? “Do ye think that I will accuse you
“to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses
“in whom ye trust; For had ye believed Moses, ye would
“have believed me; for he wrote of me.”* I trust this will be proved in the course of this work.

* John v. 45, 46

The Christian, indeed, heartily believes, that the law of Moses is "the law of God:" but he distinguishes between, what was introductory to the Messiah's coming, and what is of permanent, nay, eternal, obligation: but the Mohammedan equally allows the truth of Christianity, as of the Mosaick law: he distorts both of them, and endeavours to maintain his system on the ruins of both. Mohammed never attempts to adduce any thing from the Old Testament, but he adds, alters, leaves out part, and pollutes, the rest. Perhaps the power of falsehood in marring the beauty, purity, and simplicity of scriptural narrative, does not appear more striking in Hesiod's dreams about Pandora's box, than in Mohammed's history of Joseph.

In fact, of all the books, which I ever attempted to read, the Koran contains the fewest ideas, and the most wearying sameness. I suppose, they who, fully understanding Arabick, read it as, in some respects, a living language, find the periods and cadences sonorous and pompous. But it is the *dullest* book I ever opened: and I turn from it with a sort of anticipated satisfaction, not only to the sacred scriptures, or to the writings of Christians, or to heathen moralists; but even to the entertaining and ingenious fictions and trifles of the Latin and Greek poets.

P. 18. l. 4. '*Good fortune attended both.*' What is the meaning of '*good fortune*,' in the vocabulary of a Jew or a Christian? I read nothing of it, either in the original scriptures, or in our translation of them. In our Prayer-book translation of the Psalms, '*good luck*' thrice occurs: and it would be an improvement, if it were changed for some other term; but as it is '*good luck in the name of the LORD,*' it does not lead us to erroneous sentiments.—The heathen considered Fortune as a sort of independent goddess, in some respects superior to their other gods; and they built temples and altars, and offered sacrifices, to her:—and the clause '*good fortune*

‘attended them both,’ savours of the same heathenism. It has been seen, how God made Christianity successful: but as to Mohammed’s success, we may write as one did under Pope Adrian’s inscription—‘*Hic Deus nihil fecit:*’ indeed the same reprehension is far more justly due to all Mr. C.’s language in this passage—Moses, Jesus, Mohammed: Jew, Christian, Turk, begin, continue, and end the whole; as if altogether independent of God, who is not at all mentioned, except as the law of Moses is called ‘the law of God.’ But this is not the worst. What shall we say to such language as this? ‘If Moses should one day come to visit his castle, he would be surprised to find two castles built on the top of his: and in a great rage, *he would command one of his tempests*, saying, ‘go ye and pluck them both off, and cast them away, and let me see no more of them.’ How different the language of prophecy! “Thus saith the LORD God; I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury, and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hail-stones in my fury to consume it. So will I break down the wall that ye have builded with untempered mortar,” &c.* Are the *tempests* then at the command of Moses? Are they *his tempests*? Surely this language is as contrary to the Old Testament as to the New. Let us at least, in pleading our several causes, not forget, that “the LORD reigneth.”—Mr. C. makes the word Turk to mean the same as Mohammedan: (P. 17. l. 2,) but *Turk* is the name of a *nation*, not a *religion*. Probably, the Turks in general are Mohammedans: but the Mohammedans in Persia, the East Indies, and the interior of Africa, are not Turks.

P. 18. l. 13. ‘*The castle of Moses, &c.*’—What says Jeremiah on this subject? “Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house

* Ez. xiii. 10—16. Job xxxviii. 22—25. Ps. cvii. 25. Jer. x. 13. Jon. i. 4.

“of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to
 “the covenant which I made with their fathers, when 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. And this shall be
 “the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after
 “those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their
 “hearts, and write it in their inward parts; and I will be
 “their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall
 “teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man
 “his brother, saying, Know ye the LORD: for they shall all
 “know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them,
 “saith the LORD; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I
 “will remember their sin no more.” Was not the apostle
 warranted by this prediction to say, “In that he saith, a
 “new covenant, he hath made the first *old*; now that which
 “decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away?”*
 Even the letter and form of the law of Moses, as it relates
 to ritual observances, has, not only in its most important
 requirements been rendered impracticable, ever since the
 destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, that is for above
 seventeen hundred years; but it has also been disregarded in
 many things practicable, by the Jews in their dispersions.

P. IS. I. 14. ‘*It was ordained, &c.*’ The Messiah is
 predicted by Daniel, as coming under the fourth kingdom,
 made known by Nebuchadnezzar’s dream:† but his com-
 ing was predicted under the emblem of “a Stone cut out
 without hands;” evidently intimating the feeble beginnings of
 his kingdom; being of the same import with the parables of
 the grain of mustard-seed, and of the leaven, by which Jesus
 Christ predicted the nature and progress of his gospel.‡ Its
 original was small, and its success gradual, and at first unob-

* Jer. xxxi. 31—34 Heb. viii. 8—13. † Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45.

‡ Matt. xiii. 31—33.

served by the rulers of the world : it proceeded without any human help, or power, and amidst great opposition from man. The coming of the Messiah must indeed be under the fourth kingdom; and so was the coming of Jesus: but it is, *his final success*, when “the Stone cut out without hands, became “a great Mountain, and filled the whole earth,” which is predicted, as taking place when the fourth kingdom was divided into ten kingdoms. There is no intimation that the Messiah should not come *till that time*: on the contrary the same prophet predicted, that he should come before the desolations of Jerusalem.*—“Of the *increase* of his government and peace “there shall be no end,” says Isaiah.† Jesus came when the fourth kingdom had attained to its height of power and dominion: and by the influence of his gospel, and those “weapons of warfare,” which have been described, he undermined and subverted the pagan idolatrous power of Rome; and its temporal dominion at length was enfeebled, till ten kingdoms were formed from the ruins of that unwieldy fabrick; the legs and thighs of iron terminated in the ten toes of the image; and in this form, “the Stone cut out without hands “shall smite the image,” and fully dissipate it as chaff, and “shall become a great Mountain and fill the whole earth.” This remains to be fulfilled; but it is connected with the last victories, and largest increase of the kingdom, of the Messiah, and not with his first coming, and his feeble beginnings. Indeed nothing in the whole prophecy is at all spoken concerning the coming of the Messiah; but merely about the fifth kingdom, and its final prevalence, and its “filling the “whole earth.”

P. 18. l. 23. ‘IS THE MESSIAH TO COME TWICE?’ Christians do not suppose that the Messiah will come twice, in that sense in which Mr. C. seems to propose the question: or, a second time, until he shall come in glory to judge the

* Dan. ix. 24—27.

† Is. ix. 7.

world. But in that sense, in which it has been shewed, that he came in the early times of the gospel, to set up his kingdom, to rescue his persecuted church, and to take vengeance on his crucifiers, by destroying Jerusalem and the temple, and inflicting the most tremendous judgments on the Jews: even by the power of his Providence, and by the sacred influence of his holy Spirit. He will also come again ere long, to dissipate all the remains of the Roman, antichristian, persecuting empire, and “to fill the earth with his glory.” He came once “as a Child born, as a Son given;” “as a Root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness, or any beauty that men should desire him:”* but he shall come again gloriously, as Lord of all, as “King of kings and Lord of lords,” to take to himself the kingdom over all the earth.

Some Christians indeed expect his *personal* appearance and reign on earth: but this seems, to me at least, not capable of proof, either from the Old Testament or the New: and the first verses of the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah, clearly predict his coming as a Conqueror, to destroy his enemies, and rescue his people; indeed as clearly as any part of the New Testament.

Thus Daniel also says, “I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days; and there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.”† “The Son of man,” is here spoken of, not as coming from heaven to earth, to receive this kingdom; much less as born on earth, and coming as “a Child born, and a Son given;” but as ascending from the earth, into the presence of “the

* Is. ix. 6, 7. liii. 1, 2.

† Dan. vii. 13, 14.

“Ancient of days,” and receiving from him this kingdom. This then, however interpreted, must be distinct from his first coming, as “a Child born.” ‘Though the immediate Ruler of this kingdom be called “the Son of man:” yet it is obvious, that there is something amazing in the ‘prophetick description of the high honour and glory that ‘is given to him. There is at least some difficulty in conceiving, how such everlasting glory and dominion should ‘belong to any one, who should be no more than man, ‘or a mere creature: and particularly in conceiving how ‘such magnificent things should be ascribed to one, who ‘was no more than “the Son of man,” by the prophets ‘who inculcated so strongly and justly, that all mere ‘creatures, are before God, as nothing, and less than ‘nothing.’—(*Maclaurin.*)

If Christians have formed expectations, which the scripture does not warrant, that may be shewn: but the coming of Christ has been so *unanswerably* proved to be predicted, as an event preceding the destruction of the temple by the Romans, and the dispersion of the Jews: that no misapprehension of that kind can affect the main question.

Was the “little Stone” a great Mountain filling, or immediately to “fill the whole earth,” at the very time when it was “cut out of the mountain without hands?” Isaiah prophesies that of “the *increase* of his government and peace “there shall be no end:” but this imagination would preclude *increase*. The prophet says, “In the days of those “kings,” and not after they were destroyed, but when they were in full dominion; and his language implies, that the kingdom, which the ‘God of heaven would set up, would have a sharp conflict with opposing powers, before its final victory and triumph.* It should be carefully observed, that the coming of the Messiah is not mentioned in this whole

* Dan. ii. 44.

prophecy, nor even the Messiah himself. Mr. C. indeed says, ‘It pleased God to shew to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream ‘what should come to pass *until the coming of the Messiah*, ‘and that there should be four empires *until that time*. (P. 19. l. 5.) But this is so far from being accurate, that neither Nebuchadnezzar, nor any other man, would ever have known that a Messiah should come at all; if no clearer predictions of his coming had been given, than this prophecy contains.—With the other prophecies before us, we can understand that the fifth kingdom predicted is that of the Messiah: but, neither from Nebuchadnezzar’s dream itself, nor from Daniel’s interpretation of it, could any man have known this. If Christians have indeed adduced it as the grand proof that the Messiah should come twice; they seem to have acted very injudiciously; for, in fact, the coming of the Messiah at all cannot be proved from it, as an insulated prophecy; much less can any conclusive argument be deduced, respecting the time of his coming.—We only learn that the fifth kingdom, the kingdom which “the God of heaven should “set up,” would grow from “a Stone, cut out without hands, “and become a great Mountain, and fill the whole earth;” and that this vast enlargement of the Stone, into a Mountain filling the whole earth, would take place after the fourth kingdom had been divided, and would be introduced by its entire destruction and dispersion.* The dream deposes nothing beyond this: all else must be added, either from other scriptures, or from human traditions and imaginations.

P. 20. l. 11. ‘*How could it be that the Messiah, &c.*’ Answer: By his rising from the dead, and ascending into heaven, and being invested, as the Son of man, with all authority and “power in heaven and earth.”

L. 14. ‘*He could not come before the end of the fourth ‘empire.*’ How then could he subvert it?

* Dan. ii. 33—35. 44, 45. See Is. ii. 2—4.

P. 20. l. 26. ‘*The person who hath eyes, &c.*’ Important subjects must be discussed by *argument*; and not by *assuming* wisdom and truth to be on our side. The reader may obtain some information on this point from the texts referred to below.*

P. 21. l. 6. ‘*He will smite them only once, &c.*’ Where does Daniel say this? He shall smite them, and their destruction will be effected: but nothing is spoken whether it will be by one blow or by many, at once or in a course of ages.

P. 21. l. 16. ‘*NO MESSIAH FOR THE GENTILES.*’ The first text adduced as a proof of this position, is an exhortation, or command, to “the daughter of Zion to rejoice, &c.” But *exhortations* are not always complied with; *commands* are not always obeyed; nor were they by “the daughter of Zion,” either in this, or in numerous other instances. “The daughter of Zion,” had cause to rejoice, and ought to have rejoiced, when her King came unto her: and some, yea many, of the tens of thousands of the Jews did rejoice;† but as the nation in general, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in particular, rejected and crucified their King, and persecuted with unrelenting enmity his loyal subjects, they were adjudged traitors; and no wonder that the traitors did not rejoice at the coming of their King. (l. 24.) No doubt the Messiah is especially “the King of Zion;” and Jesus came to Zion. *Unto thee, and not to another.* (l. 19.) In the next verse after the text quoted, it is said, “He shall *speake peace unto the heathen*; and his dominion shall be from sea even to “sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.”‡ The other texts adduced, (l. 30, &c.) either relate to widely

* Prov. iii. 5, 6. xxvi. 12. Is. vi. 9, 10. xxix. 10–14. xlii. 19, 20. Rom. xi. 7–10. 2 Cor. iii. 13–18.

† Zech. ix. 9, 10. Matt. xxi. 4–11. Mark xi. 9–11. Luke xix. 36–38. John xii. 12–19.

‡ Zech. ix. 10. Eph. ii. 15–17.

different subjects, from the coming of the Messiah, and the question under consideration; or they will come in our way, when we consider what the prophets foretold, concerning the reception of the promised Messiah by his countrymen, and the event of their conduct in this particular.

P. 22. l. 5. '*There is no Messiah, &c.*' Certainly if Jesus be not the Messiah, the Gentiles have *none*; nor the Jews either. Wherever Mr. C. finds a proof, that the Messiah would be Man, he imagines that he has found a proof that he is no more than man: (p. 6:) and wherever he finds, that the Messiah should come to Israel, he imagines he has found a proof, that he will not come to any except Israel. But was it predicted, that the Messiah would deliver Israel, even if they obstinately rejected him? and all Israelites, however wicked? and none but Israelites?—Moses and the prophets teach a far different doctrine.

"Thy King cometh," "but not the King of the Gentiles."
"Unto thee," "but not to another." Some may think the whole of this is a quotation from the prophet; but the latter part of each clause is either interpolation, or unfounded exposition. The prophecy from Joel, some detached parts of which are quoted, does not mention the Messiah at all, or the time of his coming. It is a remarkable prediction of Israel's Restoration, and the terrible destruction of those who obstinately oppose it; and of other coincident events, which cannot be clearly understood till the fulfillment.—But, considered as the sequel of the preceding chapter, the whole sets before us, 1st, The pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the apostles and Jews, after our Lord's ascension. 2dly, The terrible destruction of the unbelieving Jews, at the taking and burning of their city; and their subsequent sufferings and oppressions; and 3dly, Their restoration and the destruction of their enemies.

P. 22. l. 19. '*NO MESSIAH FOR THE GENTILES,—By*

'the proof of their gospel, &c.' Here a similar interpolation occurs, *but not of the Gentiles*; as if these were the words of Matthew!*

To prove from the New Testament, that there is no Messiah for the Gentiles, is such an arduous attempt, that he who succeeds in it, needs not despair of accomplishing any thing which he can possibly undertake. But far different proof will be requisite, than that which is here given. A few hints on the texts quoted, and the use made of them, will follow the more direct argument, that the Messiah is predicted in the Old Testament, and recorded in the gospel, as *'the Messiah of the Gentiles'* as well as of the Jews. All the prophecies, however, which speak expressly of the Messiah, with one voice announce him to be the "Messiah of the Gentiles," as well as of Israel: but all these, as well as the numerous passages which the New Testament contains on this subject, are by Mr. C. passed over in entire silence, as if they did not exist. I, however, must adduce some of them as a specimen.—The first predictions of scripture which can possibly relate to this subject, having been given at the very time, when the distinction between Abraham and his seed, and the "families of the Gentiles," began to be revealed, is decisive on this question. To Abraham: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed"†— "In thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"‡— And to Isaac, "In thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"§—And to Jacob, "In thee, and in thy Seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed."|| Now, was the Messiah predicted in these promises to the patriarchs, or was he not?—If he were, the question is at once completely answered. All nations were to be "blessed in him," even "all the families of the Gentiles." If not, how, and

* Matt. ii. 6. † Gen. x. 5. 20. 31, 32. xii. 3. ‡ Gen. xxii. 18.

§ Gen. xxvi. 4. || Gen. xxviii. 14.

when, and in what "seed of Abraham; Isaac, and Jacob," have "all nations been blessed?" or, shall they hereafter be blessed? This question requires and demands a clear and full answer; or the cause is abandoned, and no such answer can possibly be given.

I shall reserve to another place, the words of God by Moses, "Rejoice ye nations with his people;"* because Mr. C. has made an observation on them, which will require notice. (p. 88.) But probably, most readers will allow that the apostle has made the proper application of it: and how could any of the nations, or Gentiles, continuing such, "rejoice with Israel," if there were no Messiah for them? The language of the second Psalm demands our particular attention: for several things, contained in it, can be verified in no other but the Messiah. "Yet have I set," (or *anointed*, *Marg. Heb.*) "my King upon my holy hill of Zion—I will declare the decree—The LORD hath said "unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, and shall dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with reverence. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and so ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."† How is this, that, in the midst of a prophecy of the Messiah, as "breaking the nations with a rod of iron, and dashing them in pieces as a potter's vessel;" the kings and judges of the earth are called on to kiss "the Son lest he be angry?" Does not this imply submitting to him, and vowing allegiance to him, yea, honouring him as their Lord

* Deut. xxxii. 42. Rom. xv. 10.

† Ps. ii. 6-12.

and God? * How is it that they are not only thus called on to avoid or deprecate his wrath, and escape destruction: but that a general blessing is pronounced on all, who “put their trust in him?” How could this be, if there ‘were no Messiah for the Gentiles? Or, what blessing could be to those who trusted in him, if he were no more than Man, and “the Son of man,” as other men are? † If any assert that this Psalm is not a prophecy of the Messiah; let him shew, by a fair and particular explanation of the terms employed in it, and by adducing facts coincident with it; how it was or could be fulfilled in David, or in any other, except David’s Son and David’s Lord; “the only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”—In the twenty-second Psalm, which will hereafter be shewn to be a most undeniable prophecy of “the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that followed,” ‡ it is said, “All the ends of the earth shall remember themselves, and be turned unto the LORD, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.”—“A seed shall serve him; they shall be counted to the LORD for a generation. They shall come and declare his righteousness to a people that shall be born, that he hath done this.” § It is here predicted, that all nations on earth shall, through the Messiah, become the worshippers of JEHOVAH; and in him, “a generation,” and “a chosen generation,” like that of Israel; “a nation that shall be born,” according to the prophecies of Isaiah; “He shall be called the everlasting Father,” or, “the Father of the age to come.” and “He shall see his seed, and shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.” ||

In another Psalm, it is said, “His name shall endure for

* 1 Sam. x. 1. 1 Kings xix. 18. Hos. xiii. 2.

† Ps. cxlvi. 3--6. Jer. xvii. 5--8. ‡ Luke xxiv. 26, 27. 44--47.
1 Pet. i. 10--12. § Ps. xxii. 27--31. || Is. ix. 6. liii. 10.

“ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and
 “men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him
 “blessed:”* or, “shall bless themselves in him;” the very
 words, are used in the original, which occur in the promise
 made to Abraham,† except as the preterite with the *vau* con-
 versive, is used in one place, and the future in the other.
 Now, is this Psalm a prophecy of the Messiah, or is it
 not? If it be, then, “all nations shall bless themselves in
 “him,” and “call him blessed:” but how can this be,
 if there be ‘no Messiah for the Gentiles?’ If it is not; let
 it be shewn how the several particulars predicted in it, were,
 or could be, accomplished in the short lived glory of
 Solomon’s reign.—“Surely a greater than Solomon is here!”

“The LORD hath made known his salvation: his right-
 “ousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen.
 “He hath remembered his mercy and truth to the house of
 “Israel; and all the ends of the earth have seen the Salva-
 “tion of our God.” “Make a joyful noise unto God, all
 “the earth, &c.”‡ But how shall “all the ends of the
 “earth see and rejoice in the Salvation of God,” if there
 be ‘no Messiah for the Gentiles?’

But, for the sake of brevity, I shall pass over many other
 evident predictions of the same events. It will not be de-
 nied, that Isaiah prophesied of the Messiah, as “the Rod
 “from the stem of Jesse,” in the eleventh chapter: but he
 there says, “The earth shall be full of the knowledge of
 “the LORD, as the waters cover the sea. And in that day
 “there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an
 “ensign to the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his
 “rest shall be glorious.” This precedes the prediction of
 ‘the Restoration of Israel,’ and the song of praise prepared
 by the Holy Spirit, for the use of converted Israel on that

* Ps. lxxii. 17.

† Gen. xxii. 18.

‡ Ps. xcvi. 2—4. See also Ps. lxxxvi. 9. cxvii.

grand occasion.* The apostle quotes part of the prophecy from the Septuagint: "He that shall arise to reign over the Gentiles, in him shall the Gentiles trust."† This gives the real import, though not an exact translation. Let it, however, be observed, that he who sprang from Jesse's root, would "stand for an ensign to the peoples;"‡ and "to him would the Gentiles seek; and his rest would be glorious." For, Shiloh being come, "to him would the gathering of the peoples be;" "All nations would bless themselves in him," and find a "more glorious rest," than Israel did in Canaan.§ Now the Gentiles could not flock to the Messiah, as to a standard;|| they could not seek to him, and find a "glorious rest in him;" if there were 'no Messiah for the Gentiles.'¶

"In this mountain shall the LORD of hosts make to all peoples" (*plural*;) "a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all peoples, and the veil which is spread over all nations, &c."*** How, or when, has this prophecy been fulfilled, or can it be fulfilled, except the blessings of Messiah's reign be imparted to all nations? And how is it possible, if there be 'no Messiah for the Gentiles?'

"Behold my Servant, whom I uphold, my Elect in whom my soul delighteth, I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.—He shall not fail or be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law."††—"In his name shall the Gentiles trust." (*Sept.*) Thus the evangelist

* Is. xi. 9—16. xii. † Rom. xv. 12. ‡ John iii. 14, 15. xii. 32.

§ Mat. xi. 28—30. Heb. iv. 8, 9. || Is. v. 26. xiii. 2. xviii. 3.

xxx. 17. *Heb.* ¶ See also Is. xix. 23—25, ** Is. xxv. 5—8.

†† Is. xlii. 1—4.

quotes it. His *law*, evidently means his *instruction, doctrine, command*, as in another prophecy of Isaiah.* “For his “law shall the Gentiles look with expectation,” יִתְחַלֵּץ † “The Lord hath called thee in righteousness, and will “hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and will give thee “for a covenant of the people, for a Light to the Gentiles; “to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from “the prison; and them that sit in darkness out of the “prison-house.”—“Sing unto the Lord a new song; and “his praise from the end of the earth, ye that go down “to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles and all the “inhabitants thereof.”‡—What! ‘Is there no Messiah for the “Gentiles?’ When “the Gentiles shall wait for his law;” he “shall be the Light of the Gentiles.” “When all the in- “habitants of the isles shall sing,” on account of him, “a “new song unto the Lord.”§ Who can help recollecting, in this connexion, the words of old Simeon? “Mine eyes “have seen thy Salvation; which thou hast prepared before “the face of all people; a Light to lighten the Gentiles, “and to be the glory of thy people Israel.”||

“And now, saith the Lord, who 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. And he said, It is a light thing, that thou “shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, “and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give “thee for a Light of the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my “salvation to the ends of the earth.”¶ Some parts of this prediction will come again under consideration: but the question here recurs; Is the whole a prophecy of the

* Is. ii. 2—4. † Is. xlii. 5. li. 5. Heb. ‡ Is. xlii. 6, 7. 10—12. Zech. ix. 11. Acts xxvi. 18—20. § Rev. v. 9, 10. xiv. 3.

¶ Luke ii. 25—32. Acts x'ii. 47. xxviii. 28. ¶ Is. xlix. 5—12.

Messiah, or is it not? If not: whom, and what events, does it foretel? When hath it been, or when will it be, fulfilled? It is impossible to give any other interpretation of it, considered clause by clause, than that which refers it to the Messiah; the treatment, which he met with from the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles: but how can these things be, if there be ‘no Messiah for the Gentiles?’ It foretels also, that Israel, as a nation would not be gathered by the Messiah; but only a remnant of them, called “the preserved of Israel.” For “the Redeemer of Israel, and “his holy One,” addressed “him, whom man despiseth, “whom the nation abhorreth, a servant of rulers;” yet it is predicted that “kings shall see and arise, princes also “shall worship, because of the LORD, who is faithful;” with much more to the same effect.*—“Behold,” says the LORD, “I have given him for a Witness to the people, “a Leader and a Commander to the people. Behold, thou “shalt call a nation, that thou knowest not, and nations “that knew not thee, shall run unto thee.”† Who is this, to whom “nations, who knew him not shall run,” but “Shiloh, to whom the gathering of the people shall be?” Is not then the Messiah predicted, as the Messiah of the Gentiles?‡

In fact, I feel myself in this part of my subject, pressed with a considerable difficulty; having only the choice of two things, each apart undescribable: viz, either to pass over, and as it were *suppress*, a great part of the evidence; or to weary the reader with tedious argument, and superfluous evidence. I, therefore, only just touch upon points which might with great advantage be more fully opened, were proofs scanty; and pass over, or merely refer to, portions

* Is. xlix. 22, 23.
compared with Rom. x. 19—21.
Acts xi. 26. lxvi. 18—22.

† Is. lv. 4, 5. See also Is. lx. lxv. 1, 2,
‡ Is. lxv. 14, 15, compared with

of scripture, alone sufficient to decide the argument, beyond all reasonable controversy. Some of these will come in our way, on other topics; and I must hasten to conclude this part, by a few quotations from the other prophets.

“O Lord,” says Jeremiah, “my Strength and my Fortress, the Gentiles shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit.”* Certainly “the Gentiles from the ends of the earth,” are here represented, as, of *their own accord*, “coming unto” the true God, as renouncing idols, and as avowing themselves his worshippers. But shall this take place under the Messiah’s reign, or at some other time?

Do the apostles give the true meaning of the predictions of Hosea, when they apply them to the conversion of the Gentiles?—“I will call them my people, which were not my people, and her beloved, which was not beloved: and it shall come to pass, that in the place, where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God.”† Certainly, apart from all claims of inspiration, the application must be considered as very reasonable and apposite, by every attentive and impartial reader.

One would suppose, that a man, not previously biassed either way, could hardly avoid falling in with the apostle James’s application of a prophecy by Amos. “Simeon hath declared, how God did at the first visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name: and to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, After this I will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and will set them up; that the residue of men

* Jer. xvi. 19. † Compare Hos. i. 10. ii. 23. with Rom. ix. 25, 26. 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.

“may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom
 “my name is called, saith the LORD who doeth all these
 “things.”* The variation of the Septuagint, whence for
 substance the quotation is made, from the Hebrew text, as
 it stands at present, does not at all affect the general mean-
 ing. But the reader may observe, that in Amos, this pre-
 diction concerning the Gentiles, is introduced between a
 remarkable prophecy of the dispersion of Israël, as at this
 day; and another as remarkable, a prediction of his resto-
 ration;† and that it is expressly connected with the king-
 dom of the Son of David.—Again, another prophet says,
 “The LORD 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.”‡ Does not this foretel the
 conversion of Gentiles, to the worship of the true God, not
 at Jerusalem, but “every one from his place?” and when
 shall this be, but under the reign of the Messiah?§

“Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion, for lo, I come,
 “and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the LORD;
 “and many nations shall be joined together to the LORD
 “in that day, and shall be my people; and thou shalt
 “know that the LORD of hosts hath sent me unto thee.”||
 Who is the Speaker in this prediction? Is not the Messiah?
 When he comes to the daughter of Zion “many nations shall
 “be joined to the LORD, and become his people.” The
 passage, from the eighth of Zechariah has before been
 considered.

“From the rising of the sun, unto the going down thereof,
 “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.”¶

* Comp. Am. ix. 11, 12. with Acts xv. 14—17. † Am. ix. 9—15.

‡ Zeph. ii. 11. § Zeph. iii. 9. || Zech. ii. 10, 11. ¶ Mal. i. 11.

To what times does this last of the ancient prophets refer in this prediction? Does he not evidently speak of the times of the Messiah? "Under his reign, the name of JEHOVAH, shall be great among the Gentiles," and "*in every place,*" acceptable worship shall be rendered; as acceptable, as the incense and oblations at the temple, when presented in the most proper manner: But how can this be, if there is 'no Messiah for the Gentiles?'

"To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."* "Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also.'†—When it is considered, that Israel, taken at his largest increase, through all generations hitherto, hath not formed one hundredth part of the human species, probably not above one third of that proportion; the mind revolts from the idea of the Creator wholly overlooking all the rest of mankind, and confining all his special favours to this single nation. Nothing could reconcile the man of reflection to this, but some clear proof, that this favoured nation was, either *by nature*, or at least *by grace*, and in character, decidedly more holy and devoted to God, than other nations: but their whole scriptural history, and the testimonies of Moses and all the prophets, and even that of their own historian, decide against this. It would also be previously expected, in this case, that uniform pre-eminence in prosperity, as well as piety, would have been conspicuous, in all the annals of the nation: but the contrary to this has hitherto been the case; and the whole term from the calling of Abraham to this day, must constitute a vast proportion of the duration of the world, according to the scriptures.—If, however, the word of God had so decided it, though contrary to all analogy and reasoning, we ought to be silent, and

* Acts x. 43.

† Rom. iii. 29.

adore the depths, which we cannot fathom: but, while a precedency of honour and distinction is reserved for Israel; it seems to be the clear tenour of scripture, that this precedency was not conceded, merely for their own benefit; but, that they might be a blessing to the nations of the earth in general. “I will bless thee, and thou shalt be a blessing;” “In thee and in thy Seed shall all the families of the earth “be blessed.” This Israel has been, and shall be, most eminently: and it might be thought this was more desirable and honourable, than a monopoly of blessings, with curses on all other nations on their account.

But Mr. C. is not apt to despair of his cause: and what it was impossible he could support out of the Old Testament, he attempts to prove from the New!

In quoting from Matthew, he inserts, ‘but not the ‘Gentiles;’ (p. 22. l. 22,) which is assuming the point in debate. The scribes did not consider the Messiah, as the Messiah of the Gentiles; and neither the prophet, nor the evangelist was speaking on that subject.

P. 22. l. 24. ‘*I am not sent, &c*’ The personal ministry of Christ was intended to be principally among “the lost “sheep of the house of Israel:” yet he healed the centurion’s servant, and commended his faith; and added, “Many “shall come from the east, and from the west, and shall “sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the “kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom “shall be cast out, into outer darkness, where shall be “weeping and gnashing of teeth.”* He healed also the daughter of the woman of Canaan, and commended her faith.† He spent two days among the Samaritans.‡ He said expressly to the chief priests and elders, “The kingdom “of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation

* Matt. viii. 5—13.

† Matt. xv. 21—28.

‡ John iv. 39—42.

“bringing forth the fruit thereof.”* And his instructions to his apostles shew what he purposed, concerning his future church or kingdom.†—It would not be fair, to argue with Jews from the New Testament, if they did not absurdly claim its authority, against the whole religion contained in it. But this assuredly can never serve their cause.

L. 25. ‘*When the Son of man, &c.*’—When our Lord says to his apostles, “Ye shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;”‡ he was so far from exclusively assigning the blessings of his kingdom to Israel, that he predicted the condemnation of Israel, by the testimony and judgment of his apostles.§

Last line. ‘*Christ forgot the whole world, &c.*’—What has already been stated sufficiently answers this; especially his commission, given to the apostles,|| and his account of the day of judgment.¶

P. 23. l. 7. ‘*Neither Christ, &c.*’—By far the greatest part of the history of Christianity, in the acts of the apostles, and the apostolical epistles, relate to the Gentiles. But let the reader consult the passages referred to.**

It does not appear, why the quotation from Philippians was brought in (l. 10, 11;) except to introduce the assertion that follows; which would have stood quite as well alone as with this introduction.

L. 14. ‘*Hitherto we have proved, &c.*’—I trust the contrary to all this has been *fully proved*: viz, That the Messiah is come; that the Messiah was predicted, as “the Messiah of the Gentiles,” as well as of Israel; that Jesus was the promised Messiah; and that he is “over all, God “blessed for evermore.”

* Matt. xxi. 43.

† Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Luke xxiv. 47.

‡ Matt. xix. 28.

§ 1 Cor. vi. 1—6.

|| Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Luke xxiv. 47. ¶ Matt. xxv.

31—46.

** Rom. iii. 29. ix. 24—32. x. 12—21. xi. 11—13.

1 Thes. ii. 16, 17.

L. 21, 22. ‘*I am sent only to the house of Israel, &c.*’ “I am not sent, but to the lost sheep of the house of “Israel.” These are our Lord’s words in the passage referred to.* His personal ministry, and his commission to his apostles have already been considered: and it will hereafter be fully shewn, that “the house of Israel,” including and principally signifying the rulers, priests, and teachers of Israel; that is, “the blind guides,” false teachers, and hypocritical wicked rulers of Israel; means something vastly different from “the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” He was sent “to the lost sheep,” and not to the wicked shepherds “of Israel;” through whose crimes, the people were “as sheep not having a shepherd.”†

L. 23. ‘*Why did they not believe in him?*’ Answer, “Because they had not the love of God in them:” “because they received honour one of another, and sought not “the honour which cometh from God only:” and because “they loved the praise of men, more than the praise of “God.”‡ Because of the ambition, avarice, enmity against God, and wickedness of their hearts and lives.

L. 24. ‘*Whose word shall stand, &c.*’—I know not, how Mr. C. means to apply this: but certainly the unbelief of the Jews, when the Messiah came, fulfilled and established “the words of God,” as spoken by the ancient prophets.§ This will be shewn more fully hereafter: at present, let it be noticed, that Zechariah distinguishes between the “poor “of the flock, that waited” on the Messiah; or “the lost “sheep of the house of Israel,” and all the rest of Israel, especially the pastors of the flock.

L. 26. ‘*When Moses &c.*’ Did the Israelites so unreservedly welcome Moses, when God sent him to them, as

* Matt. xv. 24. † Mark vi. 34. ‡ John v. 42—44. viii. 38.
42—44. xii. 43. § Is. xlix. 4, 5. 7. liii. 1, 2. Zech. xi. 7—11.
Mal. iii. 1, 2. Rom. iii. 3, 4.

as to give Mr. C. a ground of glorying on that account? The narrative given us by Moses himself, and the language of all the prophets, exhibit a widely different view of the subject. The mission of Moses was expressly for the purpose of bringing Israel, as a nation, out of Egypt; their conduct therefore was not permitted wholly to defeat this design. "But," says God by Ezekiel, "they rebelled against me, and would not hearken unto me; then I said, 'I will pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt. But I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen.'*" And Moses, having numbered up many of the rebellions of Israel, concludes by saying, "Ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you."† Nothing but the terrifick displays of the divine glory, and dreadful miracles, by which thousands at a time were destroyed, proved sufficient to curb their revolting and rebellious spirit; and to deter them from stoning Moses, and returning unto Egypt: so that the event was, that the generation which God brought out of Egypt, fell in the wilderness, by the awful judgments of God, notwithstanding the persevering intercessions of Moses and Aaron for them.‡ This was also expressly the punishment of their *unbelief*: "Yea, they despised the pleasant land, they believed not his word."§ Even a candid Jew, who has well studied the books of Moses and the prophets, must allow that Stephen had scriptural ground for saying to the rulers of Israel, "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye.—Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted?"|| Except as he concluded by

* Ez. xx. 8, 9.

† Deut. ix. 24.

‡ Ex. v. xxxii. Num. xi. xiii. xiv. xvi. xxv.

§ Deut. i. 22. ix. 23. Ps. cvi. 24—27. Heb. iv. 18, 19.

|| Acts vii. 51, 52.

applying it to their conduct towards Jesus of Nazareth. This might be urged much further,* but I forbear. The argument, if it prove any thing, proves that the mission of any one who professed to be the Messiah, must be tried, whether it were of God or not, by the *national* reception with which he met; and not by the credentials which he produced, that he was indeed sent by God: or, that no demonstration could have been sufficient, had the Jewish rulers and people persisted in unbelief. By the fulfilment of ancient prophecies, by stupendous miracles of mercy, by the coincidence of his instructions with those of Moses and the prophets, by the most perfect example of holiness, and by the subsequent most astonishing and beneficial effects even to this day, God has said, 'This is the Messiah;' "this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him."

L. 30. '*But Israel said, No.*' And Israel's word is, according to Mr. C. to prevail against the word of God.

L. 32. '*To what purpose, &c.?*' "But what if some did "not believe, shall their unbelief make the word of God of "none effect? God forbid." To what purpose was Moses sent to Pharaoh, to demand the liberation of Israel, when God had said, "I am sure that the king of Egypt will 'not "let you go, no, not by a mighty hand?"† To what purpose did God commission Isaiah to "go and tell this people, "Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, "but perceive not; make the heart of this people fat, &c.?" When Mr. C. has answered these questions, he will have answered his own. Many and important ends were answered, even respecting the unbelieving Jews, and the glory of God in his dealings with them; as an instruction to the whole world, by the coming of the Messiah to them; though

* Is. liii. 1, 2. Rom. iii. 3.

† Ex. iii. 19—Comp. ix. 16, 17.

‡ Is. vi. 9, 10—Comp. Matt. xiii. 14, 15. John xii. 38—40. Acts xxviii. 25—27.

God *foreknew* and *foretold*, that the bulk of the nation would not believe in him. But objections of this kind are not started by Jews alone: for multitudes of nominal Christians seem to be the dupes of them; though in fact they are absurd and impious in the extreme. Upon the supposition that God foreknew the perverse and ruinous use, which men would make of his gifts, of whatever kind; they, in language as remote as possible from reverence of his holy name, either expressly, or by consequence, charge him with having done wrong in conferring them. Thus, for instance, we frequently hear an objection started against thanking God for our creation; because he foreknew, that to multitudes creation would, through their own wickedness, become a curse. "It had been good for that man, if he had never been born." Thus they transfer the guilt from those, who pervert the goodness of God by their crimes to their own destruction, unto God who foresaw that they would do this! How deeply this kind of reasoning *infects* the speculations of men, in controversies concerning the distinguishing and undeserved mercies of God, to some of our fallen race above others, must here be only hinted. In many cases it forms the grand hinge on which the controversy turns. But how could these things be otherwise, unless God were not omniscient, or not the moral and providential Governor of the universe?

L. 33. '*Did God intend, &c?*' "He shall be for a Sanctuary: but for a Stone of stumbling, and a Rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and many among them shall stumble and fall, and be snared, and be taken."* The answer, contained in these words, does not depend on our interpretation of them.† However explained, they prove that God did appoint events in his providence, which he

* Is. viii. 13—15.

† Rom. ix. 32, 23. xi. 8—11. 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8

foreknew and foretold, would be “a Stone of stumbling, and “Rock of offence to both the houses of Israel.”*

P. 24. l. 1. ‘*The word of God came to nothing, &c.*’ It has already been shewn, that the ‘word of God,’ as it related to the Messiah, and as fulfilled in Jesus, did ‘not come to ‘nothing;’ but produced effects of most prodigious amplitude, and most beneficial and enduring consequences to the human race at large. But the second and third clauses of this passage are certainly true; ‘the Messiah (even the true ‘Messiah) was rejected and despised, and he lost his life.’ It would too much interrupt our argument to take up the subject in this place: but I shall hereafter illustrate the apostle’s words, by inductions from the prophets, “Him, “being delivered, by the determinate counsel and fore-“knowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands “have crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up, hav-“ing loosed the pains of death,” &c.† Or, rather the words of our Lord himself, “Thus it is written, and thus it be-“hoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third “day.”‡ In this especially ‘the scriptures of the prophets’ were fulfilled; and in this all the grand ends of the Mes-
siah’s coming were accomplished, and could not have been effected, *according to the prophets*, in any other way.§

P. 24. l. 3. ‘*We also learn, &c.*’ The words of the apostle Paul are entirely coincident with the several prophecies of the Old Testament, which he quotes:¶ and therefore the charge brought against him, falls on David and Isaiah; or rather on the Holy Spirit who spake by them. Men first proudly and wickedly close their own eyes against the truth, in determined unbelief; and then God, as a punishment, shuts them up in unbelief.

* Comp. Ps. cxviii. 22, 23. Matt. xxi. 42—45. Acts iv. 11.

† Acts ii. 23, 24.

‡ Luke xxiv. 46.

§ Ps. xxii. lxix.

Is. liii. Dan. ix. 24—27. Zech. xiii. 7.

¶ Ps. lxxix. 22—28. Is. vi.

9, 10. xxi. 10. Rom. xi. 7—10.

L. 10. '*Had Israel, &c.*' The unbelief of Israel was merely the *occasion*, not the *cause*, of the calling of the Gentiles, which had been predicted from the time, when the distinction between Abraham with his seed and the Gentiles commenced.

L. 13. '*Israel was to be made guilty, &c.*' If '*to be made guilty,*' means '*to be brought in guilty as a criminal by a just verdict,*' God '*made Israel guilty:*' but they themselves committed, wilfully and obstinately, the crimes, by which they exposed themselves to this righteous condemnation. Yet it has been shewn, that an immense number "*of the lost sheep of the house of Israel,*" were previously gathered into his fold by the good Shepherd, who "*came to seek and to save that which was lost.*"

I must notice with decided disapprobation, the whole passage under consideration; as destitute of reverence towards God, and humility before him. However criminal the conduct of Israel was; however obstinate in rebellion, and most unreasonable in unbelief: still if God "*leave them to their own hearts' lusts,*" and they reject the Messiah, and crucify him, and are punished for it; '*God did them wrong,*' (p. 24. l. 16,) '*imposed on his creatures,*' (l. 17,) '*destroyed them without cause:*' (l. 22, 23.) Yet the Jews themselves have never been able to assign any other adequate *cause*, of the unexampled miseries, and degradation of their nation, for above one thousand seven hundred years. By the common voice of the rulers and people, when demanding the crucifixion of Jesus, they imprecated this vengeance on themselves; "*His blood be upon us, and on our children.*"* And so long, as they proceed to "*crucify him afresh,*" and put him to open shame, by saying, '*he received due punishment, for by the law he was guilty,*' (l. 28, 29,) their dispersions and oppressions will continue. But when "*the*

* Matt. xxvii. 25.

“Spirit of God shall be poured out upon them,” and they shall look with penitent sorrow, and humble faith, to “him whom they have pierced:”* they shall be gathered, restored, and honoured, even far more than in times of old. The day when this shall take place, I firmly believe to be near at hand; and I earnestly long and pray for it, as the very crisis of the world, so to speak. In the full persuasion that such will be the event ere long, I have engaged in this argument, and desire to conduct it in a manner as conciliatory, as regard to truth and holiness will permit; in hopes of being an instrument, in some small degree, of effecting the happy revolution.

If it was the purpose of God, that Israel as a nation should welcome the promised Messiah; and if it was previously revealed that they would: then, Israel, as a nation, will receive him (l. 24) when he comes; and he has not yet come.

The text from Isaiah,† (l. 30, &c.) certainly proves, that the word of God shall accomplish *his* purpose, whatever that may be: but this does not inform us what that purpose is, at least in regard to Israel as a nation. Concerning the *secret* purposes of God we know nothing. He predicted that Israel as a nation would reject the Messiah, and be themselves for a long time excluded on that account.‡

P. 25. l. 10. ‘*When he is sent he will be the Leader.*’ The Messiah as Leader of the company, is not mentioned. In a preceding part of the chapter indeed he is, but not exactly so as to suit Mr. C.’s argument. “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 knew not thee, shall run unto thee, because of the LORD thy God, and for the

* Ez. xx. 37, 38. 43, 44. Zech. xii. 9—14.

† Is. lv. 10, 11.

‡ Is. xlix. 7. l. 1, 2. Hos. iii. 4, 5.

“Holy One of Israel, for he hath glorified thee.”* The nations here spoken of must be the Gentiles; and this is the only place in which Israel is mentioned throughout the chapter.

L. 13. ‘*Who being, &c.*’ Here Mr. C. charges Jesus with wishing to set up for himself, and to be “equal with God:” (l. 15, 16,) but in another passage he says, ‘Jesus himself never thought of such a thing; therefore he called himself the Son of man; but had he thought that he was God, he would have called himself the Son of a woman.’ (p. 8.)—That Jesus did prosper and accomplish astonishing things has already been shewn. Mr. C. might have rendered his statement, in the next words (l. 17—21,) more convincing, if he could have quoted the words, which he puts into the mouth of the Messiah, from “the scriptures of the prophets,” instead of “speaking them out of his own heart,” and according to what he supposes will be the case.

L. 22. ‘*WAS THE MESSIAH OF THE GENTILES A PROPHET, OR NOT?*’—The questions concerning our Lord’s predictions will come before us, more regularly in another place. (p. 67, 68.) Indeed, after Mr. C. had decided that Jesus was justly put to death, the question itself seems to come too late. The clause however from the seventy-fourth Psalm requires a brief notice. (l. 25—36.) It is plain, from the whole of this Psalm, that it was written at a time, or at least that it referred to a time, when the sanctuary *lay in ruins*.† Either this was during the Babylonish captivity, or after the destruction of the temple by the Romans. If it related to the Babylonish captivity, it can be nothing to the purpose; for several prophets arose subsequent to that event. If it refer to the times following the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; it does most affectingly describe the state of the Jews, during above seventeen centuries:

* Is. lv, 4, 5.

† Ps. lxxiv. 3—9.

but as Jesus lived, and died, and arose again, many years before the destruction of the second temple; it can prove nothing against his character as a Prophet, for it relates exclusively to subsequent times.

P. 26. l. 1—7. The prophecy of Daniel has been considered; but “the sealing up the vision and prophecy,” or “Prophet,” relates to times three or four hundred years subsequent to Malachi; namely to the end of the seventy weeks, which Christians calculate to have been about the time of the crucifixion of Jesus; Mr. C. computes them to end, either with the death of king Agrippa and his son Menves, or at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. There was no prophet in Israel, from Malachi, till near the times of Jesus; but the scripture does not say *there never would be any*: and, however satisfied Mr. C. may be on the subject; the scribes, and priests, and elders, in our Lord’s time, confessed, that they did not know, whether John Baptist was a prophet or not.

L. 8. ‘*One thing, &c.*’—If this proposition can be established, the business is settled: for as Israel is not restored, if ‘the restoration of Israel, and the coming of the Messiah’ be the same thing,’ it is plain that the Messiah is not come! Indeed if ‘the Messiah is Israel and Israel the ‘Messiah:’ (l. 10, 11,) then the Messiah came, when God surnamed Jacob by the name of Israel: the Messiah is now dispersed throughout the earth; the Messiah is to be *restored*, and not to *restore* others. What Mr. C. means by this, I know not: but if he speaks the language of his nation, it proves, that the Jews are apt to think of themselves, *as the whole world*; and that nothing is of much consequence, in the dispensations of Providence, except as it tends to the aggrandisement of their nation.

L. 12. ‘*The next, &c.*’—It has generally been thought, that Elias, or Elijah, the prophet, either personally, or by

one "in his spirit and power," would precede the coming of the Messiah. This the prophets foretold:* and this the ancient Jews fully expected.† But, not to dwell on this, Mr. C. *here* allows that the Messiah will be a Prophet: and we allow, that if Jesus were not the Messiah, he could not be a Prophet; and from the fulfilment of the prophecies of Jesus, we draw a most conclusive argument, that he was the Messiah. With whom then does Mr. C. contend; when assuming, that 'Jesus was not the Messiah,' he attempts to prove, 'that he was not a prophet?' Not with Christians certainly. But in truth, the fulfilment of our Lord's prophecies stands very much in the way of the Jews; and they seem sometimes to have *great misgivings* on the subject; and almost to say among themselves: 'If not the Messiah, 'but a deceiver; how could he be a prophet? And, if 'not a prophet, how could he predict the state of Jerusalem, 'and of the Jews, for so many hundred years to come, and 'with such wonderful particularity?' This obstruction Mr. C. repeatedly labours to remove; but I must think, completely without success.—The reader must determine, whether the right interpretation of the prophecy in Joel, is given by the apostles, or by Mr. C. (l. 15.)‡ One thing should be noted, that after the prediction "of the pouring "out of the Spirit," and its effects; it is added, "I will "shew wonders in the heavens, and in the earth, blood, and "fire, and pillars of smoke; the sun shall be turned into "darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and "terrible day of the Lord come."§ The extraordinary appearances, in the heavens, would be presages of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and of the subversion of the Jewish church and state; which would be attended by immense bloodshed, terrible conflagrations, and "pillars

* Is. xl. 3—9. Mal. iii. 1. iv. 3, 4.

† John i. 19—28.

‡ Joel ii. 28—32. Acts ii. 16—21. Rom. x. 11—15. § Joel ii. 30, 31.

“of smoke,” such as ascend from the flames of burning cities. Now, is not this a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and the dissolution of the civil and ecclesiastical state of the Jews, with dreadful massacres, and miseries? Yet this is predicted as *subsequent* to “the pouring out of the Spirit:” and only a remnant would be rescued from these tremendous judgments. The events predicted in the New Testament, and recorded in Josephus’s History of the Wars of the Jews, confirm this interpretation. The third chapter of Joel contains a prediction of Israel’s restoration, but the second predicts those events which made it necessary.

L. 24. ‘*Thus far, &c.*’ Mr. C.’s *inferences*, at least, are not deficient in perspicuity and decision.

L. 26. ‘THE GENTILES’ QUESTION.—*Only one, &c.*’

L. 29. ‘THE ANSWER OF THE JEWS.—*Miracles, &c.*’ This, and the following pages, suggest a most important question—‘HOW FAR AND IN WHAT CASES, MIRACLES ARE ‘THE PROOF OF A DIVINE MISSION?’ But before we proceed to the more direct answer to it, a few particulars require a cursory notice.

P. 26, last line. p. 27. l. 1. ‘THE WISE MEN OF PHARAOH performed also the same miracles, &c.’—Indeed! The magicians *imitated*, or rather *aped*, a few of Moses’s miracles; whether by Satanical aid or not, or by what power, forms no part of our present question. Their rods were turned into serpents, as well as his: but his rod devoured theirs, and their rods disappeared. When, at the word of Moses, the waters of Egypt had been turned into blood; they also turned into blood a little of the water, which the mercy of God had spared: but to equal the miracle of God by Moses, they should have turned the rivers, and reservoirs, and streams of blood throughout the land into water. They added to the plague of frogs; but they

could do nothing towards removing it. They could neither produce lice, nor remove the disgusting and mortifying plague; but were forced to confess, "This is the finger of God."* "The boil was upon the magicians," as well as upon the other Egyptians, and they "could not stand before Moses."† Thus they were driven with contempt from the field of contest, and are no more mentioned by Moses. But why did God thus display the superior power of the miracles wrought by Moses, in the sight of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, if 'miracles be no proof of a divine mission?' Why did he work one miracle after another, in proof of this, if the miracles wrought did not prove it? Why did Moses afterwards, in the wilderness, appeal to the miracle about to be wrought, in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? "If these men die the death of all men, or be visited after the visitation of all men, then the LORD hath not sent me: but if the LORD make a new thing,‡ and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they go down quick into the pit; then ye shall understand that these men have provoked the LORD."§ And why did Elijah, (having put the proof of the important cause, whether JEHOVAH, or Baal, were God, on the answer by fire,) thus address the LORD—"LORD God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day, that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and have done all these things at thy word?"|| Why, I say, did he make such an appeal, if 'miracles be no proof of a divine mission?' The miracles of Moses were wrought by the power of God; those of the magicians by their enchantments.

P. 27. l. 5. '*To drive devils, &c.*' Whatever credit may

* Ex. viii. 19. Luke xi. 20.

† Ex. ix. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9.

‡ See Jer. xxi. 22.

§ Num. xvi. 29, 30. See also 1 Sam. xii. 16-18.

|| 1 Kings xviii. 36, 37.

be attached to Josephus's narrative; no doubt, exorcists among the Jews, cast out devils in some instances, or induced them to go out. But, even in this respect, the miracles of Christ were so vastly superior, and so stupendous, that the people said, "It was never so seen in Israel:" and the Pharisees were compelled to allege, that he cast out "devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils."* It must be evident that evil spirits cannot be *constrained* to quit their hold of a man, in any way, except by a superior power.† This superior power 'a common man' has not: (l. 6;) either God or angels must help him, or the devil must retire from motives of policy.

L. 7. '*They have even the power, &c.*' I do not here presume to determine, what evil spirits are or are not able to perform, or discover, or foretel by sagacity or conjecture, as far as God may see good to permit; or how far all divination, fortune-telling, and sorcery have been from *Satanical* agency, or from *human* imposture. But the power and foresight of evil spirits must have limits; they cannot be *infinite*: and when the apostle in the name of Jesus, cast out the spirit from the Pythoness;‡ and when he terminated the enchantment, so that the effect was manifest both to the enrag'd masters, and to the multitude; and when he silenced the prophetess by a single word: it was sufficient proof of superior power and authority.

L. 13. '*Two men, &c.*' Mr. C. informs us that he learned the additional particulars, which he relates concerning Jamnes and Jambres, from tradition: and it may amuse the reader to learn, that Mohammed, perhaps on as good authority, records, that they were converted, and cruelly martyred by Pharaoh.—I do not clearly understand Mr. C.'s language, 'Symbols, they also prophesied, but all by the works of the 'devil:' (l. 17.) The number however, of well authenticated

* Matt. ix. 32—34. xii. 22—24. † Matt. xii. 29, 30. ‡ Acts xvi. 16—19.

undeniable miracles, wrought publicly, before powerful enemies, in proof of a religion not yet established in authority, will, on investigation, be found very few indeed. Impostures in abundance are recorded; and some ambiguous events, which, whether they arose from human, or Satanical delusion, may admit of a doubt: but nothing can be adduced which will bear a comparison with the miracles of Christ, any more than those of the Egyptian magicians could with the miracles of Moses. *'None can say, I command that a fire shall come down from heaven:'* *'none of them can say I command the sun to stand still:'* (l. 21.) May we not add, None could say, to one who had been four days dead, "Lazarus, come forth." None could say to the winds and waves, in a tremendous storm: "Peace, be still, and there was a great calm."

There was no occasion for our Lord to command "the sun to stand still;" unless for the purpose of ostentation, or to gratify the wicked presumption of the scribes and Pharisees: nor would there have been any propriety in calling for fire from heaven, by him, "who came to save and not to destroy." But the sun was darkened, and the promised land became as Egypt, in the plague of darkness, while the lands of the Gentiles were as Goshen; when Jesus was suspended on the cross.

L. 26. *'There shall no sign, &c.'* Let the reader compare the words of Matthew, with those here quoted from Mark: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."* The sign, which our Lord gave the Jews, was that of his own resurrection on the third day; which, as predicted and accomplished, to the confusion and silencing of his powerful enemies, and as connected with its extensive and permanent effects, was immensely more

* Matt. xii. 38-40. xvi. 1---4.

conclusive, than any transient "sign from heaven" could have been.

L. 31. '*It was his duty, &c.*' Our Lord, in his character of the Ambassador, or Apostle, of the Father, was required, and if such language must be used, concerning "the Lord "of all," 'it was his *duty*,' to "fulfil the will of him who "sent him;" but not to gratify the unreasonable demands of those to whom he was sent, who "hated both him and his "Father." God gives that degree and kind of evidence, which he knows to be suitable and sufficient; and not such, as his rebellious subjects may insolently require.—"Nay, "father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, "they will repent: and he said unto them; If they believe "not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be per- "suaded, though one rose from the dead."* They, who said, "Let Christ the King of Israel descend from the cross, "that we may see and believe;" "Let him come down from "the cross, and we will believe him;" (a demand subversive of the whole design, for which he came into the world, as predicted throughout the Old Testament;) were by no means disposed to believe in him, when he just after "arose from "the dead."

Moses did not work such miracles, as either Pharaoh, or Israel, prescribed to him: but such, and such only, as God directed him to work. He who teaches the prophet his *duty*, in the execution of his prophetic office, prescribes the conduct, which he presumptuously thinks ought to have been adopted by God himself. The false prophets were the *compliant* persons; not Elijah, Micaiah, and the other true prophets.†

P. 28. l. 16. '*Moses the Lord of, &c.*'—The reader must

* Luke xvi. 29–31.

† Ahab's messenger wanted to teach Micaiah his *duty*, or, more modestly, to counsel him; but he received his answer. 1 Kings xxii. 13, 14.

determine, how properly Moses, or any mere man can be called 'the Lord of all the prophets.'

L. 23-35. From the statement given in this passage, it might be supposed, that God *first* commissioned Moses to work miracles before the people; but because Moses knew that this would 'not be sufficient to convince them,' he was 'sent by God,' that "the token" was *afterwards* added. Whereas the token was *first* given; and, it seems, Moses supposed that it would be insufficient, and therefore, the commission to work miracles was added. Indeed the whole passage in Mr. C. is a reversal of the order, in which the narrative by Moses is arranged.

But let that narrative speak for itself. "Moses said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? And he said, Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee, when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain."* "This shall be a token unto thee," for his own satisfaction, as one who believed the promise of God. It does not appear that the people were made acquainted with it; and his *asserting* that God had spoken this to him, would not be any proof to them of his divine mission.

Afterwards, "Moses answered and said, But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken to my voice; for they will say, The LORD hath not appeared unto thee. And the LORD said unto him, What is that in thy hand? And he said, a rod. And he said, cast it on the ground. And he cast it on the ground and it became a serpent; and Moses fled from before it. And the LORD said unto Moses, Put forth thine hand, and take it by the tail. And he put forth his hand, and caught it, and it became

* Ex. iii. 11, 12.

“a rod in his hand, *That they may believe* that the LORD
 “God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of
 “Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee.
 “And the LORD said furthermore unto him, Put now thy
 “hand into thy bosom. And he put his hand into his bosom:
 “and when he took it out, behold, it was leprous as snow.
 “And he said, Put thine hand into thy bosom again. And
 “he put his hand into his bosom again; and plucked it out
 “of his bosom, and, behold, it was turned again as his other
 “flesh. And it shall come to pass, if they will not believe
 “thee, neither hearken to the voice of the first sign, *that*
 “*they will believe* the voice of the latter sign. And it shall
 “come to pass, if they will not believe also these two signs,
 “neither hearken to thy voice, that thou shalt take of the
 “water of the river, and pour it out on the dry land; and
 “the water which thou takest out of the river, shall become
 “blood upon the dry land.”—“And Moses and Aaron went
 “and gathered together all the elders of the children of
 “Israel. And Aaron spake all the words which the LORD
 “had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of
 “the people. And the people believed.”* It must now be
 clearly ascertainable, whether the *token*, or the *miracles*,
 were the ground on which the people were required to
 believe Moses.

The sign to Moses that “God would certainly be with
 “him,” was a *private and personal token*: but his publick
 miracles proved that JEHOVAH had sent him, and established
 him as a prophet, both to Israel and to Pharaoh. Indeed;
 Pharaoh and the Egyptians were destroyed, and a most
 important part of Moses’s commission, as a prophet, was ac-
 complished, before Israel came to Horeb. The same kind of
 reasoning which Mr. C. adopted concerning Jesus, may lead
 us to ask, Of what use then were the miracles of Moses to

* Ex. iv. 1--9. 29--31.

Pharaoh and the Egyptians? or the establishment of Moses as a prophet, or his subsequent miracles, to the rebels who afterwards perished by thousands? or to that whole generation which fell in the wilderness? Yet these miracles answered great and important purposes, both to Israel, to the surrounding nations, and to all subsequent generations, even to this day.

P. 29. l. 2. ‘*Establish Moses, &c.*’—L. 21. ‘*All the Miracles, &c.*’—Notwithstanding Moses’s establishment as a prophet at Horeb; the people, it seems, were so little satisfied respecting it, and so prone to murmur, if their desires were not immediately granted; that nothing but miracles of wrath could prevent their open rebellion against both the prophet, and God who sent him! This also shews, that the conduct of the Jews in rejecting Jesus, is no proof, that he was not the true Messiah: for, by exactly the same kind of evidence, it may be proved, that Moses was not a true prophet; and this is at least a valid *argumentum ad hominem*.

L. 32. ‘*Now to make them all fit, &c.*’—The people after all confessed, that they were not able to hear the word of God.*

L. 34, 35. ‘*Became a whole nation, in one moment, prophets, &c.*’—When the Lord appointed to Moses seventy assistants, he said “I will take of the Spirit, which is upon thee, and I will put it upon them.”—“And he took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave unto the seventy elders.—“And Eldad and Medad prophesied in the camp.” “And Moses said, Would God that all the LORD’s people were prophets, and that the LORD would put his Spirit upon them.”† In this place alone, do we read of God’s “pouring out of his Spirit on Israel,” to make any of them prophets, and this only *seventy* out of the whole nation.

* Ex. xx. 19. Deut. v. 23—27. † Num. xi. 17. 24—29.

Moses's wish, according to Mr. C.'s account, would have been superfluous and absurd.

P. 30. l. 1. '*We find that afterwards, &c.*'—Nothing is recorded in the scripture of this kind, concerning prophets in general; nor what entirely accords to it, respecting any particular prophet: but, as it does not affect the general argument, it does not require further notice. The same may be said of the rest of this page.

Let it here be distinctly observed, that Mr. C. admits the authenticity of the history, contained in the New Testament, concerning the ministry and miracles of Jesus, and of his apostles: at least he says nothing to the contrary, and he frequently appeals to it. Indeed, this is the only *original* history, extant in the world, of the introduction and establishment of Christianity. Neither friends nor enemies gave any other which has been preserved, and which can be referred to as *authority*. This is a most extraordinary, though little noticed, fact! The greatest revolution, in itself, and productive of by far the most extensive, important, and permanent effects, in the history of the human race; occupies scarcely any pages in the writings of original historians, except those of the New Testament: all else is *tradition* or *report*. These books were written by Christians; and no contemporary opposer ventured to publish a counter narrative: though the credit of the Jewish rulers, priests and scribes, and even that of pagan persecutors and philosophers, loudly demanded it of them! This is a testimony to the fidelity of the sacred historians of the New Testament, which is altogether without parallel. Even modern enemies to Christianity, are compelled to derive all their information from the evangelists themselves!

Let it be also observed, that Mr. C. does not attempt to deny the *reality* of the miracles, recorded as wrought by Jesus and his apostles; but ascribes them unreservedly to

witchcraft and enchantment: 'All by enchantment.' (P. 27. l. 20.) This is exactly the ancient solution of the difficulty given by the Pharisees; and our Lord's answer to it, is worthy the consideration of moderns also, who retain it.*

Having premised these things, we proceed more directly to the question:—

HOW FAR, AND IN WHAT CASES, MIRACLES ARE A PROOF OF A DIVINE MISSION?

It is readily allowed, that 'bad and wicked men have wrought miracles;' (p. 31. l. 2, 3.) yea, *real* miracles, by the power of God: for to be a *prophet*, and to be a *saint*, or *holy person*, are quite distinct things. No doubt, Judas wrought miracles, as well as the other apostles: and our Lord assures us, that many instances will be made known at the day of judgment of miracles wrought in his name by "the workers of iniquity."†

It is also conceded, that wicked men, by various artifices of *legerdemain*, imposing on the senses of the ignorant, may perform many things, which appear to be miraculous; and the history of the church abounds with such "lying miracles," in which some knowledge of chemistry, or mechanics, or opticks, and other sciences; combining with the tricks of a juggler, among illiterate people, and those, who were not permitted closely to investigate what they saw, gave reputation to appearances, which passed for miracles; but in which neither divine power, nor diabolical operation, were at all concerned. This was clearly ascertained at the reformation from popery: It appears also *to me* undeniable, that by witchcraft and enchantment, the actual operation of evil spirits has been, in many instances, obtained: and thus *supernatural* effects have been produced; and the magicians of Egypt seem to have wrought their miracles, at least some of them, in this way; nor is it easy to say, which of the

* Matt xii. 23—32.

† Matt. vii. 21—23.

lying miracles of the antichristian church, have been wrought by human imposture, and which by Satanical influence.

In this view, however, it is worthy of notice, that the only formidable rival to Christianity, on earth, Mohammedism, was established without any *publick* miracles; and that Mohammed employs no small portion of the Koran, in framing excuses, for not giving signs and miracles in proof of his mission, and in intimidating those who demanded them. The only religions in the whole world, which so much as profess to have been *at first introduced, and established, by publick miracles*, wrought in the presence of powerful opposers, and demanding investigation from the most learned, potent, and sagacious of them, are that of Israel as contained in the Old Testament, and that of Jesus in the New. There never, in any age or place, was another *introduced* with this avowed claim. Miracles, said to have been wrought in support of a system already *established, and possessed of authority*; or by those, whose rank or superiority, *in any respect*, precluded or discouraged free examination; are widely different from those wrought during the feeble infancy of a new religion, in the midst of opposition, by men in other respects obscure, challenging investigation, and forcing opponents to say, “This is the finger of God;” “This man doeth many miracles;” “That a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all, and we cannot deny it:”* Thus driving them to persecution, and to calumniate the most undeniable miracles, as the effect of magick and enchantment.

It is further granted, that there may be cases, in which, those events which appear to us true miracles, are insufficient to prove a divine mission.—When the worship of the One living and true God alone had been established in Israel, by most stupendous miracles, and invincible evidences, no

* Ex. viii. 19. John xi. 47. Acts iv. 16.

sign or miracle was to be considered, as any argument, to authorize the worship of idols: for it could not possibly outweigh, nay it could not be worthy of comparison with, the demonstration already given to the contrary; but must be considered as a temptation.*

If therefore *real miracles* could be wrought in support of any doctrine, *manifestly* and *expressly* contrary to “the oracles of God;” they would not prove the truth of that doctrine. But the Lord graciously so orders it, that careful examination has hitherto sufficed to distinguish the *miracles*, by which new impostures sprung up, almost like yearly Almanacks, to have their short notice, and the admiration of the superficial; and then, like old Almanacks, to be neglected and forgotten; from such miracles as introduced the Mosaick dispensation, and afterwards the religion of Christ. Yet each of these successive impostures deludes some, or many; and often disgraces the cause of truth, and seems to weaken the credibility of scripture, through the sanction given them by some ill-judging religious characters.

Were a few apparent, or even real miracles, the *only* proof, which Christians can adduce, in support of their holy religion: and could it be as *easily proved*, as it is *confidently asserted*, that this religion is subversive of that contained in the Old Testament; *plausibility* at least would be given to the arguments of a Jew against them. But it is observable, that amidst all the stupendous miracles, wrought by Jesus and his apostles, they every where appealed to the Old Testament; alledging that “thus it was written, and “thus it must be.”†

In this respect Christianity has an important advantage above the Mosaick dispensation, because, prophecies, during many ages, introduced it: and not only were all other particulars respecting the Messiah and his kingdom, his labo-

* Deut. xiii. 1—4.

† John v. 35—47.

rious suffering life, and his violent death as a sacrifice for our sins, and his glorious resurrection and ascension,* predicted even with minuteness, but his very miracles also were foretold.† Thus Jesus, when John Baptist sent to enquire of him, “Art thou He that cometh, or do we look “for another?” answered, “Go, and shew John again, those “things which ye do see and hear: the blind receive their “sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the “dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached “unto them.”‡ Whereas Moses could appeal to no preceding prophecies, as marking out any particulars of his mission.§

The religion of Moses, therefore, stands more singly on the demonstration of undeniable miracles, than that of Jesus does: and he, who allows that Jesus wrought the miracles recorded of him, and his apostles those recorded of them, and then says, ‘miracles are a poor and miserable defence,’ &c, (P. 26. l. 29, 30,) does *what in him lieth* to undermine the authority and divine mission of Moses, and to give advantage to infidel opposers of the whole scripture.

Let it be observed also, that the two miracles, which Mr. C. mentions, intimating, that Jesus should have wrought them, (P. 27. l. 22—24,) were not performed by Moses, but by Joshua and Elijah, after the religion of Moses had been fully established.||

If Moses had gone to Israel and to Pharaoh, exactly as he did in all other respects; if they had answered, “The “LORD hath not appeared unto thee,” and demanded some proof of his mission; and, if he could have produced none, except the private token given to encourage his own faith, “This shall be a token *unto thee*, that I have sent thee,

* Ps. xvi. 8—10. lxviii. 18. Is. liii. 4—12. Dan. ix. 24—27. Zech. xiii. 7.

† Is. xxix. 18. xxxv. 4—6.

‡ Is. lxi. 1—3. Matt. xi. 4—6.

Luke vii. 20—23.

§ Gen. xv. 13—16. Ex. xii. 40—42.

|| Josh. x. 12, 13. 1 Kings xviii. 22—38. 2 Kings i. 10—15.

“When thou hast brought forth this people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain:”* it may, I suppose, be spoken confidently, that there would have been an end of the whole business; except that Pharaoh would have punished him as a deceiver, and have oppressed the people more severely, for forming designs of recovering their liberty. The token would have come too late, either to induce Pharaoh to let the people go, or Israel to venture on leaving Egypt.—But when, in proof that JEHOVAH had sent him, Moses gave the appointed miraculous signs to the people; and when, by the lifting up of his shepherd’s rod, or waving it, the waters of Egypt were turned into blood; and tremendous judgments denounced beforehand, followed one another in rapid succession, which were also removed at his word; the LORD God almighty bare witness to his mission; so that even Pharaoh and the Egyptians could not disprove it, or indeed doubt of it.

If, however, the magicians had been able, by their art, to remove each judgment at once, and to repair the damages of it, the case might have still remained doubtful: but when, after aping a few of his miracles, they were constrained to confess, “This is the finger of God;” when “the boil was on them, as well as on the other Egyptians,” and when they were driven away, defeated, and covered with ignominy: the difference between Moses, who spake in the name of JEHOVAH, and these impotent contemptible jugglers, was fully demonstrated; and “their folly was made manifest to all men.”†

It is manifest, that Moses himself, and all the subsequent writers of the Old Testament, appeal to the miracles wrought in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness, as the foundation of their religion. Something has already been adduced on this topick, and I will not enlarge. “Hath

* Ex. iii. 12.

† 2 Tim. iii. 9.

“God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst
 “of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by won-
 “ders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a
 “stretched out arm, and by great terrors; according to all
 “that the LORD your God did for you before your eyes?
 “Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know, that
 “the LORD he is God,”*—“How long will it be ere they
 “believe me, for all the signs which I have shewed among
 “them?”† These miracles are also represented as exciting
 convictions in all the neighbouring nations, which were not
 forgotten for ages afterwards.‡

It is readily allowed, that this was far from the only
 proof, that the Lord spake by Moses: and careful examiners
 find decisive internal evidence of his divine legation, pervad-
 ing the whole of the books written by him. The sublime
 and truly rational views of the nature, perfections, and
 works of God; and the history of the creation of the world;
 the holy, just, and good law, which Moses promulgated; the
 excellent *judgments*, or political laws, which he enacted, com-
 pared with those of other ancient legislators, nay, with modern
 codes of law, even in Christian countries; the sacramental
 prefigurations, in the ritual law, of “good things to come;”
 and the prophecies contained in his writings, and either
 fulfilled in past events, or fulfilling at this day, especially
 in the state of Israel; are a few of the other conclusive
 proofs, that God spake by Moses.—His disinterestedness,
 and some laws and promises, which no politician would have
 committed himself upon, except conscious of delivering the
 word of God, § and even the obscurity of his own descen-
 dants render his divine mission illustrious. Yet the whole

* Deut. iv. 34, 35.

† Num. xiv. 11. Comp. Mark ix. 19.

John xii. 37. See also Num. xvi. 28—30. xvii. 2—10.

‡ Ex. xv.

14—16. Josh. ii. 9—11. 1 Sam. iv. 8.

§ Ex. xxxiv. 24. Lev. xxv.

20—22.

was introduced, and established by miracles; without which there would have been no opportunity of exhibiting the other evidences of his mission, or of calling the attention of Israel, or of mankind, to them.

In like manner, the holy nature of Christianity, in which all, that has been noticed of the perfections and holy law of God, is still more clearly exhibited; and the success of such a holy religion, in this wicked and unholy world, by such means and instruments as have been considered; with innumerable internal proofs, and prophecies already fulfilled, and fulfilling at this day; not to dwell again on the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled in these events; constitute a full proof, and moral demonstration, that Christianity is from God, even apart from the miracles of Jesus and his apostles: nay, the prevalence and continuance of his religion to this day, is more wonderful than any external miracle, or all of them united. The tendency also of Christianity, yea, its actual effects, shewing that if it universally prevailed, not in name and form, but in power and efficacy; if men did indeed repent, believe, love God, and love one another, according to its peremptory requirements, universal peace and felicity must be the consequence; this, I say, proclaims its divine original.

Yet the whole was introduced, and must have been introduced, by miracles, to excite the attention of the prejudiced Jews, and of a careless world; to force a temporary conviction at least, even on its opponents; and to procure the preachers a patient hearing from those whom they addressed. Without this, no other evidences could have been so brought before men, as to have obtained a fair investigation. In this respect, the case of the Mosaick, and that of the Christian dispensations are entirely similar.

The nature of our Lord's miracles also should be considered.—Mr. C. seems indeed favourable to tremendous

and splendid miracles : and to “ turn water into blood ” was more suited to the law given by Moses ; but to “ turn “ water into wine ” better accorded to him, by whom “ grace “ and truth came ” to mankind. The power which raised the dead, in many instances, was doubtless sufficient to strike dead the living opponents ; and certainly, it ought not to be an objection to our Lord’s miracles, that he did not inflict, I will not say such miraculous judgments, as desolated Egypt, but such as slew rebellious Israelites by thousands and ten thousands, in the wilderness. When Jesus merely said, “ I am he,” his numerous and powerful assailants “ went backward, and fell to the ground ; ”* and he shewed that his mild conduct in this respect did not arise from want of power. The special miracles wrought by Jesus, which accord to the predictions of the prophets, should not be overlooked.—No prophet or apostle, except the Lord Jesus, ever “ opened the eyes of the blind,” either of those who had been before known to be blind, or born blind.† Nothing of this appears in the history of the Old Testament, or in the Acts of the Apostles. The same may be said of his “ unstopping the ears of the deaf, and giving “ speech to the dumb.” “ He hath done all things well ; he “ maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.”‡ Not to dwell upon the suitableness of these miracles, to be emblems of his salvation ; it is plain that the predictions referred to never were accomplished but in him ; and nothing could more explicitly point out the promised Messiah, for “ unto many that were blind he gave sight.” (ἡχαρισατο το ελεπειν).

He healed all manner of diseases, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead by a word spoken ; rebuked a legion of evil spirits, and drove them out ; “ rebuked the winds and

* John xviii. 3—6.

† Is. xxxv. 5, 6. John ix. 32.

‡ Mark vii. 32. Comp. Ex. iv. 11. Luke xxi. 15. Acts xxvi. 16—18.

“waves” in a violent storm, “and there was a great calm;” “walked upon the waves of the sea:” and, to complete the whole, he shewed that he had “power to lay down his “life and power to take it again.”

This last miracle was the grand sign given to that generation. It was predicted by the prophets; and so clearly foretold by Jesus himself, from the beginning of his ministry, that it was well known to the scribes, priests, and rulers: yet all their precautions were vain; the body was gone, and their silence, after the bold and explicit testimony of the apostles to his resurrection, with the unqualified accusation of them, as the murderers of the Messiah, “the Prince of life,” was a clear confession that they could adduce nothing against it. The testimony of twelve men of sober minds, good characters, and most evidently disinterested, who had intimately known him for several years, and ate and drank with him after his resurrection, and saw him ascend towards heaven, was enough to prove any fact, not wholly impossible in the nature of things. In this testimony they all persevered, without one discordant voice, amidst labours, hardships, and persecutions, even until death; and most of them sealed it with their blood. Besides their testimony, very many others bare witness also; and the apostle Paul, several years after, could appeal to the greater part of five hundred persons, who saw Jesus after his resurrection. But it was deemed proper, to put the matter beyond all reasonable doubt; therefore, as if no human testimony was sufficient in such a cause, “God himself bare witness with “signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts “of the Holy Ghost.”* The gift of tongues, enabling unlearned men to speak fluently, and understand readily, the languages of all the nations, to whom they addressed themselves; every miracle which the apostles wrought in the

* Heb. ii. 4.

“name of Jesus of Nazareth;” every instance, in which they conferred the gift of tongues and power of working miracles on others, by the laying on of their hands; not only increased the number of witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus, but was *the attestation of God himself* to their testimony. Either the resurrection of our Lord must be disproved; or it must stand confirmed, I had almost said, beyond demonstration, that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

Impostors have made many vain pretensions: but did any man, from the beginning of the world to this day, having rested the proof of his mission on this ground, ‘Put me to death; and if I do not rise again on the third day, I am a deceiver:’ I say, did any man ever *establish such a demonstration* of his mission, except Jesus of Nazareth? Why talk of magick and enchantment? What could these do in such a case as this?

It appears then, that miracles, publick, undeniable miracles, wrought in the name of God, (as an express proof and confirmation of a doctrine not manifestly contrary to preceding revelations in essential matters, and destitute of human support; but vehemently opposed by the powerful, sagacious, and learned, and the multitude,) are one grand evidence that God sent him who wrought them, and by them God himself attests the testimony; that they introduce and make way for all other proofs; and that when such changes, as Christianity introduced, are to be effected in consequence, by unarmed instruments, and without human power or violence, they are almost, if not absolutely, indispensable.

When only a few of our Lord’s miracles had been performed, they drew from a ruler and teacher in Israel, the confession, in his own name and that of his company; “Rabbi, we know that thou art a Teacher come from God:” “for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except

“God be with him.”* “Many of the people,” also, “believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles, than this man doeth?”† And the man born blind spoke unanswerably, when he said, “Herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes;—since the world began was it not heard, that any man opened the eyes of one who was born blind: if this man were not of God, he could do nothing.”‡ The council also felt the energy of this proof, after he had called Lazarus out of the grave—“What do we? for this man doeth many miracles; and if we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him.”§ After his resurrection, the testimony of his apostles produced the most embarrassing difficulties to the opposing rulers: and they were induced to put the cause on another kind of trial, when Gamaliel had counselled, after introducing apposite examples, “Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel and work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found to fight against God.”|| According to the reasoning of this prudent opponent, trial has been made for much above seventeen hundred years; and because Christianity is “of God,” neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither open enemies, nor treacherous friends, have been able to overturn it, to this very day. After all, no other religion, from the beginning of the world, except that of Moses, and that of Jesus, ever claimed to have been introduced and established by publick miracles, as the testimony of God to the teacher and his doctrine. Popish miracles, heathen miracles, and Mohammedan miracles, accord in this, that they were wrought, or asserted to be wrought, in favour of a religion already

* John iii. 1, 2.

† John vii. 31.

‡ John ix. 29—34.

§ John xi. 47, 48.

|| Acts v. 33—40.

established and possessed of authority, or publick favour; privately, among friends, or at most before those, who dared not, or were not able, to investigate their pretensions. There are, therefore, no other claimants in this cause; though some men speak, as if such claims were *quite common things*! The miracles of Moses, and of Jesus, were as much superior to all the effects of magick and enchantment, as well as to those of human imposture, “as “the heavens are above the earth. They stand on the same ground, and must be supported by the same arguments, and share the same fate. So that, if either Jew or Christian could succeed, in discrediting the miracles of Moses, or of Jesus, as God’s attestation to the divine mission of either of them; every shrewd opposer of both, would perceive his advantage, and fight him with his own weapons: nay, the attempt itself would tend to universal scepticism.

P. 31. l. 4. ‘*The authorities, &c.*’ The quotations, though inaccurate on this page, do not affect the main question. But if the Messiah is to be only an earthly, and not a spiritual Deliverer; what connection can his coming, and the restoration of Israel, have with “the circumcision of the heart to love the LORD?” (L. 28—31.) Is not this a *spiritual* blessing? Or what does Mr. C. suppose to be meant by it? Does he, with many writers concerning Christian baptism, suppose the sign and the thing signified to be the same, or inseparably connected with each other?

P. 31. last l. P. 32. l. 1. ‘*Let every one observe, &c.*’ —The law of Moses, undeniably, contains three distinct kinds of precepts: *moral*, *ceremonial*, and *judicial*. The *moral* law is contained in the ten commandments; summed up in the two great commandments of “loving God “with all the heart,” and “our neighbours as ourselves;” and explained and enforced by every precept or exhortation in scripture, requiring piety, justice, temperance, inward

purity, truth, and love.—The *ceremonial* law comprises all instituted worship, and the whole of the external observances, respecting sacrifices, festivals, distinction of meats, purifications, and various things; neither arising from the nature of God and man, and mens' relation to God and one another, nor previously obligatory.—The *judicial* laws were the magistrate's rule of political government. Of the two last, it may be questioned whether they be now in force, or not: but, it is manifest, that they have not been, as to the most essential parts of them, obeyed, since the destruction of the temple, and the dispersion of the Jews; nor can they be obeyed, in the present state of the nation. The ceremonial institutions, not being previously obligatory, might be abolished by the same authority as instituted them. Christians consider them, “as having been “ shadows of good things to come;” and having now answered their end, and received their accomplishment, as disannulled, and of no validity: and it appears to us, that this was intimated with sufficient clearness by the ancient prophets.* Several of the prophets, also, allowed of deviations from the ritual law; and set the example of them, with acceptance from God, in peculiar circumstances: as Elijah and Elisha, and the other prophets, who were sent to the ten tribes; and who neither went themselves, nor required the pious remnant of Israelites, to go up to Jerusalem to worship; and they always marked strongly the superiority of moral to ritual obedience.† Now that, which is *inferior* in excellency, cannot be of the same nature, and the same immutable obligation, as that which is *superior*, and to which it must give place, when they

* Ps. xl. 6—8. Comp. Heb. x. 1—9. Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Comp. Heb. viii. 8—13.

† Ps. l. 23. li. 16, 17. Is. i. 10--18. lxvi. 3. Jer. vii. 21--23. Hos. vi. 6. Am. v. 21—24.

interfere with each other.—“ I desired mercy, and not “ sacrifice.”*

The judicial laws were framed, with an equity, wisdom, mildness, and benevolence, which marks their divine original: but they were so specially accommodated to Israel, as under a Theocracy,* that they could not be adapted to the political government of nations, in different circumstances; though the spirit of them might be very advantageously infused into, perhaps, every code of laws on earth.

But the moral law is unchangeable, as to its substantial requirements, in its own nature; the gospel establishes it, in its full authority, both by the obedience and atonement of Immanuel, by giving it as a rule of duty to all called Christians, and by writing it, in the heart of all, who are really Christians; thus leading them to love and delight in it, to repent of every transgression of it; and to breathe out the constant prayer, “ Oh, that my ways were directed “ to keep thy statutes !”

Many professed Christians, and teachers, speak of ‘ the ‘ law being abolished,’ and a *better*, a *new* and *mitigated* law, introduced by Christianity: but, as I believe this to be, the most *general of all heresies*, and one of the most *destructive both to law and gospel*, I shall only say concerning it, “ Let Baal plead for himself.” The notion undermines the very doctrine of redemption, and hides its glory; it makes void the holy, just, and good law of God; and gives the Jew one of his most plausible arguments against Christianity.

P. 32. l. 10. ‘ *The LAW of Moses is perfect.*’—Each of these laws cannot be *perfect*, in exactly the same sense, or, the one never could have been preferred before the other. Each of them is *perfect*, as entirely suited for the purpose,

* Hos. vi. 6.

for which God intended it. But if God intended the *moral* law, as the complete and unchangeable standard of holiness, and rule of duty, to all his worshippers under every dispensation, according to which also he will judge the world: if he intended the *ritual* law, as a temporary rule for instituted worship, a wall of separation to preserve Israel from apostacy to idolatry, and being lost among idolaters, by familiar intercourse with them; and as a shadow of good things to come: and if he intended the *judicial* law for the political law of Israel, under the theocracy; the perfection of each, to answer these several intentions, could not be precisely the same.—Now *absolute* perfection must be entirely the same, wherever it exists; that is, in God alone: *relative* perfection, in the fullest sense, belongs to all his works, as he made them; not more to an angel than to Adam, or the lower creation, or any part of it.—“God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.”* “As for God, his work is perfect:” yet the perfection of the human body does not consist in all being one member; but in the completeness and symmetry of the whole, consisting of many members, each perfectly fitted to its place and office.

P. 32. l. 23—32. ‘*I have produced, &c.*’ Perfectly satisfied with the testimonies from Moses and from David, when soberly interpreted, we have no desire to bring forward any witnesses to oppose them. If indeed there were any contrariety, we might point out Immanuel, and say, “Behold a greater than Moses, than David is here!” “I am one that bear witness of myself; and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me:” the apostles also concur in his testimony; and so doth “the Holy Spirit, which God hath given to them that obey him.”† But there is no

* Gen. i. 31.
Acts v. 32.

† Matt. xii. 41, 42. John viii. 13—18. xv. 26, 27.

contrariety; yea, rather there is. the most entire coincidence.

P. 32, last line. p. 33. l. 1. ‘*These two tables contained the whole law.*’ Then the *ceremonial* and *judicial* law form no part of that, in behalf of which Mr. C. is pleading; for the ten commandments alone were written on the two tables of stone. And, in that case, I have no further controversy with him, on this part of the subject.

P. 33. l. 2. ‘*In the ten, &c.*’ I should probably labour in vain, did I attempt to advise Christians, to count the letters of the ten commandments; and to compare them with the number of precepts, of every sort and kind, in the law of Moses. Will not reasonable Jews allow this to be egregious trifling? “How forcible are right words! but “what doth your arguing prove?”* If indeed God, or Moses, had told us that each *letter* in the ten commandments was the representative of a *precept* in the law, we ought to have attended to it: but *asserting* that it is so, without proof, or with no proof but from “the tradition of “the elders,” requires no attention. The only sense, in which the ten commandments comprised the whole law, moral, ceremonial, and judicial, is this:—it virtually required every one to obey each ritual, or instituted appointment, for the time in which it continued to be in force; as a part of the general obedience to the law of God: but if the same authority, which *instituted*, afterwards *abolished* the institution, that obligation ceased.

Let it, however, be carefully observed, that a law, in every sense as perfect as it can be, is not all which a *sinner* wants, in order to salvation or happiness, (p. 33. l. 7—9.) “If there had been a law given, which could have “given life, verily righteousness should have been by the “law: but the scripture hath shut up all under sin.”† An

* Job. vi. 25.

† Gal. iii. 21, 22. Comp. Ps. cxxx. 3, 4. cxliii. 2.

act of parliament, however good, cannot meet the case of a criminal exposed to condemnation, or already condemned for breaking it; or supersede the necessity of a pardon from the king. Mr. C. himself observes, that in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, 'is pronounced the blessing for obedience and the curses for disobedience.' Now the law cannot be sufficient for the happiness of him, whom it *curses for disobedience*; the law in itself says nothing concerning forgiveness; this must come from the mercy of the Law-giver. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered:"* and "the circumcision of the heart," by which transgressors are brought to repent and turn to God, and love and serve him, is the work of his special grace, according to the new covenant, by which he "writes the law in our hearts," while "our sins and iniquities he remembers no more."† We suppose that the ritual law, rightly understood, contained the gospel of mercy and grace, as proposed to Israel; which when Christ came, and after his crucifixion, was virtually abrogated: and plain testimonies, invitations, and promises, made known the way of salvation to mankind. As 'a law of works,' the gospel itself cannot save transgressors, any more than the law of Moses can. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" yea, every man has broken his own law, that which he, however erroneously, has proposed to himself as the law of God; and thus he is condemned by his own conscience and heart: and if our "heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things!"

We do not then say, that God has by Jesus given a new and better law: but that "he is the Mediator of a better covenant," than that made with Israel, by the typical mediation of Moses. It is manifest, that God made a covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was the

* Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.

† Jer. xxxi. 31—34.

outward seal; but of which the Aaronick priesthood and most of the ceremonies were no part: and surely the apostles argument is conclusive, "The covenant which was confirmed," (that is, with Abraham) "of God in Christ; the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul."* This *covenant*, so manifestly distinct from the Sinai Covenant, we suppose to have comprised for substance what the prophets, and the writers of the New Testament, speak of, as "a new and everlasting covenant."

But as the new covenant, in various *circumstances*, differed from that made with Abraham; it is generally spoken of, in appropriate language, distinguishing it from the national covenant with Israel. The passage from Jeremiah, which the apostle produces and argues from, in *an unanswerable manner*, has been considered:† and the same prophet proposes the subject in similar language in a subsequent chapter. "I will give them one heart and one way that they may fear me for ever; for the good of them, and of their children after them: I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me."‡ This must certainly be distinct from the Sinai-Covenant, in which none of these things are engaged for.—Thus Ezekiel also; "I will remember my covenant with thee, in the days of thy youth, and I will establish with thee an everlasting covenant.—Then shalt thou remember thy ways and be ashamed, when thou shalt receive thy sisters, the elder and the younger," (Samaria and Sodom,) "and I will give them unto thee, for daughters, but not by thy covenant."§ "God will remember his covenant with Israel;" "He will establish unto Israel an

* Gal. iii. 16, 17.

† Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Heb. viii. 8.—13. x. 15—18.

‡ Jer. xxxii. 39, 40.

§ Ez. xvi. 60, 61.

“everlasting covenant:” and he will give the Gentiles “to them for daughters, but not by thy covenant.”—What does this mean; but that God will restore Israel, not by the national covenant, but by another distinct covenant, including the Gentiles also? For substance, this was the Abrahamick covenant;* more explicitly proposed by the Messiah, as “the new covenant in his blood,” and of which he is the Surety and Mediator.—Thus again, speaking of the restoration of Israel; “My Servant David shall be their Prince for ever; and I will make a covenant of peace with them; and it shall be an everlasting covenant with them, &c.”† Is it not evident, that this “covenant of peace,” which God will make with Israel, on their restoration, and under which “David shall be their Prince for ever,” is entirely distinct from that covenant, which God made with their fathers, at Mount Sinai?

In like manner, God by Isaiah says to the Messiah: “I will give thee for a Covenant of the people, for a Light of the Gentiles.”‡—And again, “I will preserve thee, and give thee for a Covenant of the people, to establish the earth, &c.”§ And again, “Incline your ear, and come to me, hear and your souls shall live: and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.”|| Whether we understand this literally of David,¶ or figuratively of the Messiah; it must denote a covenant distinct from the national covenant of Israel; and one which is made through the Messiah with individuals, who ‘obey the calling,’ and with no others.—Again, “And the Redeemer shall come to Zion; and unto them who turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the LORD, as for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD, &c.”—Now, this

* Ps. cv. 8—10.

† Ez. xxxvii. 25—27.

‡ Is. xlii. 6.

§ Is. xlix. 8. See also liv. 10.

|| Is. lv. 3.

¶ 2 Sam. xiii. 5. Ps. lxxix. 4, 5.

covenant made with a *remnant* of penitent Jews, at the coming of the Redeemer, (or at any other time,) could not be the same, with the national covenant made with Israel at Mount Sinai." In like manner, also Gabriel says to Daniel, concerning the Messiah, "he shall confirm the covenant with "many for one week."* Now this covenant which was confirmed "*with many*," while the rest were given up to desolations, could not be the national covenant of Sinai.—In fact, in the Old Testament, as well as the New, the covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not the Sinai Covenant, is almost always referred to, whenever the promised mercies to Israel are spoken of.†

We therefore conclude, that the Messiah is "the Mediator of a new and a better covenant," than that made with Israel at Mount Sinai, promising far more valuable blessings to those with whom it is made, and securing them in a far more irrevocable and unalterable manner: being for substance the same, with the covenant made with Abraham, in behalf of himself and his Seed, even Christ, and confirmed by the oath, which was sworn unto him: including also the Gentiles, who are grafted into the good olive-tree by faith in the Messiah, and so "partake of the root and fatness of "the good olive-tree."‡—But as this is proposed, in a new, and clearer manner, and its extent, and blessings, and security, are more explicitly exhibited; it is generally called "the new covenant," as distinguished from the Sinai Covenant. I forbear to quote the New Testament on this subject; except as I introduce it, to shew what our views on this subject are, and on what grounds we consider them warranted by clear testimonies from the Old Testament. This

* Dan. ix. 27.

† Deut. iv. 31. viii. 18. 2 Kings xiii. 23. 1 Chr. xvi. 15—18. Neh. ix. 8.

Ps. cy. 9, 10. Micah vii. 20. Luke i. 54, 55. 72—75.

‡ Rom. xi. 16—24. Heb. vi. 13—18.

part of the subject is wholly overlooked by Mr. C. but this *new covenant*, is a far different thing from a *new law*. This I suppose St. Paul meant, when he said, “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.” (εὑνομας Χριστοῦ.)*

We indeed read in the New Testament of “fulfilling the law of Christ:” but I apprehend the apostle meant, the new commandment requiring Christians to love one another for his sake, and according to the pattern of his love to them.† However, the constant reference of the apostles to the moral law of ten commandments as the rule of our duty, sufficiently proves, that Jesus did not intend to abolish the holy, just, good, and spiritual law of the Old Testament, to substitute one of a milder and more indulgent nature in its place.‡

P. 33. 1. 12. ‘*This law cannot make happy, &c.*’—No law can make happy him who has *broken it*.—“Blessed are they that keep judgment, and he that doeth righteousness at all times.” “He that doeth these things shall live in them.” “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.”§ “Where is then the blessedness?” “Blessed is he whose iniquity is forgiven, and whose sin is covered.” “Blessed is the man, to whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity.” But this properly belongs, not to the law but to the gospel;|| for “Without shedding of blood there is no remission.”

L. 19, 20. ‘*He ought to have, &c.*’—True Christians never think of prescribing to God what he *ought* to do: it is their question, “What must I do to be saved?”—“Lord what wouldst thou have me to do?”

L. 22. ‘*In number seventy, &c.*’—It is not very easy to make out the number of the distinct families, which sprang

* 1 Cor. ix. 21. † John xiii. 34. Gal. vi. 2. 1 John ii. 7, 8.

‡ Rom. vii. 12. xiii. 8—10. Gal. v. 14. Eph. vi. 1, 2. Jam. ii. 8—11.

§ Ps. cvi. 3. Ez. xviii. 4. xx. 11. 21. Luke x. 25—29

|| Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. cxxx. 4, 5. Rom. iv. 6—8.

from Noah's three sons; as any one will find, if he attempt to be accurate, and to distinguish exactly between their immediate and their more remote descendants. I do not think the matter deserving of a laboured investigation: but as Mr. C. purposes to build much upon it, he ought well to secure the foundation; else the whole superstructure will fall to the ground on the slightest assault.

L. 29, 30. '*Lest we be scattered, and God said, they shall be scattered.*'—*Scatter* is not a very appropriate word for such a *regular allotment*, as Mr. C. supposes was made of the earth, to these seventy families at this time.* Jacob said of Simeon and Levi, "I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel."† And God declared by Moses, "I said, I would scatter them into corners."—"I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men."‡ And Israel is now *scattered* among the nations: but could Joshua, when he divided the promised land among the tribes of Israel, be said to *scatter* them in Canaan?

L. 31. '*The heavenly Sanhedrin, &c.*' As the scripture reveals nothing of this Sanhedrin and their proceedings; I must consider the whole as a mere fable, and class them with the legends of popery; that especially, which gives the several countries of the world, to different saints, who are the special patrons of them: and who, I suppose, go to war with one another, when these nations choose to engage in war; nay, with God himself, when they war against his chosen people! Thus St. James is the patron saint of Spain, St. George of England, St. Patrick of Ireland, St. Dennis of France.—The virgin Mary, I have lately heard, is now substituted in the place of the latter. We require THE WORD OF GOD, not the dreams of men:

* Gen. xi. 3—9.
xxx. 3. xxxii. 26.

† Gen. xlix. 7.

‡ Lev. xxvi. 33. Deut. iv. 27.

“What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the LORD?”* There is not the least ground in scripture, for supposing any such regular allotment of the countries, to the several families descended from Noah. The greatest part of the earth was to them *terra incognita, an unknown country*. A succession of most stupendous miracles must have occurred, even in many respects far greater, than that of Israel’s deliverance from Egypt and settlement in Canaan; in making known to each of these families the distant, unknown, and uncultivated country allotted to it; in prevailing on them to leave the rest of mankind, and all the cultivated parts of the world, to go in quest of this unknown land; and in conducting them, some to one region, and some to another; several of them to the most remote districts of the four continents; and also to the islands of the sea, before, as far as we know, ships were in use.—To raise such an *hypothesis* as this, from the two verses in the eleventh of Genesis on this subject, may prove ingenuity; but it must fall, and

‘Like the baseless fabrick of a vision,

‘Leave not a wreck behind.’

God was pleased to *scatter* mankind: he knew where each tribe or family would eventually settle; and he left matters to their course, according to the usual methods of his providence. This sufficed, as far as the intended inheritance of Israel was concerned:† and we have no further information of his purposes.

P. 34. l. 33. ‘*The lot of God, &c.*’ (L. 18.)—God, then, did not *choose* Abraham and his posterity to be his portion;‡ but the heavenly Sanhedrin settled it *by lot*. (P. 33. l. 31—34.) But what is the lot? “The lot is cast into

* Jer. xxiii. 25—29.

† Dan. xxxii. 8.

‡ Deut. vii. 6, 7.

Neh. ix. 7. Is. xli. 8, 9. xlv. 1.

“the lap, but the whole disposing of it is of the LORD.”* The heart revolts and shudders, at the narration of the great dispensations of the infinite God, in such language, as hardly suits even the more important concerns of puny mortals.

Last line but one. ‘*One good family:*’ ‘*a right to his oracles:*’ (P. 35. l. 7.) ‘*an act of justice.*’ (L. 12.) I only note these expressions, that they may not escape the reader’s attention. At present, I desire the reader to recollect, if he can, any thing of similar language on the subject in the scripture; and I quote a passage or two, suited to convey other ideas of the transaction: “Speak not in
“thine heart,—for my righteousness the LORD hath brought
“me in to possess this land.—Not for thy righteousness, nor
“for the uprightness of thy heart, dost thou go in to
“possess this land: but for the wickedness of these nations
“the LORD doth drive them out from before thee; and
“that he may perform the word, which the LORD sware
“unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.—Under-
“stand, therefore, that the LORD thy God giveth thee
“not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness, for
“thou art a stiff-necked people.”—“Ye have been rebel-
“lious against the LORD, from the day that I knew you.”†
—“In the day when I chose Israel, and lifted up my hand
“unto the seed of the house of Jacob, and made myself
“known to them in the land of Egypt.”—“I said unto
“them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his
“eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt;
“I am the LORD your God. But they rebelled against
“me, and would not hearken unto me; they did not cast
“away every man the abominations of their eyes, neither
“did they forsake the idols of Egypt: then I said, I will
“pour out my fury to accomplish mine anger in the midst

* Prov. xvi. 33.

† Deut. ix. 4—7. 24.

“of the land of Egypt. But I wrought for my name’s sake.”*—“And ye shall remember your ways, and all your doings, wherein ye have been defiled; and ye shall lothe yourselves in your own sight, for all your evils that ye have committed. And ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have wrought with you for my name’s sake; not according to your wicked ways, nor according to your corrupt doings, O ye house of Israel, saith the LORD God.”† The man, who claims of God what is *justly* due to him, shall have it “without mercy.” But God confers his favours on those, who allow that they do not *deserve* them. As I cannot understand, so I do not stay to enquire, in what sense ‘the lot of God was in number, as much as that of the seventy angels.’ (P. 34. l. 30.)

P. 35. l. 28. ‘*They are called and invited by the word of the Lord, &c.*’—Does this mean, that without circumcision, or being proselyted to the observance of the ritual law, men may share the benefits of Israel? If it do, it is a concession, which I did not expect to meet with; but the words, *no law, no promise*, seem to confine it to those who are fully proselyted.

P. 36. l. 30. ‘*Here is the calling, &c.*’—Are then no more Gentiles to share these blessings, than can dwell among the Jews and Israel in the land of promise? This, I fear, will in great measure disannul the former concession; for the land of Canaan can hold a very small part of the Gentiles, that is, the inhabitants of the globe, along with Israel.—It is, however, proper to note the assertion, that Abraham was forty-eight years old, when the earth was divided. (P. 34. l. 40.)

We find in Genesis, that “unto Eber were born two sons: the name of the one was Peleg; for in his days

* Ez. xx. 5—9.

† Ez. xx. 43, 44.

“was the earth divided.”* The word *Peleg* signifies *division*. According to the chronology, calculated from the fifth and the eleventh, of Genesis, Peleg was born about A. M. 1757. Terah, the father of Abraham, descended from Peleg by Reu, Serug, and Nahor, was born about A. M. 1878. Terah died at the age of 205 years, and his son Abraham was then seventy five years old;† so that he was born when Terah was 130: about A. M. 2008; or 251 years after Peleg was born: but Peleg lived in all, no more than 239 years.‡—Peleg died A. M. 1996. Abraham, according to Moses, was born A. M. 2008.—This suffices to shew, that general assertions from tradition, when compared with the scripture, are often detected to be *false*, and are always *uncertain*.—Probably, Peleg’s name was given him, about the time of his birth, which occurred 251 years before that of Abraham.

L. 14. ‘*He cursed them, &c.*’ The Psalm, from which Mr. C. adduces the words of Abraham’s curse, “Destroy, O Lord, and divide their tongues,” is expressly ascribed to David, in the Hebrew Bible, after the manner of the other Psalms written by him.§ It is generally allowed to have been composed during Absalom’s rebellion, and to relate to Ahitophel.||

P. 36. l. 11. ‘*For he who will be a sharer, &c.*’ This hint should be carefully observed; as it seems to be overlooked in great measure, in the following parts of the publication. Perhaps, however, it is exclusively meant of proselytes from the Gentiles, and not of Israelites by birth.

P. 36. *last line but one.* ‘THE MESSIAH’S KINGDOM IS ‘NOT SPIRITUAL, BUT ABSOLUTELY EARTHLY.’

IS THE KINGDOM OF THE MESSIAH SPIRITUAL, OR ABSOLUTELY EARTHLY?

* Gen. x. 25.

† Gen. xi. 32. xii. 4.

‡ Gen. xi. 18, 19.

§ Ps. lv. *Title.*

|| Ps. lv. 9—15.

I introduce this part of our subject, by forming Mr. C's assertion into a question, which I purpose to discuss.

Last line. 'In the last chapter of Ezekiel, &c.' It would be easy to shew, that the strictly literal interpretation of Ezekiel's vision, including the last nine chapters, is attended by very great, if not absolutely insurmountable difficulties. It is generally allowed to be one of the most obscure portions in the whole scripture; I apprehend, the most obscure of all. Various opinions have been formed respecting the times and events to which it relates: but the order in which it follows the predictions of 'the Restoration of Israel,' and the slaughter of those powerful opposers, predicted under the names Gog and Magog; its coincidence, in this respect, with the New Testament predictions of the establishment of the millennium, after the terrible destruction of all opposers;* and, in addition to all, its very obscurity leads me to conclude, that it relates to events yet future, and subsequent to the conversion and 'Restoration of Israel.' But I am fully persuaded that nothing, previous to its fulfilment, will enable any man to know, how far it should be understood *literally*, and how far *figuratively*. The city, (which is never called *Jerusalem*,) according to the admeasurement assigned to it, would be forty miles square: and the land, (which is never called *Canaan*,) of far larger dimensions, than that divided by Joshua. Exactly the same proportion is assigned to each tribe, without any difference as to numbers; and each portion is stated as extended directly across the country. I only hint these things, as obvious difficulties to the strictly literal interpretation; and to shew how little certainty there can be in our reasonings from this obscure unfulfilled prophecy.

I have already observed, and desire again to point out to the reader; that 'the Restoration of Israel' is, neither in Eze-

* Notes, Ez. xxxix. xl. xlviii.—Rev. xix. xx. Family Bible by the author.

kiel, nor in any of the prophets, directly connected with the coming of the Messiah: but if his coming be spoken of, something is constantly introduced, between the mention of it and the prophecy of Israel's restoration.—Thus in Isaiah, the calling of the Gentiles is introduced between the coming of the Messiah, and the Restoration of Israel.* Thus in Amos, the same order is observed.†—But in very many prophecies, the coming of the Messiah is not at all mentioned: He is supposed to have come, and to have set up his kingdom; and at length Israel receives him, or submits to him, and is restored.‡—The prophecy of Jeremiah seems more like an exception to this statement, than any other:§ yet the days of the Restoration of Israel, are marked distinctly, as subsequent to his coming. It may also be observed, that the coming of the Messiah is, in several prophecies, closely connected with judgments on the Jews, as the *immediate* consequence; which is wholly inconsistent with the restoration of the nation being the *immediate* consequence.||

I would however most especially observe, as connected with the present question, that 'the Restoration of Israel' is uniformly connected with the promise of spiritual blessings: if forgiveness of sins, and renewal of the heart to holiness, be spiritual blessings. It will, I believe, be difficult to find any clear exception to this arrangement. Thus Moses connects that event with their confessing their sins, "their "uncircumcised hearts being humbled; and their accepting "the punishment of their sin."—And let it be here noted, that the Lord says, "Then I will remember my covenant," "with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also "my covenant with Abraham."¶—The Abrahamick, not the Sinai-covenant is pointed out.

* Is. xi. 10—16. † Am. ix. 11—15. ‡ Ez. xxxiv. 23—31.
xxxvi. 21—28. Hos. iii. 4, 5. § Jer. xxiii. 5—8. || Dan. ix.
24—27. Zec. ix. 9, 10. xiii. 7—9. Mal. iii. 1—5. ¶ Lev. xxvi. 40—42.

Again, predicting of the present dispersion of Israel :
 “ But if from thence thou shalt seek the LORD thy God,
 “ thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart
 “ and with all thy soul. When thou art in tribulation, and
 “ all these things are come upon thee in the latter days;
 “ if thou turn to the LORD thy God, and shalt be obedient
 “ to his voice, (for the LORD thy God is a merciful God,)
 “ he will not forsake thee, nor destroy thee; nor forget the
 “ covenant of thy fathers, which he swore unto them.”*—
 Observe again, “ the covenant of thy fathers, which he
 “ *swore* unto them.”† The Sinai Covenant was not *confirmed with an oath*.

But whence does this conduct of the dispersed Israelites arise?—Moses, speaking concerning the same events, says,
 “ The LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart to love
 “ the LORD thy God, with all thy heart.”‡

It would be far too prolix to adduce the other passages, which connect the Restoration of Israel with spiritual blessings; and I must only refer the reader to them.§ And let those, who contend for an *absolutely earthly kingdom*, produce those prophecies, in which this connection cannot be traced; if indeed any such can be found. If then the Restoration of Israel be seldom, if ever, immediately connected with the coming of the Messiah; if his coming be sometimes predicted in connection with judgments on the Jewish nation; and if ‘the Restoration of Israel’ be uniformly predicted in connection with spiritual blessings to be poured out on the nation: we shall understand what estimate we ought to make of the assertion; that “ THE KINGDOM OF
 “ THE MESSIAH IS NOT SPIRITUAL, BUT ABSOLUTELY

* Deut. iv. 29—31.

† Gen. xxii. 16, 17. Ps. cv. 8—10.

Luke i. 72—74. Heb. vi. 14—18.

‡ Deut. xxi. 6.

§ Is. xi. 11—16. xii. 1—3. lix. 20, 21. Jer. xxxi. 31—36. xxxii. 39—41. Ez. xi. 17—20. xxxvi. 24—28. Hos. xiv. Mic. vii. 15—20. Zeph. iii. 13—20. Zech. xii. 10—14.

“EARTHLY:” especially as the kingdom of the Messiah and the Restoration of Israel are constantly considered by the writer, as inseparably united.

P. 37. l. 10. ‘*One Shepherd, &c.*’ We Christians are apt to think, that invaluable spiritual blessings are implied in the title of SHEPHERD, as used concerning the Messiah, in several of these prophecies: and we suppose, that this is grounded on many parts of the Old Testament, as well as on the New; and contains a prominent revelation of “the great mystery of godliness, God is manifest in the flesh.”—“JEHOVAH is my Shepherd,” says David; and again, “Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel.”*—“He shall feed his flock like a Shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.”†—“And he shall stand and feed in the strength of JEHOVAH, in the majesty of the name of JEHOVAH his God.”‡ Who is here spoken of? Surely, he who was to be born at Bethlehem, “whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.”—“Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, against the Man, who is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts; smite the Shepherd.”§—When, I say, we consider these predictions in connection, with what the New Testament says, of “the good Shepherd, who layeth down his life, for the sheep:” “the great Shepherd of the sheep:” “the chief Shepherd:”|| we consider vast, yea, *all* spiritual blessings, involved in this name alone.

P. 38. l. 6. ‘*He shall execute judgment and justice in the earth; but not in heaven.*’ I do not see the intention of this addition to this text from Jeremiah. Our enquiry is not concerning the kingdom of the Messiah in heaven; (though he there reigns Lord of all worlds,) but the nature

* Ps. xxiii. 1, 2. lxxx. 1. † Is. xl. 11. ‡ Mic. v. 2—4.

§ Zech. xiii. 7. || John x. 11—14. 26—30. Heb. xiii. 20. 1 Pet. v. 4.

of that kingdom, which he hath set up, or will set up, on earth; whether the nature and administration of it be spiritual or 'altogether earthly.'—Perhaps it is meant, that he shall reign visibly on earth; and not as ascended into heaven, and ruling by his providence and the influences of his grace. This, however, suggests the propriety of stating most explicitly our views of a spiritual kingdom, as distinguished from one 'altogether earthly.'

We consider that as an *earthly* kingdom, (whether we see the king or not,) which is administered, in great measure, like the other kingdoms of this world; and which provides, or professes to provide, *only* for the temporal security and prosperity of its subjects. It may indeed be connected with the support or establishment of religion, in one form or other; but it does not profess directly to confer spiritual blessings on those, over whom it is established. On the other hand, we consider that as a *spiritual* kingdom, which is conducted on different principles, from the kingdoms of this world, and for other purposes; which does not profess to confer temporal wealth, honour, and prosperity on any of its subjects; nor always to secure them from great and heavy temporal trials, and oppressions; but immediately to confer spiritual blessings, on all who truly belong to it, even "righteousness, and peace, and joy in "the Holy Ghost."* "*Spiritual* blessings," are those benefits which, (besides their tendency to our temporal comfort) secure the eternal happiness of our immortal souls, and also that of our bodies as raised incorruptible and glorious: but merely *earthly* blessings, at most, only conduce to our comfort and well-being, for our short and uncertain continuance in this present world. To say, therefore, that the Messiah's kingdom is *spiritual*, implies, that it secures, (as distinct from *temporal* good,) *eternal* happiness, to all the

* Rom. xiv. 17. Eph. i. 3.

true subjects of it: but to say, that it is 'altogether earthly,' in our view of it, denotes, that it only secures *earthly* advantages to its subjects, however loyal and faithful; and that, as to *eternal* happiness or misery, it leaves them precisely as they were. If Mr. C. or the Jews in general, understand the terms in any other sense, when that sense is clearly stated, it may require consideration.

Our view of the Messiah's kingdom, as *spiritual*, does not exclude many temporal advantages ensured to its genuine subjects: for whatever prepares the soul for holy happiness in another world, adds to our true comfort in this life; and to them, who "seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness," "all other things shall be added." "The Lord will give grace and glory; and "no good thing will he withhold from them that walk "uprightly."* But we exclude from the catalogue of these blessings, whatever tends to gratify, and give energy to, man's corrupt passions; such as rapacity for wealth, ambition of pre-eminence, lust of dominion, thirst after revenge, desire of the pleasures, pomp, and pride of life; and indeed the craving after any animal indulgence, beyond the rule of duty, expediency, and love to all men.—And we give an immense pre-eminence to those blessings, which will be enjoyed *for ever*, above the most rational and legitimate comforts of this present state.—To be made partakers of heavenly wisdom and knowledge; to have "the heart "circumcised," by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit; to be pardoned, and justified by faith, with believing Abraham; to be renewed unto holiness; to have God for our Father, Friend, and Portion; our "Guide unto death, "and," at that crisis, "to receive us to glory;" to walk with him, in assured faith and hope; to worship him in "the Spirit of adoption;" to enjoy the earnest and fore-

* Ps. lxxxiv. 11. Matt. vi. 33.

tastes of eternal happiness; to be delivered from the fear of death, and at length from death itself, when "mortality shall be swallowed up in life:" These are some of the spiritual blessings of our Messiah's kingdom.

On the other hand, 'a kingdom altogether earthly,' would supply or ensure none of these things; neither heavenly wisdom and knowledge, nor renewal unto holiness, nor "justification unto life," nor "reconciliation unto God," nor adoption into his family; nor the meetness for a holy heaven, nor admission into it; nor "the resurrection of the just." If these things belong exclusively to a *spiritual* kingdom; it would be waste of time, to bring a formal proof, that the Messiah's kingdom, at least includes spiritual blessings to its true subjects. But if such blessings be included in Mr. C.'s notion of an *altogether earthly kingdom*; he only uses words in a different sense, than we do, or men in general do, and "a strife of words" is not edifying.

I suspect, however, that the question, whether these things are included among the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, or not, was out of sight, when he wrote the passage: for, while temporal advantages appear far most prominent in his mind, in every part of his book, he occasionally gives intimations of some things, that are certainly *spiritual* blessings, which will be conferred by the Messiah.

According to the expectations of the Jews in the time of Jesus, and even the expectations of his apostles before his resurrection; it is evident, that a Messiah, coming, like the conquerors of this world, but far superior in power to all of them; to free the nation of Israel from subjection to the Romans, and from all foreign vassalage; to lead them forth to victory and triumph; to subjugate other nations, and to advance Israel to pre-eminence, prosperity, and dominion; constituted the object of their desires and hopes. It is also evident, that this, in most instances, was connected with the

thirst after a contemptuous and insulting revenge upon their oppressors, and of exercising a haughty and severe domination over mankind at large: and, as far as I can judge from the specimen before me, it appears, that the expectation and desire, of modern Jews, are nearly the same. If this be not the case, let them explicitly declare, what they do expect and desire, at the supposed coming of their Messiah.

It is now becoming more and more the opinion of studious Christians, that when Israel shall be converted to their long rejected Messiah, they will be gathered from their dispersions, and reinstated in their own land; which being rendered as fertile, as in times past, (perhaps much more so,) and extended to the utmost limits of the grants made to the patriarchs; will yield them in rich abundance all things needful and comfortable for this present life. It is also thought, that they will live in this land, under rulers of their own nation, as the vicegerents of the Messiah, of David, or "the Son of David," in entire peace and security, free from invader or oppressor, and from the fear of any: and that, along with all spiritual blessings in rich abundance, they will be voluntarily regarded, by all other nations, then truly converted to Christianity, with peculiar love, and gratitude, and honour, as the source of all their spiritual blessings; and especially, as most nearly related to their common Messiah and Saviour, who is "the Light of the Gentiles, and the GLORY of his people Israel."

It is indeed supposed, according to several prophecies, that great opposition will be made by many powerful enemies, to this their restoration; and that immense destruction of opposing Gentiles will precede and attend it, while other Gentiles will concur in promoting it. But, this being accomplished, a general conversion of the nations will follow, till those prophecies, which assure us, "that the earth shall

“be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD, “as the waters cover the sea,” shall be literally accomplished; that then, “they will beat their swords into “plough-shares—and learn war no more;” and that this state will continue at least a thousand years, and nearly to the end of the world. During this whole period, an honorary and affectionate pre-eminence will be freely rendered to Israel, by all the numberless partakers of the blessings of their Messiah’s reign.

But it is not supposed, that Israel will either *possess* or *desire* authoritative dominion over the nations; or any thing to gratify the corrupt passions before spoken of; but every thing to promote “righteousness and peace, and joy “in the Holy Ghost.” The *personal* reign of Christ on earth, the existence, or non-existence, of the ceremonial law of Moses; and several other things, are differently held by different persons: and it is not needful for the author to be very explicit here, concerning his own sentiments on these points.—But the above is the outline of his views, after the constant study of the scriptures, day by day, during thirty-eight years at least.

Every promise of the Messiah, from that made to our fallen first parents, which contains, as it were in embryo, all the blessings of redemption and deliverance from sin and all its consequences; from Satan and his dominion, with victory and triumph over all enemies; and those to Abraham, and throughout the scripture; to the last prediction of the Old Testament, “Unto you that fear my “name, shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing “in his beams;”* combine in shewing, that *spiritual* blessings, primarily and especially, constitute the felicity of Messiah’s reign: and I shall not weary the reader by enlarging in so plain a case.

* Gen. iii. 15. Mal. iv. 2.

In fact, I should feel an increasing disregard to the result of the controversy, if I could doubt that the blessings of Messiah's kingdom were *spiritual* and *eternal*. Were I a Jew, or proselyte; and were 'an altogether earthly kingdom,' in all possible glory and majesty established, under an earthly Messiah; and did I occupy the highest station in this kingdom: what, at my time of life, and with the full conviction, that "shortly I must put off this "my tabernacle;" I say, what good could such a station secure to me?—But if I am partaker of those spiritual and eternal blessings, which "are the gift of God through Jesus "Christ," I have "all my salvation and all my desire;" and may say with Simeon, "Now, Lord, dismissest thou "thy servant in peace; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation:" or, with dying Jacob, "I have waited for thy "salvation, O LORD."* And here, I cannot but lament that Mr. C., throughout his book, does not appear to be possessed with any deeply realizing and influencing views of an eternal world of happiness or misery. It is not easy to discover, with exactness, what his sentiments are on these topics. There are indeed, occasionally, some intimations on this immensely momentous subject; yet in general he writes, very much as if this world were our all. Probably, he has the same sentiments of the superior advantages of Jews above Gentiles, as to eternal salvation, which his ancestors had in the days of Christ: but they are not prominently stated, or particularly insisted on, as the *grand concern*; and not at all, in any connection with the coming and kingdom of the Messiah. If I understand him, salvation is to be to the Jews by the law of Moses; and in no respect by the Messiah.

Now, as I most firmly believe, that after this vain, transient, and uncertain life, a state of endless happiness

* Gen. xlix. 18.

or misery will follow; and that, as all are sinners, no man can be saved from final misery, and obtain eternal happiness, but by the mercy and grace of God, in the way of his appointment, which, I am assured is, by faith in the Messiah, promised from the fall of Adam: and as all else seems *nothing* to me, in comparison of this, I stand amazed, that a man can think it worth while, to dispute about an 'altogether earthly kingdom;' which by his own account, will not commence, till he is either very far advanced in years, or has entered into the eternal world; and so can have no farther concern with any of those things which "are done under the sun!" or in the words, which he marks in Italicks, *under the whole heaven*.

All the past generations of Israel, according to this, have left the earth, without the least advantage from this 'altogether earthly kingdom of the Messiah:' at any rate most of the present race will leave the earth, before the earliest period *now* specified for his coming shall arrive: and, alas! if there were any well grounded hope of its arrival, still only a few of the whole race could partake of the more splendid advantages expected; and that only for a short space. Still "vanity and vexation" would be the inventory of earthly good; still man must "eat his bread in labour and sorrow, till he return to the ground whence he is taken." Are we then to consider this writer's views as a specimen of Judaism? At any rate it excites my deepest commiseration.

I shall close this part, by asking, whether the texts adduced, concerning the Messiah's kingdom, on the thirty-seventh page, contain no predictions or promises of spiritual blessings?

P. 38. l. 6. In adducing the prophecy of Daniel, "The kingdom and dominion—shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High." Mr. C. quotes it, "to the

“holy nation of the most High.”* I am not fully competent to say, how far the Chaldee will bear this translation: but I thought it right to note the variation. Our version seems to be literal.

P. 38. l. 19. ‘PROOF FROM THE GOSPEL, &c.’ From these quotations, it is probable, that the *place*, where the Messiah reigns, or shall reign, is principally intended by Mr. C. when he affirms, the Messiah’s kingdom to be ‘altogether earthly:’ as he has added after the quotation from Jeremiah.—“He shall execute judgment and justice in the “earth,”† *but not in heaven.*

L. 26. ‘*A throne, &c.*’ “Thy throne, O God, is for “ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right “sceptre, &c.” Will any ‘throne on earth’ be “for ever “and ever?”‡ It appears evidently, that the dominion mentioned by Daniel, as given to the Son of man, is established in heaven, and not on earth.§ This, however, is a subject, on which I shall not at present enter: many, who hold with me, the general views of the Messiah’s kingdom, expect a personal and visible reign of Christ on earth, during the millennium. (l. 30.) “Eating and drinking,” are terms often used *figuratively*, as in the place referred to: but in the Messiah’s kingdom, as far as this world is concerned, men literally eat and drink, as well as in other kingdoms, though in a more holy manner. It is surprising, that a proof, *from the New Testament*, of Christ’s judging Israel only, should be brought; and that *judging Israel* should be considered as synonymous to “reigning “over Israel;” when the judgment spoken of most evidently must be judging, in order to the condemnation of the nation in general. The same is the import of the promise to the apostles, that they shall “judge the

* Dan. vii. 27.

† Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

‡ Ps. xlv. 6.

§ Dan. vii. 9—14.

“twelve tribes of Israel.”* When Mr. C. asserts, (*last line but two*,) that the Messiah will be king ‘over Israel only,’ he fixes a meaning on the words, which is totally inconsistent with the whole of the New Testament: indeed it does not clearly appear in what sense he himself understands them; for I suppose he will allow that the Messiah shall rule the nations, though it be only to punish and destroy them.

P. 38, *last line but one*. ‘LAW OF AN AMBASSADOR.’
 P. 39. 1. 2. ‘*This ambassador, &c.*’ If the ambassador be commissioned and instructed to go to the *government* of the country, to which he is sent, he certainly ought to do it: but it is not the uniform practice of kings to send ambassadors to the governors of a country; especially when those governors are *usurpers, rebels, and traitors* to their prince; and *tyrants* over his loyal subjects. In these cases, they sometimes send ambassadors to inferior persons, who loyally adhere to their lawful king. Indeed it is by no means uncommon for princes to send ambassadors to those, who, in any country, resist the authority of the ruling powers, according as political purposes may be answered by it.—But were it otherwise, surely the infinite God is not bound by the rules and customs of puny mortals.—“My thoughts
 “are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,
 “saith the LORD: for as the heavens are higher than the
 “earth; so are my ways higher than your ways, and my
 “thoughts than your thoughts.”† Even Moses was sent to the enslaved Israelites to deliver them, and not as an ambassador to *treat with* Pharaoh about their deliverance. The prophets in general were sent to the people, as well as to the princes: and when sent to the princes, it was *never to treat with them*, as the ambassadors of one king,

* 1 Sam. ii. 25. Ez. xi. 4. xxii. 2. xxiii. 24. 36. 45. xxiv. 14.
 Ob. 21. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. † Is. lv. 8, 9.

with another king, thus placing the Sovereign of the world on a level with his creatures: but as reprovers of their crimes in the name of JEHOVAH, or as encouraging their confidence in him. What does Mr. C. think of Jeremiah's conduct, who even counselled the people to desert Zedekiah and the princes, and to submit to the Chaldeans?* Did he observe 'the law of an ambassador?' It is awfully presumptuous, in this manner to dictate and prescribe to God, what his conduct ought to be.—“Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed him the way of understanding?”†—It is 'the law of an ambassador,' at all times and in all cases, to obey the commands, and adhere to the instructions, of him *who sent him*; and not to deviate a hair's breadth, to oblige or conciliate those to whom he is sent. If either inclination, or fear, or hope, induce him to act contrary, in any respect, to the instructions given him, he betrays his trust, and is liable to be disowned and punished by his principal.—Thus Jesus says, “I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me:”‡ and he continually declares himself to this effect. His apostles also declare, that—“if they were men-pleasers, they could not be the servants of Jesus Christ.” If an ambassador be sent to one people, to make proposals; and, in case they will not accede to them, if he be ordered to go to another people, (which is not uncommon,) he fulfils the 'law of an ambassador,' by acting according to these instructions.

P. 39. l. 24. *'Burst out a laughing, &c.'* The reader will judge how far this language suits the nature and importance of the subject. It however approaches more

* Jer. xxvii. 12—17. xxxviii. 1—3. † Is. xl. 13, 14. ‡ John vi. 38.

nearly to the actual conduct of the Jews, in our Lord's days, than perhaps even Mr. C. was aware.*

L. 30. '*Punished with a just punishment.*'—Thus the Jews, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, &c.:" therefore the old imprecation of their ancestors remains in force, "His blood be on us and on our children."† Oh, may "the Spirit of grace and supplication be speedily "poured out upon them," that they may look on him "whom they have pierced," with godly sorrow and penitent faith; and have the curse exchanged for a blessing, and for all blessings! Let all Christians pray for this without ceasing.

L. 31. '*This was the case with the Gentile Messiah. He was sent, &c.*'—Our Lord's personal ministry was principally among the Jews: but the commission which he gave to his apostles shews, that he considered himself, as Saviour and King of all nations.‡ Let it, however, be observed, that he said, "I am sent to the *lost sheep* of the house of "Israel:" but he never said, 'I am sent to the nation of 'Israel;,' much less was he sent to its corrupt and wicked shepherds. His profession therefore was consistent with his conduct, and it was *his duty* to adhere to his commission, or "the will of his Father who sent him."

L. 35. '*KING Herod, &c.*'—King Herod died when Jesus was an infant:§ but had he been living, would it have been proper that Jesus, when about to enter on his ministry, should go to that cruel tyrant, who had before attempted to murder him?—Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee, (who probably is meant,) had no authority in Judea, or connection with the Sanhedrin. Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea. Ought Jesus then to have gone to

* Luke vi. 25. xvi. 14. Jam. iv. 9. † Matt. xxvii. 25.
Heb. vi. 6. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Luke xxiv. 47, 48
Acts i. 8. § Matt. ii. 19, 20.

this idolatrous governor, as well as to Annas and Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin?

P. 40. 1. 1, 2. ‘*He never went to Jerusalem, &c.*’—It would be well, if men, before they publish their remarks on any book, or attempt to refute it, would carefully read the whole of it. Our Lord went to Jerusalem soon after he entered on his publick work; and when he had hitherto, as far as we can learn, wrought only one miracle.* Nothing could be more publick, than his conduct on this occasion, in driving the buyers and sellers from the courts of the temple; nothing more suited to make his claim known to the rulers and priests; nothing more efficacious could be even imagined, to excite them to investigate that claim. Accordingly he was interrogated concerning it; and the Jews “said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, that thou doest these things?”† To this demand, he gave an answer, exactly coinciding with what he spake on another occasion; making his resurrection from the dead, after they had slain him, THE SIGN, above all others, of his authority to do these things. The language, in which this answer was given, implying a decisive intimation of his divine dignity and power, being misunderstood, and misreported, yet remembered long afterwards, formed one of his accusations before Caiaphas, and the Sanhedrin.‡ Thus the prophecy of Malachi was fulfilled, “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: But who may abide the day of his coming?”§

At this time, he wrought such miracles, that Nicodemus, one of the Sanhedrin, acknowledged in his own name, and in the name of other rulers and Pharisees, “We know, that

* John ii. 11—13.
Matt. xxvi. 61, 62.

† John ii. 14—18.

‡ John ii. 19—22.
§ Mal. iii. 1, 2.

“thou art a Teacher come from God; for no man can do the miracles which thou doest, except God be with him.”* Indeed the miracles wrought by him at Jerusalem procured him a favourable reception even in Galilee.†

This preceded the imprisonment of John Baptist. It was also in an early part of our Lord’s ministry, that he healed the man at the pool of Bethesda, and ordered him to carry his bed on the Sabbath. On account of this he was persecuted evidently before the Sanhedrin; and made that defence, which contains as high claims of Deity and universal dominion, as can be conceived; and at the same time stated before his judges, the evidences by which those claims were supported, in the most explicit, and, as the event shewed, most unanswerable manner.‡

‘*He never went to Jerusalem.*’ Such an *assertion* should render the reader cautious how he credits other unproved *assertions* of the writer.

L. 2. ‘*And why? Because he had heard, &c.*’ L. 9, 10. ‘*He was afraid to go to Jerusalem, &c.*’

Our Lord certainly went to Jerusalem, both before and after John’s imprisonment; and taught boldly at the temple without fear of any man, or body of men. But why should John Baptist’s imprisonment by Herod make Jesus afraid of going to Jerusalem? What authority had Herod in Jerusalem? He was tetrarch of Galilee,§ while Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea. Had a motive of this kind acquired any influence on our Lord, he would have declined going into *Galilee*, lest Herod should imprison and kill him also: and indeed his insidious enemies did afterwards urge this reason, why he should leave Galilee.||

Jesus had preached and wrought miracles, in Judea, in Galilee, and at Jerusalem, for a considerable time

* John iii. 1, 2.

+ John iv. 45.

‡ John v. 16—47.

§ Luke iii. 1. 19, 20. xxiii. 6, 7.

|| Luke xiii. 31—35.

before John was imprisoned: and his usual abode seems to have been at Nazareth.—"But when he had heard "that John was cast into prison, he departed" (probably from Judea) "into Galilee; and, leaving Nazareth, he came "and dwelt at Capernaum."* So far from fearing the power, which had shut up John in prison, that he went to reside in the heart of Herod's dominions; and his more stated labours were from that time in Galilee.

P. 40, 41.—The quotations on these pages are made with the omission of many verses, on which the meaning greatly depends; but nothing requires special notice.

P. 41. l. 5. '*What sign, &c.*' L. 21. '*Not once gave them 'a sign, &c.*' Our Lord paid no more court to the *many* than to the *powerful*; and would no more work a needless ostentatious miracle, to satisfy the presumptuous multitude, who were disposed to "take him by force and make him "King;" than at the demand of those enemies, who determined to "take him by force, and put him to death."

P. 41. l. 27, 28. '*Was his commission, &c.?*'—"Jesus came "into the world to save sinners." "I came not to call the "righteous, but sinners to repentance." He came to be "the Saviour of the world:" the Prophet, Priest, and King of his church; the Ruler over the whole universe, and the Judge of the living and the dead. But his personal ministry consisted principally in teaching, and in confirming his doctrine by miracles of mercy and love. "He "went about doing good."

L. 31, 32. '*If this is true, &c.*'—Let the reader make his own remarks on the language of this sentence. It could hardly have been expected from a Rabbi, or from a teacher of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. The end of our Lord's coming, both as stated by Gabriel and Zacharias, takes in the *whole effect of his mission*, from his birth to

* Matt. iv. 12—18. Mark i. 14. John iii. 22—24. iv. 3.

the end of the world; and not merely his personal ministry.

P. 42. l. 8. ‘*His people, &c.*’—Not to adduce the New Testament use of this expression, before the conclusion drawn from it be established, some passages in the prophets should be noticed.—“Whom the LORD of hosts shall bless, saying, blessed be Egypt, *my people*, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.”* “In the place, where it was said to them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.”—“And I will say to them, which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.”† “And many nations shall be joined unto the LORD in that day, and shall be *my people*.”‡ “His people,” therefore, includes, all who truly believe and obey him, whether Jews or Gentiles, and none else. “He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.”§

L. 10. ‘NOT A PREACHER.’ The predictions, that the Messiah should be a King, by no means prove, that he would not be a Preacher. Moses was “king in Jeshurun:”|| Yet he says, “Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God hath commanded me.”¶—“The Spirit of the LORD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to *preach* good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.” Is this a prophecy of the Messiah, or not? If not, Whom does the prophet personate?*** Again, either David, or the Messiah says, “I have preached righteousness in the great congregation. Lo, I have not refrained my lips, and that thou knowest

* Is. xix. 25. † Hos. i. 10. ii. 23. ‡ Zech. ii. 11. § Heb. v. 9.

|| Deut. xxxiii. 5. ¶ Deut. iv. 5. *** Is. lxi. 1—3. Luke iv. 17—21.

“I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have
 “declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not
 “concealed thy loving kindness and truth from the great
 “congregation.”* And again, “My mouth shall shew
 “forth thy righteousness and thy salvation all the day.”
 “Hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works. Now, also,
 “that I am old and grey-headed, O God, forsake me not;
 “until I have shewed thy strength to this generation, and
 “thy power to every one that is yet to come.”† Even
 Solomon appears perhaps more glorious as a preacher, than
 as a king.—“The words of the PREACHER, the son of
 “David, the king of Jerusalem:” “I the PREACHER was
 “king over Israel in Jerusalem.”‡ In this especially
 Solomon was a type of Christ: but “behold, a greater
 “than Solomon is here.”

P. 43. 1. 2. ‘*To fight, &c.*’—No doubt, the Messiah will
 fight against the enemies of Israel: but probably Zechariah,
 or the Holy Spirit as speaking by him, intended enemies
 of another kind, from whom the Saviour delivers all true
 believers as his people. And let it be observed, that the
 Sinai-covenant is not referred to; but that which was con-
 firmed to Abraham by an oath.

P. 43. 1. 21. ‘CONCLUSION OF THE EMBASSY.’

P. 44. 1. 3. ‘*Well might, &c.*’—That worldly and ungodly
 men should oppose and revile the holy Jesus, cannot be
 wonderful: but that any one should consider their revilings
 as a proof, that he was a bad man, without any other evi-
 dence adduced, is most unreasonable and most marvellous.
 He was indeed taken, and judged, and put to death; but
 his embassy did not conclude with his death. For he arose,
 and ascended, and reigns over all worlds, while the deso-
 lations of Jerusalem and the temple, the dreadful judg-
 ments which overtook his crucifiers; and the subsequent

* Ps. xl. 9, 10. † Ps. lxxi. 15, 17, 18. ‡ Ec. i. 1. 12. xii. 8—10.

establishment of Christianity in the world, with all the past, present, and future happy consequences, resulting from it, are sequels of his embassy; which will be concluded, when he shall come to judge the world, to “put all “enemies under his feet,” and cause his friends to sit down with him upon his throne: but not till that final catastrophe.

P. 44. l. 9. ‘THE MESSIAH WAS TO BE A CONQUEROR.’

‘*He will subdue, &c.*’—The Messiah will eventually subdue all nations; but not immediately at his coming. “The “Stone cut out of the mountain without hands,” does not at once, “become a great Mountain and fill the whole “earth.”—“Of the increase of his government and peace, “there shall be no end.”* It is nowhere said, that this should occur *at his coming*. With what weapons, and in what manner, the Messiah fights and conquers, may give occasion to discordancy of sentiment: but we all agree, that he fights and conquers, and will conquer, and “must “reign till all enemies are put under his feet.”† Vast multitudes have been and will be conquered by those “wea- “pons, which are not carnal but mighty through God,” and become his willing subjects.‡ Others he has fought against, and will fight against, by his hostile armies; as he did against Jerusalem by “his armies” the Romans;§ and as he will against all antichristian opposers of his cause, at the introduction of the millennium.|| Among others, he will fight against the adversaries of converted Israel, when the time of their restoration shall come. “And the breath “of his lips shall slay the wicked” at the day of judgment.

The prophecies here produced, (P. 44, 45.) prove nothing in this argument; because, when compared with the context of each, they evidently appear to refer to different parts of the same general subject.

* Dan. ii. 34, 35. 44, 45. Is. ix. 5, 6. † Ps. cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25.

‡ Ps. cx. 2, 3. 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. § Zech. xiv. 1, 2. Matt. xxii. 7.

|| Ez. xxxviii. Rev. xix. 11—21.

The first promise of a Messiah, "Her Seed," (that of the woman,) "shall bruise thy head," (that of the serpent, the devil,) leads us to consider other victories of the Messiah, and over very different enemies, than those mentioned by Mr. C. as of by far the greatest importance in this holy warfare. Satan, sin, the world, and death are especially those enemies, which Zacharias meant, when he said; "that being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, we might serve him without fear, in righteousness and holiness before him all the days of our life."* Thus it is said in Micah. "He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us: he will *subdue* our iniquities:" and by Ezekiel, "I will also save you from all your uncleannesses."† These are enemies and victories, which Mr. C. seems not to have a thought of.

It is indeed frequently predicted, that the Messiah will terribly destroy his enemies, and graciously protect his people: but it is by no means so prominent in prophecy, that he will exalt his people to dominion over the rest of the world. In the millennium, "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the *saints* of the most High."‡ In and with their King, they shall have the pre-eminence. But where is the prediction, that Israel as a nation shall have dominion over other nations? Little is spoken upon this part of the subject. Even the result of their restoration, is generally represented, as their dwelling in peace and security, and none making them afraid.§

P. 46. l. 10. '*A particular observation, &c.*'

L. 11. '*Every man knows that whatever has a beginning has also an end.*'—According to this, there are no *created* immortal spirits, either angels or men. If Mr. C. did not

* Luke i. 71—75. † Ez. xxxvi. 29. Mic. vii. 19. ‡ Dan. vii. 14. 27. § Jer. xxiii. 5—7. xxxii. 37. xxxiii. 16. Ez. xxxiv. 25—28. Am. ix. 14, 15.

mean, (as I should not suppose he did,) to deny the immortality of the human soul, and of holy angels, here is an exception to his universal rule. Plato seems to have held a similar opinion; for he grounds many of his arguments for the soul's continuing to live after the death of the body, on the supposition that it had a previous existence, to which he assigns no beginning. (*Phædo.*)

L. 26. '*A drawing, &c.*'—That "known unto God are "all his works from the beginning of the world," yea, from eternity; that he formed, so to speak, a plan of his grand designs in his own infinite mind; that he revealed, in the way of prophecy some particulars of this plan; and that he invariably and without any change of purpose, is accomplishing this great object, through successive generations; I firmly believe. But when the *drawing* of this plan is said to be contained in 'the law of Moses,' (P. 47. l. 4.) further proof is needful. The tabernacle, and all connected with it, was made "after the pattern, which was shewed "Moses in the Mount:"* for they were intended, as "a shadow of good things to come." And in like manner David had "the pattern of all—by the Spirit," respecting Solomon's temple. "The Lord made me to understand in "writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of the "pattern."† Moses also seems to have had something of a drawing, or delineation, shewn him of the promised land:‡ but where do we meet with any intimation, that God gave him a *drawing*, of all the particulars here mentioned? or indeed how was it possible? Can mortal man receive and comprehend all the plans and designs of the infinite God? Some intimations are given concerning a few of the particulars in this catalogue; but very little: and in most cases, that little is intimated with considerable and intended obscurity. 'In this drawing is also to be found, how long

* Ex. xxv. 40.

† 1 Chr. xxviii. 11. 19.

‡ Num. xxxiv.

‘this world shall exist,’ (P. 47. l. 2.) I ask, Where? Conjectures have been made, some sufficiently presumptuous; and conclusions from inadequate premises: but I believe, that neither man, nor angel, knows the exact time, when the world shall come to an end.* As Mr. C. means to build a great deal indeed on this *drawing*; something more than assertion is requisite, in laying and strengthening his foundation. The *subdrawings*, (P. 47. l. 5.) of the prophets, contain some further intimations; but very far from what is ascribed to them; they only contain detached extracts, so to speak, out of the volume of God’s secret decrees.

P. 47. l. 11. ‘*Abridgment of the law and of the prophets.*’

L. 18. ‘*Six is a complete number.*’—Some think, *seven* is a complete number; and it must be allowed, that the number *seven* is so often, and so emphatically, specified in scripture, as to imply something peculiar in it: I suppose from the six days of creation, and the seventh of rest. Yet nothing, in a way of argument, can thence be deduced.

L. 28—32. ‘*His name was called Adam, &c.*’—The name *Adam*, as every smatterer in Hebrew knows, is the name of the human species, as well as of the first man; and seems to have been taken merely from אָדָם, the material from which his body was formed.† The scripture indeed assigns special significations to several names, and the reasons for which they were given; as Eve, Abraham, Ishmael, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Israel, &c.:‡ but not a hint is given, that there was any mystery in the name ADAM: all advanced therefore on this ground is mere assertion or imagination.

Last line. ‘*So long, or near it, &c.*’—The words ‘*or near it,*’ are very conveniently introduced: for Mr. C.’s *computation*, must be made to fit his *hypothesis*. This resem-

* Matt. xxiv. 36. † Gen. ii. 7. v. 2. ‡ Gen. iii. 20. xvi. 11. xvii. 5. 15. 19. xxi. 3—6. xxv. 26. xxvii. 36. xxxii. 28. Ex. ii. 10.

bles the bed of Procrustes, 'who, having seized on travellers, measured them by his bed; and if too long he cut them shorter, but if too short he stretched them longer.'

P. 47. *last line but one.* P. 48. l. 1—11. '*In the year of the creation, &c.*' According to the most approved chronologists, the computation being made from the Hebrew bible, David was born A. M. 2919; and the present is computed to be about A. M. 5818.—Exactness is not the object. The Septuagint makes it much more, but I believe few well-informed persons make it much less. Yet this entirely subverts the whole of Mr. C.'s hypothesis: for 2919 years to David's birth, require 2919 subsequent to it, before the coming of the Messiah; which would lead us to A. M. 5838, instead of A. M. 5708, and so prolong the term of his expected coming 130 years longer, than Mr. C. calculates.—But perhaps our chronology may answer his purpose as well, when fairly considered; for, according to our computation, the present year is A. M. 5819: and this leaves only 19 years to A. M. 5838, when the date of David's birth will be doubled. This would be more convenient for his scheme than 137 years yet to come; it would also save him the trouble of *shortening the term*; and besides be more consistent with his calculations in another place. (p. 66.)

P. 48. l. 17. '*The end of any thing may be shortened.*'—It seems it may also be *lengthened*: for, from the time of Jesus, false Messiahs have appeared, almost in every century; and have for a while been welcomed by many of the Jews, and then disappeared. Thus every disappointment has reduced them to the necessity of *lengthening* the termination of the intervening period, one hundred years after another, to the present day: and when the present dream has proved a delusion, (as it most assuredly will,)

some other will be dreamed, to find a pretence for still lengthening the period: till "the Spirit of grace and supplications" be poured out, and they shall look with penitent faith on him whom they have so long "pierced," and "crucified to themselves afresh," from age to age.*

But there is no grappling with a phantom, or grasping smoke: like the shade of Anchises, it eludes the hand of him who would seize on it, *Par levibus ventis, volucrique simillima somno*. A serious argumentative answer cannot be expected, and the subject is too momentous for any other. The passage may, however, remind the reader of the prophet's words: "They hatch cockatrice eggs, and weave the spider's web:"—"their webs shall not become garments."†

L. 13. 'We know that Christ was born 910 years after David.'—"The Jews have a tradition, that in the last year of Darius, (Hystaspes,) died the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. And from the same tradition they tell us, that the kingdom of the Persians ceased also the same year. For they will have it, that this was the Darius whom Alexander conquered, and that the whole continuance of the Persian empire was only fifty-two years. This shews how ill they were acquainted with the affairs of the Persian empire. And their countryman Josephus, in the account which he gives us of those times, seems to have been very little better informed concerning them.' (*Prideaux*.) They confound Darius Hystaspes, with Darius Codomannus; though Xerxes, Artaxerxes, Longimanus, Darius Nothus, and Artaxerxes Mnemon, reigned between them. The Persian empire, from the accession of Darius the Mede, to the death of Darius Codomannus, continued for about 207 years. This occasions the great difference in chronology between Jewish and Christian writers, as to the

* Zech. xii. 10—14.

† Is. lix. 4—6.

times between the captivity, and the coming of our Lord: but Mr. C. varies even from this, and is repeatedly inconsistent with himself. It is generally computed that David died 1015 years before Christ, and consequently was born 1085 before him; but this is of little consequence.

P. 48. l. 32. ‘*The placing of Adam in the garden of Eden.*’ As far as this passage agrees with the narrative of Moses, it is entitled to firm credence: (P. 48, 49.) but it is ‘*intermixed with a few traditions;*’ (P. 49. l. 32.) I do not indeed believe these traditions, yet they are not of sufficient importance to require any remarks. But the familiar colloquial manner, in which the events recorded in the word of God, and inseparably connected with the present and eternal interests of the human species, are mentioned, cannot satisfy any serious mind, Christian, Jewish, or Gentile.

P. 48. *last line but one.* ‘*No angel could, &c.*’ This the scripture does not say.—‘And God taught Adam the names even all of them. Then he proposed them to the angels, and said, Declare unto me the names of these things, if ye be true. They answered: Praise is thine; we have not knowledge, except as much as thou hast taught us. Truly thou art knowing and wise: and God said, O Adam, Declare to them the names of these things. And when he had declared to them their names; he (God) said, Did not I say to you, that I know the secret of the heavens and the earth; and I know what ye do openly and what ye conceal? And when we said to the angels, Adore Adam; they even adored: but Eblis (the devil,) refused, and was lifted up in pride.’ ‘And Satan caused them to fall from paradise, and we said, Go down, the one an enemy to the other.’ (*Koran, 2d Chap.*) Probably Mohammed derived his information from Jewish tradition; and he has added absurdity to it: but the coincidence is remarkable.

P. 49. l. 28. ‘*Overcame Satan.*’ It is well that Satan, the

grand enemy of all, is at all mentioned, as to be overcome by man : but is this victory to be obtained by the power of Adam, or any of his fallen and sinful posterity, or, by that of “ the Seed of the woman, who shall bruise the serpent’s head ? ” “ The second Adam is the Lord from heaven.”

P. 50. l. 3. ‘THE LAW OF NOAH.’ It may be proper here to make a few remarks on this supposed law of Noah : because many writers, Christians as well as Jews, have mentioned it, as of an *existing rule of duty* : but where it is to be found *in scripture*, they do not state. In fact, it belongs to *tradition* : and, like the traditions of men in general, it “ makes void the law of God,” and at the same time disannuls the gospel. The law of God commands “ us “ to love him with all the heart,” and “ all men as ourselves.” And the gospel calls transgressors to repentance, conversion, faith in the mercy of God, through the promised Redeemer, and obedience to the divine law as the fruit of this faith. But what do these precepts of Noah require, in order to acceptance and future happiness ? Provided idolatry, blasphemy, (a crime not easily defined with precision,) incest, (another ambiguous term, diversely explained,) murder, robbery, and theft, and eating the member of a living creature, be avoided : a man may be a fornicator, an adulterer, a liar, a perjurer, a drunkard and glutton ; a malignant, envious, contentious neighbour ; covetous ; a tyrant in his family ; and in short guilty of almost all kinds of ungodliness, unrighteousness, and licentiousness ; besides sins of omission of every kind without exception : and all this without endangering his salvation ! Future happiness, according to this law, is secure even to such a character, without repentance, conversion, faith in the Saviour, mercy, or any benefit from “ the covenants of promise.” On the other hand, if a man have once committed idolatry, blasphemy, incest, murder, robbery, or theft ; this law opens

no door of faith or repentance; provides no refuge or redress; but leaves him under hopeless condemnation. It is not probable, that all, perhaps any, of those who have spoken of this law, or these precepts, as actually given to Noah and his posterity, meant the whole of this: but as the matter is stated, in this publication especially, these are the undeniable consequences of such a law given to men, by which the obedient may obtain eternal life; and none else.

The third precept to ‘appoint and constitute just and upright judges, that justice might be maintained and impartially administered to all,’ could be obligatory upon very few, as few are concerned in the appointment of magistrates: and if no other law, either from revelation, or from man’s reason and conscience, were in force, what could be the standard or rule of that *justice*, which was to be impartially administered?—We may therefore conclude, that these precepts of Noah never were inculcated by God, for the purposes here spoken of: though some things afterwards incorporated into the ceremonial law of Moses, were previously obligatory, with respect to the atoning sacrifices, and the *blood* especially, “which is the life,” and that by which the atonement was made.*

We Gentiles, however, have the less cause to complain of the Jews, in endeavouring exclusively to appropriate the blessings of the Messiah’s kingdom, which they consider as ‘altogether earthly;’ while they allow us almost an equality, in those things which “accompany salvation with eternal glory.” And we would desire, in return for this liberality, to communicate to them, if possible, the inestimable blessings of the true Messiah’s spiritual and eternal kingdom. “That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you; that ye may have fellowship with

* Gen. ix. 4. Lev. xvii. 10—14.

“us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and
“with his Son Jesus Christ.”*

P. 50. l. 16. ‘*There is a tradition, &c.*’ I foresaw that the seventy nations, before spoken of, (p. 33, 34,) would introduce a difficulty about the descendants of Abraham, by Ishmael, by Keturah, and by Esau: but *tradition* comes in very conveniently to obviate or remove it: and as the Jews have *tradition* almost wholly in their own power; it must always be at hand for their accommodation, whenever its help is wanted. As Mohammed, when pressed with any new difficulty, always had a *new revelation*, and added a new chapter to the Koran; often in part *contradictory* to those which had before been published: so, from the immense farrago of traditions in the Talmuds, some one may at any time be produced, by him who will bestow the pains to rummage for it, suited to the emergency, whatever it may be; but not always consistent with other authorities produced from the same inexhaustible store. Something further, however, still remains to be done about these ‘seventy nations,’ before the whole can stand free from insuperable objection. It will be needful to shew, how many of the seventy nations were destroyed, whether by deluges, or fire, or earthquake, to make room for all the descendants of Reu, Serug, Nahor, and Terah, except Abraham. The seventy nations are those mentioned in the tenth of Genesis. “By these were the nations divided in “the earth after the flood.”† But no descendants of Heber, except Peleg, and his brother Joktan, are mentioned in that chapter: therefore, the descendants of Peleg, except Abraham, are there omitted; and *niches* must be provided for them, if they be admitted among the seventy.

L. 21. ‘*Proof that there were no more than seventy
‘nations.’* L. 25. The text from Deuteronomy has already

* 1 John i. 3.

† Gen. x. 32.

been considered. (L. 29.) It is indeed commanded that seventy bulls should be sacrificed on the several days of the feast of tabernacles;* and different methods have been taken of accounting for the singular arrangement of the number, as decreasing each day. But *tradition alone* informs us, that they were sacrifices for the seventy nations: and then this same *tradition* about these sacrifices is adduced as a *proof*, that there were seventy nations and no more! The *proof*, however, of this *tradition* itself will presently be considered.

P. 51. l. 11. 'ABRAHAM AND HIS FAMILY.—*Next, &c.*' There is nothing in this passage requiring particular notice; unless it be the notion of a *drawing* (l. 12,) and *sub-drawing*; (l. 22;) for which, I suppose, even tradition does not readily furnish authority, as it is not mentioned. In this *drawing*, 'it is recorded, that a man by the name of Abraham *was* to appear in the world, &c.' Now it so happens, that the drawing was not made till long after Abraham's death!

P. 52. l. 6, 7. '*I say, they are mistaken.*' This may be compared with what has already been adduced concerning Shiloh, "and the gathering of the people to him."

L. 10. '*Everlasting, &c.*' It is impossible, that any thing on earth can be *everlasting*, because the earth itself is not to endure for ever: neither does the original denote this. As, however, the seed of Abraham has not been possessed of the promised land, during more than seventeen hundred years past; the stubborn fact is against this interpretation. And if it be said, that Israel shall be reinstated in Canaan, and possess it till the end of the world, (which I doubt not will be the case) this does not in the least disprove our exposition of Jacob's prophecy. The sceptre and the lawgiver departed from Judah, as a nation, when Jesus came, and have been withheld from them ever

since; which proves that Jesus is Shiloh, the promised Messiah. The prophecy of Hosea, in the former part of it, has been turned into history; "The children of Israel have abode many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim." And, I trust, that in answer to the prayers, and by the blessing of God on the exertions, of Christians, the latter part also shall soon become history: "Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God and David their King; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness, in the latter days."* The *sceptre* and the *land* are not precisely the same thing: had God seen good, he might have continued the Jews in Canaan, and kept them in hard and oppressive bondage under the Romans, the Saracens, and the Turks, to this day, without *sceptre* and *lawgiver*; yet they might have lived in the promised land. It cannot be properly said, *the sceptre is the land, and the land is the sceptre*; (p. 53. l. 5.) for a nation may have a country as their own to inhabit, and may yet be the abject slaves of a foreign despot in that land. Israel, however, for seventeen hundred years has neither had the *land* nor the *sceptre*.

P. 53. l. 17. 'The true explanation of the prophecy, (l. 21.) 'As long as Israel shall obey the law.' Jacob did not speak one word about Israel obeying the law: how, indeed, should he? for the *law* was not yet given.—The possession of Canaan was *conditional*, and the *sceptre* also; but the coming of Shiloh was not.

L. 30. 'The kingdom shall be restored to Israel.' Then certainly the kingdom has *departed* from Israel; else how could it be *restored*? Therefore Shiloh is come.

P. 54. l. 10. 'The argument of the Gentiles, that the *sceptre* has departed from Judah.'

* Hos. iii. 4, 5.

L. 12. ‘*Take notice, &c.*’—This paragraph states the fact, according to our interpretation of the prophecy.—When Jesus, the Son of David, came, he took the kingdom over Israel, and over all nations; whether they “would have him to reign over them,” or not.* But Israel, as a nation, crucified their King, and still “crucify him to themselves afresh.” The sceptre then departed from Judah, as a people, that it might be swayed by Judah’s most illustrious Descendant. And when Israel shall welcome their long rejected King, they shall share the blessings of his kingdom pre-eminently; but never till that time.—“Thus saith the LORD GOD, I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one; and will plant it upon a high mountain and eminent. In the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it; and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar: and under it shall *dwell all fowl of every wing*; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the trees of the field shall know, that I have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and made the dry tree to flourish. I the LORD have spoken and have done it.”†

The sceptre and the lawgiver were departing from Judah, as a nation, when Shiloh came, whose right they were. As his kingdom more and more attained establishment, the sceptre and lawgiver disappeared, more and more from Judah: and at length his spiritual rule being fully confirmed; the whole political as well as ecclesiastical state of the Jews was subverted, and continues so to this very day. “He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David;

* Is. ix. 6, 7. Luke xix. 11—27.
Ez. xxi. 26, 27. Dan. vii. 14. Am. ix. 11, 12.

† Ez. xvii. 22—24. See also

“and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever;
“and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”*

P. 55. l. 17. ‘*The four empires were shewn to Abraham.*’

L. 24. ‘*In the shape, &c.*’—It was revealed to Abram, that his seed should be in bondage in a strange land, till four hundred years were expired; and then God would bring them forth: and, respecting this, God made a covenant with him; and ordered him to prepare the animals here mentioned as a sacrifice, that the covenant might be ratified, with the customary rites and observances. Further than this Moses testifies nothing. The four kingdoms in Daniel were represented by a lion, a bear, a leopard; and a fourth beast, far more dreadful than any of them.† In a subsequent vision, a ram was the emblem of the Medo-Persian kingdom, and a he-goat of the Grecian: yet this he-goat is described as very powerful and formidable.‡ But in the dream of the four empires here given, a young heifer, (not an ox or bull,) is the emblem of the first kingdom; a *she-goat* of the Persian; a ram of the Grecian; and a gentle, loving, harmless *turtle-dove*, of the tremendous Roman power!—‘In the shape of a bird he saw the family of ‘Israel.’ (L. 28.) I suppose it is meant, that a young pigeon was an emblem of the Messiah’s kingdom: but, according to the view of it given in this publication, it is scarcely more apposite, than that of a turtle-dove of the Roman victories and domination! Do men, who amuse themselves and others, with fancies of this kind, really believe them? However that may be, I cannot think they require any answer.

P. 56. l. 27. ‘*Although, &c.*’—I am not disposed to object to Israel’s primogeniture, or pre-eminence among the nations: but fathers in general have some affection, and make some provision, for other children, besides the first-

* Luke i. 31—33.

† Dan. vii. 4—7.

‡ Dan. viii. 1—8.

born; nay, they sometimes disinherit the first-born, for ill-behaviour, and give the inheritance to their other children. This passage, however, concerning the unalienable right of the first-born, not only to the *inheritance*, but to the *subjection* of the other children as his *servants*, always to remain so, (P. 56, 57;) come with rather an ill grace from a *Jew*. Not only was Ishmael older than Isaac; but Esau was Jacob's elder brother, by the same mother; and by God's express appointment "the elder was to be the servant of the younger." Judah was younger than Reuben, and Simeon, and Levi; yet Jacob made him 'lord over all his brethren.' David was Jesse's youngest son; yet God chose him to be king over Israel. Solomon was not David's eldest surviving son; "and of all my sons," says David, "God hath chosen Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel."* The general rule, therefore, admits of so many, and such important exceptions, that every argument grounded on it must be wholly inconclusive.

P. 57. l. 14. 'QUESTION.'—L. 16. '*His birth made him Lord, &c.*'—I suspect, that Mr. C.'s *political sentiments*, which suppose subjects not born for themselves, but to be servants to the king, and to obey the orders of their king, (L. 19—23;) will not be much approved in this land of liberty; in which most men reasonably think, that kings and rulers are born, or advanced to authority, not for themselves; but for the benefit of the people; and will have a terrible account to render to God at least, if they neglect the welfare of their subjects, in order to please, and gratify, and aggrandize themselves. In respect of the kingdom of our God, who is infinite in wisdom, justice, truth, and goodness, the statement, though improperly expressed, might be admitted; and so in respect of the

* 1 Chr. xxviii. 5.

Messiah's kingdom, which yet is established wholly for the benefit, not only of *subjects*, but of *rebels* who submit to him; the glory alone of his manifested wisdom, righteousness, truth and love being reserved to himself. But that God should appoint one nation so to rule over other nations, as that all others should be considered as born to obey the orders, *just* or *unjust*, *wise* or *foolish*, of this favoured people, gives such a view of the divine conduct, as is wholly unscriptural, irrational, and intolerable; and makes the heart recoil at the very thoughts of it.

L. 27. '*His great seal, that is circumcision.*'—As by God's express command, Ishmael, and the men of Abraham's household, and the sons of Keturah and Esau were circumcised; this *great seal* has been given to many others, besides Israel:* and if this be the only token of dominion over all nations; there will be a danger of great competition about it, among the several nations who use circumcision at this day; and profess to derive it from Abraham. Even Ishmael and Edom may contest it with Israel.

L. 32. '*The noun, &c.*'—Learned men in general, whether Jews, Christians, or heathens, have hitherto agreed, that ISRAEL signifies "a Prince of God." "Thy name shall be no more called Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed."† "By his strength he had power with God." יִשְׂרָאֵל is composed of שָׂרָה, *he obtained the dominion*, and אֱלֹהִים God:—יִשְׂרָאֵל is therefore, "a prince of God," 'one who obtains principal power from God.' (Leigh.) SARAI, from the same root, signifies, *my princess*, SARAH *a princess*.

If, however, Mr. C. contrary to the text itself, and the general opinion of learned men, chooses to assign to the name another derivation; it is not a matter of such im-

* Gen. xvii. 10—15. 23—27.

† Gen. xxxii. 28. Hos. xii. 3—5.

portance, as to require a refutation. The derivation assigned seems to require *ISHRAEL*, not *ISRAEL*: as *JESHURUN*, not *JESURUN*.*

P. 58. l. 4. ‘*To Israel was delivered, &c.*’—St. Paul calls “circumcision the seal;” but it was “the seal of the “righteousness of the faith, which Abraham had, being “yet uncircumcised.”† Circumcision is never called *a seal*, much less *the great seal*, in the Old Testament; nor yet *the crown*. The scriptures of the Old Testament never speak of any special blessings, as connected with the outward circumcision; but sometimes the contrary.‡—When peculiar blessings are promised, they are connected with “the circumcision of the heart.”§ Indeed it is surprising, in examining this subject, to find how very seldom *circumcision* is mentioned in the Old Testament, except at its appointment; and when the Israelites were circumcised on entering Canaan.|| There can, however, be no doubt, that the apostle has summed up the instruction of the Old Testament on the subject, when he says, “That is not “circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:—circum- “cision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the “letter, whose praise is not of men but of God.”¶—“A “great seal,” and “a crown,” in which Edom, the type of the most inveterate enemies of Israel, participated equally with Israel, is not greatly to be gloried in. The noun *circumcision* occurs but once in our version of the Old Testament.**

L. 9. ‘*Israel was elected before the creation of this world “to be the lord and king of it.*’—It is rather unfavourable to this statement, that Israel, through so long a course of years, has had so little, even of the appearance of dominion among

* Deut. xxxii. 15. xxxiii. 5.

† Rom. iv. 11. ‡ Jer. ix. 25, 26.

§ Deut. xxx. 6. Jer. iv. 4.

|| Gen. xvii. Josh. v. 2–9.

¶ Rom. ii. 28, 29.

** Ex. iv. 26.

the nations. This the writer felt, and anticipated the answer of the Gentiles; and he tries in vain to repel it. Above 3500 years have passed since the calling of Abraham, and the institution of circumcision. More than 400 years passed before the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage:* 480 from that time to the building of Solomon's temple:† 434 more to the Babylonish captivity: 588 from the beginning of the captivity to the Christian æra, and above 1800 years since that commenced. Yet the reign of David, after he became king over all Israel, and that of Solomon, comprising together 73 years, is almost the only term, in which they had any considerable dominion over other nations; and this was in comparatively a contracted circle, not extending over the twentieth part of the continent of Asia, and not at all including any part of Africa or Europe. So that, if dominion over the world was the grand *temporal* advantage intended for Israel, they have hitherto been unaccountably kept out of the possession of it. All the great kingdoms and empires, noted in history, have been possessed by the Gentiles; and Israel was generally subjected to one or other of them. Now 3500 years are so large a part of the 7000 to which the author seems to limit the duration of the world; and another so large a part had elapsed before the calling of Abraham; that it seems impossible, this design of Israel's election can ever be answered.

The passage under consideration, may, however, remind us of the answer, which the Jews of old made to our Lord, and which has perplexed commentators.—He had said “to those Jews which believed in him, If ye continue “in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed: and ye “shall know the truth, and the truth shall *make you free*. “They answered him, We be Abraham's seed; and were

* Ex. xii. 41.

† 1 Kings vi. 1.

“never in bondage to any man, how sayest thou, Ye shall ‘be made free?’”* The nation had been bond-slaves in Egypt, captives at Babylon, and vassals to the three preceding great empires; Judea was at the time a province of the Roman empire, and deeply oppressed by that haughty power: yet they had “never been in bondage to ‘any man!’” The whole may also illustrate the words: ‘And to this day, Israel is still Israel:’—not the same as in the days of their pious progenitors; but the same, as in the days of Christ and his apostles.—St. Paul has given us the true meaning of the promises, to this effect. “The ‘promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not ‘to Abraham and his seed, through the law, but through ‘the righteousness of faith.’”† The Messiah to descend from him, would be Lord of all the world: and all true believers of every age and nation, being considered as one with him, “inherit the earth,” the world, “all things.”‡

L. 18, 19. ‘*It is a vain thing for the Gentiles to grasp ‘at the kingdom of this world.’*—Whatever other Gentiles may have, Christians, as such, have no controversy with Jews on this subject: they have no idea of ‘grasping at the kingdom ‘of this world:’—Though *sons*, yet their valued inheritance is in heaven, not on earth. It is nothing to them, whether Gentile conquerors and oppressors exercise dominion over Jews, and treat them as abject slaves; or Jews exercise similar dominion over Gentiles. The oppressed they compassionate, and condemn the oppressors: yet they at least equally pity them also. The *fact* is clearly as here stated: ‘the Gentiles are the lords of the world and Israel are ‘their servants even until this day:’ (L. 26, 27.) the right or grant is another thing, as is the future superiority or dominion. These things however seldom occur to the

* John viii. 31—35.

† Rom. iv. 13.

‡ Dan. vii. 13, 14. 27.

1 Cor. iii. 21—23. Gal. iii. 28, 29. Rev. iii. 21. v. 10. xi. 15. xxi. 7.

thoughts of real Christians: and they severely condemn themselves, if conscious of any rising desire of rule and dominion of this kind, over any human being. They know it to be wholly inconsistent with their principles to rule with rigour over the meanest servant: all men are their *brethren*, if not in Christ, yet in Adam; and their *neighbours* to be "loved as themselves." Even nominal Christians in general think little on the subject; nay, the pagan nations do not think of grasping in this sense 'at the kingdom of this world.' The idea seems peculiar to the Jews, and almost exclusively their own. I cannot conceive, that it ever enters into the politicks either of the potentates on the continent, or the Grand Turk, or the Great Mogul, or the Emperor of China; much less is it any part of the object of the London Society. The event will prove, whether the *vain* expectations of the Jews, from age to age, of temporal dominion over all nations, will ever be realized or not. I say *vain*: for what advantage could this be to all preceding generations, who have here lived in a state of vassalage, and have, previously to the expected period, entered the eternal world? and what real advantage, will the gratification of rapacity, ambition, love of domination, and vindictive passions, prove even to those who live at the expected time? An honourable precedency we allow will be given to converted and restored Israel; even that of cordial love and gratitude, for their and our Redeemer's sake. We know that, taught and influenced by Christian principles, they will bear these honours meekly and lovingly: and if God shall see good to invest them with any other authority; we know, that they will exercise it in righteousness, truth and goodness; and that their fellow Christians will cordially submit themselves in the fear of God. We feel, therefore, no concern on the subject. But we are fully convinced, that so long as their present ambi-

tion of dominion prevails, they never can be the subjects of the true Messiah. Till this be humbled and mortified, they never can receive the blessings of his kingdom. “The loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.”* As far as this is their expectation from their Messiah, they should enjoy it unmolested; did I not believe, yea, certainly *know*, that they want a Messiah for far other and more important purposes, and are dying in their sins, because they believe not that Jesus is He.†

The statement in the rest of the passage might in many things be shewn to be doubtful or erroneous: but there seems nothing peculiarly requiring notice; nothing that affects the main argument.

P. 59. l. 28. ‘THE WILDERNESS.—*One question, &c.*’—The reason assigned for the law having been given in a wilderness contains no argument, and has not much plausibility. It is probable, however, that the apostles at first thought, that the Gentiles would share the blessings of Messiah’s reign, by submitting to the law of Moses, and, as proselytes to Judaism, embracing also Christianity. But they were afterwards led to a different view of the subject. The ceremonial law of Moses never could combine with a religion, which was to fill the whole earth.

P. 60. l. 3. ‘THE SABBATH.’

L. 14. ‘*Every person knows, &c.*’—This *pairing* of the days, and *pairing* of the nations, is so entirely without foundation in scripture, and so remote from all deduction of reasoning, or analogy, that one can hardly refrain from asking, Can any man be serious in maintaining such notions? In the *pairing* of the nations, we ought to have known which were joined together: and it can hardly help occurring to the reader, that, on the supposition, of any

* Is. ii. 11. 17.

† John viii. 24.

thing of the kind having indeed taken place; it certainly was an introduction to stated and habitual quarrelling and fighting: for which pair have not repeatedly gone to war one with the other?

L. 28. ‘*The world compared to a ship without a rudder.*’—If Israel, as a nation, be the rudder to this ship, as the rudder was made so very long after the ship, and has had so very little connexion, in any age, with the greatest part of it; no wonder that the ship has been tossed about by storms. But it is a wonder, that men will amuse themselves and one another with these fancies, on the brink of death, and of an eternal state of happiness or misery; and upon subjects intimately connected with that awful alternative.

P. 61. l. 5, 6. ‘*This compass, &c.*’—That Israel should be the foundation of the law of Moses, and that law the compass of a ship, and that ship the world; and that the law of Moses, the ritual part especially, never known to one part out of a hundred, or a thousand, of the world, are very wonderful things: but they do not at all affect the question, Whether Jesus be the promised Messiah or not.

L. 17. ‘*Come then, &c.*’—God gave Israel his sabbaths, but they greatly polluted them.* This seems the short history of this ‘blessed pair.’—The question about the sabbath, as far as Christianity is concerned, will ere long be considered: and I by no means deny, that the sabbath, as given to Israel, was an honourable and important distinction and advantage; but merely to state, that they have little reason to glory in what has been so grievously neglected and perverted.

P. 62. l. 4. ‘*Millennium and properly, &c.*’—The word *millennium* is not found in scripture; it simply means *a thousand years*. It is generally agreed, that these thousand years, of which no intimation is given in the Old Testament,

* Ez. xx. 12. 20, 21.

or in the New, except in the Revelation of John, will be passed under the especial rule of the Messiah, as the acknowledged, and willingly obeyed, King, over all the earth: but that they comprise the whole term of his reign is not only not said, but it is directly contrary to many scriptures; especially that of Isaiah; “Of the *increase* of his government and peace there shall be no end:”* and that of Daniel, concerning “the Stone cut out of the mountain without hands,” which “became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.”†

P. 62. l. 6. ‘*The opinion of the Gentiles concerning the sabbath.*’

L. 7. ‘*If I say, &c.*’—The views of Christians concerning the law of Moses have been sufficiently explained. Some things further concerning the abolition of the ritual law, as predicted in the Old Testament, will come under consideration, when the priesthood of the Messiah, (a subject wholly omitted by Mr. C.) will call for our attention.

We certainly consider the dedication of a portion of our time, even of *one day in seven*, as a part of the *moral* law. It was appointed, as it appears evident to me at least, from the creation; and was merely *incorporated* into the law of Moses, being of previous and universal obligation. But perhaps it is not so easily ascertained, as at first glance it may appear to be, which of the seven days that constitute our weeks, answers to the seventh day at the creation. A voyage round the world, whether it be entered upon in a westerly, or an easterly direction, always gains or loses one day in the computation. Two navigators setting sail on the same day, one taking his course to the East Indies, and returning by South America; and the other, going by South America, and returning by the Cape of Good Hope; would vary *two days* in their com-

* Is. ix. 7.

† Dan. ii. 34, 35. 44, 45.

putation of time: as one would proceed according to the daily course of the sun, and lose one whole day; and the other against the course of the sun, and would have one day over. Now which would be the seventh day of the week, to these two navigators? If the sabbath were only obligatory on the inhabitants of one small country, as Canaan, the difficulty would not be found: but if extended to all nations, the sabbath would not consist of precisely the same individual hours, in any of the countries, either to the east or to the west. But, however that may be, it appears to many Christians, provided one day in seven be thus consecrated to the worship and service of God, to the exclusion of all worldly employments, however lawful, if neither necessary, nor connected with piety and charity, that the *moral* obligation is satisfied. Not that *we* are to choose the day for ourselves: but that the determining which of the days by our great Lawgiver, is a matter of *positive* appointment, and not of *moral* or *immutable* obligation. From the creation to the giving of the law, the seventh day was appointed, in commemoration of the creation being completed; “pronounced very good,” and rested in by the great Creator. And, though the intervention of the fall greatly altered the state of this lower creation, and of man especially, the original appointment continued. It appears to me also, (though this is not undisputed,) that the Mosaick sabbath was instituted on the same day of the seven: but the redemption from Egyptian bondage was added, as one great benefit to be commemorated by Israel on the sabbath; and this *redemption* we consider as typical of spiritual redemption by Jesus Christ. We, however, are satisfied, that “the Lord even of the sabbath day,” Jesus Christ the Son of God, has, by *his authority*, changed the *instituted* part of the command, and has appointed the first day of the seven, instead of the last, in commemoration of his

resurrection: because that event, as completing his work of redemption, was of far greater importance, and an infinitely greater benefit to *fallen* man, than creation without redemption would have been. Our observation of the first day, as the Christian sabbath, is not ‘derived from what ‘Paul said;’* but from the general language of the New Testament, and the general practice of the primitive Christians, in the apostles’ days. It is by the apostle John called “the Lord’s day,”† (τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, as St. Paul calls the eucharist, Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον.)‡ The same authority which, as we suppose, abolished the other festivals of the ceremonial law, changed the ceremonial part of this law. “The “first day of the week” is, subsequent to our Lord’s resurrection, distinguished from other days;§ and sabbaths are put among those ritual observances which are no longer in force.|| With this the constant practice of the Christian church accords: and every argument, which proves Christianity to be from God, establishes this change in the day of sacred rest. “This is the day which the LORD “hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it;” for “the “Stone, which the builders refused,” on this day arose, that he might “become the Head-stone of the corner.”* If indeed God said to the apostles on the mount, as we believe, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well “pleased; HEAR YE HIM:” and if he, as it is manifest, made known his will to the apostles concerning this change of the day; then the same authority, which appointed the seventh day, for wise and holy reasons substituted the first in its place. But it pleased God, that this change, as some others, should be gradually introduced, rather by apostolical example, than by direct injunction; that no need-

* 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

† Rev. i. 10.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 20.

§ John xx. 19, 26. Acts xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

|| Col. ii. 16.

¶ Ps. cxviii. 22—24. Acts iv. 10, 11.

less stumbling block might be thrown in the way of the Jews.

P. 62. l. 30. '*Type, &c.*'—It is no where in scripture said, that 'the sabbath is the type of the millennium;' but if it were, this would confirm the view which we have of it, namely, that in some respects it was a part of *instituted worship*. The apostle shews, that he considered it as a figure or anticipation of heavenly happiness; when he says, "there remaineth therefore a rest," (σάββατον, the keeping of a sabbath,) "for the people of God."

L. 33, 34. '*They have no right to keep holy, &c.*'—*To have no right* to obey the command of God, seems an uncommon idea, or expression. The rest of the paragraph does not require any particular answer. Christians consider the festivals, as well as other parts of the ceremonial law, as abolished; and they judge that the moral part of the fourth commandment, is obeyed, by observing the Lord's day, if it indeed be kept as the Lord's day should be.

P. 63. l. 10. 'THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.'

P. 64. last line. '*A little sanctuary.*'—It is rather difficult to conceive how *many* synagogues widely dispersed through distant countries, could be "a little sanctuary." I have no doubt, but that believing and humble Israelites of old worshipped God by prayer and praise, with acceptance at the synagogues, wherever dispersed: but this was always with a reference to the tabernacle and temple, where alone sacrifices, *atoning sacrifices*, were appointed to be offered. The NAME and perfections of God,* his grace and providence, and promises, trusted in by a few prudent, pious Jews, was to them as "a little sanctuary;" when they could not go up to the temple. Their worship was accepted, wherever presented, through the ministrations of the priests, and the *atoning* sacrifices offered "in the place, which

* Ps. xx. 1. Prov. xviii. 10.