

THE

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.]

APRIL, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. I.

---

ART. I.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE Protestant reformation proceeded from the practical development of two propositions, the one of which embodied its formal, the other its material principle. The first is, that the Scriptures are the only rule of Christian faith and practice; and the second, that justification before God is solely through the righteousness of Christ, imputed to the believer, without the works of the law. The former of these principles inaugurates the right of private judgment, and rescues the liberties of the church and people of God from the bondage of a usurping priesthood. The latter enunciates a theology, which, whether designated, from its unanimous reception by the divines of the reformation, by the name of "Reformed;" or from its great expounders called Calvinistic, Augustinian, or Pauline, has always proved itself the alone sure basis of a stable faith; and the only reliable fountain of a pure morality.

Viewed in its practical bearings the reformation was characterized by their cardinal features, springing from these principles. These were, the preaching of a Pauline theology, instead of the Pelagianism of the papacy; the vindication of the morality of the divine law, in contrast with the licentiousness of Rome; and the establishment of a scriptural polity and order in the church, in opposition to the hierarchy of a domineering priesthood. The three elements thus indicated, that is, doctrines, morals, and polity, sustain to each other relations exceedingly intimate and almost inseparable. A pure morality has never long survived that

VOL. X.—NO. 1.

1

mighty *bruit*, under the puritan influences in New England, in the nineteenth century. The one is all physical. It subjugates matter. It excels in the mechanic arts. It makes constant and important contributions to the material comforts of outward life. It glories in the wide diffusion and the shallow depth of education. It is envious of all but itself. It is devoted to pecuniary profit. It has learning enough to receive ideas—not logic enough to sift them, so as to discern between the superficial and the profound, the plausible and the true, the sham and the real.

The other was all spiritual. The moral, intellectual and spiritual grandeur which its writers spread over religious life, yet lies on it like golden sunshine, still uneclipsed by any brighter radiance. It had its trophies on battle-fields. It had its Marstons, and Nasebys, and Worcesters. But it had more trophies in the realms of genius and learning. It was full of great ideas and generous impulses. It gloried in all depths of learning, of thought, of piety; and strove to diffuse learning without rendering it shallow. It had no inordinate thirst for the *peculium*. Mammon was never its God.

It was its highest glory to be able to know truth from plausibilities; fleeting shams, and unveracities, and empty forms, from eternal realities. Never was the same name borne by two more intrinsically different things, than the English puritanism of the seventeenth and the New England puritanism of the nineteenth century.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT JEWS TO THE PLURALITY AND TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD.

ON this point we have already adduced a number of very strong passages from the most authoritative books of Jewish learning.\* We will, however, give an outline of the sources from which testimony may be drawn to prove that the ancient Jews did not believe in the present Jewish dogma of an absolute personal, metaphysical unity of God. These views are sustained by other learned men from an examination of the same writings. The ten Sephiroth† have been represented in three different forms, all of which may be seen in H. Moore's *Opera Philos.*, I., 423. The

---

\* See especially the Article on the Unity of God as an objection. *So. Pres. Rev.*, Vol. VIII., p. 305.

† *Kitso's Bib. Cyclop. Art. Kabbalah*, vol. 2., p. 190. English Edition.

Jews themselves generally regard them as the sum and substance of Cabbalistic theology, as indicating the emanating grades and order of efflux according to which the nature and manifested operation of the Supreme Being may be comprehended. Several Christian scholars have discerned in them the mysteries of their own faith, the Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Messiah. In this they have received some sanction, by the fact noticed by Wolf, that most learned Jewish converts endeavour to demonstrate the truth of Christianity out of the doctrines of the Cabbala. (Bibliothk Hebr., I., 360.) The majority of all parties appear to concur in considering the first three Sephiroth to belong to the essence of God, and the last seven to denote his attributes or modes of existence. The words of Count G. Pico della Mirandola are very remarkable.\* After studying the Talmudic and other writings of the Jews "with indefatigable labour and the greatest diligence, I saw in them, God is my witness, not so much the Mosaic as the Christian religion. There I found the mystery of the Trinity, there the Incarnation of the Word, there the divinity of the Messiah, original sin, expiation from it by Christ, &c. In short there is scarcely any controversy between us and the Jews concerning which it is not possible so to argue and convince from the Cabbalistic writings that there shall not be a corner left in which they can hide themselves."†

The celebrated Witsius makes a similar statement. As a result of his researches he expresses himself as follows: "De Trinitate et Judæus contra Judæos disputaturus hanc mihi observandam methodum esse existimavi. *Primo* ut tollam præjudicium illud, quod per sententiam Christianorum derogetur unitati essentiæ Divinæ, quam toties et merito inculcant Judæi; *Deinde* ostendam in genere, non posse non, juxta propria ipsorum secta, pluralitatem aliquam personarum in Deo agnosci; *Ac denique* probem in specie, tres illas personas esse, Patrem, Filium, et spiritum sanctum, *nota ac vulgata apud ipsos nomina.*"

Grotius, also, in his learned treatise, "De Veritate Religionis Christianæ." L. v., S. xxi.,‡ vindicates Christians from the charge of worshipping three Gods, against the Jews, on their own principles, and from their own writings. The following are his words: "We are now to answer the two remaining charges with which the Jews at once attack us on the points of doctrine and of worship. In the first place, they accuse us of worshipping a plurality of Gods. This, however, is no more than an exposition of some foreign tenets maliciously wrested to such an application. For

\* Cited in Hottenger's Thea. Phil., p. 439.

† See in Kitto, *ibid.* Burgess, p. 171.

‡ See also the numerous proofs given by him and Le Clerc in the notes.

why should this be urged as an objection against the Christians, rather than against Philo-Judæus who has frequently established a Trinity in the Deity; and who calls the reason or word of God (the original expression is λογος) the name of God; the Maker of the world; neither unbegotten, as God the Father of all is; nor so begotten as the human race are? The same is also called, both by Philo himself and by Moses, the son of Nachman, an angel or messenger regarding and protecting this universe; why against the Christians, I say further, rather than against the Cabbalistics, who consider the Deity as three distinct *Lights*; and some, indeed, adopt the very same appellations that we do, of Father, Son or Word, and Holy Spirit? But, now, to avail myself of a fact universally and especially admitted by the Jews, *that* Spirit by which the prophets were impelled is a something *uncreate*; yet it is mentioned as a *distinct* essence from *that* which sent it; and the Jewish Shechinah is, again, considered as a similar distinction. It hath, moreover, been recorded by several of the Hebrew writers that that vis Divina (Divine Energy) which, by them, is called *wisdom*, was to dwell in the Messiah; and hence the Chaldean paraphrast gives to the Messiah the appellation of "the word of God;" hence, also, he is called in David, in Isaiah, and elsewhere by the august titles of "God and Lord."

Maurice, in his Dissertation on the Oriental Triads, in confirmation of this opinion says,\* "It became absolutely necessary to examine the Hebrew Scriptures as well as the Jewish Cabbala; and to prove, not only that this distinction in the divine nature formed a part of the Rabbinical creed, but was promulgated to the Jewish nation at large, as far as a people, forever relapsing into Polytheism could bear the revelation of so important and mysterious a truth."

The proofs upon which these and other learned men have founded their opinions are, of course, very numerous, drawn as they are from the voluminous writings of the Jews. They are, therefore, given by many writers and constitute many volumes.† As one example out of many we would adduce, Rabbi Simeon, who explains the repetition of the word "Holy" three times, (Is. vi., 8.) as meaning, Holy is the Father, Holy is the Son, and Holy is the Holy Ghost; and the second from Jonathan ben Uzziel, whose paraphrase of the text is as follows, viz: Holy the Father, Holy the Son, and Holy the Holy Spirit.‡

No less than about seventy passages were quoted by Dr. Pye

---

\* Ind. Antiq., vol. 4., p. xli.

† See Allix's Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church. Gill's Commentary throughout. Lightfoot. Carpzovius' Introd. Theol. Judaic, c. li., p. 6. Gray's Connex. of Sacred and Prof. Lit., vol. I., p. 148.

‡ Knowle's Primitive Christianity, p. 98.

Smith, which are applied by the writers of the ancient Chaldee paraphrases to the Messiah, in the most express manner. And, though the number of such is not very great, still they sufficiently show that the writers did not refrain from ascribing to the Messiah the titles and attributes of the Supreme God. In instances innumerable those writers translate the Hebrew JEHOVAH by the expression, "the Word of the Lord." Many have maintained that this supplies an indubitable ascription of personal existence to the *Word* in some sense distinct from the personal existence of the Supreme Father; that this *Word* is the *λογος* of the New Testament, and, consequently, that the phrase is a proof of a belief among the ancient Jews in the preëxistence, the personal operations, the Deity of the Messiah, "the Word who became flesh and fixed his Tabernacle among us." For as the date of the earliest and most valuable Targums may be safely assumed, as not much exceeding, nor much below, the first century of the Christian era; it is but natural to expect to find in the Targums the vestiges of purer knowledge and more correct interpretation of the sacred text. All, however, must acknowledge that, during that period, the theology and religion of the Jews had become extremely corrupt. But as in an advancing state of society there will always be some who outstrip their cotemporaries, so, in a degenerating state, there will be found individuals whose knowledge bears the character of the departed, more than of the existing age. The summits of the mountains catch the last feeble rays of the sun when all below is covered with shade. From these considerations we should expect to find, in the Targums, the vestiges of purer knowledge and more correct interpretation, combined with other matter of an inferior kind. It ought not, therefore, to excite our surprise, if we should discover in those compositions, doctrines concerning the Messiah, which the general state of sentiment, at the particular period, would not have led us to expect.

"Solely from the phrase 'memra Jah,' or 'the Word of the Lord' in those paraphrases, no absolute information can be deduced," says Dr. Pye Smith, "concerning the doctrine of the Jews, in the interval between the Old Testament and the New, upon the person of their expected Messiah. I have said 'solely' from the use of this phrase, adds this writer; but if we combine this fact with others, derived from the study of the Old Testament, it will, I conceive, appear a very rational conjecture, that the Rabbinical authors of the age referred to, had vague ideas of the 'Word' as an intelligent agent, the medium of the Divine operations and communications to mankind. This sentiment is strengthened by the reasons which we have to conclude, that the Jews of the same age employed the term 'Word' with a personal reference, and that reference to the Messiah. The use of this

term, by Philo, and by the Christian Evangelist John, appears unaccountable, except on the supposition that it had grown up to the acceptance supposed, at least among the Jews who used the Greek language, such an extension of meaning and reference agreeable to the ordinary progress of language would flow from the primary signification of the term 'Word,' that is 'a medium of rational communication;' and yet it would thus become a natural designation of 'Mediator' between God and man; one who should 'speak' to man on the things of infinite moment, in the name and by the authority of the Most High. We have, also, another evidence which is entitled to the greater weight, as it comes from a quarter the most hostile to the Christian religion. Celsus, whose words are cited by Origen, reproaches the Christians with absurdity and folly, for imagining that such a mean and contemned person as Jesus could be 'the pure and holy Word;' the 'Son of God;' and personating a Jew, which is his manner in the construction of his work, he declares their belief that 'the Word was the Son of God,' though they rejected the claims of Jesus to that honor. No reason can be imagined why the malignant and inveterate Celsus should have invented the statement; or that it could have come into his mind, if it were not true. It was not likely to answer his purpose of denying Christianity. On the contrary, its tendency is favorable to the claims of Christianity."

Such is the least we can deduce from these Targums. Others, however, eminently qualified to give an opinion, have been much stronger in their support of the Trinitarian views of the ancient Targumists, as for instance Walton,\* Owen,† Lawrence,‡ and Ryland.§

Another source of proof of the Trinitarianism of the ancient Jews, will be delivered from the writings of the Jews, called Apocryphal, which are considered as a collection of the most ancient Jewish works next to the inspired books. They are curious, and some of them extremely valuable. The earlier of them seem to have been compiled or translated from materials written within a century after the last of the inspired prophets; and the latter of them, interpolations excepted, were probably composed some years before the birth of Christ.

In some of these books, the "Eternal Saviour" is represented as the object of prayer and trust, under the sufferings which the Jews endured in the Babylonish captivity. Simon Maccabæus was, we are told, confirmed in the pontificate

---

\* Proleg. in B. B. Polygl., p. 86.

† Owen on Heb., vol. I., p. 114 and vol. II., p. 273.

‡ Diss. on the Logos.

§ In Smith, 1., 526.

"until a faithful prophet should arise;" not improbably referring to the Great Prophet foretold by Moses. In the prayer which concludes the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, there is a passage which, (if the reading be genuine,) it seems impossible not to admit as a recognition of the Messiah as the Son of God; "I called upon THE LORD, THE FATHER OF MY LORD."

There are some other very ancient Jewish writings, of which the most celebrated and possessing the highest interest, is called "The Book of Enoch the Prophet." The Epistle of Jude recites a declaration of the Divine justice upon the wicked expressly as made by "Enoch," the seventh from Adam. The existence of such a book is mentioned by Clemens of Alexandria, by Origen, and by others of the Christian fathers, as "The Prophecy of Enoch," extant in their times, and apparently in a Greek translation from a Hebrew original. None of them, however, appear to have regarded it as having divine authority, except Tertullian who considered it as both authentic and genuine. The two following passages from the Zohar (still found in the existing book of Enoch) will sufficiently demonstrate that the Cabballists were acquainted with a written composition, in their own language, under the title of The Book of Enoch, viz: \* "The Holy and the Blessed One," it is said, "raised him (Enoch) from the world to serve him, as it is written, *for God took him.*" "From that time a book was delivered down, which was called the Book of Enoch. In the hour that God took him he showed him all the repositories above; he showed him the tree of life in the midst of the garden, its leaves and its branches. We see all in his book." "We find in the Book of Enoch, that after the Holy and Blessed One had caused him to ascend and showed him all the repositories of the superior and inferior kingdom, he showed him the tree of life, and the tree respecting which Adam had received a command, and he showed him the habitation of Adam in the Garden of Eden."† In this book called Zohar—the most celebrated compilation of what was long supposed to constitute the hidden wisdom of the Jewish nation,—other occasional references are made to the Book of Enoch, as to a book carefully preserved from generation to generation.‡ It was only, however, after a lapse of many centuries, during which this book was supposed to be lost that Bruce, the Scottish traveller, happily succeeded in bringing from Abyssinia three manuscripts of this lost and long-desired Book of Enoch, which, in the year 1821, was translated into English by the Rev. Dr. Richard Laurence, now Archbishop of Cashel. The argu-

\* See Zohar, vol. I., Parashah Bereshet, p. 37., v. ed. Mantua and Amsterdam.

† See Zohar, vol. II., Parashah Beshallah, p. 55.

‡ See given testimony in Pye Smith, vol. I., p. 536, and Prof. Stuart's Diss. in Bib. Repository, Jan. and July, 1840.

ments of Dr. Laurence, as also those of Dr. Gottlieb Hoffman, of Jena, have proved that it was written (undoubtedly by a Jew) in the earlier part of the reign of Herod the Great, and, consequently, about thirty years before the birth of Christ, and most probably in the country which had been the northern part of the ancient Assyrian Empire. Now, in this extraordinary work which has been restored to our use and enjoyment, we have an undeniable witness to the religious opinions and expectations which were entertained by at least some of the Jewish nation, supplying many additions to our information upon the belief and expectations of the Jews before the Christian era, concerning the Messiah. The Book of Enoch contains undeniable references to a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. Thus, in chap. xlviii., 5. 1. 2. 3., the following language is found, viz: "In that hour was **THE SON OF MAN** called upon with **THE LORD OF SPIRITS**, and his name in the presence of the chief of days. Before the sun and the signs (of the heavens) were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, was his name called upon, in the presence of the Lord of the spirits. He will be a support to the righteous and holy on which they may lean without falling; and he will be the light of nations. He will be the hope of those whose hearts are in distress. All who dwell upon earth will fall down and worship before him, will laud and glorify him, and will sing songs of praise to the Lord of spirits. On this account was the Chosen One and the Hidden One in his presence, before the world was created, and forever in his presence, and the wisdom of the Lord of spirits hath unveiled the Holy One and the Righteous One; for he hath preserved the lot of the righteous, since they have hated and rejected this world of unrighteousness, and have abhorred all its works and ways in the name of the Lord of spirits. For in his name shall they be preserved, and his will shall be their life."

In this book of Enoch, therefore, clear and distinct allusions are made to a Being, highly exalted with the Lord of spirits, under the appellations of the Son of Man, the Elect One, the Messiah, and **THE SON OF GOD**. Disputes have arisen respecting the nature of the Son of Man described in the vision of Daniel; and Unitarians contend, that his existence commenced at the birth of Jesus Christ; affirming without fear of contradiction that no Jew of any age ever held the opinion of his preëxistence, much less ever regarded him as an object of Divine worship. "But that the Jewish doctrine before Christ upon this point was totally different from that which the Unitarians assert it to have been, I have," says Archbishop Laurence, "shown in my remarks upon the first book of Ezra. The present publication, however, affords fuller and more decisive testimony upon the same subject."

After quoting the above and several additional passages, he remarks, that "in these passages the preëxistence of the Messiah



is asserted in language which admits not the slightest shade of ambiguity. Nor is it such a preëxistence as the philosophical Cabbalists attributed to him, who believed the souls of all men, and, consequently, that of the Messiah, to have been originally created together, when the world itself was formed; but an existence antecedent to all creation, an existence previous to the formation of the luminaries of heaven, an existence prior to all things visible and invisible, before every thing concealed. It should also be remarked that the preëxistence ascribed to him is A DIVINE PRE-EXISTENCE. For before all things, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of spirits—the Elect and the Concealed One existed in his presence, who has dominion over all things, for “from the beginning the Son of Man existed in secret, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of his power.” Hence, therefore, is it explicitly affirmed, that all the kings of the earth shall fall down and worship before him, shall bless and glorify him, as a true object of adoration.

Neither is allusion thus only made to the Elect One or the Messiah, but also to another divine person or power; both of whom, under the joint denomination of THE LORDS, are stated to have been over the water, that is, as I conceive, over the fluid mass of unformed matter, at the period of creation. “HE, THE ELECT ONE, it is stated shall call to every power of the heavens, to all the holy above, and to THE POWER OF GOD. The Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophanim, all the angels of power, and all the angels of the Lords, namely, of THE ELECT ONE, and of THE OTHER POWER, who *was* upon earth over the water on that day, shall raise their united voice,” &c. In this passage an obvious reference, I conceive, occurs to the first verse of Genesis, in which it is said, that THE SPIRIT OF GOD moved on the face of the waters. As, therefore, the more full description of the Son of Man here given may be considered as the Jewish comment of the day upon the vision of Daniel, so also, I apprehend, must the last quoted allusion to the book of Genesis be considered as a comment of the same nature, upon that account of Moses, which describes the commencement of creation. Here, then, we have not merely the declaration of a *Plurality*, but that of a precise and distinct TRINITY, of persons, under the supreme appellation of God and LORDS. THE LORDS are denominated THE ELECT ONE, and THE OTHER (DIVINE) POWER, who is represented as engaged in the formation of the world, on that day, that is, on the day of creation. And it should be added, that upon these a particular class of angels is mentioned as appropriately attendant.

“This argument, adds Archbishop Laurence, in proof that the Jews, *before the birth of Christ*, believed the doctrine of the Trinity, appears to me much more important and conclusive than that which has been, indeed, frequently, deduced from the philosophical prin-

ciples of the ancient Cabbala, which is full with allegorical subtleties. The passage under consideration is, indeed, liable to no objection whatever. Here there is nothing Cabbalistical, here there is no allegory; but a plain and clear, although slight, allusion to a doctrine which, had it not formed a part of the popular creed of the time, would scarcely have been intelligible. Three Lords have been enumerated; **THE LORD OF SPIRITS, or THE LORD, THE ELECT ONE; and THE LORD, THE OTHER POWER;** an enumeration which evidently implies the acknowledgment of three distinct persons, participating in the name, and in the power of the Godhead. Such, therefore, from the evidence before us, appears to have been the doctrine of the Jews, respecting the Divine nature, antecedently to the rise and promulgation of Christianity.”\*

Another source from which we may derive a knowledge of the opinions of the most ancient Jews is the writings of Philo. Philo was a Jew of Alexandria, of a sacerdotal family, eminent above his contemporaries for talents, eloquence and wisdom; and whose learning it is not probable that any of his nation, in any subsequent period, if we except Josephus, have exceeded, or even approached. From the most probable estimation, says Dr. Pye Smith, he was about sixty years old at the time of the death of Jesus Christ; and he lived for some years afterwards. The coincidences of sentiment, and more frequently of language of Paul and John in the New Testament, are very remarkable. Yet it would be contrary to all the philosophy of human nature not to ascribe these different, but similar, streams to one primary source. That source, I venture to propose, is not so much to be sought in the writings of Plato, or in the ethical lectures of the learned Jews of Alexandria, or in the sole speculations and invented diction of Philo himself;—as in the sacred writings of the Old Testament, transfused into the Alexandrian idiom, paraphrased and amplified in the terms and phrases which were vernacular to the Grecian Jews, and mixed in a very arbitrary manner with the speculations of both the Persian and Greek philosophers. Since the New Testament was written in this idiom, and since the component parts of the Christian dispensation were not so much new ideas as the fuller explication and the more interesting impression of truths and promises previously revealed, the conformity of which we are treating appears less an object of just surprise than its absence would have been. But no part of the writings of Philo has excited so much attention and admiration as his frequent expressions on the subject of the Logos or word. He has been thought to ascribe to this mysterious object, personality, divine perfections, and gracious communion from heaven, the be-

---

\* See Archbishop Laurence's Preliminary Dissertations, pp. xlviii—lvi: 3. Oxford Ed., 1838.

stowment of the highest blessings on mankind. Hence Philo being only a Jew, furnishes the most authentic statement of the belief and the expectations entertained by the most pious and the best informed of his nation with regard to the hope and redemption of Israel.

Philo is as express as words can enable him to be, on the limitation of the number of the persons spoken of as divine to THREE, as is evident from the passages, well known and frequently referred to, for the illustration of this subject. I have not room to insert them at length, though the purpose of them all, is much elucidated by the sentences which immediately precede and follow, but shall faithfully give the substance. In the first of the remarkable passages alluded to, which occurs in the tract on the Cherubim, speaking of the Eternal *Ens*, he asserts, that in the ONE TRUE GOD there are TWO SUPREME and PRIMARY Δυνάμεις or POWERS, whom he denominates *Αγαθότητα και Εξουσία*—that is, GOODNESS and AUTHORITY, and that there is a THIRD AND MEDIATORIAL POWER between the two former; who is the Λογος. \*In the second, which is that in his dissertation concerning the sacrifices of Abel and Cain,† Philo is still more explanatory, for, speaking of the same ὁ ὧν, he says, (“He came attended by his two Most High,”) appearing to Abraham, he acquaints us that HE came attended by his two Most High and puissant powers, PRINCIPALITY and GOODNESS; HIMSELF in the middle of those POWERS, and through ONE, exhibiting to the discerning soul the appearance of THREE. In a third passage Philo is still more decisive; for he says, THE FATHER OF ALL is in the middle; and as if to prevent any possibility of those POWERS being mistaken for mere attributes, he assigns to each of them active, personal properties, and denominates one the POWER CREATOR and the other the POWER REGAL. He then adds, “the POWER CREATOR is LORD.”‡

One other source from which we may deduce the opinions prevalent among the Jews of a still early, though later period, is the Talmudical writings.

In the Talmudical writings frequent and honourable mention is made of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Jochai, who is said to have been before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. A collection of Cabbalistical doctrines called *The Book Zohar*, or *The Book of Light*, is extant, which is affirmed to have been gathered up after Simeon's death, from his oral instructions, by his pupils and companions; in the same manner as the sayings of Socrates were collected by Xenophon. This book is written in the Chaldee dialect, similar to that of the Targums, a dialect which became totally

\* Vide Philonis fudaci Dissert. de Cherubim, p. 86., F. G.

† Dissert. de Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini, p. 108., B.

‡ Dissert. de Abraham, p. 287., F.

extinct by the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era, and was succeeded, in Jewish literature, by the Talmudical Hebrew. The circumstance of its language and style is held by those who are sufficiently skilled in the Hebraic dialects, to be decisive of its having been written at, or very near, the time to which it is attributed.

The eminent scholar, Schœttgenius, has devoted a large portion of his life to the study of the Zohar, and has made much use of it for the illustration of the New Testament in his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*. The following are extracts from Schœttgenius' numerous citations. "The angel of the Lord, which is the Shechina," referring to Exod. iii., 2.\* "God, the holy and blessed, is perfectly united with the Schechina," literally "united in one unity."† "There was the Schechina, God the holy and blessed, who is one."‡ "It is he who liveth for ever and ever, who is arrayed with the name (Metatron) Mediator."§ "The Mediator is the servant of the Lord, the elder of his house, who is the Head of the creation of the Lord, exercising dominion over all things that are his, for the Holy and Blessed God hath given him dominion over all."||

There are other passages, the sense and purport of which are, that the Shechinah is both of a heavenly and an earthly nature; that the Messiah is the Shechina, the Angel of the Covenant, the Mediator, the Redeemer, the Just One; that the Shechina is the Heavenly High Priest, and the Fountain of Life; that all perfections belong to the Messiah. In several places the divine name "Jeyah"—the Chaldee abridgment of "Jehovah"—is in a circuitous manner given to the Shechina. The following passages, also, are quoted by Eisenmenger. \* "All those who do not study the Law of God very earnestly, the Holy Ghost, which is the Shechina, does not rest upon him;"† and, "God forbid, to suppose that the Shechina is a created Being. HE IS THE GLORIOUS AND BLESSED GOD. For, in the writings of our Rabbis, there are many things, which very plainly indicate that the Shechina is THE GOD BLESSED FOR EVER. Amen."‡

I now subjoin a part of the summary drawn up by Schœttgenius himself. "With respect to the names of the Messiah," says this learned writer, "he is expressly called in the Zohar by

\* Schœttgenius *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* tom 2., p. 451.

† Do. do. do. do. do. p. 353.

‡ Do. do. do. do. do. p. 335.

§ Do. do. do. do. do. p. 334.

|| Do. do. do. do. do. p. 427.

\* See Eisenmenger *Entdecktes Indentum*, Part I., p. 268.

† Tickoni *Azohar*, vol. 6., col. 2.

‡ *Avodath Ackodesh*, 5th chap. of *Cheleack Ayichod*, fol. 11., col. 1.

the incommunicable name of Jehovah, the Angel of the Lord, the Shechina or Divine Glory, the Mediator, Michael the Archangel of the Covenant, the Word of the Lord, God the Holy and Blessed—the image of God, the Brightness of his Glory, the Lord of Hosts, the Son of God, the Son of the Most High, the Faithful Shepherd, the Lord of the Ministering Angels—the Angel Redeemer.”\*

“When,” says Dr. Pye Smith, “the utmost allowance is made that reason will warrant, for the figurative style and the mystical character of this ancient book, a sufficiency of evidence will yet remain that the doctrines concerning the Messiah, which existed among the Jews about the time of their dispersion, had, indeed, much of the characters of absurdity and indistinct apprehension; but that, without any reasonable ground of question, they attributed to him a superior nature, a preëxistent state, and, to say the least, many characteristics properties of Deity. Even Gesenius admits that they at least rose up to the conception of AN INCARNATE JEHOVAH.”† And this opinion is confirmed by both the elder Buxtorf and Witsius, who have collected several opinions of several eminent Rabbies which testify to the great truths of the Messiah’s mediation, his expiation of sin, his authority, and his teaching.‡

It is thus evident, from evidence drawn from a variety of sources independent of one another, and as accessible to Christians as to Jews, that the ancient Jews, both before the time of Christ, immediately after, and during the early ages, did not believe in an absolute unity in the Godhead, but in a plurality of divine subsistence, and which they limited to THREE, in the One undivided Godhead.

\* Schoettgenius *Hor. Heb. et Tal.* tom. iii., pp. 911—913.

† See Gesenius *Commentar über den Isaia*, I., 865.

‡ See Buxtorf *Lexic. Talm. et Rabb.* Col. 1192 ed. Basil 1639. Witsii *Miscellanea sacra*, vol. ii., p. 126. ed. Herbom 1712. See Schoettig. *Jesus der wahre Messias*, pp. 12, 25, ed. Leipzig, 1748.