Q. In the Introduction of our Illustrations, there are several Points well worthy to be enquired after.

And first of all; The Division of the Bible into Chapters and Verses, whence was it, and when, and what?

A. First, for the Old Testament.

The Pentateuch in Hebrew, was Divided into Fifty Four Parts, called, Parasha’s, or Sections, and, Seders, or Orders. One of these Portions was Read Every Sabbath Day, in their Synagogues. Thus they dispatch’d the Reading thereof, in a Year; for they twice joined, a Couple of the lesser Parts, in that Exercise. And when they had Read the Last, they began with the First again, that they might not seem to be glad, when they had ended it.

Compare, Act. 15.21. and you will date this Custome, at least as high as the dayes of Ezra.

But when Antiochus had committed his Barbarous Outrages, & Forbidden the Reading of the Law, either publickly or privately, on Pain of Death, hereupon they betook themselves, to Reading the Prophets; and they made Choice of such Portions from them, as had some kind of Affinity with, or Correspondence to, those of the Law, in the room of which they were substituted. E.g. Instead of that Section in the Law, concerning the Creation of Heaven & Earth, they chose, Isa. 42.5. which begins thus; Thus saith the Lord God, Hee that created the Heavens.

These Portions of the Prophets, they called, Haphtaroth, or, Dismissions; because, when they were ended, the congregation was Dismissed. Now, when once they had begun thus to Read the Prophets, they continued the Exercise ever afterwards, together with the Reading of the Law tho’ the Occasion ceased.

None of these Divisions were distinguished by Numbers and Figures; but they were called by the Name of the first Word, or first Remarkable Word, in each Division. The first Section of Genesis, they called, Parashah Bereschith, the second, Parashah Noach. Thus Kimchi, on Joel. 3.19. So did Isaiah, saith hee, in the Parashah Kirbu; that is in the
Section, which, (Isa. 24.1.) begins with Kirbu.\(^7\)

The Division of the Bible, into *Chapters*, is a late Invention, and not more than four or five hundred Years old. *Genebrard*, in his *Chronology*, saies, It was about the Year 1240. and it seems to bee the Invention of the *Schoolmen*, hee saies, *Qui cum Hugone Cardinali, concordantiarum fuere Authores*. And *Sixtus Senensis* agrees with him. Hee saies, *Till within these Five Hundred Years*, there was no Place of Scripture quoted by Number, but only the *Psalms*, which from the Infancy of the Church were so quoted, as appears by the *Acts* of the Apostles. The Numbers of *Chapters*, hee saies, which now appear, as well in the *Greek*, as in the *Hebrew* Copies, are taken out of our Latin Books. *Austin* saies, Hee wrote, from the Beginning of *Genesis*, to the Expulsion of our First Parents, out of Paradise. And *Gregory*, saies, Hee expounded, from the Beginning of the Book of *Kings*, to the Anointing of *David*, to be King. Instead of which, wee should thus express it; *On the three First Chapters of Genesis*; And, *On the Fifteen first Chapters of the First Book of Kings*.\(^8\)

Now, tho’ these Writers, do seem Ignorant of the Author of the Invention, *Bale* tells us, That *Stephen Langton*, A.B.C. was the Person, *Qui omnes Bibliorum Libros per capita distinxit, quibus adhuc Ecclesia utitur*. And the like is affirmed, by *Weever* in his *Funeral Monuments*. This *Langton* died, A.C.1228. We shall elsewhere bring you another Author.\(^9\)

From the *Chapters*, Lett us come to the *Verses*, of the Old Testament. Now, of these, the latest Original, that can be assigned, is, the Time and Work of the *Tiberiensian Masorites*, about 500 Years after our Saviour. The *Masoretical Notes*, at the End of every Book in the Bible, recite the *Numbers* of the *Verses* in every Book. Tho’ indeed, they can be presently convicted of gross Mistakes in their Computations; yea, sometimes their *Total Summs*, are not such as their own *Particulars*, would produce, in the *Arithmetic* of Children. And the Mistakes cannot be in the Transcribers, or Copiers, because the Accounts are express’d, as well by Words at length, as by a *Siman*, [σηµειον] or, Character. Tis plain the *Verses* were then in Use: yea, a Passage of the *Mishna*, written, A.D. 100, plainly mentions them. But indeed, the *Verses* of the *Old Testament*, are as old as the Testament itself, & of the same Date, with the Books themselves, that compose it.\(^10\)
For, first, it is evident, that the *Accents* depend on the *Verses*; [for Instance, every one of them ending with a *Silluk*;] The *Accents* could not be before the *Verses*, nor the *Verses* before the *Accents*.\(^{11}\)

And wee may add, That certain Parts of the Scripture, do plainly distinguish themselves into *Verses*, if there were no *Accents* to do it; as, the most of the *Proverbs*, & the *Canticles*, and the most of the Book of *Job*, also, with other Characteristicks; And the *Alphabetical Parts* of Scripture, namely, Psalm. 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145. And Prov. 31.10-31. And all the Book of the *Lamentations*, except the last Chapter.\(^{12}\)

Secondly, The *Vowels*, depend on the *Accents*. The *Accents* make a Change in the *Vowels*, on Multitudes of Occasions. Every *Hebrew Grammar*, gives you the Rules of this *Permutation*.\(^ {13}\)

Yea, Thirdly; The *Consonants* depend on both the *Vowels*, and the *Accents*. On the *Vowels* they depend, both in Point of *Pronunciation*, & of *Signification*.\(^ {14}\)

Now, the *Verses*, in all our Translations of the Bible, are exactly the same with those in the *Hebrew*. Only, the Titles of the *Psalms*, are counted *Verses* in some, & not in others. And all our *English* Bibles, (as well as the *French*, & the *Dutch*,) begin the Sixty fourth Chapter of *Isaiah*, in that which according to the *Hebrew*, is the Middle of the last *Verse* of the Sixty third Chapter. And our *English*, in I. Sam. 20.42. join those Words, [And hee arose, etc] unto the forty second *Verse*; whereas in all the *Hebrew* Bibles, they are a distinct *Verse* of themselves; & so they should be in our *English*.\(^ {15}\)

The Number of the *Verses*, was not express’d in any *ancient Bibles*, any otherwise, than that every *Fifth Verse* had the *Hebrew* Letter standing for it. The first Bible printed with *Verses*, was that of *Pagnines*, printed at *Lions*, A.D. 1528. The *New Testament* was also then divided into *Verses*; but much longer ones, than those that are now used among us. E.g. The first of *Mark*, which according to our Division, ha’s *Forty five Verses*, ha’s there but *Fifteen*. The second of *Mark* there, had but *Nine*; whereas with us, it ha’s *Twenty eight*.\(^ {16}\)

As for the *New Testament*, it was in the elder Times, divided with larger ΤΙΤΛΟΙ, and lesser, κεφαλαια [tho’ sometimes these Divisions were promiscuously called by that latter Name.] But the least of the Divisions then used, was that of στίχοι, i.e. *Rowes; Ranks, or Files*; which do seem to be no other than the *Lines* of the Writing; which
contained commonly about Six Words, more or less.\textsuperscript{17}

The modern Division of the New Testament, was made, as H. Stephens, in his Preface to his Greek Concordance tells us, by his Father, Robert Stephens; and that hee did it in a Journey, from Paris to Lions. Hee adds, That most People said, Hee was unadvised to bestow his Time & Pains about that which was altogether useless, whereby hee should gett no Credit, but expose himself to Derision. \textit{At, Ecce, contrà eorum Damnatricem instituti Patris mei opinionem, inventum illud, simul in lucem simul in omnium, gratiam venit: simulque in tantam authoritatem, ut quasi exauctorarentur aliae Testamenti Novi, sive Graecæ, sive Latinae, sive Gallicæ, sive Germanicæ, sive in alia Vernaculâ Linguâ Editiones, quæ inventum illud secutæ non essent.} The Invention was entertained, it seems, with universal Approbation; and all Editions of the New Testament, that had it not, were laid aside, & out of request. It first appeared in an Edition, printed at Paris, A.D. 1551. in a large, 12\textdegree, containing the Greek Text in the Middle, the Vulgar Version on one side, and Erasmus’s Translation on the other.\textsuperscript{18}

T’was an useful Invention; but as the Honourable Mr. Boyl saies, \textit{It will be no Slander to that industrious Promoter of heavenly Learning, to say, Hee hath sometimes severed Matters that should have been left united, and united others, that more conveniently hee might have severed; & that his lucky Attempt ought not to lay any Restraint upon other learned Men, from making Use of the same Liberty hee took, in altering the former Partitions of the New Testament, in altering his Alterations, to the best advantage of the sense or method.} \textsuperscript{19}

These Remarks have Mr. Clark for their Author.

But in the Appendix to this \textit{Opus Ecclesiae}, we shall have a more perfect and exact Account of these Matters given unto us.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{tabular}{lccc}
\textbf{The Number of the Verses in the} & \textbf{The Number of the Verses} \\
According to the English Bible. & \\
\textit{Genesis}, & 1533. & \textit{Matthew}, & 1071. \\
\textit{Exodus}, & 1213. & \textit{Mark}, & 678. \\
\end{tabular}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1288.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>959.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td></td>
<td>658.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td>618.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>811.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>695.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td>817.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td>719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>822.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td></td>
<td>280.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>406.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td></td>
<td>167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>1070.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2471.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>915.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canticles</td>
<td></td>
<td>117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1292.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1364.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>154.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>357.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosæa</td>
<td></td>
<td>197.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
<td>146.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>880.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td></td>
<td>433.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Corinthians</td>
<td></td>
<td>437.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Corinthians</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td></td>
<td>149.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td></td>
<td>155.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td></td>
<td>104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td>113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrewes</td>
<td></td>
<td>303.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. John</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td></td>
<td>404.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summ total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7956.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Verses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habbakkuk</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>211.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summ total</td>
<td>23205.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the whole Bible, there are Thirty one thousand, One Hundred, Sixty One, Verses.
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[42v blank]
The Old Testament.

4849.

Q. It may prove a Good Preparatory unto our Illustrations upon the Bible, to have the CHRONOLOGY of the *Old Testament*, briefly secured and explained, and exposed unto us?

A. To be admired and Adored, is that Providence, of God, that ha’s preserved, such a *Chronology* for us. A learned Man, whose Name is Mr. William Whiston, ha’s lately given us, *A short View of the Chronology of the Old Testament*; and, acknowledging the Favour of Heaven, in my being accommodated with such a Treasure of Good Thoughts, as there are in that Composure, I will endeavour in this Place, to produce many of them. How well had it been for him, & for the Church if no worse Thoughts, had since proceeded from the Author of these!  

The *Mathematical Canon* composed by Ptolomy, the most learned Astronomer of all the Ancients, who ha’s all along apply’d his Accounts unto the uncontested *Æra* of Nabonassar, and confirm’d them still from the *Eclipses* mention’d by the Ancient Astronomers before him; this is the surest Guide wee have, where the Sacred Historians are silent. This *Canon* computes the Beginning of any of the Years of each Kings Reign, from the First Day of the First Month (called, *Thoth*,) of the Nabonassarean Year, which falls out in that Respective Year of his Reign. And tho’ any King should Dy immediately after the First of *Thoth*, yett all the rest of that Year, till the next first of *Thoth*, is attributed unto his Reign in the Canon. And if any King, whose Reign was less than a Year, had never a first of *Thoth* within the Compass of his Reign, that King was omitted in the *Canon*, and his Reign added unto the Reign of his Predecessors. Now the Nabonassarean Year, was just 365 Dayes long, without the Intercalation of a Day every Fourth Year. So that after every Four Years, the first of *Thoth* would run back in the Julian Year, in such a Manner, as that 1461 Nabonassarean Years would be equal to 1460 Julian ones: The first of *Thoth* in that time coming to its old Place in the Julian Years.  

This *Canon* begins a considerable While before the *Old Testament* ends, and it reaches beyond the Times of the New Testament. It contains an uninterrupted
Chronology of the whole Interval, between the Histories of the Old and New Testament. It contains the Kings of those Four Monarchies, and no others, which are so famous in the Prophecies of the Sacred Scripture. By the Comparison of this Canon, with Xenophon, and with the Sacred Writers, we have an exact Account of the Space during the 70 Years Captivity of the Jewes in Babylon, and of the Time of its Solution under the Crown of Persia; which otherwise we had been but very imperfectly acquainted withal. This Canon does exactly agree in every thing with the Chronology of the Old Testament. It is an Authentic Record alwayes to be relied upon. And, as Marsham observes Sanè canon iste multis compaginibus cum Sacro Textu aptissimè connectitur.26

It is not amiss to introduce this Observation, as early as might be; because of the Use, which we shall have Occasion to make of it, in the Discourses that are now coming on.

It is Remarkable, That the Intire Summ of Years, from the Creation, till the Christian Æra, is not concerned in the greatest Number of the chronological Difficulties of the Old Testament. Most of the Disputes about the Chronology of the Old Testament, arise from the Particulars of Three Famous Periods. I. From the Ingress to the Exodus out of Egypt; II. From the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple. III. From the Foundation of the Temple to the Captivity. But it ha’s pleased the Divine Providence, most happily to prevent the Ill Consequences of any Mistake, & to secure the entire Summs unto us, by Three express Texts of Scripture. The First Period, is punctually, 430 Years. [Exod. 12.40, 41.] The Second Period, is punctually, 480 Years. [1. King. 6.1.] The Third Period, is adjusted thus; From the Beginning of Jeroboams Idolatry, to the last Captivity of the Reliques of the Ten Tribes, in the 23d Year of Nebuchadnezzar, is expressly, 390 Years. [Ezek. 4.4, 5.] These Three Remarkable Texts, are the great Measures and Standards of the Chronology of these Periods. 27

Another thing that appears very Remarkable is; That the Chinese Chronology when rightly understood, is exactly agreeable, to what we draw from the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. Fohi, the founder of the Chinese Monarchy, was the same with Noah. The Chinois tell us, he had no Father; no doubt the Memory of his Father was lost in the Deluge. They tell us, his Mother [44v] conceived him, as she was encompassed with a Rain-bow; which seems a cloudy Remembrance of the Rain-bow first appearing after the
Flood. The Character of FoHi among the Chinois, agrees mighty well, with what the Scriptures relate of Noah. FoHi (they say) carefully bred up seven sorts of Creatures, which he used to sacrifice, to the Supreme Spirit of Heaven & Earth. For this reason some called him, Paohi, that is, Oblation. Compare, Gen. 7.2, 3, 9. and, 8.20.28

The Chinese Histories affirm, that FoHi settled in the Province of Xensi; which is the most North-West Province of China, and very near to Mount Caucasus, upon which the Ark rested, & from which Noah must descend, to go thence into China. Indeed, the entire Series of the Annals of China, taken together as they stand at present, are false, & reach too high from our Times. They relate a Remarkable Conjunction of the Five Planets, in one of the Signs, the same Day that the Conjunction of the Sun and the Moon also happened, in the Reign of their Fifth Monarch, Chuenhio. Now this Astronomical Character ha’s been examined by the famous Cassini, and found to have happened about 500 Years later, than the present Series of their Years does suppose. They relate, that in the Reign of their Seventh Monarch, Yao, the Winter-Solstice was observed to be about 50 Degrees distant from the Place where it is at present. This also, if the Observation were exact, must be 500 Years later than the Time which they have assigned for it. The Duration of the Reigns and Lives of the First Monarchs of China, likewise do not answer to the Standard of Humane Life in those Ages, to which the present Series of their Years do affix them. It is likely, That the Years of the First Family of their ancient Kings, were not Successive, but Collateral.29 Other Nations as well as the Chinese, have carried their Antiquities too high, by erroneously setting ancient Collateral Families, in Succession one to another. This made the Ancient Egyptian Chronology so extravagant, until Sir John Marsham found out the Mistake.30 And Martinius himself allowes it in the Chinese History. Suppose then, that Noah, 235 Years after the Deluge, A.P.J. 2601. descended from the higher Regions at Caucasus, to the lower of China, and governed such of his Posterity as he found planted there; and that he Transmitted the Government unto the Successors we find mention’d in the Chinese Annals; That a considerable while before the Period of the First Nine Emperours, Yu, the Founder of the First Great Family, began a Succession of Kings in a different Province; and that also about the Time that Chim tam the Head of the Second Great Family succeeded unto the First, Vu Van the Head of the Third, began a Succession of Kings in a Different Province, which Third therefore, was
not *Successive* to, but *Collateral with*, the Second; and accordingly, their several Founders were about the same Number of Descents from *Hoam ti*, as they appear to have been by their Respective Genealogies. But what is here chiefly Remarkable, is, That if the *Chinese Annals* be thus adjusted, the Length of the Reigns and the Lives of their Monarchs, will very exactly agree, with the Duration of the Lives of Men, in the same Ages recorded in the Sacred Scripture. You may at your Lisure compare the Tables. And this is a principal Character, whereby pretended Antiquities are distinguished from genuine.³¹

We will now proceed with our *Chronological Canon*, and having stated Six Great Articles of it, we may proceed unto the Consideration of the several Difficulties, under each of those Articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Dayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. From the Autumnal Equinox next after the Creation of <em>Adam</em>, to that at the End of the Deluge.</td>
<td>1656.</td>
<td>00. 00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no considerable Difficulties in this Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Dayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. From the Autumnal Equinox, at the End of the Deluge to the Departure of <em>Abraham</em> out of <em>Haran</em>.</td>
<td>426.</td>
<td>6. 00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from the plain Words of *Moses*, [Gen. 11.32. with, 12.1 — 4.] confirmed by those of *Stephen*; [Act. 7.4.] That *Abraham* was born, when his Father *Terah* was 130 Years of Age. We read indeed; Gen. 11.26. *Terah lived Seventy Years, and begat Abraham, Nahor and Haran*. But the Priority of *Abrahams* Name, does not imply, that he was the *Eldest Son*; as it is plain, that *Shem* was not the *Eldest Son* of *Noah*, tho’ he be First mentioned. *Haran* was undoubtedly here the *Eldest Son*. For he was the Father-in-Law of *Nahor*, [45r] and probably of *Abraham* also. *Sarai* is taken to be the same with *Iscah*, the Daughter of *Haran*; else we cannot easily conceive, how she should be styled, *The Sister of Abraham, the Daughter* [or, Grand-daughter] of *his Father*. And yet *Sarai* was but Ten Years younger than her Husband. Besides, we find, that *Lot*, the
Son of Haran, was very near as old as Abraham. About the Time that Abraham begat Isaac, at the Age of 100, (which was then but the Beginning of old Age,) the Daughters of Lot could say, Our Father is old. The Reason why Abraham is first mentioned, is not only, The Dignity of his Person, The Friend of God; but also the Continuation of the Chronology by him. There seems to be an Objection against this; That it is improbable Terah should have a Son so late as at 130 Years of Age; especially since in so small a Time afterwards as at the Promise of Isaac, it seems a mighty Surprize unto Abraham, to have Thoughts of Issue at 100 Years of Age. But since Terah lived 205 Years, it cannot be more unsuitable, to suppose that he begetts a Son, at 130; than that now, Men who may reach 80, begett at 50. Besides, Abraham himself had Children by Keturah, long after Isaac. And the Lives of Men for many Generations after Abraham, were long enough, to admitt of their having Issue at 100 Years old. Jacob was 104 Years old, at the Birth of Benjamin. Several of the Progenitors of David appear to have had Children, some a little before, some a little after this Age; and at a much longer Distance from the Dayes of Abraham. But the Surprize of Abraham and Sarah, seems to have been This. Abraham had now been married unto Sarah a great while, without any Appearance of Issue. And since it ceased to be with Sarah after the Manner of Women, there was not left now the least Hope of Children by her. Nay, it was Fourteen Years also, since the more Fruitful Hagar conceived by him. It is also probable, that his Change of his Countrie, and wandring & weary Way of Living in a strange Land, brought early Infirmitues on his Constitution, which he observed; he found himself Decaying sooner than else he would have done; & his Body Dead as to Generation, especially with regard unto Sarah. And yet his Contemporaries might have Children at a greater Age; yea, he himself had so, upon the Restoration of his Health, and this no less than 40 Years afterward.

Indeed we read, Exod. 12.40. The Sojourning of the Children of Israel, who sojourned in the Land of Egypt, was 430 Years. But these 430 Years include all the Sojourning of the
Israelites, and their Ancestors, in a Strange Land. The Translations of the Samaritan and of the Septuagint, are therefore so paraphrastical, as to read it thus. The Sojourning of the Children of Israel, which they sojourned in the Land of Egypt, and in the Land of Canaan, they and their Fathers, was 430 Years. And the small Number of Generations, between the Entrance into Egypt, and the Going out of it, are a Demonstration of this Matter. Jochebed was the immediate Daughter of Levi, (who was 50 Years old at the Descent into Egypt,) and the immediate Mother of Moses (who was 80 Years old, at the Ascent out of Egypt.) Hezron, one of those who went down with Jacob into Egypt, had a Grandson Jair, an Active Man, about Forty Years after the Coming up out of Egypt, for he siezed on the Villages and Countrey of Basan at that time. Sheerah the Daughter, or perhaps the grand daughter of Ephraim, was alive at the Division of the Land of Canaan by Joshua. Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, the Ringleaders of the Sedition against Moses in the Wilderness, were Grandsons to some of these Persons, who were among the Descendents into Egypt. And yet the general Period of Humane Life, was now no more than 140 Years of Age. Moreover, the Ancestors of Moses, whose particular Ages are mentioned, will further demonstrate it. Levi, his great Grandfather, was 50 Years old, at the Descent into Egypt, & lived but 137 Years in all. Kohath, his Grandfather, liv’d but 133 Years; and his Father Amram but 137 Years, and Moses himself was no more than 80 Years old at the Exodus. If we allow every succeeding Person to be born as late in the Fathers Life as the Time for Generation would permitt, yet there will want many Years of the 430 which belong to this Period. Finally; The Apostle Paul clears it up, when he reckons these 430 Years, from a solemn Promise of the Messiah, the Seed of Abraham, in whom all the Families of the Earth should be Blessed. [Gal. 3.17.] But we Read not of any such Promise, to Jacob, at his going into Egypt.

Well; The 430 Years take their Date, from the Dayes of Abraham. We will now see, what Year in the Life of Abraham, will be that whereon we are to fix our Epocha. It falls exactly, when Abraham was 75 Years old, and at his Departure out of Haran. It ha’s its Date, from the primary Sojourning of the Progenitors of the Children of Israel in a Strange Land. The Departure of Terah and Abraham, from Ur to Haran was not into a Strange Land. It was in the same Countrey of Mesopotamia, with Ur itself. It was the Habitation of his Brother Nahor and his Posterity. Yea, Abraham himself calls it,
in so many Words; [Gen. 24.4.] *His own Countrey.* And all along in the Scripture, it is not *Mesopotamia,* but *Canaan,* that is called, *The Countrey of their Sojourning;* and, *A Strange Land;* and where *Abraham* and his Posterity, were for a long Time said to be *Strangers* and *Pilgrims.* And to render all, the more incontestable; The famous Promise of the *Messiah,* was made unto *Abraham,* at this his Departure out of *Haran.*

Wherefore, since *Isaac* was born 25 Years after *Abrahams* Departure out of *Haran,* and from thence, to the Deliverance out of *Egypt,* was at the utmost no more than 405 Years, tis no Wonder, if in a Place, where the *Chronology* is not so much concerned, that Space be stated only by the Round Number, 400 Years. Thus tis, in the Promise of a Son, unto *Abraham.* [Gen. 15.13.] Such a *Round Number* is very common with all Writers; & not to be wondred at, in the Sacred Ones.

The Subdivisions of this Period, are all found in express Texts of Scripture; except only the Interval of 64 Years, which falls between the Death of *Joseph,* and the Birth of *Moses.*

But in this Period, we meet with Two Remarkable Difficulties.

The First is, The Number of *Ten Children* assign’d unto *Benjamin,* the Youngest of the Patriarchs, at the Descent into *Egypt.*

The Second is, The Grandchildren of *Judah,* namely *Hezron* and *Hamul,* reckon’d among them who descended into *Egypt,* when, according to the Circumstances of the History, as usually understood, they could not be Born at this Time.

Now, first, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that when the Vigor of Mankind was much greater than it is at present, of which the great Length of their Lives is a sufficient Argument, the Ripeness for Procreation might commence earlier, than in our Times. Tis also plain from the Sacred History, that in those Times Men were extreamly desirous of having Children; a Numerous Offspring, especially among the Posterity of *Abraham,* was counted the greatest of Blessings; they had Recourse to Polygamy, and Concubinage, and Incest itself, to supply the Want of it. And yet we may add; There is nothing in either of these Instances, but what might happen in our Age.

*Benjamin* might have his *Ten Children* by several *Wives;* yea, he might have them all by *one Wife;* since he was now, according to Dr. *Usher,* about 27 Years of Age.

The Case of *Judah* calls for more Examination. Tis commonly taken, that *at the*
Time of the Selling of Joseph to the Midianites, that is to say, 22 Years before the Descent into Egypt, he took Shuah to Wife; who successively bare him Three Sons, Er, and Onan, and Shelah. His eldest Son Er, is grown up; he marries Tamar; he Dies by a Divine Stroke. Onan then marries Tamar; and is killed by the Judgments of Heaven. Tamar is to stay, till Shelah come to Ripeness of Years. At this time, her Impatience of having Children puts her on a Method of Impregnation by Judah her Father-in-Law. She bears him Pharez and Zara; and lastly, Pharez begets Hezron and Hamul; and all this before the Descent into Egypt. Now it must be confess’d, if we can allow no more than 22 Years for these Occurrences, tis to no Purpose to seek for a Solution; and if the Time of the Selling of Joseph, be the same with the First Marriage of Judah, it is really inexplicable.42

But we must Remember, That tho’ the Words, At that Time, seem to refer unto the foregoing History of Joseph, yett the Expression is of a much larger Extent in the Language of the Scripture; and includes a great Space of Time. Some have observed, the Phrase used Seventeen times in the Bible, Sine determinatâ aliquâ temporis notatione. It seems to be little more than a Particle of Transition, or a common Way of introducing a New Branch of an History, like the English Particle, Now. I may add; It is enough, that a Part of the Occurrences in this History, (the latter Part of them,) fell out, after the Selling of Joseph, and while he was in Egypt.43

Well; we will now connect Judah’s Marriage, with Jacob’s Return to [47r] Canaan, after his 20 Years Service to Laban; which according to Dr. Usher was 33 Years before the Descent into Egypt. Now suppose Judah at 17 Years of Age, to have his First-born Er, at 18 Onan, at 19 Shelah. Then, when Judah was 32 Years of Age, Er and Onan successively take Tamar to Wife, & perish by the sudden Stroke of Heaven. When Judah, was 33, and Shelah at Years of Puberty, but not married unto Tamar, Judah stumbles into his Incest with her. The next Year, when he was 34, he ha’s Twins by her, Pharez and Zarah; when he was 48, Pharez begets Hezron, and when he was 49, Hamul; who therefore are then reckoned among the rest of the Infants, who came out of Jacob’s Loins, and descended with him into Egypt. Here is nothing, but what might have happened in our Age. As to Judah himself, his Inclinations appear, in that his Wife was no sooner Dead, but he must visit an Harlot. And for Er and Onan, the Words of Judah to Tamar...
seem to intimate, what they were: saies he, Remain a Widow, till Shelah my Son be
grown; for he said, lest peradventure he Dy also as his Brethren did. q.d. “My Sons Er
and Onan, seem to have been the Occasion of their own Ruine, by some indecent
Behaviour, upon their over-hasty Marriages, while they were so young. I’ll therefore send
Tamar, to her Fathers House, till my remaining Son Shelah, arrive at a riper Age before
he marries her.” This appears to have been the Reason of Judahs Delaying the Marriage
of Shelah, upon his First Arrival, at the Age of Puberty; which small Delay was yett born
with such Impatience by Tamar, (who suspected perhaps, he was afraid of ever venturing
his Son with her,) that she immediately procures herself to be with Child, by a wilful
Incest with her Father-in-Law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Dayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>From the Exodus out of Egypt, to the }</td>
<td>480.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation of Solomons Temple. }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Book of Judges ha’s occasion’d wonderful Difficulties in this Period, which were
inexplicable, till Sir John Marsham cleared them. He does it, by stating, which Numbers
are Collateral, and which are Successive. And so he finds Room for Joshua’s
Government to continue 25 Years after the Death of Moses; and 34 Years more for the
Idolatrous Generation, before Cushan, the King of Mesopotamia Tyrannized over them.

We read upon the Death of Eglon, [Judg. 3.30.] The Land had Rest 80 Years. By the
Land, understand the Eastern Part of it, (which had newly been discoursed of, & which
had now shaken off the Yoke of Moab:) and not the whole Land of Israel. For IN THE
MEAN TIME, not only the Philistines, invaded the Western Parts, and had a Repulse by
Shamgar, but also, [Judg. 4.1.] The Children of Israel again did Evil in the Sight of the
Lord, when Ehud was dead, and the Lord sold them into the Hand of Jabin King of
Canaan, that Reigned in Hazor; [in the Tribe of Naphthali] for Twenty Years; tho’ at the
same Time there was Peace enjoy’d in the Eastern Regions. At length, the Northern
Israelites beat Sisera, and the Peace thereby becomes universal; until 40 Years afterward,
the Midianites, and their Allies from the East, conquer all before them. How long Ehud
lived, is no where said; and it is not probable, that he lived 80 Years after the Death of
Eglon. All that we certainly know, is, that the Servitude to the Canaanites did not
commence, till after his Death. We may suppose, that Jabin enslaved Israel, when Ehud was Dead, about 20 Years after the Victory over the Moabites; for the Tyranny of Jabin lasted 20 Years, and the Land had Rest 40 Years afterward. By this Computation, we gain 60 intire Years; whereof 25 must be allow’d unto Joshua, (according to Josephus,) and the remaining 35, to the Idolatrous Generation that succeeded; much such a Space of Time, as was allotted unto the Generation in the Wilderness. In this Part of the Period it was, that every one did what was Right in his own Eyes. And here we are to place the Histories of Micha, and the Danites, and of the War against Benjamin. There are therefore 185 Years, from the Exodus, till Jabins Invasion; and 300 Years from the Death of Moses, to the Incursion of the Ammonites.\footnote{47}

Now, that there should be Different Judges in Different Parts of the Land, and War in one Part, while there was Peace in another, was not a thing Inconsistent with the Civil State of the Israelites at this Time.\footnote{48}

The hasty Distribution of the Land by Lott, before it was throughly subdued, scattered the People and weakened the Government. After this Division, there was no General Assembly of the whole Body. The Aristocracy, which was the Security of the Nation was laid aside.\footnote{49} In Extraordinary Cases, there were Judges raised up. If Prophecy at any time were wanting, Anarchy succeeded. Scarce any of the Judges had Authority over the whole Body of the Nation; They [48v] were the Leaders of such Tribes, as were willing to submitt themselves, unto their Conduct, as they were disposed unto it by Dangers from their Neighbourhood. We have plain Instances of this, in the Armies of Barak, and of Gideon; and in the Double Invasion which happened afterwards, from the Ammonites on the one Quarter, and the Philistines on the other. The War with the Ammonites was managed entirely by Jephtah and his People, that is to say, the Tribes beyond Jordan. The War with the Philistines was managed wholly by the Tribe of Judah. When Judah, by Divine Appointment was praeferr’d before his Brethren, (on which account, the Tribe obtained a larger Portion, & in a more secure Province,) Ambition and Jealousy & Emulation prevailed on both Sides. The Tribes never well united their Forces, or joined in Confederacies, to Resist a common Enemy. Indeed, in the Dayes of Saul, an Army was levied out of the whole Nation; but even then, they were Two Bodies, Israel was one, and Judah another. Upon the Death of Saul, they ran into Factions; the one for
Ishbosheth, the other for David; and this Division became fixed and incurable after the Death of Solomon. Very Different Conditions must thus befall the Tribes, while they had their Separate Interests.  

Well; There yett remain 140 Years to be accounted for. Of these Years, the last 84 belong to Three of the Kings, just before the Foundation of the Temple. There are then 56 Years, left in the Period of the Judges. In that Space, we meet with a Double Servitude of the Israelites; the one to the Ammonites, the other to the Philistines. These two Servitudes were contemporary. They commenced at once, tho’ they did not conclude so. The Idolatries of the Israelites multiplied; The Almighty Doubled their Punishment, and Sent Enemies upon them, both from the East, and from the West. [Judg. 10.6, 7.] The Ammonites Tyrannized indeed, but 18 Years; but the Philistines no less than 40. The Sacred Historian, first præmises a short Mention of both Invasions, because they began in the same Year; and then he proceeds to Relate them distinctly, beginning first with that which would be dispatched soonest. Thus, the Number of Years, which would else increase too much upon us, is brought within Compass, and the Chronology is cleared from all its Difficulties.

On the one side, after the Eighteen Years Tyranny of {the} Ammonites, there are Four Judges, namely, Jephtah, and Ibzan, and Elon, and Abdon. All the Years ascribed unto them, (including the 18 Years of Servitude also) are no more than 49. That Part of the Land, with which these were concerned, was in Peace, after the Tyranny of Ammon was over. In the Times that succeeded, [1. Sam. 7.14.] There was Peace between Israel and the Ammonites.

In the mean time, (during this Rest of the Eastern Parts,) the Violence of the Philistines extended itself in the West, and continued 40 Years. Nor do we find any Mention of a Deliverer from it, before the Time of Samuel, who by gaining that famous Victory at Ebenezer, putt an End unto their Tyranny. [1. Sam. 7.13, 14.] The Hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the Dayes of Samuel. Those Dayes of Samuel, are the Sixteen Years of his Government, before Sauls Inauguration. These were {the} only Years interposed, between the End of the Philistines 40, and the Beginning of the 84 of the Kings. But soon after Sauls Accession to the Crown, (the Second Year of his Reign,) the War began again with the Philistines, & held all the Dayes of Saul. Wherefore,
Samuel began to Judge (in Judah, and the Parts adjacent,) in the last Year of Elon, of the Tribe of Zebulon; and was contemporary with Abdon, of the Tribe of Ephraim.  

We read of Sampson, [Judg. 15.20.] That he Judged Israel Twenty Years in the Dayes of the Philistines; that is to say, within the Space of those 40 Years, wherein they had the Philistines Rulers over them. However, he had not the supreme Power; nor did he deliver the Israelites, but was by his own People delivered into the hands of the Philistines.

Nor ought we to look on Eli as a Deliverer. He lost the Ark; and he died in the Twentieth Year of the Servitude unto the Philistines; Twenty Years before the Victory at Ebenezer. His Power of a Judge, was no other than that of an High-Priest; and like that of Deborah, when she Judged Israel under the Palm-tree; or like that of the Successors to Gideon and Jephtah in times of Peace; or, like that of the Sons of Samuel, whom he made Judges over Israel; or, lastly, like that of Samuel himself, after the anointing of Saul, who still Judged Israel all the Dayes of his Life; and Josephus tells us, that was Eighteen Years; but indeed it was many more.

We find among the Tyrians, That Judges were constituted over them, after the old City on the Continent, was destroy’d by Nebuchadnezzar. [49r] They were confined unto an Island; and these Judges were successively their Governours. Among the Carthaginians, (a Colony of the Tyrians) the Order of Judges had the Dominion, & chiefly præserved it in their own Hands, because they were during Life. These Judges are called Suffetes, by Livy; Cum suffetes ad jus dicendum consedissent. Thus our Judges are called, Sophetim, i.e. Suffetes. The Word signifies, one who Avenges the Cause of a People, or Delivers them out of the hand of their Enemies.

Hence, the Apostle Paul, [Act. 13.20.] mentioning 450 Years, for the Time of the Judges, only used a Number then commonly ascribed unto this Time among the Jews; (which we also find in Josephus’s Account of this Period:) But he uses a Particle, As it were, or, As it commonly seems, which intimates, that an Accurate Chronology was not intended in this Account of it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Dayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, is abundantly established, by the famous Prophecies of Ezekiel, touching the utmost Extent of the Divine Patience to Israel and Judah. [Ezek. 4.4, 5, 6.] Ezekiel is to bear the Iniquity of Israel, lying on his Left Side, 390 Dayes; & to bear the Iniquity of Judah, lying on his Right Side, 40 Dayes; and the Lord saies, I have appointed thee Each Day for a Year. The plain Meaning is this; That the longest Time of the uninterrupted Idolatry of the Israelites, and of Gods Patience with them, from the First Idolatrous Feast of Jeroboam, till the Final Captivity of the Ten Tribes by Nebuchadnezzar, should be 390 Years. And that the longest Time of the uninterrupted Idolatry of Judah, and of Gods Patience with them; till the Final Captivity of the last Remains of the Two Tribes, by the same Nebuchadnezzar, should be 40 Years. All that can here be question’d, is, whether the Captivity of the Remnant, which happened in the twenty third Year of Nebuchadnezzar, which we have here assign’d, as the Conclusion of the 390 Years of the House of Israel, was of the Remainder of the Ten, and not rather of the Two Tribes. If it belong to the Ten Tribes, we have what we desire. If it be only of the Two, we are at a mighty Loss. The Reason of the Doubt is; The Historian ha’s call’d them Jewes; Jer. 52.30. In the Twenty third Year of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan Captain of the Guard, carried away captive of the Jewes, Seven hundred and forty five Persons. But we must observe, that all the Remainders of the Twelve Tribes, have been styled Jewes in common, ever since the Babylonish Captivity, and are so styled at this Day. These Jewes were Israelites; remaining in those Parts of the Land, which belonged unto the Ten Tribes. They are styled Ezek. 33.24. The Inhabitants of the Wasts of the Land of Israel. And their Mountains are called, Vers. 28. The Mountains of Israel. This Captivity happened, at the Time that Nebuchadnezzar was besieging of Tyrus; now, t’was the Land of Israel, and not of Judah, that adjoined unto Tyrus, and so was the likeliest to afford him an Opportunity of carrying its Inhabitants into Captivity.58 Yea, we are certain, that all the Reliques of the Two Tribes, were not now in the Land of Judah, but in the Land of Egypt, and so could not possibly be led into Captivity until the Conquest of Egypt afterwards. [Consider, Jer. 43.4, 5, 6, 7.]59

We will proceed now to consider the Difficulties, which occur in the several Intervals of this Period.
1. From the Foundation of the Temple, to the Beginning of the Reign of Rehoboam, was, 36 Years, & 5 Months. How many odd Months are to be allow’d here, and in other parallel Cases, is not for the most Part expressly noted in the Sacred Scripture: But it is to be collected from the exact Adjustment and Connection of the Reigns of one King with another, & to be fetched from the Tables of their Reigns.\textsuperscript{60} And indeed, it highly deserves, not only our Observation, but our Admiration, that those many Texts of the Scripture, where the Reigns of the Kings of one Kingdome are adjusted unto those of the other, and which have generally for Want of due Attention been look’d upon as the Causes of Abundance of Difficulties, in the Sacred Chronology, are in themselves really so far from being so, that they generally help us to state the Accounts of each Reign much more accurately, and that commonly even to a Single Month. The Seeming Contradictions of the Scripture-Accounts do at last appear, but so many Proofs of their greater Accuracy. In that which looks like a Carelessness in the Chronology of the Bible, there ly Helps to state it more Nicely and more Accurately, than the most Accurate Monuments of other Antiquity can enable us to do in any profane History whatsoever.\textsuperscript{61}

2. From the Beginning of the Reign of Rehoboam, to the Beginning of the Reigns of Athaliah and Jehu, was 90 Years, and 6 Months.\textsuperscript{62}

There is a New Hypothesis to be considered, for the Reconciling of the Years of the Two Kingdoms, in this Interval. And that is [50v] This. The Year used by the People of God, was either a True Solar Year, or a Lunar one so adjusted by proper Intercalations, as to be æquivalent unto it. The Julian Year is so near to it, as to leave little Difference. But when Jeroboam drew the Ten Tribes to Idolatry, he took the Year, which was used by all the Idolatrous Nations of the Neighbourhood; a Year, which was a Month shorter than that of Judah, and contained but Eleven Months. The Annals of the Ten Tribes were carried on by such a vagrant Year, until Jehu’s Revolution. This one Observation being applied, will produce a most perfect Accord, between the Annals of Judah, and of Israel, for this Interval; which else will be clog’d with horrid Encumbrances.\textsuperscript{63}

We will pass on to certain particular Difficulties.

First; The Sacred Historian makes Jehoshaphat Reign 25 Years; But the same Historian assures us, That his Son Jehoram did begin to Reign during his Fathers
Life-time; and we shall find, it was 3 Years before his Fathers Death. Accordingly, we reckon only 22 Years to Jehoshaphat, in our Successive Chronology.64

Secondly; Ahaziah King of Judah, in one Text, begins his Reign in the Eleventh Year of Jehoram King of Israel; in another Text, not until the Twelfth. Now consider the Circumstances of his Father a little before his Death, & you will see this Epocha, most highly agreeable to the History. We read; [2. Chron. 21.18, 19.] The Lord smote him in his Bowels, with an Incureable Disease. And after, (or rather, about) the End of two Years, his Bowels fell out by reason of his Sickness; so he died of Sore Diseases. From this Incureable Disease in his Bowels, there would naturally arise, the making of his Son a Partner in the Kingdom, & the committing of the public Administration unto him, some time before his Death. And the Different Phrases used on the Different Beginnings of the Sons Reign, lead us to acknowledge this Observation.65

Thirdly; Omri King of Israel, in one Place, begins his Reign, in the 27th of Asa; in another Place, not until the 31st of Asa. And his Reign is 12 Years in all; but no more than 6 in Tirzah.66 The Case was plainly thus. In the 27th of Asa, Omri is made King over Israel, upon the Conspiracy of Zimri; and being accompanied by the Body of the People, he besieges Tirzah, where Zimri then was; and in Seven Days takes the City, and puts an End unto Zimris Power and Life at once. Upon the Death of Zimri, the People of Israel were Divided into Two Parts; Half of the People followed Tibni, to make him King, and Half of them followed Omri. After a Four Years War for the Crown, the People that follow’d Omri prevailed, and Tibni died, & Omri reigned without Molestation.67 So, tis no Wonder, we have a double Epocha, for the Reign of Omri, and of the Twelve Years he Reign’d in all, only Six were in Tirzah. Four were spent, before he gott the Royal City of Tirzah, from his Rival; Two were spent after his leaving Tirzah, and making Samaria the Royal Seat of his Kingdom. The Thirty first Year of Asa, was the Year of his taking Tirzah.68

3. From the Beginning of the Reigns of Athaliah and Jehu, to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, is, 163. Years, and, 2. Months.69

We will address ourselves, to solve the chronological Difficulties of this Interval. Tho’ Jehoahaz of Israel died not until the 39th Year of Joash of Judah, yett the same Historian, makes the Successor, namely Joash of Israel, to begin his Reign at the
37th of Joash of Judah.70 We must therefore suppose, that Joash began to Reign Two Years before the Death of his Father. But is there in the Sacred History, any Hint of this Matter? Yes. We read, [2. King. 13.3 &c] That the Kings of Syria oppressed Israel all the Dayes of Jehoahaz; And yett, we find, that upon his Petition for Deliverance, God heard his Prayer, and gave Israel a Saviour. This was Joash, the Son of Jehoahaz, a mighty and a valiant Man, who during his Fathers Life-time, recovered the Cities which his Father had lost, & restored Peace to the Nation. These Different Affirmations are best Reconciled, by supposing, That his Father, upon his constant Ill Success against the Syrians, resign’d Part of the Royal Authority to him, and made him the General of his Army. After which beginning of the Sons Administration, affayrs were altered, & those Enemies, who during the Fathers Government were alwayes Conquerors, were now conquered by the Son, and at last were driven out of the Land.71

Secondly. Amaziah King of Judah, is said, to Reign in the Second of [51r] Joash; that is, in the Seventeenth of Jehoahaz, of Israel. And yett his Father died not, until above a Year after the Death of Jehoahaz. In this Case again, we must suppose, that Amaziah, began to Reign, above a Year, before the Death of his Father. But we will admitt no such Supposition, without a Foundation for it, in some Expression of the Sacred Scripture. Behold, a notable one on this Occasion! What is the Importance of that Phrase, [2. King. 14.5.] of, The Kingdomes being confirmed in his Hand? But that, upon the Death of his Father, he was again Inaugurated into his Kingdome?72 He undertook the Sole Administration of Affairs, which he had before administred Jointly with his Father. The Phrase is of this Importance, in two other Instances. [Compare, 2. Chron. 1.1. and, 21.4.]73

Thirdly. The Beginning of the Reign of Uzziah, (or Azariah) of Judah, must needs fall into the 16th Year of Jeroboam II. if his Reign be accounted from his Fathers Death; and yett it is said to begin in the 27th Year of Jeroboam. This drives us, to seek a Double Epocha, for the Reign of Jeroboam; and the Sacred History gives us a shrewd Intimation of such a Thing! Upon the Death of Jehoahaz, we find his Son Joash, paying a Visit unto the Prophet Elisha; and the Prophet then discoursing on the affairs of the War with Syria, wherein Joash had already been very successful, foretels, That he should be successful in but Three Campaigns more against them. Accordingly Joash governs alone, and
prosecutes the War, for the Three Years ensuing. When those Three Years expired, because he could no longer expect Success himself, & because his Father had so done before him, he does entrust the Command of the Army and a Share in the Government, with his Son Jeroboam, who was doubtless a Prince of great Hopes, and proved afterwards the most potent and glorious of the Kings of Israel. Accordingly the First Date of his Reign, appears Eleven Years before the Death of his Father.\textsuperscript{74}

Fourthly. We suppose an Interregnum, in the Kingdome of Israel, after the Death of Jeroboam II. and another, after the Death of Pekah. Answering to 163 Years, and 2 Months, of the Kingdome of Judah, we find but 143 Years & some odd Months in the Kingdome of Israel.\textsuperscript{75} It must therefore be observed, That Hoshæa began his First Imperfect Reign, upon his Murder of his Predecessor Pekah, Eight or Nine Years before his real Dominion, and the true Date of his Reign, in the Royal City, commenced. We read, 2. King. 15.30. \textit{Hoshæa made a Conspiracy against Pekah, and Smote him, & Slew him, & Reigned in his Stead, in the Twentieth Year of Jotham the Son of Uzziah.} That is to say, In the Fourth of Ahaz. For Jotham himself Reigned but Sixteen Years in all. But because there had yett no mention been made of Ahaz’s Reign, therefore the old Epocha of his Predecessor Jotham is still made use of. But we also read, 2. King. 17.1. \textit{In the Twelfth Year of Ahaz King of Judah, began Hoshæa to Reign in Samaria, over Israel, Nine Years.} Again; After the Death of Jeroboam II. we also find a Deficiency of several Years. And the two very short Reigns afterwards, which were over in Seven Months, and both the Kings came to untimely Deaths, are sufficient Indications of a very unsettled State of Affairs. But that which renders an Interregnum here very little short of certain, is, the Divine Threatning in the Words of Hosæa the Prophet, who prophecied in the Reign of Jeroboam II. Hos. 10.3. \textit{Now (or, e’re long) they shall say, we have no King, because we feared not the Lord. What then should a King do unto us?} This prophetical Intimation of an Interregnum, is very observable!\textsuperscript{76}

Nevertheless, there are some Texts, which do not seem to favour the Interregna mentioned. We read, 2. King. 14.29. \textit{Jeroboam slept with his Fathers, & Zachariah his Son Reigned in his Stead.} And, 2. King. 15.30. \textit{Hoshæa made a Conspiracy against Pekah, & Smote him & Slew him, and Reigned in his Stead.} But it is no Wonder, that upon the Death of a King, he, who during the Interval fought for the Kingdome, and at
last obtained it, is in some sense said to Reign in his stead, all that time; as Reigning over Part of the People; tho’ his full Reign in the Royal City receive not its Date, until his peaceable Possession of the Crown, and his Dominion in the Royal City did commence afterwards. Tis enough, that during these Confusions, they had a greater Share of the Royal Authority, than any others; and when they obtained the Royal City, the Scripture takes notice of it, and the true Dates of their Reigns are derived from it. 77

In this Interval, we have an unusual Instance of Early Ripeness. [52v] Ahaz is no more than Twenty Years old, when he began to Reign. He Reigns not quite Fifteen Years before his Son Hezekiah begins to Reign. Yett Hezekiah himself was then Twenty Five Years old. Whence it will follow, that Hezekiah was born, when his Father was hardly Eleven Years old. This would be thought strange in our Age and Climate. And no doubt, it was an unusual Instance in Judæa itself, seeing we have not in the whole Bible such another. Possibly the Inhabitants of those hotter Countreys, come to Maturity sooner than in ours. Tis very certain, that Mahomet, in Arabia, a Region bordering on Judæa, married one of his Wives, when she was but Six Years old, and bedded her in Two afterwards. 78 But there have not been wanting Exemples in the more Northern Regions, of as early Ability for Procreation, as that in Ahaz; which therefore ought not to seem Incredible. My Author will give me Leave to add, That the modern Travellers assure us, The People of Java at this day commonly marry & have Children at Nine or Ten Years of age; and generally leave Childbearing at or before Thirty. 79

It is also to be noted, That Chronology obliges us, to place the Reign of Hezekiah, a little before the Death of his Father Ahaz; But it was a very little while; so little an one as to afford very little Occasion for any Historical Relations. And this is the only Instance of a Double Epocha for a Reign, without some Intimation of it, in Sacred History. 80

4. From the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, to the Conflagration of the Temple, is, 134 Years & 2 Months. This Account, will arise from the plain Summ of the Years of the Kings of Judah. And the 23 Years allow’d therein, from the 13th of Josiah, to the Great Captivity of the Jewes, in the 4th of Jehojakim, have in the Scripture, a very express Remark upon them. [See Jer. 25.1, 3.] 81

But it is from that 4th of Jehojakim, and from the Beginning of the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar, that we are to date the 70 Years of the Captivity of the Jewes. 82 This
was the Main Captivity; tis that, whereof we read, 2. King. 24.3. *This came upon Judah, to remove them out of the Sight of God.* Tho’ the Number of the Captives, is no where declared in the Scripture, yet it is evident, the Main Body of the Two Tribes, were now captivated. The Number of the Captives under Jehojachin is recorded, and it is plainly no more than a Remnant of the whole People; no more than 10000, the Reliques of the ancient Inhabitants. The last Captivity under Zedekiah, when the Temple was burnt, was chiefly confined unto Three Strong Holds; as being the only Places of Note and of Strength, which were then remaining; so that the Body of the Nation was already removed unto Babylon. And it was also in this Fourth Year of Jehojakim, that the Prophet Jeremiah, received and uttered, the Prophecy of the Seventy Years. See Jer. 25.1, 11, 12. Moreover, The Subjection to the King of Babylon for Seventy Years, was not peculiar to the Jewes only, but common to them with all the other Nations about them, as the Prophecy of Jeremiah intimates. Now, tis evident from a known Fragment of Berosus, that the famous Expedition of Nebuchadnezzar, in which he conquered all these Nations, was before his Fathers Death, in the Beginning of his Reign; and not at either of the following Captivities. By Ptolomies Canon, compared with Xenophon, there are from this Captivity, to the Beginning of Cyrus’s Monarchy, when the Solution of the Captivity happened, just 70 Years. And certainly all these things together, place the Matter beyond all Disputation.—

This hinders not, but that the other Captivities, may be Epocha’s, from which those who then went into Babylon, or others, upon proper Occasions, might reckon. Daniel was carried away in the First Captivity, and he mentions no other. Ezekiel was carried away in the Second; (with Jehojachin:) and he reckons from that.

And this is no Prejudice to a like Number of 70 Years, from the Beginning of the Siege of Jerusalem under Zedekias, till the Second Year of Darius; [Zech. 1.7—13.] nor to the Duration of the Two famous Annual Fasts of the Jewes. [Zech. 7.1, 5.] These Periods, were not those intended in the Prophecy of Jeremiah; nor should they create us any Difficulties about it.

We may here also observe the Importance of the Three Lesser Captivities of the Jewes, mention’d by the Prophet Jeremiah, which have been by some unreasonably expounded of the Three Greater, under Jehojakim, and Jehojachin, and Zedekiah. The
Words are these. [Jer. 52.27—30.] *This is the People whom Nebuchadnezzar carried captive. In the Seventh Year, 3023 Jewes. In the Eighteenth Year of Nebuchadnezzar, he carried away captive from Jerusalem 832 Persons. In the Twenty third Year of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan Captain of the Guard, carried away captive of the Jewes 745 Persons. All the Persons were 4600.* Now the Three Greater Captivities were in the First, the Eighth, and the Nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar; and therefore we may be sure, they were wholly [53r] different from those which were in the Seventh, the Eighteenth, and the Twenty Third. The Smallness of the Numbers in the Three Lesser Captivities is also enough to distinguish them from the Three Greater ones. The First of these Captivities, in the Seventh Year of Nebuchadnezzar, was of 3023 Persons. It was Three Years after Jehojakim, by breaking the League he had made with him, had exposed himself unto his Fury, and Bands of Chaldaens, & Syrians, and Moabites and Ammonites, came upon him; and it was out of the whole Body of the Jewes, not confined unto the Inhabitants of Jerusalem. The Second, which was of 832 Persons, was during the Siege of Jerusalem, which happened in the Eighteenth Year of Nebuchadnezzar; And this was made up of the Inhabitants of Jerusalem only, or of such as fell away to the Chaldaens according to the Counsel of God, and so had their Lives given unto them. The Third was of 745 Jewes; that is to say, of such Reliques of the Ten Tribes, as at this time remained in their own Land. These were carried away captive, by an Officer of Nebuchadnezzar, while he himself was besieging of Tyre, in their Neighbourhood.⁸⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Dayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI. From the Conflagration of the Temple,} to the Beginning of the Christian Æra,}</td>
<td>587.</td>
<td>4. 00.⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nebuchadnezzar began to Reign in his Fathers Life-time; near two Years and an half, before his First Thoth in the Canon of Ptolomy; And his Reign is Dated in the Scripture accordingly, That Nebuchadnezzar was made Partner in the Kingdome, with his Father Nabopolassar, upon his coming General of his Army into Syria, is justly collected from several Passages in Berosus, which are extant at this Day in our Hands. But the Bible ha’s rendred it yett more unquæstionable.⁸⁹
The Two First Years ascribed unto *Cyrus* in the Canon of *Ptolomy*, are by the Scriptures ascribed unto *Darius* the Mede; and this agrees exactly with the Account given by *Xenophon*. It is well-known, from the Book of *Daniel*, that after the Conquest of *Belshazzar*, or *Nabonadius*, King of the *Chaldeans*, and the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyaxares*, or *Darius* the Mede, and *Cyrus* the Persian, this *Darius took the Kingdom* for some Time before his Death, and the Succession of *Cyrus*. But the *Canon*, taking no Notice of *Darius*, ascribes all the Space after the taking of *Babylon*, or the Death of *Nabonadius*, to the Monarchy of *Cyrus*, & accordingly gives him *Nine Years*. Nevertheless, *Xenophon* who was perfectly acquainted with the History of *Cyrus*, assigns but *Seven Years* unto his Monarchy. The Year therefore, when *Cyrus* made his Decree for the Return of the Jewes, was the *Third Year* of his Reign in the *Canon*; and its first *Thoth* was, Jan. 5. 4178.

*Jehojakims* Captivity happened near the Middle of A.M. 3398. which was the First of *Nebuchadnezzar*. *Jehoachins* Captivity happened near the Beginning of *July*; A.M. 3405. and towards the Conclusion of the Eighth of *Nebuchadnezzar*, in the Scripture-Account.

*Zedekiahs* Captivity, and the Conflagration of the Temple, happened about *August*; A.M. 3416; at the End of the Nineteenth Year of *Nebuchadnezzar* in the Scripture-Account.

The Beginning of *Ezekiels* 390 Years of Gods Patience with the *Ten* Tribes, was at *Jeroboams* Idolatrous Feast, about the Middle of *November*, towards the Beginning of A.M. 3030. And so their Conclusion was towards the Beginning of A.M. 3420. Now that Captivity, of the Remnant of the *Israelites*, which putt a Period unto these 390 Years, was in the 23\textsuperscript{d} of *Nebuchadnezzar*.

The Beginning of *Ezekiels* 40 Years of Gods Patience with the *Two* Tribes, was at the Death of King *Josiah*, towards the latter Part of A.M. 3394. And so their Conclusion was towards the latter Part of A.M. 3434. Now it appears by the profane Chronology, that *Nebuchadnezzar* then conquered *Egypt*, and carried away with him, the Remnants of the *Two* Tribes, which had Retired thither.

The Solution of the Captivity, in the Beginning of *Cyrus’s* Monarchy, happened 70 Years after the main Captivity; and near the Middle of A.M. 3468.97

The Beginning of the 70 Years current, of *Gods Indignation against Jerusalem & the Cities of Judah*, was at the Return of the *Chaldaens* to besiege those Places, after the Flight of the *Egyptians*; About the End of *May*; A.M. 3415. And so their Conclusion must be between the same Time of the Year; A.M. 3484, and, 3485. Now the Time of the mention of these 70 Years, was towards the End of *February*, in the Second Year of *Darius Hystaspis* in the *Canon*.98

[54v] The Commencing of the 70 Years current Duration, of two *Jewish Annual Fasts*, for the Destruction of the Temple in the *Fifth* Month, and the Murder of *Gedaliah* in the *Seventh*, was at the Time of those Disasters; in the last Month but one, of A.M. 3416. and the First of A.M. 3417. And so their Conclusion, must be; for the one, between A.M. 3485; and 3486: For the other, between A.M. 3486, and 3487.99

In the famous Astronomical *Canon* which upon all the Experiments imaginable, we find to be Incontestable, the Year of the Conflagration of the Temple, namely, A.M. 3416. answers to the Year of the *Julian Period*, 4126. To this add, 587 Years, and 4 Months, and we come to the End of A.P.I. 4713. And it is well known to all Chronologers, That this was the very Year præceding the *Christian Æra*.100

This may suffice for a short View of, *The Chronology of the Old Testament*. — The learned Gentleman from whose Labours I have extracted it, has in this one short View, so established every thing, as to putt an End unto Thousands of Disputations, and to render many and bulky Volumns, on these Points, altogether superfluous. For my Part, I have done with ’em!101
Q: A Just Paraphrase on the First Chapter of *Genesis*, agreeable to the Modern Discoveries?

A: Take what Mr. *Pyles* has given us.

1. The World did not exist from all Eternity, by Necessity of Nature, nor did it, or any Part of it, come into being by chance and Fortune, but all things whatever, whether Visible or Invisible, Material, or Immaterial were in the beginning created, by the Power of that infinitely Wise, Good, and Alsufficient being whom we call GOD.

2. And being now by divine direction to give Such a Particular Account of the Creation of our Earth, and of those Parts, that have a Special Relation to it, as may be Sufficient toward our Religious Acknowledgment of the Great Creator; I observe in general, that its Materials were at first at the time when this Account begins, in a confus’d, and disorderly State, consisting of an Irregular Mixture of Solids and Fluids thrown together: and were reduced into the Beautifull order wherein we now behold them by the Powerfull Operation of the Divine Spirit in the following Manner, within the Space of Six Days.

3, 4, 5) Preparatory to which, the first thing done, was such a Separation of the gross and heavier, from the lighter, and more fine Parts of the Chaos, as might in a good measure prepare the Earth (as in like Manner the rest of the Planets) for the Reception of Light, from the Sun, and Stars, for the use and benefits of its inhabitants, and by its Warmth to nourish the Plants, and animals it was to be stored withal. And then by Means of regular, & proper Motions, to cause a Continual Succession of Light, and Darkness upon the Several Parts of the Earth. These Causes and Effects obey’d the Will of the Almighty Creator, who saw them most Perfectly to answer the Wise and Good Ends He designed them for: this was the Work of the first Day; and hence is dated the Beginning of our Day and Night.

6, 7, 8) Within the Space of one Natural Day more, this Separation was brought to Such a degree of Perfection that the Main bulk of the heavier Fluids were Sunk down toward a Center, while a Considerable Number of their lighter Parts remained Suspended above, at Some distance from the Earth, in Clouds or Vapours kept up...
there, and continually Supplied by Exhalations from the Waters of the Earth; So that there appeared between these Clouds above, and the great Collections of Waters below, a free, lightsome, and open Space, Strecth’t, as it were over the whole Surface, and this is what we call, the Firmament, or Air, or Atmosphære, or Heaven.

(9, 10) These lower Waters thus collected and Spred over the Surface of the Earth, were in the Next Place, to be gathered closer together, and thrown into their Proper Receptacles to uncover, and leave dry the rest of the Earth, and form the whole into a Terraqueous Globe fitted for the Maintenance of Such Plants, and Animals, wherewith its Several Parts of Land, and Waters were to be Provided. Accordingly these Waters were, by divine Power made to Subside in the Caverns, and Channels provided for them making the distinction we now See between Sea, and Land, wisely Proportioned, and Exactly adapted to the Good Ends they were designed for.

(11. 12. 13.) For Now those Parts of the Globes, that were drained of their Waters, and Exposed to the kind Influences of Increasing Light, were in a Condition to Nourish that Great Variety of Grass, Herbs, trees, & Plants wherewith GOD had Stored them, giving to Each of these Vegetables its proper Seed for the Propagation of its Kind, and accordingly, they now began to Shoot and Grow up for the Sustenance and Gratification of the Animals Providence intended them for, and for the benefit whereof they were most wisely contrived, and these two things took up the Work of the Third Day.

(14. 15.) The Sun, and Stars which at the first Separation of the Earths Materials, began (but imperfectly) to Shed their Light, and Influences, on it were, by the End of the Fourth [56v] Day, (the Air, or Atmosphære being compleat and Clear) come to their full Lustre; and appeared those Perfectly luminous and Splendid Globes we now See them to be, and came in all respects, to Serve the wise Purposes the Creator intended them for, with Relation to this our Earth, and its Inhabitants, Particularly those of Making the distinctions between Day, and Night; with that Gratefull Variety of Seasons, Spring & Summer, Autumn, & Winter of which the Year Consists; all which they most regularly Produce by their Revolutions to or from us,
as their Motions are with respect to the Earth, or those of the Earth with respect to
them, thus Successively and constantly to consist to the End of the World.

(16.) Among these Glorious Luminaries The Wise Creator appointed two that by their
Proportionate apparent bigness, distance, and Situation, should be of Special use,
and Benefit to this our Earth, viz. the Sun, by his Presence in the Daytime, to give
his comfortable and full Light, by Suitable turns to the Inhabitants of its Several
Parts, and to Nourish its Plants, and animals: and the Moon along with the other
Stars of greater distance, and less apparent light, to Supply in Some Measure the
Suns Absence, and to allay the Darkness of the Night.

(17. 18. 19.) All these bodies GOD placed, & ranged at Such convenient Distances with
respect of their bigness and the Powers they have on other Bodies about them, &
ordered the Revolutions between them and this our Earth with Such Perfect
Wisdom and Proportion as compleatly answered these, and all other Good Purposes
His Providences foresaw, and graciously intended them for. And thus concluded the
Work of the Fourth Day. 105

(20. 21.) The Waters being now fitted to recieve and nourish Such Creatures as were by
divine Wisdome intended to inhabit them, were upon the fifth Day Stored with all
the Various Kinds of Such fish as dwell only in that Element; and of Such Fowl as
Swim upon and feed in the Water, or fly about in open Air; At the Same time were
produced those vast, & bulky Creatures, Such as the whale, the Crocodile and
others of the large and Uncommon Size together with every Species of Water
Animals; fish, or fowl some whereof live wholly in the Sea, or rivers, while others
of an Amphibious Nature, can Subsist either by land or waters. 106

(22. 23.) To all these GOD was pleased to give a Power and inclination to Propagate their
kind, and in Such degrees to Increase, and multiply as might best Serve the wise
Purposes they were Created for. Causing the fishes to Spawn in Such Abundance,
as is Proportionable to the vast compass of waters inhabited by them and the Fowls
thô in less Numbers, yett Sufficient to replenish the Places they were to live in. All
and Each of them is so perfect, and exact a Measure as was suitable to the Natures,
and might best answer the uses, and necessities of Mankind.
(24. 25.) In like Manner the Dry land being now furnished with Grass, Herbs, and Plants, and all provision for the Maintenance of land animals, the Creation of these was the Next Work of the Divine Workmanship. On the Sixth day therefore were Produced all the Several kinds of Beasts wild, and tame; with all the Innumerable train of Reptile Species, whether Such as creep on their Belly as worms & Serpents, or Such as by the Shortness of their leg seem to Creep, or Such as creep, and fly, as flyes, bees, Wasps these were by the almighty Power all framed out of the Earth, as the fish, fowl, and all Water Animals were out of the Preexisting Matter of the Water; brought out in their full, and perfect Growth; endowed with the faculty of propagating, preserving and continuing their Several Species by generation, in Such numbers, and Methods, as were most agreeable [57r] to the wise Purposes of their existence.

(26, 27.) Thus was our Earth compleatly finished in both its Parts of Sea and land: all this fair and plentifull Provision being designed for the Use and Enjoyment of a Race of Creatures noble and excellent. This was mankind; the first Pair whereof were created upon the Conclusion of this Sixth Day; consisting indeed of a Body made out of the Earth, but by almighty Power, and Wisdom wrought into a most lovely, and exquisite Frame; and of a Soul united to it, of Immaterial Spiritual, and Immortal Substance, endowed with the admirable Faculties of understanding will, and freedom of Choice for the government of all his Actions and Passions, and his Continual Improvement in Purity Wisdom, and Happiness. Thus qualified to be the Lord of this Earth, and in these respects made the faint Image, and Resemblance of his Creator, to whose glory he was to enjoy all the Furniture, and to have Dominion over the Creatures of the lower world.

(28.) In them therefore in common with other Animals, the Almighty implanted the inclination, and Power of propagating by generation in order to replenish the World with Men, & Women; under whose Subjection he putt all the Several Species of Creatures; giving them the Privilidge of cultivating and improving the Earth into a Pleasant habitation for themselves by Subduing the more Wild, and unruly Kinds of Animals, and (afterwards) granting them free use of Such of them as were proper for their Food, and Nourishment.
(29, 30.) For in the Primitive and Pure Condition of mankind after his first Creation, and when the Earth continued in its original State of fertility, The Fruits Herbs Plants and Trees afforded nourishment most Pleasant and Sufficient for Man, as well as for all other Creatures; and were accordingly, now at first, appointed them for their food.

(31.) And thus with Creation of Man was this our World compleately finish’d at the End of the Sixth Day: and all its Parts appeared in the most Perfect Manner to answer the excellent Purposes of the all Powerfull, and Wise GOD, by whose Good Providence it is continually Supported, governed and preserved.  

[58v blank]
Q. Wee must grant that a Divine \textit{Inspiration,} directed the Pen of \textit{Moses,} to single out what should bee \textit{True} and \textit{Fitt} in his Writing of his \textit{Genesis;} but wee may suppose also, an \textit{Use of credible Tradition,} in handing down unto him those famous Memorables: I pray, what was there in the Circumstances of this \textit{Tradition,} to render it the more credible unto all Gain-Sayers? v. 1.

A. You know the Father of \textit{Moses,} was \textit{Amram,} the Son of \textit{Levi.} Now, \textit{Levi} lived \textit{Thirty Three Years with Isaac; Isaac} lived \textit{Fifty Years with Shem; Shem} lived \textit{an Hundred Years with Methusela; Methusela} lived \textit{Two Hundred and Threescore Years} with \textit{Adam.} So that from \textit{Adam} to \textit{Moses,} the Course of Tradition, in the Families of the Faithful, ran so easily & certainly along, as to render the Truth of it un\textit{quéstionable,} tho’ the greater Assurance of \textit{Inspiration} had not been thereunto superadded.\textsuperscript{109}

Q. The Antiquitie of the \textit{Mosaic Writings,} in Comparison of others, What is it? v. 1.
A. That the Writings of \textit{Moses,} were most Ancient and Long before all others, is proved by several of our \textit{Ancients.} You may Date his Books about A.M. 2460. which was more than 400 Years before the \textit{Trojan War;} but before that War, wee hear not of any Writers whatsoever; yea, it was not until above a 1000 Years after it, that the oldest Historian appeared, except you’l take those Fabulous Ones, \textit{Dares Phrygius,} and \textit{Dictys Cretensis,} to bee otherwise than what they are.\textsuperscript{110}

There were some other Books of the Old Testament, which were also before the Writings of any Pagans whatsoever.\textsuperscript{111} They\textsuperscript{112} tell us, that \textit{Zoroastres,} and \textit{Mercurius Trismegistus,} flourished in the Dayes of \textit{Moses;} but you’l find no less than four \textit{Zoroastres}’s, unto which of whom, none can tell to ascribe the Composures that go under that Name: and about \textit{Hermes Trismegistus,} there are so many Disputes, that wee can tell neither when hee lived, nor whether hee composed any Books at all.\textsuperscript{113}

\textit{Manetho, or, Manethos,} who writ the \textit{Egyptian History,} lived but in the Time of \textit{Ptolomæus Philadelphus.} The \textit{Phaenician Antiquities,} written in their Tongue, by
Sanchoniathon, turned into Greek by Philo Biblius, in the Dayes of Adrian (of which Version, Eusebius ha’s preserved us a famous Fragment) tho’ Scaliger go to prove them suppositional; Bochart ha’s prov’d them Genuine. But still this Phœnician Author, for his Date, must come far short of Moses.\textsuperscript{114}

[60v] If the Friar Annius, ha’s imposed on the World, under the Name of Berosus, the Chaldæan; yett there was an old Berosus, of whom Josephus and Eusebius have preserved Fragments. However, hee lived not so early as Moses; nor any earlier than Manetho.\textsuperscript{115}

Orpheus and Musæus, the oldest of the Greek Poets, pretend for the Dayes of Gideon; but still this was 200 Years after Moses. Dares Phrygius, and Dictys Cretensis, who write the Trojan War, pretend not until 200 Years after them; and an 100 Years after this, is the oldest Pretence of Homer, and 150 Years after David, the better Poet.\textsuperscript{116}

The Greeks had no sooner gott Letters, but they fell to Writing of meer Fables: for which Cause, Eusebius complains, That there was nothing but Fables in their Histories, before the Beginning of the Olympiads, or the Epoch from the Instauration of those famous Games by Iphitus. But Men can’t agree, when to commence this Epoch; whether in the Time of Uzziah K. of Judah. A.M. 3173. or A.M. 3189. Eight Years before the Birth of Romulus & Remus, & 407 Years after The Destruction of Troy, or, about A.M. 3228. or, A.M. 3256. about 750 Years before Christ. Varro’s Division of Times, into Unknown, and Fabulous, and Historical, the last of which, hee begins at the Olympiads, does illustrate this Matter.\textsuperscript{117}

The most ancient Greek Historians, Archilochus, Aristæas Proconnesius, Hecateus Milesius, &c have nothing of their Histories preserved. Herodotus is the oldest Greek Historian extant; & therefore called, The Father of History: But his Historical Relations, begin a little before the Histories of Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel make an End.

Briefly, consult Clemens Alexandrinus, and you’ll see this Argument largely prosecuted.\textsuperscript{118}

Q. Does Pagan Antiquitie, take any Notice, of Moses, the first Penman of the Sacred Scripture? v. 1.
A. Yes. This was he, that is by Orpheus called, Ὑδογενὴς, alluding to his Name of Mosheh, [Exod. 2.10.] which was given him on the Score of his being Drawn out of the Water.

Besides this, Alexander Polyhistor, Philochorus, Thallus, Appion (cited by Justin Martyr) Manethon and Numenius (quoted by Origen and Eusebius) Lysimachus and Molon (allledged by Josephus), Chalcidius, Sanchoniathon, Justin, & Pliny (in Porphyrius) do all celebrate him. ¹¹⁹

And Moses, is by Diodorus the Sicilian, placed in the front, of his famous Law-givers; only a little disguised under the Name of Μνευης; who, hee sais, received his Lawes of Mercury. ¹²⁰

But why, of Mercury? Chronologers tell us, that the great Mercurius, called also Trismegistus, was contemporary with Moses.

But Austin tells us, in his famous Book, De Civitate Dei, that this Mercurius was Nephew to another Mercurius, whose Uncle was Atlas, the Renowned Astrologer; and belike, t’was hee that flourished in the Time of Moses. ¹²¹

Very fitly then, did the Poets relate, how Atlas bore up the Heavens; when in the mean time, they only meant, our Moses; who, giving us the Records of the Worlds Creation, keeps up Heaven and Earth too, from sinking into a Chaos. ¹²²

Why might not Moses bee the true Hermes Trismegistus? I am sure, Both of the Names, in their Signification, agree well unto him. Iamblichus, from his Master Plato, tells us, that Letters were invented by Hermes; and Moses, being the first Writer that wee have, might therefore bee accounted, the first Inverter of Writing. Diodorus likewise tells us, That Moses was the first, who gave the Egyptians (which they commonly mistake, for Jewes) written Lawes; and that hee was, Ἀνῆς Τῇ Ψυχῇ Μεγάς καὶ, τῷ βίῳ ἐκανοστατος, A Man of a great Soul, and very powerful in his Life: And, that hee excelled, in Wisdome & Valour. ¹²³

Strabo, makes an Honourable Mention of this great Personage; yea, & of the Religion established by him. Hee Recites his Actions, and Sayings; and reports, that hee left Egypt, and came into Syria, because hee disliked the Egyptians for their Worshipping of corporeal Gods.
To conclude; *Philo* speaks truly, in the Life of *Moses*; “Tho’, (saith hee) some Pagan Historians speak of him, yett they say but little, and that not truly neither. Out of Envy, tis likely; or because of the great Disagreement between his, & the Lawes of other Law-givers, they vouchsafe not to Remember him.”

Wee may also gather, that the famous *Law-givers* among the *Græcians*, as *Lycurgus* and *Solon*, had many of their Politicks from the Lawes of *Moses*; whence afterwards the *Romans* took some of theirs. And in Imitation of *Moses’s* Receiving *his* Lawes immediately from God, the greatest Lawgivers did seem to have *Theirs* from some Deity; As, *Numa*, from *Ægeria*; *Minos* from *Jupiter*; *Lycurgus* from *Apollo*; *Zaleucus* from *Minerva*.  

---

Q. What is the Name, which the *Creator* of the World, chooses to wear, in the History of the Creation? v. 1.
A. The Jewes observe, That in the First of *Genesis*, throughout the whole Chapter, unto the Finishing of the six dayes Work, the Creator is called, אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim*, which is a Name that signifies, *Power*; and this, no less than Thirty Two Times over. An Intimation, That the *Power* of God, is eminently display’d, in the *Creation* of the World.

Q. In the History of the Creation, wee find the *Great God who formed all Things*, Imposing of NAMES, upon, The *Day*, The *Night*, The *Heavens*, The *Earth*, The *Sea*; & several Parts of the *Creation*; But Hee Imposes no Name upon the *Whole Creation* itself; nor, ha’s the Hebrew Language, that I remember, any *One Word*, by which the *Whole World* is expressed. What may bee the Intention of this Matter? v. 1.
A. I can at present give you none but a *Devout* Answer to this Quæstion. Wee should learn from hence, to distinguish well, between the *Heavens* & the *Earth*; Don’t throw the whole *World* into one Conception; but lett Man who was made on the *Earth*, consider himself as made for the *Heavens*.

Q. A Remark on the very *First Words* in the *Mosaic Account of the Creation*? v. 1.
A. The Words are capable of being translated; *The GODs had created in the Beginning*. This Conjunction of a *Plural Noun*, with a *Singular Verb*, which is a Breach upon the Construction of all Languages, Monsr. *Saurin* observes, could not be done without *some Design*. The Jewish Doctors did observe it, without being able to explain it. 

R. *Simeon Ben Jochai* in the Book *Zohar*, sais, *Come, See the Mystery of the Word ELOHIM: See, There are Three Degrees; Each degree apart, is One; and yett Three together are but One; They are united in One, and are not separated.*

*Philo* acknowledges a Mystery, in this Way of Speaking; but he adds, *GOD only knows it.*

---

Q. But look back again to, *The Beginning*. Is there no special Sense couched in that Passage, *In the Beginning God created*, beyond what is commonly observed? v. 1. 

A. Wee must by no means exclude, the Received Sense of this Passage; That the Creation had a *Beginning of Time*. 

Nevertheless, I know no Damage in it, for us to entertain a further Advice as here offered unto us. 

No less Persons than *Origen*, and *Basil*, and *Jerom*, and *Austin*, and *Bede*, and *Junilius*, look upon the Word /דְּבַר הָיוֹת/ here, which wee will translate, *The Beginning*, to bee a Name of the *Messiah*. Yea, the *Chaldee Paraphrast* had some such thing in his Eye, when hee renders it, /םֹהֶקֶן דְּבַר הָיוֹת/. *By Wisdome, God created*. *Galatinus* well argues, That this must bee the *Messiah*, because *Wisdome* is called in Prov. 8.22. by the Name of /דְּבַר הָיוֹת/ *The Beginning*. And thus, our Lord Jesus Christ being asked, in Joh. 8.25. *Who art thou? Answered, The Beginning*. Compare Joh. 1.1. and Col. 1.16. Attentively. Thus our Lord is called, in Rev. 3.14. *Αρχή τῆς κτίσεως, The Beginning of the Creation*. 

Q. I am sensible, that the Jewish Rabbis lett their Fancies please themselves, with much Gayetie, upon the *First Word* in the Bible. And I know not whether t’wil bee worth the while to mention all their pretty Notions, upon that Word. However lett us have One or Two of them? v. 1.
A. What think you of that? [in *Baal Turim*, and *Tanch.* on Gen. 1.1.] *The History of the Creation,* begins with the Letter א because Two Worlds were created, this World, and the World to come.\(^{131}\)

A. The Hebrew Word, as you will often find it observed, signifies, the Action of a *Bird,* hatching her Eggs, or moving herself over her young ones. Perhaps, it was from the Encouragement of this Word, that some of the best Philosophers compared the *Fire* and *Air,* to the *Shell & White,* the *Water* and *Earth* to the *Yolk,* of an *Egg.*\(^{132}\)

3385.
Q. Entertain us, if you please, with a Jewish Curiosity, upon that Passage, *Lett there be Light?* v. 3.
A. *Abarbinel* (upon the XL of *Exodus*) takes this to be the SHECHINAH, the most excellent of all created Things, called in the Holy Scriptures, *The Glory of the Lord,* which God, saith he, sealed up in His Treasures, after the Luminaries were created, for to serve Him on special Occasions; (as, for instance, to lead the *Israelites* in the Wilderness, by a *Cloudy Pillar of Fire,* when He would make Himself appear extraordinarily present. And because of the Perfection of this Light, he thinks, it is, that *Moses* adds in the next Verse, That *God saw the Light* (repeating the Word, Light,) *that it was good:* whereas in all the rest of the Six Dayes Work, He only saies, He *saw it was good;* without Naming again, the thing He had made.\(^{133}\)

There may be Fancy enough, in this Notion; yett it is not altogether to be despised. There is a certain *Bright Cloud of Heaven,* of quite another Consistence than that which drops our ordinary Rain upon us; That *Cloud* filled with the *Light and Fire,* wherein the Son of God chose to lodge, as in His Covering, from the Beginning, that so He might therein exhibit Himself with an Agreeable *Majesty* unto His People: Tis the same that was called, The *Shechinah;* and it was of old seen by the People of God, on several great Occasions. The Great God ha’s chosen, to dwell in this *Light, which no Man can approach unto*; and a special Remark, may be putt upon the *Goodness* of the *Light* in
general, because unto the general Head of Light belongs that Illustrious & Celestial Matter, on which the God of Heaven has put this peculiar Dignity.\textsuperscript{134}

Q. May there be any Mysteries \{in\} that Expression, GOD SAID, so often occurring in the History of the Creation? v. 3.\textsuperscript{135}

A. Monsr. Saurin, in his \textit{Dissertations}, thus expresses himself.

\begin{quote}
\textquote{"Several Divines among the Ancient & Modern, whose Knowledge we reverence, & whose Opinions we do not reject, have thought that \textit{Moses} did understand in this Place, the Co-operation of the SON of GOD, in the Construction of the Universe. From the Writings of the New Testament, they fetch their Comments on this Part of the Old.}

\textquote{\textit{Philo} himself, seems to have had this Notion: He says, \textit{That placed His Real Word, which is His Eldest Son, in the Government of the World}. But nothing is more worthy the Attention of the Learned, than the Manner, in which so many Heathen Authors have express\'d themselves on this Subject. You may find a rich Collection, upon this Matter, in the learned Work entitled, \textit{Plan Theologique du Pythagorisme}.\textsuperscript{136}"
\end{quote}

4740.

Q. It may do well, if we begin betimes, in our Illustrations, to take notice of some Jewish Traditions, relating to the Creation, and some other Matters that lie everywhere throughout the Old Testament.

It is particularly Remarkable, That the Scriptures, and the Ancients, not only \textit{Christian}, but \textit{Jewish}, assert, that the \textit{Logos} of God, (who is His \textit{CHRIST}) made the World. Is there any thing in the \textit{Mosaic} Writings, that looks this Way? v. 3.

A. We must consider, That the Scriptures contain more in them, than we commonly or easily suppose, who take our Measures from other Books, to which we are accustomed. We must not wonder at it, if the old Jewes, yea, our Saviour Himself, \& His Apostles, interpret Scriptural Expressions, as referring much farther than we could have at first imagined; God had a \textit{Latent Sense}, an \textit{Hidden Scope} in them, which requires the greatest Attention of the Readers.\textsuperscript{137}

What shall we say, concerning the very first Word in the Book of \textit{Genesis}? It is true, \textit{בראשית} / \textit{Breshith}, most obviously signifies, \textit{In the Beginning}; so as to denote some
first * Epocha*, or Date of Time. And yett you shall find it also taken by famous Authors, for an *Agent*; an *Efficient* by whom any thing is made; as the Word Αρχη is likewise taken. *Hilary* on the Second Psalm, tells us, That *Breshith* was understood by the *Hebrewes*, not only for the *Beginning* of a thing, but also for the *Son of God*. Indeed, our Lord CHRIST is expressly called, Αρχη, which answers to the Hebrew /נֶּרֶשֶׁת/ Reschith. The *Jerusalem Targum* gives us the Meaning of this Word, to be *Wisdome*. Now, *Wisdome* is but another Name for the *Logos*. Hence the Christian Fathers, find our Glorious CHRIST in this Word. So *Tertullian*; *If by the Wisdome of God all things were made, then was Heaven & Earth made in that Beginning; that is to say in His own Wisdome, which is Christ*. Unto that Sense he interprets, the Eighth Chapter of the *Proverbs*, & the First Chapter of *John*. The Passages in *Tertullian*, and in *Origen*, and in *Theophilus Antoniochenus*, this Way, insisting on CHRIST, as the Αρχη, of the Creation, are too many to be recited. And much more in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in *Tatian*, in *Ambrose*, in *Basil*, in *Jerom*, in *Austin*, in *Cyprian*, and in the Fragments preserved by *Photius*.  

There is one Mr. *Robert Fleming*, who on the Occasion of such Thoughts, [in his *Christology*] offers an Interpretation of that Passage; Psal. 40.7. *In the Volumn of the Book, it is written of me*. Seeing it appears probable, That the very First Word in the Bible, denotes our Glorious CHRIST, why may it not be thought, that our Lord alludes to that Expression, as well as to other Passages in the *Volumn* of the Old Testament, where mention is made of Him? And if the Reading of the LXX be considered, we may be further induced to think, that our Lord points at this very Thing. Tis, εν κεφαλιδι βιβλιου, *In capite libri*; *In the Head*, or the *Beginning*, of the Bible; *In the very Title of the Book of the Law*. [Yea, which brings the Matter a little closer still; *In the Reschith* that is there.] The Hebrewes called the Five Books of *Moses*, by the *Initial Words*. What the *Greeks*, and others from them call, *The Book of Genesis*, the Hebrewes called, *Sepher Breshith*, or, *The Book of the Beginning*; *The Book that Begins with Breschith*. If then the Word, *Breschith*, denote our Glorious CHRIST; as the *Logos* of God, He might well say, That He was mentioned and written of, in the very *Title* of the *Book of God*. The *Title* of the Book of *Genesis*, may justly be look’d {at} as the Title of indeed all the *Bible*. As the *Ethiopic* and *Arabic* Versions, which follow the LXX, render this Passage the same
Way, so does Jerom, whose Version was from the Hebrew. Others of the Ancients, tho’ they used not the same Greek Word, yet seem to have had the same Thought in their Minds. Aquila and Symmachus render it, εν ειληματι του βιβλιου· This comes yett nearer to Mr. Flemings Notion. Ειλημα is properly, Involucrum, Integumentum, The Cover or Binding of a Book, or that which is wrapt about it. According to this, The Name of CHRIST was written upon the very Cover. The Ancient Books were Parchments Coiled and Rolled round, as a Scrol, (called, Volumns à Volvendo;) And if we suppose either the Pentateuch, or the Book of Genesis, wrapt up all together, the Title of Breschith, was written on the Cover of the Volumn.  

Of these things, Mr. Fleming, adds, He will only say, Valeant quantum valere possunt. And Modesty will allow no more. But then, he leaves it unto the Reader to Judge; whether our Saviour Himself does not insinuate something of this, when He saies, unto the Jewes, who enquired of Him, who He was; Joh. 8.25. την αρχην ο τι και λαλω ιν· which may be rendred, [not, Even the same that I said unto you from the Beginning; but] I am the Αρχη, Beginning, as I tell you. Thus, the Vulgar Latin, the Ethiopic, and Arias Montanus render it. Our Lord had a little before told them, That He was not one that had His Original in this World. A little after, He tells them, That He had His Existence before Abraham. It was proper for Him here to represent Himself as the Reschith, the Αρχη, the Beginning of all things.

[64v]Q. On that Passage, The Evening & the Morning were the First Day; and so, the Second, and, the rest? v. 5.
A. It is a Note of as much Ingenuity as Antiquity; That in all the Six Days of the Creation, there is an Evening and a Morning. There is a Vicissitude of Conditions. There is no Morning without an Evening. But when the Seventh Day arrives, we find not any of this Vicissitude. An Intimation, that when we come to the Rest which remains for the People of GOD, it will have no Evening in it; & No Darkness will belong unto it.

Q. We read concerning the Plants, That they have their Seeds in themselves? v. 11.
A. Our Inquisitive Bradly Observes & Reports.
“Every Plant contains in itself Male and Female Powers. Plants wanting local Motion, require this Union of Sexes in themselves. — There is in the Plants, a Farina fecundans, or Male-Dust, which has a Magnetic Virtue. This is what the Bees gather to make their Wax withal. But the Particles of this Powder, being to pass into the Ovaries of the Plants, and even into the several Eggs or Seeds, there contained, we may easily perceive, if we split the Pistillum of a Flowre, that Nature has provided a sufficient Passage for it, into the Uterus.

“A curious Person (he says) may by this Knowledge, produce rare kinds of Plants, which have not been heard of, by making Choice of Two Plants, that are near alike in their Parts. The Farina of the one will impregnate the other; and the Seed so enlivened will produce a Plant differing from either. [Like Mules.]”

[65r]Q. The Mosaic Distribution of Plants, what is to be thought of it? v. 11.
A. Tis accurate and admirable! Tis into Tree and Herb.

In Theophrastus and the modern Herbalists, the Division of Plants, is into, Arbor, Frutex, Suffrutex, & Herba. But the learned Caesalpinus, concludes, Clarius agemus, si alterâ Divisione neglectâ, duo tantum Plantarum Genera substituamus, Arborem &c. et Herbam; conjungentes cum Arbores Frutices, et cum Herbâ Suffrutices; Frutices being the Lesser Trees, and Suffrutices the Harder Herbs.

This Division of Plants into Tree and Herb, admirably suits the Natural Ground of the Division of Perfect Plants. For, Plants in their first Production, do send forth Two Leaves, adjoining to the Seed; and then afterwards, do either produce two other Leaves, & so successively, before any Stalk; and such go under the Name of Ποα, Βοτανη, or, Herb; or else, after the first Leaves that succeed unto the Seed-leaves, they send forth a Stalk, or a Rudiment of a Stalk, before any other Leaves; and such fall under the Classis of Δενδρον, or, Tree. In this natural Division, there are but those two grand Differences; Tree, and Herb. The Frutices, and Suffrutices have their Way of Production accordingly. Tis from Sir Tho: Brown, that I have this Observation.

Q. On the Influences of the Stars? v. 16.
A. Hartsoeker very truly & justly observes.
“All the Heavenly Bodies, except the Sun and Moon, can do us neither Good nor Hurt, except to communicate unto us some weak Rays of Light. They have no more Share in any thing that passes here upon Earth, than Candles lighted up & scattered here & there in the Countrey, can have upon any thing that is done in a City, which they surround, but from whence they can scarce be seen.”

I add, Away with the Idle Whimseys of Dog-days.145

Q. Why is the Moon called, One of the Two Great Lights; whereas we know, tis in Bulk so much smaller than the other Cœlestial Bodies? v. 16.

A. Tho’ it be less in Bulk, yett it is to us greater in Light; greater as a Light, than the other Heavenly Bodies; — velut inter ignes Luna minores. And greater in Use; in very many Benefits.146

Mendoza; a learned Portuguese, in his Flores, ha’s a Discourse on this Problem.

He will have the Moon to be called, A Greater Light, because next unto the Sun, it is of the greatest Use in the Distinction of Times unto us. It was unto the Hebrews yett more eminently so.

He concludes a little wittily. Hæc de Luna satis, ne Lunæ laboranti succurrere videamur.147

3427.

Q. A Remark on that, Lett the Waters bring forth ABUNDANTLY? v. 20.

A. For the most Part, among the Fishes, the Females discharge their Spawn, and the Males their Melt, in the Water near one another; and the Seminal Matters being so entrusted unto the Waters, the Propagation is carried on.

Dr. Nieuentyt remarks, That the Procreation of Birds here is not ascribed unto the Air, as that of the Fishes is to the Waters. But then, what is more obvious here, is the prodigious Multiplication & Fæcundity of the Fishes, here intimated in the Expression of Bringing forth ABUNDANTLY. They are, Psal. CIV.25. Innumerable.

And yett, as Dr. Nieuentyt observes, even the Fishes also feel the Force of the Curse upon the Sin of Man; In that their Multiplication meets with strange Obstructions, that
render them very much less Fruitful, than from the Number of Eggs in their Spawn might have been looked for.148

Q. What are the Creatures intended in the Original, where our Translation reads, Great Whales? v. 21.
A. Job Ludolphus ha’s demonstrated, That the Name, Tanim, signifies, Crocodiles. (Compare Ezek. 29.3. and 32.2. where, tis certain, there can be meant nothing else.) And we know, that Crocodiles are elsewhere singled out, as a most astonishing Work of God.149

There seems to have been a special Reason, to prevent some false Opinions, (& perhaps, to suggest a Mystery touched elsewhere, in our Illustrations,) That so noxious & so terrible an Animal as the Crocodile, should be particularly recognized, as created by the Lord.150

A. Sometimes we find, Image, alone; and sometimes, Likeness, alone.

Rivet looks on it, as an Hendyadys, and notes, Mos est Hebrais duo substantiva ità conjungere, ut diversæ res esse videantur, cum tamen alterum Adjectivi et Epitheti significationem habeat.151

But what I here most aim at, is an Elegancy of Dr. Arrowsmiths. “It is exceeding much for Mans Honour, that he is an Epitome of the World, an Abridgment of other Creatures; partaking with the Stones in Being, with the Stars in Motion, with the Plants in Growing, with the Beasts in Sense, and with Angels in Science. But his being made in Gods Image is far more. As great Men are wont; They often erect a stately Building; then cause their own Picture to be hung up in it, that Spectators may know who was the chief Founder of it, So when God had created the Fabric of this World, the last Thing He did, was the Setting up {of} His own Picture in it.”152

A. By these two Terms may be meant רַחֲמִים, Res Una. It is as much as to say, 
Imago Simillima. Thus we read, Rom. 1.23. About, A Likeness of Image. Hear Austin, 
speaking, De Genesi ad Literam.

Omnis Imago similis est ei cujus est Imago; nec tamen omne quod simile est alicui, 
etiam Imago est ejus! Sicut in Speculo, vel Picturā, quià Imagines sunt, etiam similes 
sunt; tamen, si alter ex altero natus non est, nullus eorum Imago alterius dici potest. 
Imago enim tunc est, quum de alio exprimitur.

Q. When God said, Lett Us make Man, in Our Image, after Our Likeness, what special 
Effect was there of it? v. 26.
A. Man is a Σωσόν πολιτικόν, a Sociable Creature. There is a Natural Disposition in 
Man, and Institution for Man, to unite with others, in Society.

And it seems a Special Effect of that Passage in his Creation; Lett US make Man, in 
OUR Image, after OUR Likeness. A Plural Number unites for the Making of Man, in 
some Agreeableness to His Maker. An Union of Three in One, is display’d, when Man 
comes to bee made. Hence tis, that Man, in the Image and Likeness of God, affects an 
Union with a Plurality.

Compare, Joh. 17.21, 22. till your Contemplations arise to some Astonishment.

Q. Give mee a notable Comment on that Place, Lett us make Man? v. 26.
A. Philo the Jew, is of Opinion, that the Angels, were Co-operators, in framing the 
Body of Adam, and this Platonist fetch’d this Notion, from his Master, who held, that 
Man was made by Inferiour and Created Gods, at the Command of the Supreme Deity.

But others deservedly explode this Opinion, and think, that these Words denote God 
the Father, conferring with the two other Persons in the Trinity, concerning the Making 
of Man. The Ancient Writers of the Church are generally of such a Sentiment, and 
usually allledge this Place, to prove the Trinity. But there were Cause enough to use this 
Manner of Speech, if it were only because Man is a Noble sort of Creature, and worthy to 
be consulted about. I will then, with a learned and worthy Author, offer you the Words of 
Seneca, for a notable Comment on this Place; Scias non esse hominem tumultuarium et
incogitatum opus. [De Benef. L.6.] “Be it known to you, that Man is not a Work huddled over in Hast, and done without forethought; for Man is the most stupendous Work of God.”\textsuperscript{157}


A. Verily, They do! Tertullian therefore, and Athanasius, and Cyril of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom, and Austin, and others of the Ancients, understood these Words, concerning the \textit{Trinity}.\textsuperscript{158}

The only thing that ever opposed such a Sentiment (setting aside the \textit{Folly}, which they are to be \textit{charged withal}, who bring in the \textit{Angels} as here consulted with,) is an Imagination, That the Great GOD is here introduced as imitating the Style of \textit{Princes}, who use to speak in the \textit{Plural Number}. But there is much Ignorance and Vanity betray’d in this Imagination. For as there were no \textit{Men} at all, and therefore no \textit{Great Men}, when this Language was used about the Making of \textit{Man}. So, tis very certain, there was no such Style among that Rank of Persons, for many Ages after Moses.

It was not until very late Ages, & in the \textit{European} World, that when the Power of many Persons came into \textit{One Mans} hand, this \textit{One Man} had the Complement paid him, of being address’d in the \textit{Plural Number}. Before the late Invention of this Complement, it was customary forever, \textit{Tutoyer}, (as tis called by the French,) to, THOU, and, THEE, the Greatest of Men. And the Greatest of Men spoke still in the \textit{First Person Singular}, as others address’d them in the \textit{Second}. Before the Time of our King \textit{John}, the Kings of \textit{England} used the Singular Number. The King of \textit{Spain} does it still.\textsuperscript{159}

[67r]

Q. The Sacred Oracles tell us, That \textit{God made Man after His own Image}. May we not find that, and many other Passages of the Sacred Oracles, imitated in the Pagan Writers? v. 26.\textsuperscript{160}

A. Yes. Phocylides writes, \textit{πνευμα ἐστι θεοῦ εἰκόν}, \textit{The Soul is the Image of God}. And the same Phocylides also writes, \textit{Μηδέ τις ὁρνίθας καλής ἄμα πάντας ἔλεσθο}, \textit{Lett no Man destroy all the Birds of a Nest together}; which is the same that we read in Moses.\textsuperscript{161}
Agur prays that God would give him neither Poverty nor Riches. Horace, (who it seems, had seen the Books of our Psalms and Proverbs,) writes, *Benè est, cui Deus obtulit parcâ, quod satis est, manu.*

_Solomon_ writes, That no Man knowes what a Day may bring forth. Theognis writes, That no Man knowes, ὃ τι νύξ καὶ ἡμέρα ἀνδρὶ τελεῖ: *What a Night & a Day, may bring to pass.*

_Solomon_ writes, That without Knowledge, the Mind is not good. Sophocles writes, οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο νοῦς κακὸς, καλὸς φρονεῖν. *Wisdom is inconsistent with an ill Mind.*

_Solomon_ writes, There is not a Just Man, that sinneth not. One of the Minor Poets, writes,

'Ανθρώπων δ’ ἄφικτος επὶ χθονι γίγνεται οὐδές:
There is not a Man upon the Earth, that is undefiled.

_Solomon_ writes, That God ha’s made every thing beautiful in his Season. Sophocles writes, πάντα καιρὸ καλά: *Every thing is good in its Season.* And in the Description of Old Age and of Death, _Solomon_ writes, The Dust shall Return to the Earth, as it was, and the Spirit shall return to God that gave it. So Phocylides,

Σομα γάρ εκ γαίης εξομεν, και παντες ε αυτην
Ανουμενοι κοινης εσμεν· απρ δ’ ανα πνευμα δεδεκται·
*Our Bodies, which are made of the Dust of the Earth, shall be resolved into that again: But the Heavens receive the Spirit.*

_Solomon_ praising his Queen, saies, That upon her Temples, were Threescore Queens, & fourscore Concubines, and Virgins without Number. Like to this, is the Strain of _Musæus_ upon Hero;

Οφθαλμὸς γελοιων εκατον Χαριτεσσι τεθηλει·
*That when he smiled, an hundred Graces were produced in one Eye.*

 Jeremiah writes, *It is good for a Man, that he bear the Yoke in his Youth.* And Sophocles, τὸ φέρον ἐκ θεοῦ καλῶς χρῆ φερεῖν. *What God will have us to bear, Lett us bear it becomingly.*

But no Poet imitates the Scriptures more than _Homer_, who having been, as _Pausanias_ tells us, an Inquisitive Traveller into all Countreys, had no doubt, been among the Jewes.
Ganymedes being taken into Heaven, is an Allusion to Enoch's Translation. In Allusion to the Story of Balaam, he will have Xanthus, the Horse of Achilles, upon his Carreer, to speak to him, and Achilles answer him. He makes an Interposmal of the Gods, in almost every Part of the War, between the Græcians, and the Trojans. This highly imitates the Sacred Story. As he came after David (as Herodotus will have it, near two hundred Years, and near one hundred, according to Philochorus,) thus his Imitations of David, are Numberless.  

Agamemnons Prayers, have many Strokes of the Psalms in them. Homer tells us, The Gods eat Ambrosia; David speaks of the Manna, which is Angels Food. From the Falling of Manna in the Wilderness, we have the Ambrosiae campi. David saies, Bread strengthens, & Wine makes glad the Heart of Man. Homer saies, Bread & Wine give Men both Strength & Heart. The Psalmist saies, That God had given his People to be Meat for the Fowls of Heaven, & their Flesh to the Beasts of the Earth. The Poet makes Achilles tell Hector, Th{at} he should lye dead in the open fields, till Fowls & Dogs devoured him. The Psalmist saies, The Poor committeth himself to God, and, The Lord preserveth the Stranger. The Poet saies, That the Poor & the Stranger, are always in the Hands of God.  

I will, from Dr. Grew, mention only Two more of this Poets Imitations; and they are pretty Remarkable ones. One of them is This.

He transfers the Circumstances of the Transactions between the Israelites & the Egyptians, to that between Penelope and her Wooers. Penelope takes Presents of them, & this by the Advice of Pallas, before they were all Destroyed, even by Ulysses, who answers to Moses. Nor were the Presents made unto Penelope, before they were asked; which was the Case of the Israelites. And, as the sudden Destruction of the Egyptians, was in the Night, so when the Time for the Wooers to be destroy’d was come, the House wherein they were, became Dark. And as the Israelites were ordered then to Sprinkle their Door-Posts with Blood, So, the Beams of Penelopes House now seemed all Bloody. The other of them is This.  

His Twentieth Iliad is wonderfully taken out of our Eighteenth Psalm. David makes a Triumphant sort of Descant upon his Deliverance from all his [68v] Enemies, & from Saul. Much of this the Poet borrowes, to express Æneas’s Pæreservation from Achilles. The Psalmist saies, God Thundred with fiery Lightnings in
the Heavens. The Poet says, Jove Thundered terribly above. The Psalmist says, Then the Earth Shook & Trembled. The Poet says, Neptune shook the Earth on every Side. The Psalmist says, The Foundations of the Hills moved & were shaken. The Poet says, the like, of the Plains beneath, & the Tops of Ida. The Psalmist says, The Channels of the Waters were seen & the Foundations of the World were discovered. And in the Poet, Pluto bids Neptune hold his Hand, lest his dismal Dwelling should be discovered. In the Psalmist, Thunders and Lightnings precede the Sea-Storm. The Poet brings Phæbus opposing himself to Neptune. The Psalmist expresses his Deliverance, by saying, The Lord sent from above; He took me, He drew me, out from many Waters. Thus in the Poet, Neptune carries Æneas from Achilles, over the Heads of the Trojan Army. David speaks of his Enemy, as too strong for him; And Neptune asks, who betray’d Æneas to Achilles, much the stronger? David says, That God delighted in him. And Æneas is represented by Homer, as Beloved of the Gods.

The like Imitations of our Sacred Scriptures, are observed in the best Philosophers of all Ages and Countreys. But none discovers a greater Acquaintance with the Books of Moses, than the famous Plato; for which Cause by Clemens Alexandrinus, after Numenius, he is called, Μωσῆς Ἀττικίζων· Moses in an Athenian Dress.

The Passages that might be quoted, would make a Volum. I will supersede all quotations, with a notable Saying of old Minutius Felix. Disputant philosophi eadem quæ dicimus; non quòd nos simus eorum vestigia secuti, sed quòd illi de divinis prædicationibus prophetarum, umbram interpolatæ veritatis imitati sunt.

Before I wholly dismiss this Illustration, I will invite you to read the Sixth Eclog among Virgil’s Pastorals. On which his Translator observes, That his Description of the Creation has in it, not one of the Terms peculiar to the Epicurean Hypothesis, (and indeed how could he well introduce a GOD, oddly denying the Power and Providence of the Deity, and singing an Hymn to the Atoms, & Blind Chance?) But it agrees very well with that of Moses; And M. Dacier, who is confident that Horace had perused the Sacred History, might with more of Reason have affirmed the same concerning Virgil. For besides the famous Passage in the Sixth Æneid, where the Word, Principio, is used in the Front both by Moses and Virgil, and the Seas are first mentioned, and the, Spiritus intus
alit, which might not improbably allude unto the *Spirit moving on the face of the Waters*;— Omitting this parallel Place, the successive Formation of the World, is evidently described in these Words;

— *Rerum paulatim sumere Formas.*

And it is hardly possible to render more literally that Verse of Moses; *Lett the Waters be gathered into one Place, and Lett the Dry Land appear,* than in this of our Virgil;

*Tum durare solum, et discludere Nerea Ponto.*

After this, the Formation of the *Sun* is described (exactly in the Mosaical Order:) and next the Production of the first living Creatures, but in a small Number; (all in the same Order still.)

*Rara per ignaros errent Animalia montis.*

Here also Virgil keeps more close to the *Mosaick* System, than the Writer, who will by no means allow *Mountains* to be coæval with the World.

Q. It cannot bee deny’d, That the common Glosses, wherein the *Mosaic* Account of the *Creation,* is dressed out unto our Understanding, are full of Difficulties. For this Cause, you know, learned Men have of late used several *Essayes,* all not with æqual Success, to rescue the Inspired Writings of *Moses,* from the *Hardships* that have been putt upon them. Favour mee, with communicating at least One or Two of those *Essayes.* v. 31.

A. If I do, you must not expect, that I declare myself, how far I concurr, with every Point, that shall bee offered. And I will also leave you, to the same Liberty that I take myself.

The *Sentiments,* which I will first offer you, have Mr. *William Whiston,* for the Author of them: who in a Book published, 1696. under this Title, *A New Theory of the Earth,* ha’s the Substance of the ensuing Passages.

Hee first laies down this Position: “*That the Mosaic Creation is not a Nice and Philosophical Account of the Origin of All Things*; but an Historical and True Representation of the Formation of our single Earth, out of a confused *Chaos,* and of the
successive & visible Changes thereof, each day, till it became the Habitation of Mankind.”

He saies, The very first Words of Moses plainly imply, that the Production of the World out of nothing, which wee usually style Creation, was precedaneous to the Six dayes Works, given account of, in the same Chapter. In the Beginning God created the Heaven & the Earth. q. d. “Tho’ the History of the Origin of the World, which shall now bee given you, do not extend any farther than that Earth wee live upon, and the Bodies that belong unto it; yet, to obviate any Ill Effects of a perfect Silence touching these things, I am obliged, by the Divine Command, to assure you, That the Original of all Beings whatsoever, was primarily owing to the same God of Israel, whose Works I am going to Relate; and that, not only this Earth, and all its Bodies, but the Vast Frame of Universal Nature, was by him at first created out of Nothing, and disposed into the several Systems that are now extant.” — It is clear, That as soon as the Holy Writer, descends to the Description of the Chaos, and the Commencing of the Six dayes Creation, hee mentions not a Word, of any Production out of Nothing; which was before Supposed and Asserted to have been past and done, In the Beginning. —The Words here used, of, Creating, or, Making, or, Framing of things, in the Style of the Scripture, do frequently signify no more, than the Ordering, Disposing, Changing, or new-modelling those Creatures which existed already, into a different, & sometimes perhaps a Better, & more Useful State, than they were in before. In the very History of the Creation itself, you find it so. — Moreover, Those Phrases, The World, or, The Heavens & the Earth, under which, the Object of the Six Dayes Creation is comprehended in Scripture, do not alwayes denote the whole System of Beings; but are in the Sacred Style, frequently, if not mostly, to bee re{strained to} the Terraqueous Globe with its Dependences.

The only considerable Objection, is, That neither the Light, by whose Revolution Night and Day are distinguished, nor the Sun, Moon, and Stars, which are sett in our Firmament, belong to our Atmosphære, and yett both of them do belong to the Mosaic Creation, and are the First and Fourth Dayes Works therein.

To give Satisfaction in this Point; The Original of the Light, were without Difficulty to bee accounted for, if the other Point, the Making of the Heavenly Bodies were once settled. And that would bee no Harder, if the Translation of the Words of Moses, were but
thus amended: *And God said, Lett there bee Lights in the Firmament of the Heaven, to Divide the Day from the Night: — And God had (before) made Two Great Lights, the Greater to rule the Day, & the Lesser to rule the Night; and Hee had (before) made the Stars also, and God sett them in the Firmament.* The Hebrew Tongue, having no *Plusquam Perfectum*, it must and does express the Sense of it, by the *Perfectum*; and the particular Circumstances of each Place, must alone determine, when thereby the Time *Present*, and when the already *Past* and *Gone*, is to bee understood. How many *knotts* in the Scripture, the Omission of this Observation hath left unsolved, & which being observed, would immediately bee untied, wee shall not here enumerate. Lett it bee particularly considered, in the History of the Creation itself. Gen. 2.1. *On the Seventh day God had ended His Work, which Hee had made.* v. 3. *Hee had Rested from all His Work.* v. 5, 6. *The Lord God had not caused it to Rain on the Earth; and there had not been a Man to Till the Ground.* So, v. 7, 8, 9, 19. —

In the Holy Scriptures, the *Heavenly Bodies*, are no otherwise considered, than with Relation to our *Earth*, and as Appurtenances of our *Atmosphære*. Tho’ the Heavenly Bodies are *universally useful*, yett here those Great and Noble, Main and Glorious Parts of the Universe, are not considered as under the many wise, vast, & *Comprehensive Ends* designed by the Divine Providence; but they are placed in the *Firmament of Heaven* (a Phrase used in this History, for our *Atmosphære*) *to Divide* our *Day from Night*, *to bee* to us *for Signs & Seasons, for Dayes & Years; to bee for Lights in the Firmament of Heaven, to give Light upon the Earth; to Rule over our Day & Night; to Divide our Light from Darkness*. And the *Order* of their Introduction here, is not that of their proper *Dignity*, but that of their *RespectiveAppearances* and *Uses* here below. Thus, the *Sun* and *Moon*, as if they were two Globes of Fire and Light, pendulous in our Air, and hanging over certain Places, are order’d to *stand still*, the one *upon Gibeon*, the other *in the Valley of Ajalon*.¹⁸⁷

Wee will attempt to find out, the True *Origin* and *Source*, of such Notions and Expressions. God hath so Framed the *Eyes* of Men, that when the Distance of Bodies, and their proper Magnitude is very great, they shall both bee *Imperceptible* to us. There is every Way from our *Eye*, a *Sphaerical Distance*, [70v] or *Superficies*, which terminates our distinct Perception of Objects, and beyond which, all Distances and Magnitudes
absolutely considered, are not by us distinguishable. Until Geometrick and Philosophick Principles Rectify Mens Notions, all Bodies whatsoever beyond the Clouds, such as the Celestial are, must needs bee esteemed at the same æquidistant Superficies with the Clouds, and appear among them. The Heavenly Bodies consequently, as to us, are with them placed in our own Air; when their visible Magnitude, Scitation, Motion, and Habitudes, are all one with respect to us, as if they really were fiery Bodies, rowling upon, or among the Clouds.

The Production of these Heavenly Bodies out of Nothing, was præcedaneous to the Six Dayes Work; and on the Fourth day of the Creation here, they are wholly considered as belonging to our Earth, and placed in our Air: Their Original Appearance, or their First becoming visible in our Air, is the only thing then referred unto. Light is then said to Bee, when the Superior Regions of the Chaos, were become so far Clear & Defæcate, that the Rayes of the Sun, in some Degree could penetrate the same, enough to render a sensible Distinction between Night and Day, or that Space the Sun was above, & that it was beneath, the Horizon. And agreeably, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, are said first to Bee, or, to bee made, when afterwards the Air, was rendred so very Clear and Transparent, that these Luminaries became conspicuous, and their Bodies distinctly visible, as in a clear Day or Night, they now appear to us.

The Including of these Distant Bodies, thus in the Mosaic History of the Creation, might very well bee, to take away the very Foundation of that Idolatry, with which the Jewes were prone to adore the Host of Heaven. Tis hereby asserted, That they were Created, and Dependent Beings, which could have no Influence of their own, but what they derived from God, and were subject unto His Government, who placed them in the Firmament, and subjected them to such Motions, Rules, and Lawes, as rendred them serviceable unto this Lesser World.

Moreover, the Mosaic History of the Creation, being, A Journal of the Mutations of the Chaos, & of the Visible Works of each Day, such an one as an Honest Spectator on the Earth would have made, and Recorded, nay, and Beleeved, as in all Cases the Reality of the Things themselves: it is evident, that both the Appearance of the Light, and of the Bodies themselves, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, must come, within this Journal, & make as
Remarkable Changes in the World, unto such a Spectator, as any other within the Six dayes, could possibly do.\textsuperscript{193}

To prove, that the Mosaic History, extends not beyond the Earth, & its Appendages, will bee easy; because all Men grant, that the Confused Mass, which wee call, The Chaos, whence all the several Parts of the Creation here described, were derived, extended no farther. The Ancient Chaos, was doubtless the single Source, or Promptuary of the Six Dayes Productions. Now the Chaos mentioned by Moses, is by him expressly called, The Earth, in Contradistinction to The Heavens, or\{tion to The Heavens, or\} the other Systems of the Universe. And the Chaos of Moses, could not include the Sun and Fixed Stars, because just before the Extraction of Light from it, as tis usually explain’d, it was Dark & Caliginous. The Text saies, Darkness was upon the Face of it. This, on such a Supposition were Impossible. A strange Darkness! where more than Ninety Nine Parts of an Hundred, appear to bee Fiery Corpuscles, and the very same, from whence the Sun itself was constituted. And the now undoubted Property of the Universal Gravitation of Matter, contradicts and overthrowes this Fancy, of the Heavenly Bodies having been originally extracted from the Chaos of Moses. On this Hypothesis, when once they were mingled with the Parts of the Earth, and are since, at Immense Distances from it, they must have fled off every Way from their former Place, and in a small Space of Time, have thrown themselves to those vastly Remote Seats, which they have ever since possessed. Now, if instead of the, Vis Centripeta, a Vis Centrifuga; instead of Mutual Attraction, a Mutual Repulsion or Avoidance were found to bee, the standing unchang’d Law of Nature, and Property of Matter, this might have look’d like possible. But, when the contrary Force of Gravitation obtains, and that, as far as wee have any Means of knowing, Universally, there is now no Room for such an Imagination. Tis by no means Impossible, that all the Bodies in the Universe, should Approach to one another, and at last Unite in the common Center of Gravity, of the entire System: Nay, from the Universality of the Law of Gravitation, and the Finiteness of the World, in Length of Time, without a Miraculous Power Interposing, it must really happen. But by what Law of Nature, or Property of Matter, they, when once conjoin’d, should bee separated, its hard to conceive. And the Difficulty is increased, by the prodigious Velocity of their Motions: when, according to the vulgar Hypothesis, but a few Hours can bee allow’d the
Heavenly Bodies, to waft them into those Immensely, yett variously distant Seats, which they were ever after to possess. In fine, This Fancy, that the Heavenly Bodies proceeded originally from the Terrestrial Chaos, and cast themselves off from it every Way, supposes the Earth to bee the Center of the World, or of all that System of Bodies, and them to bee placed in a kind of Circumference every Way about it. But this Ptolemaic System of the World, must not hope, at this Time of Day, to bee entertained with considerate Men.\textsuperscript{194}

Our Author, proceeds to argue, That the Mosaic Creation is confined unto our Earth, with its Appurtenances, because otherwise the Time of the Creation of each Body was so extreamly disproportionate unto the Work itself, as is perfectly Irreconcileable to the Divine Wisdome of its Creator, and the Accounts of the Works themselves, as they are sett down by Moses. Hee freely confesses, Tis not necessary in all Cases, that wee should comprehend the Reasons of the Divine Actions, before \{we can be under an Obligation\} (71r) \{to Beleeve them. They may be hid from us on several Accounts, tho’ the things themselves be plain in Scripture.\}\textsuperscript{195} Nevertheless, hee thinks, tis one thing to bee Above Reason, and another thing to bee Against it. And hee thinks, the Clearness, or Obscurity, of the Revelation, may bee very considerable, in leaving us Room for the Exercise of Reason about it. Hee saies, with due Allowance every where made, for that Infinite Distance, and Different State of the Supream Governour of the World, from those of all finite Beings, depending on Him, & subject to Him; wee collect our Idea’s of the Divine Attributes, by considering what is good, great, valued, & esteemed lovely & venerable among Men. Tis a Dishonourable Reflection on God, hee saies, to ascribe those Things to Him, which to the Free Faculties of Mankind, would among us, bee look’d on as Marks of Unskilfulness, Foolishness, & Imprudence, in parallel Cases; & for which Meer Men, could not escape the most severe and Indecorous Imputations.\textsuperscript{196} Hee saies then, putt the Case, that an Husbandman, who had Two Plotts of Ground, the one of a score Feet in Circumference, not very promising or capable of Cultivation above others; the other, of a thousand Acres of good Land, & very fitt for Tillage, or Improvement; should spend four or five Dayes in a Week, about his Little Spott of Indifferent Ground, and allott no more than the remaining One or Two for the Management of the other spacious Field, or, suppose, one should light upon an Historian, who undertook to give a compleat & full
Account, of some large and spacious Countrey, with the many Noble Kingdomes, Principalities, Lordships, & Governments therein contained; and upon Perusal, nothing was to bee found mentioned in any particular Manner, but a certain Little & Remote Island, so inconsiderable, that the Generality of the Inhabitants of the Main Land, never heard so much as its Name, which indeed was described carefully, and its several Circumstances diligently accounted for; but as to the rest, there appeared no more, than at the Conclusion of a Chapter, two or three Names of its Principal Divisions, & some Advantages which one or two of their Maritime Towns afforded this Small Island; & then all was concluded. Hee affirms, the common Glosses on the Mosaic History of the Creation, to afford us, as gross Idæa’s as these; and Notions, which an Humane Soul, ha’s too quick a Sense of the Decency of things, and withal too deep a Veneration for the Adorable Majesty of God, to bee easy under, tho’ it may bee overborn with them. Hee complains, that according to the vulgar Hypothesis, not only the Length of the Day, usually assign’d the Mosaic Creation, is disproportionate unto the Business done upon it, but also, that when the Works of each of the other Dayes, are Single, Distinct & of a Sort, the Third Day ha’s two quite different, nay, Incompatible Works assign’d unto it; and that the Earth, with its Furniture, how inconsiderable a Body soever it is, takes up Four entire Dayes, at least, of those Six, which were allotted unto the Whole Creation, when the Sun, Moon, and Stars, those vastly greater, and more considerable Bodies, are crouded into One single Day together.¹⁹⁷

Hee goes on with many other Complaints, of the Irregular, and Unbecoming Procedure, in the vulgar Scheme of the Creation; which for some Reasons, I choose to omitt; and so I hasten, to give you, the Authors own, Idæa of the whole Matter, as most conformable to the Mosaic History, and gloriously vindicating it from the Cavils of the Deists, and those that would bee thought Socinians: not omitting by the way, this one Passage, which is very pleasing. “I perswade myself, saies hee, if there were a Collection made of the Ancient Knotts in several Parts of the Bible, and how very many of them, as Praèludes and Pledges of the rest, are now entirely clear’d, or might easily bee so, it would contribute more, to the Recovery of the Ancient Honour, and due Esteem of the Sacred Scriptures, than all the most zealous & general Harangues, from some Popular Topicks, either for them, or against their Contemners.”¹⁹⁸
I shall pass by this Authors Conjectures about Comets, and the Relation which They might have to the several Mutations of this Earth. The first Thing I shall Quote from him, is, A Paradox, which hee expects will appear a most Extravagant Assertion of all other, to not a Few of his Readers.

That tho’ the Annual Motion of the Earth, commenced at the Beginning of the Mosaic Creation; yett its Diurnal Rotation did not, until after the Fall of Man.

Hee attempts to prove, in the first Place, That in the Primitive State of the World, Dayes and Years were all one. Hee showes, That on this Hypothesis, the Letter of Moses is as exactly followed, as in the ordinary one. Moses calls by the Name of Dayes, the several Revolutions of the Sun, in which the Creation was perfected. A Day, is the Succession of Light and Darkness, Once: or, the Space One Single apparent Revolution of the Sun, from any certain Semi-meridian, above or below the Horizon, till its Return thither again: which is in the Case before us. And this Hypothesis gives a Rational Account of the Scripture-Style, wherein a Day, very frequently denotes a Year. Besides the Language of the Genealogies in the Fifth Chapter of Genesis, there are other Numberless Instances of that Style; especially in the Prophetic Writings. [Consider Deut. 14.28. with Amos. 4.4. And consider, Num. 14.33, 34. Ezek. 4.4, 5, 6. and Dan. 8.13, 14. Chap. 12.11, 12, 13. and Rev. 11.3. and Chap. 12.6. and Dan. 9.24, 25, 26.] Why should a Day, and not rather an Hour, a Week, or Month, denote still a Year, in the Sacred Writings? The primitive Years of the World, once being Dayes, & call’d by that Name in the History of the Creation, the Succeeding Style of the Scripture, now appears, with much Elegance, to have been but a Continuation of the Primitive, & Fitted for to hint unto us, a Time wherein a Day and a Year, was really the same. Add hereto [72v] That the Six Dayes of Creation and Seventh of Rest, were by Divine Command, in afterages to bee commemorated by Years, as well as by Dayes, and so in reason answered alike to both of these Denominations. The Israelites were Six Years to sow their Fields, & prune their Vines, and gather in the Fruits thereof; But in the Seventh Year, the Land was to keep a Sabbath unto the Lord. Finally, The Author argues from the Works done on some of the Dayes, that it is an Indecent Thing to Recurr unto Pure Miracle, for the Acceleration of them, into the Space of Twenty Four Hours, when the Lawes of Motion, were now already Stated and Fixed in the World. Especially, the Works of the Sixth Day
appear too numerous for so short a space. e. g. The Production of the Terrestrial Animals. The Creation of Adam. The Donation of his Dominion over the Creatures. His Exercise of the Dominion in giving of Names unto them, which required some Consideration of the Nature of each Species. A Deep Sleep cast upon him, which probably must last more than a Few Minutes to deserve that Appellation. The Taking of his Rib, and Closing of the Wound, and Making of a Woman. The Bringing of the Woman to him, his Owning her, and Naming her, and Receiving the Benediction of God with her. The Appointing of a Food for them. And, in fine, according to the Tradition of the Jewes, The Fall of Man, on this Day. Now, tho’ God Almighty can do all things in what Portions of Time Hee pleases, Man cannot. Hee must have Time allow’d him, in Proportion to the Business, that is to bee done. But behold here, Business enough allotted into the Sixth Day, to require no small Part of a Year, for the Dispatch of it.  

Hence it followes, That in the Primitive State of the World, the Sun and Planets, Rose in the West, and Sett in the East, contrary to what they have done ever since. This may seem to have been the Foundation of that Story in Herodotus, who tells us, That the Sun, in the Space of 10340 Years, four Times, Inverted his Course, and Rose in the West. And Plato relating some very ancient Traditions, about the Primitive State of Things, and what a Remarkable Change was effected by a certain mighty Alteration in the Heavenly Motions, hee ha’s this Passage; The Motion of the Universe sometimes Revolves the same Way, that it does Now, & sometimes the contrary Way, [τοτε δ’ ἐπὶ τὰοντία]  

Moreover, In the Primitive State of Nature, there was a perpetual Equinox, or æquality of Day and Night throughout the World. This Phenomenon is usually by the Christian Fathers, applied unto the Paradisiacal State; and by the Ancient Heathens; unto the Golden Age, or the Reign of Saturn. Hence Anaxagoras tells us, That the Stars then Revolved [θολοειδως] in a Tholiform Manner, & the Pole appeared perpetually at the Vertex of the Earth. It may bee supposed hee means, That the Motion of the Heavens, was originally about one Center, or Axis, that of the Ecliptic.  

In fine, To the First Inhabitants of the Earth, (dwelling at the Intersection of the Ancient Ecliptic, with the present Northern Tropic,) the Poles of the World, were neither Elevated nor Depressed, but at the Horizon. But some time after the Formation of Things, they suddenly chang’d their Scitution; the Northern Pole appear’d to bee Elevated
above, and the Southern Depressed below the Horizon, or, in plain Words, there was a New Diurnal Rotation began, about the present Axis of the Earth. This Matter is much insisted on, by the Ancients. Plutarch hath a Chapter, περὶ ἐγκλίσεως γῆς, Of the Inclination of the Earth. To recite the Expressions of Leucippus, of Democritus, of Empedocles, and of Anaxagoras, to this Purpose, (namely, as the last mention’d ha’s express’d it, ὑστερον δὲ πόλον τὴν ἐγκλίσιν λαβεῖν, Afterward the Pole received a Turn, or Inclination.) would now take up too much of our Time. Tis enough to wind up all, in this Reflection; How should such surprizing Paradoxes run so universally thro’ the Eldest Antiquity, if there were not Some Foundation in earnest for them? 204

If any object, that Half a Year of Night, would have been too disproportionate unto the Condition of Mankind, it may bee answered, That the State of Mankind, without Quæstion, and perhaps that of other Animals, was before the Fall, vastly different from the Present; And our Judging of One Scheme of Nature by another, is very Fallacious and Unreasonable. The Dayes in Jupiter are not Ten Hours long. Those in the Moon, are near Seventy Two Times as long as they, or, a Month. And yett wee may not conclude, That no Creatures do Inhabit them. 205

Wee will proceed now, to some of the Phænomena, that occurr, in our Authors Account of the Creation, inserting here and there, his Descants upon some of them.

I. All those particular small Bodies, of which our Habitable Earth, is now composed, were originally in a Mixed, Confused, Fluid, & Uncertain Condition; without any Order or Regularity. It was an Earth without Form & Void; It had Darkness spread over the Face of its Abyss; And in reality, it was what it hath been ever styled, A Chaos. 206

II. The Formation of this Earth, or the Change of that Chaos into an Habitable World, was not a meer Result, from any Necessary Lawes of Mechanism, independently on the Divine Power; but it was the Proper Effect of the Influence and Interposition, and all along under the peculiar Care, & Providence of God. 207 [73r] Indeed, it is not very easy to determine, how far a supernatural or miraculous Interposition of the Divine Power, is concerned in such Things as these; and how far, the Lawes of Nature, or Mechanical
Powers, ought to bee extended. It is now evident, That Gravity, the most Mechanical Affection of Bodies, & which seems most Natural, depends entirely, on the constant, and efficacious, and, if you will, the supernatural and miraculous Influence of Almighty God.

There is more of God, in the Falling of a Stone to the Earth, than there would bee in that which, with greatest Surprize wee should call, A Miracle, its remaining Pendulous in the open Air: since to the former is required a more Active Influence of the First Cause. It is not unreasonable, that the most common Effects of Nature, or usual Accidents of Humane Affayrs, bee ascribed unto the Supream Being. Tis from Him every Thing is ultimately derived. Hee conserves the Natures, & continues the Powers of all Creatures. Hee not only at first produced, but perpetually disposes, and makes Use of the whole Creation, and every Part thereof, as the Instruments of His Providence. Hee foresaw, and fore-adapted the Entire Frame. Hee determined His Co-operation, or Permission to every Action. Hee so Ordered & Appointed the whole System, with every Individual Branch of it, as to Time Place, Proportion, & all other Circumstances, that nothing should happen any otherwise, than the wise Intentions of His Providence did require. Wherefore, wee need not fear, the most mechanical, and philosophic, Account of the Creation, as if thereby the Holy Scripture were superseded, or the Divine Power and Providence excluded. Nevertheless, a Supernatural Efficiency is more eminently to bee expected in the first Origin of Things; and the Dayes of the Creation are signally distinguished from those following, wherein tis said, God Rested, altho’ His Ordinary Concurrence, & Course of Nature, was continued without Interruption. Wherefore, wee must allow, a Peculiar Power exercised, by the Great Creator of all, in the first Formation of our World; and particularly, in the Following Instances. 208

First, The Creation of the Matter of the Universe, and particularly of that of the Earth, was originally the Alone and Immediate Work of God Almighty. Tho’ our Imagination, a poor finite, Limited & Imperfect Faculty, bee unable to have a positive Idea, of the Manner of a Production of a Real Being at first, yett, seeing the Infinite Absurdities following the Eternity, and Self-subsistence of Matter, are so enormous, wee cannot but rest satisfied in this Assertion.
Secondly, The *Placing* of the Earth, in its primitive circular *Orbit*, at its proper Distance, therein to Revolve about the *Sun*, was either an Instance of the Immediate *Power*, or, at least, of the Peculiar *Providence* of God.\(^{209}\)

Thirdly; The Formation of the *Seeds* of all *Animals* and *Vegetables*, was originally, {I suppose the immediate Workmanship} of God. As far as our *Micrometers* can help us to discern the Constitution of *Seeds*, those of *Plants* evidently, and by what hitherto appears, of *Animals* too, are no other than the *Entire Bodies* themselves *in parvo*, and contain every one of the same *Parts* and *Members* with the *Compleat Bodies* themselves, when grown to Maturity. When therefore, consequently, all *Generation*, is with us, nothing, as far as wee can find, but *Nutrition*, or *Augmentation of Parts*; and that agreeably thereto, no *Seed* hath been by any Creature produced since the *Beginning* of things; tis very philosophical to conclude them, to have been *Originally* every one created by God, either out of *Nothing* in the primary Existence of Things, or, out of the pre-existing *Matter*, in the *Mosaic Creation*. For indeed, the Origin of *Seeds* appears to bee hitherto unaccountable, by the mechanic Lawes of *Matter* and *Motion*.\(^{210}\)

Fourthly; The *Natures*, *Conditions*, *Rules* & *Quantities*, of those several *Motions* and *Powers*, according to which all *Bodies* (of the same general Nature in themselves,) are Specified, Distinguished, and fitted for their several Uses, were no otherwise determined, than by the Immediate *Fiat*, Command, Power, and Efficiency of *Almighty God*. The Power of mutual Attraction, or *Gravitation* of Bodies, appears to bee *constant*, & *universal*, nay, almost *essential* to *Matter*, in the present Constitution of the World; yett, the other *Lawes of Nature*, on which the particular Qualities of *Bodies* depend, seem not to bee so; but *changeable* in themselves, and actually *changed* according to the *Changes* in the *Figure*, *Bigness*, *Texture*, or *other Conditions* of the Bodies, in which they are contained. Thus, the *Cohesion* of the Parts of Matter, with more or less Firmness; the *Fermentation* of several *Heterogeneous Particles*, when mixed together; the *Magnetism* of the *Loadstone*; the *Elasticity* of certain *Fluids* and *Solids*; the obstinate *Inflexibility* of others; the Different *Density* of several Collections or Masses of *Fluids*, (while yett the greatest Part of their contained Space is *Vacuity*) not to bee considerably Increased or Diminished, without the Destruction of the *Species*. Now the Rules of *Matter*, and *Motion*, shown by such *Phænomena*, were Impress’d and Ordered at first, by the *Spirit of*
God moving on the Face of the Waters; and by His Concurrence they are still preserved.  

Fifthly; The Ordering of all things so, that in the Space of Six successive Solar Revolutions, the whole Creation should bee finished, and each distinct Dayes Work, should bee confined to, and compleated in, its own distinct and proper Period, it is also to bee ascribed unto the particular Providence and Interposition of God.

Lastly, But principally; The Creation of our First Parents, is to bee esteemed, the Peculiar Operation of the Almighty; and that, whether wee consider the {Creation} of their Bodies, or {the Forepast Creation and After-Infusion} of their Souls. Our First Parents were, on the very same Day in which they were made, in a State of Maturity and Perfection, and capable of all Humane Actions. As for the other Animals, their Seeds were here and there scattered by their Great Creator, and their Growth might bee, with a more Mechanical Proceedure; but there is a signal Distinction, in the Sacred History between the Formation of all other Animals, and the Creation of Man. In the former Case, tis only said, Lett the Waters bring forth the moving Creature, that hath Life, Lett the Earth bring forth the living Creature after his Kind. But of the latter, the entire Trinity consult; God said, Lett us make Man.

III. At the Time Immediately preceding the Six Dayes Creation, the Face of the Abyss, or superior Regions of the Chaos, were Involved in a Thick Darkness. All things Beginning then to take their Places, according to the Law of Gravity, the Mass of Dense Fluids, being heavier than the Masses of Earth, Water, and Air, would sink downwards, with the greatest Force & Velocity; & elevate the Masses enclosed among them upwards. Those Opake and Earthy Corpuscles, which before did Rove about the vast Regions of the Atmosphære, were now crouded nearer together; and by Consequence excluded the Rayes of the Sun, from the Central Solid, in another guise Manner than before.

IV. The visible Part of the First Dayes Work, was the Production of Light, or its Successive Appearance to all the Parts of the Earth; with, the consequent Distinction of Darkness and Light, Night and Day, upon the face of it. The Subsidence of the Earthy and Opake Masses, that were before this, in the upper Regions of the Chaos, did in some
Degree admitt the Rayes of the Sun. As the Mass of the upper Chaos was separated from the heavier Abyss beneath, so it again divided itself into diverse Orbs, which gave the Light some Access to our Earth.\textsuperscript{215}

V. The visible Part of the Second Dayes Work, was, The Elevation of the Air, with all its contained Vapours; the Spreading it for an Expansum above the Earth, and the Distinction thence arising of Superior and Inferior Waters: The former consisting of those Vapours, Rais’d and Sustain’d by the Air; the latter, of such as either were inclosed in the Pores, Interstices, and Bowels of the Earth, or lay upon the Surface thereof. The lower Earthy Strata, now would bee settling somewhat closer together; the Watry Parts would subside, and saturate their Inward Pores and Vacuities; and the Atmosphære would Free itself more and more from the heaviest and opakest Corpuscles, and thereby become in a greater Degree Tenuious, Pure and Clear than before. By that Time the first Half-Year of this Day was over, {and the Sun arose, The Light and Heat of that Luminary would} more deeply penetrate the Atmosphære: and the proper Effect of this would bee, that vast Quantities of Vapours would bee elevated into, and there sustained by, the now better Purified Air; while the Earthy Corpuscles, which were uncapable of, Rarefaction, & with them, all such Watry Particles as were so near the Earth, that the Suns Power could not sufficiently reach them, were still sinking downwards, and increasing the Bulk of the Solid Earth, & of its Included Waters. The Expansum, or Firmament which was this day spread out above the Earth, was plainly the Air, now truly so call’d, as being Freed, from the most of its Earthy Mixtures. The Superior Waters, were all those, which in the form of a Vapour, an Half Years Heat of the Sun, with the continual Assistence of the Central Heat, could elevate, & the Air sustain. The Inferior Waters, were those which remain’d below, all that fell down with, were enclos’d in, were sunk into, or lay upon, the Orb of Earth beneath. The Air, which is the Means of such a Separation, (still somewhat continued, in the serviceable Clouds,) is here said, to make this Division.\textsuperscript{216}

VI. The visible Parts of the Third Dayes Work were Two: The Former, the Collection of the Inferiour Waters, or such as were now under the Heaven, into the Sea’s, with the consequent Appearance of the Dry Land: The Latter, the Production of Vegetables, out of
the Ground so lately become Dry. In the Half Year of Night, the Vapours must not only descend upon the Earth, but by Reason of the Inequality of the Surface, and therewithal the Solidity of the Earth, [Mountains being the Lighter Sort of Earth, tis likely enough, that in the very Course of Nature, enow of these were produced in the Formation of our Earth,] have run down into Declivities, and Hollowes, into the Lowest Valleys, and most Depressed Regions of all; and must in these Places have composed Sea's and Lakes every where, throughout the Surface of the Earth. And so, by that Time the Light appeared, and the Suns Rising began the latter Part of the Half-Year, the entire Face of the Globe, was distinguished into Sea and Dry Land. Now was, of all other, the most convenient Season, for the Germination of the Seeds of Vegetables, and the Growth of Plants out of the Earth. The Soyl, fatned by the foregoing Half-Years descent of Vapours, was now, like the Ίλυς, that Fruitful Seminary of the Vegetable and Animal Productions of Primitive Nature, so much celebrated by all Antiquity. However, Tho’ the Influencing Heat of the Sun, was on this Day very great, yett his Body was not hitherto become visible. The Earth and lowest Regions of the Air, were very Full of Moisture; a Thick Mist must thence needs hinder the Air of its Transparency, But, ²¹⁷

VII. The Fourth Dayes Work, was, the Placing of the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, Moon, & Stars, in the Expansum, or Firma{ment, i.e. the rendring them visible} [75r] and conspicuous on the Face of the Earth; Together with their several Assignations to their Respective Offices there. Tho’ the Light of the Sun had, ever since the First Day, penetrated the Atmosphære, in some Sort, yett his Body must not bee supposed visible all this while. Wee see, how much & how long, a few Clouds, in our Dayes, will hinder our Prospect of the Sun. How much Time, then might it well take, to clear the Atmosphære, for a distinct View of the Body of the Sun, by a Spectator on the Surface of the Earth? But before the Morning of the Fourth Day, the Air might well bee left in the greatest Pureness, & Clearness imaginable; and first the Moon, then the Stars, and afterwards the Sun himself, might most plainly appear, unto our Little World? They now were so placed in the Firmament of Heaven, as to give Light upon the Earth; & begin to Rule plainly over the Day & over the Night, and to Divide the Light from the Darkness. Thus the Inanimate World is compleated; and there appears more Truth, than one thought, in the
Tradition of the Chineses, who Inhabit Formosa; That the World, when first created, was without Form and Shape; but God in *Four Years* brought it unto its full Perfection.\(^{218}\)

VIII. The *Fifth Dayes Work*, was the Production of the *Fish* and *Fowl* out of the *Waters*; with the Benediction bestow’d on them, in order to their *Propagation*. The *Seeds*, or little Bodies of *Fish* and *Fowl*, contained in the Water, were now exposed unto the kindly *Warmth* of the *Sun*, and the constant Supply of a most gentle and equal *Heat* from beneath. The Agitations of the *Tide*, in the small Sea’s, by the Absence of the *Diurnal Rotation*, were Imperceptibly Easy, Gentle, and Gradual. And the *Seeds*, being Invigorated with the Divine Benediction, became now prolific; and in this *Fifth Dayes Time*, a Numerous Offspring, of the *Swimming* and *Flying* Sorts arose; whereby the Two Fluid Elements, *Water* and *Air*, became Replenished with those *First Pairs*, which, by the *Benediction* they straightway Received, were Enabled to become the *Original* of all of the same Kinds, which were ever to bee the Inhabitants of those Regions afterwards.\(^{219}\)

IX. The *Sixth Dayes Work*, was the Production of all the *Terrestrial*, or Dry-land *Animals*; and that in a different Manner. For the *Brute Beasts*, were produced out of the *Earth*, as the *Fish* and *Fowl* had been before, out of the *Waters*; but after that, the Body of *Adam* was form’d of the *Dust of the Ground*, who, by the *Breath of Life*, breath’d into him in a peculiar Manner, became a *Living Soul*. Some time after which, on the same Day, hee was cast into a *Deep Sleep*, and *Eve* was form’d out of a *Rib*, taken from his Side. And several other Things were done on This Day. The *Earth* was now grown more Solid, Compact, and Dry; the *Air* was fully clear, and fitt for Respiration: the other Dispositions of *External Nature* were become *Subservient*: Now was a proper Season, for the Generation of the *Dry-land Animals*, and the Introduction of, *Man*, the Noblest of them all. But tho’ the other Works mentioned by *Moses*, were brought to pass, with a *Mechanical Process*, yett an *Immediate* and *Miraculous* Power, was exercised in the Formation of the *Body*, and Infusion of the *Soul*, of *Man*. Our Author takes it, That the same \( \Lambda \delta \Gamma \omicron \omicron \omicron \Theta \epsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \varsigma \), our Blessed *Mediator*, who was afterward, very frequently conversant on *Earth*, and appear’d in an *Humane Form* to the Patriarchs, & gave the *Law* in a *visible Glory*, and with an *audible Voice* on Mount *Sinai*, and guided the *Israelites*
personally in a Pillar of Fire & Cloud, thro’ the Wilderness, and inhabited between the Cherubins in the Holy of Holies, & took the peculiar Style, Titles, Attributes, Adoration, and Incommunicable Name of the God of Israel, and at last, was Incarnate, Lived a True Man among us, Died for us, and Ascended into Heaven, and still makes Intercession for us with the Father, and will come to Judge the World in Righteousness at the Last Day: That this very same Divine Person, was Actually & Visibly in an Humane Shape, conversant on Earth, and was really employ’d in this Creation of the World, (& particularly, in this peculiar Formation of Man,) so frequently ascribed unto him in the Holy Scriptures. Man was now made, in the Likeness of this Divine Person, and constituted His Deputy and Vice-gerent, among the Creatures here below; and there was a peculiar Interposition of God, for his Original. So, upon the Sixth Period, when every thing that could bee subservient unto him, and advance his Felicity, was compleated; hee, who was to bee the Lord of All, and for whose sake the Whole was framed, was brought into the World.  

This is a short Idea, of that Illustration, which this Author, ha’s given to the History of the Creation, left us by the Inspired Moses. The Author, ha’s very many other Strokes, upon the State of the Primitive World, & the Changes that have come, or must come, upon this World, which are not here to bee Repeted.

All that I shall further Transcribe from him is, a Mathematical and Incontestable Demonstration, of one Point, relating to the System of the World, which hath hitherto been undetermined. You shall have it, in his own Words.

[76v]  “Tis certain, saith hee, That the Annual Motion belongs to the Earth about the Sun, and not to the Sun about the Earth. For when, from the Moons Orbit, and the Planets Orbits, and periodical Times, tis certain, That the Law of Gravitation, towards the Earth, and towards the Sun, is the same; and by Consequence, all the periodical Times, of Bodies Revolving about each of them, in the same Proportion to one another, compared with their several Distances from each other. On which Hypothesis, the Proportion that suits the Phænomena of Nature, & the same must bee the True one, and to bee fully acquiesc’d in. Now, tis known, That on the Hypothesis of the Earths Annual Motion, her periodical Time, exactly suits, and is so between that of Venus and Mars, as the Proportion observ’d thro’ the whole System, and demonstrable à priori, withal, exactly
requires: but on the other Hypothesis, tis enormously different. For, when the Moon, undoubtedly, and on this Hypothesis, the Sun also, Revolves about the Earth, and when the Distance of the Sun is to that of the Moon, as about 10000 to 46; and the Moons periodical Time less than 28 dayes: the periodical Time of the Sun, is by the Rule of Three discoverable thus: As the Cube of the Moons Distance, 46 equal to 97336; to the Cube of the Suns 10000 æqual to 1000000000000: (or almost as 1 to 10000000,) so must the Square of the Moons periodical Time, 28 dayes, æqual to 784, bee to the Square of the Suns periodical Time, 7840000000; whose Square Root, 88204, are dayes also, æqual to 242 Years. So that on the Hypothesis of the Suns Revolution about the Earth, its periodical Time, must undoubtedly bee 242 Years; which all Experience attests to bee but a single one. Thus at length, the Controversy between the Ptolemaic and Pythagorean Systems of the World, is to a Demonstration determined; and the Earths Annual Motion, forever unquestionably established."

What our Author further observes, That the Year before the Flood, was Ten Dayes, One Hour, & Thirty Minutes, shorter than the present, is very curious. But, I have already produced as much from his Theory, as may serve our present Purpose, for the Illustration of the Divine Oracles. 222

As for a Judgment upon this Description of the Creation, I will presume to make None, at all; I leave it unto Men of Judgment; All that I will add of my own is, That if wee apprehend the more peculiar Prærogative of our World, or this Terraqueous Globe, with its Appendages, to bee, That the Soveraignty of Heaven, has pitch’d upon This, as the Peculiar Field for the Glorious Actions of the Messiah, which the Gospel of God ha’s Reported unto us, and that from hence the Son of God, would with Soveraign Grace choose the Creature, that Hee would have to subsist forever in One Person with Himself, I beleev, wee shall entertain a Right Idea of it. This is, on some singular Accounts, the Messiah’s World, tho’ all Worlds are His, and were made by Him and for Him. And, before wee read any further, the Bible, which begins with the Creation of this World, Lett us take up this Thought: for to bee carried all along with us, in our Minds, That our Bible is the Book of the Messiah.
Q. The Theories of the Creation, (particularly what I last offered you,) invented by our Modern Philosophers, do certainly make too bold with the Mosaic, and Inspired History thereof. It were a Noble, and a Worthy Work; to Illustrate that History, and rescue it from the presumptuous Glosses, that many Neotericks have made upon it. v. 31.223

A. It is notably done, by the most ingenious Dr. Dickinson in his, Physica Vetus et Vera. That Gentleman who near Fifty Years ago, obliged the World with the Curiosities of his Delphi Phænicissantes, ha’s now in this present Year, 1702. presented us, with a curious Treatise of above three hundred Pages in Quarto, in which he proves, In Historia Creationis, tum generationis universe methodum atque modum, tum veræ philosophiæ principia, strictim atque breviter à Mose tradi. To this Treatise I shall now be beholden, for the Illustration upon the Mosaic Hexaemeron, with which I am now going to entertain you. And upon this Entertainment perhaps we shall be more able than ever, to say with Nazianzen; ὅταν τὴν ἔξαπομενον αὐτὸν μεταχειρίζομαι κλ. As often as I take that Hexaemeron into my Hands, I am with my Creator immediately, and I see the Methods and Reasons of His Creation.224

The main Design of Moses, being to inculcate Piety upon his Nation, & Mankind, it was wonderfully agreeable for him, to begin with a Display of the Divine Power, & Wisdome & Goodness, in the Creation of the World. It is, probable, That Moses wrote this History, while he was an Exile in the Land of Midian, and sent it unto his Brethren in Egypt, that he might comfort them under their Bondage, and confirm them in their Beleef & Worship of that one God, who is the Creator of all things. Tis not likely, that he wrote Ænigmatically; but the Mosaic Philosophy was well understood in those first Ages; and tho’ afterwards vain Men, like Celsus, and Simplicius, have reflected on him, as if he wrote ἀντέχων καὶ ἀθεωρήτως, Inartificially & Inconsiderately, tis only because the true Notions of the Mosaic Philosophy are lost, and Men, like Harpaste in Seneca, cry out upon the House as Dark, only because they themselves are Blind, or have used none but Peripatetical Spectacles.225

Lett it not surprize you now, if I tell you, That the Mosaic Philosophy, was no other than the Corpuscularian.226 Aristotle himself, as great an Enemy as he was, unto the
Doctrine of *Atoms*, yet confessing concerning *Democritus* a great Asserter of the *Atomic Philosophy*; *Omnia prævidisse, et principià supposuisse, quibus omnia possunt explicari*. *Hippocrates* that great Philosopher, called this *Democritus*, Ἄριστον φύσεως ἐρμηνεύτην καὶ κόσμου, *The best Interpreter of Nature, & of the World*; and *Seneca* calls him, *The Tongue of Nature*. So far is this Philosophy, from the *Atheism*, which is ignorantly & injuriously charg'd upon it, that no Man more explicitly than this Corpuscularian *Democritus*, called all Things, Θεοῦ ἔργα, *The Works of God*. Could we enjoy those Books of his, which either Time, or the Envy of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, ha’s destroy’d, we should no doubt, find them full of Praises to *God the Creator*, & see what a Perswasion he had of a *Future State in an Heavenly Countrey*; for which *Pliny* maliciously derides him, as a *Chymist* who boasted of a Medicine, by which he should *Rise from the Dead*.227

The *Jonians*, who were the principal Followers of the *Atomic Philosophy* in *Greece*, were the most honest Sect of them all; And *Empedocles*, a great Man among them, as *Plutarch* informs us, asserted an *Intellectual World*, as well as a *Sensible*, and a *Righteous, an Holy, an Happy, Life* in that World, with the *Immortal Daemons*; from which World some of those *Daemons* were banished, [τοὺς θεηλάτους καὶ υρανοπετονας·] and pursued by the *Nemesis* of Heaven. *Anaxagoras* was another great Man among them; and with him, Νοῦς, or, *Mind*, was the *Creator of the World*; and he talk’d of *Returning after Death to Heaven as his own Countrey*. *Pythagoras* was another, (who putt the Name of *Monads*, upon *Atoms,* ) but so fine a Man, that the Title of Θεόσοφος, ha’s been thought proper for him. Indeed, we read of a famous Phænician *Moschus*, or *Mochus*, who long before the *Trojan War*, did at *Sidon* maintain the *Atomic Philosophy*. But no smaller Men, than *Theodoret* of old, and *Selden* of late, assert this *Moschus* to be no other than our very *Moses*; who, tis not unlikely, might, while an Exile in *Midian*, take a short Journey into *Phœnicia*. It was from a vile Degeneracy and Corruption in Manners, that the Scholars of *Thales*, in *Greece*, came at length, to deny a *God*; tho’ *Thales* himself owned Him, & called the World, πόιημα Θεοῦ, *The Work of God*. *Anaximander* was the Wretch, who first run into the *Atomic Atheism*; quià talem vitam degebat, ut suà maximè interesse putaret, [78v] *nullam in universo providentiam existere*. The *Epicureans* are well-known.228
But, *Stultè arrogat sibi, qui mentem et rationem in se putat in esse, in caelo mundoque non putat*. And let the Doctrine of Atoms be supposed, what can more necessarily infer a GOD? Will any Man be so sottish, as to imagine, That *Solomons Temple*, was but a casual Jumble of the Materials that composed it? And what is the World, but the most beautiful *Temple of GOD*? We may as well imagine a Parcel of Blind Men, to stumble upon one another, and form themselves into a Regular Army without a Leader, and in well-ordered Regiments perform a great Action, as that the floating Atoms of the World, should come together in that Order, wherein we now see Heaven & Earth, and the Hosts thereof, but excluding, τὸν νοῦν διακοσμοῦντα, *mentem omnia digerentem ac dirigentem*.  

*Adam* was, no doubt, thoroughly instructed by his Maker, in the History of the Worlds, & his own Creation. And since *Methusela* was above two hundred & forty Years old before the Death of *Adam*, how easily might there be from him, received and preserved among the Antediluvian Patriarchs, who were ἐυφυεῖς καὶ μακρόβιοι, as *Ingenious as Long-lived*, the *Tradition* of that History? *Noah* was the Heir of those Patriarchs; and the Sons of *Noah*, reckoned this *Philosophy* of the *Creation*, to be no little Part of the *Religion*, wherein they instructed their Posterity; tho’ for their Wickedness, God at length left them to be swallowed up in Ignorance. However, the Offspring of *Heber*, descended from *Shem*, seems longer to have retained that *Philosophy*, which acknowledged the True God, as the Creator of the World; whereof the *Philosophical Flights* in the Discourses between *Job* and his Friends, are a notable Instance. But especially favoured in this Matter, was the Family of *Abraham*; whom the Writings of the *Gentiles* themselves have cried up, as a great *Philosopher*; & whom God Himself commends for his *Teaching* of his Children. *Moses* had the Advantage of knowing all that was thus handed down unto his Time, and had the Direction of a Divine Inspiration too, for his committing to Writing so much of it, as he did.  

Now, before we can well interpret the *Mosaic History* of the *Creation*, it is necessary, that we should a little apprehend the *Principles* of that *Philosophy*, which *Moses* had alwayes in his Eye, while writing of it. And that we may come at the more clear & sure Apprehensions hereof, it is necessary that we should know what *Philosophy* prevailed in the First Ages; which was, in truth, no other than the *Corpuscularian*. But
then the *Atoms*, whereof they supposed all *Bodies* to be compounded, must not be supposed Absolutely and Physically *Indivisible*, (whereof nothing ever could be produced,) only so very small, that it should be beyond our Power any further to *Divide* them. These *Atoms*, are the very *keyes of Nature*; and all the Philosophers in the World, whether *Egyptian*, or *Phœnician*, or *Arabian*, or *Hebrew*, or, *Syrian*, or *Indian*, or *Græcian*, repaired unto them, in their *Philosophising*, until the World was above *Three Thousand and Five Hundred Years old.*

However they did not all putt the same Name upon these *First Principles*; for what some called *Atoms*, others called, *Waters*, others called, *Sand*, others *Dust*, & others *Particles*. Our *Moses* particularly here, first calls that *First Matter*, by the Name of *Heaven & Earth*; presently, he calls it only *Earth*; Anon, he calls it, *The Deep*; and then, *The Waters*. The *Brachmans of India*, and the *Druids of Europe*, held, *Aquas esse rerum principia*. And it may be, *Waters*, was used as the Name for *Atoms*, even before the Dayes of *Moses*; for there were Colledges of those Philosophers in *Germany*, as *Aventinus* tells us, in the Dayes of *Hermion*, which was, when *Isaac* was yet scarce forty Years old.

*Thales*, one of the most ancient Fathers of the *Greek* Philosophers, held, *That Water* was the Origin of the World; by which *Water* was meant the same that was also called, *The Many*. And *Thales* was conversant not only among the *Egyptians*, and the *Phœnicians*, but also among the *Babylonians*, among whom the *Mosaic Writings* were in such Credit, that it is affirm’d, They were translated into the *Caldee* Tongue, long before the Translation of the *Septuagint*, about the *Fiftieth Olympiad*, which was the very Age of *Thales*.

But the same that *Thales* called *Water*, *Pherecydes* the *Syrian*, his Contemporary called, *Earth*; following therein also the Authority of *Moses*; & putting the Name of *Xθονια*, upon that whereupon *Moses* putts, the Name of *Tohu*. Whereas *Pythagoras*, the Scholar of *Thales*, gave to the very same, the Name of, *Particles*, and of *Monads*. *Echphantus* the *Pythagorean*, we find in *Stobeus*, affirming, the *Monads* to be *Corporeal*; and *Aristotle* affirms the *Monads* to be σωμάτια μικρά, *minuta corpuscula*. At last *Anaximander* brought in the Name of υπέρλη, *Hyle*; which *Aristotle* himself took up, tho’ in another Signification. And what others had called by the Title of τὰ πολλά, *The Many*, the more Atheistical *Anaximander* would have to be το Ἄπειρον, *The Infinite*. This *First Matter* had yett other Denominations among other Philosophers; *Heraclitus* called it, ψέγματα ἐλαχιστά, *[79r] Ramenta Minutissima*;
Empedocles called it, θραύσατα, Fragmenta; Asclepiades called it, ὅγκους, Moleculas; Xenocrates called it, Μεγαθῆ ἄδιαιρετὰ, Magnituidines indivisibles; and others, mention’d by Aristotle, called it, Χήματα, Figuras. But it was Leucippus, and Democritus at last, who brought in the Name of Atoms. There is no need now of mentioning any other Term or Phrase, used for this Matter among the Ancients. Only one would not pass by, what Plato saies, That the Name of, τὰ Πολλὰ, multa, was used, à vetustissimis ac optimis, Dijsque proximis philosophis; And that the most ancient Wise Men, beleived all things to be made at first, ἕξ ἕνος καὶ πολλῶν, of one, and, many; By one, they meant God; By many, they meant our Atoms, or, immensam particularum multitudinem. This was the very Name, that Pythagoras too putt upon that which Moses calls, The Waters. 235

No doubt, the most ancient among the Sons of Noah, were the Dijs proximi philosophi, which according to the Concession of Plato, cultivated the Corpuscularian Philosophy. And the Jewes continued in it, until the Peripatetic Philosophy was introduced by Aristotle, who, as his Pupil Clearchus affirms, conversed with a Reverend Jew, that better Instructed him in Divinity, and others report, he was instructed at the Feet of Simeon the Just. But, if he received their Divinity, he made them a Return of his Philosophy; upon which they ran as mad, as Maimonides of later time did, and the true Understanding of the Mosaic Philosophy was lost among them. 236 Since therefore, the ancient Philosophy, was derived unto other Nations from the Hebrewes, it is proper to look for the Original of their Philosphic Terms among the Hebrewes. If we should particularly instance in, Hyle, as the Egyptians called it, or, Ile, as the Phœnicians: Tis true, we don’t plainly find the Original of it, in the Writings of Moses; but we must not imagine that the Sacred Writers have all the Terms of Art used among their Philosophers. And yett it is very probable, That Hyle, or Ile, may be found in the Hebrew הַחִיל/ Hiul, which signifies, The Sand; And Philo countenances this Conjecture: which is confirmed by the Hiule, wherein Hyle is rendred in the Arabic Tongue, which is a Daughter of the Hebrew. How agreeably indeed, are Atoms called Sands, as well for their Exility, as for their Fluidity? And how agreeable is it, for the same to be called, Waters? The oldest of all the Egyptian Philosophers, namely Taautus (whom the Greeks called Hermes) affirmed all things to be formed, ἐκ τοῦ ἁμμοῦ, out of Sand, which was as much as to say, out of minute Particles. And the Egyptian Philosophers affirmed the same of Water; by which they meant,
The Ancient Hebrewes applied also, the Name of Dust, unto this First Matter. A Fitt Name for any Multitude!

Other Nations used that Name for, A Multitude, as early as the Dayes of Moses. [Compare, Num. 23.10.] And that it was a Name for the First Matter, is intimtated, where it is said, first of Heaven; Isa. 40.22. He stretches out the Heaven as Dust; The Term Dok, to which the Matter of Heaven is there compared, according to Jerom signifies, Pulverem minutissimum, qui vento raptante sæpìus in oculos mittitur, et tam tenuis est, ut non videatur, etiamsi sentiatur. And then of Earth; Prov. 8.26. He made its Beginning, even the Dust of the World; as much as to say, That the Dust, was the Beginning, or Principle of the Habitable Earth. Compare Eccl. 3.20. All are of the Dust, and all turn to Dust again. And, Job. 4.19. whose Foundation, (or, Origin,) is in the Dust. Tho’ Moses do elegantly enough use the Name of Haphar, or Dust, for the First Matter, yett he rather chooses the Name of Water; because in his Time, Water, was an usual Phrase for an Immense Multitude. Yea, and it hath since been so: [Compare, Psal. 124.4.] And when many People are compared unto Waters, it seems originally to be a Comparison unto Atoms, for the Multitude of them. This was the Philosophy, derived from those whom Aristotle calls, παπαλαίως, The most ancient of all; and whereof a Renowned Philosopher of Idumæa, saies, Job. 15.18, 19. It is that which Wise Men have told from their Fathers, and have not hid it; unto whom alone the Earth was given; By which he means, the Patriarchs that were the more immediate Sons of Noah.238

We will begin, with the Amplitude of the Creation described by Moses.

There are Five Words used by Moses in the Entrance of his History, upon the Knowledge whereof, depends the Knowledge of all.239

First, we have Samajim and Aretz, that is, Heaven and Earth. Moses uses these Two Words together, in one, the more significantly to express Universal Matter; and not Heaven and Earth as distinctly formed, but as Jumbled together in one Unformed Mass. Hesiod, instructed with Hebrew Traditions, uses the like Expression. Moses in the next Place, calls the same Universal Matter only Aretz, that is Earth. This was that so the Corporeity of it, may be [80v] more plainly intimated. He proceeds then to call it, Tohu and Bohu, that is, Formless, and Empty. This is to Declare unto us, the Void Spaces every
where interspersed in it. The old Greek Philosophers called this *Universal Matter*, όνόδεν καὶ κενόν, *Nihil et Vacuum*: which *Theodotian* and *Aquila* will tell you, is the Translation of *Tohu* and *Bohu*; And others, for the *Turbid State* of it, called it, χθονίαν Meaning the *Chaotic Earth*, & not the *Habitable*. He passes to call it then *Tehom*, or, *The Deep*; to note the Immense Profundity of it. There is a Notable Hint unto this Purpose, in *Aretas* on the Tenth of the *Revelations*; Ἄβυων καλοῦστι, τὸ πολύβαθος τοῦ πρώτου στοιχείου, *Abyssum vocant immensam profunditatem primi principij*. But the Particles of this *Universal Matter*, so wonderfully Diffused and Confused, could avail nothing, until putt into regular *Motion*. Wherefore *Moses*, to point out the *Multitude* and the *Motion* thereof, comes in the fifth Place, to call them, *The Waters*. He does not mean, the Body which we now call *Waters*, for they were not yet produced; but such *Atomical* and *Chaotical* ones, as the *Brachmans* in *Strabo*, make to be Άρχας τῆς κοσμοποίησις, *The Principles of the World*. This is that *Universal Matter*, which the Greeks called, *Chaos*; a Name, not of such a Notation as *Philo Judæus* assigns for it, but coming from the Hebrew Chauth, which signifies, * Darkness*; in which Sense, *Orpheus* called it, νυκτὰ Σοφώδη, *A Dark Night*; and the *Phœnicians*, as *Philo Biblius* made ἄερα Σοφώδη, *A Dark Air*, to be the *Origin* of all things.

Now, inasmuch as all the *Ancient Philosophy*, which was the Daughter of the *Mosaic*, pretended unto an Account of nothing less, than the *whole Creation*, tis highly probable that *Moses* would give no less in his *Cosmology*. But being thus prepared, Lett us view the *Six Dayes* of the *Creation*, and what was done in each of them.

**The First Day.**

*In the Beginning* was *Universal Matter* by God first created of nothing; a wondrous *Congeries* of all sorts of *Particles*, uniform’d, and unmov’d, and every where separated from one another with empty Spaces. This *Universal Matter* was putt into *Motion*, by the *Spirit of God*, and not left unto a fortuitous *Motion* and *Concurse*. Thus was there given unto *Matter*, that *Force* which we call *Nature*; for, *Nature* is nothing but that *Motion* which the *Spirit of God* ha’s imprinted upon *Matter*, and which He perpetually governs with His infinite Wisdome. The *Atoms* of this *Universal Matter*, must not be supposed
Absolutely Indivisible; tis enough, that they were very Minute Particles. And the Motion at first given to the Atoms we may suppose to have been Twofold. The first Motion, may be called, A Motion of Preparation. This might be Transverse, or, Across; in which the various Meetings of the Atoms one with another, gave an Opportunity for such whose Figures were agreeable unto one another, to join, and stick together, in Bodies, that from this First Concretion, would soon grow into Elements. The Second Motion may be called, A Motion of Separation. This might be circular. And the first Essay of it, might be the Producing of Fire or Light. The Atoms are of diverse Figures; according to which they may be some of them called, Pilulae, others, Globuli, others, Bracteoleæ, and a Fourth sort, of a grosser Consistence, and of so many Forms, that it is not easy to assign a fitt Name for them. It may be, the Fire is composed of the First Sort, the Water of the Second, the Air of the Third, and the Earth, of the Last. And there may be a Fifth Sort, smaller than any of these; broken off perhaps from the rest in their Circumgyration; and subservient especially to Matters in the Firmament. The Motion where into the Universal Matter was now putt, no doubt carried off the Pilulae, into that vast Collection of them, which we call the Empyraen Heaven, (or the Sphaere, whereof see Prov. 8.22, and Job. 22.14.) And this Fire, is implied in that Light, whereof we find it so early spoken, Let there be Light; and whereof Hippocrates takes Notice, That the ancients called it, Æther. Had the Word, Ur, been so translated, some Scoffers at Moses had been silenced. But when Fire was produced, Light was also produced; which is no other than Ignis Effluxio. It was not amiss in Empedocles, to call this Light, ἰλαν ἀρχήτυπον, Solem Originalem et Primigenium. The First Day and Night were distinguished, by the Rotation of that Matter, so elevated and congregated, and carried about with such a Glare, that if there had then been a Præ-adamite, he might by the Shine of it, have seen the rest of the Abyss. The Lucid Particles of that Matter, may be the Morning Stars, that sang together, when the Angels shouted for Joy, at the Laying of Foundations of the Earth. But it must be remembred, that the Motion which thus carried off the Pilulae, did carry off, & carry up, vast Numbers of the Globuli too: by which Means [81r] we find Real and Natural Waters, as well as Fire, in the Highest Heavens: As in a Distillation we see, that in a Pound of Spirit of Wine, so inflammable a thing! there are carried over, several Ounces of Water with it. The very Name Shamajim, seems composed of Fire, and
Water. This was the Philosophy of the Ancient Hebrewes. [Compare Psal. 148.4. and Psal. 104.3.] These Waters may be of unknown Uses, in those Heavens; To Temper the Heat, of the Heavenly Bodies; and Augment their Light, as Chrystals about them; and convey subtile Influences from thence to the Inferior Orbs.\textsuperscript{244}

The Second Day.

The whirling Motion of the Abyss, or Universal Matter yett continuing, the Atoms of a more Bractal Figure, now possessed themselves of that vast Space, which Moses calls, The Firmament. But probably, the Mixture of them, near the Surface of our Globe, was yett so thick and so dark, that the Light could hardly yett make its Passage hither; And this may be the Cause, why God would not call it, Good.\textsuperscript{245} The Figure of these Atoms, would not allow them so swift a Flight, towards the Selvidge of the World, as those which gott the Start of them. The Atoms, of the whole Expanse, and of the Air, may be the same; except, that near the Surface of our Globe, there are added such Vapours, as to distinguish that Region, which we call Our Atmosphære. The Name /עַרְגָּא/ Rakiah, used by Moses, (cui semper placuere compendia) for this Expanse, is admirably suited, to express the Nature of the Particles that compose it; It signifying, both to Expand, and also to Constringe, or Compress. They spread themselves, and chase away all others from themselves, and at the same time, they do firmly as far {as} they can compel together, those that are within their Embraces. Tis by the Efficacy of these, that God, [Job. 26.7.] hangs our Globe upon nothing; and [Psal. 104.5.] He layes Foundations, not only for the Earth, but for the Stars too, that shall not be removed forever.\textsuperscript{246}

The Third Day.

The Conatus Dispansivus, of those Atoms, to whom the Creator ha’s assign’d so large a Province in His Creation, now accomplished, That the Waters under the Heaven, were gathered together into one Place, and the Dry Land appeared. It protruded the Particles of Grosser Matter, down toward the Center; where they need no other Cement, than their Agreement in Figure, to produce their firm Cohærence. But from their various
Distribution, and perhaps from some other Varieties, arose the Inequality of the Surface of the Earth. And a considerable Portion of the Globular Atoms being left here, behold, the Waters, whose Figure disposes them to run and fill all the Cavities provided for them. Nor is it amiss to represent all the Seas, as one, in this Collection of Waters, inasmuch as they have (like the Caspian with the Mediterranean,) their Subterraneous Communications with one another. And tho’ the Earth have the Name of Dry Land given unto it, yet it is not so Dried, as to be left wholly destitute of that Humour, which must accompany all Seeds, to carry on the several Generations in the World. But the Vapour and Humour so sent forth continually, supposes a Central Fire in the Bowels of the Earth; which probably is a vast Congregation of Pilular Atoms, by the Wisdome of God, so placed at first in the Center of the Abyss, that being hedged about with such a Number of Gross Particles, when God gave to Matter its first Motion, they could not make their Way thorough, with their Companions, up unto the Æther; and they putt on the more Fiery Appearance, because they are cramm’d so close together. The Mist whereof we read, That it watered the whole Face of the Earth, before God had caused it yett to Rain upon the Earth, seems to have been a Vapour of Watry Particles boil’d forth, by that Central Fire. We may add, That the unæqual Descent of the Terrestrial Particles, at the first Settlement, produced not only the vast Basons, wherein the Sea’s are lodged, but also the Channels, wherein the Rivers flow about the World, like the Veins and Arteries, in an Humane Body. But, that the Central Fire, may not be, thro’ Length of Time, and long Evaporation, wasted, it seems, that Heaven affords it a Nourishment, in a continual Descent of Sulphureous Particles, which being absorb’d by the Sea, sink to the bottom, until they find their Way in proper Channels, to that awful Receptacle. By the warm Aspirations of the Central Fire, the Generation of Plants, on the Third Day, was forwarded; of Seed made by the Immediate Hand of God. There might be something peculiar in the Season, for a vigorous Effort of Nature, as well as a Display of the Divine Power & Energy, in the Acceleration of such a Generation. The Succus Nutritius requisite unto this Generation, is not Water, but a certain, special, Viscous Matter, which lies in Water, [82v] and which cannot well permeate the Pores of the Vegetables, unless there be Water to attenuate it. 247
The Fourth Day.

A vast Multitude of Igneous Particles were left all this while scattered throughout the whole Expanse. The Great Creator of the World therefore, collected them into that one Globe, which we call, The Sun, & which Empedocles call’d, πυρός ἄθροισμα μέγα, A Great Heap of Fire. The Solar Matter thus collected, keeps continually whirling about, with great Inæqualities in the Surface of it; and is more changeable than the very Moon itself: which alone, might be enough to lead Reasonable Men, from the Worship of That, unto the Worship of that glorious Father of Lights, who is without Variableness or Shadow of Turning. The Sun being always upon a vast Expence of itself, God ha’s both encompass’d it, with a Transparent Sort of a Covering Shell, or Hedge; and the Atoms of the Expanse are also of such a Figure, as to leave Channels, thro’ which there is a continual Recourse of a Nourishment unto it, and unto that Covering from all Parts of the Creation. But yet such is the Contexture of that Covering upon the Sun, that sometimes tis thick enough, to check the Passage of the Sun-beams; from whence arise the Maculæ Solares; yea, the Countenance of the Sun sometimes is paler than ordinary, for a whole Month together; and Pliny tells the Time, when the Sun, Totius Anni ferè Spacio palluit. Thus hath the Almighty sett Bars about the Sun, (as well as about the Sea) and said, Here, shall thy Fiery Waves be staid! This Heavenly Carbuncle, thus formed by God, seems designed, not only to impart Light and Heat unto the rest of the Creation, but also to have in it the most subtil Sulphur of Nature, by the Steams whereof it produces most eximious Effects in the other Creatures, and particularly in the Bodies, (and by Consequence, in the Spirits,) of Men. That rich Sulphur of Nature, (which Moses may mean, by, The precious Things putt forth by the Sun & Moon, the precious Things of the lasting Hills,) may have certain fine Particles of the Cœlestial Waters, as well as Fires, to constitute it. An agreeable Motion is therefore ordered for the Sun; which Motion, we find celebrated by Abraham, the most Renouned Astronomer of the Ancients, of whom the old Writer of the Orphicks thus expresses himself,

Oυ γαρ τις ιδοι’ κλ.’
Nemo illum novit mortalia cuncta regentem
Unicus ille nisi Chaldæo sanguine cretus;
Norat enim solis qua se astrum lege rotaret  
et circum terram magnus se volveret orbis,  
Æqualisque teresque, intus sita complectens.

So far from Unlikeness, by the way, is the Tradition of Abrahams being an Astronomer, that it is likely, his Father Terah from the very Foresight of his being one, gave him the Name of Abram; wherein the Heigths of the Heavens, and the Stars of the High Heavens, to be consydered by him, are perhaps, referr’d unto. But then, that the scalding Influences of the Sun might be conveniently Tempered, God created, that other Planet, the Moon; of a wat’ry and moister Texture, to dispense unto the Earth, which cannot bear to be scorch’d, a certain Fatt Liquor, which is wondrously agreeable to the Humidum Radicale of things generated on this Terraqueous Globe. I Judge it not worth while, to recite the Conjectures of my Dickinson, about the Production, and Consistence of the other Planets, or of the Fixed Stars; For, tho’ the Lord ha’s call’d them all by their Names, (whereof a few are instanced in the Book of Job,) until we know those Names, and the Signification of them, tis but little that can be conjectured concerning them. Tis possible, that if we understood those Four, namely, Ghas, and Chimah, and Chesil, and Mazzaroth, which are all that are Named in the Book of God, we might guess a little more about the rest; which perhaps may have their Varieties much comprized under those Four; but concerning these also, we are much in the Dark. All we will add, shall be, That probably the Moon shone before the Sun, on that Haemisphere where Moses lived; and this may be a Reason for his putting the Evening before the Morning, in his History of the Creation. The Expanse was now Good; that is to say, Perfect; nor was it called Good, until it was thus admirably furnished.

The Fifth Day.

Moses proceeds now, to the Animated Parts of the Creation. The Water and the Earth were the Elements, (and the fittest ones,) to be employ’d in producing of them. And yett, all that they could pretend, was, to carry the Seeds thereof in their Bowels, and afford that warm and moist Matter unto them, which might be their Nourishment. God immediately
creating the Souls of Animals, probably lodg’d them in a Seminal Matter, which carried the Figure of an Egg. For which Cause, the Ancient Philosophy, both Egyptian and Græcian, discoursed much of the Egg, at the Mouth of God, and the 'Ων πρωτόγονον, Ovum Primigenium, from whence all things had their Original. In that Egg, with the Souls of the Animals, there were also the Shapes [83r] of them, formed by the Finger of God; or the Pores of them so disposed, as to entertain the Nutritious Juice, which does increase their Bodies, into what at last they come to. For these Corporeal Ideæs, our sacred Philosopher uses the Word, /\v{y}m Min, which we render, Their Kind. God gave to the Seeds of Animals, the faculty of admitting from the circumambient Slime, a Nutritious Juice, into all the Parts of them; and so to dispose thereof, as to augment, & perfect, and specify the Animals. The Souls of Animals, which God produced indeed from the Earth, (but no Doubt sublimed into a very fine Essence, by His own Omnipotent Hand,) were of a most Subtil, and Active Nature; and the Seeds, whereto God united them, were admirably suited, for their Animal-Functions; and that Fatt Clay, wherein the Almighty Potter, putt them, yeelded Liquors very agreeable for their Concretion and Accretion; and the Vapour which ascended, before the Lord had caused it as yett to Rain upon the Earth, was doubtless a very Digesting sort of a Thing. Old Archelaus was not altogether ignorant of this Proceeding, when he said, γεν{v}ασθαι τα ζωα ε ḥ θερ ῎ης της γης, και ι λυ Vν παραπλησίαν γάλακτι, οιο Êν τροφην ανιείσης; Genita fuisset Animalia Terræ calore, limum lacti similem in alimentum liquante. And the Generation of the Aquatils, was carried on like that of the Terrestrials. But after this Day, (such is the Order of God,) the Generation must be carried on, by a Conjunction of Male and Female; in the Seed whereof lies hid, that fine Spirit, much more fine than the Æther itself, which is the Soul of the Animal; and yett that Soul being but Sublimed Earth, is Corporeal, and at length returns to the Earth: but that fine Spirit, when enkindled, finds in the Seed, the Ideæ of an Organic Body, of a most wonderful Structure, which it manages accordingly.  

The Sixth Day.

At last, MAN, the Lord and King, of the other Creatures is introduced, into the Palace, thus Erected and Furnished for him. The Soul of Man is a most Noble Thing; and called,
Gen. 2.7. *A Breath of Lives*, in the Plural Number; because by it a Man does not only **live** the present **Life**, which is Frail, and Earthly and Mortal, but also **breathe** after, & at length come to live, a **Life Eternal** in the Heavens, *æqual to the Angels*. It is said to be **Breathed** by God *into his Nostrils*, (or Hebr. *Into his Face.*) because, God both made his **Body**, [see Job. 10.8. and Psal. 119.73. and Isa. 64.8.] and then so infused the **Soul**, that from the action of **Breathing** and other **Senses** appearing in the **Face**, it appear’d, that he was indeed **Alive**. The Lodging provided for this Noble Thing, the **Soul**, was not immediately made of the **Common Earth**, (tho’ it had before been such **Dust**) but of **Adamah**, a Red, Rich, Rosie, and **Shining** Sort of Earth, by an unknown Fermentation, advanced now into a Sort of a **Quintessence**; and, no doubt, the **Body of Adam**, did by his Fall, unhappily lose much of the **Primitive Glory**, wherein it shone like the **Ruby**. The **Body** of Man was perhaps, the most Illustrious Thing in the whole Visible Creation, and the most precious Treasures of the **Stars** themselves, not excepting the very **Sun**, were in the Composition of it. The fitter Habitation it was, for the Heavenly **Soul**, which **Moses** chooses to call by the Name of *שָׁם/ Neshamah*, wherein he alludes to the Word, *שָׁם/ Shamajim*, for this Cause, because it came from thence. My **Dickinson**, adds, *Nec abhorret à fide nostrâ, doctissimorum virorum sententia, qui credunt Deum ad singendum corpus primi hominis verè manus suas adhibuisse, assumptâ nimirum formà Humanà, in quà postè apparuit Adamo facto, non secus ac posteris etiam sæculis visus est. A Seed*, formed by the exquisite Workmanship of Heaven, was now putt into the **Body** of Man, a fitt Instrument for the **Soul**, in carrying on the succeeding Generations. It is the **Soul**, that Begins and Perfects every **Generation**: and Excites the united **Seed** of the Parents, and cherishes that purer **Seed**, the *Bullula*, and digests that thicker **Seed**, in the Χόριον, and by its *æthereal* and *plastick* Warmth manages the whole affair, except the first Delineation of the Parts, which it finds lodged there by the peculiar Work of God. The **Seed** would be altogether Torpid, & and not bring anything to Effect, if it were not for the **Formative Power**, which God, the great γενεσιουργος, hath implanted in the **Soul**. Harvey’s History of **Generation** makes it evident, that the **Soul** in the **Seed**, carries on all, without any Assistance from the Mother, for at least the First **Three Months**, in all which Time, the **Embryo** remains, not fastned unto the Mother, by any *Ligaments*. In what Part of the **Body** soever, the **Soul** may have its principal Seat, which is variously disputed, it is most
certainly no other than a *Foreigner* and a *Sojourner* here, and placed by God in this earthly Tabernacle, for a certain *Term*; upon the Expiration [84v] of which Term, it should go back, to its *heavenly Country*; even the Countrey, which *Plato* acknowledged, when he called it, ὑπερουράνιον τόπον, *The Super-Cæstial Place*; and *Pythagoras*, when he called it, ἐλεύθερον ἀθέρα, *Liberum Æthera*, where he taught that the *Souls of Hero’s*, after they left their *Bodies*, remained, ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀμβρότους, *Immortales et Incorruptibles*. But since the *Souls of Men* come from Heaven, and are not generated by our Parents, it may justly be enquired, How it could be said unto Mankind, *Increase and Multiply*. Tis very sure, That the *Souls* of Men, are in our Sacred Bible, represented, as the *Sons* of God. And the ancient Philosophy of the Gentiles called them, *The Offspring of God*, and called God, *Their Father*. Whereas our *Bodies* are called, *Branches*; which intimates their Derivation from the *Seed of our First Parents*; wherein there is yet also, a very Divine Workmanship. The Wisdom of the Ancients, looks upon the Humane *Seed*, as of a very sublime Nature; and not only akin, τῶ τῶν ἀστρων στοιχείω, *To the Element of the Stars*, (as *Aristotle* expresses it,) but also peculiarly stamp’d with a very Divine Character. This little Portion of the *Humane Body*, whereby a thing of so vast Consequence, as the Propagation of Mankind, was to be carried on, was framed with a most astonishing Artifice, & made capable of being multiplied; but the True & Pure *Seed*, which is but a little Portion of that Mass, which we call so, is a most *refined Essence*, capable of an inexpressible *Mixture* (as one may call it,) with the very *Soul* itself, so that the Affections of the very *Soul* of the Parents, may by it, as by an agreeable Vehicule, be transferr’d unto their Children. *Placuit autem Deo, ut speciei multiplicatio, non masculi solius, aut Feminae, sed utriusque virtus existat*. *Nec dubitandum est, quin mulier eâ ratione præsertim facta sit adjunctus viro, ut ad multiplicandam speciem symbola sua mittat*. *Quod Moses honestâ quidem, modestâque locutione satis aperta docet, quando ait Deum fecisse Evam ut Adamo fieret adjutorium*  יִהְיֶה/ *Chenegdo, tale nimirum, quale fiat ei coram, vel Anteriori parte conjuncta.*

Briefly, The united *Seed of the Parents*, producing a sort of Æthereal Flame, and by a secret *Magnetism* drawing unknown Influences from the very Æther, itself, affords a most congruous Receptacle for a *Soul*, which the Great God accordingly places in it; And hence the *Generation* is not improperly ascribed unto the *Parents*. 
But after all, Such is the Mystery of the Divine Operations, in this, as well as in other Matters, that it becomes all Men humbly to confess, *That what they know, is the least Part of what they do not know.* If they are *Divines,* Lett them acknowledge with *Lactantius,* *Hominem in Generatione,* præter materiam nascendi (nempè semen) nihil conferre; cætera omnia, nimirum, conceptionem, Inspirationem Animæ, corporis Formationem, partiumque virtutem et incoluntatem Dei esse. If they are *Philosophers,* Lett them acknowledge with *Harvey,* *Ille recté piéque rem reputavit, qui rerum omnium generationes ab eodem illo aeterno atque omnipotente numine deducit; à cujus nutu rerum universitas dependet.* If they are *Physicians,* Lett them not incur the Rebuke of *Galen,* who saies, *Quo pacto hæc fiant, si scrubaberis, convinceris te non intellegere, neque tuam imbecillitatem; nec opificis tui potentiam.*

Some fine Hints, my Author, now falls into, as the Effects of his own Experiments; That there is in Man, a certain Lucid and Igneous Nature, which ha’s a strange Affinity with the Cælestial *Sun.* A Tincture, fulgid like the *Sun,* may be by Art, fetched out of an Humane Body, which if the Rayes of the *Sun* fall upon, it will take *Fire* immediately. This *Essence* being lodg’d in a Glass, will Illuminate the Largest Room in the Darkest Night, beyond any *Carbuncle.* Tis the *Aurum Naturæ* in us; and there are no where so Rich Veins of it, as in the *Humane Body;* yea, the *Aurific Tincture* may there be mett withal. When *Moses* notes, That the *Luminaries* of Heaven, are to send, Gen. 1.17. /א realiza que todas as coisas, e assim, *Aurum,* ou *Gold;* e principalmente, *Solar* and *Golden Essence,* which is in other things, but especially, in the Body of Man. But this is a Matter here to be no further prosecuted.

Thus we see a most *Beautiful World,* produced; and the *First Matter,* (which was those *Atoms,* that the Apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon* calls, *The Unseen Matter,* & that for the Smallness of them rendring them *Invisible,* the Apostle calls, Heb. 11.1. μὴ φανημενα, *Not Seen,* formed into Shapes Innumerable. The old Jewes called that *First Matter* by the Name of /א realiza que todas as coisas, and that is, *Nothing;* because it consisted of so very *Small Bodies,* as could be no more seen, than if they were *Nothing.* It was most expressively done in *Moses,* to assign that *First Matter* those Two Names, of *Tohu,* and *Bohu.* The
Tohu, was the First Matter, scattered throughout the Universe; but Empty Space was necessary, to putt that Matter into Motion; and that Space, as a Principium sine quo non, is called Bohu; as among the Arabians also, Bahi, signifies, a Vacuum.\textsuperscript{258} [These Names, tho’ we sometimes find them together in the Prophets, Jer. 4.23. and Isa. 34.11. yett it is a Mistake in those Interpreters, who make them of but one Signification. Accordingly, we elsewhere have Tohu alone. Isa. 45.18. Psal. 107.40. Job. 12.24. Deut. 32.10.] Agreeably, the old Greek Philosophers, made these the two Principles of all things; τὸ πλήρες, Plenum, and, τὸ κενὸν, Vacuum. Asclepiades called those very Principles, ὁγκους, Moles, and, πόρους, Meatus. But, as for the First Matter itself, t’was a Vain Philosophy, which came at length, to assert it eternal; No, its Beginning, and Creation by God out of Nothing, is asserted in the very first Words of the Bible; on which the Gloss of the Blessed old Austin, was highly in the Right; Informis illa materia, quam de nihilo fecit Deus, primò appellata est Cælum et Terra. Nam quem admodum, si semen Arboris considerantes, dicamus ibi esse Radices et Truncum et Ramos et Folia, atque Fructus, non quià jam sunt, sed quià indè futura sunt; sic in principio Deus fecit Cælum et Terram, quasi semen Cæli et Terræ; cùm in confuso adhuc erat Cæli et Terræ Natura. The Way, by which this First Matter came into Shapes, was, by the Spirit of God moving it. This was that Wind, κολπία, celebrated by the Ancients; not a proper Wind, but / פ ישפוך Kol-pi-jah, or, The Voice of the Mouth of God. But the general Notion, that so many Thousands of Interpreters have run upon, That here is a Metaphor in the Mosaic Word, Merechepheth, taken from the Incubation of a Bird, is altogether mistaken, and it proceeds from their Ignorance of the Old & the True Philosophy.\textsuperscript{259}

In the Creation thus brought about, we find Moses, as a Philosopher mentioning only Two Heavens; the Æthereal, and the Aëreal; but as a Divine, he elsewhere mentions, A Third Heaven. [see Deut. 10.14. with 2. Cor. 12.2.] This is that Light which no Man can approach unto. The Two Heavens are certainly very Fluid, and Various. And for the Motion of the Bodies in them, the Ptolomeæans, and the Copernicans, & the Cartesians, may save themselves the Labour of their several Hypotheses. Tis enough, that we are told, Job. 37.12. It is turned about by the Counsels of God; where the original Word, alludes to the Counsels of a Pilot. And inasmuch as we read, that the Fingers of God, have a special Work about the Heavens; But the Angels of God, are meant by His
Fingers; And we read of Angels having particular Parts of the Creation, peculiarly committed unto their Charge: Behold a further Provision, for the Carrying on of things in the Government of the World, which we do not as yett fully understand! A Provision, whereof the ancient Philosophers among the Gentiles were not Ignorant; For, besides what Aristotle speaks about Intelligences, wee have Hesiod, near Three Thousand Years ago, acknowledging Myriads of Angels, as having the World under their Management.²⁶⁰

This is the Scheme, & the Summ, of the Philosophy, which our Dickinson supposes constantly preserved among the Patriarchs, down unto the Dayes of Moses. Nor is it likely, that the Israelites were Strangers to this Philosophy, even while they were in Egypt. They were an Ingenious Nation, and probably the Egyptians themselves among whom they lived, were not in the Dayes of Joseph, sunk into that Idolatry, to which they afterwards degenerated; but worshipped the same True God, with the Israelites, and according to the Instructions of Joseph, who taught their Senators Wisdome. Yea, tis not improbable, That the Israelites, when they grew Numerous, built a Temple, (as well as lesser Synagogues) for the Worship of the True God: [whereof we have some Intimation, in 2. Sam. 7.6.] Indeed, Both Egyptians and Israelites afterwards fell into Idolatry; and God made those very Egyptians, in Conformity to whom they so corrupted themselves, to prove a sore Scourge unto them. Nevertheless, even then also, their Servitude [86v] was not so very hard, [see Num. 11.18. and Exod. 5.21.] as to leave them, without Men of Education, who still instructed them, in this Religious Philosophy. And how well instructed in it, their Neighbours and Kinsmen, the Idumæans were, the Book of Job, is enough to satisfy us; if the Prophets Jeremiah and Obadiah, had hinted nothing about it. But for Moses himself, the whole World could not show a Man, that was more Accomplished. His Education in the Court of Egypt; His Fellowship in the Colledge of Diospolis; His Expedition into Æthiopia; His Conversation with the wisest Men of Arabia, and Idumæa, and, perhaps Phœnicia, during his long Exile; But above all, His Intimate Communion with Heaven; All conspire to Invite our Expectations, of great Things from him. Among his other Excellencies, it seems likely that his Chymistry enabled him to do such things, as the Philosophers in our Age, are Strangers unto. That of Dissolving the Golden Calf into Powder, seems to be one of those things. A Work for
none but an Adeptist! And it will be hard for us, to obtain satisfactory Thoughts, about, The Holy Anointing Oil, prepared by Moses, for the Use of all the ensuing Generations; or about, The Perfume, which might not be imitated; except we suppose Moses, a Master of the great Philosophic Secrets, by which the true and pure Essences of Things, and the finest Magisteries may be come at.  

Our Dickinson having mentioned the Chymistry of Moses, his Profession will be some Excuse for him, if he take Occasion to give a more ancient Instance of the most exquisite and exalted Chymistry, in one that lived long before the Dayes of Moses; and that is, Noah himself.

We read of, A Window, ordered for the Ark; [Gen. 6.16.] The Word, Tsohar, signifies, not, A Window, but, A Splendor; and for a proper Window, Moses uses the Word, Chalon, and one Window would hardly serve the Three Stories of the Ark. Some Hebrew Doctors, do therefore, by Tsohar, understand, the Light of certain precious Stones, hung up, in the several Stories there, like so many Carbuncles. But our Dr. Dickinson, apprehends, That it was the Splendour, of a certain Igneous, and Sulphureous Liquor, which Noah prepared with admirable Art, and hung up in Chrystal Vessels every where, so as to Illuminate the several Cells of the Ark; the subtil Steams whereof contributed not a little to the Sustaining, Refreshing, and Nourishing of all the Creatures there Imprisoned.

But thus you have had sett before you, a Key to the Philosophy of that excellent Moses, of whom the very Pagans themselves knew not how to speak any thing, but what was magnificent; Chalcidius calls him, τὸν προφήτην, The Prophet; Plato calls him, Νόμοθετην, The Lawgiver; but Eupolemus calls him, τὸν πρῶτον σοφὸν, The First Wise Man; and Numenius, σοφώτατον, The Wisest of Men. Tho’ in giving you this Key, I have taken the Liberty, to cloathe the Conceptions very much in my own Expressions, yett for these Conceptions, I have been very much beholden unto my Dr. Dickinson, whose Book of above Three hundred Quarto Pages, I have here digested into an Epitome, which you see less than Three Sheets have contained. And I am verily perswaded, That if this Account of the Creation, be further examined and considered, you will find it an
Incomparable Key, to very many other Passages, throughout the whole Sacred Scriptures.265

I will only add, That the Vain Witts of the Foolish and Profane Men in this Age, do take too much Liberty in the Diminutive Terms, with which they speak of the Terraqueous Globe whereon the Great God ha’s placed us. It is not from a Religious Contempt of this World, but because the Spirit of Irreligion in them, too often, designs a Contempt of the Great God, & of His Works, that they so express themselves. This Lower World is a more Noble Part of the Creation, and more highly to be accounted of, than many are well aware. But of all its Prerogatives, whereof our Dickinson does enumerate several, I cannot break off, till I have in his own Words mention’d This;

Nihil potuit amplius, nihil elatius in ejus honorem proferri, quàm quòd FILIUS HOMINIS, qui Deus est, et Cælos atque Terram fecit, ipse ad Terram descendere, et sumptâ sibi carne ex eodem luto, ex quo omnes mortales efficti sunt, ibidem morari per plures Annos haud dedignatus est.

Allow me for once to be a Translator. Nothing Further, Nothing Higher, can be spoken for the Honour of this Earth, than that the SON OF MAN, who is God as well as Man, & made both Heaven & Earth, would vouchsafe to descend unto the Earth, & assume Flesh of the same Clay, whereof all Mortals are formed, and sojourn here for many Years together.

[87r] Having thus done with my Doctor Dickinson, I will add one Historical Remark for the Conclusion of all. There have been Two great Physicians, who have betaken themselves unto Scripture, that they may understand the Secrets of Nature.

Sennertus, who finds much Fault with such as perverted the Text of Moses, and attempted an Exposition of him, out of Heathen Authors; Ausu infelici et non tolerando.

And, Valesius, who in his Proem to his, Sacra Philosophia, tells us, That whereas he had in the former Part of his Life commented upon Aristotle, and upon many Pieces of Hippocrates and Galen, he was resolved now to devote the Remainder of his Dayes, to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, & seek his Philosophy out of them for the time to come.
We know, that in respect of God, it is alike, to create all things in an Instant, or to do it successively in a shorter or a longer Time. We may humbly enquire, after the Reasons, why the Almighty took a Period of Six Days, to finish the Works of Creation? v. 31.

A. It is, as Mr. Robert Jenkins observes, more suitable to the Capacities and Apprehensions of Men, that the Creation of the World should be delivered unto us, as finished in Six Days, rather than a shorter or longer Time; and therefore it was fitt, that it should be really so Performed and Finished, as to render the History more useful unto us. By such a Successive and Gradual Proceeding in the Production of things, the Glory of God is more manifested unto Men, than it would have been, if all had been done at once, or by more Tedious Methods. The Obligation to the Observation of a Sabbath hence arising, & this to commemorate the Works of Creation, is one Remarkable Instance.  

But lett us ascend a little Higher. It is Austins Opinion, That the Six Days of the Creation of the World, are distinguished, according to the Perception which the Angels had of the Creation; From whence was framed the Distinction of the Schoolmen, between Cognitio Matutina, and, Cognitio Vespertina. We will not altogether keep to that Notion. But this we will propose. The Angels were the Beginning of the Creation, and were created probably in the Morning of the First Day. We read, Job. XXXVIII.7. The Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for Joy; & glorified God, for His Creating of the World. Now the Angels, tho’ they are so very Blessed and Glorious, yett they are but Finite, and are unable to fathom the wonderful Works of God, which things the Angels desire to look into: And the more they Know of God and His Works, the more they Adore Him with their Praises. The whole Scene of the Creation seems to have been laid open in Order before them, according to the several Degrees and various Natures of things; whereby they must have had a fuller View, & a clearer Understanding of the Divine Power & Wisdome, than they could have had, if the World had been started forth in an Instant, and Jump’t as it were into this beautiful Frame &
Order. God was pleased by several Steps to declare His Glory before the Angels, and excite their Adoration, which was expressed in Songs and Shouts of Joy. His Glory, and their Happiness was this Way advanced, much beyond what it would have been, if all things had been Created, & Disposed into their Order, in a Moment. They look’d into the First Principles of Things; and every day presented them with New Wonders; and thus were their Voices Tuned and Raised unto those Praises, which are to be their Employment unto Eternity.266

But after all, as our Jenkins expresses it; It were a strange Præsumption, to demand of Almighty God a Reason of all His Actions, and not Beleeve Him upon His Word.

Q. The Wisdome and Goodness, of the Great God, in the System of the World, is it not very sensible to all that will observe it? v. 31.
A. The Order and Beauty of the Systematical Parts of the World, and the Discernible Ends thereof, wherein there still appears a τὸ βελτίον, or a Meliority above what was necessary to bee, this is evidently such, as to make us conclude, That the present Constitution, proceeded not from any blind Causes of Necessary Matter, or Fortuitous Atom; wee must from hence conclude, That an Intelligent Being of Infinite Wisdome and Goodness, formed this World, out of Choice, in this particular Way.267

For our Assistence in the Contemplation hereof, I will call in the Industrious and Ingenious Reflections, of Mr. Bentley, in his Discourse, at the Lecture, founded by Mr. Boyl, for the Defence of the Christian Religion.268

Come then; Laying aside the Prejudices of our Youth, Lett us consider;269 Tis evident, that all the Planets Receive Heat & Light, from the Body of the Sun; without which, our own Earth particularly, would bee a Desolate Lump of Clay. It is Good therefore, that there should bee a Sun, to Impart these Influences. But how came the Sun to bee Luminous? It was not from the Necessity of Natural Causes, or from the Constitution of the Heavens. All the Planets might have moved about him in the same Orbs, & with the same Velocity, as they do now; and yett the Sun might have been a Dark, and a Cold Body, like any of them. For, as the six primary Planets, Revolve about
the Sun, so there are secondary ones that Revolve about those Planets; as the Moon about the Earth, and the Satellits about Saturn and Jupiter. But then, in what horrible Desolation must the whole World have been overwhelmed! It had been utterly unfitt for the Animated Creatures, that God intended for its Inhabitants. That the central Sun, should bee a lucid Body, and convey Heat and Light and Life unto the Planets round about him; This is a Wise and a Good Contrivance of Him, who in His Wisdome made the Heavens.

To proceed; The concentric Revolutions of the Planets about the Sun, proceed from a Compound Motion; a Gravitation towards the Sun, which is a constant Energy infused into Matter, by the Author of all Things; and a Projected, Transverse Impulse, in Tangents to their several Orbs, that was also Imprinted at first by the Divine Arm upon them, & will carry them around, until the End of all Things. Now, admitting, that Gravity may bee essential to Matter; and that a Transverse Impulse might likewise bee acquired by Natural Causes; yet, for all the Planets to move about the Sun, in Circular Orbs, there must bee given to each, a Determinate Impulse, & these present particular Degrees of Velocity, which they now have, in Proportion to their Distances from the Sun, & to the quantity of the Solar Matter. For, had the Velocities of the several Planets, been greater or smaller than they are, at the same Distances from the Sun, or, had their Distance from the Sun, or the quantity of the Suns Matter, & consequently his Attractive Power, been greater or smaller than they are; now with the same Velocities; They would not have Revolved in Concentric Circles, as they do, but have moved in Hyperbola’s or Parabola’s, or in Ellipses very Eccentric. And what wee thus assert about the Primary Planets, may also bee applyed unto the Secondary. Now, that all these Distances, and Motions, and Quantities of Matter, should bee so accurately & Harmoniously adjusted, in this great Variety of our System, it is above the Fortuitous Hitts, of meer, blind, material Causes; it must certainly flow, from the Disposals of that infinitely Wise and Good Being, who, as Plato saies, ἀξί γεωμετρεῖ, always acts geometrically. If the Planets had moved in such Lines, as wee have described, sometimes they would have approached the Sun, as near as the Orb of Mercury, and sometimes have exorbitate{d} beyond the Distance of Saturn, & some of them, would have quite left the Sun, with{out} ever seeing him any more. Now, the very Constitution of a Planet, would have been Corrupted, & Ruined, by
such a Change of Interval, between \textit{It}, and the \textit{Sun}; and no Animals could ever have endured such Excesses of Heat and Cold.\textsuperscript{271}

Furthermore, The Æthereal Spaces are perfect{ly} \textit{Fluid}; they neither do assist, nor, do they retard, the Revolutions of the \textit{Planets}, which rowl thro’ those Regions, as unresisted, as if they moved in a \textit{Vacuum}. They might, any of them have moved in Courses opposite unto the present, and in Planes crossing the Planes of the Ecliptic, in any kind of Angles. Now if the System had been fortuitously framed by the convening Matter of a \textit{Chaos}, how should all the Planets, as well the primary as the secondary, move the \textit{Same Way}, from the West to the East, & in the \textit{Same Plane} too, without any considerable Variation? Here would bee Millions of Millions of Odds to an Unit, in such a Cast of a \textit{Chance}; and therefore, tis to some Divine Conduct, that such a Regular Harmony must bee ascribed. Especially, if wee consid\textsuperscript{er,} that the smallest Planets, are scituated nearest the \textit{Sun}, & each other; whereas \textit{Jupiter} and \textit{Saturn}, that are vastly greater than the rest, & have many Satell\textsuperscript{i}tes about them, are happily placed at the extreme Regions of the System, and Immensely Distant. At so wide a Distance, they do in their \textit{Conjunctions}, a little Disturb one another, by their Gravitating Powers; but if such huge Masses of Matter had been scituated much nearer to the Sun, or to one another, the Disturban\textsuperscript{ce} in the World, must have been consider\textsuperscript{able.}\textsuperscript{272}

To pass on; Our \textit{Ear\{th par\}ticularly}, is placed so conveniently, \{that\} the Creatures which inhabit it, live and \{thrive\} in their Habitation. The Distance from the \textit{Sun} as it now turns, most likely is \textit{Better}, than any greater or smaller Distance would have been. Tis mathematically certain, That the \textit{Heat} of the Sun, is, according to the Density of the \textit{Sun-beams}, and is Reciprocally Proportional to the Square of the Distance, from the Body of the Sun. By this Calculation, if the \textit{Earth} should now Revolve, suppose, in the Orbit of \textit{Mercury}, the whole Ocean would boil with Extremity of Heat, & bee exhal’d into Vapours, and all that growes upon the Dry Land, would bee consumed as in a Fiery Furnace. But suppose the \textit{Earth} should bee carried as far off as the Orbit of \textit{Saturn}; There the whole Globe would bee one \textit{Frigid Zone}, the deepest Seas under the very Equator, would bee frozen to the bottom, and there would bee nothing of Animation, or Germination in these forlorn Regions of the Universe. Place the \textit{Earth} yet at any other Distance, and still you alter it for the worse, proportionally to the Alteration.
Tis then in a Place, which an infinitely Intelligent, & Voluntary Agent hath assign’d unto it. But if any one think, How then can any thing live in Mercury, or in Saturn? Lett him also think, That the Matter of each Planet, may have a Texture very Different, which will dispose the same to bee acted on, by greater or smaller Degrees of Heat, according to their several Scituations, & that the Lawes of Life, and Vegetation & Propagation, are the Arbitrary Pleasure of God, and may vary in every Planet, as Hee pleases, to us Incomprehensibly. Tis enough, that the Texture of Ours, is inconsistent with any other Scituation: Wee could not wear Flesh and Blood, any where else.273

Moreover; The Earth Revolves with a Double Motion: while tis carried round the Sun, in the Orbis Magnus once a Year, it perpetually wheels about its own Axis, once in a Day, in every twenty four Hours, turning all the Parts of the Equinoctial to the Rayes of the Sun. Conspicuous are the Uses of this Vertiginous Motion; this tis that successively gives Day and Night, over the Face of the whole Earth, and makes it all over Habitable; Without this Diurnal Rotation, one Hæmisphære would ly Dead, in perpetual Darkness, Frost, and Cold, and the best Part of the other, wasted with a permanent Heat wherein it must ly basking without Intermission. The Vicissitudes made by the Earths Moving about its own Center, are better, than an Exposing of the same Side alwayes unto the Sun. But whence came these Vicissitudes? The Earth might Annually have compassed the Sun, without such a daily Turn; as wee see the Moon ever showes the same Face unto us. Indeed, Shee does in her menstrual Orb, turn all her Globe to the Sun, and enjoy Dayes and Nights, alternately Fourteen Times as long as ours. But should the Earth bee deprived of its Diurnal Motion, one half of it, must never see any Dayes at all. Behold, that Glory of Him, that made Things, as now they are.274

Besides; Compare the Diurnal and the An{nu}al Revolutions of the Earth, which have a {ve}ry Different Degree of Velocitie. In {ev}ery Natural Day, all Parts of the Equator have some thing more than Three of the Earths Diameters, which makes about Eleven Hundred in the Space of a Year. But within the same Space, the Center of the Earth is carried more than fifty times as far, once round the Orbis Magnus, whose Wideness wee now assume to bee Twenty Thousand Terrestrial Diameters. The Annual
Motion therefore is more than Fifty Times swifter than the Diurnal. But it must bee acknowledged, That since the Earth Revolves not upon a Material, but a Geometrical Plane, their Proportions may bee varied in Innumerable Degrees, any of which might have happened as easily as the present. What was it then that præscribed this particular Proportion and Celerity to each Motion? Tis certain, That there is a Meliority in the present Constitution. Suppose the Annual Motion of the Earth, were now performed in Six Months rather than Twelve; The Seasons then, would bee Twice as short as they are, and the cold Winters would overtake us before any of our Fruits could bee Ripe. Were the Motion Retarded, the Mischief would on the other Side be as fatal; for most Countreyes would bee so parched & effæte, by the Draught of the Summers, that they could never have an Harvest of a Store sufficient for the Consumption of a Double Year. And then, for the Diurnal Motion of the Earth; suppose it made only Twelve Circuits in a Year; Then every Day & Night, would bee Thirty Times as long as they are Now, and not at all suited unto any Humane Affayrs. But on the other Hand, suppose it wheeled a Thousand Times about its own Center, while the Center describes one Circle about the Sun; Then an Equinoctial Day would bee but Four Hours; and such Hasty Returns of Evening would sadly confound, all our Labours, and our Journeyes, & our other Affayrs.

Yett further; Lett the Mode of the Earths Diurnal Motion bee considered. Conceive an Imaginary Plane, which passing thro’ the Centers of the Sun, & of the Earth, extends itself on all Sides as far as the Firmament; This Plane is called, The Ecliptic; and in this, the Center of the Earth is carried without any Deviation. But then the Axis of the Earth, about which its Diurnal Rotation is made, is not erect, unto the Plane of this Ecliptic, but Inclines towards it, from the Perpendiculum, in an Angle of Twenty Three Degrees, and an Half. Now, why is the Axis of the Earth, in this Particular Posture, and not in any other? Was this, by Chance, or from Choice? Wee all know, that this Inclined Position of the Axis, which keeps alwayes the same Direction, and to construct Parallelism to itself, is the sole Cause of those grateful, and needful Vicissitudes, of the Four Seasons of the Year, and the Variation in the Length of Dayes. If wee take away the Inclination, it would absolutely undo our Northern Nations; the Sun would never come nearer us, than
hee doth now, on the Tenth of March, or the Twelfth of September. But would wee rather part with the Parallelism? Suppose then, that the Axis of the Earth, keeps always the same Inclination towards the Body of the Sun. This would cause indeed a Varietie of Dayes, and Nights, and Seasons, on the Earth, but then every particular Countrey, would have always the same Diversity of Day and Night, and the same Constitution of Season, without any Alternation; some would always have Long Nights and Short Dayes: others again perpetually Long Dayes and Short Nights: one Climate would bee sweltered with everlasting Dog-Dayes, while an eternal December blasted another. But shall the Axis rather observe no constant Inclination to any thing, but vary and waver in all Manner of Uncertainty? Truly, there could bee no Health, no Life, no Subsistence in such an Irregular System: by the surprizing Nods of the Pole, wee might bee tossed backward or forward, from January to June, yea, possibly from the January of Greenland, to the June of Abyssinia. Certainly, the present Constitution, is more Beneficial for us, than any other. Some have Imagined, that if the Poles had been erect unto the Plane of Ecliptic, all Mankind had enjoy’d a Perpetual Spring, & a very Paradise upon Earth, with all the Comforts, in the utmost Measures of Longævity. But this perpetual, and universal Spring, is a meer Poetical Fancy; & bating the Equalitie of Dayes and Nights, in all other Points tis an Impossible Imagination. To the People, who dwell near the Equator, the Spring, so much admired, would bee an Insupportable Summer: and as for the Countreyes nearer the Pole, tis not a Spring that would answer their Necessities; they must have nearer Approaches of the Sun, with longer Dayes, & a less Obliquity of his Rayes, a Summer, & an Harvest, for the Ripening of their Fruits, or else bid an eternal adieu to the very best of their Sustenance. An equal Distribution of the same yearly Heat, would no more bring our Fruits unto Maturity, than such a quantity of Fuel, gradually & successively lighted, would make Water to boil, which being all kindled at once, will do it immediately. A perpetual Equinox would render the best Parts of the Globe, no other than perpetually Desolate. And the Expectation of a Constant Serenity, from such a Position of the Sphære, this also, is but precarious: For the affections of the Atmosphære, do not proceed only from the Course of the Sun, but also from the Scituations and Exhalations of the Earth, & many other uncertain Causes. Nor are the Equinoxes of our Year, upon Experience found, more free from Tempestuous
Exorbitances, than any of the other Seasons, which also dismisses the Fond Hopes of Longævity, from such a Spring, as these do talk of: Longævity, can’t bee prov’d, the Effect of meer Calm; and the Inhabitants of the Torrid Zone, are generally, both shorter-lived than other People, & inferiour to them in Strength, Stature, & Courage, as well as Intellectual Capacities.276

And shall wee now come a little nearer, within our Atmosphære? The Air, is a Thin, Fluid Body, endued with Elasticity, and capable of Condensation and Rarefaction. If the Air should bee, much more expanded, or condensed, than it naturally is, no Animals could live and breathe in it; nor could those Vapors, bee exhaled, or supported, which are absolutely necessary to keep alive all that growes upon the Earth.277 Tis demonstrated, That the Air is always condensed, or expanded, according, proportionally to the Pressure of that Weight which is incumbent on it: so that if the Atmosphære had been much greater or smaller than it is, it would have had, in its lowest Region, on the Surface of the Earth, much more Density or Tenuity of Texture; & consequently have been unserviceable unto its most necessary Purposes. Who, but an Intelligent Being, did, or could so adapt it? The Atmosphære of the Moon, hath no Clouds; but if ours had been so, nothing that growes upon Earth, had been produced, or præserved. If our Air had not been a springy Body, no Animal could have exercised the very Function of Respiration; and yett the Designs & Uses of Respiration, are not served by that Springiness, but by some other Quality: as is evident from the Death of things in the exhausted Receivers of Air-pumps where an Air is left, exhal’d from, it may bee Minerals, Flesh, Fruits, or Liquors.278

But, Lett us, make our Descent into the Ocean. The vast Atlantic Ocean is of more Worth unto the World, than if it were changed into a Fifth Continent.279 Before the Dry Land grow too little for its Inhabitants, there will arrive New Heavens, and a New Earth. The mighty Stores of Waters, upon this Globe, are no more than what is Necessary for the present Constitution. The whole Substance of all Vegetables, and consequently of all Animals too, is but Modified Water. An Immense Quantity of it, is continually exhaled by the Sun, to fill the Atmosphære with Vapours, & feed the Plants, with Dewes and Showrs. If wee could but compute the prodigious Mass of it, that is daily thrown into the Channel of the Sea, from all the Rivers in the World, wee should then with Admiration
know, how much is again, by Evaporation, cast upon the Continent, for the Supply of those Innumerable Streams. Behold, not only the Use, but the Cause also, of the Vastness of the Ocean; wee never heard of any Nation, complaining of Rivers, too many, too broad, too deep; all nations stand better, how to value those Inestimable Gifts of Nature. But if the Breadth and Extent of Rivers, bee as now it is, the Ocean must needs bee no less than it is. The Origin of our Fountains, is from Vapors, with Rain, & the Receptacle of Waters, into which the Rivers flowing from those Fountains must empty themselves, must have so spacious a Surface, that as much Water may bee continually fetch’d out by the Sun, and brush’d off by the Wind, as (besides, what falls again in Rain upon its own Surface) is brought into it, by all the Rivers; Now the Surface of the Ocean, is just so wide; for if more were evaporated than returns into it again, the Sea would become less; if less were evaporated, it would grow bigger: but since it ha’s been, from Time Immemorial at a stand, without any considerable Variation, wee may bee sure, it is exactly proportioned.  

Finally; The Irregular Surface of the Earth, is displeasing to some: and, they say, Nequaquam nobis Divinitus esse creatam, Naturam Rerum, tanta stat prædita culpa. They would have the vast Body of a Planet, as round as a factitious Globe represents it, and as plain, and smooth, & æquable every where as the Elysian Fields. If the Ocean were dried, what an horrible hollow! But, a very small skill in the Mathematicks, would instruct us, that before a Man could bee carried far enough off the Surface of the Earth, to take a full View, of any large Extent, all the Inequality of the Surface would bee lost unto his View; all would appear as an even Plane, tho’ every Rock were as high, as the Pico of Teneriff. Besides, Is there any physical Deformity in the Fabric of an Humane Body, because our Imagination can strip it of its Muscles, and shew us the Scragged & Knotty Back-bone, the gaping & ghastly Jawes, and all the Sceleton underneath? However, our Objectors would at least have the Seashores to have been uniform, without Creeks, and Bayes, and Angles; which would bee a fine Bargain! To part with our commodious Harbours, for the Imaginary Pleasure of an open Shoar, without any Retreat, or Shelter from the Winds. But what Apology can bee made, for the hideous Deformity, of Rocks, and Cliffs, and barren Mountains, even in the convenientest
Latitudes for Habitation, if those Ruines could bee removed out of the Way? Truly, wee
don’t contend, for this Earth to bee our Paradise, or to make an Heaven of our Globe? Tis
the Land of our Peregrination, and wee aspire after a better Countrey. And yett wee may
further say, That these Irregularities, must necessarily come to pass, from {the} established Lawes of Mechanism, & {from} the ordinary Course of Nature. For, if there bee a Sea, the Banks must bee Torn by the Waves of it; and if there bee Mountains, the Gravel upon the Tops thereof, must bee swept off by Tempests, and their Naked Ribs bee exposed unto the Face of the Sun: and if the Seeds of Subterraneous Minerals must ferment, there must follow Earthquakes, that produce what looks like much Confusion. To murmur at these Things, is as unreasonable, as to complain, that wee are Men, placed in this World at all. Moreover, Lett it bee considered, That the Deformity objected, is but in the Imaginations of Men. For there is an Universal Reason, that a Figure, by us called Regular, with æqual Sides and Angles, is absolutely more beautiful than any Irregular one. All Pulchritude is Relative; and all Bodies, are beautiful in all possible Shapes, that are good in their Kind, and fitt for the proper Ends of their Natures. The Ranges of Barren Mountains, by condensing the Vapours, and producing of Rains, and Fountains, and Rivers, give the Plains & Valleyes themselves, that Fertility they boast of. And if there were no Inæqualities in the Surface of the Earth, wee should loose a considerable Share of the Vegetable Kingdome; for all Plants will not grow on an uniform Level. To deprive us of Metals, would render us meer Salvages; but wee are obliged unto our Hills for these. Who would part with all these Blessings, for a fantastical Pleasantness, of an uniform Convexity, and Rotundity, of a Globe? And yett this also, could never bee enjoy’d by any Man living; for the Inhabitants of such an Earth, could have only the short Prospect, of a little circular Plane, about three Miles around them, tho’ there were neither Wood, nor Hedge, nor Artificial Bank to Intercept it; and this little too, would appear to have an Acclivity on all sides, from the Spectators; Every Man would fancy himself the Lowest, & as dwelling in a Bottom. But if a Man were lifted up a great Heighth in the Air, for the View of a spacious Horizon, hee would only see below him a great circular Flat, as level, as the face of the Moon. Whereas, the Poets themselves, cannot embellish the most blissful Seats, without Idæas, of Hills, and Vales.
Thus have I driven into as little Room as I could, without Injury to them, the excellent Contemplations of a Christian, and Orthodox Philosophy, which make it evident, that it could bee no other than an Infinite God, who by His Wisdome hath founded the Earth, & by His Understanding hath established the Heavens.  

---

1 Mather’s synoptic history [39r-42v] of the chapter-and-verse divisions of the Bible is cribbed from the Anglican divine Samuel Clark (1626-1701), rector of Grendon-Underwood, in the County of Bucks, and author of several works on biblical philology. Clark’s Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures (1699) was highly esteemed, and Mather here excerpts discourse II, appearing under a separate title An Exercitation concerning the Original of the Chapters and Verses in the Bible, which also has a 1698 imprimatur and a separate pagination. A note of caution may here be in order lest we judge Mather’s use of sources as intellectual dishonesty and plagiarism—conventions that were not as narrowly defined in his day as they are today. In his efforts to reconcile the flood of new, if not dangerous, discoveries in the natural sciences and philosophy, with conservative standards of interpretations, Mather is less concerned with the identity of the authors of his sources than with the significance of their discoveries: not who, but what. In this respect, Mather follows the centuries-old tradition of compiling catenae, florilegia, or anthologies of biblical interpretations much prized by the schoolmen throughout the ages. A good case in point is Synopsis Criticorum Aliorumque S. Scriptura Interpretum, 5 vols. (1669-76), a massive digest of biblical interpretations by the English nonconformist minister Matthew Poole (1624-79), whose commentary is as useful today as the print is taxing to the eyes. Like Poole and many others before him, Mather distills the essence of his sources, but identifies his authors or titles, if at all, in abbreviated form in marginal annotations. In a letter to his London Pietist friend Anthony William Boehm (Aug. 6, 1716), Mather freely confesses that “BA” represents the glory of other men’s achievements but here made serviceable to the Church: “There being so little of my own in that Work ["Biblia Americana"], I may use the more Freedome, in giving you some Account of it. Yea, I may venture to say this: I can without Vanity assure you, that the Church of God, has never yet had so rich an Amassment of the most valuable Things together tendered unto it” (Diary 2:413). In his Christian Philosopher (1721/22), composed during the second decade of the 18th century, Mather also acknowledges his debt: “[T]is true, some Scores of other Philosophers have been consulted on this Occasion; but an Industry so applied, has in it very little to bespeak any Praises for him that has used it: He [Mather] earnestly renounces them, and sollicits, that not only he, but the Greater Men, who have been his Teachers, may disappear before the Glorious GOD, whom these Essays are all written to represent as worthy to be praised, and by whose Grace we are what we are; nor have we any thing but what we have received from Him. . . . Most certainly there can be very little Pretence to an I, or ME, for what is done in these Essays, ’Tis done, and entirely, by the Help of God: This is all that can be pretended to” (Christian Philosopher, “Introduction” 10). All citations from Mather’s Christian Philosopher are from W.U. Solberg’s excellent 1995 edition. See also Solberg’s “Science and Religion.”

2 This passage appears in Clark’s Divine Authority, Discourse II, chapter ii, page 2, paragraph 2. Hereafter Clark II.i.2.2. Samuel Mather, Cotton Mather’s brother, says much the same in his Vindication of the Holy Bible (1723), bk. 1, ch. 7, §§ 10-11. pp. 61-63, and may have relied on “BA” for many aspects of his own book.

3 Clark II.i.2-3.2-3. See also Richard Simon, Critical History of the Old Testament (1682), bk. 1, ch. 26, p. 162.

4 Clark II.i.3.2. Clark’s own source is Tiberias, sive, commentarius masorethicus triplex (1618/19), a commentary on the Masorah, by Johannes Buxtorf, the elder (1564-1629), eminent professor of Hebrew at Basel. Ezra lived in the mid 5th-4th centuries BCE.

5 Clark II.i.4.5. Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), brother of Seleucus and king of Syria (175-164 BCE) forbade Jewish customs in 167 BCE and tried to suppress Judaism by advocating Hellenist deities, culture, and language. (EJ)

6 Clark II.i.5.5. The customs regarding the Haphtaroth or dismissions read among the Ashkenazic and Sephardic Jews differ in several places, yet are the same for Genesis. The Haphtarah Bereishis is Isa. 42:5-43:10; Haphtarah Nouch, Isa. 54:1-55:5; Lech Lecha, Isa. 40:27-41:16; Vayeira, 2 Kings 4:1-37; Chayei

7 Clark II.i.5-6.6. The first section begins with Gen. 1:1-5:28; the second, Gen. 5:29-9:29. See also EJ: “Masorah” (1.2.1.2). Rabbi David Kimchi, also Kimhi (Radak) (c. 1160-c.1235) was a renowned Hebrew grammarian and exegete of Narbonne, France. Clark refers to Kimchi’s commentary on the later prophets, reprinted in the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Jacob ben-Chajim, in Venice (1525, 1548). Clark here relies on Johannes Buxtorf’s famous edition Biblia Hebraica (1618-19). For Radak’s commentary (Gen. 4:19, Isa 24:1), see Mikraoth Gedoloth: Twelve Prophets (1:112-13) and Isaiah (1:190). There are twelve Parashioth or sections in Genesis: Parashas Bereishis begins at Gen.1.1; Parashas Noach at Gen. 6:9; Parshas Lech Lecha at Gen. 12:1; Parashas Vayeira at Gen. 18:1; Parashas Chaye Sarah at Gen. 23:1; Parshas Toldos at Gen. 25:19; Parashas Vayetzei at Gen. 28:10; Parashas Vayishlach at Gen. 32:4; Parshas Vayeishlach at Gen. 44:18; and Parshas Vaayehi at Gen. 47:28.

8 This paragraph is a representative example of the classical and biblical scholarship of the period, in which layer upon layer of paraphrases and citations at second, third, even fourth hand are integrated into the biblical commentaries of the time. Mather’s immediate source is Clark (II.iii.7-8). Next, Clark’s primary source is Gilbert Génébrard (1535-97), a French Benedictine exegete and Hebrew scholar at the Collège Royal, later archbishop of Aix-en-Provence, whose Chronologia Hebraeorum quae Seder Olam Rabba inscibitur (1578), lib. 4, p. 644, Clark cites paraphrastically. On the next layer, Génébrard refers to Philibert Hugonet (Hugo) (d. 1484), French Benedictine, Cardinal of Macon; and to Sixtus Senensis (1520-69), an Italian converso of Sienna, Franciscan, and later, Dominican preacher, Hebrew scholar, and exegete. Clark identifies in his margin book 3 of Sixtus Senensis’s Bibliotheca Sancta (1566), a compendium to the Bible in 8 books. Clark’s references to Austin and Gregory (via Génébrard) are to St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) and either to the Cappadocian Father St. Gregory of Nazianzus (329-89) or to the Cappadocian Bishop St. Gregory of Nyssa (c. 330-95). At any rate, Mather’s point is to illustrate the Fathers’ cumbersome method of identifying biblical references before the numerical chapter-and-verse-divisions of the Bible were established. Clark’s Latin citation from Génébrard’s Chronologia (lib. 4, p. 644) is also translated by Clark: “those who, together with Hugo Cardinalis, were the Authors of the Concordance” (Divine Authority II.iii.8). However, Mather merely excerpts a single line, which he leaves untranslated. See also Johannes Leusden, Philologus Hebraeus (1657), Diss. 3, § 4, pp. 20-21. For a similar account, see Richard Simon, Critical History of the Old Testament (London, 1682), bk. 1, ch. 28, p. 183.

9 Clark, Divine Authority (II.iii.8-9). John Bale (1495-1563), bishop of Ossory, credits the Stephen Langton (d. 1228), archbishop of Canterbury, for having introduced the division of biblical books into chapters and verses. The Latin citation from Bale’s Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum (1548) appears in the second section, “Centuria Secunda” (folio 102v). Clark’s translation reads, “who distinguishes all the Books of the Bible into Chapters, as they are now used in the Church” (Clark II.iii.9.). See also the anonymous work Stephen Langton, Arch-bishop of Canterbury, who died in the reign of Henry III. Ann Dom. 1228. was the first that distinguishes the chapters of the Bible into that order and number as we now use them (London, 1655). John Weever (1576-1632) confirms this statement in his Ancient funerall monuments (1631) 220. Samuel Mather says much the same in his Vindication (bk. 1, ch. 7, § 9. pp. 61-62).

10 Clark II.iv.10-16.1-4. Clark’s primary source is Johannes Buxtorf’s commentary on the Masorah, Tiberias (1618-19) and the Masoretic notes in “the last edition of Athias’s’s Bible, printed A.D. 1667” (II.iv.15.4.), the famous Hebrew Bible Biblia Sacra Hebraica correcta (Amsterdam, 1661), printed by the Dutch printer Rabbi Joseph ben Abraham Athias (d. 1700). Clark refers to the second edition Biblia Sacra Hebraica correcta (Amsterdam, 1667), whose printing was supervised by the renowned Hebrew scholar Johannes Leusden. The Tiberian Masorites of the post-Talmudic period (6th c. CE) contain a system of vocalization and accentuation of the Hebrew language in the form of notations to facilitate pronunciation and meaning of Hebrew words (EJ: Masorah). See also Jacques Basnage’s History of the Jews (1708), bk. 3, ch. 9, pp. 181-84. And the Mishnah, redacted by Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi (c. 135-c. 220), is a collection of rabbinic laws (Oral Torah) arranged in 66 tractates gathered in 6 divisions under the headings of agriculture, appointed times, women and marriage laws, injuries and damages, ritual laws, and purification.

11 Clark II.vi.21.1. A “silluk” is a “period” or “pause.” See also Richard Simon’s Critical History of the OT (bk. 1, ch. 28, p. 175).

12 Clark II.vi.26-27.6.

Clark II.x.31.

Clark II.vii.27-29.1-2.

Clark II.vii.28.2. Sanctes Pagninus (1466-1541) was an Italian Dominican, a renowned Hebraist, and a professor of oriental literature at the Pontifical College in Rome. His *Veteris et novi Testamenti nova translatio* (1528) was the first Latin Bible printed that inserted numbers for chapters and verses in the text. See J.S. Penkower, “Verse Divisions.”

Clark II.xiii.41-45.1-3. The Greek word ΤΙΤΛΟΙ [titloi] signifies “titles” or “superscriptions”; i.e., large capital letters for headings. The Greek word κεφαλαια (kephalaia) signifies “capitals” or “heads”; i.e., small capital letters in this context.

Robert Stephens (1503-59) is a notable French printer, classical scholar, and editor. His son Henry printed the NT in Paris (1551), in parallel columns, juxtaposing the Greek and Latin versions with a new Latin translation by the renowned Dutch humanist Desiderus Erasmus (1467-1536). Stephens’s innovative edition was the first to divide the NT text into verses and verse numbers, thus facilitating the compilation of concordances. Clark’s Latin citation is not from Stephens’s 1551 original, but at second hand from Johann Leusden’s *Philologus Hebræo-Græcus Generalis* (1670) 166. Clark translates Leusden’s Latin citation from Stephens’s 1551 preface, but Mather merely copies a fragment here: “But, behold, it fell out quite contrary to this their opinion of my Father’s performance; for as soon as ever this Invention appear’d abroad publicly, it was entertain’d with universal Approbation and Applause; and came into so great request, that all Editions of the New Testament, whether in Greek, Latin, French, Dutch, or any other Vulgar Tongue which wanted this Division, were laid aside, and grew out of date and request.” (Clark, *Divine Authority* II.xiii.43.3). See also Samuel Mather’s *Vindication* (bk. 1, ch. 8, §§ 3-4, pp. 65-66).

Clark II.xiii.44-45.3. Clark’s citation is from *Some Considerations Touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures* (1661) 60-61, by Robert Boyle (1627-91), the celebrated physico-theologian and founding member of the Royal Society in 1662. Even though he owned the 3rd edition (1668) of Boyle’s work, Mather chose to transcribe this passage from Clark’s text with minor alterations in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. See J.H. Tuttle, “Libraries” (318).

Mather here acknowledges Samuel Clark as his source, but not the title of Clark’s work, which is *The Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures*. This is the “Opus Ecclesiæ,” or “ecclesiastical work,” from which Mather here excerpts the two subsequent appendices on the number of the verses in the OT and NT. While Clark also lists the number of verses according to the Masoretic notes in Athias’s 1667 edition of the *Biblia Sacra Hebraica correcta*, Mather only copies the number of verses in the English Bible (KJV).

The table for the OT appears in Clark (II.iv.17-18.5); for the NT (II.xiii.47.4).

Clark II.xiii.47.4.

Mather refers to *A Short View of the Chronology of the Old Testament, and of the Harmony of the Four Evangelists* (1702), by William Whiston (1669-1752), a controversial English clergyman, millenarian, and Sir Isaac Newton’s successor to the Lucasian chair of mathematics at Cambridge. When Whiston published *Athanasius Convicted of Forgery* (1712), attacking the doctrine of the Trinity as a pious fraud perpetrated by St. Athanasius and his anti-Arian party, Mather composed in 1713 *Goliathus Detruncatus* (Diary 2:230), an epistolary refutation, but the manuscript sent off for publication was unhappily lost when his contact in London died (Samuel Mather, *Life of Cotton Mather* 73). Whiston’s anti-Trinitarian Arianism rendered him obnoxious to Mather and his peers, even though Mather retained an unmitigated admiration for the philological, scientific, and hermeneutical works of his life-long friend and correspondent (Diary 2:106-07, 182, 186, 191). Mather excerpts Whiston’s *Short View* at great length (as he had done previously with Samuel Clark’s *Divine Authority*) and incorporates Whiston’s harmony of the OT chronology in the subsequent manuscript pages of “BA” [43r-54v]. See also, K. Silverman’s *Life and Times* (328-30), J.E. Force’s *Whiston* (105-13), J.H. Tuttle’s “William Whiston” (197-204), and M.F. Wiles’s *Archetypal Heresy* (62-133).

This compound sentence is a paraphrastic citation from Whiston’s *Short View* 12 (prop. I). Whiston reprints Ptolemy’s chronological table, “The Astronomical Canon of Ptolemy” (or “Kings Table”) at the end of his *Short View* (544-45). The “Mathematical Canon” refers to *Ptolemy’s Almagest* (CE 138-161), a highly influential astronomical work in thirteen books, in which the Alexandrian geographer and
astronomer Claudius Ptolemaeus (c. 100-c. 175 CE) develops mathematical tables that locate the positions of the five major planets, the sun, and the moon in his geocentric universe. By using the beginning of King Nabonassar’s reign in Babylonia as his fixed date (year 1; i.e., c. 3980 in the Julian Calendar; i.e., c. 746 BCE in the Gregorian Calendar), Ptolemy provides a fixed point by which the position of the celestial bodies can be aligned with the astronomical dates of the reigns of Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman kings. Sir John Marsham (1602-85), the renowned English historian and chronologer, acknowledges that without Ptolemy’s Mathematical Canon, historians would not be able to align the various calendars of ancient Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome with that of the Hebrews. See Marsham’s Chronicae Canon Ægyptiacus Ebraicus Græcus (1672), lib. 4, seculum XVII, pp. 473-76. See also Ptolemy’s Amalgest (11). Very little is known about the era of the Babylonian King Nabonassar, whose reign dates from February 26, 747/46 BCE to February 23, 733/32 BCE according to the Gregorian Calendar (KP). For a very helpful discussion of how late Renaissance scholars tried to reconcile the chronologies of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks with that of the Bible, see A.T. Grafton’s “Joseph Scaliger” as well as volume 2 of Grafton’s daunting Joseph Scaliger (1993).

Beginning with “This Canon” and ending with “Julian Year,” Mather excerpts this paragraph from Whiston’s Short View. Whiston’s own source is a manuscript of “Mr. Allin, Fellow of Sidney College MS. Chronology” (Whiston 14, scholium).

This paragraph is cribbed from Whiston, Short View (12-13). The Four Monarchies are those listed in Ptolemy’s Canon or table but here prophetically combined into the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman empires of Nebuchadnezzar’s prophetic dream vision (Dan. 2:31-45). See also Mather’s exegesis of this prophecy in Threefold Paradise (319-20). Xenophon (c. 430-c. 355 BCE), the Athenian historian and military leader, relates the semi-fictional life of the Persian King Cyrus the Great, in Cyropaedia (c. 362 BCE), whose troops occupied Babylon (539 BCE) and ushered in the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity (c. 538 BCE). See Jer. 25:11-12, 29:10-14; Dan. 9:1-2; 2 Chron. 36:20, 32; Ezra 1:1-4. The dates for the beginning and end of the prophetic seventy-year captivity in Babylon vary considerably and range from 608-539 BCE, or even from 588-517 BCE, depending on whether Nebuchadnezzar’s captivity of a first group of Jews is taken as the starting date or the destruction of the first temple. Whiston’s Latin citation is extracted from Marsham’s Chronicon Canon (seculum XVII, p. 475) and tries to reconcile the chronology of ancient Egypt with that of the OT. Mathershortens his second-hand quotation from Marsham (475), which is given at length in Whiston (13n), and translates, “Indeed, that canon is most aptly connected with the sacred text in many combinations.” Helpful information on the views on astronomy at Harvard in the seventeenth century is provided in S.E. Morison’s “Astronomy.”

Mather’s excerpts render Whiston’s argument much more certain than Whiston’s many qualifiers intend to make it (Short View 30-31). See Appendix A.

Whiston, Short View (60-61). Whiston’s source is Sinicae Historiae Decas Prima (1659), cap. 1, pp. 12-13, by Martino Martini (1614-61), an Italian Jesuit missionary of Trent, who visited China. Martini argues that the Chinese chronology disagrees with that of the Europeans: “Chronologia Sinica nova Europaeorum repugnatur” (13). The mythical Fohi (Fu Hsi), who is to have reigned for 115 years (c. 2952 BCE), is to have taught his people how to fish (Martini, Sinicae Historiae, cap. 1, pp. 21-24). The italicized passage in Mather’s paragraph attributed to Fohi is cited from Louis LeComte (LeCompte) (1655-1728), a French Jesuit missionary of Bordeaux, whose 2-volume Nouveaux mémoires sur l’état présent de la Chine (1696) appeared in an English translation as Memoirs and Observations (1697) 313. Among many others, the London architect John Webb (1611-72) explores Chinese chronology, the Chinese version of the Flood, and the possibility that Chinese was the primitive language of Noah and his descendants, in his Historical Essay (1669) and Antiquity of China (1678). See R. Ramsey, “China.” The German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) was similarly engaged in reconciling Chinese chronology, creationism, and science with Western tradition, in his Discourse on the Natural Theology of the Chinese (1716), chs. 2 and 4. Finally, A.D. White (History of Warfare 1:249-65) and, more recently, P. Rossi (Dark Abyss 137-82) have ably reviewed the heated debates about biblical chronologies and the beginning of time.

Whiston, Short View (61-62). Among Whiston’s sources are Martini’s Sinice Historiae; Philippe Couplet’s Tabula Chronologica Monarchiae Sinicae (1686), by the Flemish Jesuit missionary to China Father Philippe Couplet (1623-93); and A New Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Siam (1693) 2:252-58, an English translation of Du Royaume de Siam (1691), by Simon de la Loubère (1642-1729), a French linguist, diplomat, historian, and poet. Whiston’s table (65) aligns the lives and reigns of the ancient Chinese rulers with those of the OT patriarchs. Whiston’s source for Giovanni Domenico Cassini (1625-
1712), the renowned Italian mathematician and astronomer in the employ of the French King Louis XIV, is Loubère (2:252). Significantly, Cassini shortens the astronomical calendar of the Chinese by 500 years, ostensibly to align their chronology with that of the Hebrews. Sir Isaac Newton, Whiston’s friend and supporter, did much the same when he abridges the chronology of the Greeks by several hundred years in his Chronology of the Ancient Kingdoms Amended (1728), pp. 86-95. See also F.E. Manuel (Confronts the Gods, ch. 3, pp. 93-102). Martini describes the Fifth Monarch Chuenhio (c. 2513 BCE), emperor for 78 years, in Sinicæ Historia (cap. 1, pp. 33-35). For Emperor Yao (c. 2357 BCE), who ruled for 90 years, see Martini (cap. 1, pp. 36-43).

30 John Marsham (Chronicus Canon) unraveled the mystery of the diverging chronologies when he came across Aegyptiaca (Epitome) by the Egyptian priest Manetho (3rd c. BCE), who wrote his invaluable history in Greek. In fragments that survive in Eusebius Pamphilus’s Chronici Canones (bk. 1), in Praeparatio evangelica (9.13, 2.1, 3.3, 4.16, 10.13), and in George Syncellus’s Byzantine Chronica (fl. c. 800), Manetho’s chronology links the names of Egyptian gods and rulers with those of the Hebrew patriarchs and thereby harmonizes conflicting reports on chronological calendars, lengths of rulership, and longevity of Egyptian god-kings (Manetho, Aegyptiaca: Epitome, fragments 1-6).

31 Whiston, Short View (62-64). Modern accounts on the mythical Chinese rulers and their dynasties disagree widely. Whiston’s attempt (here followed by Mather) to identify the mythical Fohi with Noah was widely accepted at the time as can be seen in Chronologia Sacra (1660) 3, by Archbishop James Ussher of Armagh (1581-1656). Ussher dates the First Day of Creation to 4004 BCE and Noah’s Flood to 2348/2349 BCE or Anno Mundi (AM) 1656/57 (or APJ 2365 in the Julian Calendar). Whiston’s date APJ 2601 (Anno Periodi Julianae) refers to the Julian Calendar, according to which Christ was born in the year 4714 (APJ). Martini has the founder of the Yu dynasty (c. 2207 BCE) rule only for 10 years (Sinicæ Historia, cap. 2, pp. 47-54). The first nine emperors are (1) Fohius (c. 2952 BCE), who ruled for 115 years; (2) Xinnungus (c. 2837 BCE), for 140 years; (3) Hoangtius (c. 2697 BCE), for 90 years; (4) Xaohauus (c. 2597 BCE), for 84 years; (5) Chuenhious (c. 2513 BCE), for 78 years; (6) Cous (c. 2435 BCE), for 70 years; (7) Yaus (c. 2357 BCE), for 90 years; (8) Xunus (c. 2258 BCE), for 33 years; and (9) Yaus (c. 2207 BCE), who ruled for 10 years. Emperor Chim Tam (probably Emperor Tangus), ruled for 13 years (c. 1766 BCE), and was head of the Xanga family (Martini, cap. 3, pp. 71-75); Vu Vam (or Faus), head of the third family of Cheva (c. 1122 BCE), ruled for only 7 years (cap. 4, pp. 101-03). Emperor Hoam ti (perhaps Hoaius) (c. 2040 BCE), reigned for 26 years (cap. 2, p. 62). By adjusting the Chinese calendar according to Ptolemy’s system, Martini demonstrates that the lives of the Chinese patriarchs were comparable to those of the Hebrew Bible and that the Chinese chronology does not exceed that of our postdiluvian Noah. See also G.W. Trompf’s “Newtonian History” (216-17).

32 Whiston, Short View (69-70), tables I and II. Mather and Whiston follow Ussher’s Latin edition of Chronologia Sacra (cap. 2, p. 44; cap. 10, pp. 160-71) for this and all other calculation; they assign 1656 years to the antediluvian period (from Adam’s creation to Noah’s Flood) and 426 years to the postdiluvian period (from Noah’s exiting the ark to Abraham’s departure from Haran).

33 Gen. 18.11.

34 Mather here agrees with Whiston and others who argue that the ability to procreate and to bear children at an advanced age was directly related to the long lifespan of the patriarchs and their spouses (Whiston, Short View 72).

35 Whiston, Short View (69 and 71), here relies on Ussher’s Chronologia Sacra (cap. 2, p. 44, and cap. 9, pp. 136-59).

36 Though differing in nearly 6,000 places from the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, the Samaritan Bible is not a version of the Torah, but a text written in Samaritan characters, dating back to the fifth century BCE. The Samaritan text agrees in more than 1,600 places (of the 6,000) with the Septuagint (LXX), the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, dating back to the first half of the 3rd c. BCE. For the state-of-the-art debate of this issue in Mather’s time, see Richard Simon’s Critical History of the Old Testament (bk. 2, chs. 1-18). The Samaritan Bible was accessible in various seventeenth-century polyglots, especially in the “London Polyglot” of Brian Walton, Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (1653-57), in 6 vols. See also P.N. Miller’s “Antiquarianization.”


38 Whiston, Short View (71).

39 Whiston, Short View (71-72).
phrases from Whiston's elucidations (72). Whiston’s source is *Reflections Upon the Books of the Holy Scriptures* (1688), vol. 1, part 1, ch. 15, pp. 71-72, by Pierre Allix (1641-1717), a learned Huguenot divine, translator of the Bible into the French vernacular, and refugee in England after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.


Whiston, *Short View* (73-74). The phrase *At that Time* appears in Gen. 38:1. The Latin citation translates “without any specific reference of time” and is taken from Ussher’s *Chronologia Sacra* (cap. 9, p. 186).

Judah’s speech to Tamar appears in Gen. 38:11. The passage in quotation marks is Whiston’s own heuristic invention (75).

Whiston, *Short View* (75) only assigns 479 years and 1 month to this period; his source is again Ussher’s *Chronologia Sacra* (cap. 2, p. 44; cap. 12, pp.189-202; cap. 13, pp. 203-13).


Whiston, *Short View* (78-79). This and all subsequent paragraphs to the end of Mather’s section IV (47r-49r) are cited at second hand from Marshall’s *Chronicus Canon* (29ff.), in Whiston (78-83). The story of Sisera’s decapitation at the hands of Jael is related in Judg. 4:17-11. The Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (CE c. 37-c. 100) argues that Joshua succeeded Moses and served as the commander of the Israelites for 25 years (*Antiquities* 5.1.29 and 5.5.4; Whiston’s translation).

Whiston, *Short View* (79).


Whiston, *Short View* (79-80).

Whiston, *Short View* (80-81). The identity of “The Sacred Historian” mentioned in Marshall (Whiston’s source) is perhaps deliberately left unclear, for at least since Thomas Hobbes (1651) and Baruch Spinoza (1670) theologians could no longer attribute the authorship of the Pentateuch, of the Books of Joshua and Judges, and of most of the other OT books, to the purported authors whose name they generally bear. Both Hobbes and Spinoza argue that, based on the apocryphal 2 Esdras 14:20-47, the ancient scriptures and the law had been burned in the first Temple in 588 BCE. The fifth-century BCE Jewish priest, prophet, and leader Ezra dictated from memory the ninety-four books of the Hebrew Bible that had been lost in Exile (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, bk. 3, ch. 33; Spinoza, *Tractatus Theologicopoliticus*, ch. 8-10, pp. 120-56). See G. Reedy, *Bible and Reason* (chs. 2-3).

Whiston, *Short View* (81).

Whiston, *Short View* (81-82).

Josephus, *Antiquities* (6.5.4; 13.5; 14.9).

Whiston, *Short View* (82-83). The Tyrrians were an ancient Phoenician people, whose stronghold was Tyre (near the modern Lebanese city Beirut), located on a promontory off the shore of the old city of Tyre. This city fell to the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar (586-573 BCE) while judges ruled over Tyre (626-539 BCE). (*HBD*). Josephus relates the fall of Tyre in his book *Against Apion* (1.21), and the story of the judges governing the ancient N. African city of Carthage, in *Against Apion* (1.17-18). The Roman historian Livy (Titus Livius) (59 BCE-CE 17) calls the judges and chief magistrates “suffetes” in his famous *Ab urbe condita libri*, a history of Rome from its foundation to the year 9 BCE. Livy’s Latin quotation (34.61.15) translates, “when the chief magistrates (suffetes) took their seats to administer justice.” With this paragraph ends Whiston’s lengthy citation from Marsham, which Mather copies at second hand.

Josephus reads, “for more than five hundred years” (*Antiquities* 11.4.8).


Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre for thirteen years (586-573 BCE). According to James Ussher’s *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (1650-54) 93, a third group of Jews was taken into Babylonian captivity in AM 3420, APJ 4130 (c. 584 BCE), the approximate date of the destruction of the first Temple.

This paragraph is excerpted from Whiston, *Short View*, prop. XIV (52-54).

The tables of the reigns of the Israelite and Judean kings are given by Whiston (*Short View* 85, 86, 88, 89, 94) and juxtapose the round figures given in the Bible with the exact number of years and months in Whiston’s chronology.

Whiston, *Short View* (83, 84, 85).

Whiston, *Short View* (85).

Mather condenses into a single paragraph the headings of Whiston’s propositions II and III, as well as phrases from Whiston’s elucidations (*Short View* 15, 16, 17). To establish an exact timeline in biblical
chronology is notoriously difficult because the ancient Hebrews used both solar and lunar calendars for various secular and religious dates—the solar calendar generally being tied to agricultural seasons of the year, and the lunar to religious observances. Even though the lunar month consisted of 30 days, the actual duration was only about 29 ½ days per month. Over a period of a lunar year, the 354 ½ lunar days necessitated an intercalation of the missing days. Hence every 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th year of a 19-year cycle, the Hebrews (adopting Chaldean precedent) added one full month to their calendar to correct the shortfall. Hence a second month of Adar was added to the year. Given this intercalation, the Hebrew lunar calendar nearly coincided with the Julian Calendar instituted by Julius Caesar (46/45 BCE), who intercalated 90 additional days to bring in line the calendar dates with the natural and seasonal events. From then on, each year was fixed at 365 days per year, one day being added (29th of February) every 4 years. However, since the Julian Calendar amounts to 365 days and 6 hours and exceeds the true solar year by 11 minutes and 14 seconds, an increasing disparity between the dates of the physical phenomenon and seasonal dates occurred over the centuries. To rectify this discrepancy and to establish a uniform date for Easter in the Christian churches, Pope Gregory XIII disbanded the Julian calendar on Feb. 24, 1582, by dropping 10 days from the calendar and thus restored the date for the vernal equinox to March 21. This Gregorian or New Style calendar was not adopted in Protestant Great Britain until 1752. Hence the dates used by Whiston and Mather are based on the Julian or Old Style calendar. For a helpful discussion, see Grafton, “Joseph Scaliger,” pp. 181-85 (“Appendix”).

Mather’s reference to “Jehu’s Revolution” (2 Kings, chs. 9-10) alludes to the war of Jehu, who became king of Israel (843-816 BCE) after killing Jehoram, king of Judah (849-843 BCE), and King Ahaziah of Israel (843 BCE), in Jehu’s war on Baal worship in Israel. The daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, Queen Athaliah ruled over Judah for six years (c. 843-837 BCE) after her husband, King Jehoram, had been assassinated by Jehu.

Whiston, Short View (86). 1 Kings 22:42, 2 Kings 8:16. The Successive Chronology mentioned here refers to Whiston’s tables of the reigns of the Israelite and Judean kings (85, 86, 88, 89, 94).

Whiston, Short View (87). 2 Kings 8:25, 9:29.

1 Kings 16:8, 15-16, 23.

1 Kings 16:21-22.

Whiston, Short View (87-88).

Whiston, Short View (88).

2 Kings 13:10.

Whiston’s tables (Short View 88, 89) juxtapose the scriptural years with the actual years of the kings’ reigns. For Mather’s excerpt, see Whiston (89-90).

2 Chron. 25:3.

Whiston, Short View (90, 91).

Whiston, Short View (91).

5 See Whiston’s table, in Short View (89).

Whiston, proposition XI, in Short View (47-48 and 91-92).

Whiston, Short View (92).

Whiston’s source is The True Nature of Imposture Fully Displayed in the Life of Mahomet (1697) 52, by Humphrey Prideaux, D.D. (1648-1724), a notable English theologian and historian, whose popular Life of Mahomet went through three editions in the first year. A useful discussion of British attitudes toward Muhammad and Islam in the 17th and 18th centuries appears in D.A. Pailin’s Attitudes (81-104).

Whiston, Short View (92-93). Mather’s “Author” is, of course, Whiston. Any number of seventeenth-century travel accounts could have been the source for Mather’s information about the Javanese. See for instance, Christoph Frick (b. 1659), A Relation of Two Several Voyages made into the East-Indies (1700).

Whiston, Short View (93, scholium).

Whiston, Short View (93-94).

Ussher’s Annals of the World (1658) 83, 102, dates the Babylonian Captivity from 606-536 BCE, when a first group of Jews was taken into captivity in AM 3398-AM 3468.

The burning of the Temple, which Ussher dates to 588 BCE, resulted in the deportation of a third group of Jews (2 Kings 24:10-25:21).

Whiston’s proposition XIII, in Short View (48-50). Ptolemy’s Astronomical Canon (Whiston 544-45) lists the number of years and periods of reigns of the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman emperors according to the Julian Calendar. Nabopolassar (626-605 BCE) is considered to be the founder of
the Babylonian dynasty (626-539 BCE), whose son, Nebuchadnezzar II, defeated the Egyptians before his father’s death, destroyed the Temple of Jerusalem in 588 BCE, and captured the Tyrians in 586 BCE (HBD). The Medo-Persian King Cyrus the Great (c. 557-c. 530 BCE) conquered Babylon in c. 539 BCE. Xenophon relates Cyrus’s conquest in his semi-fictional biography Cyropedia (c. 362 BCE). Whiston’s source is Josephus (Antiquities 10.11.1), who excerpts a fragment of Babylonika (2), the famous history of Beros(s)us (fl. 290 BCE), a Babylonian scholar and historian of Egypt.

85 Whiston, Corollary 1, in Short View (50). Dan. 1:1, 9:1-2; Ezek. 1:2, 8:1.
86 Whiston, Corollary 3, in Short View (51).
87 Whiston, Corollary 3, in Short View (51-52).
88 Whiston, Corollary 3, in Short View (51).
89 Whiston, Lemma 1, Short View (55). The fragments of Berosus appear in Josephus’s Antiquities (10.11.1) and Against Apion (1.19-20).
90 The confusion of names occurs because the Greek mathematician Ptolemy assigns to the Medo-Persian ruler Cyrus II (the Great), who conquered Babylonia in 539/538 BCE, what the Bible ascribes to Darius the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus (Dan. 5:30-31, 9:1). According to the Greek historian Xenophon, Cyrus diverted the Euphrates, surprised the palace guards of King Belshazzar (Nabonadius), and took Babylon in one night (Cyropedia 1.2.1 and 7.5.7-34). See also Josephus (Against Apion 1.20). Cyrus II set up Darius the Mede as ruler in Belshazzar’s stead. Further confusion arises because the prophet Daniel is said to prosper during the reigns of Darius and of Cyrus the Persian (Dan. 6:28), as if to suggest that Darius preceded Cyrus. According to another tradition, Cyaxares II, son of Astyages and last king of Media, entrusted his son-in-law Cyrus II (ruler of Persia) with the government of Media (Xenophon, Cyropedia 1.5.2) and ordered him to conquer Babylon. However, Josephus’s account differs from Xenophon’s in that Josephus identifies Darius as the son of Astyages, who is “known to the Greeks by a different name” (Josephus, Antiquities 10.11.1, 4). Whiston (whose Short View Mather excerpts here) therefore identifies Cyaxares II with Darius the Mede (CBTEL, OCD, HBD).

91 See the Astronomical Canon of Ptolemy appended to Whiston (544).
92 Whiston, Short View (56). See Xenophon (Cyropaedia 8); Dan. 9.1, 24; 2 Chron. 36:22; Ezra 1:1-2. The year APJ 4178 corresponds to 536 BCE in the Gregorian calendar. The source for Whiston’s date is given in Ussher’s Annals (102).
93 Whiston, Short View (57). The years Anno Mundi 3398 and 3405 correspond to 606 BCE and 599 BCE in Ussher’s Annals (82-84).
94 Whiston, Short View (58). AM 3416 corresponds to 588 BCE, in Ussher’s chronology.
95 Whiston, Short View (58). Ezekiel’s 390 years are given in Ezek 4:4-6. AM 3030 and 3420 correspond to 975/74 and 584 BCE respectively.
96 Whiston, Short View (58). Ezek. 4:6. AM 3394 and 3434 respectively correspond to 610 and 570 BCE, in Ussher’s Annals (81, 85).
97 Whiston, Short View (59). AM 3468 corresponds to 536 BCE, the year to which Ussher (Annals 102) assigns Cyrus’s edict to allow the Jewish captives to return to the Holy Land (2 Chron. 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-2).
98 Whiston, Short View (59). Zech. 1:7, 12. Jer. 25:3. AM 3415, 3484, and 3485 respectively correspond to 589, 520, and 519 BCE. See Ussher’s Annals (90, 110, 111).
99 Whiston, Short View (59-60). A Jewish governor of Judah, Gedaliah was appointed by Nebuchadnezzar after the fall of Jerusalem (1 Kings 25:22). Gedaliah was assassinated by militants who resented his collaboration with Babylon. The destruction of the Temple and the murder of Gedaliah, resulting in another train of captives to Babylon, was commemorated by the two fasts here mentioned (Zech. 7:1, 5) (HBD).
100 AM 3416, the year of the Temple’s destruction; and AM 3417, the year of Gedaliah’s assassination, correspond to 588 and 587 BCE respectively. Whiston (and Mather) therefore date the beginning of the 70-year captivity from this period, ending either between AM 3485 and 3486 (519 and 518 BCE) or between AM 3486 and 3487 (518 and 517 BCE) according to Ussher’s Annals (109-113).
101 Whiston, Short View (60). According to Ptolemy’s Astronomical Canon (Whiston 544-45), the fall of the Temple occurred in 4126 (Julian Calendar), which date corresponds to AM 3416 (588 BCE) in Ussher’s Annals. The birth of the Messiah was to be expected in APJ 4714. Whiston’s “learned Gentleman” is of course William Whiston, whose Short View Mather had here copied into his “BA” to reconcile the discrepancies between biblical chronology and the various calendars used in
ancient history. In this manner, commentators tried to reassert biblical authority, which Hobbes and Spinoza had dared to dismiss by pointing at the many contradictions in biblical chronology.

Here begins Mather’s commentary on Genesis, ch. 1 [55r-129r], which is his longest discussion of any single biblical chapter or issue in the entire “BA” manuscript. The length of this section does not come as a surprise: he recovers a cross-section of ancient cosmogony, early Enlightenment science, and philological and textual disputes about the authorship of the Pentateuch. In Mather’s day, the Mosaic creation account underwent unprecedented scientific challenges, as Copernican heliocentrism replaced the ancient Ptolemaic geocentric cosmogony, Newtonian physics supplanted theological literalism, and the Peripatetics pitted their theory of the eternity of the universe against that of orthodox physico-theologians who sided with Moses that God had created the universe out of nothing. See Mather, Christian Philosopher (Essay I, pp. 18-19), A.D. White (vol. 1), I. B. Cohen, A. Rupert Hall, and P. Stearns (chs. 1, 5, 10), T. Hornberger, G. McColley, and R. Smolinski’s “How to Go.”). Significantly, Mather is highly sensitized by the controversial debates of his time as he tries to reconcile both ancient and modern theories of creationism. He does not as yet see any contradiction between the two separate creation accounts (Gen. 1:1-2:3 and Gen. 2:4-25) or the many duplicate narratives in the OT as the next generation would do, because he writes more than twenty-five years before Jean Astruc (1684-1766), French physician and biblical philologist, posited in his Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux (1753) that Genesis was compiled from two separate documentary traditions—the Elohist and the Yahwist traditions. Nevertheless, Mather does address some of the main philological issues raised by Maimonides, Hobbes, Spinoza, Richard Simon, and Jean LeClerc (See R. Smolinski, “Authority”).

In a different hand than the remainder of the holograph manuscript of “BA,” Mather’s first excerpt [55r-57r] is from Thomas Pyle (1674-c. 1756), an Anglican clergyman and prebendary of Salisbury, whose 2-volume Paraphrase with Short and Useful Notes (1717) was accessible to Mather at Harvard (Catalogus Librorum [1725], supplement, p. 111). Pyle’s paraphrase appeals to Mather because its distinctly Newtonian flavor never seriously compromises conservative exegesis of the Mosaic creation. In §(1.1), which Mather excerpts from Pyle’s commentary on Genesis in Paraphrase (1:1-2), Pyle rejects the ancient Peripatetic idea of the eternity of the universe (Aristotle, De caelo 1.10-12, 279b-283b20). Plato’s argument about the cosmos created from the four elements of fire, air, water, and earth (Timaeus 28a-38b) posited an alternative theory, decidedly more in line with the Mosaic creation, but still open to speculation. It led not only Justin Martyr (Apologia 1.10, cf. Hortatory Address to the Greeks—all in ANF 1:165, 273-89), but also Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata 5.14), to speculate about the creation of the universe from pre-existing, albeit formless, matter. Philo Judaeus, however, attacked this position as unscriptural (De somniis 1.13.76), because it conflicted with the concept of the creation out of nothing (2 Macc. 7:28; Genesis Rabbah 1.9). Similarly, Theophilus Antiochus (Apologia ad Autolycum 2.4, in ANF 2:95), Irenaeus (Adversus haereses 2.10.2-4, in ANF 1:370), Ambrose (Hexaemeron 1.1.1.1-2), and many others, eventually codified the dogma of creatio ex nihilo, the creation out of nothing. How hotly this issue was debated in the seventeenth century can be seen in Edward Stillingfleet’s Origins Sacrae (bk. 3, ch. 2, pp. 421-69), John Milton’s De Doctrina Christiana (1.7) and Paradise Lost (7.170-242), and in Joshua Sylvester’s translation [1640] of Guillaume du Bartas’s Divine Weeks and Works (1.1.219-97)—and even long before him in Moses Maimonides’s Guide for the Perplexed (2.1-30)—who felt increasingly defensive about the tradition that God created the universe a little more than 5,600 years earlier. Mather, like Stillingfleet, rejected the Peripatetic heresy; frowned upon the Necessitarians such as Thales and Tully who conceded that an Efficient Cause had formed the universe out of preexisting, eternal matter (Material Cause), in Tully (De natura deorum 1.25); decried Epicureans (such as Lucretius and Democritus) who, though denying the eternity of the universe, insisted that it came about through blind chance and accidental coalescence of atoms (De rerum natura 1.146-249, 1008-52); Dionysius the Great (d. c. 264), bishop of Alexandria (Extant Fragments 2.1-3, in ANF 6:84-88); and objected to the Cartesians who insisted that the universe came about through mere mechanical laws that determined the motion of matter. In his Christian Philosopher (Essay IV, p. 40), Mather argues that since the particles of light emanating from the sun diminish its volume (albeit ever so small), it is evident “that the Sun had a Beginning; it could not have been from Eternity: Eternity must have wasted it: It had long ere now been reduced unto less than the Light of a Candle.” Mather extracts this argument from George Cheyne, Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion (1705), ch. 1, pp. 95-98. A still useful discussion of the hexaemeral tradition among the Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers is F.E. Robbins’s The Hexaemeral Literature (1912).

This and subsequent paragraphs (§§ 1-31) are taken from Pyle’s Paraphrase (1:1-9).
Thomas Hyde (1636–1703), the distinguished Orientalist, insists that Zoroaster was a Perfection of the Books of the Old and New Testament. Historical Books of the Old Testament bestows this honor on the Egyptians and Syrians, corrects himself by insisting that the Egyptians received this pious notion is not supported by such of the ancients as Plato, Diodorus Siculus, Lucan, Cicero, or Sanchoniathon, the Chaldean Berosus, the mythical Orpheus, and many others—if the enumerations in Taautus, Thoth, and Hermes) invented the art of writing are such early historians as the Phoenician Ephemeris Tou Troikon Polemon. The argument that the tradition of the creation was handed down from Adam to Moses without interruption was a popular one in Mather’s time and beyond and can be found in many places, including Robert Jenkin’s Reasonableness and Certainty (1700), bk. 2, ch. 1, pp. 49-56; and in Adam Clarke (c. 1760-1832), the distinguished antiquarian, Orientalist, and Wesleyan divine, whose Commentary and Critical Notes (1810-25) 1:26, is still consulted today. Mather here draws on A Commentary upon the Historical Books of the Old Testament (1727) 1:1, by Simon Patrick (1625-1707), bishop of Ely, whose Commentary on Genesis appeared as early as 1694. Patrick’s work is one of Mather’s principal (and frequently unacknowledged) sources for “BA.”

In the seventeenth century, the antiquity of the Mosaic Pentateuch and the reliability of its chronology were questioned by many who pointed at the discrepancies between the Mosaic chronology and those of the Egyptian, Chaldean, and Greek historians. Edward Stillingfleet for one defended the Pentateuch by sneering at the fabulous origin of heathen histories and their notoriously exaggerated chronology (Origines Sacrae, bk. 1, chs. 1-6; bk. 2, chs. 1-2). Mather’s defense in this and subsequent paragraphs is extracted from John Edwards (1637-1716), a noted English Calvinist divine, minister of Trinity Church, and fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge, whose Discourse Concerning the Authority, Stile, and Perfection of the Books of the Old and New Testament (1693) 1:189-93, 269, 270, 271-73, supplies Mather with detailed information. Among the “Ancients” who “proved” that Moses (frequently associated with Taautus, Thoth, and Hermes) invented the art of writing are such early historians as the Phoenician Sanchoniathon, the Chaldean Berosus, the mythical Orpheus, and many others—if the enumerations in Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica (1.9.31d-32a; 1.10.36a; 9.27b; 10.9-11) can be trusted. By and large, this pious notion is not supported by such of the ancients as Plato, Diodorus Siculus, Lucan, Cicero, or Tacitus, see Iversen’s Myths of Egypt (41-48). Edwards adopts from Ussher’s Annals (12-25) the approximate date A.M. 2460 (c. 1560 BCE) for the writing of the Pentateuch and for the Trojan War A.M. 2894-2884 (c. 1194-1184 BCE). The oldest Ionian prose historian—according to Herodotus (5.36, 125)—is Hecataeus of Miletus (c. 6th-5th c. BCE). The French Protestant divine Pierre Jurieu (among many others) disagrees with the pious claim of the Mosaic invention of the art of writing, in A Critical History (1705), bk. 1, ch. 4, pp. 30-32, for even the Greek historian Diodorus Siculus (1.9.2; 1.16.1; 1.68.5; 3.4.1-4), who bestows this honor on the Egyptians and Syrians, corrects himself by insisting that the Egyptians received this art from the hieroglyphics of the more ancient Ethiopians (3.4.1 ff.). Mather dismisses both Dares Phrygius (Homer’s Iliad 5.9) and Dictys Cretensis (Scholia in Iliadem [Erbse] 1.108-9b, scholion 11) as fabulous, because the former was believed to be a Trojan Priest of Hephaistos and the supposed author of a Phrygian Iliad (a Latin version of which survives as Historia de excidio Troiae) whereas the latter, a companion of Idomeneus and Meriones in the Trojan War, claimed to tell the true story of Troy, in his Ephemeris Tou Troikon Polemon. See also R.M. Frazer, Jr. (“Introduction” 3-15).

Mather’s immediate source is Pyle’s Paraphrase (1:3-4), but Pyle’s ideas are borrowed from Astro-Theology (bk. 5, ch. 4, pp. 105, 119, 128, 130), by William Derham (1657-1735), the influential Anglican clergyman, physicist, and member of the Royal Society of London. First published in 1715, Derham’s Astro-Theology was extremely popular and went through many editions until 1777. Mather corresponded with Derham and quoted him at length in his CP and elsewhere.

Pyle (Paraphrase 1:5) alludes to Derham’s discussion of the celestial bodies, in Astro-Theology (chs. 3, 6, 7).

Mather here skips the following passage from Pyle’s Paraphrase (1:6): “The Word Tanim signifies any Creature of extraordinary Strength and Bulk, and is used sometimes of the whale, sometimes of the Crocodile, as [Samuel] Bochart and Job Ludolphus have very clearly proved.”

Here ends the excerpt from Pyle’s Paraphrase (1:1-9).

See Appendix A.

The argument that the tradition of the creation was handed down from Adam to Moses without interruption was a popular one in Mather’s time and beyond and can be found in many places, including Robert Jenkin’s Reasonableness and Certainty (1700), bk. 2, ch. 1, pp. 49-56; and in Adam Clarke (c. 1760-1832), the distinguished antiquarian, Orientalist, and Wesleyan divine, whose Commentary and Critical Notes (1810-25) 1:26, is still consulted today. Mather here draws on A Commentary upon the Historical Books of the Old Testament (1727) 1:1, by Simon Patrick (1625-1707), bishop of Ely, whose Commentary on Genesis appeared as early as 1694. Patrick’s work is one of Mather’s principal (and frequently unacknowledged) sources for “BA.”

In the seventeenth century, the antiquity of the Mosaic Pentateuch and the reliability of its chronology were questioned by many who pointed at the discrepancies between the Mosaic chronology and those of the Egyptian, Chaldean, and Greek historians. Edward Stillingfleet for one defended the Pentateuch by sneering at the fabulous origin of heathen histories and their notoriously exaggerated chronology (Origines Sacrae, bk. 1, chs. 1-6; bk. 2, chs. 1-2). Mather’s defense in this and subsequent paragraphs is extracted from John Edwards (1637-1716), a noted English Calvinist divine, minister of Trinity Church, and fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge, whose Discourse Concerning the Authority, Stile, and Perfection of the Books of the Old and New Testament (1693) 1:189-93, 269, 270, 271-73, supplies Mather with detailed information. Among the “Ancients” who “proved” that Moses (frequently associated with Taautus, Thoth, and Hermes) invented the art of writing are such early historians as the Phoenician Sanchoniathon, the Chaldean Berosus, the mythical Orpheus, and many others—if the enumerations in Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica (1.9.31d-32a; 1.10.36a; 9.27b; 10.9-11) can be trusted. By and large, this pious notion is not supported by such of the ancients as Plato, Diodorus Siculus, Lucan, Cicero, or Tacitus, see Iversen’s Myths of Egypt (41-48). Edwards adopts from Ussher’s Annals (12-25) the approximate date A.M. 2460 (c. 1560 BCE) for the writing of the Pentateuch and for the Trojan War A.M. 2894-2884 (c. 1194-1184 BCE). The oldest Ionian prose historian—according to Herodotus (5.36, 125)—is Hecataeus of Miletus (c. 6th-5th c. BCE). The French Protestant divine Pierre Jurieu (among many others) disagrees with the pious claim of the Mosaic invention of the art of writing, in A Critical History (1705), bk. 1, ch. 4, pp. 30-32, for even the Greek historian Diodorus Siculus (1.9.2; 1.16.1; 1.68.5; 3.4.1-4), who bestows this honor on the Egyptians and Syrians, corrects himself by insisting that the Egyptians received this art from the hieroglyphics of the more ancient Ethiopians (3.4.1 ff.). Mather dismisses both Dares Phrygius (Homer’s Iliad 5.9) and Dictys Cretensis (Scholia in Iliadem [Erbse] 1.108-9b, scholion 11) as fabulous, because the former was believed to be a Trojan Priest of Hephaistos and the supposed author of a Phrygian Iliad (a Latin version of which survives as Historia de excidio Troiae) whereas the latter, a companion of Idomeneus and Meriones in the Trojan War, claimed to tell the true story of Troy, in his Ephemeris Tou Troikon Polemon. See also R.M. Frazer, Jr. (“Introduction” 3-15).

Perhaps Mather has in mind the Book of the Wars of the Lord (Num. 21:14-15) and the Book of Jasher (Josh. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18)—both mentioned in the Bible, but apparently lost.

“They” does not refer to these lost books, but to the “Writings of the Pagans.”

Zoroastres is the Greek name for Zarathustra, the ancient Persian founder of fire worship with the God Ahuramazda at its center (Xenophon, Cyropedia 8.3.11, 24; 8.7.3). In his Natural History (30.2.3), the Roman historian Pliny the Elder, aka. Gaius Plinius Secundus (CE 23/4-79), dates Zoroaster’s book Avesta to 6,000 years before Plato, yet modern historians variously assign 1768 BCE, 630 BCE, or 599/98 BCE as dates for Zoroaster’s writing (see P. Krivaczek). In Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum (1700), cap. 8, pp. 150-61, the distinguished Orientalist Thomas Hyde (1636-1703) insists that Zoroaster was a...
contemporary of the Persian ruler Darius Hystaspes I (6th-5th c. BCE). Because of the vastly diverging time periods assigned to Zoroaster’s life, Mather speaks of four different prophets by that name. Mercurius Trismegistus, also called Hermes Trismegistus (Hermes the thrice great) is the Hellenized Hermes, associated with the Egyptian god Thoth, and is described in his various incarnations and as author of the Corpus Hermeticum in Cicero’s De natura deorum (3.22), in Lactantius’s Divinarum institutionum (1.6; 4.6; 7.18), in Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica (1.9.31d-32a; 1.10.36a-d), and in St. Augustine’s De Civitate Dei (8.23-26). Since this Mercurius or Hermes appeared in so many guises, periods, and religions, Mather’s legerdemain dismissal of the 42 books, which Hermes Trismegistus is to have written on all aspects of Egyptian religion (see Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata 6.4 and 6.15.132), becomes evident.

Mather’s reservations about Hermes’s Corpus Hermeticum are further informed by the Renaissance debate about their trustworthiness, especially after Isaac Casaubon’s De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI (1614), Exerc. I, sec. 10, pp. 70-87, dismissed them as early Christian forgeries. The Corpus Hermeticum was accessible at Harvard in Marsilio Ficino’s Greek and Latin edition Mercurii Trismegisti Poemander (1554); see Catalogus Librorum (1723) 51. Mather also owned a copy of Hermann Conringius’s Hermetis, Ægyptiorum (1674). For the Renaissance debate about the authenticity and significance of the Corpus Hermeticum, see F. Yates’s Giordano Bruno (1-46, 433-70), F. Purnell’s “Francesco Patrizi,” and B.P. Copenhaver’s Hermetica (“Introduction” xiii-lix).

114 The Egyptian priest Manetho of Heliopolis authored Aigyptiaka, a history of Egypt in Greek, for Ptolemy II Philadelphius (282-229 BCE), ruler of Egypt. Manetho’s work covers Egypt’s mythical history to 342 BCE, in 30 dynasties, but survives only in fragments in Praeparatio evangelica, by Eusebius Pamphilus (c. 260-c. 340), bishop of Caesarea, and in Josephus Flavius’s Antiquités. Sanchoniathon (Σανχονιάθων, Sanghuniathon, Sanchuniathon) was a Phoenician historian, whose treatise on Phoenician cosmogony and civilization recorded the teachings of the Priest Hierombalos. According to the Greek scholar Philon of Byblos (c. 70-c. 160 CE), Sanchoniathon lived before the Trojan War and taught at Beirut. In the days of Adrian, i.e., Roman Emperor Publius Aelius Hadrianus (117-28 CE), Philon of Byblos translated Sanchoniathon’s work and integrated it in his own Phoenician History of which only fragments survive in Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica (1.9-10; 4.16; 10.9). The learned French scholar Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609), professor of belles lettres at Leiden (also Leyden), dismisses the antiquity of Sanchoniathon as a contemporary of Moses, in his Notitiae in fragmenta Graece, in Opus de emendatione temporum (1599) 140, and in his Thesaurus temporum (1608). But the erudite French Huguenot scholar Samuel Bochart (1599-1667), whose popular Hierozoicon (1646, 1663) and Geographia Sacra (1646, 1674, 1707) were quoted by all scholars of the period, identifies Sanchoniathon as a contemporary of the biblical Gideon, who lived c. 200 years after Moses; asserts Sanchoniathon’s work as a reliable source, in Geographia Sacra (pars 2, lib. 2, cap. 17, col. 771-90); quotes Manetho affirmatively, in Hierozoicon (pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 9, col. 61; lib. 2, cap. 14, col. 198; lib. 2, cap. 57, col. 699; lib. 3, cap. 1, col. 715); and describes the transmission of Manetho’s history in Geographia Sacra (pars 2, lib. 1, cap. 4, col. 357). Unless otherwise specified, all references to Bochart’s Geographia Sacra are to the 1707 (4th) edition; all references to Bochart’s Hierozoicon are to the 1663 London edition. Edward Stillingfleet also dismisses Manetho’s account as unreliable, in Origines Sacrae (bk. 1, ch. 2, pp. 25-39). Pierre Jurieu, whose work Mather puts to good use throughout “BA,” tells much the same story in his Critical History (1705), vol. 2, part 3, ch. 4, pp. 50ff. Given this contradictory evidence, Mather’s hesitation is justified. Henry Dodwell’s Discourse Concerning Sanchoniathon’s Phoenician History (1681) also debates the credibility of ancient Phoenician historian. For Scaliger’s significant contribution to the study of ancient chronology, see Grafion, “Joseph Scaliger.”

115 Mather’s source for this and the subsequent paragraphs is, of course, John Edwards’s Discourse (1:271, 272, 273). Ludovicus Vives (1492-1540), Raphael Volateranus (1455-1522), and Melchior Canus (1509-60)—the latter in De Locis Theologicis (1563), lib. 11, cap. 6, pp. 360-82—charged the Dominican Friar Joannes Annius, aka. Giovanni Nanni of Viterbo (1432-1502), with having forged the books of several ancient historians and published them in his Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII cum commentaria (1498), esp. sections “Berosi Babylonici dignitate Chaldaei ad emendandos Antitutatum errores” (lib. 1), pp. f-ii(v) – i-ii(r), and “Manethonis Historici quod post Chaldaeos historicos probatur,” pp. i-ii(r) – i-iii(r). Annius of Viterbo claimed he had found the lost volumes of Berosus, the Chaldean priest of Belus (Babylon) and contemporary of Alexander the Great, and that these volumes should be part of Berosus’s fragmentary history Babylonika libri tres (c. 290 BCE). The extant fragments of Berosus’s genuine history complement Manetho’s Aigyptiaka and cover the history of antediluvian times from the creation to
Nabonassar’s reign (747-734 BCE) and down to the period of Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE). Fragments of Berosus’s history survive in the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius, *Antiquities* (1.3.6, 9; 1.7.2; 10.1.4-5, 2.2, 11.1) and in *Against Apion* (1.19-20), as well as in Eusebius’s *Praeparatio evangelica* (9.11, 12, 16, etc.). An English translation of Noah’s travels to Italy—as imagined by Nanni—appeared in Richard Lynche’s excerpt *An Historical Treatise of the Travels of Noah into Europe* (1601). Aware of Annius’s forgery, but like many who found his material too compelling, Mather could not resist incorporating some of it in “BA” (on Gen. 6:22). The brilliant English Hebraist John Selden (1584-1654) derides Friar Annius’s forgery, in his *Jani Anglorum Facies Altera* (1610), lib. 1, pp. 1-10. Helpful studies of Annius’s forgery and its detection are E.N. Tigerstedt’s “Ioannes Annius” (2:293-310) and C.R. Ligota’s “Annius of Viterbo.”

Orpheus is the famed son of Apollo and Calliope, best known for his unhappy affair with Eurydice, commemorated in Virgil (*Georgics* 4.453-525) and in Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, bks. 10-11). The Orpheus myth has been dated to the seventh and sixth-century BCE, and Orpheus is generally considered the first poet and singer to whom much pseudepigraphic poetry in hexameter verse is ascribed—all collected in *Orphica*. Likewise Musaeus, purported author of *Hero and Leander*, is a mythical bard, who is closely associated with Orpheus. According to Plato (*Republica* 2.364e), Musaeus and Orpheus are the offspring of “Selene and the Muses,” but Diodorus Siculus (4.25.1) identifies Musaeus as the son of Orpheus. Both Orpheus and Musaeus are associated with Moses in Hellenistic Jewish writing (see Stillingfleet’s *Origines Sacrae*, bk. 1, ch. 4, pp. 56-62; cf. Ralph Culworth’s *True Intellectual System* [1678], bk. 1, ch. 4, sec. 17, pp. 294-308). For Homer and David, Mather seems to follow Ussher’s *Annals*, which assigns the date of death for the Israelite Judge Gideon to 1236 BCE (*Annals* 29), or roughly 200 years after Moses (1571-1451 BCE), in Ussher’s *Annals* (12, 28). As mentioned above, Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis (Homer, *Iliad* 5.9) were believed to have participated in the Trojan War (1194-1184 BCE), according to Ussher (*Annals* 29). Ussher places the Greek poet Homer roughly 200 years after the Trojan War and 150 years after King David (1085-1015 BCE), relegating the dates for the blind bard of Chios to the ninth century BCE (*Annals* 34, 38). For the Renaissance debate about Orpheus as a progenitor of the *prisca theologia*, see D.P. Walker’s *Ancient Theology* (22-41).

Mather’s source for this paragraph is John Edwards (*Discourse* 1:272), but Edwards himself cribs his material from Ussher (*Annals* 56). Eusebius (*Praeparatio evangelica* 10.1-2, 7-8) complains about the fabulous nature of Greek mythical history and its whole-sale borrowings from Egypt and Chaldea. The foundation of the Olympic Games as religious rites are by Pindar (*Olympian Odes* 10.56-59) attributed to Heracles and took place in Olympia every fours years; Pausanias (5.4.5; 5.9.4) relates that following a long interruption, King Iphitus of Elis, the son of Ephitos and contemporary of Lycurgus, the lawmaker, restored the festival at Olympia with some changes. James Ussher dates the first Olympiad to July 776 BCE (*Annals* 56). In Mather’s time this date functioned as a fixed point in ancient historiography, allowing historians to establish a timeline for all other events. Mather’s dates, which are borrowed from Ussher (yet at second hand from Edwards) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>APJ</th>
<th>CE/BCE</th>
<th>Source: Ussher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Troy</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>1184 BCE</td>
<td><em>Annals</em> (31 [29])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzziah’s birth</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>3888</td>
<td>826 BCE</td>
<td><em>Annals</em> (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzziah, king of Judah</td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>3904</td>
<td>811 BCE</td>
<td><em>Annals</em> (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Olympiad</td>
<td>3228</td>
<td>3938</td>
<td>776 BCE</td>
<td><em>Annals</em> (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus &amp; Remus</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>3966</td>
<td>748 BCE</td>
<td><em>Annals</em> (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discrepancies in the dates given for King Uzziah (Azariah) of Judah occur in Edwards (*Discourse* 1:271-75), which Mather copies here. The Roman soldier, statesman, and voluminous writer Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BCE) is best known for his history of the Roman people, *De genti populi Romani* in four books. Here, Varro establishes a chronology, which allows him to calculate ancient Roman history from the foundation of Rome by the mythical Romulus and Remus (754/753), the Varronic era. In his *Antiquitates rerum humanorum* (41 books), Varro describes the history of the Roman people from mythical times to his day (books 1-25). His division into “Unknown, and Fabulous, and Historical” times—the latter beginning with the Olympiad (776 BCE)—proved to be a useful tool for aligning fixed dates in different calendars, and is emulated by Ussher (*Annals* 56), by the Italian historian, philosopher, and mathematician.
PseudokAuctores Hellenistae by the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (CE c. 37-pc. 100) and charged with misrepresenting Moses and the beginning of the Olympiads no accurate history has been written by the Greeks, the earlier accounts being before 425 BCE. Mather refers to the earliest events mentioned in Herodotus (the conflict between Greeks and Parthians) which Herodotus traces to the period of Croesus, king of Lydia (c. 560-546 BCE). This event precedes slightly in time the restoration of Israel under Cyrus, described by the OT Priest Ezra (6th-5th c. BCE) and by Nehemiah, governor of Judah (c. 445-pc. 433 BCE); and foretold by the Prophet Daniel who, in Mather’s time, was believed to have lived during the Babylonian Captivity (c. 606-c. 536 BCE)—according to Ussher’s Annals. Lastly, St. Clemens Alexandrinus (CE c. 150-pc. 215), a theologian in Apostolic times, warns Christians not to trust Greek historians who mix actual with fabulous events (Stromata 1.21, 28).

118 This section to the end of [60v] is extracted from Edwards (Discourse 1:189-92), and Mather cites these authors to defend the pious notion that Moses was the most ancient historian of all antiquity. For this reason, Mather refers to Justin Martyr (CE c. 100-pc. 165), one of the earliest Christian Apologists, who argues in his Hortatory Address to the Greeks (ch. 14), in ANF (1:279), that the ancient Greek mythic poet Orpheus acknowledged Moses as his teacher. Orpheus called him Ydogenes (waterborn or Nileborn), in Pseudo-Auctores Hellenistae (Fragment, p. d, 76) and in Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 13.12.5, 36; 13.12.666a). Likewise, in his Hortatory Address (ch. 9), in ANF (1:277), Justin Martyr cites as evidence of Moses’s antiquity Alexander Polyhistor (c. 105-pc. 40 BCE), a Greek grammarian, historian, and geographer, whose works survive only in fragments; Philochorus (c. 340-pc. 260 BCE), an Athenian scholar-historian best known for his Athhis (17 bks.), a history of Greece; Thallus (2nd c. BCE), a Greek chronographer, whose history covers the period between the fall of Troy to the 167th Olympiad (c. 1184-c. 112/109 BCE); and Ap(p)ion (fl. 1st c. CE), a Greek grammarian, son of Poseidonius, and author of a book of wonders Aigyptiaka. Numenius of Apamea (fl. 2nd c. CE), a Platonist and Pythagorean, here cited by Origen of Alexandria (CE c. 185-pc. 254), acknowledges Moses and Pythagoras as the source of all wisdom (Contra Celsum 4.51), in ANF (4:521). Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 9.6.411a; 9.8.411d; 9.6.13.415d) cites Numenius’s praise, “What is Plato, but Moses speaking in Attic Greek,” and Manetho’s alleged esteem of the Jewish Lawgiver. The Greek grammarian, mythographer, and author of Nostoi, Lysimachus (fl. 3rd c. BCE), not to be mistaken for Lysimachus of Pela; and Molon (2nd c. CE), also called Apollonius Molon, the Greek rhetorician, grammarian, and author of a tract Against the Jews, are both cited by the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (CE c. 37-pc. 100) and charged with misrepresenting Moses and Jewish Law (Contra Apionem 1.34, 2.15). Finally, Porphyry (CE 234-pc. 305), the Neoplatonist philosopher, refers to the Hebrew Lawgiver, in Vita Plotini (secs. 20.48; 22.16, 20, 22); Sanchoniathon is the Phoenician historian mentioned before; and C(h)alcidius, a 4th-5th-century Christian commentator and translator of Plato, was greatly influenced by Numenius and Porphyry; Justin [Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus], the second, third, or fourth century CE Roman epitomizer of Pompeius Trogus’s Historia Philippicae, refers to Moses in Justin’s Epitome T. Pompeius Trogus (36.2); and Pliny (30.2.11), in discussing various forms of ancient magic, argues that “another branch of magic, derived from Moses, Jannes, and Lotapes [‘lotape,’ i.e. ‘Yahweh’], and the Jews, but living many thousand years after Zoroaster.” Finally, Porphyry mentions most of these authors in his De abstinentia (2.55-56). The English nonconformist divine Theophilus Gale (1628-78) maintains in his celebrated Court of the Gentiles, in 4 parts (1669-72) that the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phoenicians, and Greeks stole their philosophy and philology from the Hebrew Scriptures. For a recent discussion, see S. Hutton’s “Decline of Moses Atticus” (68-84).

119 This paragraph refers to the Greek elegiac poet Archilochus of Paros (late 7th c. BCE); to Aristaees of Proconnesius, a legendary character and compiler of the Arimaspeia, mentioned in Herodotus (4.13-16); and to Hecataeus of Miletus (fl. 500-494 BCE), an important Greek historian and geographer, whose works survive in many fragments in Diodorus Siculus (10.25.4) and elsewhere. Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 10.3-4, esp. 10.10.487d), with Julius Africanus’s Chronography (bk. 3) at his elbow, similarly impugns Greek history as unreliable: “Until the beginning of the Olympiads no accurate history has been written by the Greeks, the earlier accounts being all confused and in no point agreeing among themselves.” The Greek historian Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 484/480-c. 420 BCE) mentions Hecataeus of Miletus in his famous History (2.143), which was written before 425 BCE. Mather refers to the earliest events mentioned in Herodotus (the conflict between Greeks and Parthians) which Herodotus traces to the period of Croesus, king of Lydia (c. 560-546 BCE). This event precedes slightly in time the restoration of Israel under Cyrus, described by the OT Priest Ezra (6th-5th c. BCE) and by Nehemiah, governor of Judah (c. 445-433 BCE); and foretold by the Prophet Daniel who, in Mather’s time, was believed to have lived during the Babylonian Captivity (c. 606-c. 536 BCE)—according to Ussher’s Annals. Lastly, St. Clemens Alexandrinus (CE c. 150-c. 215), a theologian in Apostolic times, warns Christians not to trust Greek historians who mix actual with fabulous events (Stromata 1.21, 28).
“Mousen,” the latter worshiping the god Ταό ("Jao" or "Jah") from whom he received his laws. Diodorus Siculus (1.94.1, see also 1.45.5-6, 1.45.1) praises Mneves as a great man and “the most public-spirited of all lawgivers” who received the laws from deified Hermes. (Compare with Strabo’s Geographica 16.2.34-37). According to John Toland’s Origines Judaicae sive Strabonis de Moyse et Religione Judæica Historia (1709), §§ 2-5, 24, pp. 103-16, 193-97, the Bishop of Avanches, Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721) deliberately glosses over this distinction to uphold Moses’s primacy, in Huet’s apologia Demonstratio Evangelica (1679; 1690), Prop. IV, cap. 2, §§ 37-42, pp. 62-64. (All references to Huet’s work are to the authorized and expanded third edition [Paris 1690]). Justifiably, Toland charges Huet with committing pious fraud, because Huet argues that the Egyptian Μνευης (Mneves), who received his laws from Evangelica pantheon, rejects the authority of his opponents in brother and Mercury’s grandson, was Moses’s contemporary (but long after the Patriarchs “and even after Moses himself.” Indeed, the astronomer Atlas, Prometheus’s yet under a different name, Mather readily embraces the story of Hermes Trismegistus, who (according to Clemens Alexandrinus) authored 42 books on Egyptian religion, culture, and history—knowledge he received from the Egyptian Thoth (see Corpus Hermeticum XIII, in Copenhaver 49-54).

11 In his De Civitate Dei (18.39) [PL 41.598], St. Augustine of Hippo (350-430), the great Father of the Latin Church, relates that Mercury, called Trismegistus, taught philosophy long before the Hellenic sages, but long after the Patriarchs “and even after Moses himself.” Indeed, the astronomer Atlas, Prometheus’s brother and Mercury’s grandson, was Moses’s contemporary (NPNF 2:384).

12 Edwards (Discourse 1:190). St. Augustine, who maintains the superiority of the Judeo-Christian pantheon, rejects the authority of his opponents in Reply to Faustus the Manichæan (15.5-6; 20.9, 11, 12; 32.19). Among the poets who describe how Atlas bore up heaven and how his daughter Maia gave birth to Hermes (by Zeus) are the ancient Greek poet Hesiod (6th c. BCE), in Theogonia (519-21, 938-40) and the Roman poets Virgil (Aeneid 8.138) and Ovid (Ibis 214). St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei 18.39) seconds Clemens Alexanderinus’s argument (Stromata 1.21) that the Jewish institutions and laws are of far higher antiquity than the philosophy of Greece.

12 Both Edwards and Mather (or the printer’s devil) take some liberties with the original Greek text of Diodorus Siculus (1.94.1-7.8), which reads in the modern edition as follows: άνδρα καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς μέγαν καὶ τὸ βίον κοινωνοῦν. Whereas Edwards condenses the original, but retains the diacritical marks, Mather, who copies Edwards (1:190 n), generally omits them because (Mather argues) they were of a much later invention (Manuductio ad Ministerium 29-30). In his De mysteriis (1.1-2; 8.1-6), the Neoplatonist Iamblichus of Chalcis (c. 245-c. 325 CE) refers to Plato’s Cratylus (407e-408b) as his source for the tradition of Hermes’s divine power and his invention of the art of rhetoric, writing, and hermeneutics. However, a generation or two after Iamblichus’s death, St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei 18.39) insists that Hebrew as a spoken and written language was neither invented by Moses, nor by his ancestor Heber (Gen. 10:24, 11:14); Heber only preserved and transmitted the art of writing through the biblical patriarchs down to Moses (NPNF 2:383-84). Mather’s contemporaries did not necessarily agree either with Hermes being Moses or with Moses being the inventor of the art of writing. For instance, Pierre Jurieu (1637-1713), Huguenot professor of theology and Hebrew at Sedan, discusses this time-honored tradition, but “find[s] not the least probability why the first Invention of them [letters] should be ascribed to Moses” (Critical History, bk. 1, ch. 4, pp. 30-34; quote is on 31). The Swiss-Dutch Arminian theologian Jean LeClerc (1657-1736) presents a similar argument in his controversial Twelve Dissertations (1696), Diss. 1, 1-50, but Theophilus Gale upholds the conservative position in his Court of the Gentiles (1672), part 1, bk. 1, chs. 10-12, pp. 51-85. For the historical debate about Hebrew as man’s original language, see A.D. White’s History of the Warfare (2:168-208). The debate about Moses Aegyticus, his association with Hermes Trismegistus, and Egyptian polytheism occupied some of the leading scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The dispute involved the Corpus Hermeticum, which many Renaissance scholars believed was composed by the ancient Egyptian King Hermes Trismegistus and antedated the Mosaic Pentateuch by hundreds of years. The Corpus Hermeticum, they alleged, served as a source text when Moses wrote his own. In his De Rebus Sacris et Ecclesiasticis (1614), Exerc. 1, sec. 10, pp. 70-87, Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), the Genevan classical scholar and church historian, debunked this threatening speculation by demonstrating that the Corpus Hermeticum originated in late antiquity and was most likely a pious forgery. Casaubon’s counterargument, however, did not still the gnawing doubt. Athanasius Kircher for one vehemently defended their trustworthiness in his Œdipus Ægyptiacus (1652-54), tomi secundi, pars altera, classis 12, cap. 3, pp. 506-10. In his True Intellectual System (1678), bk. 1, ch. 4, pp.19-37, Ralph Cudworth (1617-88), the Cambridge Platonist, was not far behind in supporting his Jesuit colleague against
Casaubon’s wholesale rejection of the *Corpus Hermeticum* as a late forgery. The *Corpus* was frequently translated into the vernacular and reprinted in many editions. See for instance, *Hermes Mercurius Trismegistus. His Divine Pymander in Seventeen Books* (1657). The emerging debate shifted toward comparing the similarities between ancient Egyptian cultic rituals and those established by Moses. While the orthodox position upheld Moses’s primacy in teaching true religion to the Egyptians, others, most notably the Cambridge Hebraist John Spencer (1630-93), master of Corpus Christi College, embarked in a different direction. He posited that Moses (though an Israelite) was an Egyptian in culture and education. In his *Dissertatio de Urim & Thummim* (1669, 1670) and his massive *De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus* (1685, 1727), Spencer contends that after four-hundred years of residence in Egypt, the Israelites were so thoroughly steeped in Egyptian culture, religion, and cultic practices that Moses could not have introduced his new religion without resistance from his people. (See, for example, the episode of Aaron’s Golden Calf as the Egyptian Apis Bull, in Exod. 32:4). To wean the illiterate masses from the heathen religious practices of the Egyptians, Moses instituted a monotheistic counter-religion and ritual laws as an inversion of their Egyptian original. The debate about such radical ideas took various forms and involved some of the greatest minds of the period: Gerard Joannes Vossius, *De Theologia Gentili* (1641), pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 10, 28, pp. 75, 206-12; John Selden, *De Dis Syris Syntagmata II* (1617) and *De Jure Naturali & Gentium* (1640); Athanasius Kircher, *Edipus Ægyptiacus* (1652-54); John Marsham’s *Chronicon Canon Ægyptiacus* (1672) 231-37; Richard Simon, *Critical History of the Old Testament* (1682), bk. 1, ch. 2, pp. 17-22; Herman Witsius, *Ægyptiaca, et ΛΕΚΑΦΥΛΟΝ* (1683, 1739), lib. 2, cap. 14; lib. 2, cap. 5, sec. 6; lib. 3, cap. 1-12; Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae* (1662), bk. 1, chs. 2-3, 5; bk. 2, chs. 1-21.i-ii); Ralph Cudworth, *True Intellectual System* (1678), esp. bk. 1, ch. 4, secs. 18-19, pp. 308-69; Isaac Vossius, *De Sibyllinis alisique* (1679), cap. 7, pp. 39-40; John Edwards, *Πολυσοκαίμος Σώφρος: A Compleat History... of Religion* (1699), pp. 240-63; Pierre Jurieu, *Critical History of the Doctrines* (1705), esp. vol. 2; John Toland, *Letters to Serena* (1704), esp. Letters 1-3, and *Origines Judaicæ, in Adeisidaeum* (1709), pars 2, pp. 99-199; Christoph Matthaeus Pfaff, “Dissertatio Praeclimalìaris”; and many others who joined one or the other side of the dispute. For a summary of the debate among the ancients and moderns, see Daniel Waterland’s *Charge Deliver’d to the Clergy* (1731) and John Woodward’s posthumous *Of the Wisdom of the Antient Egyptians* (1786). J. Assmann’s *Moses the Egyptian* (18-21, 35-38, 80-143) furnishes one of the best discussions of this historical debate. For a discussion of Isaac Casaubon’s debunking of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, see F. Yates’s *Giordano Bruno* (433-70), F. Purnell’s “Francesco Patrizi” and “Hermes,” and A. Grafton’s “Protestant” (78-93). For the emergence of comparative religion, see D.A. Painlin’s *Attitudes, P. Harrison’s “Religion” and the Religions* (99-172), H. Kippenberg’s *Discovering* (1-35), J. Gascoigne’s “Wisdom,” G.G. Stroumsa’s “John Spencer” (esp. 18-23), and Fausto Parente’s “Spencer.”

The Graeco-Roman geographer Strabo of Amaseia (c. 64 BCE-c. CE 21) identifies Moses as an Egyptian priest who came to disown the Egyptian gods and led his followers to Jerusalem (*Geography* 16.2.35-36, 39), and the Jewish philosopher Philo Judaeus of Alexandria (c. 20 BCE-p. CE 50) defends Moses in his *De vita Mosis* (1.1.2-3). Mather’s second-hand quotation from Philo is a free translation and appears in Edwards (1:191).

Edwards and Mather may have in mind Philo Judaeus, who asserts that many Mosaic laws were adopted by the barbarian nations and by the Greeks (*De vita Mosis* 1.1.2-3). Theophilus Gale’s *Court of the Gentiles* (1669-78) upholds Moses’s primacy throughout his huge book in four parts. Lycurgus is the progenitor of Sparta’s ancient laws (*eunomia*) and received his codex from Apollo’s oracle at Delphi (Herodotus 1.65-66; Diodorus Siculus 1.94.1; Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 5.2-3, 6.1-5; *Numa* 4.7-8; *Comparatio Lycurgi et Numae* 1.1-2). Likewise, Solon (c. 600-c. 560/69 BCE), an Athenian poet, reformer, and lawgiver, is greatly admired by Herodotus (1.29-30, 2.177) and by Plutarch (Solon 26.1), and is to have traveled to Egypt where he studied with the priests of Heliopolis and Saís. According to the Roman orator and historian Livy (1.21.3), Numa (Pompilius Numa), mythical king of Rome (c. 715-673 BCE), received the laws for Rome’s religion and institutions from Egeria (Aegeria), a water goddess and consort of Numa (Quintus Ennius, *Annals* 113-19). Minos, legendary king of Crete, is to have lived before the Trojan War and received with his brother Rhadamnaths divine laws from Zeus, i.e., Jupiter (*Plato’s De legibus* 1.624a-625b, *Minos* 318d-321c; Homer’s *Odyssey* 19.179; Diodorus Siculus 1.94.1). Finally, Zaleucus (misspelled as Zabeucus, in Edwards 1:192) is the mythical lawgiver of a town in Southern Italy and the earliest lawgiver of Greece (c. 650 BCE). He received his laws from Minerva (Athena), goddess of craftsmen (Diodorus Siculus 12.19.3-21). Here ends Mather’s excerpt from Edwards (*Discourse* 1:189-92, 270, 271-73).
Nevertheless, Christ “is proved to be founder of heaven and earth both at the very front of Genesis, which beginning,” in Augustine’s Mosaicae account; Maimonides felt the need to refute it in his assertion of the world’s eternity (uncreated and indestructible) because it violated the Mosaic creation account (Gen. 1) does not refer to the whole universe, but merely to the creation of the sublunary world—man’s terrestrial globe (Whiston, “A Discourse Concerning the Nature, Style, and Extent of the Mosaick History of the Creation,” secs. 3-5, pp. 9-66).

The preceding two paragraphs are extracted from Jacques Saurin (1677-1730), Huguenot theologian and preacher to a French church in London (1701) and later minister to a Walloon Church in The Hague. Mather refers to Saurin’s Dissertations, Historical, Critical, Theological and Moral (1:7-8), a 1723 revised English translation of a two-volume French original (1720). Mather draws on Saurin to prop up the embattled doctrine of the Trinity, which William Whiston (and other Arians) had vociferously denounced as a fourth-century forgery, in Primitive Christianity Reviv’d (1711) and in Athanasius Convicted of Forgery (1717). On Whiston, see Force (105-11). Mather tries to counter Whiston’s antitrinitarianism by citing evidence from R. Simeon Ben Jochai (also Yohai and Bar Jochias), a mid-second-century rabbinic teacher, whose Midrash de Simeon ben Yohai, better known as the book Zohar (Splendor), is a collection of rabbinic literature, commentaries, and expositions, in 5 books. The Hebrew word “Elohim” (אֱלֹהִים) generally signifies (pl.) “gods.” A variant translation of Mather’s citation from R. Simeon appears in Suncino Zohar, “Shemoth, Raya Mehemna” (43b). See Zohar, Shemoth (secs. 2, 26b), Bereshith (secs. 1, 2b, 15b). Philo Judaeus acknowledges this mystery in his De opificio mundi (24.72) and in his commentary on Gen. 3:22, in Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis (1.54).

Mather’s caveat is well taken because the age-old contention of the atomists that the world is eternal, without a beginning or end (Aristotle, De coelo 1.10-12; De generatione et corruptione) was hotly debated throughout the ages. Philo Judaeus (De aeternitate mundi 2.4-24.131; De opificio mundi 2.12-3.15ff) appears to side with the Stoics in his review of the philosophical debate, but ultimately rejects Aristotle’s assertion of the world’s eternity (uncreated and indestructible) because it violated the Mosaic creation account; Maimonides felt the need to refute it in his Guide for the Perplexed (2.1 and 30); and Mather and his peers returned to this ancient debate when Cartesian mechanism seemed to jeopardize biblical creationism. See also Simon Patrick, Commentary (1:1-2) on Gen. 1:1, and D.B. Sailor, “Moses and Atomism.”

The Hebrew word “rashith,” as well as the Greek word “Αρχη” (arche), is translated as “the beginning” (Gen. 1:1), a concept suggesting substance, which Origen associates with the Divine Logos, or the Word become flesh (John 1:1), in Homilies in Genesis (Hom. 1, p. 47), Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (1.4.22; 1.5.29; 1.9.58; 1.12.79, 81; 1.21.125-126, etc.), and in De principiis (1.2.1-3; 2.6.2-3; 2.9.4), in ANF (4:245-51, 281-82, 290-91). Similarly, Basilius Caesariensis, better known as Basil the Great (c. 330-79), the Cappadocian Father, has much to say on “the beginning” and on Christ as God’s “Co-operator” through whom the world was made (Hexaemeron Hom. 1.1-11, and esp. Hom. 9.6) and in “Letter VIII: To the Caesareans” (Letters 8:52-58, 105-7, 115-22). St. Jerome (c. 331/345-c. 419/20), one of the most renowned Fathers of the Western Church and translator of the LXX into Latin (Vulgate), adds his thoughts in Epistola CVIII. Ad Eustochium virginem, § 10 [PL 22. 884], and in Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesis, lib. 1 (on Gen. 1:1) [PL 23. 937C]. In the latter work, however, Jerome specifically warns against those who think that the Hebrew original (Gen. 1:1) “contained In the Son, God made heaven and earth, which the facts of the matter itself prove to be mistaken,” because neither the LXX, nor Symmachus, nor Theodotion, nor Aquila renders the Hebrew bereshith (“In the beginning”) as “In the Son.” That is why Jerome contends that this phrase pertains to Christ only in “its intention,” but not in “its literal translation.” Nevertheless, Christ “is proved to be founder of heaven and earth both at the very front of Genesis, which is the head of all the books, and also at the beginning of John the Evangelist’s work” (Hebrew Questions, p. 30). St. Augustine, however, disagrees with St. Jerome’s conclusion and argues for Christ as “the beginning,” in Augustine’s Sermones de Scripturis 1.5 [PL 38. 25], in Two Books on Genesis against the Manichees (1.2.3, p. 49), and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book (1.2, p. 145); the same is true for the Venerable Bede (c. 673-735), a renowned Father of the early English Church, who
is best known for his famous history of the English Church and its people, *Historia ecclesia* (c. 734); Junilius, bishop of Africa (6th c.), also associates the Divine Logos with the Hebrew concept “bereshith,” in his *De partibus divinae legis* (2.22) [PL 68. 37], a dialogue between a master and his student. Significantly, in his *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses* (Gen. 1:1), John Calvin vehemently rejects as “frivolous” the venerably tradition of identifying Christ with “In the Beginning.” Moses merely suggested, Calvin argues, that God’s creation as we know it now was not yet finished (Commentaries 1.1:69-70). Neither Simon Patrick nor Mather, who uses Patrick as a source throughout, agrees with Calvin in this point. Patrick insists in his *Commentary* (1.2-3) on Gen. 1:2: “By the Spirit of God some of the ancient Jews have understood the Spirit of the Messiah, (as [Theodor] Hackspan observes in his [Exercitatio] Cabala [sic] Judaica [1660], n. lxvi. out of Baal Hatturim, the Hierusalem Targum, &c.) which explains the Evangelist St. John, who in the beginning of his Gospel says, all things were made by the Eternal ΛΟΓΟΣ [Logos] or WORD of God, (the same with Νους [Nous] of the ancient Philosophers) whose Almighty Spirit agitated the vast confused Mass of Matter, and put it into Form.” (See also Plato, *Phaedo* 97c-98b). Mather’s Hebrew citation from the Chaldee Paraphrast, or Targum (interpretation), is actually from the Targum Hierosolymitanum (Gen. 1:1), a commentary and glossary written in Aramaic, reprinted in Brian Walton (c. 1600-61), “Triplex Targum, sive verso Pentateuchi,” *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1653-57) 4:2. Petrus Galatinus (1460-1539), the Cistercian monk and confessor of Pope Leo X, authored the controversial *De arcanis catholicae veritatis* (1518). The Greek citation from Rev. 3:14 more literally reads “the head of the creation.”

131 Traditional for his time and age, Mather’s condescending and insulting remarks about rabbinic scholarship are found throughout “BA,” as well as in much of Mather’s body of published works. Given their preoccupation with literal and typological readings as a means to bracketing the potentially subversive nature of philological and textual challenges to the Bible, Renaissance and Reformation theologians until the early Enlightenment often felt threatened by Hebrew scholarship even while they were forced to come to terms with the wisdom of the Talmud, Midrash Rabhah, the Zohar, Mishnah, Cabbala, and many other collections of Jewish midrashim. The centuries-old traditions and allegorical interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures became threatening for many reformed theologians precisely because the rise of Christian Hebraism since the late Renaissance proliferated printed editions and translations of Hebrew scholarship previously accessible only to a group of highly select scholars. (See H. Oberman, “Discovery”; L. Friedman, “Cotton Mather and the Jews”; I. Twersky and B. Septimus, *Jewish Thought*, S. Goldman, *Hebrew*; and P.T. van Roorden, *Theology*).

Mather’s response is extracted at second hand from Simon Patrick (Commentary 1:3, on Gen. 1:2), whose own source is *Exercitatio de Cabbala Judaica* (1660), n. lxvi, a commentary by Theodor Hackspan (1607-59), an eminent Lutheran Orientalist and professor of theology at the University of Altdorf in Franconia (Germany). Mather’s reference to “Baal Turim, and Tanch.” is to Baal Hatturim (Baal HaTurim), a commentary on the Pentateuch, by R. Yaakov ben Rabbeinu Asher ben R’Yechiel, aka. ROSH (c. 1269-c. 1349) of Cologne, Germany, first published in Constantinople in 1514; and to Tanchuma (Tanhuma), a homiletic midrash on the Torah generally attributed to R. Tanchuma bar Abba (c. 350 CE), a Palestinian scholar, whose commentary was first published in Constantinople in 1522. According to Baal HaTurim (Gen. 1:1); Tanchuma (Bereishis 5), in Midrash Tanchuma (1:25-26); and Midrash Rabbah (Gen. 1:10), the Hebrew letter ב [beth], which here has the numerical value 2 (Gematria), suggests that God created two worlds: this world and the one to come. Baal HaTurim adds that “the Torah begins with the letter ב, rather than with the letter ר [aleph], because ב connotes . . . blessing, while ר connotes . . . curse (Baal HaTurim Chumash 1:2). Mather and many of his peers take exception to such mystical interpretations, many of which appear in the above-mentioned commentaries. On the same issue of the two worlds suggested by the Hebrew letter beth, see also Jacques Basnagne’s *History of the Jews* (bk. 4, ch. 6, sec. 6, pp. 292-93).

132 For this paragraph, Mather’s source is again Patrick (Commentary 1:3, on Gen. 1:2-3), but the ancient idea of the primeval ovum hatched by a fowl was a popular metaphor throughout the Renaissance. Sir Walter Raleigh mentions the same trope in his *History of the World* (pt. 1, bk. 1, ch. 1, § vi, p. 5) and refers to the Latin annotations of Francis Junius, in *Biblia Sacra* (1593) 1, on Gen. 1:1-2. Long before Junius, however, the Greek comic playwright Aristophanes (c. 460-c. 386 BCE) tells the creation story of the Cosmic Egg (*Aves* 693-700, *Birds* 3:117), in which Chaos and Night brought forth a wind egg, from which came forth Love. And Love mingling again with Chaos engendered heaven, earth, all living things, and all
the gods. For Aristotle’s account, see his *Metaphysica* (1.3.983a, 24-1.8.990a, 32). For an earlier version of this ancient creation story, see the Greek bard Orpheus, whose famous egg alludes to the Egyptian god KNEPH, or Knuphis, out of whose mouth the world egg issued—see Porphyry *Προφυριον* (sec. 10.1), Eusebius Pamphilius (*Praeparatio evangelii* 3.11.115a-c), Proclus’s *In Platonis Parmenidei commentarii* (7.168), *In Platonicus Timaeum commuentarii* (1.138, 3.160); as well as *Recognitions of Clement* (10.17, 30) and *Clementine Homilies* (6.3-4)—the latter two are in *ANF* (8:197, 200, 263). For a similar discussion, see Edwards (*Discourse* 1:263-64); Ralph Cudworth’s *True Intellectual System* (1678), bk. 1, ch. 3, secs. 17-18, pp. 120-23; Poole’s *Synopsis Criticorum* (1:4); and E.A. Wallis Budge (*Legends*, ch. 2; and *Gods*, vol. 1, chs. 7-8).

133 Mather cribbs the entire paragraph from Patrick (*Commentary* 1:3, on Gen. 1:3). Patrick himself relies on the commentary on Exodus, ch. 40, by Isaac ben Judah Abarbanel (also Abrabanel, Abravanel), the learned Jewish philosopher and biblical exegete of Lisbon (1437-1508), whose *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Venice, 1579; Hanau, 1710) is highly prized by Jewish and Christian exegetes.

134 The “Shechinah” (also Shekinah) of God signifies “God’s visible presence” or “dwelling,” as in the light in the camp of the Israelites in the Sinai desert (Exod. 29:45-46), in the Shechinah glow of Moses’s face after he descends with the Tablets of the Law from Mt. Horeb (Exod. 35:30-35), or in the cloudy pillar in Moses’s tabernacle (Exod. 33:30-35). “Shechinah” does not appear in the Hebrew or Christian Bibles, but is used in the Septuagint (LXX), Chaldee Paraphrase, Targum Onkelos, and Targum of Jonathan (Exod. 25:8; 29:45-46; 1 Kings 8:12, 13, and elsewhere), in Walton’s *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*. Mather again relies on Patrick’s *Commentary* (1:299, 331), which also bears the influence of Abrabanel, Maimonides, and Nachmanides.

135 Maimonides (*Guide* 1.65.97-98) insists that the anthropomorphisms “God said” or “the breath of his mouth” (all too common in the Bible) are figures of speech denoting, “He wished,” “desired,” “willed,” and must never be taken “in its literal meaning,” for it denotes that all the creation “exists through His will and desire” (98). See also Patrick, on Gen. 1:3 (*Commentary* 1:3).

136 Mather’s source for the two cribbed paragraphs is Saurin (Diss. I, 1:6-7). The quotation from Philo Judaeus, in turn, appears to be a paraphrastic Christological interpretation of certain themes in *De opificio mundi* (24.72-76) and in *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim* (1.4, 8), which Saurin (1:7, note 22) excerpts from *Plan theologique du Pythagorisme* (1712) 1:149, one of the most significant works of Michel Mourgues (c. 1642-1713), a French Jesuit and professor of rhetoric and mathematics at the Royal Academy of Toulouse.

137 In his “Note Book of Authors and Texts Throughout the Bible” (1720), vol. 1 (Gen. 1:3, 8, 9), Mather identifies as his source “Arndt. vol. 2. p. 317” and “vol. 2. p. “319”; i.e., *De Vero Christianismo* (London, 1708), a two-volume Latin translation of the illustrious *Wahres Christenthum* (1605), by the German Lutheran theologian and precursor of Pietism Johann Arndt (1555-1621). Arndt interprets the Light (Gen. 1:3-4, 14) as a spiritual representation of Sophia (Wisdom), i.e., the Logos as God’s master-worker (Wisd. Sol. 7:26, Heb. 11:3), in *De Vero Christianismo* (tom. post., lib. 4, cap. 1, pp. 317-25). A copy of the 1708 Latin edition belonging to Increase Mather is listed in Tuttle (”Libraries” 315). Identifying Jesus of Nazareth as the Anointed of God was one of the principal endeavors of the early Church Fathers in their effort to link the Hebrew concept of “Beresith” (the Beginning) with “Sophia” (Wisdom), and with the Greek concept of the Divine Logos (the “Word” itself having substance) (Gen. 1:1, Prov. 8:22, and John 1:1)—see for instance Origen’s *De principiis* (1.2.1-3), in *ANF* (4:245-46); and *Homilies on Genesis* (Hom. 1, p. 47). Rabbinc tradition in Midrash Rabbah connects “bereshith” (Gen. 1:1) with Prov. 8:22-30 and identifies the speaker (Wisdom) as “ammon” and “torah” (“nursling,” “workman,” or “working tool”), the divine agent who assisted God in the creation. Rashi’s commentary (Gen. 1:1, Prov. 8:22) similarly associates the Divine Logos with the Torah and Wisdom, whereas Christian tradition identifies the Logos with Christ (John 1:1). For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see Jean Daniélou’s “The Son of God” (ch. 5), in *Development of Christian Doctrine* (1:147-72).

138 Hilarius Pictaviensis (c. 315-67), better known as St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, identifies Christ with the *Arche* [Arche] (“head,” or “beginning”) in his commentary on Psalm 2 [PL 9. 263A-263B]; see also St. Hilary’s *On the Trinity* (7.2-3), in *NPNFii* (9:118-19). The Jerusalem Targum (Gen. 1:1) associates “Bereshith” with “Sapientia” (“Wisdom”), in Walton (4:1); Tertullian, the African Church Father Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus (c. 160-c. 225), develops his argument in (among many other places) *Adversus Hermogenem* (20) [PL 2. 215A-216B], and in *ANF* (3:488-89). Origen affirms the hotly debated issue in *Homilies on Genesis* (Hom. 1, p. 47), *De principiis* (1.2.1-3; 2.6.2-3; 2.9.4), in *ANF* (4:245-51,
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1, bk. 2, ch. 6, pp. 279-82), in 2 vols. (1705-8, 1725), by Robert Fleming (c. 1660-1716), a Presbyterian minister, sometime pastor of a Scottish church in Rotterdam, and advisor to William of Orange. The Greek passage is from the LXX (Ps. 39 [40]:7-8), but Mather omits the diacritical marks (ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου; i.e., “in the volume of the book”), which do appear in Fleming (vol. 1, bk. 2, ch. 6, p. 280). The Ethiopic and Arabic translations (c. 4th CE), whether based on the LXX or Syriac versions is still debated, were readily available in Mather’s time in Walton’s Bibliia Sacra Polyglotta (the best edition at the time) and in the earlier Complutensian Polyglot Biblia Polyglotta (1514-17), edited by Cardinal Francisco Ximénez Cisneros (1436-1517). See J. Pelikan’s The Reformation of the Bible (esp. 17-20) and P.N. Miller’s “Antiquarianization.”

Unlike the Old Latin Bible, a compilation of various Latin translations of the LXX, St. Jerome’s Vulgate translation (4th c.) brought coherence to the many Latin versions in use in the early Roman Catholic Church. Highly controversial at the time, Jerome largely used the Hebrew (rather than LXX) as his source-text for his Vulgate, which subsequently became the authorized version of the Bible for the Western Church. The Greek versions of Aquila and Symmachus, which survive in parallel columns in Origen’s famous Hexapla [PG 15-16 pt. 1-3], are frequently cited by Mather and his sources when Christological readings are at issue. Aquila of Sinope in Pontus (fl. CE 117-38) opted for a more literal translation in harmonizing the LXX with the official Hebrew text (c. 140) and thus became an invaluable reference source to later textual scholars. Likewise Symmachus of Samaria (fl. CE 150), a Jewish conversio, translated the Samaritan and Hebrew versions into stylistically sound Greek as an alternative to the Alexandrian LXX. The Greek citation from Ps. 39 (40):8 ἐν εἰκόνι τοῦ βιβλίου [en eilemati tou bibliou], which means, “in the scroll of the book is written of me,” only appears in the column of Aquila, whereas Symmachus’s Greek translation renders it ἐν τῷ τέμνει τοῦ ὄρισμοι σου γένεσται περὶ ἕμου, which signifies “in the scroll of your law is written of me,” both appearing in Origen’s Hexaplorum quae supersunt in librum Psalmorum monitum [PG 16. Pt. 1. 760-761]. Mather’s “Volumina à Volvendo” are “rolled scrolls.” Nehemiah Grew makes much of the same argument in his Cosmologia Sacra (bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 133-143).

Mather shortens Fleming’s Latin comment, which translates “Let them go as far as they can” (Christology, bk. 1, ch. 2, sec. 6, p. 281). The Greek passage from John 8:25 lacks the diacritical marks and reads in the original τὴν ἄρχην ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν· and translates more accurately “Altogether, what I also say to you.” The Spanish Benedictine Orientalist Arias Montanus of Estremadura (1527-98) is one of the editors of the Antwerp Polyglot Biblia Sacra, Hebraice, Chaldaice, Graece, et Latine, in 8 vols. (Antwerp, 1571).

See Appendix A.

The two cited paragraphs are extracts from the 1717 edition of New Improvements of Planting and Gardening (ch. 2, pp.11-12, 14-15, 23-24), by Richard Bradley (1688-1732), professor of botany at Cambridge and Fellow of the Royal Society. For Mather’s interest in plant hybridization, see C. Zirkle’s “Forgotten Records” and “More Records.”

The preceding paragraphs are extracted (verbatim) from Sir Thomas Browne (1605-82), renowned English physicist and essayist, whose Observations Upon several Plants mention’d in Scripture,” in Certain Miscellany Tracts (1684), Tract I, § 41 (Works [1907] 3:263-64), is the work in question. Browne
makes a similar argument in his Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus (1658; 1668), ch. 5, p. 66, but his original source is the Greek philosopher Theophrastus of Eressos (c. 372-287 BCE), whose contributions to botany can be found in his De causis plantarum (6 bks.) and De historia plantarum (9 bks.). Following Aristotle’s classifications, Theophrastus categorizes plants into “trees,” “bushes,” “shrubs,” and “herbs” (Historia Plantarum 1.3.1). Browne’s reference to De plantis (1583), by the learned Italian physician, physiologist, and botanist Andreas Caesalpinus (1519-1603) demonstrates that Theophrastus’s Aristotelian categories of plants no longer satisfied Renaissance scientists, for Caesalpinus (Cesalpino) introduces the modern pre-Linnaean categorization of plants according to their fruits, and concludes “We shall treat [of this] more clearly if we were to omit the second division and name only two kinds of plants, tree[s] and plant[s], grouping lesser trees with tree[s] and harder herbs with stalk[s]” (B. Melton’s translation). The Greek terms Ποα Βοτανή [Poa Botanē] “herb” and Δενδρον [Dendron] “tree” are from Theophrastus (Historia Plantarum 1.3.1). Suffice it to add that Mather seems to ignore some of the hotly debated issues raised in the Mosaic creation account—although he does offer a typological reading at a later point [102v].

According to Gen. 1:11, God created on the third day “grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit” (KJV), before he creates sunlight on the fourth day (Gen. 1:14). Simon Patrick on Gen. 1:12 (Commentary 1:5) is more careful when he refers to Theophrilus Antiochenus (Ad Autolycum 2.13, in ANF 2:99-100), Porphyrius (De abstinentia 2.5.12), and Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 11.23-24.545d, 547d, 548a-b), who insist that God’s power brought forth plants even without sunlight to make them grow because a supercelestial light shone before the sun was formed. Patrick solves this philosophical conundrum by insisting that God created all vegetation in their fully mature state carrying their seeds within them, thus no sunlight was necessary in their first state. However, all subsequent generations of plants grew from their seeds and therefore required sunlight.

Mather cites from Nicholas Hartsoeker (1656-1725), a Dutch naturalist and physician, whose Essai de Dioptrique (1684), Principes de Physique (1696), and Conjectures Physiques (1706) were highly regarded. The text in question is most likely an early edition of Cours de Physique (1730), which contains a discussion of the nature and property of fire and the rays of light (book 2). Mather rejects the ancient belief in the malignant influence of the dog-stars Procyon and Sirius (c. July 3-c. Aug. 15), during which hot Dog-days (dies caniculares) dogs (as well as bipeds) are likely to go mad. See also his essay “Of the Light” (Christian Philosopher, Essay I, pp. 18-26) and W.U. Solberg, “Science and Religion.”

For a more detailed discussion, see Mather’s Christian Philosopher (Essay XI, pp. 56-60). The Latin passage reads, “as if the moon sat between smaller stars.”

Mather may have in mind Francisco Mendoza’s De Flores Philosophica, mentioned in Alexander Ross’s Arcana Microcosmi (1652), part 2, bk. 2, ch. 7, p. 133, and ch. 8, p. 138. Or, perhaps, a florilegium of “Mendoza,” cited in Josephus Angles’s Flores theologicae quaestionum (1580), listed in Isaiah Thomas’s purchase of Cotton Mather’s library, in “Catalogue of Dr. Cotton Mather’s Library” (AAS copy), p. F. At any rate, Mendoza’s Latin witticism translates, “Here [is] enough about the moon, lest we appear to support the toils of the moon.”

Mather evidently extracts the two paragraphs from The Religious Philosopher (1718-19), by the Dutch mathematician, physician, and anti-Cartesian Dr. Bernard Nieuwenyt (1654-1718). See Mather’s commentary on Gen. 9:2 (below).

Extracted from Simon Patrick’s Commentary (1:7) on Gen. 1:21, Mather’s passage refers to Hiob Ludolf [Leutholf] (1624-1704), a German polymath, jurist, Orientalist, and grammarian of the Ethiopian language (Amharic), whose Iohi Ludolfi . . . Ad suam Historiam Ethiopiam antehac editam Commentarius (1691) demonstrates that the Hebrew word “tanim” (Ezek. 29:3, 32:2, etc.), generally translated as “whales,” really signifies “crocodiles” (lib. 1, cap. 11, p. 86 n). Bochart also suggests multiple meanings of the term, in Hierozoicon Sive bipertitum opus De Animalibus Sacrae Scripturae (1663), pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 7, col. 45-52. Ludolf’s Historia Ethiopica (1681 ed.) appeared in an English translation as A New History of Ethiopia (1682) and was of particular interest to Mather because it described the kingdom of Abyssinia, supposedly ruled by the legendary Prester John. For the legend of this fabled Christian priest, see J. Delumeau, History of Paradise (71-96).

Nearly a century and a half after Mather’s evasive comment here, Herman Melville has Queequeg agonize over the “horrible vultureism” [sic] of God’s seemingly benign creation: “Queequeg no care what god made him shark . . . wedder Fejee god or Nantucket god; but de god wat made shark must be one dam Ingin” (Moby-Dick, ch. 67, p. 396).
The Rivet’s “Hendiadys” (“one expressed by two”) is a figure of speech expressing an idea by two nouns and a coordinating conjunction instead of a noun and an adjective. He suggests that “it is a custom of the Hebrews to join two nouns in such a way that they seem to be different things, when in fact the second signifies an adjective and epithet” (B. Melton’s translation). The Latin citation is quoted from Andreae Riveti Theologicae & Scholasticae Exercitationes (1633), Exerc. IV, p. 21, by André Rivet (1572-1651), Huguenot scholar, professor of theology at Leiden University, and rector of the College of Orange at Breda. Mather owned a copy of this work (AAS Mather Libraries # 0119). For the same interpretation, see also Simon Patrick’s Commentary (1:8) on Gen. 1:26. However, the original sources for all of them appear to be Tertullian (Adversus Marcionem 2.9.4), in ANF (3:304) and Gregory of Nyssa (De Opificio Hominis 16) [PG 44. 185.40-41].

The passage in quotation marks is not a verbatim citation but a pastiche of cited phrases cobbled together. Mather’s source is John Arrowsmith, D.D. (1602-59), professor of divinity, master of Trinity College, and member of the Westminster Assembly, whose ΘΕΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ [Theanthropos]; Or, God-Man (1660) 51 # 5 is the work in question. A copy of this work was part of the Mather libraries.

Mather’s Hebrew citation seems problematic (‘ענין אחר צֶלֶם), for the Hebrew word נֶפֶשׁ [selem] signifies “image” and “shadow,” whereas נֶפֶשׁ [dmuwth] signifies “resemblance,” “similitude,” and “shape” [Strong’s # 6754 and 1823]. See also Patrick’s Commentary (1:8) on Gen. 1:26, 27.

In his Liber imperfectus de genesi ad litteram (16.57) [PL 34. 242], St. Augustine argues that “Every image is like that of which it is an image, but not everything which is like something is also an image. Thus, because in a mirror or in a picture there are images, they are also alike. But if the one does not have its origin from the other, it is not said to be the image of the other. For it is an image only if it is derived from the other thing” (On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis, p. 183).

Man is by nature a “political animal” or “social creature.” The Greek citation is from Aristotle’s Politica (3.6.1278b, 19).

The debate about God’s use of the personal pronoun (2nd person plural) is an ancient one, and Trinitarians like Mather use Gen. 1:26 and similar passages to support Christ’s existence before his incarnation (Prov. 8:22, John 1:1) and to reaffirm the embattled doctrine of the Trinity (John 10:30). Simon Patrick (Gen. 1:26) offers a well-known alternative by suggesting that instead of the Trinity, this verse may merely indicate that God spoke in “the manner of kings” (Commentary 1:7-8). For a review of the entire debate, see Matthew Poole, Synopsis Criticorum (1:11-12).

Mather is a bit unfair to Philo Judaeus, who expresses his uncertainty more so than his certainty about this issue and suggests that God took council with his angels, in De opificio mundi (24.72-76), De confusione linguarum (33.168-34.175), and De fuga et inventione (13.67-14.72). Maimonides similarly wrestles with this idea in his Guide (2.6-7.160-63) and resorts to the traditions of the Bereshith Rabba to argue that God took council with the Earth. Finally, John Calvin, in his commentary on Gen. 1:26, 3:22, argues that “Let us” and “one of us” refer to God’s own sublime council (not the Trinity) in contemplating the creation of Adam (Commentaries 1.1.91-93, 183). See also Patrick, Commentary (1:7-8). The worthy author who is Mather’s primary source is probably Dr. Nehemiah Grew (1641-1712), English physician, biologist, and FRS, on whose Cosmologia Sacra (1701) Mather relies throughout. The second-hand quotation from Lucius Annaeus Seneca, the Younger (c. BCE 46-5 CE), Roman statesman, historian, and philosopher, appears in De beneficiis (6.23.6) and suggests more accurately, “You will discover that man is not a hasty and purposeless creation.”

Trinitarianism and the definition of its dogma are discussed by virtually all Church Fathers. Mather may have in mind Tertullian’s De anima (cap. 21) [PL 2. 684A-B], in ANF (3:202), but more specifically Against Praxeas 11-13 (3:605-9); Athanasius (c. 296-373), bishop of Alexandria, who discusses and defends this dogma in De sancta trinitate (dialogi 1, 3, 5) [PG 28. 1228, 1232, 1241-42], Quaestiones in scripturam sacram [PG 28. 733], and Orationes tres contra Arianos [PG 26. 212, 272-73, 388, 452 etc.]; Cyrilus Hierosolymitanus (c. 315-87), bishop of Jerusalem, in Catecheses ad illuminandos (Catech. 10.6, 11.23, 12.5, 14.10) and Catechetical Lectures (NCPFii 7:58-59, 70, 73, 96); Cyrilus Alexandrinus (d. 444), patriarch of Alexandria, in De sancta trinitate dialogi I-VII (Aubert page 471, 516, 523), Thesaurus de sancta consubstantialit trinitate [PG 75. 25, 85, 89 etc.]; Joannes Chrysostom (c. 347-407), bishop of Constantinople, In Genesim (homiliae 1-67) [PG 53. 64-72, 84 etc.], Homilies on Genesis (8.3-8, 8.12, pp. 106-10, 112), Adversus Judaeos [PG 48. 919], De sancta trinitate [PG 48. 1087]; and St. Augustine’s De trinitate (6.2-3, 7.6) [PL 42. 924, 943], On the Trinity (NPNFi 3:98-99, 111-14).
between these maxims and the Bible, see Gen. 1:26 and Deut. 22:6. More than a century before German Higher Criticism posited that pagan literatures and pagan teachings therefore point to the verity of the Old Testament. See also Gerard Vossius’s 

Theologiae Gentilis

playwright Sophocles (c. 490-406 BCE), who has Creon reason that conspiring against Oedipus is illogical when Creon can have all the benefits of coprulership without its burdens. Creon argues that conspiring "were sheer madness, and I am not mad." Mather is generally careless about diacritical marks and frequently omits them altogether.

Solomon’s truisim (Prov. 19:2) is paired with a line from Oedipus tyrannus (600), by the Athenian playwright Sophocles (c. 490-406 BCE), who has Creon reason that conspiring against Oedipus is illogical when Creon can have all the benefits of co-rulership without its burdens. Creon argues that conspiring “were sheer madness, and I am not mad.” Mather is generally careless about diacritical marks and frequently omits them altogether.

Solomon’s sententious statement in Eccl. 7:20 is again paired with one from Theognis, Elegiae (1.799). Mather’s Greek passage cribbed from Grew (152) is slightly inaccurate and should read "Ἀνθρώπων δ’ ἄνεκτος ἐπὶ χθονίν γνωταί οὐδείς·"

The prayer of the Hebrew sage Agur, son of Jakeh, appears in Prov. 30:7. Mather here corrects Grew (152), who attributes this saying to the Levite Asaph, son of Berechiah, and supposed author of Ps. chs. 1, 73-83. Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus), the Roman poet and satirist of Apulia (c. 65-8 BCE), echoes the moral sayings of Agur, in Carmina (Ode 3.16.43-44), which here translate “All is well for the man to whom God with a frugal hand has given enough.”

Mather here pairs Prov. 27:1 with Elegiae (1.160), a collection of nearly 1,400 verses by Theognis (c. 550 BCE), the elegiac poet of Megara.
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Solomon’s sententious statement in Eccl. 7:20 is again paired with one from Theognis, Elegiae (1.799). Mather’s Greek passage cribbed from Grew (152) is slightly inaccurate and should read "Ἀνθρώπων δ’ ἄνεκτος ἐπὶ χθονίν γνωταί οὐδείς·"
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Solomon’s truisim (Prov. 19:2) is paired with a line from Oedipus tyrannus (600), by the Athenian playwright Sophocles (c. 490-406 BCE), who has Creon reason that conspiring against Oedipus is illogical when Creon can have all the benefits of co-rulership without its burdens. Creon argues that conspiring “were sheer madness, and I am not mad.” Mather is generally careless about diacritical marks and frequently omits them altogether.
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Achilles, breaks his silence (at Juno’s instigation) and addresses his dying master (Homer, Iliad 19.400-15). The biblical story of Balaam’s loquacious ass is told in Num. 22:22-30 and 2 Pet. 2:15-16. The dates of Homer are uncertain, but most scholars now agree that the epic bard of Chios flourished in the eighth century (c. 750 BCE). Since King David (11th c. BCE) lived nearly three centuries before Homer, Mather assumes that the writings of the former are the source for the latter and turns for the dates of the Greek bard to Herodotus, who argues that Homer lived four hundred years before Herodotus’s own time (2.53). The Greek historian Philochorus (c. 340-260 BCE), best known for his Atthis, provides slightly different dates than those of his more famous fellow historian Diogenes Laertius (Vitae philosophorum 2.43-44). Interestingly, Mather is less inclined to assign precise dates than is Nehemiah Grew (bk. 4, ch. 2, p. 153), who argues that according to Herodotus, David lived “about 188” before Homer, and according to Philochorus, “about 87.” James Ussher’s dates for King David’s reign are 1055-1015 BCE, and for Homer, the tenth-century BCE, in Ussher (Annals 34-35, 39).

171 The prayer of Agamemnon, the Danean hero fighting in the Trojan War, is uttered in Homer (Iliad 2:412-18). The Greek deities indulge in ambrosia (immortality) and cups filled with nectar, in Homer (Iliad 1.595-600) and in Ovid (Epistulae ex Ponto 1.10.11), but Cicero (Tusculanae disputationes 1.26.65) is skeptical. King David celebrates the raining down of celestial manna in Ps. 78:24-25, from which celebration (Mather argues via Grew 153), we have the “Ambrosian fields” or the “Gardens of the Hesperides.” David’s disquisition on bread and wine (Ps. 104:15; Eccl. 9:7) inspired, perhaps, Homer’s description of the feasting Argives in Iliad (9:89-94). The desolation of Jerusalem likened to beasts feeding on human corpses (Ps. 79:2) is compared to Achilles’s curse of Hector, in Homer (Iliad 22:331-36). And, finally, the Psalmist’s lamentation and benediction (Ps. 10:14; 146:9) is to have been the source of inspiration for Homer’s faithful swineherd Eumaios, who reminds disguised Odysseus that the rites of hospitality are sacred to the gods (Odyssey 14:55-71).

172 The following three paragraphs are extracted from Grew (bk. 4, ch. 2, pp. 153-55).

173 Mather (and Grew) believes that the Israelites’ pocketing the jewelry of their Egyptian neighbors (Exod. 12:35-36) during their hasty departure from Egypt is embedded in Homer (Odyssey 18.280-303). Here, Penelope, faithful wife of Odysseus (Ulysses), acts on the behest of Pallas Athena and accepts her suitors’ gifts even though she has no intention of honoring their marriage proposals. Likewise, the sacrificial blood on the Israelites’ lintels and the death of all firstborn among the Egyptians (Exod. 12:22-23, 29-30) is paralleled with Odysseus’s bloody revenge on his wife’s suitors and on his own disloyal servants (Odyssey 22.305-520).

174 David’s thanksgiving and description of how Jehovah of Armies vanquished David’s enemies (Ps. 18) is compared to Homer’s celebration of victory in the combat between Aeneas and Achilles (Iliad 20.156ff). The divine display of thunder, lightning, and earthquakes of Jehovah (Ps. 18:7, 13) is compared to similar displays of awesome power of the Greek deities (Iliad 20.57-60); David’s superlative metaphors of the waters and foundations of the world (Ps. 18:7, 15) are associated with those of Homer’s Pluto (Hades, Aidoneus), god of the underworld, who cautions the earth-shaker Neptune (Poseidon) not to expose the chambers of the deep (Iliad 20.61-65); the thunderstorm at sea (Ps. 18:11-15) weighs against the quarrel between Phoebus (Apollo) and Neptune (Iliad 20.54-69); the deliverance of the Psalmist from the waters (Ps. 18:16) is linked with Neptune’s rescue of Aeneas (Iliad 20.318-29); David’s strong enemies (Ps. 18:17) are related to those in Neptune’s query (Iliad 20.332-39); and finally, Jehovah’s delight in David (Ps. 18:19) is equated with the love of the immortal gods for Aeneas (Iliad 20.347-48).

175 Grew (bk. 4, ch. 2, p. 155), Plato (c. 429-347 BCE), the great Athenian philosopher, is here prized for his cosmogony, cosmology, and ethics (esp. Timaeus, Philebus, Symposium, and Leges), which exhibit striking similarities to those of the Hebrew lawgiver. Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata 1.22.150.4.2), evidently following the example of the Syrian Neoplatonist Numenius of Apamea (fl. 2nd c. CE), dubs Plato “Moses Attikizon”; i.e., “Athenian Moses”—a designation that Clemens derived from Numenius’s De bono II, which survives in Fragmenta (fragm. 8.4). Mather’s likely source (via Grew) is Eusebius’s (Praeparatio evangelica 9.6.411a; 11.10.527a), where Numenius declares, “For what is Plato, but Moses speaking in Attic Greek?” See also Heptapliaus (First Proem, p. 68), by the Italian Renaissance humanist Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94), who argues that Plato’s philosophy is largely derived from that of the Israelite Lawgiver. See D.P. Walker’s Ancient Theology (10-14) and S. Hutton’s “Moses Atticus” (68-84).

176 The second-hand Latin citation (via Grew, bk. 4, ch. 2, p. 154) is from the Christian apologist Marcus Minucius Felix (fl. 200-240 CE). The passage from his Socratic dialogue between a Christian and pagan appears in his Octavius (34) and translates as follows: “Philosophers dispute of the same things that we are
saying, not that we are following upon their tracks, but that they, from the divine announcements of the prophets, imitated the shadow of the corrupted truth” (ANF 4:194). Mather is not completely faithful to the Latin quotation derived from Grew (154).

Turning to the pastoral eclogues by the Roman epic bard of Mantua Publius Vergilius Maro (70-19 BCE), Mather is delighted that Virgil (Eclogue VI) seemingly rejects the Epicurean speculation that the universe resulted from an accidental accretion of atoms that fortuitously combined and formed this world, which therefore has neither a beginning nor an end. André Dacier (1651-1722), a French editor and translator of classical works, published an edition of Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera (1694), the collected works of Horace (68-8 BCE), Roman poet and satirist of Apulia. For the revival of the atomist philosophy, see R.B. Lindsay’s “Pierre Gassendi,” G.B. Stones’s “Atomic View,” and M. Gorman’s “Gassendi.”

The famous passage appears in Virgil’s Aeneid (6.724-55) and celebrates the creation of the heavens and the earth. Mather is particularly attracted to this passage because like Gen. 1.1 in Jerome’s Vulgate, Virgil’s passage begins with “Principio” (6.724), “Beginning” or “First.” Likewise, Mather is charmed by the similarity between Virgil’s “Spiritus intus alit” [“a spirit within supports”] (Aeneid 6.726) and Gen. 1:2. Mather also sees a parallel in the six successive days of the Mosaic creation account (Gen. 1:1-31) and the Latin passage from Virgil’s Eclogue (6.36), which can be rendered “gradually to assume the shape of things.”

The divine command to separate the dry land from the waters (Gen. 1:9) is echoed in Virgil’s Latin passage, which reads in translation, “Then the ground began to harden, to shut up Nereus in the abyss” (Eclogue 6.35). Upon confining the old sea god Nereus (son of Pontus) to the deep, Mather turns to the next parallel.

The creation of the sun on the fourth day (Gen. 1:14) and the sequential creation of all living beings on earth (Gen. 1:20-26), Mather believes, are alluded to in Virgil’s Eclogue (6.40), which translates, “living beings roam over the mountains that do not know them.” With such Virgilian evidence to confirm the existence of mountains from the beginning of the creation, Mather pokes fun at the Cartesian Telluris Theoria Sacra (1681, 1689), revised and translated as The Sacred Theory of the Earth (1684, 1691), by the English latitudinarian divine Thomas Burnet (c. 1635-1715), Master of the Charterhouse and member of the Royal Society, who argues that the antediluvian earth had neither mountains nor seas, for the surface of the earth was completely level and the waters were confined in subterraneous caverns (bk. 1, chs. 5-11, pp. 53-118).

Mather’s diffidence openly to declare his position is amusing albeit understandable because William Whiston’s theories significantly challenged some of the time-honored explications of the Mosaic creation account. When Whiston made public his Arian beliefs (which his friend and mentor Isaac Newton wisely kept to himself) and accused St. Athanasius, the ancient bishop of Alexandria, of forgery, Mather’s friendly epistolary correspondence with Whiston cooled considerably, and the New England cleric edited out of “BA” the more amicable attributes he had bestowed on Whiston even while Mather continued to excerpt Whiston’s publications wholesale (Silverman, Life 328-30; Force, Whiston 105-13).

Whiston’s A New Theory of the Earth, From its Original, to the Consummation of all Things (1696) originated as a refutation of Thomas Burnet’s Sacred Theory of the Earth (1691). The significance of Whiston’s popular work—it had gone through five editions by 1737—earned him the respect of Isaac Newton, whom Whiston succeeded as Lucasian Professor of mathematics at Cambridge (Force, Whiston 40-54). My page references to Mather’s lengthy excerpt [69r-76v] are to the first edition of Whiston’s New Theory (1696).

Excerpted from Whiston’s “A Discourse Concerning the Nature, Style, and Extent of the Mosaic History of the Creation” (separate pagination), in New Theory (pt. 1, p. 3), Whiston posits that the creation account (Gen. chs. 1-2) does not intend to be scientifically accurate, but merely describes to a philosophically untrained audience the sequence of what an eyewitness might have seen at the time of creation. By introducing this distinction, Whiston (and Mather) can at once continue to defend the divine inspiration of the Mosaic narrative and acknowledge its contradiction to the scientific discoveries of Whiston’s time. Whiston’s subsequent argument is all the more innovative (and threatening) because he theorizes that the Mosaic story does not apply to the creation of the whole universe (as is uniformly assumed), but merely to the sublunary planet earth. All other planets in our solar system, the sun, and the rest of the universe were created in an antecedent event not included in the Mosaic hexaemeron.

Whiston (pt. 1, sec. 1, pp. 4-5; sec. 2. pp. 7, 9; sec. 3. pp. 9-10). The passage in quotation marks appears in Whiston and paraphrases the position of Simon Patrick (1625-1707), bishop of Ely, whose Commentary
on Genesis (1694) represented the orthodox Anglican position on the Mosaic creation account. Whiston therefore acknowledges his consent in his revised fifth edition of 1737: “This Sense of the Words is allow’d by our late Excellent Commentator, the Right Reverend the late Lord Bishop of Ely; whose Sentiments cannot but be justly valued by all who are conversant in his Expositions of the Holy Scriptures” (New Theory, 5th ed., pt. 1, sec. 1, p. 5; and New Theory [1696], pt. 2, ch. 3, p. 90) The passage in braces—lost through defacement of Mather’s holograph MS—is here restored from Whiston’s text.


The Latin “Perfectum” and “Plusquam Perfectum” are the “past” and “past-perfect” verb tenses, respectively. Whiston (New Theory, pt. 1, sec. 3, pp. 14-15).

Whiston (New Theory, pt. 1, sec. 3, pp. 18, 19). The italicized passages are citations from and references to Gen. 1:14-17, and Josh. 10:12—the latter referring to Joshua’s arrest of the sun and moon.

Whiston (New Theory, pt. 1, sec. 3, p. 21). Whiston begins his argument with a significant caveat (which Mather tellingly omits) that the Mosaic account does not aim at being an accurate or scientific record of what happened during the creation process, because “the Capacities of the People could not bear any such things; that the Prophets and Holy Penmen themselves, unless over-rul’d by that Spirit which spake by them, being seldom or never Philosophers, were not capable of representing these things otherwise than they, with the Vulgar, understood them: That even, still, those who believe the true System of the World, are forc’d among the Vulgar, and in common Conversation to speak as they do, and accommodate their expression to the Notions and Apprehensions of the generality of Mankind” (Whiston, New Theory, pt. 1, sec. 3, p. 20). This ingenious distinction allowed Whiston and his compeers to uphold the divine inspiration of the Bible while blaming its unscientific descriptions on the ignorance of God’s ancient messengers or on the prophets’ need to accommodate their illiterate audience. This ancient form of accommodationism was not unique to Whiston and goes back at least as far as St. Augustine (Confessions 12.4.4). The bishop of Hippo also struggles with the multivalent meanings of the conventional words used in the Mosaic hexaemeron: Moses explains the creation in terms that “it might be conveyed to those of duller mind.” Even Thomas Burnet and Isaac Newton embrace accommodationism. In an extant letter to the younger Isaac Newton (13 January 1681), Thomas Burnet argues that Moses (Gen. 1:1-31) does not describe the creation in scientific terms, but “gives a short ideal draught of a Terraqueous Earth rising from a Chaos, not according to ye order of Nature & natural causes, but in yt order wch was most conceivable to ye people, & wherein they could easily imagine an Omnipotent power might forme it.” Ultimately, Burnet insists that the Mosaic creation account is not literal at all, but ideal or “morall” at best, which is to say fictional. Isaac Newton, however, was not willing to go as far as that: “Moses here sets down their creation as if he had then lived & were now describing what he saw. Omit them he could not without rendering his description of ye creation imperfect in ye judgment of ye vulgar. To describe them distinctly as they were in them selves would have made ye narration tedious & confused, amused ye vulgar & become a Philosopher more then a Prophet. He mentions them therefore only so far as ye vulgar had a notion of them, that is as they were phenomena in our firmament, & describes their making only so far & at such a time as they were made such phenomena” (Correspondence of Newton 2:323, 333). Newton’s type of accommodationism therefore steers midway between the Skylla and Charybdis of allegory and literalism, revealing Sir Isaac’s intrinsic need to hold fast to the Bible’s divine inspiration even as he was at the forefront of the scientific discoveries of his age. Burnet fleshes out his side of the argument in his Archaeologiae Philosophicae (1692), lib. 2, cap. 8-9, pp. 297-329; and in its English translation (1736), chs. 2-3, pp. 27-66. For helpful discussions of accommodationism, see S. Mandelbrote, “Isaac Newton”; S. Benin, Footprints; P. Harrison, Rise (129-38); and R. Smolinski, “How.”


“Defæcate” here signifies “purified from dregs, clarified, clear and pure” (OED).


Whiston (New Theory, pt. 1, sec. 4, pp. 32, 33, 35, 36-38). The passage in braces—lost in Mather’s manuscript through defacement—is restored from Whiston (p. 33). Whiston’s argument about an ever expanding universe is surprisingly modern, for it contains the essence of the so-called “Big Bang” theory. Whiston, however, was not the first to theorize about gravity. This honor belongs to Aristotle, whose De Coelo (4.1) explains the falling of objects according to their specific weight. More than half a millennium after Aristotle (384-322 BCE), Claudius Ptolemaeus (c. 100-c. 175 CE) postulated in his famous Almagest...
that a centripetal force pulled bodies toward the earth’s center. More than fifteen centuries later, the German astronomer Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) posited in his *Astronomia Nova* (1609) that gravitation is a universal force, which reciprocally attracts, and is attracted by, falling objects. The English mathematician Robert Hooke (1635-1703) tried to measure the gravitational force of falling objects and published his inconclusive experiments in *An Attempt to prove the Motion of the Earth* (1674). His contemporaries Sir Matthew Hale (1609-76), Lord Chief Justice of England, published his experiments in *An Essay touching the Gravitation* (1673) and in *Observations touching the Principles* (1677); John Wallis (1616-1703), Puritan divine and founding member of the Royal Society, presented his *A Discourse of Gravity* (1675) to his fellow members; and finally, Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) provided the mathematical proof of what his predecessors could only speculate about, in his *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1687). For a discussion of Newton’s views on gravity and its source in God, see Westfall (*Never at Rest* 505-11), J. Henry, “Pray do not,” and more generally, S.E. Morison’s “Harvard School.”

The passages in braces are lost at the bottom of [70v] and top of [71r] “BA,” but here restored from Whiston’s *New Theory* (pt. 1, sect. 5, pp. 42).

Benedict Spinoza says as much in his demystification of biblical miracles, in *Theological Political Tractate* (ch. 6, pp. 82-83). The cessation of miracles in post-biblical times and their inadmissibility in Enlightenment England are aptly discussed in J. Shaw’s *Miracles* (2006), chs. 2 and 7.

Mather extracts the entire paragraph from Whiston’s *New Theory* (pt. 1, sect. 5, pp. 41-42, 46-47, 50-51). Whiston was not the first physico-theologian to take issue with the uneven distribution of activity during the six creative days, which (to him) could not have been literal periods of twenty-four hours each. In fact, many of the ancient and medieval Church Fathers and sixteenth-century Reformers did not see eye-to-eye on this issue and posited either an instantaneous creation or a creation during six literal days. Among those who insisted on an instantaneous creation are Philo Judaeus (*De opificio mundi* 3.13-14); Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 6.60-61), in *ANF* (4:600-1); Athanasius (*Orationes tres contra Arianos* 2.48-49); St. Hilary (*De Trinitate* 12.40) [PL 10. 458, 459], in *NPNFii* (9:228), St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologica* 1:355-57, Q 74, A 1-2). St. Augustine’s views seemed to have been unsettled over his lifetime: In *De genesi contra Manichaeos* (1.10.16; 1.14.20-21), he appears to maintain a literal six-day creation (of twenty-four hours each), but in *De Genesi ad litteram* (4.33.52; 4.34.54; 5.3.6; 5.17.35) and in *Liber imperfectus de genesi ad litteram* (7.28; 9.31), drawing on the apocryphal Sirach 18:1, he affirms a simultaneous creation of all things at once. “Creation,” Augustine explained in *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, “did not take place slowly in order that a slow development be implanted in those things that are slow by nature; nor were the ages established at the plodding pace at which they now pass. Time brings about the development of these creatures according to the laws of their numbers, but there was no passage of time when they received these laws at creation” (4.33.52, 141-42). Besides, since all natural processes—growing roots, germinating seeds, hatching eggs, growing feathers, learning to fly—take considerably longer than a single day and are dependent each upon the other, the hexaemeral division must be seen as a mere structuring device: Thus “we might say that the creation of things took place all at once and also that there was a ‘before’ and ‘after,’ but it is more readily understood as happening all at once than in sequence” (*The Literal Meaning of Genesis* 4.34.54, 143). Another variant is presented by Irenaeus, who insists that the world was made in six days and will terminate (according to 2 Pet. 3:8) in as many thousand years (*Adversus haereses* 5.28.3), in *ANF* (1:557). The Protestant Reformers were given to greater literal-mindedness and insisted that God created the world in six literal days: Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis*, ch. 1, and Gen. 1:27 (*Luther’s Works* 1:5, 69); John Calvin (*Institutes* 1.14.2, 22), on Gen. 1:5, 2:1-3 (*Commentaries* 1.78, 100, 102-3, 105); and *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (1648) and *Savoy Declaration* (1658), ch. 4. Even the great Sir Isaac Newton struggled with this problem at least in his younger years. In an extant fragment dating back to 24 December 1680, Thomas Burnet objects to Newton’s argument that the duration of the six days was not a period of literal twenty-four hours each, but considerably longer because the earth’s diurnal revolution at that time could “have been very slow, soe yt ye first 6 revolutions or days might containe time enough for ye whole Creation” (*Correspondence of Newton* 2:319). For a historical survey of these exegetical issues, see White’s *History of the Warfare* (1:1-24). F.E. Robbins’s *Hexaemeral Literature* (chs. 1, 3) provides an eminently useful survey of these issues.
The quoted passage is from Whiston’s *New Theory* (pt. 1, sec. 5, p. 62). Mather apparently dislikes Whiston’s dismissal of his contemporaries’ belief that the entire universe and its creatures were created for man as the crown and center of God’s creation. The disproportionate allotment of only one day to the creation of the entire universe (Gen. 1:3-5), but five days to the earth and all its creatures (Gen. 1:6-31), Whiston protested, reveals man’s ignorance: “Suppositions ten thousand times more disproportionate and unaccountable, when ascrib’d to God Almighty, are easily believ’d. So far can Ignorance, Prejudice, and a misunderstanding of the Sacred Volumes carry the Faith, nay, the Zeal of Men!” In fact, “The Vulgar Scheme of the Mosaic Creation, besides the disproportion as to time, represents all things from first to last so disorderly, confusedly, and unphilosophical, that ’tis entirely disagreeable to the Wisdom and Perfection of God (*New Theory*, pt. 1, sec. 5, pp. 56-57; sec. 6, p. 64). Such dangerous arguments are better left alone, Mather avers, for they would be grist for the mills of the Cartesian and Deists, who championed purely mechanical laws of the universe, and for Socinians, who espoused Unitarianism and rejected Christ’s divinity. Mather, then, cites Whiston in affirmation of the many dark passages of the Bible, which modern science has cleared up (*New Theory*, pt. 1, sec. 5, p. 62).

Mather is not happy either about Whiston’s conjecture that “a Comet, or more peculiarly the Atmosphere thereof, was the very Chaos from whence that World arose, whose Original is related in the *Mosaic Creation*, besides the disproportion as to time, represents all things from first to last so disorderly, confusedly, and unphilosophical, that ’tis entirely disagreeable to the Wisdom and Perfection of God (*New Theory*, pt. 1, sec. 4, p. 33; pt. 2, bk. 2, Hypotheses, sec. 1, pp. 69-76, separate pagination). How recurring comets in their elliptical spheres retard or accelerate planetary revolutions Whiston details in his “Lemmata” (*New Theory*, pt. 2, bk. 1, sec. 42-82, pp. 36-67, separate pagination).

By postponing the diurnal rotation of the earth until after Adam’s Fall, Whiston (and Mather) ingeniously allows for a space of time before time began. In this manner, the six creative days in the Mosaic account amount to an indefinite period of time without being constraint by the limitations of a twenty-four-hour day.

Mather condenses Whiston’s argument by extracting passages from *New Theory* (pt. 2, bk. 2, sec. 3, pp. 81, 82, 83-85, 86, 88, 89, 90; cf. pt. 2, bk. 4. ch. 1, pp. 227-30). That Adam and Eve needed more than a literal day of twenty-four hours to acquire all the knowledge of nature, name the animals, and accomplish their assigned tasks (Gen. 2:7-25) seemed all too obvious, even to Simon Patrick, bishop of Ely, whose acclaimed *Commentary* (1:16) argued that while nothing is impossible for God, man (no matter how perfect) needed more than a day to accomplish all that (see Patrick’s introductory comments on Gen. chap. 3).

The entire paragraph is from Whiston’s *New Theory* (pt. 2, bk. 2, sec. 3, pp. 91-92). Whiston’s own source is Thomas Burnet’s *Archaeologiae Philosophicae* (lib. 2, cap. 5, pp. 249-51). The change of the sun’s movement is related in Herodotus (2.142) and in Plato’s *Politics* (270b, 8), the latter of which is also the source for the Greek passage “now contrariwise,” spoken by Socrates’s interlocutor.

Mather’s source is Whiston (*New Theory*, pt. 2, bk. 2, sec. 3, p. 93); Whiston again draws on Burnet’s *Archaeologiae* (lib. 2, cap. 5-6). The citation from *Testimonia* (fragm. 1.31), by the Athenian philosopher Anaxagoras of Clazomenae (c. 500-428 BCE), reads *tholoeidos* (tholiform, dome-shaped) and is taken at second hand from Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae philosophorum* 2.9.1).

Whiston (*New Theory*, pt. 2, bk. 2, sec. 3, pp. 94, 95, 96) extracts his information again from Burnet’s *Archaeologiae* (lib. 2, cap. 6, pp. 260-62), including the reference to Plutarch’s Greek title of ch. 12, in Pseudo-Plutarchus, *Placita philosophorum* (3.12.895a, sect. F, 1). Mather (via Whiston and Burnet) here refers to the atomistic theory of Leucippus (fl. 5th c. BCE), of Leucippus’s disciple Democritus of Abdera (b. 460-457 BCE), and of the Greek philosopher Empedocles of Acragas, Sicily (c. 492-432 BCE)—all of whom are discussed in *Pseudo-Plutarchus’s Placita philosophorum* (2.8 and 3.12). According to Aristotle (*Metaphysics* 1.4, 985a21-b3), Empedocles was the first to introduce the theory of cosmic cycles governed by the predominance of either love or strife—each initiating a new cycle of history. For Empedocles and Leucippus, see also Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae philosophorum* 8.77 and 9.33). The Greek passage from Anaxagor as’s *Testimonia* (Fragm. 1.32) survives in Diogenes Laertius’s *Vitae philosophorum* (2.9.3) and is here translated by Whiston (*New Theory*, pt. 2, bk. 2, sec. 3, p. 95).


Whiston (*New Theory*, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 157). In support of his argument, Whiston refers in the margin to *De Veritate Religionis Christianae* (lib. 1, cap. 16, pp. 9-28), a highly popular missionary work by the Dutch jurist and theologian Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), and to Burnet’s *Theory* (bk. 1, sec. 4; bk. 2, secs. 7-8) and *Archaeologiae* (lib. 2, cap. 1).
Whiston’s Greek “LOGOS THEANTHROPOS” or “Logos God-Man” refers to the incarnation of God in Christ as described in the Gospel of John (1:1-14, 18) and elsewhere. Mather’s work and continues his excerpt of New Theory (pt. 2, bk. 4, ch. 1).

For his discussion of gravity as proof of God’s sustained, supernatural influence on nature, Whiston relies on Confutation of Atheism from the Origin and Frame of the World (1693), part II, lect. 7, Nov. 7, 1692 (pp. 26-40), by Richard Bentley, D.D. (1662-1742), English classical scholar and chaplain to Edward Stillingfleet, Lord Bishop of Worcester. Bentley was the first to deliver the distinguished Boylean Lectureship for 1692 and delivered eight separate lectures, which were published in 1692-1693. Mather puts the final two of Bentley’s lectures to good use (below).


For information on how the seeds of plants and animals contain miniscule replicas of each species’ complete body Whiston draws on Bentley’s fourth of eight Boylean lectures (June 6, 1692) A Confutation of Atheism (1693), part 2, pp. 3-36.

Whiston also draws attention to Sir Isaac Newton’s discussion of gravity, elasticity, levity, force, and the resistance of fluids in the Latin preface (xvii-xviii) to Newton’s Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica (1687). The entire paragraph is extracted from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 4, ch. 1, p. 227).

The entire paragraph is extracted from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 158) and the remainder from pt. 2, bk. 4: ch. 1, pp. 232-33.

The passage in braces {} was lost through wear and tear of Mather’s holograph manuscript, but are here restored from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 224-25, 228). For information on how the seeds of plants and animals contain miniscule replicas of each species’ complete body Whiston draws on Bentley’s fourth of eight Boylean lectures (June 6, 1692) A Confutation of Atheism (1693), part 2, pp. 3-36.


The entire paragraph is extracted from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 158; bk. 4, ch. 1, p. 236).

The passage in braces {} was lost through wear and tear of Mather’s holograph manuscript, but are here restored from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 4, ch. 1, p. 241), and the entire paragraph is excerpted from New Theory (pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 159; bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 241-42).

The celebrated Ῥωδ [Illy] is the fruitful “mud” or “slime” so vital to ancient agriculture.

The passage in braces {} was lost through wear and tear of Mather’s holograph manuscript, but are here restored from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 160) and the remainder of the paragraph is extracted from New Theory (pt. 2, bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 248, 249, 250). For the tradition of the Flood among the Taiwanese (Formosa), Whiston draws on Geologia: Or, A Discourse Concerning the Earth before the Deluge (ch. 2, p. 58), by the learned Erasmus Warren (fl. 1680-1714), Rector of Worlington, Suffolk. Evidently, Warren himself relies on Arnoldus Montanus’s Atlas Chinensis (1671) for this Taiwanese creation story of Pankun, the sixty-second demigod, who created the world in four years (pt. 2, p. 46).

The opening sentence is from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, pp. 160-61) and the remainder of the paragraph from bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 251-52.

The entire paragraph is extracted from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 161 and bk. 4, ch. 1, pp. 252, 253-54, 255). Whiston’s Greek “LOGOS THEANTHROPOS” or “Logos God-Man” refers to the incarnation of God in Christ as described in the Gospel of John (1:1-5, 14, 18) and elsewhere.

The paragraph in citation marks is extracted from Whiston (New Theory, pt. 2, bk. 1, ch. 1, sec. 23, pp. 26-27). Although Mather, the “Christian Philosopher,” did not hesitate to accept the mathematical underpinnings of the Copernican heliocentric system (hotly debated at the time), Mather, the theologian, kept wrestling with the implications of this philosophic revolution as it impacted biblical interpretations. His commentary on Joshua 10:12-14, the controversial miracle of the sun’s arrest in the midst of heaven, is a good case in point. Although accepted in NE’s almanacs and at Harvard, the Copernican system was still far from uncontroversial when promoted in the pulpit. For instance, when Mather delivered his Thursday Lecture, in which he praised the new heliocentrism, his friend Samuel Sewall murmured [Dec. 23, 1714]: “I think it inconvenient to assert such Problems” (Diary 2:779). (I am grateful to Kenneth Minkema for drawing my attention to Sewall’s remonstrance.) Significantly, Mather must have thought better than to expose himself to the pious censure of parishioners when he published his lecture as Pascentius (1714), for the printed sermon contains no reference to Copernicus or any heliocentrism. For an assessment of the new astronomy at Harvard, see S.E Morison, “Harvard School” and Harvard College (1:216-19); R. Lockwood, “Scientific Revolution”; R.P. Stearns, Science (160ff); D. Fleming, “Judgment” (2:160-75); W.U. Solberg, “Introduction” (xxiii); Solberg, “Science and Religion.”

Mather’s ambidextrous, if not ambivalent, approach to the theories of Whiston and his peers is indicative of his internal conflict between his fascination with Newtonian science and his conviction that the Mosaic creation account must be defended against any threats from Latitudinarians. For these reasons, Mather incorporates excerpts from more conservative physico-theologians to balance his lengthy extract from such “Neotericks” as Whiston and Burnet, who espouse novel ideas. Given that lesser lights frequently ignored challenges to the Bible altogether, Mather’s mediation reveals how far he had progressed in embracing Enlightenment ideas. Mather’s argument that the earth is the “Messiah’s, tho’ all the Worlds are His” may allude to the popular seventeenth-century idea of the plurality of worlds. See The Discovery of a World in the Moone (1638), by John Wilkins, Lord Bishop of Chester; and A Discourse of the Plurality of Worlds (1687), an English translation of Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle’s popular Entretiens sur la Pluralité des Mondes (1686). M.J. Crowe examines this conjecture in Extraterrestrial Life Debate.

The following MS pp. [77r-87v] are highly condensed excerpts from Physica Vetus & Vera (1702), an arcane atomist defense of Genesis, chs. 1-2, authored by Edmund Dickinson, M.D. (1624-1707), an English alchemist and Physician in Ordinary to King Charles II and James II. Dickinson’s earlier work to which Mather alludes is Delphi Phoenicizantes (1655). The Latin passage from the title page of Physica Vetus & Vera suggests that “in the history of creation, at one time the method and manner of every generation, at another time the principles of the true philosophy, are precisely and concisely taught by Moses” (B. Melton’s translation). Mather adorns his commentary on the Mosaic hexaemeron with a Greek citation from Funebris oratio in laudem Basili Magni Caesarea in Cappadocia episcopi (67.1.1-2), by the Cappadocian Father Gregorius Nazianzenus. Mather’s translation is much longer than his Greek excerpt, which ends with μεταξύγεισεμοί “I take into my Hands.” A helpful summary discussion of Dickinson’s atomist Physica Vetus et Vera appears in K.B. Collier’s Cosmogonies of our Fathers (1934) 149-65. Useful discussions of the return of the atomist philosophy in the seventeenth century are provided by R.B. Lindsay, “Pierre Gassendi”; G.B. Stones, “Atomic View”; and M. Gorman, “Gassendi.”

This paragraph is extracted from Dickinson (Physica 3) and agrees in its opening sentence with Spinoza’s argument that miracle stories in the Pentateuch are not scientific accounts of what happened, but rhetorical devices to instill awe and wonder in the minds of an illiterate people. See Spinoza, Theological-Political Treatise (vi. 90-92) and Whiston, “Of the Mosaic Creation” (New Theory, pt. 1, p. 25). The Platonic philosopher Celsus (Kelsos) of Alexandria and author of Ἀληθὴς λόγος [Alethes logos], The True Doctrine (c. 175-181 CE), a defense of Hellenic philosophy against the incursions of Christianity, is now best remembered through Origen’s apologia Contra Celsum, which provides summaries of Celsus’s argument along with Origin’s repudiations. Celsus disparages Moses for having derived his smattering of philosophy from Egypt (On The True Doctrine, ch. 2). Simplicius (6th c. CE), the Neoplatonist philosopher of Athens who settled in Harran (Carrhae) to escape persecution under the Christian Emperor Justinian, wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Epicetus, Hermogenes, and Iamblichus. Simplicius’s critique of Moses appears in In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria (10:1166-67). Mather (like Dickinson) likens the blindness of such Neoplatonists to that of Harpastes (servant maid of Seneca’s wife), who mistook her dimming eyesight for the house being dark. The oft-repeated story is told in Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Younger), Epistulae (50.2-3).

The entire paragraph (below) is a extracted from Dickinson’s Physica (9, 10, 11, 13, 14-15). The “Corpuscularian” philosophy is an archaic designation for “atomism.”

Aristotle analyzes the atomic philosophy of Democritus at great length in De anima (1.2.405a ff), De Caelo (303ff), Fragments (208 R). Aristotle’s praise for Democritus reads that “he had foreseen all things and supposed principles by which all things can be explained” (B. Melton’s translation). Hippocrates of Cos is the famous physician of classical times (5th c. BCE), who praises Democritus in Epistulae 20 (14-15). Mather’s second-hand citation of Hippocrates appears in Dickinson (Physica 9). Seneca speaks highly of Democritus and discusses his theory of nature in Naturalis quaeestionis (4.9.15.2-4, 7.3.2) and elsewhere. Democritus’s reverential view of nature as “The Works of God” appears in Hippocrates’s Epistulae 17 (80). Whereas Mather’s irritation is borne out by the fact that none but second-hand fragments survive of Democritus’s philosophical writings, Pliny (7.55.189-90) derides Democritus for promising that the dead would come “to life again—who did not come to life again himself!”

Among the Ionian “sect” to which Mather here wittily refers are the atomist disciples of the Milesian philosophers Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Xenophanes of Colophon (all 7th-6th c. BCE). Their works survive only in fragments in Aristotle and Simplicius. The Greek biographer and moralist Plutarch...
Natural philosophy. The English philosopher Ralph Cudworth (1617–1688), prebendary of Gloucester, follows these beginnings of all things (In Aristotelis physicorum 156.13–157.7), the Athenian philosopher Anaxagoras taught that an unlimited and independent “Mind” (Thought) caused and ordered everything in the universe (Diels-Kranz, Fragmenta 59 B 12), but Plato (Phaedo 97c–98c) was disappointed to discover that Anaxagoras’s works only mentioned such conventional causes as “air and ether and water and many other strange things.” Likewise Aristotle (De generatione et corruptione 1.1.314a, 10ff) and Lucretius (De rerum natura 1.830–920) seem less pleased with Anaxagoras. Dickinson (Physica 11). The Greek philosopher Pythagoras of Samos (mid-6th c. BCE), here honored with the title Theosophos (theosopher), discusses his concept of the monads in Fragmenta (165.2; 186.8–11). The elusive Mo(s)chus [Moxos] of Sidon, the alleged originator of the atomistic theory, is to have lived before the Trojan War (c. 1194–1184 BCE), as Strabo tells us in his Geography (16.2.24). In Mochus’s theogony, the intelligible god (ulom or noetus) is hatched from the cosmic egg (visible universe), which arose from cosmic space (aether) and cosmic spirit (air); see Recognitions of Clement (10.17, 30) and Clementine Homilies (6.3–4). Iamblichus tells his version of the cosmic ovum in De Vita Pythagorica (3.14). Mather’s reference to “Theodoret of old” is a bit misleading, because not Theodoret (c. 393–c. 466), bishop of Cyrrhus, is here intended but Johannes Arcerius Theodoretus, the Elder (1538–1604), Fresian professor of Greek at Franeker and Douai, whose Latin original of Daniel Sennert’s Atomes et Mixture” (ch. 1, pp. 455 [445]–454), translated by Peter Cole. The reference to the Phoenician Machus (Moses) (c. 610–c. 540 BCE) postulated in his natural history (Peri physeōs) that the ungenerated, eternal, and infinite “apeiron” generated the cosmos through an eternal process of separating and ordering opposites such as the four elements. This process, however, is an ongoing one, and natural laws subject the cosmos to eternal cycles of generation and dissolution (OCD). For Mather, this theory smacked too much of the mechanistic universe of the latter-day Cartesian Deists turned Peripatetics, or faintly sounded like the teachings of Epicurus of Samos (341–270 BCE), who believed in an infinite universe formed of randomly colliding elements of imperishable matter (atoms) that would eventually dissolve again into their components from which they arose only to regroup to form other objects yet again (Lucretius, De rerum natura 1.146–634; 2.333–581, 1023–1074; 5.91–770). Dickinson (Physica 13) casts aspersions on Anaximander, “because he [Anaximander] was leading such a life that (he thought) no providence existed in the universe that was especially concerned with him” (B. Melton’s translation). Dickinson’s source is the Latin original of Daniel Sennert’s Thirteen Books of Natural Philosophy (1659), “The Third Discourse. Of Atomes and Mixture” (ch. 1, pp. 455 [445]–454), translated by Peter Cole. The reference to the Phoenician Machus (Moses) appears on p. 446. See also Cudworth’s True Intellectual System (1678), bk. 1, ch. 3, sec. 21, pp. 124–26. For the rise and fall of this Renaissance belief in Moses (Mochus) as the originator of the atomist theory, see D.B. Sailor, “Moses and Atomism.” For a fresh discussion of John Selden’s De Jure Naturali, see Rosenblatt’s England’s Chief Rabbi (esp. 135–58).

The entire paragraph is extracted from Dickinson (Physica 14–15), who declares (14) that “he is foolishly presumptuous who believes that understanding and reason is in him and does not believe it is in heaven and earth” (B. Melton’s translation). The Greek passage (which Dickinson expands in his Latin translation) signifies “the Mind who ordered and directs all things” and is probably adapted from St. Athanasius (Contra Gentes 45.3), in NPNFii (4:28).

Dickinson (Physica 17–18, 19–20). The proximity of Adam’s death and Methuselah’s birth is a mainstay in Mather’s time, for his peers still believed that Adam’s creation took place just 4004 years before Christ. Adam’s death occurred Anno Mundi 930 and overlapped with the life of Methuselah (eighth generation after Adam) for about 243 years. The ancient patriarchs’ longevity therefore allowed for an uninterrupted...
transmission of ancient wisdom from Adam to Moses (James Ussher, *Annals* 1-3). The Greek passage “εὐφεις καὶ μακροβιοὶ” signifies “well-grown and long-lived.”

231 The entire paragraph is extracted from Dickinson (*Physica* 28-36, 42-49). Relying on Ussher’s chronology, Dickinson here refers to the flowering of Greek philosophy in the fifth century (BCE).

232 For the Indian “Brachmans” (Brahmins) and the Celtic Druids who (according to Dickinson) held that “water is the principle element,” see Strabo (*Geography* 15.1.59 and, respectively, 4.4.4); for the same belief among the Egyptians as well as among the Stoics, Philo Judaeus (*De vita Mosis* 1.17.98.2-4) and *De aeternitate mundi* (5.18). The humanist and historian Johannes Thurmair (1477-1534), better known as Joannes Aventinus, composed his history of Bavaria *Annales ducum Boioariae*, in 1517-21, and published an expanded version as *Annalium Boiorum libri septem*, in Ingolstadt (1554). For “Hermion,” see *Annalium* (1554), lib. 1, pp. 41-42. Whatever German schools of atomistic philosophy may have existed in the days of Hermione, daughter of mythical Menelaus and Helen (Homer, *Odyssey* 4.14), when Abraham’s son Isaac was nearly forty and married Rebecca, Mather extracts his information from Dickinson (*Physica* 31) without verifying his dates. According to Ussher’s *Annals* (6-7, 29), Isaac was nearly forty years old (Gen. 25:20) in c. 1856 BCE, whereas Hermione would have been born nearly seven-hundred years later, after the Trojan War (1194-1184 BCE).

233 Aristotle reports in his *Metaphysica* (1.3.983b, 20 ff) that Thales of Miletus (c. 640-546 BCE) took water to be the principle source of all matter—so Cicero reports in *De natura deorum* (1.10.25). Since Thales’s atomistic theory echoes the creation myths of Egypt (Manetho, *Epitome of Physical Doctrine*, fragm. 83) and of Babylonia (Berosus, *Babylonica*, fragm. 1, 52), and since the Mosaic Pentateuch had been translated into the Chaldaic language of Babylon during the Babylonian Captivity, which according to Ussher’s dates took place in c. 606-536 BCE about the year of the fiftieth Olympiad (c. 576 BCE), Dickinson argues that Thales could easily have had first-hand knowledge of the Mosaic creation account without knowing ancient Hebrew and long before the Alexandrian LXX (c. 280 BCE) became available in Greek. The substance of Dickinson’s argument here is extracted from Cudworth’s *True Intellectual System* (bk. 1, ch. 1, sec. 12, pp. 13), but echoes from Stillingfleet’s *Origines Sacrae* (bk. 1, chs. 2-3; bk. 2, ch. 2; bk. 3, ch. 2), Richard Simon’s *Critical History of the OT* (bk. 1, chs. 10-13), and Theophilus Gale’s *Court* (1676), part 2, bk. 1, chs. 2-3, pp. 23-64, can be found throughout.

234 The Greek cosmographer Pherecydes of Syros (fl. 544BCE), believed to be a rival of Thales, wrote *Ἐξάγωνος* [Heptamychos], a cosmogony that only survives in fragments (Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 1.16.38; Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 1.43). The Greek “Chthonia” or “Earth” survives in Damascius’s *De principiis* (124b), in *Testimonia* (fragm. 8.2). Dickinson identifies “chthonia” with the Hebrew term הַתּוּ [tohu] “without form” (Gen. 1:2). Pythagoras’s discussion of monads is extant in fragments by Iamblichus, in *Nicomachi arithmeticam introductionem* (p. 10.12-20) and in Pseudo-Justinus *Martyr’s Fragments* (fragm. 14.6p9, 11, 13; fragm. 30.13). Similarly, Aristotle’s “hyle” denotes “matter,” “material,” “body,” or “essence,” in many places including *De anima* (1.1.403b, 1.3, 7, 10, 12; 410b, 11: 412a, 7 etc.), but also the “chaos” of the four elements before the demiurge imposed order on the prima materia (*Timaeus* 30a, 52d-53b). For the substance of what appears here, Dickinson relies on Cudworth’s *True Intellectual System* (1678), bk. 1, ch. 1, sec. 11-15, pp. 13-17.

235 Anaximander’s definition of *atoms as the infinite* survives in fragments by Aëtius (*De placitis reliquiae* 1.3.3 ff), by Simplicius (*In Aristotelis de Physica commentarii* 24.13 ff), and by Aristotle (*Physica* 3.4.203a, 23-203b, 17)—most of which Dickinson extracts from Joannes Stobaeus (*Anthologium* 1.10.12.11-19, etc.) and from Cudworth (*True Intellectual System*, bk. 1, ch. 1, sec. 21-22, pp. 20-22). The phrase from Heraclitus of Ephesus (fl. 500 BCE), which translates “smallest fragments,” or “motes,” “dusty particles,” appears in Aristotle’s *De anima* (1.2.404a, 1-2), but also in a longer version in Pseudo-Plutarch’s *Placita philosophorum* (1.13.883b, 7). The same meaning is suggested in a composite passage in Heraclitus, the Platonist Xenocrates of Chalcedon (fl. 339-314 BCE), and in Empedocles’s *“thrasymata”* ("fragments")—all in Stobaeus (*Anthologium* 1.14.1k). The physician Asclepiades of Prusias, Bithynia (1st c. BCE), called his molecules “ogkous” or “lumps,” in Stobaeus (*Anthologium* 1.49.41-44) and in Sextus...
The phrase from Xenocrates should read Μεγέθη και άθροιστα [Megethe adiaireta] or “indivisible in the highest degree,” and appears in Xenocrates (Testimonia, doctrina et fragmenta, fragm. 144.7, 10). Mather misspells Aristotle’s σχήματα [skemata], which signifies “figures,” “shapes,” or “body” (De sensu et sensibilibus 4.442b, 10-12; Metaphysica 1.4.985b, 6-10; 6.2.1026a, 36, etc.); Aristotle here mentions Democritus as his principal source. Leucippus and his disciple Democritus (both 5th c. BCE) are generally credited with originating the atomistic theory (Aristotle, Metaphysica 1.4.985b, 4-20; Diogenes Laertius, Vitae philosophorum 9.30). Fragments of the works of Leucippus and Democritus survive in many sources including Leucippus (Testimonia, Fragm. 1, 6-7, 13-15) and Pseudo-Plutarchus (Placita philosophorum 2.8, 3.12). Plato says that the name of “the many” was used “from the oldest and the best, the philosophers nearest to the gods” and that the most ancient wise men believed all things to be made at first “out of one and many” (Philebus 17d), by which we mean our atoms, or “the immense multitude of particles.” See Galenus (De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis 9.5.15, 28). See also G.B. Stones, “Atomic View.”

236 Noah’s three sons are here identified as “the philosophers closest to the gods.” Aristotle’s disciple Clearchus of Soli tells of Aristotle’s philosophic discussions with Jews during his travels, in Josephus Flavius (Against Apion 1.22), in Clemens Alexanderinus (Stromata 1.15.70, ANF 2:316), and in Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 9.5.6-409b-410c). Dickinson (Physica 36) refers to Simeon the Just (Simeon ben Johanan), high priest in the times of Alexander the Great (Josephus, Antiquities 12.2.5). If this apocryphal story were true, Aristotle could have met with Simeon I (son of Onias I), but the story sounds too much like that of St. Paul, who was instructed at the feet of Gamaliel, son of Simeon, the president of the Sanhedrin in c. 13 CE (Acts 22:3). Arguably the greatest Jewish philosopher of the Middle Ages, Rabbi Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides), aka. Rambam (1135-1204), reconciled Jewish philosophy with Aristotelianism, and is best known for his huge commentary Mishneh Torah and his Moreh Nebuchim (Guide for the Perplexed). In Mather’s time, Latin translations of individual tracts of Mishneh Torah and of Rabbi Mosis Majemindis Liber הלייבר רמב”ם [Doctor Perplexorum (1629), translated by Johannes Buxtorf, the younger (1599-1664), were accessible at Harvard library (Catalogus [1723], pp. 52, 53).

237 Dickinson, Physica (42-44). “Hyle” signifies “matter” (Anaximander’s Testimonia, fragm. 14.6 ff, and “prima material” or “chaos,” in Aristotle (De anima 1.1.403b, 410b, 412a; Timeaues 30a, 52d-53b). The Hebrew term כינם [hhiul] or [chuwl] designates “sand” (as whirling particles) [Strong’s # 30a, 52 dp 53b). The Hebrew term חוֹל [haphar] (Gen. 2:7) denotes “dust” or “powdered mud” [Strong’s # 6083], and Dickinson uses it as a synonym for the creative concept of water (Gen. 1:2, 6-7) [Strong’s # 4325]. Aristotle calls the ancients who lived long before his generation “pampalaious” (Metaphysica 1.3.983b, 28-29). And the renowned philosopher of Idumaea is none less than the biblical Job himself, who (so Dickinson, Physica 48-49) refers to Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Noah’s sons), as heirs to the antediluvian knowledge handed down from Adam.

238 Both the Geneva Version (1599) and King James Version (1611) render Dickinson’s translation “dust” (Isa. 40:22) as “curtain” (Physica 44). The Hebrew term כנם [doq] or [dok] is commonly translated as “curtain,” but also signifies “something crumbling,” “to crumble,” or “to make dust” [Strong’s # 1852, 1854]. According to the Latin adaptation from Jerome’s Commentary in Isaiam lib. XI (on Is. 40:12) [PL 24. 407B], the term dok signifies “a very fine dust, which, when the wind carries it away, is rather often dispersed into the eyes, and it is so fine that it is not seen, even if it is felt” (B. Melton’s translation). The Hebrew term חָוֶל [haphar] (Gen. 2:7) denotes “dust” or “powdered mud” [Strong’s # 6083], and Dickinson uses it as a synonym for the creative concept of water (Gen. 1:2, 6-7) [Strong’s # 4325]. Aristotle calls the ancients who lived long before his generation “pampalaious” (Metaphysica 1.3.983b, 28-29). And the renowned philosopher of Idumaea is none less than the biblical Job himself, who (so Dickinson, Physica 48-49) refers to Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Noah’s sons), as heirs to the antediluvian knowledge handed down from Adam.

239 Mather extracts the subsequent paragraph from Dickinson (Physica 52-58).

240 Dickinson here may think of Leucippus and Democritus, who philosophize about the “void and nothing,” as Aristotle tells us in his Metaphysica (1.4.985b, 5-10). Hesiod (Theogonia 115-38) relates how Chaos and “wide-bosomed Earth” came to be. The Greek translation for the Hebrew “tohu” and “bohu” (Gen. 1:2) is rendered “chenon kai outhen” (“vacuum and nothing”), by Theodotian (2nd c. CE), and “chenoma kai outhen” (“empty and nothing”), by Aquila of Sinope (early 2nd c. CE), whose more literal
Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible survive in Origin’s famous Hexaplorum quae supersunt [PG 15. 144, 146]. As mentioned above, the Greek noun “Chthonian” (“Earth”) appears in many places including in Damascius’s De principiis (1.321.4); Pausanias (2.35.4-5) for one relates that Chthonia, daughter of Colotas, received the goddess Demeter hospitably, for which kindness Demeter took her to Hermion to build Demeter’s temple. In a related version of the story, Chthonia is a goddess, whose festival the Hermionians celebrate every summer.

241 Aret(h)as (c. 6th c. CE), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, is to have written a commentary on Revelation, in which he collected different interpretations from different authors. Aretas’s “Notable Hint” reads, “The immense depth of the first origin is called abyss.” And Strabo describes the Indian Brahmin’s principles of the world in Geography (15.1.59). Dickinson may have in mind Philo Judaeus’s De opificio mundi (6.24), which asserts the creation of the world in terms of God’s Reason being occupied in its creation, but see also his De aeternitate mundi (5.18-20). Mather’s Hebrew transliteration of פֶּשֶׁךְ [choshek] “darkness” (Gen. 1:2, 5), derived from “withholding of light,” seems questionable (see Strong’s # 2821p 2822), but the problem occurs in Mather’s source as well (Dickinson, Physica 58). The mythological poet Orpheus sings of the dark night νυκτος ζοφερήν [nuktos zopheren], in Orphica (Hymni 78:4), and the Phoenician grammarian and historian Philon of Byblos relates the Phoenician philosophy of the original chaos or dark air, in Fragmenta (F 3c, 790; F 2.5). See also Cudworth’s True Intellectual System (1678), lib. 1, ch. 4, sec. 17, pp. 299-300

242 The entire paragraph on “The First Day” is extracted from Dickinson (Physica 65-80, esp. 76-77, 78, 79). The Latin terms “pilulæ,” “globuli,” and “bracteolae” signify, respectively, “little balls,” “globules,” and “thin leaves of gold.”

243 By “Empyrean Heaven,” Dickinson means the hemisphere from which God and Sophia (Christ) created the universe. Hippocrates of Cos (5th c. BCE), the famous physician of antiquity, is associated with a body of writings on medicine that bears his name. The “Ignis Effluxio” is none other than the “outflowing fire.” “Aether” suggests the pure air and the abode of the gods in heaven. Dickinson (Physica 77) may probably have in mind Hippocrates’s doctrines collected by Galenus (De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis 3.8.13; 7.5.48; 7.7.25). The Greek/Latin variant passage from Empedocles’s Fragmenta (Fragm. 38.3) signifies, “the sun, the first principle [archetype] of all things” and survives in a corrupted fragment in Aëtius’s De placitis reliquiae, in Joannes Stobaeus (Anthologium 1.25.3e, 3), and in Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata 5.8.48.4, ANF 2:455).

244 Mather again omits the diacritical marks of the Masoretic וֹשֶׁךְ [shamayim] [Strong’s # 8064], which signifies “aether” or “heavens,” i.e., where the celestial bodies revolve. In the philosophy of the ancients, the elements “fire” עֶשֶׁר [aysh] [Strong’s # 784] and “water” מַיִם [mayim] [Strong’s # 4325] were two of the constituting parts of the aether. The pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus argued that everything consists of fire (Lucretius, De rerum natura 1.635-704).

245 Unlike the five other creative days recorded in Gen. ch. 1, God does not pronounce the second day “good.”

246 The entire paragraph is extracted from Dickinson (Physica 81-89). The Hebrew term וֹשֶׁךְ [raqiya] [Strong’s # 7549] used by Moses (“to whom the abbreviations always please”) signifies “expanse” or “firmament” (Gen. 1:6). Put in another way, Mather (via Dickinson) argues that the language of the Mosaic creation account contains cryptic terminology (like the Egyptian hieroglyphics) that embodies philosophic concepts in abbreviated form, and it is incumbent upon physico-theologians of Mather’s time to unlock these hermetic signifiers and to reconcile them with modern pre-Newtonian and Newtonian science.

247 Mather condenses into a single paragraph Dickinson’s Physica (90-119). The “Conatus Dispansivus” of atoms is the “impulse to expand,” and the “Succus Nutritius” is the “nutritious sap” necessary for the growth of plants.

248 The paragraph on the fourth creative day is extracted from Dickinson (Physica 120-43, esp. 121, 125, 126-27, 136, 141). Empedocles (Testimonia, Fragm. 1.186) calls the sun a “great mass of fire,” in an extant fragment by Diogenes Laertius (Vitae philosophorum 8.77.1).

249 The “sun spots,” according to Pliny, “palled [the sun] for the space of almost a year.” Most likely, Dickinson has in mind Pliny (2.30.89-90), where the Roman historian reports that at Caesar’s murder “and during the Antonine war,” an eclipse of the sun “caused almost a whole year’s continuous gloom.”

250 The apocryphal story that the Patriarch Abraham was a renowned Chaldean astronomer, who established the philosophic tradition of the creation of the universe out of nothing (creatio ex nihilo), is alluded to in Maimonides’s Guide (2.13.171-72; 2.19.188). Medieval Jewish tradition also ascribes to the biblical
patriarch The Book of Creation (Sefer Yezirah), popular among mystics of the period (E.J.). Mather’s claim that the name “Abram” or “Abraham” means “height” or “high heavens” is problematic, for on the one hand the root meaning of “Abram” is unknown, and on the other his name popularly signifies “high father” or “to be populous” (Gen. 17:3-5) [Strong’s # 85, 87]. However, Clemens Alexandrinus similarly reports that Abraham was called “sublime” because he studied the stars and the movement of the heavens (Stromata 5.1, ANF 2:446), a tradition which Clemens evidently derived from Philo Judaeus (De Abrahamo 15.69-71, esp. 18.81-82). The “old Writer of the Orphicks” is the mythical singer Orpheus, Apollo’s son, to whom many hymns, theogonies, and cosmogonies are attributed. The Greek passage is a variant of “Οὐ γὰρ κεν τε ἰδον” and appears in Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 13.12.5.22; 13.12.665c). Similarly, a variant of the Latin passage appears in the same location and reads as follows: “The king in His power no mortal could behold./ Save one, a scion of Chaldean race:/ For he was skilled to mark the sun’s bright path,/ And how in even circle round the earth/ The starry sphere on its axis turns.” But Dickinson’s actual source (127) appears to be Clemens Alexandrinus’s Stromata (5.14.123), where Orpheus says of Abraham, “But one a scion of Chaldean race:/ For he the sun’s path knew right well,/ And how the motion of the sphere about/ The earth proceeds, in circle moving/ Equally around its axis” (ANF 2:472).

251 Dickinson (135, 136, 139, 141) argues that to counterbalance the scorching heat of the sun, God endowed the earth with “Humidum Radicale” or “fundamental moisture.” And the writer of Job (9:9, 38:32) mentions “Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south” and “Mazzaroth.” Mather’s transliteration of the Hebrew terms should read: Ash, Chimah, Chesil, and Teyman (Mazzoroth); i.e., the Great Bear (Hesperus), Orion, Pleiades, and the chambers of the South wind; and Job 38:32, Mazzaroth (also: Mazzoroth) signifies the 12 signs, or the Zodiac collectively. See Strong’s # 5906 (5789), 3598, 3685, 8486 (4216).

252 The entire paragraph is a translated extract from Dickinson (Physica 144-58, esp. 145, 148, 149, 150-51). The story of the cosmic egg is told in Aristophanes (Aves 693-700). The “Oon protegonon” or “ovum primigenium” is the “Ur-egg” or “First Egg” at the mouth of the Egyptian god KNEPH (Knephis) from which all else sprang (CBTEL). Dickinson may have in mind De principiis (1.286.15-17; 1.319.2-6), by the Neoplatonist philosopher Damascius (c. 458-533 CE), or rather Porphyry’s Περί ἐξουσίας (10.1) extant in Eusebius Pamphilius (Praeparatio evangelica 3.11.115a-c). The Hebrew word מין [miyn] [Strong’s # 4327] appears in Gen. 1:21 and signifies “their kind.” A student of Anaxagoras, the philosopher Archelaus (fl. 5th c. BCE) describes this generative process, in a fragment surviving in Diogenes Laertius (Vita philosophorum 2.17.4-6). Dickinson’s second-hand Greek citation (Physica 150) from Archelaus, here copied by Mather, addresses the ancient concept of spontaneous generation and explains that “the animals had been brought forth through the warmth of the earth, liquefying mud [serving] as a nourishment similar to milk” (B. Melton’s translation). Mather also rejects the ancient belief in spontaneous generation in his commentary on Exod. 16:33.

253 Dickinson (Physica 159-94, esp. 162, 164, 166, 168-71, 174-75, 192). Mather presents a similar argument about the color of Adam’s prelapsarian body, in his Threefold Paradise (135-36) and Diary (2:113), where he describes Adam as wearing a luminous garment, or “Vestis Onychia,” resembling the color of onyx. 254 The Mosaic נ النف [neshamah] [Strong’s # 5397] suggests “a puff” (of wind), “vital breath,” hence “breath of life” (Gen. 2:7); whereas נמה [shamayim] [Strong’s # 8064] signifies “heavens” or “aether,” the abode of the celestial bodies (Gen. 1:2). Mather’s untranslated Latin quotation from Dickinson (Physica 166) reads, “Nor is the opinion of very learned men inconsistent with our faith that God truly used his hands in forming the body of the first men, since the human form had undoubtedly been borrowed, in which He [Christ] later appeared, after Adam had been made, not otherwise than He was seen in subsequent centuries” (B. Melton’s translation). The nouns “bullula” (Aulus Cornelius Celsus’s De medicina 2.5.3) and “chorion” respectively mean “watery vesicle” (“bubble”) and “sac enclosing the fetus” (placenta). The great “genesiourgos” is none other than the great “maker” (Wisdom of Solomon 13:5, LXX Apocrypha). The English physician William Harvey (1578-1657), professor at the Royal College and discoverer of the body’s blood circulation, describes mammalian generation and the stages of embryonic development in Exercitationes de Generatione Animalium (1651).

255 Plato’s “uperouranion topon” (Phaedrus 247c) signifies “the place beyond heaven,” which (Socrates instructs his interlocutor) has never been praised enough by the poets. And the influential Greek philosopher Pythagoras (fl. 6th c. BCE) called this heavenly country “eleutheron aithera,” i.e., “unrestricted heavens,” where the heroic souls remained “athanatous kai ambrotous,” i.e., “immortal and incorruptible.”
“to the element of the stars” (“De generatione animalium” 2.3.737a, 1). The Latin passage from Dickinson (Physica 171) reads, “Moreover, it pleased God that the multiplying of the species arises as a capacity not of the masculine or the feminine, but of both. Nor should it be doubted that woman was made for that reason chiefly a helper to man that she contribute her share to the multiplication of the species. Moses indeed teaches this in a proper and restrained yet sufficiently frank speech, when he says that God made Eve in order that she become a helpmeet (chenegdo) to Adam, truly of such a kind as would be in his presence, even joined to the former by a member” (B. Melton’s translation).

The Latin passage here greatly condensed and extracted from Lactantius (De opificio Dei 19) [PL 7. 74A] insists that “during procreation, parents contribute nothing more than the material of birth (namely seed). Everything beyond this is the work of God,—namely, the conception itself, the breathing in of life, the moulding of the body, and the bringing forth in safety whatever afterwards contributes to the preservation of man” (On the Workmanship of God, ch. 19), in ANF (7:299). Natural philosophers should second William Harvey’s pious remark in his Exercitaciones de Generacion Animalium (50) that “man considers the matter rightly and in a devout way who derives the begetting of all things from that same eternal and omnipotent divinity on whose will the universe of things depends” (B. Melton’s translation). Lastly, physicians should not incur the censure of the famous Greek physician Galen of Pergamum (129-c. 216 CE), who rebukes unbelievers in his De usu partium corporis humani (15.1): “If you will investigate in which way these things are made, you will be convinced that you grasp neither your own weakness nor the power of your maker” (B. Melton’s translation).

Mather here refers to Dickinson (Physica 192), whose experiments are, perhaps, too much like those Jonathan Swift would ridicule two decades later in Gulliver’s Travels (1726) 3.5-6. The “Aurum Naturae” or “gold of nature” is perhaps as fine an essence as that which a worthy professor at Swift’s Academy of Lagado sought to extract from cucumbers (3.5.152-53). The Hebrew word און [owr] (Gen. 1:17) suggests “to be luminous” and “luminary” [Strong’s # 215, 216]. (Gen. 1:17) suggests или —ןאָם הָאָמֶר [ayin] means “nothing, nonpentity” [Strong’s # 369]. For the Arabic word for the Hebrew און [owr] (Gen. 1:17) suggests “to be luminous” and “luminary” [Strong’s # 215, 216].

The passage about the “Beautiful World” that is seen, but made from atoms or “Unseen Matter” (i.e., “matter without form”) evidently refers to Wisdom of Solomon 11:17; 13:1-7 (LXX Apocrypha). The Hebrew word און [ayin] means “nothing, non-entity” [Strong’s # 369]. For the Arabic word for the Hebrew און (Gen. 1:2), suggesting “void,” see Walton’s Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (1:3).

Mather extracts the entire paragraph from Dickinson (Physica 198, 200, 203, 206, 207). The ancient Greek philosophers who called these principles “to pleres” and “to kenon,” meaning, respectively, “body” and “space” (or “fullness” and “emptiness”), are Leucippus and Democritus (Aristotle’s Metaphysica 1.4.985b, 5-7). These principles are called by Asclepiades “ogkous” (i.e., “mass,” “lumps,” and “molecules”), whereas “porous” suggests “way” or “means” (of achieving something). See also Cudworth (True Intellectual System, bk. 1, ch. 1, sec. 6, pp. 8-10). The adapted citation from St. Augustine of Hippo’s gloss De Genesi contra Manichaeos (1.7.11) [PL 34. 178] tries to harmonize the seeming contradiction: “That unformed matter which God made from nothing was first called heaven and earth. [Not because it already was, but] because it could be. If we consider the seed of a tree, we say that the roots, trunk, branches, fruit and leaves are present there, not because they are already in the seed, but because they will come to be from it. In the same way [Scripture said], ‘In the beginning God made heaven and earth,’ the seed, so to speak, of heaven and earth, since the matter of heaven and earth was still in a confused state” (On Genesis against the Manichees 58-59). Dickinson’s holy wind קולפיה [kolpijah] appears as a Greek transliteration [Kolxipa] in Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 1.10.7.3; 1.10.34b-c), where the bishop of Caesarea (citing Philon of Byblos) relates, “from the wind Colpias and his wife Baau (which he [Philo] translates ‘Night’) were born Aeon and Protogonus, mortal men.” The Hebrew word קולפיה does not appear in the Hebrew Scriptures, but seems to be a composite of 2 Chron. 35:22 (mouth of God) and Deut. 4:32 (voice of God). Dickinson’s source for Physica (206) is Bochart’s Geographia (pars 2, lib. 2. cap. 2, col. 706). See also Keil-Delitzsch (Commentary 1:24, note 1).

Mather extracts and translates this paragraph from Dickinson (Physica 229, 232, 236). The motion of the celestial bodies as debated between Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Descartes alludes to Galileo Galilei’s famous Dialogue (1632; 1638), in which Aristotle, Ptolemy, and Copernicus debate the structure of the universe and the motion of the celestial bodies (Dialogue 3); and to René Descartes’s Principles of Philosophy (1644), esp. part II and IV, who explains motion purely in terms of natural laws without the hand of God. (See also R. Blackwell’s Galileo, esp. chs. 2, 5, 7, and D. Stimson’s Gradual Acceptance, esp. chs. 2-5). For Mather and his peers, their arguments were either outdated or too mechanistic. Although
Mather embraced Copernicus’s heliocentric universe, he shared the disdain of many of his contemporaries who felt threatened by the natural laws of a purely mechanistic (Cartesian) universe; in a purely mechanistic universe there was seemingly no room for God’s providential intervention. Much better then Isaac Newton’s *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1686), which seemed to explain gravity and the motion of bodies in terms of the operations of God’s supreme power in the universe. For detail see A.R. Hall (*From Galileo 37-77 ff*), J. Henry (“Pray” 123-47), and E. McMullin (*Newton*). Although Cotton Mather’s *Christian Philosopher* (1720/21) is justly celebrated for promoting Newtonian science in colonial North America, he felt equally at home in the ancient cosmology of his father’s *Angelographia* (1696) in which myriads of angels and invisible messengers carried out God’s eternal plan. Like their immortal counterparts in Hesiod’s *Theogonia* (363-70), the ancient gods proliferated myriads of offspring, including three thousand nymphs with shapely ankles born to Oceanus and Tethys (see also Plato, *Timaeus* 41a-42d).

261 This translated paragraph is excerpted from Dickinson (*Physica* 298, 302). Since Moses was a member of the royal household, he is likely to have been initiated into the hermetic secrets of Egypt’s priestly classes. Philo Judaeus relates that philosophers from Chaldea, Babylonia, Greece, and Egypt were recruited to educate the young Moses, who was known by various other Egyptian names (*De vita Mosis* 1.5.20-25). Josephus describes Moses as an Egyptian general, who vanquished the Ethiopians and married Tharbis, daughter of the Ethiopian king (*Antiquities* 2.9.6-7, 2.10.1-2; *Contra Apion* 1.31-32). That Moses was educated “in the Collège of Diospolis” is not unlikely, for Diospolis Megale, better known as Thebes (Upper Egypt), was the Pharaonic capital (2nd millennium BCE), with the temples of Luxor and Karnak and the worship of Amun (the Invisible) at the center of the eleventh dynasty (KP). Moses’s dissolving of Aaron’s molten calf into powder (Exod. 32:4, 20) and of preparing the sweet-smelling ointment and incense “according to the work of the apothecary” (Exod. 37:29) are frequently cited as evidence of the occult knowledge of the Hebrew lawgiver. The history of the golden calf and its cultic significance are examined at length in John Selden’s *De Dis Syris Syntagmata* (1617), Synt. 1, lib. 1, cap. 4, pp. 46-64, and in Samuel Bochart’s *Hierozoicon* (pars 1, lib. 2, cap. 34, col. 330-60). For the use of perfume as a means of covering the odor of sacrificial animals, see Maimonides (*Guide* 3.45.358). Significantly, Mather’s seeming belief in the occult powers of Moses is not shared by Simon Patrick (on Exod. 32:4, 20), who argues that the wrathful lawgiver used nothing but a common file to reduce the calf to dust (*Commentary* 1:341-43, 346).

262 Dickinson (*Physica* 324, 325, 326). The source for this legend on Gen. 6:16 is the Soncino Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXXI:11). R. Abba ben Kahana relates that the word “Zohar” here signifies “a skylight,” but R. Levi opts for a “precious stone” or “polished gem,” which (according to R. Phineas) lit Noah’s Ark for an entire year, dimmed during the day, and shone at night. (See also Talmudic tractate Sanhedrin 108b.) Mather’s objection that the word "[tsohar]" (Gen. 6:16) means “splendor” is correct, but it is also used to denote “glistening light” and “window” [Strong’s # 6671, 6672]. However, the word "[[challown]]" [Strong’s # 2474], suggesting “window” [Strong’s # 2474], also appears in Gen. 8:6. Mather returns to the same issue in his annotations on Gen. 6:16 (below).

263 Dickinson (*Physica* 331). Chalcidius (4th c. CE), whose “ton propheten” signifies “the prophet,” is a Christian commentator and translator of Plato’s *Timaeus*. Plato uses the term “nomotheten” (*Cratylus* 389d, 5; 390a, 4, 7 etc.) to signify “rule-setters” (i.e. “lawgivers”) in general but does not refer to the Hebrew lawgiver at all. The Jewish historian Eupolemus (fl. c. 150 BCE) is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus as calling Moses “the first wise man” (*Stromata* 1.23.153, *ANF* 2:335). Finally, Numenius of Apamea praises Moses as more eminent than Plato: “For what is Plato, but Moses speaking in Attic Greek?” (*Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica* 9.6.411a, and Clemens Alexandrinus’ *Stromata* 1.22.150.4.2). Dickinson’s book is 344 quarto pages long. For a summary of Dickinson’s main ideas, see K.B. Collier (*Cosmogonies* 149-65).

264 Daniel Sennert (1572-1637), a German physician and iatrochemist, professor of medicine at Wittenberg University, is best known for his *Tractatus de consensu et dissensu Galenicorum* (1619) and *Hypomnematum Physicorum* (1636), which were partly incorporated in Peter Cole’s English translation of Sennert’s *Thirteen Books of Natural Philosophy* (1659). Sennert rebukes those who pervert the Mosaic Pentateuch “by means of unfortunate and intolerable daring” (B. Melton’s translation). In his third discourse “Of Atomes and Mixture,” Sennert credits “one Mochus, a Phoenician, who is reputed to have flourished before the destruction of Troy,” with having originated the atomistic theory long before Democritus, Empedocles, and other ancient Greeks (later followed by Aristotle) were given credit for inventing it (*Thirteen Books*, Discourse 3, ch. 1, p. 446). Dickinson, Cudworth, Selden, Theophilus Gale,
More, Boyle, and others associate this Phoenician “Mochus” with the Israelite Lawgiver Moses. Increase Mather owned two of Sennert’s medical works Medicina practica (1629), Institutionum medicinae (1645)—see Tuttle (“Libraries” 290); however, it is unclear which specific edition he owned. Cotton Mather also mentions Sennert as an authority on the gout, in Angel of Bethesda (1972), “Capsula XII” (67).

Finally, the Spanish physician Franciscus Valesius, aka. Valles (1524-92), author of Francisci Vallesii De Sacra Philosophia, sive De iis Quae Physice Scripta sunt in Libris Sacris (1587, 1608), in his old age relinquished his former study of heathen authors and henceforth devoted himself to God’s Word. Valesius confessed that “what remainder of life God has conceded to me, I have decided to pursue philosophy in these Scriptures, not only because I believe that by no other method can anything certain and in natural things be known, but also because I do not know at all how the study of those things, even history or physics, [might not] secretly imbue the mind with piety” (B. Melton’s translation).

Mather refers to Robert Jenkin (1656-1727), chaplain to the earl of Exeter. Jenkin’s The Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion (1698) was very popular and went through six editions in Mather’s lifetime. Whether God created the universe in six literal days, years, millennia, or in an instant was a hotly debated issue in Mather’s time. The Swiss Calvinist Francis Turretin (1623-87) identifies some of the most significant combatants and their respective arguments in Questions 5 and 6 of his Institutes of Elenctic Theology (1:444-52).

St. Augustine (Liber imperfectus de genesi ad litteram 3.7-8, De Genesi ad Manichaeeos 1.2-3-4, and De Genesi ad litteram 4.24.41) tries to solve this dilemma by arguing that the reference to day and night (Gen. 1:1-5) before time was created must be understood from the point of view of the angels who had existence either before Chaos was formed into the heaven and earth of the first day (Gen. 1:1) or were part of the first-day’s creation. One way to redress this problem is to read the Mosaic hexaemeron as an allegory of angelic cognition, because God presented “so many notions to the intellect of angels. Thus each angelic cognition may be called a day and may be said to have a morning [matutina] and evening [vespertina],” in Turretin, “Fifth Question,” Institutes (1:444). This tradition dates back to Jewish Wisdom literature and non-canonical books such as the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Jubilees, Secrets of Enoch, Enoch, and their emulators. See F. E. Robbins’s Hexaemeral Literature (24-27).

Mather’s Greek “to beltion” suggests “amelioration” or “betterment.”

The following MS pp. [89r-95r] are extracted from Richard Bentley’s Confutation of Atheism (1693), eighth Boylean lecture (Dec. 5, 1692). J.H. Monk’s The Life of Richard Bentley (1833) is still one of the best biographies on this early Newtonian. For the significance of the Boyle Lectureships and the spread of Newtonianism, see M.C. Jacob’s Newtonians (chs. 5) and S. Mandelbrote’s “Natural Theology.”

Mather invites conservative readers to lay aside the Ptolemaic geocentric cosmogony and to embrace the Copernican heliocentric system. See also Blackwell, Galileo (chs. 5, 7); McColley, “Rosse-Wilkins Debate”; and D. Fleming, “Judgment.”

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 1, pp. 10, 11). Jer. 51:15.

Bentley here summarizes Isaac Newton’s “System of the World” (esp. # 1-8), appended to Newton’s Principia (1686). For the necessity of God’s hand in maintaining the planetary orbits, see Robert Boyle’s “About the Excellency and Grounds Of the Mechanical Hypothesis” (1674). Plato’s “aei geometrei,” suggesting “ever-geometrically” or “ever-proportionately,” appears in Plutarch, Moralia: Quaestiones convivales (8.718 B, 8 and 8.718 C, 3), but is also an adaptation of Plato’s Gorgias (508a, 6-8), where Socrates explains to his interlocutor Callicles the order of the world as evidence that the gods (and men) greatly favor proportion and harmony.

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 3, pp. 13, 14). Bentley’s teleological argument seems modern, yet asserting his argument on the basis of how the solar system benefits mankind renders his proof more in line with medieval cosmogonies. The passages in braces {}—lost through defacement—are restored from Bentley’s text.

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 4, pp. 14, 15, 16). The passages in braces {} are lost through wear and tear, but are here reconstructed from Bentley’s first edition (1693).

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 5, pp. 16, 17, 18).

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 6, pp. 18-19, 20).

Bentley, Confutation (lect. 8, sec. 7, pp. 20-21, 22-23, 24, 25). Bentley here echoes Thomas Burnet’s Sacred Theory (1684), bk. 2, chs. 3, 8, pp. 194-96, 268-69. On Burnet’s explanation of the tilting of the earth’s axis, see also F. Haber 78-79.
Bentley here refers to Robert Boyle’s *General History of the Air* (1692) or rather one of its preceding incarnations such as *New Experiments Physico-Mechanicall, touching the Spring of the Air* (1660).

Bentley, *Confutation* (lect. 8, sec. 8, pp. 27, 28). Bentley extracts his information on Boyle’s air pump from *A Continuation of New Experiments* (1680; 1682).

Bentley’s reference to the Atlantic as a fifth continent suggests that even by the time of William Dampier’s visit to the west coast of Australia in 1689 and 1699, European geographers still assumed that Australia was not a continent, but another island or extension of South-East Asia. The famous Captain James Cook corrected that misconception in 1768 and thereafter.

The passages in braces {} are lost through wear and tear, but are here reconstructed from Bentley, *Confutation* (lect. 8, sec. 9, pp. 29, 30, 31).

Bentley, *Confutation* (lect. 8, sec. 10, p. 32). The Latin passage from Lucretius, *De rerum natura* (2.180-81; see also 5.199-200) signifies “the nature of the universe has by no means been made for us through divine power: so great are the faults it stands endowed with.”

The third-largest volcano on earth, the Pico del Teide (12,185 ft; 3,718 m) is located on the island of Tenerife (Canary Islands), off the coast of West Africa, and widely visible to seafarers.

Bentley specifically targets Thomas Burnet, whose *Sacred Theory of the Earth* (1684) postulated that the antediluvian earth was uniformly level and without mountains, valleys, or craggy shorelines. For a discussion of the changing attitudes toward rugged mountains and nature’s nature, see M.H. Nicolson’s *Mountain Gloom* (esp. ch. 4) and M.H. Abrams’s *Natural Supernaturalism* (esp. pt. 2, ch. 6).


The italicized passage is from Prov. 3:19.