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Section 3

Cotton Mather: Theologian, Exegete, Controversialist

During the early modern era, the cosmological and philosophical revolutions precipitated by Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, Hobbes, and Spinoza not only challenged the traditional biblical cosmology, but also called into question the integrity of the scriptural texts and the harmony of the two testaments. Of course, for the majority of ordinary believers, the Good Book remained the Word of God. In the Protestant camp, the scientific revolution caused many academic theologians to reappraise the Bible in terms of a new hyper-literalism, as a quasi-scientific source of knowledge and storehouse of literal facts that could be held to the new standards of empiricism. The more radical minds of the period, however, began to push for a separation of science and religion as two distinct fields of human inquiry, because the Bible seemed to address moral, not mathematical truths. For them, Galileo’s famous observation that the Bible taught believers about divine redemption, not about the laws of physics, rang all too true. This dramatic qualification of the Bible’s mandate, however, could not but impact other claims that were equally invested in the authenticity of the Bible, in textual transmission, and verbal inspiration.

To those who believed that every word in the Holy Scriptures was divinely dictated, the very idea of research into such matters was shocking. If the seal of God’s imprimatur were broken, how was Truth to be certified? If the Word turned out to be more human than divine, what was to become of faith in a transcendent God? The rise of biblical criticism in the seventeenth century thus contributed to eroding the authority of the Bible. In turn, the subversion of divine authority went hand in hand with the elevation of human reason, with confidence in man’s judgment, and with his emancipation from dependence on tradition. Biblical criticism therefore lies at the root of what is called the Enlightenment and the evolution of modernity in Western culture. It is still widely believed that modern biblical criticism was an invention of radical German theologians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Johann David Michaelis (1717–91), Johann Salomo Semler (1725–91), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827), Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860), David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74), and Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) are generally cited as the main representatives of German “Higher
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Crimson” which, in the second half of the nineteenth century, would seep into English and American seminaries and lead to the great division between theological liberalism and a programmatically anti-modernist literalism. While German Higher Criticism certainly took the philosophical and historical analysis of the Bible to a whole new level of sophistication and radicalism, the origins of this method lie in seventeenth-century England, France, and the Netherlands—long before the German rationalists began to dominate the discipline.¹

When James I acceded to the throne of England in 1603, no one seriously doubted (or dared to question) the authority of the Bible as the Word of God, the divine inspiration of its prophets, their supernatural visions, dreams, and voices. When the last of the reigning Stuarts was laid to rest in 1714, the Good Book, in the eyes of a growing number of fair-minded scholars, had irrevocably lost its epistemological infallibility. Textual variants, lacunae, repetitions, interpolations, and anachronisms signified to the foremost scholars of the age that textual origin and transmission was anything but certain or trustworthy, that the Bible’s verbatim inspiration and divine dictation were simply pious myth, that revelation’s exclusive object was obedience to God, not disclosure of rational knowledge about nature. The Mosaic Hexameron, once believed to be a scientifically unassailable account of what had happened a mere six thousand years ago, by the beginning of the eighteenth century seemed little more than an abridged allegory adapted to the needs of an ignorant audience best managed by tales of wonder and miracles that aimed at enforcing law and order on a fractious people. If at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Moses was still held to be the author of the Pentateuch, by century’s end, the Mosaic authorship could no longer be maintained without serious qualification. The followers of Spinoza now argued that the Hebrew lawgiver wrote little more than the tables of the law and ordinances; remainder of the Pentateuch was of considerably later origin.² The credibility of the New Testament fared hardly better. At the beginning of James I’s reign, theologians were still convinced that the Holy Spirit had dictated every word of the New Testament to the Apostles and Evangelists. By the time Queen Anne was laid to rest, radical Deists claimed that the New Testament texts had been manipulated by competing sects and that the canon was the result of factional strife, which by the time of the Council of Nicaea (325 AD) had barred from canonization more books than it actually retained.³

² The scribe Ezra (5th-c. BCE) either rewrote the lost books from memory after the Babylonian captivity (2 Esdras 14:21–22) or compiled and adapted the surviving fragments to be edited and updated by later generations of public writers.
³ Among the principal seventeenth-century skeptics are the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, (Leviathan [London, 1661], part III, chs. 33, 37); the French critic Isaac La Peyrè
It is safe to say that the hermeneutical revolution in the wake of Thomas Hobbes’ *Leviathan* (1651), of Isaac La Peyrère’s *Prae-Adamitae* (1655), and especially of Benedict Spinoza’s *Tractatus Philosophico-Politicus* (1670) seriously ruptured the Bible’s hitherto impregnable status as the Divine Oracle of God.\(^4\) Theologians on both sides of the English Channel lashed out in pious rage at these latest manifestations of atheism; yet try as they might, no individual or concerted effort could impede the subversive critique of the scriptures once the followers of Hobbes, of La Peyrère, and of Spinoza had begun to infiltrate the marketplace of ideas. Terms of derision became the favorite smear by which orthodox clergymen tried to rein in their colleagues who followed Hobbes, Spinoza, and Deism. Even the French Oratorian priest Richard Simon (1638–1712), best known for his classic *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1678), and the Dutch Arminian professor of ecclesiastical history Jean LeClerc (1657–1736), notorious for his assault on the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in his *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande* (1685), branded each other “Spinozists.” Through this mutual defamation, both clergymen tried to render themselves immune to the charge of heresy. In debating these unprecedented challenges to the authority of the Bible, physico-theologians and natural philosophers re-examined their evidence, pored over timeworn dogmas, and launched in the process the beginnings of modern biblical criticism.\(^5\) What

---

\(^4\) To be sure, neither Hobbes, nor La Peyrère, nor Spinoza was the first to challenge the Bible’s sacrosanct status. Their textual criticism and rejection of Moses as author of the Pentateuch, and their argument that most of the Pentateuch and many of the other OT texts were compilations and redactions of older (but lost) manuscripts rested on the daring investigations of such predecessors as the German theologian Andreas Karlstadt (1486–1541), the Flemish Priest Andreas Masius (1514–73), the Portuguese Jesuit Bento Pereira (1535–1610), the Flemish Jesuit Jacques Bonfrère (1673–1642), the Dutch Oratorian Johannes Morinus (1591–1659), the Huguenot scholar Louis Cappellus (1585–1668), and the Dutch Jurist Hugo Grotius (1583–1645). See H.-J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung* (28–53).

is less understood is how the historical-contextual critique of the Bible as generated by Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, and LeClerc quickly caught on – even among their greatest detractors. Ironically, the seeds of Spinozism germinated especially in the theological treatises and commentaries of those who most sought to uproot them. In fact, many ostensible refutations did more to proliferate Spinoza’s views than to impede their spread.

Even faraway New England was not immune to Spinozist influence; Cotton Mather had synthesized the hermeneutical and philological critique in his “Biblia Americana” manuscript long before anyone else would grapple with it in the North American colonies. The purpose of this chapter is to sketch some of these transatlantic connections that hitherto have escaped critical attention. Mather is intellectually situated between the Reformed dogmatism of the Post-Reformation era and the higher critics of the late eighteenth century. He confronted head-on some of the most important hermeneutic and philological controversies during the early Enlightenment: the authorship of the Pentateuch, anachronistic interpolations, the problem of textual transmission, divine communication, and verbal inspiration. This confrontation led to a surprising rapprochement, an accommodation which demonstrates that once the heat of passion had subsided, the intellectual roots of the Enlightenment began to sprout in late seventeenth-century Boston.

(Third Letter, esp. pp. 124–27). Richard Simon’s countercharges appeared in hot pursuit in his Réponse au Livre intitulé Sentimens (1685). The mudslinging and mutual incrimination between Simon and LeClerc are examined in J. D. Woodbridge, “Richard Simon’s Reaction to Spinoza’s ‘Tractatus’” (201–26). The single most important studies on Jean LeClerc’s significance as a biblical critic are Friederich Stummer’s inaugural dissertation Die Bedeutung Richard Simons für die Pentateuchkritik (esp. 1–6, 22–105); and more recently Sascha Müller’s magnificent Kritik und Theologie (2004).

6 W. van Bunge and W. Klever (eds.), Disguised and Overt Spinozism (1996). Spinozism never formed a school, they argue, but “traces appear of loosely organised groups in which Spinoza’s works were studied and discussed.” Moreover, “several of the so-called ‘refutations’ of Spinozism that were published ‘around 1700’, were actually highly skillful efforts at propagating Spinoza’s views.” Supporters of his ideas were forced “to resort to silence, secrecy, or the use of ‘double language’” (p. viii). See also, R. L. Colie’s “Spinoza in England” (183–219). Among the most useful studies of Spinoza’s impact on the authority of the Bible are L. Strauss’s Spinoza’s Critique of Religion (1980, 1965, 1997); J. S. Preuss’s Spinoza and the Irrelevance of Biblical Authority (2001); S. Hampshire’s Spinoza and Spinozism (2005); G. Hunter’s Radical-Protestantism in Spinoza’s Thought (2005); T. L. Frampton’s Spinoza And the Rise of Historical Criticism (2006). Useful background information on the history of biblical criticism can be found in N. Sykes, “The Religion of the Protestants” (175–98); W. Neil, “The Criticism and Theological Use of the Bible” (238–93); and A. Richardson, “The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship and Recent Discussion of the Authority of the Bible” (294–338).


8 Traditionally, historians have dated the beginning of the Enlightenment in British North America from the middle of the eighteenth century and pointed to Benjamin Franklin as the first representative figure, before turning to the Founding Fathers and the ideology of the
The Integrity of the Bible’s Histories:  
Who was the Author of the Five Books of Moses?

Long before the French physician Jean Astruc (1684–1766) published his *Conjectures sur les Mémoires Originaux* (1753) and surprised the Republic of Letters with the idea that Genesis was compiled of two major and nine minor parallel memoirs distinguishable through their use of God’s appellation “Élohim” and “Jéhovah” (131–48), Hobbes, La Peyrère, Samuel Fisher, Spinoza, Simon, LeClerc, John Toland, William Whiston, Sir Isaac Newton – and Cotton Mather – debated how much if any of the Pentateuch had actually been composed by Moses.9 In examining the textual evidence, they were guided by essentially the same principles of philological research that Renaissance scholars had put to good use in freeing Greek and Roman classics from layers upon layers of textual accretions, interpolations, and outright forgeries, which centuries of copyists and emendators had injected into their editions.10 The Holy Scriptures – according to one famous critic – had to be subjected to the same philological principles of investigation as any other book, for only then could it be liberated from the fetters of dogmatic assumptions, credulity, and tradition that glossed over distinctions between universal truths and principles of purely temporal significance. In the best Cartesian manner of his age, the Dutch philosopher Spinoza laid bare his ground-rule of interpretation: “I determined to examine the bible afresh in a careful, impartial, and unfettered spirit, making no assumptions concerning it, and attributing to it no doctrines, which I do

---

9 Jean Astruc, *Conjectures sur les Mémoires Originaux dont il parait que Moïse s’est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse* (Buxelles, 1753), edited, introduced, and annotated by P. Gibert (1999). Citation references are to Gibert’s edition. For the significance of Astruc’s documentary hypothesis (Quellen), see F. Stummer’s *Bedeutung* (105–10) and H.-J. Kraus’ *Geschichte* (96–98, 140–43, 152–55). A recent discussions is A.M. Acosta’s “Conjectures and Speculations: Jean Astruc, Obstetrics, and Biblical Criticism in Eighteenth-Century France” (256–66).

10 See, for instance, the philological innovations of the French scholar Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), whose restored editions of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1577) were followed by his superb reconstruction of ancient chronology, in *Opus de emendatione Temporum* (1583), and of Eusebius Pamphili’s chronicle, in *Thesaurus Temporum* (1606). For Scaliger’s contributions to textual criticism and biblical chronology, see A. Grafton’s magnificent *Joseph Scaliger* (1983–93).
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not find clearly set down.” Doing so was no easy task. It involved evaluating the integrity of the biblical texts according to their time, place, and circumstances of composition; it entailed establishing the texts’ literary forms, didactic purposes, contradictory opinions, and intertextual citations to determine their authenticity; it required scrutinizing the texts as an organic whole, their original languages, their stylistic consistency, and anachronistic interpolations to discern if one or more authors or compilers had been at work during different time periods. For Spinoza and those who followed in his steps, the methods and principles of scriptural interpretation were not unlike those employed in the study of nature. Clear definitions must be derived from empirical data, just as much as these data must be deduced from clearly established axioms. The history of each book of the Bible should therefore be established on the basis of all available information, for the identity, conduct, occasion, and purpose of the author determine the meaning of his book just as much as the time period in which he lived, the language and metaphors he used, and the demands of his benefactors for whom the book was written. To determine its authenticity, Spinoza demanded, we must uncover “the fate of each book: how it was first received, into whose hands it fell, how many different versions there were of it, by whose advice was it received into the Bible, and lastly, how all the books now universally accepted as sacred, were united into a single whole.” Most of all, we must ascertain if it has been “tampered with by sacrilegious hands, or whether errors can have crept in, and, if so, whether they have been corrected by men sufficiently skilled and worthy of credence” (TTP 103).

Given these tools, what specific evidence did textual critics muster to substantiate the claim that the Pentateuch was not authentic and Moses not its author or, at best, authored no more than the laws, statutes, and ordinances of the Torah? Among the most conspicuous types of evidence cited by seventeenth-century commentators (and their many latter-day emulators) are anachronistic interpolations and lacunae, narrative repetitions, stylistic variance, and shifts in point of view. It is worth recalling the principal points of departure from the orthodox claim that the Holy Spirit dictated every word to his amanuenses

11 The first English translation of the entire Tractatus Theologico-Politicus (1670) appeared as A Treatise Partly Theological, And Partly Political, Containing some few Discourses, To prove the Liberty of Philosophizing (1689). My citations are from Spinoza’s “The Preface,” in A Theological-Political Treatise, translated by R.H.M Elwes (8). All references are to the Elwes edition; hereafter TTP.

12 The most detailed description of these philological guidelines appears in chapter 7 of Spinoza’s TTP. They are more or less tacitly maintained or implied in Hobbes’s Leviathan (1661), edited by R. Tuck (261–68); Samuel Fisher’s Rusticus Ad Academicos (esp. Excercitation I and II); in Richard Simon’s Critical History of the OT (1682), bk. I, chs. 2–4 (esp. pp. 20–22, 24–28, 29–34); and in LeClerc’s Five Letters (Letter 1, esp. pp. 35–40 and Letter 2, pp. 57–93).

13 Hobbes presented his most trenchant evidence in Leviathan (ch. 33); Spinoza, in TTP (chs. 8–10); Simon, in Critical History of the OT (chs. 2–5); LeClerc, in Twelve Dissertations (Dissert. 3), and in Five Letters (esp. Letter 1–2).
Moses, the prophets, and apostles, who faithfully and accurately wrote them down and shaped the various books of the Holy Scriptures. The degree to which Cotton Mather’s exegesis was informed by this critical debate and—more significantly—how much of it he embraced and integrated in his “Biblia Americana” can then be determined. Internal evidence suggests that many passages in the books of Moses are of considerably later origin than the purported period in which the divine Lawgiver is to have lived. For instance, the third-person narrator in the Pentateuch frequently recounts historical events that did not take place till long after Moses’ death. Since the narrator does not earmark them as prophetic utterances or fulfillments, some other explanation needed to be found.\footnote{Spinoza introduced this significant distinction: The writers of the Bible rarely if ever mention any secondary causes, because the religious zeal and pious habit of the ancients attributed every action, blessing, inclination, or thought as coming from God. “Hence we must not suppose that everything is prophecy or revelation which is described in scripture as told by God to anyone, but only such things as are expressly announced as prophecy or revelation, or are plainly pointed to as such by the context” (\textit{TTP} 15).}

The selection of the following passages is almost always cited by those who refused to toe the dogmatic line of verbal inspiration:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Gen. 12:6:} And Abram passed through the land, unto the place of Sichem, unto the plaine of Moreh. And the Canaanite \textit{was} then in the land.\footnote{All biblical citations from and references to the King James Version of the Bible (KJV) are to the first edition (1611) of the Authorized Version. Though consulting several different translations of the Bible, Mather generally quoted from the KJV or furnished his own translation from one of the many Latin versions he owned.}
\item \textbf{Gen. 14:14:} And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained \textit{servants} … and pursued \textit{them} [Chedorlaomer and Tidal] unto Dan.
\item \textbf{Gen. 36:31:} And these \textit{are} the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.
\item \textbf{Numb. 12:3:} (Now the man Moses was very meeke, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.)
\item \textbf{Numb. 21:14:} Wherefore it is said in the booke of the warres of the Lord, what he did in the Red sea, and in the brookes of Arnon.
\item \textbf{Deut. 34:6:} And hee buried him [Moses] in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-Peor: but no man knoweth of his Sepulchre unto this day.\footnote{This list is far from comprehensive. In the second half of the 17th century, questions about Moses’s authorship of the Pentateuch were also raised about Gen. 20:7 (1 Sam. 9:9); 22:14; 35:21; 40:15, Exod. 6: 26–27; 16:35, 36; Deut. 1:1, 2:12, 3:11, 34:10. For a forceful defense of Moses’s authorship of these passages, see esp. Richard Kidder’s \textit{Commentary on the Five Books of Moses: With a Dissertation Concerning the Author or Writer of the said Books} (Diss. xxi–lxxx).}
\end{itemize}

Mather’s comments on these controversial passages are highly revealing; he wrestled with each of the underlying issues to rescue the scriptures out of
the hands of their historicist detractors. The process of restoring harmony was not always easy. Over a period of thirty years, he excerpted, anthologized, and digested for his “Biblia Americana” hundreds of commentaries, reference works, theological monographs, polemical tracts, sermons, medical handbooks, geographies, and cosmographies he had inherited from his father and grandfathers, purchased from book dealers fresh upon arrival in Boston harbor, borrowed from colleagues, accessed at nearby Harvard across the Charles River, or received as personal gifts to add to his prized library. If nothing else, his passionate bibliolatry is apparent most of all in his magnum opus, which amounts to a clearing house for all the ongoing controversies of his day. Such is the case of the vexed verse in Gen. 12:6, which Mather tried to wrest from of the clutches of the Hobbists and Spinozists and those who followed in their steps.

Anachronistic references to historical events, persons, and occurrences in the five books of Moses were particularly troubling to conservative interpreters to whom divine dictation and the infallibility of the Bible were religion. Anyone who questioned the integrity of the biblical texts was met with uniform condemnation and opposition. This resistance is not at all surprising; even the ancient rabbis of the Talmud bestowed their anathemas on those who cast doubt on the Torah’s supernatural origin or its less-than-flawless preservation. The Babylonian Talmud warns the faithful that “HE WHO MAINTAINS THAT THE TORAH WAS NOT DIVINELY REVEALED … hath despised the word of the Lord” and broken his Law. “[T]hat soul shall utterly be cut off” (Numb. 15:31). In fact, “even if he asserts that the whole Torah is from Heaven, excepting a particular verse, which [he maintains] was not uttered by God but by Moses himself, he is included in ‘because he hath despised the word of the Lord.’ And even if he admits that the whole Torah is from Heaven, excepting a single point, a particular ad majus deduction or a certain gezerah shawah, – he is still included in ‘because he hath despised the word of the Lord’” (Sanhedrin 99a; see also Avodah Zarah 18a). The codifiers of The Westminster Confession (1647) and the Declaration of the Faith and Order Owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England (1658) were not far behind the Talmudists’
condemnation of the unfaithful – even if Calvinists did not spell out the punishment awaiting skeptics: “the authority of the holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the Testimony of any man or Church; but wholly upon God (who is Truth it self) the Author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.” Both the Old and New Testaments “being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all Ages, are therefore Authentical.”

This orthodox position was not confined to the perimeter of the British Isles. Geneva’s own Francis Turretin (1623–87), magisterial expounder of Reformed theology and author of *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (Genevae, 1688–90), made it a point of orthodoxy that the Bible cannot, must not, contain textual blemishes of any kind either in the original manuscripts or any of their copies. “If God suffered either the sacred writers to err and to slip in memory, or incurable blemishes to creep into” the Holy Scriptures, Turretin contended, skepticism and mistrust would soon overwhelm all:

Unless unimpaired integrity characterize the Scriptures, they could not be regarded as the sole rule of Faith and practice, and the door would be thrown wide open to atheists, libertines, enthusiasts and other profane persons like them for destroying its authenticity (authentian) and overthrowing the foundation of salvation. For since nothing false can be an object of Faith, how could the Scriptures be held as authentic and reckoned divine if liable to contradictions and corruptions? Nor can it be said that these corruptions are only in smaller things which do not affect the foundation of Faith. For if once the authenticity (authentia) of the Scriptures is taken away (which would result even from the incurable corruption of one passage), how could our Faith rest on what remains? And if corruption is admitted in those of lesser importance, why not in others of greater? Who could assure me that no error or blemish had crept into fundamental passages? (Turretin 2.5.6.1, 2.5.7.2)

The vehemence and urgency of Turretin’s queries are not exceptional. They underscore in not-so-subtle ways the fear, doubt, and suspicion with which the likes of Hobbes and Spinoza were received when they dared to question the Bible’s authenticity or trustworthiness. Far too much was at stake. But what were commentators to do with nagging problems that were too obvious and well known to be ignored?

Moses’s odd comment in Genesis that the Canaanites still inhabited their native soil when Abram prospected the Promised Land was particularly aggravating. When this Patriarch sojourned through Canaan – Moses recounted the ancient chronology – “the Canaanite was then in the land” (Gen. 12:6, emphasis added). The knotty Hebrew adverb נָּשָׁה (*’az*), i.e., “then,” quite obviously implies

---

that when Moses wrote the Pentateuch the Canaanites no longer occupied their homeland. But this temporal reference flatly contradicts the historical situation and context in which Moses wrote; the realm of the Canaanites was neither conquered nor the archenemy overthrown until several centuries after the Hebrew Lawgiver’s death. Such radical anachronisms seemed grist for the mills of Hobbes’ disciplines. The sage of Malmsbury firmly dismissed the Mosaic authorship of this passage (and for that matter, of most of the Pentateuch), because it “must needs bee the words of one that wrote when the Canaanite was not in the land; and consequently, not of Moses, who dyed before he came into it” (*Leviathan* 33.262).21 Following in his steps, the French Marrano Isaac La Peyrère – now best known for his Pre-Adamite thesis – was not to be eclipsed by his English contemporary and argued, “the difficulty is, to know what are the words of the Copier, and which are the real words of the Original” (*Theological Systeme*, lib. 4, cap. 2, p. 212). Spinoza was not far behind his predecessors and avowed – against Rabbi Ibn Ezra’s explicit injunction to “remain silent” – “that this passage must have been written after the death of Moses, when the Canaanites had been driven out, and no longer possessed the land.” For this reason, “it cannot be the work of Moses, in whose time the Canaanites still possessed those territories” (*TTP* 122).22 So, too, the Roman Catholic Richard Simon, whose *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1678) – placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* and barely escaped complete destruction – was ostensibly written to refute Spinoza’s radical *Tractatus*, insisted that “If Moses was the Author of the Pentateuch … this [verse] could not be writ but after they had been driven out.” Like countless others, this passage corroborated the fact that many additions and changes had been introduced in the Torah throughout its long provenance and that the divine Lawgiver therefore “cannot be the Author of the Books which are attributed to him” (*Critical History* 36–37).23

---

21 Unless otherwise noted, all italicized passages appear in the original sources.
22 Perhaps to diminish the danger of novelty, Spinoza added an authoritative citation from Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra’s *Commentary*: “It is possible that the Canaanites seized the land of Canaan from some other tribe at that time,” Ibn Ezra (1089-c. 1164) speculated. “Should this interpretation be incorrect, then there is a secret meaning to the text. Let the one who understands it remain silent,” in Ibn Ezra’s Commentary on the Pentateuch: Genesis. (1:51). Quite obviously, Ibn Ezra was more audacious than his famous colleagues were prepared to be. Rabbi Solomon ben Jarchi (1040–1105), known by the acronym Rashi, and Rabbi Moses ben Nachman (1194–1270), also called Ramban, were much more circumspect than to allow for any tampering with the Torah; they both maintained the integrity of the Torah by interpreting the passage prophetically as divine assurance of God’s promise to Abram, in *Mikraoth Gedoloth* (1:53–55), and in Nachmanides’s *Commentary on the Torah* (1:170–71).
23 Simon was expelled from the Oratorian order and all copies (except for a few that escaped) were confiscated and destroyed. His English translator was all too conscious of the inflammatory nature of the work and prefaced his translation with the following caveat: “If notwithstanding what I have already said, there shall be any who, at the first sight, shall be scandaliz’d with this Author’s free way of handling the Holy Scriptures, I give this caution to all such persons, either to let it alone and not concern themselves with it, or else to reade it
It is one of those ironies of exegetical history that Richard Simon’s adversary in the Netherlands outstripped Simon’s radical criticism by approaching textual problems from a different perspective. In his anonymously published *Sentimens de quelques théologiens de Hollande* (1685), Jean LeClerc insisted that anachronisms were only problematic because interpreters erroneously believed in verbal inspiration. They regarded every word in the scripture as divinely inspired, timeless, and preserved in its original state: “They believe, first, that the sacred Historians were inspir’d with the Things themselves: And next, that they were inspir’d also with the Terms in which they have express’d them. In a word, that the holy History was dictated word for word by the holy Spirit, and that the Authors, whose Names it bears, were no other than Secretaries of that Spirit, who writ exactly as it dictated” (*Five Letters* 30). This misconception gave rise to all sorts of textual anachronisms and exegetical puzzles that could be solved if the doctrine of the Bible’s verbal inspiration were abandoned once and for all. The Holy Spirit, LeClerc postulated, only inspired his prophets with divine ideas, but left the choice of words, metaphors, and syntax to the dexterity of his amanuenses. Later interpolations therefore posed no challenge because they updated subsequent generations on the historical changes that had occurred since the Bible’s first composition. Still feeling the sting of his vociferous critics nearly a decade later, LeClerc tried to offer a more conciliatory solution in his *Genesis, sive, Mosis Prophetae liber primus* (Amsterdam, 1693). In this work he argued that the reference to the Canaanites’ disappearance from the Holy Land (Gen. 12:6) might have been “added by a later hand, after the Expulsion of the Canaanites.” In fact, this anachronism in the Mosaic text is, perhaps, “one of those superfluous Observations which frequently occur in the Sacred Volumes, which might have been omitted, without any Injury done to the History” (*Twelve Dissertations* 117–18).24

### Skepticism in the “Garden of Criticism”

In the late summer of 1693, when Mather began to work in earnest on his “Biblia Americana,” the issue of biblical certainty was at the forefront of the controversy. He considered his Bible commentary “one of the greatest Works, clear through, by which time I doubt not but they will be satisfy’d of their too nice scruples” (“To the Reader,” in *Critical History* A2v). If that didn’t fetch’em, I don’t know my Arkansas! See also P. Gibert’s recent French edition *Histoire Critique Du Vieux Testament suivi de Lettre sur l’inspiration* (2008). For the significance of Simon’s of historical scholarship on the OT, see F. Stummer’s *Bedeutung* (36–105), R.A. Muller’s *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (3:119–48); and especially S. Miller’s *Kritik und Theologie* (188–205).

24 LeClerc’s *Genesis, sive, Mosis prophetae liber primus* (Amstelodami, 1693) was quickly translated into English and published as *Twelve Dissertations out of Monsieur Le Clerk’s Genesis* (London, 1696). All references are to this translation.
that ever I undertook in my Life” (Diary 1:16–71). And rightly so. Whether the rise of historical criticism, the discoveries in the natural sciences, the insufficiency of up-to-date biblical commentaries, or his sincere devotion to defend Reformed theology – in short, whatever compelled him to launch this huge work is subject to debate. And Mather did as only Mather knew how: Careful reading of his commentary reveals he was thoroughly familiar with the historical and philological criticism which his European colleagues dredged out in the open. To exacerbate the matter, they were doing so in the vernacular (rather than in Latin), as if to ensure that the debate did not get buried in ponderous tomes of academic wrangling. Significantly, Mather rarely invokes the names of these radical critics, in part because his target audience would know who the bêtes noires were, or because he did not want to raise a memorial in their name and divert attention from the issues at hand. In fact, in his commentary on the Pentateuch, Mather mentions the names of Simon and LeClerc only six times, Spinoza’s name only once, Hobbes’ never:

Spinosa, and after him, the Author of the Five Letters, [One for Immoralities, a Monster of Mankind,] urge, That Moses could not bee the Author of the Book of Genesis, or, as F. Simon saies, of any more than Part of it. For the Canaanite was not in the Land when it was written, The Canaanite was then in the Land; It implying, that the Canaanite was driven out of the Land, when this Book was written. (BA 1:709)25

Hoping to find a more elegant solution than relinquishing the Mosaic authorship, Mather lit upon a work by Walter Cross, M. A., an obscure London preacher, whose The Thagmical Art: Or, The Art of Expounding Scripture By the Points (1698) offered a system of reconfiguring the Hebrew accentuation points of the Tiberian Masorites that allowed him to harmonize anachronistic verses with the time-honored authorship of the Hebrew Lawgiver. “Scepticism hath grown up in the Garden of Criticism,” Mather noted as he mulled over the exegetical dilemma of his age. But with Cross’s demonstration, the controversial passage in Gen. 12:6 might yet be rescued and its authenticity preserved. It should really read, “For that Canaanite was then in the Land; And that Moreh was a Man, and not a Place. The Text only saies, That Moreh, even that Canaanite, was in the Land, in the Time of Abraham, & the Owner of it; but in Jacobs Time, Sechem the Hivite possessed it” (BA 1:491, 497; Cross 273–74). Decoding the phrase “that Canaanite” as an individual, rather than as an entire people, and “Moreh” and “Sechem” as names of individual persons, not of cities that were

---

25 The anonymous “Author of the Five Letters” is no other than Jean LeClerc, whose Sentiments de quelques Théologiens de Hollande (1685) was translated into English and anonymously published as Five Letters Concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures Translated out of French (1690). Mather’s citations are from his commentary in manuscript “Biblia Americana.” He does not paginate his commentary, but generally follows the divisions of the Bible into book, chapter, and verse. The citation appears in his commentary on Gen. 10:21 in the present edition.
founded only after the Israelite conquest centuries after Moses's death, Cross believed he had refuted the skeptics who argued for an anachronistic interpolation of this passage. This seemingly effortless solution was not entirely original to Cross either, for more than half a millennium earlier it had been offered by Rashi and Ibn Ezra and could be found in the marginalia of Daniel Bomberg's famous Venice edition of *Biblia Rabbinica* (1516–17). Mather's satisfaction with this solution, however, seemed short-lived. Even before he digested Cross's *Thagmical Art* into a few choice paragraphs, he acknowledged his discomfort with retrenching such an important issue through a mere reconfiguration of the Masoretic vowel points (*BA* 1:709–10). After all, Mather had learned his lesson from a youthful error in his 1681 Harvard master's thesis “*Puncta Hebraica sunt originis divinae*” (*Diary* 1:26). Here, he had joined the controversy by affirming the hypothesis of the two Buxtorfs against the two Cappels, that the Hebrew vowel points of the Masoretic texts were not only divinely inspired but original to Moses. Older and wiser, Mather ascended the scaffold of ignominy to take his shame upon himself: “I confess That when I took my Degree of Master of Arts,” he owned up in “Biblia Americana,” “I did publickly maintain the Antiquity & Authority of the Points, now used in our Hebrew Bible: and wholly went into the Buxtorfian Apprehension; But I now find myself, compelled unto the Sentiments of Dr. Prideaux, upon this Controversy” that the vowel points of the Masorah are interpretive keys invented and inserted by 6th–c. c.c Tiberian Masorites. No, Mather was not afraid to admit error when necessary, neither did he rush in where angels fear to tread. The authority of the Bible and the certainty of its inspiration were not to be treated lightly.

---

26 *Biblia Rabbinica* (Lech Lecha, p. 20). All page references to Bomberg’s *Biblia Rabbinica* are to the second edition (Venice, 1524–25). See also Rashi’s commentary in *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis* (1:53–55) and Ibn Ezra's in his *Commentary* (1:51).

27 Perhaps he also remembered with embarrassment his 1681 Harvard A.M. thesis “*Puncta Hebraica sunt Originis Divinae,*” in which the young prodigy defended the divine origin of the Masoretic vowel points (*Diary* 1:26). In his juvenile excitement, Mather had followed Johannes Buxtorf, Jr., who defended the divine-origin thesis. The biblical scribe Ezra was inspired by the Holy Spirit, when he introduced the vowel points to render the Hebrew Scriptures intelligible to the post-exilic Jews who had forgotten the language of Moses during the Babylonian captivity. The controversy about the origin of the Hebrew vowel points is ably discussed in R. A. Muller’s “The debate over the vowel points and the crisis in orthodox hermeneutics” (53–72).

28 *BA*, “Essay IV: Ezra; or, The Things done by Ezra, for the Restoring & Preserving of the SACRED SCRIPTURES” (37v). This confession is revealing in several ways. It shows that Mather had come a long way in embracing the historical critique of the Bible as text. Yet he did not need the approval of the Dean of Norwich, Dr. Humphrey Prideaux (1648–1724), to change his mind, either on the source of the Masoretic points or on textual interpolations. D. Levin has noted that Mather changed his mind, but takes his explanation from Samuel Mather's biography of his father, *The Life of the Very Reverend and Learned Cotton Mather* (5–6, second series of pagination). See Levin’s *Cotton Mather* (83). For a subject listing of Harvard theses for the years 1655–1791, see *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 18 (1880–81): 14.
By the second decade of the eighteenth century, the novel and subversive critiques developed by Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, and LeClerc had become, if not quite conventional, an open secret tacitly acknowledged by all but the staunchest defenders of biblical inerrancy. However, increased acceptance of historicist scholarship and secularization do not fully account for Mather’s change of intellectual position. Certainly, his mature knowledge of philological criticism had rendered him less inclined to ascribe all manner of paradoxes to God’s impenetrable mysteries. But his adaptation of the biblical criticism of Simon and LeClerc and of what they meant by the “divine inspiration” of the Bible had taken a decisive turn toward the rationalism of his peers. Mather’s early annotations in his “Biblia Americana” exemplify how he struggled to balance the sacrosanct status of the Bible’s inerrancy against the compelling evidence of invasive interpolations. Gen. 14:14 illustrates this case in point. Here, Abram is said to have pursued Lot’s captors as far as the city of “Dan,” a designation, however, it did not acquire until centuries after Moses’ death. A later copyist ostensibly felt the need to update the name of the Canaanite city “Laish” (Judg.18:29) and gave it the name “Dan” by which the Danites now called this former Canaanite stronghold. “By which we may gather, that the Books of Moses, had here and there a Word inserted into them, after the Israelites were possessed of Canaan,” Mather squarely conceded (BA 1:850). Yet the baffling anachronism in Gen. 36:31, in which Moses enumerated “the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,” might somehow be defended as prophetic foreshadowing – even though Saul, first king of Israel, did not ascend his throne until roughly four hundred years after Moses’s death. The passage was certainly not “too late for Moses’s Time,” – and here Mather contradicted Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, and LeClerc – simply because Moses had previously recorded God’s promise to Jacob that “Kings should come out of his Loins” (BA 1:1074). But prophecy did not work as well in all cases of anachronism. For instance, the third-person narrator’s parenthetical praise for the Hebrew Lawgiver in Numb. 12:3, “(Now the man Moses was very meeke, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth,))” did also raise eyebrows among those who defended the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. For if Moses did author this panegyric, his self-praise was anything but consistent with his avowed meekness. “I know no Damage that would ensue,” Mather again conceded, “if wee should suppose the Parenthesis here, in Commendation of Moses, added by some other Prophet, in the Transcription.” But before entirely relinquishing this passage to his opponents, Mather reminded his readers that the use of a third-person narrator and the accompanying self-praise was a rhe-

---

29 On Gen. 12:1, see Spinoza’s TTP (8.124), Simon’s Critical History (37), and LeClerc’s Twelve Dissertations (118–19).
30 Mather quotes Gen. 35:1 but discusses this issue in his annotations on Gen. 36:31. See also Spinoza (TTP 8.124), Simon (37), and LeClerc, Twelve Dissertations (122–23).
torical device common enough among ancient (and modern) historians. Why not Moses? (BA, Numb. 12:3). Again we see how Mather positions himself as a rational mediator, who seeks after truth – no matter where his quest leads him. Although he was not beyond name-calling, he did not stoop so low as to admit defeat by bestowing anathemas on critics of the Bible.31

The Lost Books of the Bible

A related area of contention will help us gauge Mather’s response to the Spinozist critique of the scriptures’ textual coherence: the problem of the lost books of the Bible. For example, the Hebrew scriptures cite several books of which we have no surviving record: the Book of Jasher (Josh. 10:13, 2 Sam. 1:18), the Books of the Prophet Shemaiah and of Iddo the Seer (2 Chron. 12:15), the Book of Uzziah (Ozias) (2 Chron. 26:23), the Acts of Solomon (1 Kings 11:41), the Prophecies of Jonas (2 Kings 14:25), and the Book of the Wars of the Lord (Numb. 21:14) – to mention just a few.32 The writer of Numbers cites the latter book as a record of the acts of Moses at the Red Sea and the Brooks of Arnon. The apparent loss of this scroll (besides many other problems) convinced Hobbes that “the five Books of Moses were written after his time, though how long after it be not so manifest” (Leviathan 33.262). To La Peyrère, the compiler of the Pentateuch copied his material from a lost “Diarie” of Moses, “from which collections the books of the wars of the Lord might afterwards be taken; Which for that cause was neither the Original, nor the Original of the Original: but indeed a Copy from a Copy” (Theological Systeme 205–06). To Spinoza, such textual lacunae and adaptations revealed “clearer than the sun at noonday that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, but by someone who lived long after Moses” (TTP 8.124, 125). Ironically, Richard Simon followed in Spinoza’s steps when he countered that Moses – schooled in the wisdom of the Egyptians – only wrote “all that which belongs to the Laws and Ordinances,” but employed “écrivains publics” (“publick Writers”) to interpret and record “the historical part of these Books.”33 Only in this sense, then, was it true that Moses wrote “the

31 See, for instance, Mather’s outburst in his commentary on Deut. 8:15: “We shall have a Detestable Toland come, and make Nothing of the Great Works done by the Glorious GOD” (BA: Deut. 29r).

32 See Simon (Critical History 20–21, 27), Mather’s commentary on 1 Chron. 1:1, and John Toland’s Amyntor (18–80). Isaac La Peyrère (Theological Systeme 204) also mentions several other lost books of the Bible, which served later writers of the Pentateuch as source material.

33 Richard Simon’s controversial “Public Scribes” hypothesis ostensibly intended to mitigate the radical conclusions of Hobbes and Spinoza to offer a rational explanation for the many passages that suggested an authorship of the Pentateuch much later than that of Moses. For his detailed explanation of his “publick Writers” hypothesis, see Simon’s Critical History, bk. 1, chs. 1–3, pp. 1–28. Simon references Flavius Josephus’s Contra Apion (1.7) and Eusebius
whole *Pentateuch*” because the scribes and chroniclers who collected it “did not do it but by his order.” After Moses death, “these Prophets or publick Writers, were not onely charg’d with the collection of the Acts [records], which fell out in their time, and the reducing them to Registeries, but they gave sometimes a new Form to the Acts themselves which had been collected by their Predecessours, by adding or diminishing according as they thought fit” (*Critical History* 3, 4; see also “Preface a1v-a3r). In short, when they compiled the Pentateuch and the other books of the Hebrew Scriptures, these appointed historians revised, abridged, updated, and otherwise recast the scriptures as needed, “fitting them to their own times and design; which is usual with those who abridge the Books of others.” For these reasons, “what we have at present is but an abridgment of the ancient Records, which were much larger, and that those who made the abridgments had particular reasons which we cannot understand” (*Critical History* 27).\(^{34}\) That is why the Bible refers to books no longer extant, mentions events anachronistically, and contains narrative repetitions, chronological errors, and textual disagreements without number between the Hebrew-Aramaic, Samaritan, Arabic, Syriac, Septuagint, and Vulgate versions – all the outcome of disparate redactions. These disparities became all the more detectable in such polyglot Bibles as Brian Walton’s magisterial *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1653–57), perhaps better known as the *London Polyglot*. Unlike its predecessors such as Cardinal Ximenes’s *Complutensian Polyglot* (1522), the *Antwerp Polyglot* (1569–72), and the *Paris, or La Jay’s Polyglot* (1629–45), Walton’s polyglot arranged the ancient versions not in sequential order, but side by side in parallel columns.\(^ {35}\) In this way, scholars could readily discover any and all textual deviations at one glance and consult the Chaldean Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, and Targum Ben Uzziel to adjudicate the matter. Those not at home in the ancient Oriental languages could make do with the Targums’ parallel translations into Latin or with Richard Simon’s *Critical Enquiries into the Various Editions of the Bible: Printed In Diverse Places and at several Times* (London, 1684) to keep abreast of the principal translations and how they measured up.

Rational explanations of textual variants like those offered by Hobbes, La Peyrère, Spinoza, Simon, and LeClerc, certainly appealed to theologians with a philological bent. As long as the authenticity of biblical books remained inviolable, they liked to believe, textual emendations and interpolations might

---

\(^{34}\) Like Simon, Hobbes (*Leviathan* 33.262), Spinoza (*TTP* 8.124, 125), and LeClerc (*Twelve Dissertations* 12–13) present a similar argument. Nehemiah Grew, one of Mather’s sources for “Biblia Americana,” further demonstrates how far the new criticism had proliferated among his contemporaries. Grew adopted Simon’s “Publick Scribe” hypothesis in his *Cosmographia Sacra* (1701), bk. IV, ch. 3, pp. 166–68.

\(^{35}\) See J. Pelikan’s *The Reformation of the Bible* (109–13); and P.N. Miller’s “‘Antiquarianization’ of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible” (463–82).
not jeopardize the Bible’s trustworthiness. How did Cotton Mather respond to such alluringly rational explanations? Again he offered several solutions in his annotations on Numb. 21:14:

Q. Wee read here, concerning, The Book of the Wars of the Lord, mentioning what was done at the Red-Sea, & at the Brooks of Arnon. What Book was that? v. 14.  
A. Why may it not bee, The Book of Judges? A Book, which recounts the warly Enterprizes, of those, whom the Spirit of the Lord, Raised & Moved thereunto. 

Compare the Twenty sixth Verse of this Chapter, and then you’ll say, that in Judg. 11.5, 16, 17, you find the very Passage, unto which this Text refers.

But how could this bee written then by Moses, who was Dead long before, this Book of the Wars of the Lord, was written? It may bee answered, That the Pentateuch, long after the Death of Moses, underwent Interpolations from the Pens of Inspired Persons. Ezra, Revising this Book, might add this, of what was done at the Red-Sea, & at the Brooks of Arnon.

Yea, In the Original it runs in the future Tense; It shall bee said. How if it should bee a Prophecy of Moses, that afterwards this Matter should bee commemorated among the People of God; and that when there should bee a Rehearsal of the Jewish Wars, this Matter should bee inserted in it? (B/A, Numb. 21:14)

Mather speculated that “The Book of the Wars of the Lord” might not have been lost altogether, but the substance of it was incorporated into the book of Judges by inspired scribes who revised the books of the Bible long after Moses’s death. Ironically, in cutting through this Gordian knot, Mather implicitly offered a version of Richard Simon’s “publick Writers” hypothesis to accommodate his own conjecture. Mather, then, at least partially agrees that “Inspired Persons” collected the Acts of Moses in public annals and then extracted, rewrote, updated, and refitted sections from these no-longer-extant records to shape the Five Books of Moses and other OT books – all under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

However, still not happy with these explanations, Mather consulted his trusty handbook, A Commentary upon the Historical Books of the Old Testament, 10 vols. (1695–1710), by Dr. Simon Patrick (1625–1707), the celebrated Bishop of Ely. Patrick himself had paraphrased the deliberations of the two medieval scholars R. Abarbanel (1437–1508) and R. Nachmanides (1194–1270) as well as consulted The Harmony, Chronicle and the Order of the Old Testament (London, 1647) 72–73, by John Lightfoot (1602–75), the Rabbinic scholar of Cambridge, and Pentateuchi auctor (1625), by the Walloon Jesuit Jacques Bonfrère (1573–1642), professor of Hebrew at Douai. Following Patrick’s example,
Mather concluded that *The Wars of the Lord* was really a collection of Amorite victory songs composed “by some of the Wise Men of those Nations,” who commemorated their triumphs over the Moabites in a poem and “inserted it in their *Annals*” (Numb. 21:14). Upon defeating the Amorites at the brook of Arnon and thus taking Heshbon (the Amorite capital formerly belonging to the Moabites), Moses then excerpted one of these Amorite epics, inserted useful portions into the Pentateuch (Numb. 21:27–30), and “justifies what he writes, concerning this Conquest, out of their own Books; which he quotes, as the Apostle does one of the Greek Poets.”

According to this ancient example of intertextuality, then, the divine Lawgiver was not above cribbing his material from the annals of his vanquished enemies whom he did the honor of incorporating their songs into the everlasting Pentateuch. Perhaps here was good precedent for St. Paul to paraphrase the aphorisms of the Greek poet Tyrtaeus (7th–c. BCE), whom the apostle thus immortalized in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (ch 13).

If this hypothesis is true, how much of the Pentateuch, then, did Moses actually write? Most of those whom orthodox theologians branded Spinozists agreed that tradition – no matter how time-honored – was insufficient proof of the Mosaic authorship. The eponymous designation *The Five Books of Moses* verified his authorship as little as *The Odyssey* or *The Aeneid* vouched for Odysseus or Aeneas to be the authors of the epics whose name they bear. The titles were merely derived from the subjects of the books or from the protagonists whose actions are central to the stories. And the original Hebrew titles – Bereshith, Shemoth, Vayikra, Bamidbar, Devarim – did not help here either, because they were simply the beginning words of each of the five Hebrew books of the Torah, whose subdivisions or Parasha derived their titles from the opening words of the various scrolls. No matter what their original designation, strict rules of textual criticism suggested to Hobbes and Spinoza that Moses wrote only those portions of the Pentateuch he explicitly declared to be his. There was a vast disproportion between what he was believed to have written and what he actually did write. This is certainly true for the venerable tradition among the Jews who use the terms “Torah” and “the Law” interchangeably to signify all of the five books of Moses. Hobbes begged to differ. The designation “the Law” after him; see *Exod.* 17.14,16. It may be this Booke was also called Sepher Iasher, liber rectus, or a directory for *Joshua* from *Moses*, what to doe and what to expect in his wars; and in it, *Moses* directs the setting up of Archery, 2. *Sam* 1.18 and warrants him to command the Sunne, and to expect its obedience, *Josh* 10.13” (*Harmony* 72–73).

37 “Biblia Americana” on Numb. 21:14 (BA 76r–77v). Simon Patrick’s *Commentary* (1727) 1:62. R. Shlomo Yitzchaki (Rashi [1040–1105]) insisted that the Canaanite poet whose victory song Moses excerpted (Numb. 21:27–30) was Balaam, son of Beor, who cursed Heshbon – then the Amorite capital – before it fell into the hands of the Israelites.

38 Spinoza deprecates the credulity of his contemporaries: “… the light of reason is not only despised, but by many even executed as a source of impiety, that human commentaries are accepted as divine records, and that credulity is extolled as faith” (*TTP*, “The Preface” 8).
does not denote the whole Pentateuch, but merely a number of statutes that the divine Lawgiver commanded the Israelites to keep. Hobbes limited Moses’s contribution to “the Volume of the Law, which is contained ... in the 11 of Deuteronomie, and the following Chapters to the 27, which was commanded to be written on stones” (Deut. 27:2–3, 31:9; Josh. 8:32), and further to the Law of the Covenant, which Moses commanded the Levites to place inside the Ark of the Covenant (Deut. 31:26). But the historical portions of the Pentateuch, most of the histories, and of the prophetic books were compiled in the form we have them by the scribe Ezra (2 Esdras 14:21–22) after the Babylonian Captivity, but before they were translated into Greek - a thousand years after Moses (Leviathan 33.262, 265). Spinoza’s rationale was even more trenchant. Accepting no proof but that which could be clearly demonstrated, he drove his Cartesian principles to their inevitable conclusion: “We must make no assertions in such matters which we do not gather from scripture, or which do not flow as legitimate consequences from its fundamental principles.” Consequently, “we have no proof that Moses wrote any book save this of the covenant” (Deut. 1:5, 29:14; 31:9). Spinoza, too, pointed toward the fifth-century BCE Ezra as the likely candidate by whom all the historical books were written (TTP 8.127–30), but he did so with far less certainty than Hobbes.
Genesis. Chap. 6.\textsuperscript{120} \[\nabla\text{Insert from 18r–18v}\]

3291. \[\nabla 18r\]

Q. The Behaviour of them that lived before the Flood, is thus described: \textit{The Sons of God saw the Daughters of Men, that they were Fair, and they took them Wives of all which they chose.} You know the extravagant Opinion of the Jewish Rabbins, follow’d by the Christian Fathers; That the Angels coming down to the Earth, took Wives, whereof they begot a Generation of Giants? v. 2.

A. But \textit{Elohim} often signifies no more, than Persons vested with \textit{Authority}; and the \textit{Daughters of Men}, may signify no more than \textit{Daughters of the Inferior Sort}. And the Verb, translated here, \textit{To Take}, signifies, \textit{To take by Force,} or, to \textit{Ravish}. And this Behaviour was that \textit{Violence [v. 11,13.]} which was among the Provocations to Heaven, that procured the \textit{Deluge}. Such was the aggravated Wickedness of that Age! Those that were in Authority and should have been exemplary for their Vertue, were Exemples of nothing but lustful \textit{Violence}. It should be rendred, \textit{Men in Authority, seeing that the Daughters of the inferior Sort were Fair, they forceably seized on them for Wives at their Pleasure.}\textsuperscript{121}

372. \[\nabla\text{Insert from 18r–18v}\]

Q. In what Points do you consider \textit{Noah}, as a Type of the Lord Jesus Christ? v. 2.

A. Compare 1. \textit{Pct.} 3.20, 21. and 2. \textit{Pct.} 2.5.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{quote}
The Name of \textit{Noah}, is as much as to say, \textit{Rest; [with what Expectation his Father called him so, see Gen. 5.29. and what hath been said upon it.] Now,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{120} See Appendix B.

\textsuperscript{121} Extracted from Simon Patrick’s annotation on Gen. 6:2 (\textit{Commentary} 1:32–33). Rabbinic commentators are more diverse in their explication of the Gen. 6:2, 4 than Patrick or Mather here suggest. See Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXVI:5, 7); \textit{Pirke Eliezer} (ch. 22), and \textit{Mikraoth Gedoloth} \textit{(Genesis} 1:81–8). The Greek LXX (Gen. 6:2, 4; Exod. 21:6, 22:28), which the early Church Fathers used, bears out Mather’s argument. Maimonides \textit{(Guide} 1.14.25), too, asserts that “the sons of the higher order (\textit{Elohim}) saw the daughters of the lower order (\textit{adam}).” John Selden argues that the “sons of god” who saw the “daughters of men” were none other than the children of Seth who broke their vow not to leave their mountain dwellings and to mingle with the children of Cain in the valleys. Nevertheless, the beauty of Cain’s daughters and their joyous revelries were temptations too great for the sons of Seth to resist. Hence all manner of corruption and rapine ensued (\textit{De Jure Naturali}, lib. 5, cap. 8, esp. pp. 577–83).

\textsuperscript{122} The following paragraphs lean on Samuel Mather’s \textit{Figures or Types} (“Sermon on Rom. 5:14,” esp. pp. 91, 92ff). See also Edward Taylor’s \textit{Upon the Types of the OT} (1891) 1:46–49.
this vast little Word, Rest, contains the Benefits, which wee have by our Lord Jesus Christ. [Consider Cant. 1.7. and Math. 11.28. and Rev. 14.13.] Eternal Inquietitudes will distract our Souls, if estranged from this Lord.

Again, T’was Noah’s Character, (in 2. Pet. 2.5.) to bee, A Preacher of Righteousness. And of our Lord Jesus Christ, it was prophesy’d, (in Dan. 9.24.) that Hee should bring in Everlasting Righteousness.

Further, Tho’ Noah kept calling upon the World, for so many Years together, yett so few were thereby reclaimed from their Unbeleef, that it is said, (in 1.Pet. 2.20.) A few, that is, Eight Souls were saved; no doubt, the World generally despised what hee said. Such a deadly Unsuccessfulness has attended the Ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ: His own Received Him not; (see Prov. 1.24.) And what have been the Complaints of His Ministers in all Ages! [Isa. 53.1. Math. 11.17. Isa. 49.4.]

Moreover; For this was Noah admired; that tho’ all Flesh had corrupted his Way upon the Earth, yett, Hee was a just Man & perfect in his Generations; [Gen. 6.9.] and, Condemned the World. [Heb. 11.7.] Such was the World-condemning Integrity of our Lord Jesus Christ. [See Heb. 7.26.]

Yett more, When God was going to Do a great thing in the World, Hee Told Noah of it. [Gen. 6.13.] Indeed, our God never perform’d any thing, yea, Hee never purpos’d any thing but Hee has Told it unto our Jesus. [Joh. 5.19.] Such is the Similitudinary Omniscience of our Lord, that Hee is acquainted, with all things, that the Most High gives a Being unto. All the Decrees, all the Secrets, of God are discovered unto this, Wonderful Counsellour. [Of Him lett our Faith say, as Dan. 2.22.]

Add; How came all the Children of Noah to bee Preserved, when the rest of Mankind were Destroyed? It was the Obedience of their Father, which had an Influence upon the Safety of them all. [Gen. 7.1.] And unto what is it, that wee all owe, the Salvation of our Souls? Truly, wee have been, like so many Chams before the Lord. But wee are beholden to the Obedience, of our Saviour, that wee perish not. [See, Rom. 5.19.]

To proceed; They for whom Noah, was concerned, were carried above the Flood which overwhelmed other Men. This will bee the Happiness of them that have an Interest with the Lord Jesus Christ. [1. Thess. 4.17.] When the World shall bee on a light Fire, the Lord Jesus Christ, will snatch Beleevers, as Brands out of the Burning. [Ponder, Psal. 32.6.]

Once more; What became of those that were Disobedient unto the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, when once the Long-suffering of God waited in the Dayes of Noah? Wee are told of a Flood for their Bodies: (Job. 22.16.) and of a Goal for their Spirits. (1.Pet. 3.19.) This will bee the Case of them that are Disobedient unto the Lord Jesus Christ. It is judg’d by some, that the Place of Hell, is, under the Waters; because tis said of the Damned (in Job. 26.5.) They Groan under the Waters. But this is clear; the old Worlds going under the Waters, was a Figure

of Hell; for which Cause, Hell is called (in Prov. 21.16.) The Congregation of the Giants; that is, of such as the Deluge drowned.\(^{123}\)

To pass on; God made a Covenant with Noah, (in Gen. 9.11.) To Drown the World no more; & Hee made the Rain-bow, a Token of it. Such a Covenant ha’s God made with our Lord Jesus Christ, about the Elect World: His Covenant is, I will never destroy any of those Chosen Ones; and of this Covenant, Hee sais, (in Isa. 54. 9.) This is unto mee, as the Waters of Noah. Hence our Lord now appears (in Ezek. 1.28.) with a Rainbow; with the Bow that is in the Cloud, in the Day of Rain, round about Him.

Finally. There was a Curse upon Cham, when hee beheld the Nakedness of his Father, without becoming lamentatious. (Gen. 9.22.) Our Lord Jesus Christ indeed had no \(\text{Nakedness of Sin,}\) for Himself to bee Ashamed of; but Hee had a Nakedness of Suffering, which it becomes us, to bee affected with. Hee was Naked, when Hee was Hanged on the Cross. Austin speaks well, Dormijt in passione suâ, et ità nudabatur, carnis mortalis Infirmitas. Wherefore, when wee look upon the Passion of our Lord, it should bee with a Mournful Eye, yea, with a Sword entring into our Soul.\(^{124}\)

\[\triangle\] Insert ends

123 According to Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXXI:12), the giants in Noah’s time tried to escape from drowning in the Flood by blocking the water from coming out of “the deep” and by boarding the Ark.

124 Mather’s Latin citation from St. Augustine’s Contra Faustum Manichaeum (12.24) is adapted from “dormisset in passione sua, tamquam in ebrietate stultitiae, quae sapientior est hominibus; atque ita nudaretur mortalis carnis infirmitas per occultum Dei consilium, fortior hominibus,” which translates “[Christ] had slept in His passion, as in the drunkenness of the folly which is wiser than men; and so, in the hidden counsel of God, the disclosure had been made of that infirmity of mortal flesh which is stronger than men” (NPNF i 4:191)
God complained, that Men kept them Sheath’d up, under the Restraints of Carnality.  

146.

Q. Why is the Term of, An hundred & Twenty Years, pitch’d upon, as the Day of Patience for the old World, now ready for the Flood? v. 3.

A. Scaliger ha’s an Ingenious Conjecture, in L.3. Emend. Temp. That the Antediluvians gathering up the odd Six Hours, which are above Three hundred & Sixty five Days in every Year, did at the End of every Hundred & Twentyeth Year, add an Intercalar Month of Thirty Dayes, which Intercalation did then sett their Times right, as our Twenty Ninth of February do’s in the Leap-year, among ourselves. For this, Cause a Space of an Hundred & Twenty Years, went for a Sort of an Age among them; and so, the Lord now sais, Well, I’ll allow them yett One Age more, & then I’ll make an End of them. — Remember, by the way, that these 120 Years, commence not from the 500 but from the 480 Year of Noahs Life.  

[\[185r–190v\]]

Huc quicunque Venis, Stupefactus ad Ossa Gigantum.  

Q. Concerning the Dayes before the Flood, the glorious Historian ha’s told us; There were GIANTS on the Earth, in those Dayes. Could any undoubted Ruines and Remains of those GIANTS, be found under the Earth, among the other subterraneous Curiosities, in our Dayes, it would be an Illustrious Confirmation of the Mosaic History, and an Admirable Obturation on the Mouth of Atheism? v. 4.

125 Mather’s source is Hugo Grotius’s Annotationes ad Vetus Testamentum (Gen. 6:3), in Opera Omnia (1:8). The “Chaldee” is the language of the Babylonians as reflected in the post-exilic Targum Onkelos.

126 The paragraph is extracted from Joseph Justus Scaliger’s Opus De Emendatione Temporum (1598), lib. 3, pp. 179–80. Following the end of his commentary on verse 3, Mather gives the following direction: “[ o o o] See ye next Page.” In the next line he adds, “[And here insert the Illustration of the Giants.]” In the first instance, Mather intends to insert his commentaries on Gen. 6:6, 7 in this location here; however, his six-page commentary on the Giants (Gen. 6:4), which he added to “BA” at a later stage, requires repositioning to maintain the verse sequence of his annotations. See Appendix B.

127 The quotation is from a poem by Julius Pomponius Laetus (1425–97), the learned Italian humanist, classical scholar, and editor of numerous ancient Roman manuscripts. Most likely, the poem originally appeared in Pomponius Laetus’s Opera (1521), but is here cited from an excerpt in Philipp Camerarius’s Operae Horarum Subcisivarum (1602), cap. 82, p. 382, a chapter on the origin and meaning of giant fossils. The line from Pomponius Laetus’s poem reads, “Whoever you are that comes here in awe of the giants’ bones,” and commemorates the giant fossils found in Puteoli (near Naples). Because they were believed to be those of the Egyptian god Typhon, they were moved north and reburied in the Etruscan soil of Tuscany (Italy).
A. Then lett the Inquisitive Part of Mankind, know that the Bones of those who were certainly some of the Antediluvian GIANTS, have been found under the Earth, in these later Ages. Below the Strata of Earth, which the Flood left on the Surface of it, in the other Hemisphere, such enormous Bones have been found, as all skill in Anatomy must pronounce to belong unto Humane Bodies, & could belong to none but Giants, in Comparison of whom, Og, and Goliath, and all the Sons of Anak, must be hardly so much as Pygmies. But that AMERICA too, as tis but agreeable, may throw in something, to the Treasures of the BIBLIA AMERICANA, I will surprize you, with telling you, That the Men who were able to have Turned the World upside down, came hither also; [How! No Man alive can tell!] And the Bones, probably of the Antediluvian GIANTS, have here been mett withal.130

128 See Appendix A.
129 See Appendix A.
130 Mather also incorporates the same commentary (Gen. 6:4) in his “Curiosa Americana,” his first letter (Nov. 17, 1712) to Dr. John Woodward of the Royal Society of London, abstracted in the Philosophical Transactions 29 (1714–16), sec. IV, 62–63. (See also D. Levin’s “Giants”). For Mather and his peers, the question of the biblical Nephilim is inextricably bound up with the interpretation of fossils and the debate about the universality of Noah’s Flood (Threefold Paradise 242–43). Since many of Mather’s leading contemporaries limited the extent of the deluge to a mere local occurrence, he thought the bones of a mastodon discovered near Claverack, NY (1705) – an animal species nowhere mentioned in scriptures – could be no other than the fossilized remains of the giant Nephilim, the fleshly offspring of fallen angels and the daughters of man (Gen. 6:4) who drowned in the Flood. Mather’s error is all too pardonable and all too common for his time; the conjectures of his confreres, published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, more than illustrate how much the physico-theologians of the day struggled to square the geological fossil record of extinct species, flora and fauna, with biblical chronology that set the date of the universe’s creation at little more than 4,000 years before the birth of Christ. For Mather and his peers, the venerable tradition of the Nephilim at once solved not only the mystery of giant prehistoric bones – unidentified until the early nineteenth century – but also provided geological proof of the universal Flood and the trustworthiness of the Mosaic narrative. For the contemporaneous debate on the origin of fossils, their transport, and their meaning, see N. Steno’s Prodromus (1669); J. Woodward, An Essay towards a Natural History of the Earth, 2nd ed. (1702) 1–113]; J. Ray, Three Physico-Theological Discourses, 3rd ed. (1713), Disc. II, ch. 4, pp. 122–204; W. Derham, Physico-Theology, 4th ed. (1716), bk. 5, ch. 4, pp. 291–98, n. 3–4; M. Lister’s “A Letter” (PT 1671); T. Molyneux’s “Part of 2 Letters” (PT 1685); E. Lhwyd’s “Part of a Letter” (PT 1098); T. Molyneux’s “An Essay concerning Giants” (PT 1700); J. Luffkin’s “Part of a Letter” (PT 1700–1); J. Morton’s “A Letter” (PT 1706–7); T. Molyneux’s “Remarks” (PT 1714–16); H. Sloane, “An Account” and “Of Fossile Teeth” (PT 1727–28); J. P. Breyne, “A Letter” (PT 1737–38); and J. Simon and G. Berkeley, “A Letter” (PT 1746–47). The discovery of the purported Nephilim bones unearthed at Claverack was published in the Boston News-Letter (30 July 1705), and Mather sent his scientific improvements on the subject to John Woodward, secretary of the Royal Society, who published an extract in the Philosophical Transactions 29 (1714): 62–63. (For the full text of Mather’s letter, see Levin’s “Giants”). The size of the Claverack fossils, Mather believed, far outnumbered those of the fabled Og, the Amorite king of Bashan (Num. 21:33), sole remnant of the race of the giant Rephaim. According to Deut. 3:11, Og’s iron bedstead measured nine cubits by four cubits, “after the cubit of a man” (c. 15 1/2 feet by c. 7 feet); David’s Goliath (1 Sam. 17:4) only measured a mere 6 cubits (10 1/2 feet). Like the giant “Sons of Anak” (Num. 13:33), they
I will not go to trouble you, with the Opinions of the Ancients, who suppose the Original of those Giants, to be, The Sons of God coming in unto the Daughters of Men; and that the Sons of God, were Angels, or Divels; to which the Name of, Nephilim, which may signify, Fallen Ones, agrees well enough: and which the LXX induced the Fathers, to imagine; and they had Josephus and Philo to countenance it; I do not think, that it was an Error in the learned Henricus Vorstius, to say, that the Scripture does not mention the Original of the Giants; it only declares the Time, when God punished the World with them. And our Saviour ha’s abundantly taught us, how Disagreeable Matrimonial Affairs are, to the Angelical Nature: Nor is there any Strength in the Attempts of Drusius to defeat the Argument which is fetched from the Words of our Saviour, to confute the Dream of the Old Men, about this Matter.¹³¹

Tho’ we meddle not with the Original of the Men, we may touch upon that of their Name. The Name נְפִּילִים/ Nephilim, comes from נָפַל/ To Fall. And, without expounding it, of Men Fallen from an Heavenly to an Earthly Temper; [a Frivolous Exposition that some have given; and which would fill the World with Giants:] why should not the Name intend as much, as, Irruentes, Prosternentes, Dejectores; Men who took a vast Liberty to Fall upon other Men, and make them

all were mere “Pygmies” when compared to the size suggested by the Claverack fossils. How Mather’s giant survived Noah’s Flood and came to America may have been suggested to him by the Talmudic tradition in Zevachim (113b)and Nidah (61a). According to this legend, the giant Og of Bashan (like the huge horned “re’em” [unicorn] that could not be accommodated inside Noah’s ark), clung to the side of the huge vessel or waded alongside it, where the water was cool enough for him not to be scalded.¹³¹ Here and in the subsequent paragraphs, Mather again relies heavily on Heidegger’s Historia Sacra Patriarcharum (1:186–88, Exerc. XI, §§ 2, 4, 5). Apart from Hesiod, whose Titans and their offspring are mentioned in Theogonia, many of the early Church Fathers agreed that the sons of God who ravished the daughters of man were fallen angels whose offspring were the giant Nephilim (Gen. 6:4). See Lactantius (Divine Institutes 2.15, in ANF 7:64), Joannes Chrysostom (Homily on Genesis 22.6, 8–12, pp. 71–72,73–78), and St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei 15.23). The great Bishop of Hippo comments on the ambiguous translations of the Hebrew designation “sons of God” or “sons of gods” and acknowledges that the Septuagint (Mather’s “LXX”) uses both phrases (NPNF1 2:304–5). Both Flavius Josephus (Antiquities 1.3.1) and Philo Judeus (De gigantibus 2.6, 13.60) mention angels and demons – “souls hovering in the air” – who descend into bodies, but whose offspring are only giants for cruelty and carnality – not for their physical size. Guilielmus Henricus Vorstius (Wilhelm Heinrich van dem Voorst, d. 1652), son of the famous German Reformed theologian and Arminian Conrad Vorstius (1569–1622), translated various rabbinic treatises into Latin, among them קפיטולא ר’ אליאס יזריא (1644). Mather (via Heidegger 1:186) cites R. Tzodok’s gloss on the giant Nephilim, which appears in Capitula R. Elieser (1644), cap. 22, p. 50; the English translation is in Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 22, pp. 160–61). According to Matt. 22:30 and Mark 12:25, the resurrected saints will be like the angels in heaven and neither marry nor given in marriage. Finally, Mather, via Heidegger (1:186) refers to Ad loca difficilliora Pentateuchi (1617), a commentary by the eminent Dutch Orientalist at Franeker, Joannes Drusius, aka. Jan van den Driesche (1550–1616), who discourages the dreams of old men once again to be young and married (Matt. 22:30), because their angelic bodies would be devoid of all carnal desires. See the synopsis of Drusius’s commentary in Critici Sacri (1660), vol. 6, col. 655.
to Fall? If they were of such an horrid Magnitude, as the Monster I am anon to show you, the Etymology would be agreeable enough unto them. I doubt, they were a Sort of Men, as unlikely as any upon Earth, to deserve the Character, that Bolducus, in his Treatise, De Ecclesiâ antè legem, ha’s provided for them; who saies, They were called, Nephilim, Quòd ob veri Dei cultum à reliquis, in eo distinguenter, quòd Deum prostrationibus adorarent, adeò ut illà ceremoniâ eos ab improbis secerneret; Because they did use to Fall down prostrate upon the Earth, in their Adorations before the God of Heaven.  

An Extremity of Incredulity, ha’s led some to think, That the Antediluvian Giants were but Metaphorical Ones; That they were Giants for Quality only, and not for Quantity. We will not count the Gigantomachia, of Goropius Becanus, worth considering. Temporarius ha’s endeavoured more elaborately to show, That the Name is of a Scythian Original, and means no more than, A Man with long Hands; which are no other than a World of Rapacious Mortals, {which we} are at this Day furnished withal. And indeed Philo the Jew, strips these Giants of all their Procerity, and makes them no more than, ανθρωπους της γης, Homines Terræ, or another sort of Men, than the Men of Heaven, & of God.

---

132 Extracted from Heidegger (1:197, Exerc. XI, § 16). According to Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXVI:7), the Hebrew word נפילים [Nephilim] suggests וינס [they fell] כובד and brought about [the fall of the world]. See also Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 22, pp. 160–61). In his commentary on Num. 13:33, Rashi (whose source is Pirke Eliezer, ch. 22), identifies the two giants who “fell from heaven” as Shamchazai and Azael (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:8). Mather objects to this exposition as “Frivolous” and offers instead the one by Aquila Ponticus, according to whose Greek translation of the OT, “Nephilim” signifies “irruentes” (invaders, or those who seize others) and “Prosternentes” (overthrowers), and “Dejectores” (conquerors) – all in Origen’s Hexaplorum quae supersunt in Genesim monitum (Gen. 6:4) [PG 15. 188]. While Symmachus translates “Nephilim” as “violent ones,” the Chaldaic Paraphrast suggests “fortes, robustos” (strong or robust ones); Calvin (Commentaries on the Book of Genesis (1:24–46) more or less agrees, as does Luther who calls them “tyrants” and usurpers of power in both church and state who “sin without the least restraint” (Works 2:3). Following Heidegger (1:197), Mather and many of his peers here prefer the LXX translation, suggesting “giants,” but do not rule out these other significations. In his De Ecclesia ante legem (1626), the Parisian Capucin theologian Jacobus Bolducus, aka. Jacques Bolduc (d. 1646), calls them “Nephilim, because for the sake of the worship of the true God, they could be distinguished from the rest by the fact that they honored God by falling down, to such a degree that this ceremony set them apart from the wicked.”

133 Heidegger (1:19, Exerc. XI, §§ 18–19). Mather takes exception to such interpreters as Robert Hooke (1685–1703), one of the leading natural philosophers of his time, and Thomas Gale (1685–1702), dean of York, who reduce the venerable tradition of the antediluvian giants to mere metaphor. In response to Thomas Gale’s manuscript essay concerning giants, Hooke argues that the translators of the LXX frequently rendered obscure Hebrew words not in their literal sense, but in line with prevailing beliefs and traditions among the Greeks of Alexandria; the translators were eager “to show that the Bible was not unacquainted with the Greek Stories.” More to the point, Hooke agrees with Gale’s mythological interpretation of “the Gigantomachia” as nothing else but “an Earthquake, or perhaps several Earthquakes,” which the ancient poets combined into one (“A Discourse of Earthquakes,” in Posthumous Works 384). Mather, via Heidegger (1:19), also dismisses the discussion of giants “De Gigantomachia” (lib. 2), in Origines Antwerpianæ (1569), esp. 207–12, by the Flemish physician and linguist Joannes Cotton Mather, Biblia Americana, Volume 1: Genesis, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2010. Used by permission.
But the Apocryphal Baruch shall be a better Interpreter for us; who, [chap. 3.26.] expressly saies of these Giants; They were παμμεγεθους, επισταμενοι πολεμιου. Ingenti corporis magnitudine præditi, reique bellice scientissim. The Apocrypha several times, calls them, Giants. And afterwards, Chrysostom calls them, ηρωας ευμηκεις, very Tall Heroes; and, υψηλους: High Ones. Theodoret calls them, παμμεγεθους ανθρωπους; Prægrandes Hominnes. And Cyrillus, tells us, they were those, Quibus Corporum Deformitas et Magnitudo data sit, in panem effrenate, | Libidinis Parentum. But I have a greater Authority than all of this; namely, That of the Giants themselves; The Wretches under the Earth, are in some sort brought up from thence, before the Resurrection, when they are to Bow the Knee unto the Name of JESUS. The Giants that once Groan’d under the Waters, are now Found under the Earth, and their Dead Bones are Lively Proofs of the Mosaic History.134

Of all those Curiosities, I know none, that exceeds, what ha’s lately been found, in an American Plantation; adjoining to New England: And its being found in America, makes it yett the more curious, and marvellous: For, I beseech you, How did the Giants find the Way hither?135

Goropius Becanus, aka. Jan Gerartsen van Gorp (1519–72). Mather evidently disliked Becanus’s argument that the language of Paradise was unadulterated “Diets,” i.e., Dutch (Origines Antwerpianae 539), just as much as he would have disliked Becanus’s endeavor to decipher Egyptian hieroglyphics by tracing them to their Dutch [Cimmerian] roots, in Hieroglyphica (1580), 12–13. This reading seemed as preposterous as the account of a young man and woman who were 9 and 10 feet tall, respectively, and lived near Becanus’s home in Flanders. The work by Joannes Temporarius, aka. Jean du Temps (b. c. 1535), French jurist, mathematician, and geographer, is probably his Chronologicarum demonstrationum libri tres (1596), in which the author traces the word “Nephilim” to Scythian origin. Philo Judaeus strips these giants of their tall stature and allegorizes them as “men … born of the earth” – hedonists who hunt after carnal pleasure (De gigantibus 13.60). Mather’s Dutch colleague, Jean LeClerc was similarly dismissive of his contemporaries’ gigantomachia, in his Twelve Dissertations (1606), Diss. II, p. 78. See also Johann Christoph Bemann’s Historia Orbis Terrarum (1698), cap. 9, sec. 2, § 13, pp. 362–64, for an encyclopedic discussion of giants.

134 Heidegger (1:198, Exerc. XI, § 18). According to the Apocryphal Baruch (3:26), in the LXX, these giants “were [by nature] of so great stature, and so expert in war.” As usual, Mather omits the Greek diacritics. The forms of the Greek γίγαντες (literally “earth-born,” but frequently rendered “giants,” appear in the Apocryphal Baruch 3:26, Sirach 16:7, 47:4; Wisdom 14:6, and 1 Maccabees 3:3 (LXX). Mather’s citation of Chrysostom’s Homily on Genesis (22.12, p. 77) is here quoted at second hand from Heidegger (1:198). Theodoret (Quaestiones in Octateuchum: Genesis. Quest. 48, p. 47, line 25) calls them “rather large men.” Mather erroneously writes “Cyprian,” instead of “Cyrillus.” Cyrillus Alexandrinus’s Gephyra in Pentateuchum (lib. 3) [PG 69, 56] argues they were those “to whom deformity and bulk of the body were given as a punishment for the unrestrained lust of their parents.” Mather’s reference to the “Giants that Groan’d under the Waters” alludes to the tradition that assigns hell a place under the waters (Job 26:5–6), but Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXXI:12) offers a much more literal reading in that the giant Nephilim tried to board the Ark, but drowned. Be that as it may, Mather is eager to validate ancient traditions with empirical evidence as the subsequent paragraphs reveal. 135 The following paragraphs are not gleaned from Heidegger, but from different sources. Mather’s question about how the giant Nephilim found his way to America is a legitimate concern albeit amusing to modern readers. For if Noah’s Ark saved from certain death pairs of clean and unclean animals by accommodating them in the ark, how did they get across the
The Post-Diluvian Giants mentioned, in the Sacred Scriptures, were Puisny Things; in Comparison of One, above Seventy Foot High; and yet we have here the undoubted Reliques of such an one.136

What Julius Capitolinus, and others, report of the Tyrant Maximin, That he was Eight Foot High, and what Nicknames, Herodian tells us, were therefore putt upon this Typhon, and Cyclops, tis no longer worth the while to mention. And as little worth a mention, is the Suevian in the Army of Charlemaign, of whom Aventinus tells us, That he would mow down his Enemies, and spitt good Numbers of them like so many little Birds, on his huge Spear, which he would so carry in his Hand about the Camp. We shall hardly regard what Mela tells us, Of Indians, who were so tall, that Elephants were to them instead of Horses.137

We shall as little regard, the Americans, near the Streights of Magellan, to whom they assign a Stature sufficiently enormous; and a Neck as long as a Mans Arm. We shall be far from Trembling before the Giant seen by Pigafetta, taller than other Men from the Girdle upwards. Lett us make room for Greater Company.

Grandiaque Effossis Miraberis Ossa Sepulchris.138

Atlantic Ocean once they were released from their shelter? And how – in the first place – did the American species get into the Ark that was waiting for them in the Old World? Questions of this nature preoccupied many theologians of note and included the Flemish Jesuit scholar Jacobus Bonfrerius (1573–1642), Pentateuchus Moysis commentario (1625) 150–51 (on Gen. 7:8), who argued that the animals could have come to America via Greenland, Norway, Asia, if not by Angelic help. Similarly, the German Lutheran theologian, Johannes Gerhardus (1582–1637) holds forth on the origin of the nephilim in Commentarius super Genesin (1653) 175, 179–80; and the Roman Catholic scholar Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), Physiologiae stoicorum, in Opera (1637) 4:593–95, puzzled over the same questions. Mather cites these scholars throughout “BA” and agrees with Lipsius that a land bridge, now submerged, must have connected the Old with the New World at one time (See also Don C. Allen, Legend 130).

136 Among the post-diluvian giants are Og of Bashan, Goliath, and the giant race of the Emims, Anakims, Rephaims, and of Og (Gen. 6:4, Num. 13:33, Deut. 2:10–11; 3:11; Josh. 12:4). “Puisny” or “puisne” signifies “inferior in rank,” and “puny” (OED). See Appendix A.

137 The history of Roman Emperor Gaius Iulius Verus Maximinus, the Thracian (235–38 ce), is related in Historia Augusta: Maximini Duo, by Julius Capitolinus (3rd c. ce), one of the six Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Capitolinus (Maximini Duo 6.8; 8.5–6; 28.8) argues that Maximinus was “six inches over eight feet” tall and that some nicknamed him “Cyclops, some Busiris, and others Sciron, not a few Phalaris, and many Typhon or Gyges.” According to the Greek historian Herodian (early 3rd c. ce), Maximinus’s nicknames wereTyphon (the hundred-headed Titon, son of Gaia and Tartarus) and Cyclops (Homer’s one-eyed giant); his size and cruelty are described in Herodian’s History of the Empire after Marcus (6.8.1, 7.1.1–5, 12). The story of the giant of Suevia (Germany), who served in the army of Roman Emperor Charlemaneg, is related in Joannes Aventinus’s Annalium Boiorum (1554), lib. 4, pp. 364–65, 420–21, 450. Mather also cites Aventinus in Threefold Paradise (324). The Roman geographer Pomponius Mela (1st c. ce) relates the story of his tall natives of India in his De chorographia libri tres (3. 52–53).

138 The giant Americans near the Straits of Magellan in Terra Del Fuego (S tip of Chile) are the Tehuelche Indians of Patagonia. Italian traveler Antonio Francesco Pigafetta of Vincenza (c. 1498–1536), who accompanied the famous Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan (1519) on his quest for the Spice Islands, relates in his famous log how they encountered several Patagonian giants among the Tehuelche Indians, in 1520. They were so tall that even the largest of
We will not be too urgent in demanding a Consideration for what Pliny relates; That Lucius Flaccus and Metellus, in the Cretian War, found the Bodies of some Giants, that were Thirty Cubits long; and the Earth opening in an Earthquake, another was cast up, which extended unto Forty Cubits. We may suspect a Cretian Story; And, I find, the Credit of Pliny’s Relations, runs pretty low among the Learned in our Dayes. However, we may give some Credit unto this, inasmuch as we have in grave Plutarch much such another; Yea, a Skeleton amounting to Threescore Cubits.139

But lett us go on; The Egyptian Traditions of the Gigantic Emephiimi, related by Franciscus Patritius, were not altogether without some Foundation. Reineccius, in his Monumenta Brandenburgica, affirms, that in his Time, there were Dug up the Bones of Men, whose Legs reach’d up to the Waste of other Men. Fazellus as an Ey-witness, affirms, that in Italy, there were Dug up the Bones of Men, which were of a stupendous Magnitude. Camerarius in his Operæ Succisivæ, is much affected, with the Huge Humane Bones, found at Puteoli in Italy; on which, a Poem of Pomponius Letus concludes thus;

Hinc bona posteritas immanici corpora servat,  
Et tales mundo testificatur avos.140

---

139 Roman general Lucius Flaccus and Quintus Caecilius Metellus Creticus, Roman consul of Crete (69–c. 65 bce), finally crushed the pirates who had fought the Romans during the long Cretan War (c. 106–66 bce). According to Solinus (De mirabilibus mundi, cap. 1), floodwaters lay bare a gigantic skeleton measuring 33 cubits (c. 47 feet), which L. Flaccus and Metellus Creticus examined at some length. Pliny (7.16.73–74) does not refer to this particular fossilized monster, but mentions one 46 cubits tall (c. 65 feet), the supposed remains of either Orion or Otus. In his biography of the Roman general Quintus Sertorius (c. 126–73 bce), Plutarch (Vitae parallelae: Sertorius 9.5–9) relates how Sertorius, upon taking the city of Tingis (Tangier) in c. 81 bce, was shown the bones of Antaeus, the mythical giant slain by Heracles (Plutarch’s Lives 8:25). Nearly 60 cubits tall (c. 85 feet), the remains of Antaeus were honored by Sertorius who reburied his bones. For a modern discussion of how the ancient Greeks and Romans interpreted giant fossil bones as the remnants of their mythical heroes, see A. Mayor’s excellent The First Fossil Hunters (2000), esp. chs. 3 and 5.

140 Mather refers to Franciscus Patritius, aka. Francesco Patrizzi (1529–97), Italian philosopher and scientist of Dalmatia, professor of philosophy at Ferrara. As a Christian Platonist and disciple of Marsilio Ficino, Patritius opposed the Aristotelians and those who offered miraculous explanations for natural phenomena. He even tried to persuade Pope Gregory XIV to replace the peripatetic and scholastic philosophy with that of the mysteries of Hermes Trismegistus (P. Rossi, Dark Abyss 123–24; F. Purnell, “Francesco Patrizi”). Among Patritius’s most important works are Discussionum peripateticorum (1571) and Nova de universae philosophia (1591) – both of which influenced the great Athanasius Kircher a century later. The Egyptian
I find our P. Martyr, [in Jud. 1. D.] quoting it from Philostratus; That the Carcase of a Giant, was found, of no less than Twelve Cubits long; of another, no less than Twenty Two Cubits; and of another, no less than Thirty.141

traditions of the “Emephimi” probably refer to the race of colossal giants, whose hapless battle against Isis and Osiris is depicted on temple walls in Egypt. However, even Diodorus Siculus relates the disagreement among the ancients, for some believe these “giants” were men “born of the earth” at the very beginning, yet others believe they were no giants at all, but “only men of unusual physical strength who achieved many deeds” (Diodorus Siculus 1.26.6–7; cf. 3.71–72). The ancients admired their colossal bones in Nitriai (Wadi Natrun) – that is, if Publius Aelius Phlegon of Tralles (fl. c. 140 ce) and his marvels can be trusted (De mirabilibus 15). The German historian Reinerus Reineccius (1541–95) published several histories of German principalities. Mather refers to Reineccius’s Origins illustris stirpis Brandenburgicae (1581), a Latin translation of Chronica des Chur und fürsätzten Hauses der Marggrafen zu Brandenburg, published in Wittenberg (1580). The Italian Renaissance historian and Dominican friar Tommaso Fazello, aka. Thomas Fazelli (1498–1579), composed De Rebus Siculis Decades Duae (1558), which went through several editions. Fazelli relates that he witnessed the excavation of giant bones, cadavers, molars, and sepulchers in fields near Mazarenum, Panormo, and Petralium (Sicily), in De Rebus (decad. prioris, lib. 1, cap. 7, pp. 23–28; see also decad. post., lib. 1, cap. 1, pp. 238–39). Philipp Camerarius (1537–1624), German scholar and counselor to the Free State of Nuremberg, published Operae Horarum Subcisivarum (1599), an English edition of which appeared as The Walking Library (1621). The Mathers owned a copy of a three-volume edition (1644–50) of Camerarius’s Opera (Tuttle, “Libraries” 320). Puteoli (modern Pozzuoli, Italy) was an ancient Roman city on the shore of Campania, in the N part of the Bay of Naples. Finally, the Latin citation from the previously cited poem by Julius Pomponius Lactus is excerpted in Camerarius’s Operae Horarum Subcisivarum (1602 ed.), Centuria prima, cap. 82, p. 382, and reads, “From henceforth good posterity preserves the immense bodies, and calls forward such great forefathers as witnesses to the world.” Robert Plot (1640–96), early comparative anatomist, keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, and professor of chemistry at Oxford, allocates ample proof from both ancients and moderns that the giant bones dug up in Oxfordshire and in a London cemetery are of human origin, in his The Natural History of Oxford-shire (1676), ch. 5, pp. 133–39, esp. §§. 160–74. When a large “thigh-bone (supposed to be of a Woman)” and several large molars were dug up in a London churchyard and elsewhere, he first surmised that these fossils might be the remains of an elephant brought to London in Roman times. Yet providence decreed that while he was composing his Natural History, he had the opportunity to compare his fossils’ anatomy with that of a young live elephant then on public display in Oxford. Much to his surprise, the elephant’s bones were “not only of a different shape, but also incomparably bigger than ours [fossils] … If then they [fossils] are neither the bones of Horses, Oxen, nor Elephants, as I am strongly persuaded they are not, upon comparison, and from their like found in Churches: It remains, that (notwithstanding their extravagant magnitude) they must have been the bones of Men or Women” – like those of the “Sons of Anak,” or of the “Titans, and of high Giants” as those mentioned in the apocryphal “Judith 16.x. 7” and “Baruch 3.v. 26” (Natural History 135–36). See also K. Thomson’s Before Darwin (2005), ch. 7. 141 Mather refers to In Librum Iudicum D. Petri Martyris Vermiglii commentarii (1571), a Reformed commentary on the book of Judges, by Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499–1562), Italian Reformed theologian, friend of Bucer, variously professor of theology at Strasbourg, Oxford, and finally of Hebrew at Zurich. In his commentary on Judges 1:D, Martyr cites Sophist Flavius Philostratus (d. c. 244–49 c e) of Lemnius (the “Athenian”), whose Heroicus (7.9; 8.3–14) tells of ancient heroes “15 feet tall,” the skeleton of Troy’s Ajax “16 feet tall,” that of Orestes discovered in Tegea “10 feet tall,” that of Aryades on the Orontes River “45 feet tall.” Yet another skeleton at Sigeum “33 feet,” that of the island of Ikos “18 feet tall,” and lastly the remains of Hyllus (Phrygia) and of the Aloadae (Thessaly), whose bones were “54 feet long” in all.
One Way of Judging always allow’d, ha’s been, *Ex ungue leonem*; I know not, why we may not as well Judge, *Ex Dente Gigantem*. The Teeth, which are a very Durable Sort of Bones, found, below the Surface of the Earth, may serve, as well as any Tongues, to tell us, what Men there were once upon it.142

*Austin*, in his famous Treatise, *De Civitate Dei*: [Lib. 15. Cap. 9.] complains of those, who would not Beleeve, that there had been literal Giants, of an unusual and stupendous Magnitude. He saies, That *Most Noble Poet Virgil*, did Believe it, when he brought in his Champion, snatching & throwing a Stone, whereof he sings;

*Vix illud lecti bis sex cervice subirent,*

*Qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus.*143

He carrieth them down, to confute them, into the Sepulchres opened of later Dayes, where they should find, *Incredibilis magnitudinis ossa mortuorum*. Yea, He affirmt, that he himself, with several more, Saw with their own Eyes, the Tooth of a Man, which would æqual at least an Hundred of the Teeth of ordinary Men. *Vidi ipse non solus, sed aliquot mecum, in Uticensi litore molarem hominis Dentem, tam ingentem, ut si in nostrorum Dentium modulos minutatim concideretur, centum nobis videretur facere potuisse. Sed illum Gigantis alicujus fuisse crediderim.*144

To gett nearer home; *Cambden*, in his *Britannia*, when he comes as far as Nesse-point, in Essex; makes a Citation from *Ralph de Coggeshal*, (who wrote between Four and Five Hundred Years ago,) in these Terms. “In the Time of King Richard, on the Sea-shore, in a Village called Edulfiness, were found Two Teeth of a Giant, of such a prodigious Bigness, that Two Hundred of such Teeth, as Men ordinarily have now, might be cutt out of one of them. These I saw at Cogshal, and handled with great Admiration.” *Cambden* adds; Another, I know not what

---

142 Empirical proof demands that those who would be natural philosophers must judge “a lion from his claw” and “a giant from his tooth.”

143 Here continues Mather’s excerpt from Heidegger (1:198, Exerc. XI, § 18). In his *De Civitate Dei* (15.9) [PL 41.448], St. Augustine complains about the skeptics of his day who do not believe that the antediluvians lived considerably longer and were considerably larger than the post-diluvians. He quotes Virgil in affirmation that a huge bolder (which served as a landmark) could easily be carried and hurled by the giant antediluvians, whereas now “Scarce twice six strong men of such frames as the earth now brings forth could lift it on their shoulders” (*Aeneid* 12.899–900), in *NPNFi* (2:291)

144 St. Augustine asserts that those who dismiss as credulity the former existence of giants often become believers when they see “bones of the dead of incredibly large size” that are washed out of their terrestrial sepulchers by rain torrents or by the wear and tear of time. He clinches his argument by testifying (*De Civitate Dei* 15.9), “I myself, along with some others, saw on the shore at Utica a man’s molar tooth of such a size, that if it were cut down into teeth such as we have, a hundred, I fancy, could have been made out of it. But that, I believe, belonged to some giant” (*NPNFi* 2:291). Legion is the number of theologians who wrote on the topic in the seventeenth century. One of the best sources of the day is Athanasius Kircher’s *Arca Noë* (1675), lib. 1, sec. 1, cap 3, pp. 8–11; and Matthew Poole’s *Works* (1:321–24).
Gigantic Relique, was found near this Place, in the Beginning of Q. Elizabeth, by the Noble R. Candish.\textsuperscript{145}

And here were enough, to prevent any ones Quarrelling with Fulgosus, for his Report, That the Teeth of Giants, which Teeth weigh’d each of them Three Pound, were found at Drepanum in Sicily.\textsuperscript{146}

But America too will come in to shelter the Reputation of these Historians. They may shield themselves, with the Teeth, lately Dug up at Albany. Had Johannes Cassanione’s Book, De Gigantibus ever come over to America, I do not know but I might have had a fuller Entertainment for you. But what matters it, now we find the Giants themselves come over to America.\textsuperscript{147}

The First printed Account the Publick had of it, was from New York, July, 23. 1705. to this Purpose.

“There is a prodigious Tooth brought hither, supposed by the Shape of it, to be one of the Great Teeth of a MAN. It weighs Four Pounds and Three Quarters. The Top of it, is as sound and white as a Tooth can be: but the Root is much decay’d. Yet one of the Fangs of it, holds Half a Pint of Liquor. It was lately Dug up, a great Way under Ground; in the Side of a Bank, or Hill, Thirty or Forty Foot above it; at or near a Place called Clavarack, about Thirty Miles on this

\textsuperscript{145} The English historian and antiquarian William Camden (1551–1623) is best remembered for his popular historical geography Britannia; sive, Florentissimorum regnorum Anglicae (1586), a massive history that was translated into English (1610) and appeared in many editions. The citation from Ralph de Coggeshall(I), also Coggeshale (fl. 1207–26), chronicler and abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Coggeshall, Essex, England, appears on p. 351 (1695 ed.), and is most likely from a manuscript of Coggeshall’s Chronicon Anglicanum (ODNB). Since Camden refers to Ralph de Coggeshall as having lived “350 years ago” (or “Four and Five Hundred Years ago” from Mather’s vantage point), King Richard must evidently be Richard I (1157–99), who ruled England during the last ten years of his life. John Bale’s Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Britanniae (1557–59), Centuria Tertia, p. 275, identifies four of Coggeshall’s works written in the early 13\textsuperscript{th} century. Richard Candish or Cavendish (c. 1530–1601) was an English courtier, soldier, author, and minor actor (ODNB) during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558–1603).

\textsuperscript{146} The Italian Renaissance humanist and antiquarian of Genoa, Baptista Fulgosus, aka. Battista Fregoso (1462–1504), mentions such giant teeth in his Chronique de Baptista Fulgosus (1494), lib. 1, c. 6, whose fossil remains were found in the Sicilian Drepano, the capital of Trapani province, located on the NW coast of Sicily. The same reference to Fulgosus’s report appears in Raphael Holinshed’s First and second volumes of Chronicles (1587), vol. 1, ch. 5, p. 10 (col. 2). Indeed, the entire chapter 5 (pp. 8–12) of Holinshed’s famous repository contains many toothsome stories of giants and their gargantuan molars dug up from chronicles ancient and modern.

\textsuperscript{147} Earlier accounts of American giants were given by Pigafetta (Magellan’s Voyage, ch. 8, p. 46) and by Fernando Montesinos (Memorias Antiguas, ch. 9, pp. 40–41) – the latter echoing the discouraging report given by Moses’s spies who returned from Canaan (Num. 13:32–33). Johannes Cassanione (Mather’s misspells his name “Cassion”) is the French Protestant antiquarian of Monistrol en Velay, Jean de Chassanian (1531–98), whose De Gigantibus, eorumque reliquis (1580), esp. ch. 6, debates the Gigantomachia (1569) of the Flemish linguist Joannes Goropius Becanus, about the origin and size of fossils found in Sicily, Bordeaux (France), and Burgos (Spain). Chassanian takes issue with Goropius Becanus’s giants, arguing that they were not giants of physical size, but merely of political power (tyrants).
They also dug up several bones, which as they came to the air crumbled away. One of them, which is thought to be a Thigh-bone, is seventeen foot long. There is since another Tooth, taken up in the same place; which is a Fore-Tooth, broad and flat, and as broad as a Mans Four Fingers. They dug up several Trees in the same place, of great Bigness.149

That I might be able, with a better Face of Authority, to assert unto the World, a Curiosity of so much Consequence; I addressed the GOVERNOUR of New England, with my Request, That he would give me under his Hand, what he had Seen, and Thought, of this Matter. He Readily obliged me, with the ensuing Letter.150

July, 10. 1706.151

“Sir.

“I was surprised, a few Dayes since, with a Present laid before me, from Albany, by Two honest Dutchmen, Inhabitants of that City: which was a certain TOOTH, accompanied with some other Peces of Bone. These being but Fragments, without any Points, whereby they might be determined, to what Animals they did belong, I could make nothing of them. But the Tooth, was of the perfect Form of the Ey-Tooth of a MAN; with Four Prongs, or Roots, and Six distinct Faces, or Flatts, on the Top; a little worn, and all perfectly smoothed with Grinding. I suppose all the Cheirurgeons in Town have seen it. And I am perfectly of Opinion, it was an HUMANE TOOTH. I measured it, and as it stood upright, it was Six Inches high, lacking an Eighth; and Round, Thirteen Inches, lacking an Eighth. And (tho’ Part of it be broken off, & lost,) its Weight in the Scale, was Two Pounds and Four Ounces, Troy-weight. One of the same Growth, was last Year presented to my Lord Cornbury. And another of the same Figure exactly, was lately shown at Hartford, of near a Pound Weight more than this.152

“Upon Examination of the Two Dutchmen, they tell me, The said Teeth and Bones, were taken up, under the Bank of Hudsons River, some Miles below

148 I.e., Claverack (Columbia County), near Albany, NY.
149 Mather excerpts his information from the Boston News Letter, July 30, 1705, which reprinted an earlier account that had appeared in New York, July 23, 1705. See also D. Stanford’s “Giant Bones” and P. Semonin’s American Monster (15–40).
150 Perhaps because the Mathers had a falling out with Joseph Dudley (1647–1720), Queen Anne’s colonial governor of Massachusetts (1702–15), Mather cancels (with doubled strikethrough) his panegyric on their former friend. (See Appendix A). Mather’s disgruntlement with Dudley came to a pitch in A Memorial of the Present Deplorable State of New-England (1707). The deteriorating relationship between the Mathers and Governor Joseph Dudley is discussed in Silverman’s Life and Times (202–21).
151 Dudley’s letter was written at Roxbury, his seat of government, near Boston. See Appendix A.
the City of Albany; about Fifty Leagues from the Sea, many Foot below the Surface of the Earth; in a Place where the Freshet, every Year does rake and waste the Bank: And that there is a plain Discoloration of the Ground, for Seventy Five Foot long at least; different from the Earth in Colour, and Substance: which is judged by every body that sees it, to be the Ruines and Dust of the Body, that bore those Teeth and Bones.

“I am altogether perswaded, That the Tooth will agree, only to an Humane Body; for whom the FLOOD only could prepare a Funeral. And without doubt, he waded as long as he could, to keep his Head above the Clouds; but must at length be confounded with all other Creatures: And the New Sediment after the Flood, gave him the Depth we now find.

“I remember to have Read somewhere, a Tradition of the Jewish Rabbins; That the Issues of those Unequal Matches, between Heaven and Earth, at the Beginning, were such, whose Heads reached the Clouds; and therefore they were called, Nephilim. Their Issue were, Geborim; who shrunk away to, Rephaim; which were then found, not to be Invincible, but fell before less Men, the Sons of the East, in several Places besides Canaan.\(^{153}\)

“I am not presently satisfied, of what Rank, or Classis, this Fellow was; but I am sure, not of the last; for Goliah, was not half so many Feet, as this was Ells long.\(^{154}\)

“The Distance from the Sea, takes away all Pretension of its being a Whale, or Animal of the Sea, as well as the Figure of the Tooth. Nor can it be any Remains of an Elephant; the Shape of the Tooth, and the Admeasurement of the Body in the Ground, will not allow That.\(^{155}\)

“There is nothing left, but to repair unto those Antique Doctors, for his Origin; and let Dr. Burnet, and Mr. Whiston bury him at the Deluge. And, if

---

\(^{153}\) Dudley evidently confuses the different races of giants – Nephilim, Emim, Rephaim, Gibborim, Zamzumim, Anakim, Awim – with the interpretation provided by Nachmanides, that when the Nephilim procreated with the daughters of men, their children were inferior in size to those of their giant fathers, and so on. Compare Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXVI:7) with Ramban on Gen. 6:4 (Commentary 1:103) and Mikraoth Gedoloth (Genesis 1:84). According to Midrash Rabbah (Deut. XI:10), Sihon and Og were the heathen giants “to whose ankles the waters of the flood did not reach because of their [great] stature.”

\(^{154}\) Goliath’s height was “six cubits and a span” (1 Sam. 17:4).

\(^{155}\) The question of how fossils – especially of marine animals – were transported into the interior, hundreds of miles away from the present shoreline was not solved until geologists in the late nineteenth century posited the theory of shifting tectonic plates. D. C. Allen (Legend, ch. 5) and R. Rappaport (When Geologists, chs. 4–5) remind us that Renaissance and seventeenth-century naturalists sought to answer the transport problem in several ways: Through the plastic nature of the earth, fossils were believed either to grow from “seeds” embedded in rocks, or to spring up through spontaneous generation, or were the sports of nature (lusus nature), or were indeed the petrified remains of antediluvian life-forms carried to their respective locations by Noah’s Flood. In his commentary on Exod. 16:3, Mather insists that animals (including insects) generate through recreation – never through spontaneous generation.
he were, what he showes, he will be seen again, at or after the Conflagration, further to be examined.156

I am,

Syr,

Your Humble Servant,"

{Joseph Dudley}157

Soon after the Receit of this Letter, the Writer of these Illustrations, had the Opportunity, himself, to see these enormous Reliques of Gigantism; & so is now to be considered as an Ey-Witness of what he writes. Theutobocchus, who was dug up, A. C. 1613. at his full Dimensions of twenty six foot, was a Pigmy to our Albanian Memorandum. Upon the Discovery of this horrible Giant, all the Indians, within an hundred Miles of the Place, agreed in a Tradition, which they said, they had among them, from Father to Son, for some hundreds of Years, concerning him; and that he lived upon the Fish of that River, (usually swallowing Four Sturgeons in a Morning for a Breakfast:) and that his Name was, Maughkompos. But there is very little in any Tradition of our Salvages, to be rely’d upon.158

I was at a Loss, where I might find a Lady for this Gentleman, until Olaus Magnus advised me of one. Reperta est puella in capite vulnerata, ac mortua, induta chlamyde purpurea, longitudinis cubitorum Quinque aginta, latitudinis intrà Humeris Quatuor. But it is Pitty, to have such Monsters propagated.159

156 Dudley seems to dismiss the causes of the Flood as explained by Thomas Burnet (Sacred Theory [1684]) and by William Whiston (New Theory [1696]) – the former arguing that the surface of the antediluvian earth collapsed upon the waters stored in subterranean caverns, the latter explaining that a passing comet inundated the earth with water.

157 See Appendix A. Thomas Dudley’s letter to Mather was first printed as “Letter from Governour Dudley to the Reverend Cotton Mather, D.D. Account of a fossil tooth, &c. 1706,” in the Collections of the MHS (Second Series) 2 (1814):263–64. A penciled reference to this effect (in another hand) appears in the upper right-hand margin of the “BA” manuscript. See also D. Levin’s article “Giants.”

158 The description of “Theutobocchus” or “Teutonic heel” (the tarsal joint or ankle in the hind limb of a quadruped) is also mentioned in William Derham’s Physico-Theology, 4th ed. (1716), bk. 5, ch. 4, p. 291 (note 3). With his height of a mere 26 feet, Theutobocchus is far inferior in size to the “Maughkompos” or “Maw-compos” (“endowed with an able jaw or stomach”), the American giant of 76 feet, found near Albany – Mather’s “Albanian Memorandum” of the Noachic Deluge. New England’s own metaphysical poet, the Rev. Edward Taylor (c. 1645–1729), Congregational minister of Westfield, Massachusetts, was equally fascinated with the giant bones of Claverack and their human origin. He recorded his thoughts in his diary and commemorated the significance of this discovery in a poem of nearly 200 lines (rpt., in Stanford, “Giant Bones,” 52–61).

159 Pausanias (6.20.7), too, reports that the bones of Hippodameia, wife of the giant hero Pelops, were carried from Midea (Argolis) to Olympia. Olaus Magnus (1490–1557), Swedish geographer, historian, and archbishop of Upsala, relates in his popular history of Scandinavia, Historia de gentibus (1555), lib. 5, cap. 2, that “A girl was also found in the lands of the West, wounded in the head and lifeless; she was attired in a purple cloak, was seventy-five feet long,
Upon this Occasion, it is not easy, to forbear some Essay, to investigate the Original of such an Exorbitant Appearance among the Sons of Men.

And the First Thoughts, which now visit the Mind of one, whom I must confess to be but very shallow in his Philosophy, are such as these.\textsuperscript{160}

We have heard from others, and our Faithful Microscopes also, which our Fathers knew not, have told us, what wonderful Things the Great GOD ha’s done, in creating the Seminal Part of the World.\textsuperscript{161}

Among the Vegetables, the least Part of that which we call, The Seed, is really so: The True Seed lies in so little Room, that it is not visible to the Naked Eye: The Rest serves, but as a Lodging for it, and for its most proper Nourishment and Expansion, at the First Opening of it. But in that little Room, there lies the whole Plant, in all the True Parts of it: which is afterwards evolved, and extended, and filled up, with its Adventitious Nutriment, until it be carried as far as the original Stamina, are capable: And then, the Growth stops. But perhaps, towards the Period of the Growth, so weak may be the Stamina, that according to the Strength of the Soyl that nourishes it, the Growth may be more or less, but a little varied.\textsuperscript{162}

And, why may not the Seeds of Animals have the like said of Them? Yea, The Microscopical Inquisitions, have made it more than probable; That the True Seeds of Animals, floating in their Suitable Vehicle, have, lying in a Space much less than the Naked Eye can discern, the whole Bodies of the Animals, even to all their Nerves and Fibres: which afterward Grow as aforesaid, until their original Stamina can be no further carried out.\textsuperscript{163}

And this, by the way, takes away the common Cavil, against the Resurrection of the Dead; That the Bodies of Men, have been devoured by Others, and become the Parts of them. For [ according to this Hypothesis, there can be no such Thing, as a Confusion of Humane Bodies. They can, by being Devoured, lose no more, than their Adventitious Nutriment; And it is Remarkable, That

\textsuperscript{160} Mather deprecates himself.

\textsuperscript{161} Although Hans and Zacharias Janssen seem to be the inventors of a rudimentary microscope (c. 1595), their Dutch colleague, Anton van Leeuwenhoek (1629–1723), improved their invention and thereby discovered bacteria under the microscope. However, the English physicist Robert Hooke (1635–1703), father of microscopy, was the first to publish his observations in Micrographia (1665).

\textsuperscript{162} Mather here summarizes the research of Nehemiah Grew, William Derham, John Ray, Marcello Malpighi, Anton van Leeuwenhoek and many others who wrote on the subject. Mather covers much of the same terrain in his Christian Philosopher (“Essay 26,” pp. 131–3). See Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{163} See also George Garden’s Miscellanea Curiosa (1705–1707), vol. 1, pp. 143–49; and James Drake’s Anthropologia Nova (1707), bk. 1, ch. 25, pp. 334–36 (misnumbered 352) – both of whom discuss contemporaneous theories of generation and hybridization.
the Resurrection of the Dead, is called, The Filling of the Dead Bodies. [Psal. 110.6. and, Eph. 2.1.]

Quære. What Provision in the Case of Amputations? Whether a Seminal Principle seated in a Part of this original Animalcule which is yet unknown to us, may not be furnished by our Glorious and Almighty Creator, with a Plastic Vertue, to Renew what may be lost of it? Ulterius Inquirendum, aut forsan Ignorandum! However, I will here take Leave to transcribe some Words of Mr. Leibniz, whom one that was himself so, calls, One of the greatest Witts of Europe.164

“The most excellent Observators of our Time, have made me beleev, that Animals or any other organized Beings, do not begin to exist, when we think they do, and that their seeming Generation, is only an Unfolding, and a Kind of Augmentation. But the greatest Question still remains; What becomes of those Souls or Forms, after the Death of the Animal, or the Destruction of the organized Being? The only Way, left is to say, That not only the Souls, but also the Animals themselves, and their organized Machines are, preserved, tho’ the Destruction of the Gross Particles has reduced them to a Smallness, that is as imperceptible, as it was before they were born.”165 I will add, That some are of

164 This paragraph perhaps evidences that Mather was familiar with the startling discovery that crayfish and other crustaceans are able to regenerate lost limbs. The noted French biologist and entomologist René-Antoine Ferchault de Réaumur (1683–1757) published this discovery in “Sur les diverses reproductions,” Mémoires (1712): 223–45. For a modern discussion, see D. M. Skinner’s “New Limbs.” The Latin citation reads, “To be investigated further, or perhaps it must remain unknown.” The German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Freiherr von Leibniz (1646–1716) criticized Descartes’s materialist position that excepting human beings, animals are not endowed with a soul but operate on purely mechanical principles like primitive machines. Descartes’s provocative thesis was hotly debated at the time, and Leibniz countered his French colleague with his essay “Système nouveau de la Nature,” in Journal des Savants (27 June–4 July, 1695): 446–50, 457, by asserting that all living beings, by virtue of having a soul, are endowed with physical sensation and perception. In his biographical essay on Hieronymus Rorarius, Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), a French rationalist philosopher, literary critic, historian, and Huguenot refugee in Holland, praised Leibniz as “one of the greatest genius’s in Europe” and favorably cited Leibniz’s argument that ameliorated the extreme positions of Descartes and Rorarius. Mather here paraphrases Pierre Bayle’s commendation of Leibniz, which appears in Bayle’s famous Dictionnaire Historique et Critique (1696, 1701), which was first translated into English, in 1702, and subsequently appeared in multi-volume editions. Mather is likely to have been aware of the controversy over the invention of logarithms, in which mutual charges of plagiarism were traded between the disciples of Sir Isaac Newton and those of Leibniz (see F. E. Manuel, Newton Historian 30–33; R. Iliffe’s Newton 120–25). Finally, at this or a later point in compiling his “BA,” Mather may also have known of the famous Leibniz-Clarke correspondence (an epistolary debate between English Newtonians and Continental Leibnizians) on such epistemological concepts as God’s voluntarism, mechanical laws, gravity, and space and time. Samuel Clarke (1675–1729), rector of St. James’s, Westminster, published this exchange in his Collection of Papers (1717). For a discussion of the “Plastic Vertue” of the earth – a vitalist power of the earth much admired by the Cambridge Platonists – see W. B. Hunter, “Plastic Nature.”

the Opinion, that the Primitive Subject, unto which our Soul is united, goes out of our Body together with it, when we come to Die. Mr. Poiret thinks so; and beleeves that Moses, on the Day of our Saviours Transfiguration, appeared with the True Body which attended his Soul at his Departure from this Life: the \textit{Dead Body} was but a \textit{Rusty Cover}, he thinks, to that \textit{Subtil One}, unto which the Soul was firstly united. I must confess myself, at a Loss about these things.\footnote{Mather’s second-hand extract is from \textit{Cogitationes Rationalis (de Deo, anima & malo)}, “Appendice,” numero 1, (1685 ed.) 611, by Pierre Poiret (1646–1719), a learned French Protestant theologian; this extract also appears in Pierre Bayle’s biographical essay “Rorarius,” \textit{General Dictionary} (1734–40) 8:767, col. 2.}

And, what should now hinder, but that GOD, having at first created Numbers of \textit{Humane Bodies}, in these true \textit{Seeds} of them, there may be some among them, whose original \textit{Stamina}, may be much larger than others, and capable of being drawn forth, to the most \textit{Gigantic Extension}? God, for the Punishment of a wicked World, might order some of these \textit{Gigantean Stamina}, to enter the \textit{Bodies} of the Children of Men, perhaps in their \textit{Food}; and so ly ready to be brought forth, as the \textit{Propagation of Mankind} proceeded. Or, what should hinder their being all at first, in the Body of the First Man according to the Conjecture we have mentioned, on Gen. III.15. The \textit{Giants} thus brought forth, by Parents not exceeding the common Stature, were such a Plague unto the World, that if a \textit{Flood} had not exterminated \textit{Them}, they might in a while have exterminated all the rest, without a \textit{Flood}; Unto \textit{Them alone the Earth had been given, and no Stranger}, or common Man, \textit{had passed among them}.\footnote{Job 15:19.} It was most agreeable, That this Plague should come upon the World, in the Way of Generation; (as another ha’s done since:) and that when the Carnalities of the World were grown to a \textit{Gigantic Enormity}, they should be chastised with a \textit{Gigantic Posterity}. And that we now suffer no more of this Plague, as well as that it was once inflicted, is owing to that \textit{Vigilant} and \textit{Immediate PROVIDENCE of GOD}, which is employ’d about the \textit{Propagation of Mankind}: And whereof, the \textit{Proportion} of SEXES, the Difference of FACES, (to which I may, for a Third Instance add, what ha’s rarely been mentioned, The Variety of HANDS, written by the many Hundreds, all of whom learn to \textit{write} of the same \textit{Tutors};) are Instances that call for our Contemplation and Astonishment.

But I will proceed no further in the \textit{Speculation}; That I do proceed so far, may need a \textit{Pardon}.

\textbf{Appendix.}

After I had written the Foregoing \textit{Illustration}, I found in my Reading, That the \textit{Americans} in the Southern Regions, have Traditions of \textit{Giants}, who were fought by a Man descended from Heaven, that flung upon them Torrents of Fire. A Spanish Captain, who heard them tell the Story, had the Curiosity to dig
in the Place, where the Battel was fought, where he found Bones enough to make a Skeleton, the Teeth whereof were Four Inches Long, and Two Broad. Acosta relates, that another much larger was discovered at Mexico; for one of his Grinders, was as big as a Mans Fist, and the other Parts of the Body in Proportion. Lastly, other Bodies were found there, three times bigger than the ordinary Indians.


But, oh! the palpable Darkness, under which we are languishing! After I have given you, so fair an Hypothesis, as at first I thought it, about the Generations carried on in the Animal World, I must now run the Hazard of destroying it all again. I find myself obliged, for to transcribe from the Anthropologia nova of Dr. James Drake, a Passage, which will render my Hypothesis, at best but very dubious.

“This Hypothesis won’t account fairly & fully, for Mix’d Generation. For besides the vast Variety of Mongrel Dogs, there have been abundance of Observations of Mixtures of Animals of more remote kinds. That of a Bull and a Mare; which ha’s been often enough observ’d, to procure a particular Name, and is call’d a Gimar. But the most common of all these Animals, of mix’d Breeds, is the Mule, begotten by an Ass, upon a Mare. If this Hypothesis be true, the Sperm of an Ass, is full of little Asses, and the being nurs’d by a Mare should never make Mules of them; because the Species is predetermined, and the Creature is not only form’d, but living. I might perhaps, as Reasonably object,

168 Mather misspells Zárate as “Zaraet,” here silently corrected. Agostin de Zárate (1514–c. 1560), Spanish historian of Andalusia and imperial auditor to the Spanish crown in Peru, relates in his Historia del descubrimiento y Conquista del Perú (1555), lib. 1, cap. 5 (not 10), that giants lived among the ancient Peruvians. According to the remembrances of the Peruvian Indians, these cruel giants fed on vast quantities of fish, went naked, and were ultimately destroyed by flames of fire darted at them by a shining young man from heaven. The battle scars were still visible in the valley where the giants were vanquished. The Spanish Captain “Jhon [sic] de Holmos,” Lt. Governor of the port of Puerto Viejo, in 1543, visited the site and dug up great ribs, bones, a skull, and teeth, which were 3 fingers broad and 4 long. Mather extracts the story from the English translation of Zárate’s Historia, appearing as The strange and delectable History of… Peru (1581), bk. I, ch. 5, fol. pp. 6–7. The Carmelite Fray José de Acosta (1540–1600), whose famous Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias (Sevilla, 1590) was translated into English and appeared as The Natural & Morall History of the East and West Indies (1604), gleams from Agostino Zárate the same story of the Spanish captain at Puerto Viejo (Engl. ed., bk. 1, ch. 19, pp. 62–63), which Mather here summarizes. Acosta’s story of the giant grinders discovered in Mexico is related in Naturall & Morall History (bk. 7, ch. 3 [not 10], pp. 501–02) and serves Mather as further evidence of the biblical Nephilim. Finally, Joannes de Laet (1593–1649), Dutch geographer of Antwerp, tells his story of the giants in the Amsterdam edition of Notae ad dissertationem ... Hugonis Grotii, De origine gentium Americanarum (1643) 83. See also Samuel Purchas, Purchas his Pilgrims (1626), bk.9, ch. 6, § 2, pp. 922–93. A. Mayor explores the discovery of giant bones among Native Americans of the Northeast, in her Fossils Legends of the First Americans (2005), ch. 1.

169 “Gimar” or “gimmer” is an obsolete term for a one-year old ewe or “barren” mare (OED).
the Similitude that the Children of the same Parents bear to their Ancestors; Some to the Fathers line, and some to the Mothers. I know some Endeavour, to get over this Objection, by fancying that the different Matrix may have so much Effect, as to alter the Figure of the Animal so far, as may account for these Mixt Appearances. But this is so poor, so unphilosophical a shift, that it is not worth an Answer; and they might with as good Authority perswade me, that an Orange-tree translated from Sevil to England, would bear Apples; and so vice versâ. It is a common Practice in Gardening, to graft one Fruit, upon another Stock: But the Fruit still followes the Species of the Graft, or Cyon; & bear like the Parent Tree; not the Stock it growes upon.

“However old and exploded, the Opinion of a Plastick Power be, I must however embrace it; even tho’ I know not exactly wherein it lies: at least, till I meet with somewhat more sufficient to Resolve my Doubts, than hitherto I have done.”

[△Insert ends]

[▽Insert from 182v]

4207.

Q. That Passage, It Repented the Lord, that He had made Man on the Earth, and it Grieved Him at His Heart: How may we understand it? v. 6.

A. It is a notable Hint, which Munster ha’s; That it is to be understood concerning the Spirit of God, as exciting Regret and Sorrow in the Hearts of His Faithful People. Particularly, Noah who had the Spirit of God in him, seeing the Wickedness of the World, was by that Spirit stirred up to more than ordinary Grief. [Compare, Eph. 4.30.] Noah dolet et optat hominem potius non esse quàm sic malum esse. Munster proceeds, Quòd si ista referas ad voluntatem substantiæ Divinae, quòd Deus ab æterno hoc statuerit, Periculosa erit Disputatio de Prædestinatione, que suprà captum nostrum est. Tutius ergò est, ut consistamus in Humiliori

170 James Drake, M. D. (1667–1707), fellow of the College of Physicians of the Royal Society, published Anthropologia Nova (1707), which (among other things) explored new theories of generation and hybridization. Mather’s quotation is from vol. 1, bk. 1, ch. 25, pp. 334–35, 335–36 [misnumbered 352]. The idea of the “Plastick Power” of nature is derived from Plato’s concept of anima mundi (Timaeus), the theory that nature is endowed with a spiritual power that orders and shapes the size and growth of all biological life forms. Revived by the Cambridge Platonists to combat Cartesian materialism, the vitalist theory made a brief comeback, but was largely discredited by the end of the seventeenth century. In Mather’s time the English botanist John Ray (1628–1705) was one of its principal proponents in his popular Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation (1691), esp. pp. 31–40; Mather employs Ray’s vitalist argument at some length in his Christian Philosopher (Essay 26). For a helpful review of the vitalist debate in the seventeenth century, see W. B. Hunter, “Plastic Nature.”

171 See Appendix B.
locus, et sentiamus Noah, et alios patres summo Dolore affectos, postquam eis hanc Dei Iram Spiritus revelavit.172

Q. When the Occasion of the Flood is mentioned, we read, *It Repented the Lord, that Hee had made Man.* What Remarkable is there in that Expression? v. 6.

A. You know what the Expression intends. The Dispensations of God on this Occasion, were the Actions of one, who does Repent. But it is Remarkable, That Repentance is never ascribed unto God, but upon some Account of Man. As here, – & upon the Advancement of Saul; 1. Sam. 15.11 and upon the Destruction of Ninive. Jon. 3.10.

The Design hereof, is to preach Repentance unto Man himself. The Great God, ascribes unto Himself, that which ought to bee in Man, that Man, who alone is capable of Repentance, may learn his Duty from it. Compare, Jer. 18.8.

Q. That Expression *I will destroy Man, which I have created?* v. 7.

A. Our Translation will do better, to keep this Term in the Original; *I will blott out Man;* The LXX keeps it; απαλληψο· The Metaphor is taken from Writing, or Graving, or Painting. It may have reference to the Image of God pourray’d on Man, whom God had made after, His own Image. Because Man had by his wicked Imaginations depraved this Image, & instead of / יִהְיֶה יָשָׁר/ *The Good Image,* introduced / יִהְיֶה שֶׁרֶשׁ/ *The Evil Image;* the Lord threatens to Blott out all.173

---

172 The paragraph is extracted from *Biblia Hebraica* (1546), by Sebastian Münster (1489–1552), the German Protestant reformer and professor of Hebrew and theology at Heidelberg and Basel. The Latin citation from vol. 1:16, annot. (e), translates, “Noah grieved and wished that mankind did not exist, which would be preferable to its being so evil.” Münster continues, “Because if you refer this to the will of the Divine substance, since God had established it since eternity, it will be dangerous to discuss predestination, which is out of our reach. Therefore, it is safer that we should take a more humble position and agree with Noah and the other fathers who were affected by utmost grief, after the Spirit revealed to them the wrath of God.” In his “Note Book of Authors” (Gen. 6:5), Mather lists as his source “v. 5. Charnock, vol. 2,” which is *The Works Of the late learned Divine Stephen Charnock, B. D.* (1684), vol. 2, “A Supplement”: “A Discourse of the Sinfulness and Cure of Thoughts” (on Gen. 6:5) 2:1–19(second pagination series), by Stephen Charnock (1628–80), an English nonconformist minister in Dublin (Ireland) during Cromwell’s Interregnum and later practicing physician in London. For whatever reason, Mather excised Charnock’s excerpt altogether when he decided to drop his commentary on Gen. 6:5.

173 The Greek “apaleipso” (LXX Gen. 6:8 and 4 Kings 21:13)signifies “shall expunge” or “wipe out.” See also Paulus Fagius’s *Targum, hoc est, Paraphrasis Onkeli* (1546), on Gen. 6, note 5 (at end).
Q. These are the Generations of Noah? v. 9.
A. P. Fagius (on Gen. 37.2.) expounds the Word, which we translate, Generations, to signify, Events. It may therefore be translated, These are the Things which befel Noah & his Family.

Philo remarks, That Moses instead of recounting the Ancestors of Noah here, does reckon his Vertues.174

136.

Q. How far was the World peopled before the Flood? v. 12.
A. Ponder the Longævity of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, and you will not scruple to affirm it probable, That more People perished in the Flood, than there are now alive in the World. Lett us make a Computation, with as much Disadvantage, to our own Assertion, as can Reasonably bee desired. We‘ll abate Two or Three of the first Centuries, by which time, the World might bee supply’d with People not a few; & wee‘ll suppose a Man to have Children at Sixty, & in the Next Forty Years to have Twenty Children. Now single out the Shortest Liver of any mentioned (except Enoch;) before the Flood; and from that one Stock of Seven Hundred Years, multiplying still by Twenty, wee shall find the Produce to bee more than One Thousand, Three Hundred & forty Seven Millions: Thus that One Family, would long before the Flood, have afforded, it may bee more People, than are now living on the Earth. Moreover, If wee consider, that within a very few Centuries of Years after the Flood, Histories tell us of One Army, in which were Thirteen Hundred thousand Foot, Five Hundred Thousand Horse, One Hundred Thousand Chariots, & as many Camels; and This Army, encountred by a yett greater Force; it may facilitate our Beleef of the wonderful Populosity which might bee before. But indeed, I insist not upon this; for the Histories which tell us of these Armies, are not much to be relied upon.175

174 Mather’s sources are Simon Patrick’s annotation on Gen. 6:9 (Commentary 1:34) and Thargum, hoc est, Paraphrasis Onkeli Chaldaica (1546), a Latin translation with annotations of the Targum Onkelos by Paulus Fagius, aka. Paul Büchlein (1504–49), German Hebraist, professor of Hebrew at Strasbourg and Cambridge. Fagius’s rendering of “generationes” as “eventa” (events) appears in his unpaginated commentary on Gen. 37 (note 1). Mather inserted his reference to Philo’s Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin I (§ 97), in Works (81 2) at a later time.
175 Mather’s immediate source for this paragraph is unidentified. His delight in such calculations is also evident in his Threelfold Paradise (275–76), but Mather is no exception. Sir William Petty (1623–87), in his popular An Essay concerning the Multiplication of Mankind (1682, 1686, 1698), has much to say on the same subject. Similar computations about antediluvian populations appear in Thomas Burnet’s Sacred Theory (bk. 1, ch. 3, p. 36) and in William Whiston’s New Theory, fifth ed. (pt. 2, bk. 3, ch. 3, p. 249). Mather’s allusion to the epic combat between the two vast armies is to Diodorus Siculus (Bibliotheca historica 2.5.4, 2.17.1–2). This Graeco-Roman historian relies on Cresias Cnidian for these impossibly large troops, whose contradictory numbers are given in superlatives. Here we learn that the legendary Assyrian King Ninus led immense troops against his Bactrian foes. However, his spouse and heir Semiramis raised
Q. What Wood, was that *Gopher-Wood*, whereof the *Ark* was made? v. 14.

A. The learned *Nic. Fuller*, in his *Miscellanies*, hath observed, That it is no other, than that which the *Greeks* call, κυπαρισσος, *The Cypress Tree*. Taking away the Termination, *Cupar*, and *Gophar* differ very little in Sound. *Bochart* hath confirmed this Conjecture, by demonstrating, that no Countrey so abounds with this Wood; as that Part of *Assyria*, which was about *Babylon*; where *Arrianus* tells us, That *Alexander* built a *Navy* of these *Trees*; for, saies he, *There is great Plenty of these Trees alone, in the Countrey of Assyria, but of others fitt for making Ships, there is great Scarcity*. *Strabo* saies the same; From whence *Bochart* thinks it probable, that *Noah* and his Children lived in this Countrey before the Flood. Nor is it likely, that such a vast Bulk as the *Ark*, was carried far from the Place, where it was made. And the Mountains of *Ararat*, are upon the Borders of *Assyria* Northward; which Way the Wind blew (if there were any) in all Probability, the Rain coming from the South Sea.176

13.

Q. What further *Light* can you give about, *The Window of the Ark*? v. 16.

---

176 First and foremost an editor and synthesizer of other scholars’ ideas, Cotton Mather extracts this paragraph with little alteration from Simon Patrick’s annotations on Gen. 6:24 (*Commentary* 1:34), but Patrick himself draws on a wealth of information from his predecessors to whom he merely alludes by name. Nicholas Fuller (c. 1557–1626) was a learned English theologian who was rector at Waltham, Hampshire, at his death (ODNB). His *Miscellanea Sacra* (1617), lib. 4, cap. 5, pp. 492–93, is the source in question. The Greek word “kyparissos” signifies “cypress tree.” Samuel Bochart confirms the abundance of cypress trees in the area (*Geographia*, pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 4, col. 21–24), as do *Arrianus* (*Alexandri Anabasis* 7.19.4) and *Strabo* (16.1.11) Marcus Valerius Martialis (c. 38–c. 104 c.e), the Spanish poet of Bilbilis, asserts that gopher wood (cypress) is incorruptible (*Epigrammaton* 6.49.5; 6.73.7). Thus Bochart believes Noah lived in the area where cypress trees abounded (*Geographia*, pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 3–4, col. 13–24). In his letter to John Woodward (“Curiosa Americana,” first series, 1712), Mather conjectured that Noah’s Ark was built of “Shittim Wood” or “black Acacia,” also known as “the Juniperus arbor tetragonophyllus” common to the East-Indies,” in “An Extract of several Letters from Cotton Mather, D. D.” *Philosophical Transactions* 29 (1714–16) 6.
A. A learned Man, saies, The Hebrew Word, should bee Translated, rather, A Splendor, than, A Window. Whence hee infers, That God Ordered, or Directed Noah, to make some chymical Preparation, like the subterraneous Lamps known & used among the Ancients, to give Light unto the Ark. For the Air being then extremely darkened, with the Clouds of the excessive Rain, a Window could bee but little serviceable for the Transmission of the Light.177

Q. The Lord saies unto Noah; With thee will I establish my Covenant. What Covenant? v. 18.
A. Munster saies, Tis the Covenant made at the Beginning, about the Promised Seed, that was to break the old Serpents Head. This Covenant is now Renewed and Confirmed unto Noah, who now being assured, That the Messiah was to descend from him, he had an Assurance that God would have His Church continued among his Posterity.178

Q. What Footsteps of Noah, and of his Flood, can you find in Pagan Antiquity? v. 22.
A. Innumerable. But These among the rest.179

Berosus, the Chaldæan Priest, relates; how wicked the old World was, & how Noah warned them of their Wickedness & of the approaching Flood.

The fame of the Flood, & of the Ark, was every where, among the Pagans. Not only Berosus, quoted by Josephus; but Nicolaus Damascenus, by him also quoted, and Abydenus the Assyrian, quoted by Eusebius; Alexander Polyhistor,

---

177 Mather had addressed this issue before in his “The Introduction” to “BA.” The “learned Man” is Edmond Dickinson, M. D. (1624–1707), an English alchemist, whose Physica Vetus et Vera (ch. 20, §§ 7–9, pp. 324–26) Mather had mined before. The Hebrew word “tsohar” (Gen. 6:16) does signify “splendor” as well as “glistening light” and “window” [Strong’s # 6671, 6672]. According to Genesis Rabbah XXXI:11 (Gen. 6:16), R. Levi and R. Phineas argue that the word “tsohar” denotes “precious stone” or “polished gem,” a crystal which illuminated the ark throughout the year, dimming at day, but radiating at night. Simon Patrick appears to eschew supernatural explanations by suggesting that instead of “one great Window ... many little ones” might have supplied the ark with sufficient light (Commentary 1:34–35).

178 The source is Sebastian Münster’s annotation on Gen. 6:18, in Hebraica Biblia (1:18), annot. (a).

179 Even though Simon Patrick (on Gen. 6:17, in Commentary 1:35) and Nehemiah Grew (Cosmologia Sacra, bk. 4, ch. 2, § 12, p. 146) offer quite similar evidence from the ancients, Mather here extracts his entire commentary on Gen. 6:22 from John Edwards’s Discourse (103) 1:118–24.
Melo, Hieronymus Egyptius, Apollodorus, and all the Barbarian Historians, as Josephus tells us, have mentioned it.¹⁸⁰

Some call in question the Credit of these Writers; but, I am sure, they can’t question Lucian’s Dea Syria, where you’ll find most of the Passages in the Sixth & Seventh Chapters of Genesis; which Things, hee sais, the Greeks relate, out of their Archives of the Flood. I refer you to the Book it self.¹⁸¹

Plutarch also, (who, like Lucian, disguises Noah under the Name of Deucalion) reports the Egress and Return of a Dove, to signify the Decrease of the Waters, from whence likewise an Olive-branch, was in all succeeding Ages, made a Symbol of, Peace, Concord, and Friendship. Livy tells us, t was thus among the Greeks & the Carthaginians, and Polybius, with Instances of it, saies, πασι τοις βαρβαροις εστι συνθημα φιλιας. In that History wee also have a Narrative of the Raven; and from the same Original that Plutarch fetch’d his Report, wee may conceive that Elian had his; About Apollo’s employing a Raven, to bring him some fresh Water; in which Errand, he loitered on a certain Tree till the Figs grew Ripe. Tho’ Ovid, sais it was, an Apple-Tree;

Inmemor Imperij, sedisse sub arbore fertur,
Dum fierent Tardà dulcia poma morà.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Edwards (Discourse 1:118). Edwards’s own source for the Chaldean Berosus and for the peripatetic historian Nicolaus Damascenus is Josephus Flavius’s Against Apion (1.19) and Antiquities (1.5.6; 1.7.2). The Assyrian historian Abydenus, on whom Berosus draws frequently, is here cited by Eusebius Pamphilius (Praeparatio evangelica 9.12). The Greek ethnographer Alexander Polyhistor; Melo, who authored a tract against the Jews; the Phoenician historian Hieronymus Egyptius; the Greek chronicler Apollodorus of Athens (The Library 1.7.2; 3.8.2; 3.14.5), and a whole host of ancient historians — all mentioned in Josephus Flavius’s Against Apion I, or excerpted in Eusebius’s Praeparatio evangelica (9.11–2, 18–19) — are favorites among those who seek to allocate extra-biblical proof to verify the Noachic Flood by identifying Deucalion, son of Prometheus, with the biblical patriarch. Significantly, Seneca (Naturales quaestiones 3.27.1–3.30.8) believed that the Flood was not a past, but near, future event, and developed elaborate theories on how this deluge could come about through natural causation alone. If anything, Mather’s contemporaries Thomas Burnet’s Sacred Theory (1684) and William Whiston’s New Theory (1696) don’t have anything on Seneca in scientific sophistication of their explanations. In Mather’s time, the most exhaustive examination of this sort was worked up by the Dutch scholar Joannes Lomeier, whose De veterum gentilium (1681) argues that the biblical story of the Flood was the original blueprint for all the “corrupted” versions proliferated by pagan historians.

¹⁸¹ Edwards (Discourse 1:119). Edwards refers to the Greek author Lucian of Samosota (b. c. 120 ce), whose story of Deucalion’s flood (De Syria dea 12–13, Works 4:350–53) is generally read as a parallel account to that in the Bible.

¹⁸² Edwards (Discourse 1:119–0). Both Lucian (De Syria dea 12–13, Works 4:350–53) and Plutarch (Moralia: De sollertia animalium 968 F, line 4) call him Deucalion. This Greek Noah interpreted diluvial signs just like his biblical counterpart. When Deucalion “released a dove from the ark, as long as she returned, it was a certain sign that the storm was still raging; but as soon as she flew away, it was a harbinger of fair weather” (Plutarch’s Moralia 12:377). The Roman historian Livy (29.16.6 and 30.36.4) and the Greek Polybius Megalopolitanus point to the olive branch as a symbol of friendship. This is suggested by Polybius (Historiae 3.52.3.4), who argues that “all the barbarians use it [the olive branch] as a covenant of friendship.” Poly-
For which Neglect it is added, Apollo turn’d him into the Blackabird. And from hence probably tis, that Servius remarks it, as an Observation of the Ancients, That the Crowes are forgetful Creatures, forgetting sometimes to Return unto their Nests.

Briefly, Pagan Antiquitie, ha’s confounded, Ogyges with Deucalion, and both with Noah.183

And what Ovid relates, concerning Deucalion, with his Wife, betaking themselves unto their Devotions, after the Flood; it is but what Moses relates, of Noahs then erecting an Altar.184

Kircher thinks, that Nisroch [2. King. 19.37. Isa. 37.38.] is as much as, Numen Arce; & that it was the Image of Noahs Ark, worshipped among the Assyrians.

And, you know, Janus’s Coin, with a Ship upon it.

I only add; Quære, whether Prometheus were not one of the Names given to Noah, by the Ancients?185

Bius narrates the story of the ominous raven, in Historiae (1.22, 23, 27, 28). Claudius Aelianus (De natura animalium 1.47–48) relates that the sluggish raven waited until a field of corn (not figs) was ripe. Finally, Ovid tells us in his Fasti (2.255–56) that "Unmindful of his orders he [the raven] perched under the tree / to wait until the fruit should sweeten lingeringly."

Edwards (Discourse 1:21). The Roman grammarian and commentator Maurus Servius Honoratus (fl. 4th c. ce) alludes to the forgetful crow perched on an oak tree, in his commentary on Virgil’s Aeneid (12.246), In Vergili carmina commentarii (4.06). According to the OCD, the mythical King Ogygus, variously located in Boeotia (Pausanias 9.5.1), Lycia, Attica, and in Thebes (the latter city bearing the epithet Ogygian), is associated with a tremendous flood that inundated the region around Athens and Achaia, about the time of the OT Patriarch Abraham (A.M. 2140), in Edwards’s reckoning. Eusebius (Praeparatio evangelica 10.9.486c; 10.10.488d–489b) associates Ogygus with the primal Flood of Noah. In this respect, Ogygues reappears in Ovid’s Metamorphoses (1.318–94) as Deucalion, ruler of Thessaly, who with his wife Pyrrha, were the sole survivors of a flood that inundated his kingdom. This popular association of Noah with Ogygues, Saturn, Deucalion, Prometheus, and Janus – heroes all in Greek and Roman mythology – can also be found in Mathias Prideaux’s Essay and Compendious Introduction (1650) 5; in Edmund Dickinson’s Delphi Phoenicizantes (4–25); Joannes Bompartius’s Parallela sacra et profana (1689) 44–58; and in Gerard Vossius’s De Theologia Gentili (1641), lib. 1, c. 19, pp. 144–49.

Edwards (Discourse 1:22). Both Deucalion and Pyrrha implore the oracle of Themis for help, in Ovid’s Metamorphoses (1.318–23); Noah appeases his God by offering animal sacrifices on an altar (Gen. 8:20).

Edwards (Discourse 1:23). Edwards acknowledges as his source Athanasius Kircher (1601–80), renowned German Jesuit polymath, professor of mathematics, physics, and oriental languages at the Collegium Romanum, whose three-volume Eedius Aegyptiacus (162–54) attempts to decipher Egyptian hieroglyphics and the arcane symbolism of Egyptian temples. His discussion of Nisroch and Noah appears in this work, tomos 1, syntagma 4, cap. 21, pp. 376–84; Kircher also treats the story of Noah / Deucalion in his Arca Noë (1675), lib. 2, cap. 6, pp. 136–42, where Kircher replicates two coins of Roman Emperors Marcus Julius Philippus Augustus (244–49 ce) and of Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax (193–211 ce); the reverse sides of these coins depict an arklike box carrying Deucalion and Pyrrha, above whom are perched ravens or doves (Arca Noë 138). Numismatic evidence of this nature served as proof for Noah’s Flood as represented in pagan mythology. Kircher’s “Numen Arcae,” or “image of...
A Flood, was, according to them, in the Time of Prometheus; & Prometheus was by them reckoned the Restorer of Mankind. If they call’d him, The Son of Japetus, this is but one of their ordinary Confusions.

Was Prometheus chained by Jupiter, to Mount Caucasus, with an Eagle or Vulture, feeding on his Entrails? This is but more like the rambling Poets. Mount Caucasus, is Mount Ararat, on which the Ark rested; and the Raven, was the Eagle, or Vulture, whose actions, gave no little Motion to his Mind. And, if Prometheus had his Name from his Foresight; this was Noah all over, who being Warned of God, & moved with Fear & Faith, prepared an Ark.  

Q. Of that most famous Monument, The ARK, Lett us resume the Consideration; and assisted by an Exercitation of Heidegger, Lett us again consider many Circumstances, that relate unto it? v. 22.

A. A Noble and a Grateful Subject. Had it not been for the Third of Genesis, and the Fifteenth, a sinful World must have wholly perished by that time it arrived unto the Sixth of Genesis.

An ARK must be employ’d for the Præservation, and Reparation of Mankind, when a FLOOD swept away a sinful World before it.

date-185r

the ark,” is associated with the obscure Assyrian god Nisroch (shaped like a dove or eagle), in whose temple Sennacherib worshipped when his two sons assassinated him (2 King 19:37 and Isa. 37:38). For a recent study of Kircher’s significance, see P. Findlen’s Athanasius Kircher (2004). According to Rashi, the idol Nisroch was made from one of the boards of Noah’s ark (Rashi on Isa. 37:38 and Talmudic tractate Sanhedrin 96a). The two-faced Janus, Roman god of archways, is found on many ancient Roman coins, on whose reverse side an anchor or the prow of a ship are frequent motifs of Rome’s naval power. Prometheus, son of Japetus, taught man how to tame fire and grandfathered Deucalion, who built cities and temples, and was first to rule over men (Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica 3.1086–87; and Pindar, Olympian Odes 9.41–66) and is thus associated with the biblical Noah.

186 Edwards (Discourse 1:124–25). Gerard Vossius (De Theologia Gentili, pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 18, pp. 141–2), Theophilus Gale (Court [1672], part 1, bk. 2, ch. 6, pp. 72–73, §§ 4–5), and Samuel Bochart (Geographia Sacra [1707], pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 2, col. 10–13) discuss the parallels between Prometheus and Noah, and between Prometheus and Noah’s son Japheth. According to Hesiod (Theogonia 506–616), Prometheus (signifying “foresight”), son of Klymene and Japetus, is by Zeus (Jupiter) chained to a pillar as punishment for trying to outsmart him. During the day, a long-winged eagle feasts on Prometheus’s deathless liver, which regrows every night. Biblical commentators who maintain the primacy of OT history frequently associate Japetus, Prometheus, and Deucalion with Noah, who (like Prometheus) is endowed with prophetic foresight. The similarity of the names of Japheth (one of Noah’s three sons) and Japetus (Deucalion’s grandfather) suggests to many Christian apologists of Mather’s time the confusion of the pagans who, like Hesiod, allegedly borrowed much of their mythology from the Mosaic account. Warned by God, Noah is moved by faith and fear to build an ark (Heb. 11:7). Here ends Mather’s excerpt from John Edwards’s Discourse. D. C. Allen’s classic Legend of Noah (1949, 1963) is still one of the most enlightening studies of how scholars debated the evidence of Noah’s Flood from the Renaissance to the early eighteenth century.
But why called, An Ark, and not A Ship? The Reason is assigned by Aben Ezra; Quià non habuit formam Navis, neque in eà fuerunt Remi.187

Gopher, the Name of the Wood, whereof the Ark was composed, being one of the απαξ λεγομενα, Words but once occurring, in the Bible, it ha’s occasion’d much Disputation. But it is determined at length, for the Cypress tree; whereof Pliny tells us, That it is, Adversus cariem Tineasque firmissima: And Martial tells us, Nec sæcula centie{n}s peracta, Nec longe cariem timet senectae. For which Cause the Athenians, as Thucydides tells us, buried those who dyed serving their Coun-

187 Heidegger (1:320–340 [misnumbered 430], Exerc. XVII). The second-hand Latin citation from Ibn Ezra’s gloss on Gen. 6:14 appears in Heidegger (1:321, § 2) and reads, “because it [the ark] did not have the shape of a ship nor did it have oars” (Ibn Ezra, Commentary 1:D0). D.C. Allen’s Legend of Noah (chs. 7–8) summarizes the Renaissance debate on the size and shape of Noah’s Ark. In paintings and stone carvings of the period, the Ark generally appears as a “box or chest.” Since Noah is the OT type for the second Adam, the Ark was frequently portrayed as “a gravechest, like a sarcophagus, the funeral box in which the body of Christ was laid” (Legend 156). The English Hebraist John Lightfoot rendered the Ark as a rectangular three-story house with a pitched roof, in “A Chronicle of the Times,” Works (1684) 1:5. The most magnificent blueprint of Noah’s vessel, its interior compartments, and accommodation of the animals appears in Athanasius Kircher’s Arca Noë (1675), lib. 1, sec. 3, cap. 2, between pp. 46–47; cap. 9, between pp. 108–09; and cap. 11, between pp. 116–17.
trey, in Coffins of *Cypress*; διὰ τὸ ἀσηπτὸν εἶναι· Quia expers est putredinis.¹⁸⁸ Both *Arrian* and *Strabo* tell us, How plentifully that Wood grew in the Countrey where we may suppose the *Ark* to be built. And whereas *Pliny* informs us, That the *Cypress*-Tree was sacred unto *Pluto*, and employ’d at Houses of Mourning, about their *Funerals*; we will not accept the Causes for it, assigned by *Hadrianus Junius*, a Physician; but rather look on it, as an Inveterate Superstition of the Gentiles, in Commemoration of the *Ark*, which was a *Cypress-Coffin*, wherein Mankind lay buried, with unspeakable Sorrow and Horrour, for a Year together.¹⁸⁹

Of the *Pitch* employ’d about the *Ark*, *Aben Ezra* tells us, that some fly to an Arabic Interpretation. And of them who do so, *De Dieu*, and *Schindler*, take it to be the same that the *Arabians* call, *Caphura*, or, *Camphire*, which the Orientals use to preserve the Bodies of the Dead. So *Golius* likewise. But it seems not likely, that *Noah* could be supplied, with so vast a Quantity, as must be necessary for the *Ark*; of so costly a Material. But the *Pitch* employ’d about the little *Ark* of *Moses*, may lead us to the Nature of *That* which was employ’d about the Greater one of *Noah*.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ Heidegger (1:321–22, Exerc. XVII, § 3). Much of the same information appears is Simon Patrick (Commentary 1:34). The Greek phrase ἀπὰξ λεγομένα [apax legomena] suggests, “things once mentioned.” The signification of גַּם (gopher) appears only once in the Hebrew Bible (Gen. 6:14) and attracted many commentators, most of whom concur that the term suggests “wood from the cypress tree.” See Nicholas Fuller’s *Miscellanea* (1616), bk. 4, ch. 5, pp. 490–95 for the main argument and, of course, Matthew Poole’s indefatigable *Synopsis Criticorum* (1:82–83, Works 1:33–35) for a summary of the main combatants and their explanations: Jerome, Bochart, Buteo, Castalio, Drusius, Fuller, Junius and Tremellius, Menochius, Münster, Olearius, Veratius, and the Targums Onkelos and Jonathan vote for “gopher” to signify either “cedar,” or “pine,” “boxwood,” “fir,” “Juniper,” “Terebinth,” or “Cypress.” Indeed, the hermeneutical compass of these notable theologians points in many different directions. *Pliny* (16.81.22 3) relates that the wood of the pine and of cypress trees is “the strongest to resist rot and wood-worms.” *Martial* (6.49.5–6) agrees and claims that the cypress tree “fears not the passage of a hundred generations nor the decay of protracted age.” And the Greek historian Thucydides (c. 460/455–c. 395 bce), best known for his account of the Peloponnesian War (431–404 bce), relates in his *History* (2.34.3) that the Greeks buried their heroes in “coffins of cypress wood.” His Greek scholiast comments “διὰ τὸ ἄσηπτον εἶναι· (Scholia in Thucydidcs 2.34.3, line 1); Heidegger’s Latin translation reads, “Because it is immune to rotting.” Similar speculations are offered in Mather’s letter (Nov. 18, 1712) to John Woodward, secretary of the Royal Society, extracted in *Philosophical Transactions* 29 (1714–16) 58.

¹⁸⁹ Lucius Flavius *Arrianus* relates that Alexander the Great built his navy from these cypress trees (*Alexandri Anabasis* 7.19.4), and *Strabo* (16.1.11) mentions the relative scarcity of timber in Babylonia, except for “the cypress trees in the groves and the parks.” The sacredness of the cypress, its longevity, and its use in funerals are related in *Pliny* (16.60.13; 16.79.213–17); and *Ovid* (*Metamorphosis* 10.106–142). Both Heidegger and Mather reject the typological argument of *Hadrianus Junius*, aka. Adriaan *De Jonghe* (1511–75), Dutch physician, humanist, and educator, whose analogy between Noah’s ark, man’s mortality, and the longevity of cypress wood appears in his *Animadversorum libri sex* (1556), lib. 1, cap 20, pp. 53–55. Ibn Ezra (on Gen. 6:14) lists a variety of interpretations of כָּפַר [kaphar] “pitch” [Strong’s # 03722, 08804], but rejects on grammati-
The **Dimensions** of the Ark, were **Three Hundred Cubits** in Length; **Fifty** in **Breadth**; and **Thirty**, in **Heighth**. It was observed by the Ancients, that here was a notable Correspondence to the Proportions of an Humane **Body**. And **Austin**, in his Book, *De Civitate Dei*, flourishes upon it, with a **Comparison** between Christ and His Church. *Nam et Mensuræ ipse Longitudinis, Altitudinis, Latitudinisque ejus, significant corpus Humanum; in cuius veritate, ad Homines prænunciatus est venturus, et venit.*

But there have been many **Cavils**, about the Measures of these **Cubits**. **Apelles** of old complained, That a Structure no bigger than this, would hardly have carried **Four Elephants**. **Origen** therefore, to defend the History, pretends the **Egyptian Geometry**, according whereto **Six Cubits**, would be called **One**. **Capellus**, indeed would **Mend** the Reading in **Origen**, and not **Blame** it: making him say, **There were Six Feet in a Cubit**. But **Austin**, approves and applauds the Proposal of **Origen**; **Moyses scilicet, Hominem Dei eruditum, sicut Scriptum est, in omni Sapientiā Ægyptiorum, qui Geometricam dilexerunt, Geometrica Cubita significare potuisse, ubi unum quantum sex nostra valere asseverant. But this is a meer κρησφυγετον. The Ark, in this way of Measuring, would have been a Thousand and Eight Hundred **Vulgar Cubits** long; **Three Hundred** Broad; **One Hundred and Eighty**, High. Had the Ark been of such an enormous Magnitude, we should have had at least a little more Intimation of it, in the Sacred Scriptures; Nor is there Proof, that ever such large Measures, were called, **Cubits**, among the Ancients. Others have gone more modestly to Work; and have distinguished, the **Sacred Cubit**, and the **Vulgar Cubit**; making the former as large again as the latter. The best Foundation of this Distinction, is not, in the Dimensions assigned unto **Solomons Brasen Sea**, in the **Chronicles**; but in the Prophecies of

---

191 Heidegger (1:324, Exerc. XVII, § 7). D. C. Allen reviews the debate about the Ark’s size, in *Legend* (71–80). According to St. Augustine, whom Mather here quotes at second hand from Heidegger, the Ark mirrored the body of Christ in his human form: “For even its very dimensions, in length, breadth, and height, represent the human body in which He came, as it had been foretold” (*City of God* 15.26), in *NPNFi* (2:306). St. Ambrose develops this analogy at length in his *De Noé et arca*, cap. 6 [PL 14. 383–394].
Ezekiel: [ch. 40.5. and, 43.13.] where the Vulgar Cubit, is called, A Cubit; and the Sacred Cubit, is called, A Cubit, & an Hands Breadth.192

Jerom rightly observes; The Vulgar Cubit contain’d, Five Palms, or Twenty Digits; The Sacred Cubit, contained Six Palms, or Twenty Four Digits. But it appears not that the Sacred Cubit was considered, before the Law, under which there were Sacred Buildings erected unto the Lord.193

We will not concern ourselves, with Capellus distinction of Cubiti Majores, and Medij, and Minores; The Majores, he makes to be Three Foot; but the Pretensions for it, are too feeble to be insisted on. We will suppose Moses to intend the Common Cubit; the same that he calls: [Deut. 3.11.] The Cubit of a Man. It is very probable, That from the Body of Adam himself, the Measure was introduced.194

---

192 Heidegger (1:324–25, Exerc. XVII, § 8). Apelles, the heretic and disciple of Marcion, questioned the capacity of Noah’s Ark to accommodate pairs of all the animals of the earth; however, Origen defends the Ark’s dimension given by Moses, arguing that the Jewish Lawgiver (trained in the geometry of the Egyptians) used the Egyptian cubit, which is six times larger than the one commonly used (Homiliae in Genesim, “Homilia 2.2”) [PG 12. 161–67], and Homilies in Genesis (Hom. 2.2, pp. 75–77, n. 14,16). Similarly, the Epicurean Celsus laughs at the story of Noah’s Ark as a distorted version of Deucalion’s flood. Thus challenged, Origen (Contra Celsus 4.41) embarks on a mystical multiplication of the Ark’s size “nine myriads of cubits long in the base, and two thousand five hundred in breadth” (ANF 4:516). Mather here refers to Louis Cappellus’s linguistic retrenchment of Origen’s interpretation of the cubit, in Cappellus’s Commentarii et notae criticae in Vetus Testamentum (1689) 369–72. St. Augustine, however, was inclined to agree with Origen’s amplification of the cubit’s size, arguing (De Civitate Dei 15.27.3) [PL 41.474], “Moses the man of God, being, as it is written, ‘learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,’ who delighted in geometry, may have meant geometrical cubits, of which they say that one is equal to six of our cubits” (NPNFi 2:307). For much the same see Augustine’s Quaestiones in Heptateuchum 1.4 [PL 34. 549] and the rabbinic commentary Midrash Rabbah (Genesis XXXI:10). The Greek word κρησφύγετον [kresphygeton] signifies a (linguistic) “retreat” or “retrenchment.” In “An Essay for a Further Commentary, on the Sacred Scriptures,” appended to the end of “BA,” Mather measures the biblical cubit at 21.888 inches and the “hands-breadth” at 3.684 inches (Sec. III. “Tables”). These measurements, however, appear to disagree with those found in modern Bible dictionaries. According to SBD, Hebrew measures of length included the following units: one digit amounted to .7938 inches, one palm or hand to 3.1752 inches, a span to 5.5257 inches, and a cubit to 19.0515 inches. Mather repeats much of the same debate about the measurements of the cubit and the dimensions of Noah’s Ark in his annotations on Gen. 7:18 (below).


194 Heidegger (1:326–27, Exerc. XVII, § 11). Athanasius Kircher (Arca Noë, lib. 1, sec. 2, cap. 8–9, pp. 28–35) and Louis Cappellus (Commentarii et notae criticae 369–72) debate the Mosaic dimensions of the cubit and the proportions of the Ark based on those of the human body. Exact determinations, however, are notoriously difficult, because during the period of the Hebrew monarchy three different cubits were in use: “(1.) The cubit of a man (Deut. 3:11) or the common cubit of Canaan (in contradistinction to the Mosaic cubit) of the Chaldean standard; (2.) The old Mosaic or legal cubit, a handbreadth larger than the first, and agreeing with the smaller Egyptian cubit; (3.) The new cubit, which was still larger, and agreed with the larger Egyptian cubit, of about 20.6 inches, used in the Nilometer: and, secondly, that the ordinary cubit of the Bible did not come up to the full length of the cubit of other countries” (SBD).
There has been much Variety of Thought, upon that Passage: A Window shalt thou make to the Ark, and in a Cubit shalt thou finish it above. We will not spend any Time, in reciting & refuting the various Glosses, upon it. We will only give you the Opinion of our Heidegger. Two things are here ordered for the Studies and Labours of Noah. The First Thing he was to do, was, To bring Light and Air into the Ark. The Word, /\(\text{\textbf{\textit{rh'x}}}\)/, signifies, Light. Various Contignations must therefore be formed; which must be such, that the Light might come in, and yet Noah not be able (as we know) to look out. The other Thing he was to do, was to make a Covering for the Ark, which about the Middle, should Rise with an Obtuse Angle, about a Cubit above the Sides.195

The Door of the Ark, was probably made, not on the Side of the Breadth, as Pererius and Abulensis will have it, but on the Side of the Length, as Arias rather Judges; by which the Animals were more easily distributed unto their several Receptacles, on the Right and Left. And probably it was at least Five Cubits above the Sink, which the Ark had in the bottom of it.196

About the Several Stories in the Ark, and the Several Mansions in them, there are especially two Authors; namely, Buteo, and Temporarius, who have with much Sagacity made their Disquisitions.197

195 Heidegger (1:327–28, Exerc. XVII, §§ 12, 13) relies on the annotations of both Rashi on Gen. 6:16, in Mikraoth Gedoloth (1:98) and on Ibn Ezra (Commentary 1:D1) – with Rashi pointing to the disagreement among the rabbis. The term /\(\text{\textbf{\textit{tzohar}}}\)/ literally signifies “light,” but R. Abba ben Kahana specified a “skylight,” whereas R. Levi argued that “tzohar” signified a “precious stone” that dimmed during the day and shone during the night (Midrash Rabbah: Genesis XXX1:11).

196 Heidegger (1:330, Exerc. XVII, § 16). Benedictus Pererius, aka. Bento Pereira (1535–1600), a Spanish Jesuit of Valencia who worked in Rome, describes the dimensions of Noah’s Ark and its openings in his Commentarius et disputationes in Genesin (1607–10) 2:139–44. Abulensis, aka. Alonso Tostado (c. 1400–55), professor of theology at Salamanca and later bishop of Avila (hence Abulensis), wrote numerous theological and philosophical works. Mather refers to Tostado’s imaginative description of the Ark in Commentaria in Genesim, in Opera Omnia (1728) 1:25–52. And Benedictus Arias Montanus (1527–98), Spanish Orientalist, is famous for his contribution to the Antwerp Polyglot Bible Biblia Sacra, Hebraice, Chaldaice. 8 vols. (Antverpiae, 1571). Mather (via Heidegger) refers to Arias Montanus’s discussion of the Ark, in “Noah sive de arca fabrica et forma,” in Antiquitates Judicarum (1593) 71–79. Saidus Patricides (Eutychius) insists that the “Eastern Side,” in the middle of the Ark’s long side was the most logical choice for such an opening (Annales [1666], lib. 1, p. 36). See also Simon Patrick (Commentary 1:35). D. C. Allan, in his superb Legend (ch. 4), sketches much of the same debate.

197 Heidegger (1:380–31, Exerc. XVII, § 18). One of the most detailed and picturesque renditions of the Ark’s economy, its size, number of floors, compartments for the animals, storage, and living quarters for Noah’s family, appears in Athanasius Kircher’s famous Arca Noë (1675), lib. 1, sec. 2, cap. 9 through sec. 3, cap. 12, pp. 33–116(tabula). Mather is certainly aware of Kircher’s acclaimed source, but here goes along with Heidegger’s excerpts from Buteo, because Heidegger’s Historia Sacra Patriarcharum (1667–71) appeared before Kircher’s work was published. For much of the Renaissance, Buteo’s De arca Noë (1554) was the standard work on the Ark, primarily because Buteo demonstrated mathematically that Noah’s vessel was spacious enough to accommodate pairs of all antediluvian land animals in need of saving. Buteo, aka. Jean Borrel (c. 1492–1572), famed French mathematician, philologist, and abbot.
Buteo makes a Fourth Story of the Ark; namely, The Sink; which he supposes left unmentioned by Moses, because, it was no proper Habitation. And he thinks, a Ballast was necessary to be lodged here. In the Story above this, he places the Quadrupeds, and Reptiles, and assigns their several Quarters unto them. He allotts the Story above That, wholly unto Provisions, of Corn, and Hay, and Water, & what was needful to præserve the Lives of the Animals aboard. And here was the large Door, at which all the Creatures entred. Probably from the Repositories of the Provisions here, there were Tubes, by which the Food was conveniently convey’d down into the several Apartments of the Animals, below. The Men were with the Birds, in the Upper Story of all. On which the Covering, a little sloping, to the Value, that is, of a Cubit, was imposed.198

According to Temporarius, there were in the Lowest Part of the Ark, certain Dens made, for every Species of Quadrupeds and Reptiles; with such Alleyes between them, that Men might walk to look after them; and such Outletts, that the Excrements might easily be swept away, into the common Sink among the Ballast. In the Middle Part of the Ark, he also lodges all sorts of Agreeable Provisions; with Spaces, that rendred the several Granaries (as we may call them) accessible. And he contrives diverse Passages and Instruments, by which the Meat and the Drink might be lett down unto the Animals. In the Highest Part of the Ark, he assigns Chambers for the Men, and for the Women; an Hearth for a Coal Fire, and all the Necessaries of a Kitchen. And all such Tools, as Noah foresaw could not presently be recovered for Humane Uses after the Flood, might here also be præserved. I am sorry, we have no more of the Books, which here likewise might have their Præservation. But, why should I say so? The wise Dispensation of Heaven, would allow us no more, than what served as Materials for the Mosaic History. Above, he finds Nests for the Birds; even above the Floor, that was over Noahs Head; between That, and the sloping Top of the Ark. This ingenious Gentleman, proceeds with the whole Work of the Ark; and ingeniously directs a Carpenter how to frame & build one; he offers the whole Process of such an Edifice. But, because tho’ his Contrivance be very good, yett the Conjecture that Noah went just this way to work, is very arbitrary; and because, we are assured

---

198 Buteo’s exposition of the Ark’s layout (De arca Noë 5–30) seems so much more detail-oriented than those of Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 23) and of Saidus Patricides (Annales [166], lib. 1, pp. 35–40), which neglect to account for storage space for a year’s provision and for the sewer. See also Simon Patrick on Gen. 6:16 (Commentary 1:35).
we shall never have the like Occasion, for the like Peece of Architecture, I will
not be at the Pains to consider it.\textsuperscript{199}

It is quæstionable whether the Ark were built on that Side of Caucasus,
which looks toward India, as Temporarius will have it; and as the Mahometans
are of Opinion, one might rather suppose the Ark to be built near the Gordiean
Mountains, where we find it resting after the Flood; For, it was not a Vessel
made for Sailing: And probably what Way it made, it made unto the Northward;
For the Ocean, whose Irruption drown’d Assyria and Armenia, came rolling in from
the Southward. It is most credible, That the Ark was built in Chaldea, near to
Babylon; unto the Northward of which we find Armenia; and whither Men soon
returned, after the Flood.\textsuperscript{200}

But if we have the Place, can we as easily come at the Time, which Noah
took for building this admirable Structure? To pass by the Seventy Eight Years
allotted for it, by the Fabulous Berosus, the common Opinion of the Fathers was,
(and the Arabians fall in with them,) That Noah was One Hundred Years about it.
They gather it from this; That upon the mention of Noahs being Five Hundred
Years old, there followes the Command for Building of the Ark; and we know,
at Six Hundred Years old, he entred it. Heidegger will not own any Solidity in
the Argument. For, after the mention of Noahs being Five Hundred Years old,
some things are mention’d, which occur’d long before. But then, it seems plain,
That the Sons of Noah were married, when the Command for the Building of the
Ark was given him. And yett the Sons of Noah were not born, when he was
Five Hundred Years old. Yea, the Command for the Building of the Ark, seems to
be given at the End of that Hundred and Twenty Years, which the merciful God
allow’d, for the Probation of the World, whether they would Repent or no, after
He had given a solemn Warning, of His Purpose to destroy the World for their

\textsuperscript{199} Heidegger (1:31–32, Exerc. XVII, § 19) here excerpts Temporarius’s \textit{Chronologicarum demonstrationum} (lib. 1, pp. 32 ff). Mather’s misgivings about the loss of any antediluvian books in the Flood bespeaks his bibliolatry as much as his angst over losing civilization’s libraries in the Conflagration of Christ’s Second Coming: “In the Midst of the Desolations,” Mather lamented, “there has been scarce any thing, that some whom I know, would more beg to be spared, than the Libraries. Their most Pathetical Cry would be, \textit{Oh! Spare the Libraries}!” (Treefold Paradise 241). Similarly, when his third wife’s creditors tried to seize his prized possession, his private library of more than 3,000 volumes, Mather wailed, “My very Library, the Darling of my little Enjoyments, is demanded from me.” Perhaps realizing his unseemly affections for worldly possessions, he quickly compensated for his error in judgment: “Tis inexpressible, how much this Condition pleases me, gladdens me” (Diary 2:708; see also Diary 2:745, and Paterna 42).

\textsuperscript{200} Heidegger (1:32–33, Exerc. XVII, § 20). Temporarius has the Ark built on the E side of the Caucasus mountains in Armenia (\textit{Chronologicarum demonstrationum}, lib. 1, pp. 32 ff). For the opinions of the “Mahometans,” which Mather here summarizes at second hand, Heidegger (vol. 1, Exerc. IV, § 71, pp. 105–106) draws on John Selden’s \textit{De Synedriis} (1650), lib. 1, cap. 11, esp. pp. 450–54. The Gordian Mountains as the resting site of Noah’s Ark are mentioned in Berosus’s \textit{Babylonica} (fragm. F4a), extant in Syncellus (\textit{Ecloga Chronographica} 55), in G. Verbrugghe, \textit{Berosos and Manetho} (50). Ptolemy (Geographia 5.12; tabula Asia III) locates them in Asia Minor, now SE Turkey, near the modern border between Syria and Iraq.
Wickedness, if they Repented not. Probably therefore, the Ark was dispatched in less Time, than has commonly been thought for. Shem was married before the Ark was begun; and his eldest Son was born Two Years after the Flood.201

But Eight Persons were admitted into the Ark. Berosus will tell you, that the Name of Noah’s Wife, was Tytea, and the Three Daughters in Law, were Pandora, and Noella, and Noegla. Epiphanius disputing against the Gnosticks, by whom the Wife of Noah was called Noria, saies her true Name was Barthenon. Patricides, from the Oriental Traditions tells us, That All Noah’s Three Sons married the Daughters of Methuselah; Shems Wife was called, Thalita, or, Thaliba; Chams Wife was called Nachilathab, and Japhets was called, Arlisista. The Erythraean Sibyl brags, That she was Noah’s Daughter-in-Law, & was with him in the Ark. But the Assertions and Oracles of that Lady, are not much to be relied upon. The Mahometans make Fourscore Persons in the Ark. And the Traditions of those Infidels are not much to be wondred at. But it is a little wonderful, that a Christian Poet, namely Constantinus Manasses, should add unto Moses’s and Peter’s Number in the Ark; and make Daughters of Noah, and Sons-in-Law, that should be their Husbands, there; θυγατέρες, καὶ νυμφίοι θυγατέρων.202


202 Heidegger (1:34, Exerc. XVII, § 23). Even though Heidegger, Mather, and most of their peers roundly rejected Annius of Viterbo’s spurious “Berosus,” Antiquitatum variarum volumina (1408), pp. f–ii(v) – i–ii(r), Mather (via Heidegger) is too intrigued by Annius’s details, which give the names of Noah’s wife and daughters-in-law as “Tytea,” “Pandora,” “Noela,” and “Noegla” (p. f–iii[r]). The names of the female occupants of Noah’s Ark are also given in Richard Lynche’s translation of Annius, in An Historical Treatise (1601), sign. B(r)-Bi(v). St. Epiphanius (Panarion 26.1.1–9) rejects the claim of the Gnostics that Noah’s wife was called “Noria” (Noria) rather than “Barthenon” (Barthenos) in his Epiphanius (1:276, lines 6–7). Patricides, better known as Eutychius (Patriarch of Alexandria), renders the name of Shem’s wife “Salit,” of Ham’s wife “Nablat,” and of Japheth’s wife “Arisisah,” in Patricides, Annales (1666), lib. 1, p. 35; see also Hottinger’s Smegma Orientale (cap. 8, p. 245). The Erythraeans, the fifth of the ten different Sibyls (prophetesses) who predicted the future in various times and places, denies she is the offspring of the goddess Circe and of Gnostos, but identifies herself as the daughter-in-law of Noah (Oracula Sibyllina 3.815–27). Controversial as the Sibylline Oracles were in Mather’s time, William Whiston defended their authenticity in Vindication of the Sibylline Oracles (1715). Heidegger identifies as his source Achmetidis Paraphrasi in Alcoranum, which insists that besides Noah and his immediate family, their seventy-two servants also entered
There was a Distinction between the Clean and the Unclean Creatures, received into the Ark. The Jewes think, There is a Prolepsis in this Distinction; of a Matter not actually considered until the Law of Moses. Yea, they say, a great Part of that Law, was long before anticipated, in the Practice of the Faithful. It seems, That even in the Dayes of Noah, some Animals were thought Clean, and fitt for the Altar, (and from hence Heidegger gathers, for the Table also:) and others were thought Unclean, which even Tacitus calls, Feda et Profana: And it is likely that Noah was not without a Divine Direction for it.203

The Clean Creatures, were introduced, (as the Hebrew has it,) Seven, Seven; and of the Unclean, only, Two, Two. Justin Martyr hence concludes, There were Seven Males, and Seven Females, Fourteen of every Clean Sort. And Origen favours the Notion. But Josephus is of the Opinion for no more than Seven Individuals. And so is Austin, and Ambrose, and Jerom. A greater Number, would have encumbered the Ark too much. And this number might suffice, for Sacrifices; yea, and for some Food also; besides a sufficient Number left for the Conservation of the Species. Theodoret was in the right, for the Odd one, of the Seven; Unum Animal reliquum ad sacrificandum. Heidegger thinks, one Pair, was for Propagation; another Pair, was for the Nourishment of those that were in the Ark; a third Pair was for the Oblations that were to be offered, while they were yett in the Ark; and an odd Seventh, to be Sacrificed, at their coming out.204

the Ark. Finally, Mather abbreviates Heidegger’s Greek citation from Compendium chronicum (427 and 428), a chronology of Byzantine emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, by the Byzantine poet historian Constantinus Manasses (d. 1187). The citation signifies “daughters, and daughters’ bridegrooms.” According to Gen. 7:7 and 1 Peter 3:20, only eight members of Noah’s family entered the Ark.

203 Heidegger (1:384–35, Exerc. XVII, §24). The question of how Noah was able to distinguish clean from unclean animals – a distinction not established until the times of Moses – occupied many Hebrew commentators. According to Rashi, “Noah studied the Torah,” which had been passed down from Adam via Seth and Enoch to Shem, Noah’s son (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:D2). A more miraculous explanation is offered by R. Hisda: Noah led the animals alongside the Ark, and “those which the Ark accepted were certainly clean; those which the Ark rejected were certainly unclean” (Talmudic tractate Zevachim 116a). A “Prolepsis” or “anticipation” of later events is also identified by Ibn Ezra on Gen. 6:18 (Commentary 1:D3–D4) and in Mikraoth Gedoloth (Genesis 1:D0). The Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus distinguishes between “defiled and unholy” animals (Historia 4.60.2).

204 Heidegger (1:385, Exerc. XVII, §25). The literal meaning of the Hebrew words שבעה עזים (shib’ah, shib’ah) signifies “seven seven” [Strong’s # 7651]. Rashi makes the same point (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:D2). Mather (via Heidegger) refers to Pseudo-Justinus Martyr’s Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos (p. 416, sec. C, 9–11; sec. D, 5–8). Origen implicitly agrees in his Homilies on Genesis (Hom. 2.2, pp. 75–76). Josephus Flavius seems a bit ambiguous on this point and argues that Noah took into the Ark “all sorts of living creatures, the male and his female, for the preservation of their kinds; and others of them by sevens” (Antiquities 1.3.2). St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei 15.27.4) [PL 41.474–475] and NPNFii (2:307–8), Ambrosius Mediolanensis (De Noë et arca, lib. 1, cap. 12, §§39–40) [PL 14.378], and St. Jerome (Contra Jovinianum, lib. 2) – all agree that only seven individuals (3 pairs of male and female, and 1 odd one for sacrifice) are meant here. Theodoret (Quaestiones in Octateuchum: Genesis. Quest. 50, p. 48, line 16) argues that “one animal [was] left over for
It may be wondered, how Noah could make his Collection of all these Animals. The Fancy of Hugo de S. Victore, cited by Buteo, won’t agree well with the Sacred History; That as the Flood increased, the Distressed Creatures came flying and floating about the Ark, where Noah stood ready to take them in. Philo thinks, that before this, they did, by a marvellous Providence of God, come to Noah, of his own Accord. And it is plain, They must miraculously many of them lay aside their Ferocity. Could some of the Antediluvian Giants have been hired by Noah, to hunt for him, they might have done much in a little Time, to assemble the Animals; But the Phrase used for this Matter, is remarkable; They went in unto Noah; It is not said, That he Caught them and Brought them. R. Eliezer saies, That the Angel who is by God placed over each of the Species of Animals, brought unto Noah, the Species that was under his Charge, and the Food that was to nourish them. But, what should hinder the Spirit of God, who works all in all, from adding this unto the Instinct of the several Animals, on this Occasion; That they should come of their own Accord, unto the Place of their Conservation. Hence R. Solomon Jarchi, upon the Text, They went in unto Noah, adds, \( \text{̃}hylam à Semet ipsis.\)

There was Food laid in for the Animals. But what Food for the Carnivorous? κυνι δίδοναι αχυρα; And yet, it would have been a wretched Ministry, for Noah, to have kept killing for the Flesh-Eaters a Year together; if there could have been Flesh enough laid in for the Devourers. Austin handles this Quæstion; and he saies upon it; Quod potius credendum, præter carnes aliqua alimenta esse potuerunt, the sacrifice.” According to Mikraoth Gedoloth (Genesis 1:12), R. Sifthei Chachamim offers the same explanation as Theodoret does, but Genesis Rabbah (XXXII:4) and Ibn Ezra, on Gen. 6:20 (Commentary 1:25) insist that God intended seven pairs of “seven males and seven females from every clean animal and fowl because they were needed for sacrifices.” Heidegger’s interpretation (1:35, Exerc. XVII, § 35) is within the safe parameters of Rabbinic and Patristic tradition.

205 Heidegger (1:36–37, Exerc. XVII, § 27). Joannes Buteo’s De arca Noë, in Opera geometrica (1554) 27–28, refers to De arcà Noe moralì et mysticà [PL 176. 6279], a work by Hugo of St. Victore (c. 1097–c. 1141) a German Augustinian monk, early mystic, and professor of theology in Paris. The best early edition of his collected works is Opera Omnia, tomi tres (1526). Hugo may have drawn on the same sources as Rashi (Gen. 7:9), in Mikraoth Gedoloth (Genesis 1:12), as Ibn Ezra (Gen. 6:20, 7:7), in his Commentary (1:15, 107), and as Ramban, in his Commentary (1:113,116),since they all offer much of the same elucidation. In his Adnotationes in Pentateuchon, cap. 7 (on Gen. 4) [PL 175. 45A], Hugo of St. Victore further adds that before the Flood, even wild animals could be touched. Philo Judaeus explains how the animals – domestic and wild – came to Noah voluntarily without harming each other (De Vita Mosis 2.12.61–62; Works 497). According to Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 23, p. 167), the giant Og, king of Bashan, survived the Flood by clinging to a rung of the ladder or to the gutter of the Ark; Noah fed him daily through a hole while the deluge inundated the earth. Mather may have had this giant in mind, or the angelic agency, mentioned by R. Eliezer (Pirke, ch. 23, p. 166), by which means the animals were hunted down and brought into the Ark. Finally, R. Solomon Jarchi, better known by his acronym Rashi, suggests in his commentary (Gen. 7:9) what many others have said before and after him: the animals came on their own, “by themselves” (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:12).
que omnibus convenirent. There may be found a Food, which the Carnivorous Creatures may subsist upon; when there cannot any Flesh be gotten for them. He saies, He ha’s known them feed upon Fruits, especially Figs and Chestnuts. And probably Noah was instructed from Heaven, what Fruits would best suit the several Animals; and when Hunger compelled them, they would soon be Reconciled unto such Things, as they had not formerly been used unto. At least, the same Touch from Heaven upon them, that caused them on this wonderful Occasion to putt off their Ferocity, might as easily bring some Alteration upon their Appetites. Philostratus tells of Lion in Egypt, which would enter the Temples, and not so much as lick the Blood of the Sacrifices there, but live upon Bread, and Sweet-meats, and Honey-cakes.206

And Sulpitius Severus, visiting a Monk at Thebes, was horribly frighted at the Sight of a Lion upon a Tree, whither he was carried by his Friend; but came out of his Fright, when he saw the Lion feeding on Apples, which he took very tamely from the Hands of the People there, and then went his Way. J. Phocas tells of the Lions about Jordan, that would come like Dogs, to Ierus the Anchorite; and he Fed them, with, Madefacta legumina, aut forte olyrites, aut panis hordeacei frusta. And we have a shrewd Intimation, that the Creatures were fed after this Manner in the Ark; in those Words of the Prophet, which allude unto it; Isa. 11.6, 7.The Lion shall eat Straw like the Oxe.207

But after all; was the Ark of Capacity enough, to hold all the Animals for which it was provided? Celsus of old, cried out upon the Absurdity of the Supposition. And the Primitive Hereticks cavilled at it. But the Absurdity of their Cavils, is eternally confuted by the Demonstrations of Temporarius. We need not allow him, his Computations of the Animals provided for the Mawes of the Carnivorous; because we have more easily provided for them. Nevertheless, we

206 Heidegger (1:37, Exerc. XVII, § 28). Mather’s second-hand Greek citation from Heidegger “κυνὶ διδόναι ἂχυρα” can be rendered, “the dogs feed on straw.” Ibn Ezra (on Gen. 6:20) at first rejects questions of this nature as foolish, but then argues that “One who cannot find meat will eat grass or fruit when hungry” (Commentary 1:105). St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei 15.27.5) [PL 41.476] argues that it “is more probable, there might be some food which was not flesh, and which yet suited all” (NPNFi 2:308). In his Vita Apollonii (5.42.1–2), Flavius Philostratus of Lemnios relates how Apollonius of Tyana encountered a domesticated lion in Alexandria (Egypt), who lived on cakes, bread, and fruit, dressed meat, and occasionally indulged in vino veritas without ill effect. When the sage Apollonius of Tyana revealed to the priests that the lion was none less than the reincarnated soul of King Amasis of Egypt, the animal wailed, burst into tears, and was subsequently consecrated to the temple of Leontopolis.

207 The Latin historian and Christian convert Sulpicius Severus of Aquitaine (c. 360–c. 420 ce) relates his story of the monkish lion of Thebes, in “De Monacho Thebaidis” (Dialogi 1.7), in Opera Omnia quae extant (1666). For a similar tall tale of the monk and the lions, see Sulpicius Severus’s Dialogues (1.5), in NPNFii (11:31–3). The monastic pilgrim Joannes Phocas (fl. late 12th c), in his Descriptio Terrae Sanctae (cap. 23 [PG 133.927–962]), gives a much prized description of Palestine. A dual Greek-Latin edition of his work appeared in Colonia, 1543. The unidentified Ierus the Anchorite fed his lions “either moistened vegetables, or perhaps rye, or crumbs of crust of barley loaf.”
will go upon his Computation; because it will Ex abundanti demonstrate the Capacity of the Ark, to entertain all the Creatures it was intended for. He reduces all the Greater Quadrupeds, of the Tame Sort, in the Ark, to the Proportion of about 45 Pair of Oxen; but for a more fair Concession, we will suppose them equal to 60 Pair of Oxen. He reduces the Lesser Quadrupeds of the Tame Sort, unto the Proportion, of about 40 Pair of Sheep. He reduces all the Carnivorous Quadrupeds, unto the Proportion of 32 Pair of Wolves. But suppose them 40.

Allow one Sheep a Day for each of them; and a Years Allowance will be 3650 Sheep. Now for Stables for all of these in the Lower Story of the Ark. He finds, That Sixty Stables, each 5 Cubits Long, & 4 Broad, might stand on One Side of the Ark; suppose the Side over against the Door. Then, on the same Side with the Door, you may on the Right hand, have no less than Forty Folds, each 3 Cubits square. On the Left Hand you may have also Forty Dens; each between 4 and 5 Cubits Long, and 3 Broad. There are now left 6 Cubits of the Length of the Ark, for a Gang Way between the Right and Left Stabulations; by which there was a Passage to the Stables of the first Rank; which was to be separated from the second, by a Way Three Cubits Broad. There yet remain Forty Cubits, of the Breadth of the Ark, in which the Sheep for Food, might most easily be disposed of. Let there be allotted for these, a Third Order of Stables, adjoined unto the Second; unto which we leave a Passage, 5 Cubits broad, on the same side with the Door of the Ark, that so, for the whole Length of the Ark, there may be an easy Access to every one of the Receptacles. There now remain 35 Cubits of the Breadth of the Ark, which drawn into 294 Cubits of the Length of it, make 14290 Square Cubits; a Space much more than the 3650 Sheep would call for. For if you distribute no more than 10290 Cubits, among 3650 Sheep; they will each of them have near three Cubits a Piece to dwell upon. But what need such Gregarious Animals to be so separated? They might all be in Two Sheep-folds well enough disposed of. We have now abundance of Spare Room left in the Lower Story, besides what might be found over the Tops of the several Cabins; where an unknown Quantity of Provisions, might also be disposed of.  

Heidegger (1:338–40, Exerc. XVII, §§ 29, 30). Origen’s adversary Celsus, the 2nd-century philosopher, who derided the Mosaic Flood narrative as an absurd derivation from Deucalion’s deluge (Αληθῆς λόγος [True Discourse] 1.17–21; 4.11–21ff, and On the True Doctrine 55–56, 77), is targeted in Origen’s Contra Celsum (4.41–42), in ANF (4:516–17). Even more generous calculations of the Ark’s dimensions, capacity, and number of animals, are offered in Buteo’s De arca Noë, cuius formae, capacitatisque, in Opera Geometrica (1554) 17–18. Matthew Poole crunches the same numbers and tabulates the animals in Synopsis Criticorum (1:83–92, Works 1:36–65); and Athanasius Kircher catalogs all—down to the smallest insect that entered the Ark, in his magisterial Arca Noë (lib. 1, sect. 3, cap. 2–12, pp. 46–116). Heidegger (1:338) identifies such heretics as the Marcionites, Valentinians, and Gnostics who caviled at the story of Noah’s Ark. Mather (via Heidegger) synopsizes Johannes Temporarius’s detailed description of the Ark’s capacity, compartments for the animals, and storage facilities (Chronologicarum demonstrationum). The learned English Hebraist John Lightfoot is also preoccupied with the capacity of the Ark to sustain life, and estimates “450000. square cubits within the walls of it,” Cotton Mather, Biblia Americana, Volume 1: Genesis, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2010. Used by permission.
But for Provisions, our Temporarius will have the entire Middle Story; and he is willing to leave as much Room as may be, in the Lower Story, that so the Respirations, and Exhalations of the Animals might not be too much incommoded. The Carnivorous Animals, are indeed below already provided for. But however, we must now provide Food for 3650 Sheep, that we lodged below. And the Number of the Sheep continually decreasing by Slaughter, we need consider them, according to the Rules of Logistical Progression, as being æqual to no more than the Number 1820 for all the Year about. Unto these 1820 you will join the 80 proposed as the Proportion, of all the Lesser Quadrupeds of the Tame Sort, to be preserved for Propagation. These will make 1900. Suppose the Aliment of Seven Sheep, to be equal unto that of One Ox. Thus 1900 Sheep will æqual 271½ Oxen. These added unto the 120 Oxen which we formerly proposed, as the Proportion for the Larger Quadrupeds of the Tame Sort, will amount unto 392. Grant them 400. And Feed them for a whole Year, with Hay; which will not ly in so little room, as Grain, and other Food ordinarily provided for them. Oxen that are not wrought, can easily Subsist on 20 Weight of Provender, per Day. But wee’l be liberal; wee’l allow them 40 Pound Weight; which is the largest Measure that Columella [allows] for them, in March and April, when the Plough is going all the day. This 480 Ounces. Now, a Solid Cubit, will contain 40 Pound of press’d Hay. Well; Four Hundred Oxen, will then in a Years Time consume 146000 Cubes of Hay each consisting of such a Solid Cubit. But the Middle Story of the Ark, 300 Cubits Long, 50 Broad, 12 High, (for so High, Temporarius will have it,) will contain 180000 of such Cubes. Behold then, 44000 such Cubes left empty for you.209

About the Upper Story of the Ark, there is no Shadow of a Difficulty. You will find there, 90000 Solid Cubits. The Birds might have room enough to Nest, yea, and to Fly also in so large a Space.

And so much for this Matter.

I will now no longer converse with my Heidegger, as I have done in most of the Thoughts, that I hav e hitherto given you.210

I will proceed unto another Consideration of the ARK; and say with Nazianzen;

Ζητω Νωε κιβωτον οπως μορον αινον αλεξω.

in “A Chronicle of the Times,” Works (1684) 1:5. Efforts of this nature reveal how much the theologians of the day felt pressured to prop up the Mosaic narrative with feasibility studies to redress the rising skepticism among the ancients and the moderns.

209 Heidegger (1:340, Exerc. XVII, § 30). Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella of Cadiz, Spain (fl. 20–60 ce), Latin author of a Roman handbook on agriculture, details the quantity and types of feed for oxen during the various seasons of the year in his De re rustica (11.2.9–101): chaff and vetch, chickpeas, hay, oak leaves, barley, poplar leaves, fig leaves, mast, and lupines – all in specified quantities and mixtures.

210 Mather’s “conversation” with Heidegger hardly ends here, for just a few manuscript pages later (Gen. 8:19) he resumes mining Heidegger’s Historia Sacra Patriarcharum.
Quæro Ratem Nohæ ut mortis discrimina Vitem.

I will now consider the ARK, as a Type of the CHURCH. I will sing;

Ecclesiam pro Nave gero; mihi Climata Mundi
Sunt Mare; Scripturæ, Retia; Pisas, Homo.\(^{211}\)

It is prettily express’d by honest Heidfeld.

Quæ Navis Vetustissima, Capacissima, Sanctissima,
Ditissimaque omnium fuit?\(^{R.}\)

R. Ingens illa ARCA Noæ, cui totius orbis Homines et opes inculce fuerunt. Nota hic TYPUM Universe Ecclesiae; – in quam nos aggregemus, ut tui simus, à venturo Ira Dei Diluvio. Nam Extrâ Ecclesiam nulla salus.\(^{212}\)

As the ARK, was doubtless the biggest Ship that ever was; A Ship to which the largest Spanish Carrack, that carries not above 1200 German Lasts is not to be compared; a Ship outvying that of Archimedes, which contained 12000 Tuns; or that of Philopater, which was 240 Holy Cubits in Length, with a Breadth & a Depth not unproportionable: So, it seems to be the First that ever floated.\(^{213}\)

We will get aboard it, with our Meditations on the Typical Importance of it. For the Apostle tells us; 1. Pet. 3.21. *It was a Figure.* | We will behold the
CHURCH as the *Antitype*; and run the Parallel in several observable Instances.  

As *Noah* built an *Ark*; so JESUS ha’s built a CHURCH. But *Noah*: *According to all that God had commanded him, so did he*. Thus our JESUS, in Building a Church, ha’s done all things most Exactly and Faithfully, *according to the Mind of God*. [Heb. 3.2.] And so should we, in what we do about the Church. [Matth. 15.9.] Luther judiciously reckoned this, for one of the Three Things, by which the Church would be fatally endangered: *Sapientia mundi que vult omnia redigere in ordinem, et impijs medijs Ecclesie Paci consulere.*  

When the *Ark* was built, *Noah* the Builder of it, shipp’d himself upon it: If the *Ark* had perished, *Noah* himself must have perished with it. But it was secured by the Presence of *Noah* there: tho’ it seems to have drawn above **Sixteen Foot of Water**, as may be gathered from its resting on an Hill, when the Waters were above it, at least **Eleven Cubits**. Thus our Lord Jesus Christ, having built the Church, He is now Himself aboard, & will be so, *To the End of the World*. [Isa. 43.3.] *Si nos ruimus, ruit et Christus*. Tho’ the Church be *Tossed with Tempests*, yett it cannot be lost; It ha’s a greater than *Cesar* aboard.

*Niteris incassum Christi submergere Navem; Fluctuat, at nunquam mergitur illa Ratis.*

The *Ark* was made of **Good Stuff**, the Cypress Wood, which would keep sound, and breed no Worms. The *Church-Mystical* will most certainly be so. And they that belong to the *Church-Visible* should be so. [Psal. 119.80.]

Many *Carpenters* no doubt wrought with *Noah* about the *Ark*; who yett were themselves *Drowned* after all, among those, whose Foundation was overflowed with a Flood. Even so, There are very many, whose *Talents* and *Labours* are employ’d about *Church-Work* all their Dayes; And yett these very Persons go down to the *Congregation* of them that *Roar under the Waters*. [1. Cor. 9.27. Matth. 7.23.]  

---

214 Mather’s typological explication of Noah’s Ark appears to lean on his uncle’s *Figures and Types of the Old Testament* (1683) 92–97, by Samuel Mather. See also Edward Taylor’s *Upon the Types* (1899) 2:627–48. The fourfold method – literal, allegorical, tropological, anagogical – was still a common exegetical tool and can be found among Protestants of the period as much as among Roman Catholics. Athanasius Kircher offers his reading in *Arca Noë* (1675), lib. 2, cap. 9, pp. 140–54. See H. Caplan’s “Four Senses,” P. J. Korshin’s *Typologies* (328–68), and M. I. Lowance, Jr.’s *Language* (160–77).

215 See Samuel Mather, *Figures* (93, § 1). Gen. 6:22. The Latin citation from Martin Luther, probably adapted from Adam Melchior’s *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum* (1620) 158, warns of “the wisdom of the world, which wants to put everything in order, and to look out for the Peace of the Church in the midst of the wicked.”

216 See Samuel Mather, *Figures* (93, § 1). The ship of the Church cannot founder because piloted by Christ: “You will struggle in vain to sink the ship of Christ; / That vessel wavers, but it never goes down.”

217 See Samuel Mather, *Figures* (94, § 3).

218 See Samuel Mather, *Figures* (93, § 2).
The Ark had a Door; And so has the Church too. Our Saviour says, I am the Door. A CHRIST, must be Profess’d, Ador’d, Obey’d, by all that would be Admitted into the Church. They are not a Church, but as Tertullian expresses it, A Wasps-nest; who hold not the Truth as it is in Jesus.\(^{219}\)

The Ark had Passages for Light and Air, in the Upper-Story. No doubt, Noah, by Cranes and Ropes and proper Engines, pulling up, the vast Quantity of Excrements, in the Lower Story of the Ark, did here turn them out. Light as well as Breath was diffused, thro’ agreeable Port-Holes of the Ark. The Church is likewise a Place of Light; and from a Glorious Christ, that Sun of Righteousness, it fetches all its Light. [Joh. 1.9. Psal. 119.105.\(^{220}\)]

There were many Mansions and Chambers in the Ark; yet they all made but One Ark. Thus, the One Catholic Church has in it, many particular Congregations and Societies. And we should have some Care of all. [2. Cor. 11.28.\(^{221}\)]

There were Three Stories in the Ark. There are so in the Church; There is the Visible Church, and the Mystical Church, and the Triumphant Church: So many Ascending Stories. Our Blessed Noah, [JESUS] lodges in the uppermost.\(^{221}\)

There were all sorts of Creatures in the Ark; both clean, and unclean. And there are in the Church of God, Creatures of all Natures, both Good and Bad. But, It is credibly reported, That a sudden Flood in Somersetshire in England, produced a strange Agreement, between the most Quarrelsome Creatures, the Dogs and Hares, the Catts and Ratts, which were driven to the Top of the Hill together. The fiercest Creatures in the Ark, seem to have been under such a Cicuration. Certainly, They that visibly belong to the Church, ought to lay aside their Evil Natures.\(^{222}\)

They that were in the Ark were Safe; and Safety was no where else to be mett withal. There satt Noah, – medij tranquillus in undis. Our Salvation depends as much upon our getting into the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. [Act. 2.47.\(^{223}\)]

They use to compare Apostates unto the Raven, which, tis commonly understood, going out from the Ark, Returned not. Ill Birds, that go from the

---

\(^{219}\) See Samuel Mather, Figures (94, § 4). Tertullian (Adversus Marcionem 4.5) [PL 2. 367A] rejects the Marcionites: “Even wasps make combs; so also these Marcionites make churches” (ANF 3:350).

\(^{220}\) See Samuel Mather, Figures (94, § 5).

\(^{221}\) See Samuel Mather, Figures (94, §§ 6, 7).

\(^{222}\) See Samuel Mather, Figures (95, § 9). Mather may here refer to the 1607 flood in Somersetshire of which the anonymous pamphleteer reports that coneyes were sitting on the backs of floating sheep and cattle and other animals surviving side by side on the tops of hills, in A true report of certaine wonderfull overflows of waters (1607), n.p. The fiercest creatures in Noah’s Ark, as Mather assures us, were under a strange “Cicuration” or “taming” (OED).

\(^{223}\) See Samuel Mather, Figures (95, § 8). While the Flood raged, Noah sat “tranquil in the middle of the water.”

Church, without Returning again unto it any more! Wither do they go? [Isa. 34.9, 10, 11.]

There seems to have been a Sabbath considered in the Ark: a Period of Seven Dayes observed by Noah. [Gen. 8.8, 10, 12.] There is so, and should be so, in the Church of our Lord. Dominicum Servasti? Christianus sum; Intermittere non possum.

As the Water buoy’d up the Ark, and carried it up towards Heaven; so the Church of God is Raised and Lifted up towards Heaven, by the Baptism which is used there. [1. Pet. 3.21.]

When the Ark was made, a Flood then swept away a populous World before it. But there now remains a Fiery Flood, wherewith God will take Vengeance on a wicked World; The Diluvium Ignis, which we find celebrated in the Writings of the Ancients. The Poets tell us, of Pyrrha, (which Name carries Fire in it,) as the Wife of their Deucalion; and the Philosophers do frequently speak of an εκπυρωσις, A Conflagration, which is to come upon the World. Jo{se}phus would perswade us, That Adam himself left Predictions of it. [2. Pet. 3.7.]

To conclude; I will bring forth the Eight Persons, which were all that were in the Ark, to be unto us the Preachers of Righteousness, and of this awful Admonition;

There are but Few that shall be Saved.

Q. You are not insensible, That some little, flashy, silly Pretenders to Witt, endeavour, to Ridicule the Account of Noahs Ark, as if it were a Fabulous Contrivance? v. 22.

A. One saies well; They betray their Ignorance in Naval Philosophy; That nothing improbable is asserted in the Scripture concerning the Capacity, or Manageableness of that Ship, ha’s been confirmed, from an Experiment, which a celebrated Historian ha’s recorded. Tis in Hornius’s Arca Noæ.

224 See Samuel Mather, Figures (96, § 10).
225 The unidentified Latin citation asks, “Have you kept the Sabbath? I am a Christian; I cannot neglect it.”
226 See Samuel Mather, Figures (97, § 3).
227 See Samuel Mather, Figures (97, § 2). For Mather’s “Diluvium Ignis” or “Flood of Fire,” see his collection of ancient prophecies foretelling the destruction of the earth by fire, in Threefold Paradise (155–201). The story of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Ovid, Metamorphoses 1:350–437) is well known, and Mather and his peers generally read the ancient legend as a corrupted version of Noah’s Flood. The Greek word “ἐκπυρωσις” [ekpyrosis], or “conflagration,” appears many times among the ancient philosophers and early Church Fathers. Josephus Flavius, for instance, relates that the great protoplast inscribed his prophecies of the world’s destruction by fire and water on two pillars, one of which survived “in the land of Siriad to this day” (Antiquities 1.2.3).
229 Mather refers to the popular story of Peter Janslan (Jansen, also Hans), in Georgi Horni Arca Noae (1660), by the Dutch historian Georg Horn (1620–70). Janslan is to have constructed his ark in 1609. Dom Augustin Calmet relates the same story in his article “Ark,” (Calmet’s Great Dictionary, vol. 1, n.p. See also JH 149).
Peter Janslan ordered a Ship to be built, according to the Proportion of Noah’s Ark. At first, the Contrivance was entertained with Laughter and Contempt, by the Seamen, who supposed it to be a ridiculous Business.

But afterwards it was found to be most convenient for a Merchant-man in Time of Peace, as being a swift Sailor, and managed with fewer Hands than other Ships. But the Inconvenience was, it did not carry great Guns; and in that Respect, it had a greater Resemblance to Noah’s Ark, which was not intended for a Man of War.
Q. A Remark on That; *The Fear of you, and the Dread of you, shall be upon every Beast?* v. 2.

A. Dr. *Nieuentyt*, in his, *Religious Philosopher*, observes, That unto this Day, this has Place in the most Devouring & Pernicious Creatures.

For, besides that of their own Nature, they chuse to live in Wilder-nesses & uninhabited Countreys; We meet with a Remarkable Evidence, in the *German Ephemerides*, [ix & x Years] That a *Lion* will never assault a Man, unless compell’d thereto by Hunger, Self-defence, or the Discharge of a Gun against him. And in relation to *Tygers*, we read the Following Passage; *They are afraid of White and Naked Men, like ALL THE WILD BEASTS of Asia and Africa, and avoid | them, as it were with a Kind of Reverence; and it is without Exemple, that they have attack’d any such.*

And in my own Countrey, when the *Bears* ever now & then appear in mighty Numbers, I could never hear of any *Man* assaulted, much less Devoured, by any of them.

---

Q. Upon the Prohibition of *Blood?* v. 4.

A. It is Monsr. *Jurieu’s* Remark, That the Command is to pour out the *Blood* of every Animal, before the *Flesh* of it be eaten; And that a *Sacrifice* is therein Proposed & Required. The Command of *Sacrificing* is here inculcated. The Interpretation of *Aben-Ezra*, and those who follow him, allledging that the Design of this Command, is to raise in Men an Aversion for Cruelty, is not so very probable. For certainly there is much Cruelty in eating the *Flesh* of an Animal, as in tasting the *Blood.*

---

90 Mather here quotes from *The Religious Philosopher*, 3 vols. (1718–19), Contemplation XXII, secs. 2–3, vol. 2:630–31, by Dr. Bernard Nieuwentyt, or Nieuwentijd (1664–1718), a Dutch physician, who acknowledges as his own source the “German Ephemerides,” or *Miscellanea curiosa medico-physica academiae naturae curiosorum, sive ephemeridum medico-physicarum Germanicarum curiosarum*, 30 vols. in 25 (1670–1706), the German equivalent to the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. Mather, via Nieuwentyt, refers to *Miscellanea curiosa*, vol. 9 (1679), 9th and 10th year, p. 453.

91 Michael Wigglesworth (1631–1705), Puritan minister of Malden, Massachusetts, describes the peace and security during New England’s Golden Age in superlative terms: “The Lord had made (such was his grace) / For us a Covenant / Both with the men, and with the beasts, / That in this desert haunt: / So that through places wilde and waste / A single man, disarmed, / Might journey many hundred miles / And not at all be harm’d,” in “God’s Controversy with New-England” (1662), 101–08.

Every Effusion of Blood was considered as a Sacrifice. Consider, 1. Chron. XI.19. And Lev XVII.10.
This is a Thought highly worthy to be prosecuted.

2419.

Q. How shall one understand that Passage, Your Blood of your Lives will I require, at the Hand of every Beast will I require it? v. 5.
A. The Hebrew Interpreters thus understand it; Puniam eos qui Homines Bestijs objecere: The Cruelty of throwing Men to be devoured by Beasts, is herein especially referr’d unto.93

2420.

Q. That Passage, Whosoever sheds Mans Blood, by Man, shall his Blood be shed, how may it be taken? v. 5.
A. According to Grotius, Non male illud, Per Hominem, Sic interpreteris, ut morti devotus intelligatur, non is tantum, qui manu suâ perpetravit Homicidium, sed et is qui mandavit.94

Munster is of the Opinion, That in the Antediluvian World, no Murderer dy’d by the Hand of the Magistrate, (any more than Cain:) but that God Himself took the Judgment into His own Immediate Hands. After the Flood, the Lord communicate unto Man, Part of his Power over Life and Death, in the special Case of Murder. Et hic est Fons, ex quo manat totum Jus Civile et Jus Gentium. Here is the Institution of Magistracy; For, if God give the Magistrate a Power over the Life and Death of other Men, he ha’s it much more, over their Estates and their lesser Interests.95

commentary on Gen. 9:3–5 is concerned with the Noachide prohibition of eating slaughtered animals (wild or domestic) that are not properly bled; for “nesheh” or “life’s blood” belongs to God (Commentary 1:122). Jurieu (Critical History 1:244–45), Simon Patrick (Commentary 1:40–41), and John Selden (De Jure Naturali, lib. 7, cap. 1, pp. 783–91) identify Maimonides’s More Nebuchim (Part 3, ch. 48); i.e., Guide (3.48.370–72) as their principal source. Indeed, Maimonides provides a whole set of kashruth instructions on kosher meat, esp. in his Schechita. See also Rashi, Ramban, and Sanhedrin 59b, in Mikraoth Gedoloth on Gen. 9:4 (Genesis 1:119). 93 Both Rashi and the Targum Jonathan ben Uziel are here specifically alluded to (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:20), but Mather’s source – including the Latin citation translated by himself – is Hugo Grotius’s commentary on Gen. 9:5, in Annotationes ad Vetus Testamentum, in Opera Omnia Theologica (1679) 1:D.
94 According to Hugo Grotius’s juridical explanation in his Annotationes (on Gen. 9.6), in Opera Omnia Theologica (1:D), “This ‘by man’ is not wrong; you should interpret it this way: that the one who is understood to be condemned to death is not only the one who has committed murder by his own hand, but also the one who has ordered it.” See Appendix A.
95 Sebastian Münster adds in his Hebraica Biblia Latina (1:22), annot. (b), “And here is the fount from which all Civil Law and the Law of the Nations flows.”

Q. The Use of the Rain-bow directed unto Noah, is there then any thing in Pagan Antiquitie to commemorate it? v. 9.

A. The Poets observing a Change of Weather, to bee intimated by the Rain-bow, make it, The Messenger of the Gods. But when wee read, that Passage in Gen. 9.9. That it is a Token of the Covenant between God & Man, one would incline to think, That the Pagans had so far known the Sacred Writings of Moses, & from hence in their fanciful Way, advanced this Meteor to bee, Internuntia Deorum, as they call it, and, Θεων Ἀγγέλος, as Homer styles it; an, Angel of that Covenant, which assures the Preservation of the New World. This is their Iris, which is from Εἰρω i.e. Αγγέλλω, or perhaps from the Chaldee Ir, an Angel.

And on this Occasion wee may add, There are Fiery Apparitions, often mentioned in the Old Testament, as, the Burning Bush, and the Flaming Chariots: And wee read, that God appointed Holy Fire to bee kept always on the Altar. Hence perhaps it was, that Fire was Mars, a God, and worshipped by the Chaldeans and Persians, and it was in such Request, among the old Romans, that they ordered the Vestal Virgins, to keep it unextinguished.96

And on this Occasion we may add, There are Fiery Apparitions, often mentioned in the Old Testament, as, the Burning Bush, and the Flaming Chariots: And we read, that God appointed Holy Fire to be kept always on the Altar. Hence perhaps it was, that Fire was Mars, a God, and worshipped by the Chaldeans and Persians, and it was in such Request, among the old Romans, that they ordered the Vestal Virgins, to keep it unextinguished.

3392.

Q. Was there any Rainbow before the Flood? v. 13.

A. There is nothing in Scripture, to make us think there was; nor indeed any thing in Nature, unless we will assert this manifest Untruth, That every Disposition of the Air, or every Cloud, is fitly disposed, for the Producing of a Rainbow. This is well argued by Dr. Jackson, who adds, That if other Natural Causes depend upon the Final, (as the Scripture-Philosophy teaches us,) they who acknowledge the Scripture, have no reason to think, that the Air had before the Flood, that peculiar Disposition, which is required unto the Production of the Rain-bow; when this wonderful Effect, had no such Use or End, as it hath had ever since. For it was appointed by God, as a Witness of His Covenant with the New World; a Messenger to secure Mankind from Destruction, by any Universal Deluge any more. If it had appeared before the Flood, the Appearing of it after the Flood, would have been but a poor Comfort unto Noah, & his Timorous Posterity.

96 Thomas Jackson (Works vol. 1, bk. 1, ch. 16, § 7, p. 55) argues that Jupiter’s calming the waters for the Argives’ return from Troy (Homer’s Iliad 15.258–61) is one such proof of pagan knowledge of the Mosaic writings. The “Internuntia Deorum” or the “messenger between the gods” [and man] also called “theon angelos” (Scholia in Homerum: Scholia in Iliadem 3.121, line 2 of scholion) is yet another – if Jackson and Mather are to be believed. The flaming chariot (the sun) of Apollo, the Pharsi or Zoroastrian fire worshippers, and the Roman vestal virgins stoking the flame on the altar – all are seen as having had their origin in the Mosaic scriptures. See especially Gerard Vossius’s De Theologia Gentili (1641) lib. 2, cap. 12–13, pp. 365–74, Edmund Dickinson’s Delphi Phoenicizantes (1655), below, and Thomas Hyde’s Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum (1700), cap. 8–9, pp. 150–69.
The ancient Poets, had a better Philosophy, when they feigned Iris, to be the Daughter, or (as we would now speak) the Mother of Wonderment; Θαύμαντος ἔκγονον. And the Messenger of Jupiter and Juno. Homer accordingly represents Iris, as being sent with a peremptory Command unto Neptune, That he should not aid the Grecians; by the Swelling, we may suppose, of the Waters.97

The Rain-bow does, as it were, say, That God will not again Drown the Earth, altho’ the Clouds have Thickned, as if they Threatened it. Indeed, the Rain-bow is a Natural Sign, there will not be much Rain after it appears, but that the Clouds begin to disperse. The Rain-bows made by the Reflection of the Sun or the Thinner Clouds, become a Pledge that GOD would not suffer them to Thicken any more for a General Inundation. Yea, the admirable Form of this Glorious Circle (as tis called by the Son of Syrach, Eccles. XLIII.12.) bent by the Hands of the Most High, does naturally excite one, to look beyond the other Causes unto the Final. Finally, we see two things in the Mixt Colours of the Rain-bow; The Destruction of the Old World by Water, & of the present World by Fire.98

Q. Why is it said, Ham the Father of Canaan? v. 22.
A. You may easily guess, at the Design of Moses, relating to the Canaanites.

But there are also some odd Circumstances, which make the Opinion of the Hebrew Doctors, not improbable, That Canaan first saw Noah, in his indecent Posture, & made Sport with it unto his Father; who did not Reprove him as he should have done, but also sported on it. He proclaimed it in the Street, publickly mocking of it; and this no doubt with some singular Degree of Profaneness as well as Derision. For tis probable, he laughed at the Promise of the Messiah, which he had often heard his Father speak of, but now thought him incapable to Begett.

---

97 Mather’s commentary on Gen. 9:13 and 9:9 is extracted from The Eternal Truth of Scriptures, in A Collection of the Works of Thomas Jackson (1653), vol. 1, bk. 1, ch. 16, §§ 6, 7, pp. 53–55, by Dr. Thomas Jackson (1579–1640), president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. For much of the same, see Simon Patrick’s annotations on Gen. 9:13–14, in Commentary (1:42). Whether or not the rainbow existed before the Flood was also debated among the rabbis. Nachmanides’s grammatical approach establishes that the rainbow was as old as the Creation itself (Commentary 1:13). The Zohar (1:71b) offers the same explanation, as does Saadiah Gaon, but Ibn Ezra (Commentary 1:25) rejects Saadiah Gaon’s reference to the past tense of the clause and makes the rainbow a purely postdiluvian phenomenon (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:123).

Among the ancient poets who celebrate Iris, the goddess of the rainbow and generally messenger of Zeus (Jupiter), is Homer (Iliad 15.157–73), but Plato calls Iris “Thaumantos Ekgonon” the “child of Thaumas” (Theaetetus 155d, 5). The Roman god Neptune is, of course, the Greek Poseidon, the Earth-Shaker.

98 The apocryphal Liber Ecclesiasticus (early 2nd c. bce) is attributed to Jesus, Son of Syrach (Ben Sira). Though the rainbow may promise that the earth would never again be destroyed by water, yet 2 Peter 3:12 presumably foretells the destruction of the world by fire.
Whereas we read, He knew what his younger Son had done. Some fetch an Argument from hence, that Canaan first made himself Merry with his Grandfather; who is here called, his Younger Son, or his Little Son; but Ham was neither Little nor Younger, but his middlemost Son.  

Q. What may be observable in the Different Style of Noah, when Blessing of Shem, and when Cursing of Cham? v. 25, 26.  
A. The Blessing of Shem is begun with This; Blessed be the Lord God of Shem: it is directed unto God. The Cursing of Cham, (in Canaan) is more immediately directed unto himself; Cursed be Canaan. Bochart observes, That there is a notable Mystery in this Enallage of Persons. The Guilty Sinner is cursed in his own Person, because his own Sinfulness is from none but himself; Mali fomes et scaturigo est in ipso Homine. But the Patriarch delighting in the Piety of his other Son, chuses to Bless God, rather than the Son on that Occasion; An Acknowledgement of God, as being by His Grace, the Author of all that Piety. Consider, Phil. 2.13. and, 1. Cor 15.10. and, Psal. 15.1. and Mat. 5.16.  

And especially, if we have pious and worthy Children, we must ascribe unto God alone, all the Glory of it.  

Q. A further Thought on this Form of Blessing; Blessed be the Lord God of Shem? v. 26.  
A. The Words are, as Dr. Gell observes, according to the Idiom of the Hebrew Language, a Metalepsis; whereby we understand the Antecedent out of the Consequent; the Blessing of Shem out of the Blessing of God. q.d. “The Lord God so heap His Blessings both Temporal and Spiritual, upon Shem, that both he, and whoever shall see it, may say, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, who by His Blessings on him, hath declared himself the God of Shem, in Covenant with him & his.”  

Q. What is, The Dwelling of Japheth in the Tents of Shem, which is promised in the Blessings of Noah upon his Children? v. 27.  
A. I know of no such Matter promised, or so much as mentioned.  
Indeed, I have heard this Matter touch’d upon, in a Thousand Prayers and Sermons. But our good Men have quite mistaken the Matter. The Antecedent,  

---

99 Mather’s immediate source is his old vademecum Simon Patrick (Commentary 1:43). According to Pirke de R. Eliezer (ch. 23, p. 170), Canaan castrated Noah by tying a string around Noah’s testicles and subsequently derided his grandfather in the market place. The Zohar (1:73b) says much the same. Rashi from the Talmud (Sanhedrin 70a) and the Midrash Rabah (XXXVI:7) even speculates that Noah was sodomized (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:126).  
100 The extract is from Samuel Bochart’s Geographia (pars 1, lib. 1, cap. 1, col. 2–10). Bochart (pars 1,lib. 2, cap. 1, col. 66) adds that “the kindling and the spring of all evil is in Man himself.”  
101 Mather’s citation appears in Robert Gell’s An Essay toward the Amendment (1669), Sermon III, p. 93.
unto that *Relative* [HEE] is not Japheth, but GOD. The Blessing of Japheth was to bee *Enlarged*; his Posterity was to occupy the *Largest* Portion of the Habitable World. But the Blessing {of} Shem was, the *Dwelling of God in his Tents*: his Posterity was to enjoy the most notable and singular Tokens of the Divine Presence among them; Yea, when God Himself came to *Tabernacle*, or Pitch His Tent, in *Flesh*, [Joh. 1.14.] it was in that *B"sterity*.102

Q. A Note upon the Blessing of Japhet? v. 27.
A. The Jews take special Notice of it, that Noah in Blessing of Japhet uses only the Name of /God/; a Name known among all Nations.

*Joachimus Langius* apprehends, That there is promised unto Japhet, a Dominion over the Inhabitants of Canaan. In the Fulfilment whereof, when the Jews becoming the Inhabitants of Canaan, came to imitate the Manners of those Canaanites who were their Predecessors, & so to deserve the Name of Canaanites, the Romans who were the Offspring of Japhet, should siege upon their Land, & bring them into Servitude.103

3597.

Q. The *Curse* upon Cham, does it not Justify our Enslaving the Negro’s, wherever we can find them? v. 27.
A. The whole Family of Cham was not concern’d in that Curse. None but Canaan, the youngest Son of Cham, is mentioned; and he is Thrice mentioned. The Negroes are not the Posterity of Canaan. The Imprecation of the Patriarch, seems to be little more than a Prophecy, of the Canaanites Overthrow & Reduction, under the Power of the Israelites, who were the Posterity of Shem. And, as one observes, the Recording hereof by Moses, doth seem especially to Justify, or a least Encourage, the Israelites, in Dispossessing them.104

102 Excerpted from Gell’s *An Essay toward the Amendment*, Sermon IV (axiom 5), pp. 122–23.
103 The Hebrew “Elohim” [Strong’s # 430] suggests “God, gods,” and various other titles of power and authority. According to Ibn Ezra (*Commentary* 1:29), God’s proper name *יהוה* (the Tetragrammaton), or Yahweh, is invoked in Noah’s blessing of Shem – the father of the Semites or Israelites; whereas “Elohim” is used for Japheth, the progenitor of the Gentiles, who was not equal to his brother Shem. Joachim Lange (1670–1744) was a German Lutheran Pietist theologian, close associate of August Hermann Francke, and professor of theology at Halle University. Mather’s excerpt from Lange – whose Pietist works were accessible through Mather’s connection with the Pietist agent William Boehme, in London – may well have been an earlier Latin edition of Lange’s *Biblisches Licht und Recht*, 7 vols. (1730–36), a commentary on the OT and NT.
104 Mather’s comment seems uncharacteristic for his time, for it clearly demonstrates that he did not see African slavery justified on the grounds of Noah’s curse – as many of his peers did before and after him. Significantly, Mather’s reading is supported by the rabbis of the Midrash Rabbah (Gen.XXXVI:7), who point out that Noah cursed Canaan, Ham’s son, “because God had already blessed Noah and his sons, and a curse cannot take effect where there is already a blessing” (*Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis* 1:27). Noah’s imprecation of Canaan is also frequently seen as providing Moses and the returning Israelites with religious sanction to conquer the
Q. What Remarkable is there, in the Effects of Noah’s Blessing and Cursing his Offspring? v. 27.

A. Mr. Mede hath an Observation, That there hath never yett been a Son of Cham, that hath shaken a Scepter over the Head of Japhet. Shem hath subdued Japhet, and Japhet hath subdued Shem; But Cham never subdued either. This made Annibal, a Child of Canaan, cry out with Amazement of Soul, Agnosco fatum Carthaginis; I acknowledge the Fate of Carthage. [Livy. L. XXVII in fine.]

Q. Austin thinks it enough to bespeak the Title of a Prophet, for the Patriarch Noah, that the Ark which he made, Prophetia nostrorum temporum fuit. But he may be further entituled unto it, from his marvellous Prophecy, about his Posterity; which now calls for some Illustration? v. 20–27.

A. We will again consult our learned Heidegger; and principally employ his Lucubrations, to furnish our Illustrations on this noble Subject.

We find the Patriarch overtaken with Wine, after his coming out of the Ark, into his New World. The Hebrewes and the Fathers do generally agree, That he was wholly a Stranger to the Nature of Wine, and that the Inebriating Power of it, was utterly unknown to him; or, that it was, as Chrysostom expresses the Matter, διά το μη εἰδεναι τῆς μεταληψεως τα μετρα εἰς μεθην εξεκυλισθη, Quòd ignoraret modum hauriendi Vini, Ebrietati succubuisse. But our Heidegger looks on this, as an uncertain and an ungrounded Opinion; and will not be persuaded, That the Use of Wine had been all this while unknown unto the World; when Vines were so common, & the Long Lives of the People gave them Opportunity enough to find out what Use they might be putt unto; And our Saviour makes Drunkenness one prevailing Sin among the Antediluvians. That Expression, And Noah began to be an Husbandman; will not imply, That there was no Husbandry before the Flood. It only implies, That Noah sett himself to restore the Artes βιωτικων which had formerly been practised. Yea, and the Word ought rather to be rendred, as


105 Mather’s extract from Joseph Mede is at second hand from Simon Patrick’s Commentary (1:44). Mede’s observation appears in Works (1664), bk. 1, Discourse XLVIII (on Gen. 10:5), p. 378. Mede points out that the Carthaginians fell because they were from the stock of Canaan (378, note) – not that Hannibal was aware of this nicety. The Latin quotation, whose translation Mather supplies from Mede (via Patrick), is adapted from Hannibal’s contrite acknowledgement: “agnoscere se fortunam Carthaginis furtur dixisse” (Livy 27.51.12), that he “recognized the destiny of Carthage.”

106 St. Augustine’s De Civitate Dei 18.38 [PL 41.598] interprets Noah’s Ark as “a prophecy of our times” (NPNFi 2:383), no doubt illustrating that times were bad enough in Roman Carthage.
Onkelos and Jonathan have done it; Et permansit. The Great Calvin at last leaves the Matter so; _Ego hoc in medio relinquens, potius ex ebrietate Noë discendum esse arbitror, quàm fœda et detestabilis sit ebrietas._¹⁰⁷

The Conjectures and the Traditions of the Jewish Expositors, How Noah came to know, what had befallen him, relating to his Denudation, in his Drunkenness, are not worth a Recitation. Tis enough, that we say, with Chrysostom, He learn’d it by Enquiries of his Two Sons, of Shem and Japhet.¹⁰⁸

The Prophecy that follows, is Tripartite. The First Article, is, a Malediction upon Cham; who had been so horribly Abusive unto his Father. But it seems wonderful, that Canaan the Son of Cham, should be the Object mentioned; and a State of Servitude be assigned unto him. The Hebrewes, and Theodoret, and Procopius Gazeus, and Lyranus, and Abulensis, and others from them, tell us, That Canaan was the first who saw his exposed Grandfather, and impudently and petulantly play’d upon him; and that his Father Cham, was by his Informations call’d into the Mockery. But this is not a Thing Declared in the Scriptures; and therefore the Conjecture is as easily Rejected, as Received. Chrysostom therefore tells us, It was, _δια τινα λογον εγκεκρυμενον· Ob Rationem occultam._ But the most solid Answer of all, is that given by Austin; [Quæst. 17. in Genesim.] Queritur, Quarè cum Peccans Cham in Patris offensà, non in se ipso, sed in Filio suo Canaan Maledicitur? Nisi prophetatum est, Terram Canaan, ejectis Canaanæis indè, et debellatis, accepturos esse filios Israel, qui venient de semine Shem. Theodoret speaks to the like Purpose, and makes the Words of Noah, rather a Prediction, than an Imprecation; a Prophecy that the Posterity of Canaan should one day be outed by the Israelites, who descend from Shem, & should possess themselves

¹⁰⁷ Heidegger (1:408, Exerc. XX, § 2). Even though Heidegger lists Maimonides and R. David Kimchi as sources for denying Noah’s knowledge of wine and its effect (Hachut Hameshulash 1:237), Rabbi Ibn Ezra, Abarbanel, Ramban, Rashi, and others, tend to disagree. They more than hint that Noah was familiar with wine and its potency – even to the point of desiring inebriation (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:25–26). Joannes Chrysostom, _In Genesim (homiliae 1–67)_[PG 53. 263, lines 33–34], maintains that apart from planting the first vineyard, Noah was also the first person to experience inebriation and “through ignorance of the proper amount to drink [wine] fell into a drunken stupor” (_Homilies in Genesis_ 29.6, pp. 202–03). The sins of the antediluvians paralleling those of the present (i.e., Mather’s time) are suggested in Matt. 24:38–39 and Luke 17:27. The Latin-Greek compound _Artes βιωτικαι_ [biotikai] suggests “the arts pertaining to life”; i.e., _here_ “agriculture.” Both the Targums Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uziel, in Walton (4:17) read, “and he devoted [himself],” or “And Noach began to be a man working on the earth” (Etheridge 1:53, 185). In his commentary on Gen. 9:20, John Calvin, too, acknowledges that Noah’s supposed ignorance of cultivating vines is frequently used to excuse Noah’s drunkenness, and concludes that “leaving this question undetermined, I [Calvin] rather suppose, that we are to learn from the drunkenness of Noah, what a filthy and detestable crime drunkenness is” (Commentaries 1.1:30).

¹⁰⁸ Heidegger (1:409, Exerc. XX, § 3). Mather here passes over the rabbinic conjecture (Ibn Ezra and Rashi) that Canaan or his father Ham either castrated Noah, who thus cursed Canaan for robbing him of the ability to conceive a fourth son, or that they sodomized Noah (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:26–27) and Midrash Rabbah (Gen. XXXVI:7). For Joannes Chrysostom, see his _Homilies in Genesis_ (29.14–20, pp. 207–13).
of Palestine; δεδιττομενος δε τους υστερον εσομενους μη πλημμελειν εις γενεας. Deterrens autem posteros, ne peccent in parentes. The unsearchable Judgments of God, visit the Sins of Parents, on the Children; but Canaan only is mentioned here, lest the Judgments threatened should seem to belong unto all the Children of Cham. And Moses would raise the Hopes of the Israelites, about the Success of the great Expedition, which was yett before them. The Divine Sovereignty is display’d in this Matter. And it is a Mistake in any to imagine, That the Blackness of the Ethiopians & other Children of Cham, arises from the Curse of Noah upon him. The True Cause of their Blackness may be this. They were made very Brown, by the Hott Sun striking upon them. They disliked this Colour. With proper Juices and Unguents, it was their Custome, to change their Brown into Black; and, Versa est postea Ars in Naturam: Nature itself by Degrees conform’d, unto what had been by Art a long while Introducing. Vossius observes, That the Figure of the Noses, among the Moors, and other Nations, was by Degrees at length confirmed from Artificial into what is now Natural among them.¹⁰⁹

The Blessing of Shem, is; Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his Servant. God must be acknowledged as the Author and Giver of all the Piety in Shem; and pious Shem would chuse to hear the Lord God Blessed, & Praised for it. The first Article of the Blessing is; That JEHOVAH would be the God of Shem. A Federal Speech; An Excellent Thing! Vast Glories are in it. God will not be the God of a Sinner, lest He appear Like unto him. God will therefore Justify the Sinner, to whom He becomes a God, that so He may hold Communion with him. He that is Justified ha’s Peace with God, and Hope of Everlasting Life, both for Soul and Body. This brings us anon into the Heavenly City. The Surety of this Covenant, is the Messiah; whom Noah now foresees

¹⁰⁹ Heidegger (1:40–12, Exerc. XX, §§ 5, 6). Theodoret (Quaestiones in Octateuchum, Quest. 58, p. 55, lines 1–5). Procopius Gazaeus (Commentarii in Octateuchum, on Gen. 9:18–22) [PG 87. Pt. 1.302], Nicholaus de Lyra (annotations on Gen. 9, in Postilla Super Totam Bibliam [1402], vol. 1, n.p.), and Alfonso Tostado of Avila, aka. Abulensis (Commentaria in Genesim) – all put the onus on Canaan. Theodoret argues that because Ham had sinned as a son against his father, Noah punished Ham through his own son. Chrysostom (In Genesim Homilia 29.20) [PG 53. 269, line 21] seems to sidestep the issue of Canaan’s culpability for his father’s sin of disrespect, for Chrysostom argues that Noah cursed Canaan “for some hidden reason” (Homily in Genesis 29.20, p. 212). St. Augustine’s rhetorical answer appears in his Questiones in Genesim, Quest. XVII, on Gen. 9:25 (Questiones in Heptateuchum, lib. 1) [PL 34. 551]: “It is asked, for what other reason is Ham, when sinning against his father, cursed not in himself, but in his son Canaan, other than because it was prophesied that the Canaanites would be subdued and cast out from the land of Canaan, and that the children of Israel, who would come from the seed of Shem, would take it.” Theodoret adds that Noah’s curse of Canaan is not only prophetic (Quaestiones in Octateuchum, Quest. p. 55, lines 10–11) “but [should also] deter future generations from sinning against their parents.” Finally, the farsighted Isaac Vossius (1618–89), Dutch humanist, classical scholar, tutor of Queen Christina of Sweden, and subsequently canon of Windsor, attributes the Africans’ Negroid features and skin color to nature and nurture – not Noah’s curse, but adds in his Observationes ad Pomponium Melam (1658), notitiae, pp. 304–05, that by applying unguents, “art was afterwards turned into nature.”
among the Offspring of Shem. He must be born in the Tents of Shem. [Compare, Gen. 17.7.] The other Article of the Blessing is; That Canaan should be subdued, and the Land of Canaan possessed, by the Offspring of Shem. [Compare again; Gen. 17.8.] This was to be a certain Pledge unto them, That the Messiah should be born there, and there purchase Life Eternal, for all that should Believe on Him. Well might our Patriarch have the Name of Shem; or, A Man of Name. His Prerogatives were famous; and, as the Son of Syrach saies, [ch. 49. v. ult.] εδοξαδη υπερ παν εν τη κτισει Άδων. Gloriam adeptus est, Super omnia in creatione hominum; i.e. inter homines creatos.\textsuperscript{110}

The Blessing of Japhet is; God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the Tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his Servant. The First Article of the Blessing is, That in the Division of the Earth, the largest Portion by far should fall to the Posterity of Japhet. The Next Article of the Blessing, is, The Dwelling of Japhet in the Tents of Shem. Some refer this Dwelling in the Tents of Shem, not unto Japhet, but unto God, who had afterwards His Tabernacle, and His Temple, and His People, among the Israelites. Thus Philo, and Onkelos, and Theodoret, and Lyranus, and Abulensis and others; who to this Purpose bring that Passage; Psal. 132.13. The Lord hath chosen Zion, He hath desired it for His Habitation. N. Fuller largely prosecutes this Interpretation; and Interprets and Considers the Text, as pointing to the Messiah, that took among the Jewes, that Humanity, which He made His Tabernacle. Our Heidegger still argues for Japhet. He finds the Promise of the Messiah, in that of the Lords being the God of Shem; so he thinks, there was no need of Repeating it. And the next Clause, Canaan shall be his Servant; this doubtless refers to Japhet. The Tents of Shem then are the Church of God; which continued a long while among the Sons of Shem. There must be a Time, when the Posterity of Japhet, shall be brought into the Communion of the Church; and acknowledge the God of Shem for their God, renouncing all their Idols. The Vocation of the Gentiles, which was to follow upon the Death of our Saviour, was understood by the Ancients, by Chrysostom, and Jerom, and Austin, in this Prophecy. The last Article of the Blessing, is; That, as the Land of Canaan must once be conquered by the Children of Shem, so afterwards there should be a Conquest made of it, by the Children of Japhet. A shrowd Intimation of what the Jewes have suffered from the Gentiles, by the hand of God upon them, for their Unbeleef.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{110} Heidegger (1:42, Exerc. XX, § 7). The Greek adaptation from the apocryphal Liber Ecclesiasticus, attributed to Jesus ben Sirach, reads [Shem] “is [held] in great honour among men, and so was Adam above every living thing in the creation” (49:16).

\textsuperscript{111} Heidegger (1:413, Exerc. XX, § 8). For Philo Judaeus, see Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis (2.76); for the Targum Onkelos, see Walton (3:296), on Ps. 132:13; for Theodoret, Quaestiones in Ocateuchum (Quest. 58, p. 55, lines 11–22); for Nicholaus de Lyra, his annotations on Gen. 9:20–27, in Postilla (1402), vol. 1, n.p.; and for Alfonso Tostado (Abulensis), in his Commentaria in Genesim (1728ed.). Nicholas Fuller’s Christological explication appears in his Miscellaneorum Theologicorum (1616),lib. II, cap. 4, esp. p. 173. The vocation of the Gentiles
These few Words of *Noah*, deserve to be esteemed, as, *Canon prophetiae, et omnium ferè subsequentium prophetiarum epitome.*

All Christians do with Admiration behold the Accomplishment of this Prophecy.

In the Division of the World, *Shem* getts only a Part of *Asia Major*. *Cham* getts, with *Africa*, a very little Part of *Asia*. But *Japhet* shares all *Europe*; All *Asia Minor*; A very great Part of *Asia Major*; And probably, all *America* over and above.

The Church of God was for diverse Ages, remarkably maintained, and confined, among the *Sons of Shem*. A Partition-wall excluded the Chamites and the Japhetites.

The Land of *Canaan* was vanquished and possessed, by the *Sons of Shem*, under the Conduct of *Moses* and *Joshua*.

Here the Messiah was born, and came to *Tabernacle* among us.

Then the Romans, the *Sons of Cittim*, descended from *Japhet*, siezed upon the Land of *Canaan*.

The *Sons of Shem* are cast out of the *Tents of Shem*, and the *Sons of Japhet* are called in. All the Epistles of our Apostle *Paul*, except one, are directed unto the *Sons of Japhet*.

But are we to have no *Sons of Cham* gathered into the Communion of the Church. *Egypt* and all *Africa*, ha’s once had *Christianity* in it. And many who are called Christians are there still to be mett withal. There is now to be no Distinction. [see Col. 3.11.] The *Sons of Cham*, are not in the *Noetic Prophecy*, excluded from the *Tents of Shem*. And yet, inasmuch as they are not mentionned, we may suppose the Japhetites to have a peculiar Prerogative in the Church of the Gentiles. We have seen it surprizingly exemplified. The Church in *Africa*, is horribly buried in Hæresy and Apostasy; Betimes it became so. The Church in *Europe* ha’s had more of Evangelical Purity; The Light of the Gospel hath shone there, much more gloriously. Antichrist indeed ha’s appeared there. But still he has been Resisted and Opposed, by a Number of the Faithful. And anon, mighty Nations & Peoples, have shaken off their Obedience unto him. The Liberty & Purity of the Christian Religion, *Longè Latius et Lætius per Dei Gratiam, inter Japheti posteros emicat, quàm unquam inter Semi et Chami posteros effloruerit*: It has most flourished among the Sons of *Japhet*.\(^{113}\)

---

\(^{112}\) Heidegger (1:414, Exerc. XX, § 9). The ominous words of Noah should be esteemed as “the canon of prophecy, and the epitome of almost all subsequent prophecies.”

\(^{113}\) The remainder of Mather’s excerpt here is also from Heidegger (1:414–5, Exerc. XX, §, 10). The liberty and purity of the Christian religion, Mather cites Heidegger, “shines out much more widely and successfully, by the grace of God, among the descendents of Japheth,
Q. What became of Noah after the Flood? What Habitations did he seek? and what Remembrances ha’s he left? v. 28.

A. Coming out of the Ark, the first Habitation of Noah, was on the Mountains of Ararat, which the Latins call, the Gordyean, or Cordyæan Mountains. The Village which hee there erected, hee called by the Name of Themamin, as Eutychius the Patriarch of Alexandria tells us in his Arabian Annals; which Themamin signifies Eight, and it was as much as to say, Nos octo sumus. Hee tarried not long here, but returned unto his own former Countrey, of Ògyge, or Palestine, from whence the Ark, had, by the Force of the Flood been fluctuated. When Mankind was increased, they swarmed into New Colonies; and tho’ Shem remained in Palestine, yett Cham went into the Countrey of Ïημωνα, which is now called Egypt; and Noah, with Japhet, his eldest Son, travelled into Italy; where they forthwith founded a City, which they called Chethim, or Kittim. The Words used in those Antiquities of Hetruria, found by Inghiramius are very notable, to this Purpose. And besides, you know how the Romans are called in the Scriptures. [Num. 24.24. Dan. 11.2, 30.] Cedrenus also, in his Annals, informs us, That they who of old were called Cetij, were by Telephus, who had the Syrname of Latinus, called, Latini. 114

than it ever blossomed among the descendents of Shem and Ham.” The inclusion of Ham’s descendents among the Raised Saints is also part of Mather’s eschatology (Threefold Paradise 312–13) and in Terra Beata (1726) 35. 114 Mather’s primary source for his commentary on Gen. 9:28 is “Diatriba de Noae in Italiam adventu,” appended to Delphi phoenicizantes (1655), by Dr. Edmund Dickinson (1624–1707), English alchemist, atomist, and physician to the royal household, now best remembered for his Physica Vetus et Vera (1702). Dickinson’s association of Noah with pagan heroes is not unique and can also be found in Mathias Prideaux’s An Essay and Compendious Introduction (1660) 5 ff, and in Edward Stillingsfleet’s Origins Sacrae (1709) 369–70. Dickinson (“Diatriba” 1–4; Delphi 75, 138) acknowledges as his textual source for parts of this paragraph Contextio Gemmarum, sive Eutychii Patriarchæ Alexandrini Annales (1666) 1:40, 43, edited and translated by the great Orientalists John Selden and Edward Pococke, who made available in a dual-language edition the Arabic Annales (Nazám al-jawhar), by the Christian physician and historian Eutychius of Alexandria (877–940). Eutychius’s Annales went through many editions in the seventeenth century. The Latin phrase from Eutychius’s Annales (43) reads, “We are eight.” Dickinson (Delphi 75) identifies as his source for the “Antiquities of Hetruria” an Etruscan fragment Hetruscarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta ab Inghiramo edita (1686), lib. I, pp. 7–9, 14, and lib. II, pp. 132, 142, by Curzio Inghirami (1644–55), an impoverished Italian nobleman of Volterra, Tuscany, who forged a large number of supposed Etruscan documents. Neither Dickinson nor Mather is aware of Inghirami’s forgery, which like that of Annius of Viterbo (1432–1502), is among the more amusing hoaxes of the Renaissance (see I. Rowland, Scaeth 2–44; E. N. Tiggerstedt, “Annius ” 2: 293–310; and C. R. Lagota, “Annius”). Georgius Cedrenus (fl. 11th c.), a Byzantine monk who authored Compendium historiarum (1:2–8), informs Dickinson that Telephus Herculis Latinus (son of Hercules by Auge) called the “Cetij” by the name of

Noah, coming into Italie, ha’s been Remembred by sundry Names, among his Posteritie. First, One of Noahs Names, was

J A N U S.

At first, they pronounced it, Janes. But the Hebrew Word, Jajin for Wine, was the true Original of it; and so you see, his famous Vineyard commemorated. The Greeks therefore call Noah, by the Name of Ὄινώτριος, or, Vinifer. And Cato, with others, do say, Janus, primus invenit Far et Vinum, et ob id dictus fuit Priscus Oenotrius. The Planters also, which Noah carried with him, were called, Oenotrij. Antiochus Syracusanus, a most ancient Writer, particularly mentions them; Ὄινώτρους πρώτουσ τῶν μνημονευομένων ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικήσας. Moreover, the Thuscians, employ’d, a Ship, for the Memorial of Janus; in his Coins, there was hee on one Side, & a Ship on t’other; with an Eye to the Ark of Noah. They also drew Janus as a Bifrons; Whence Ovid,

Multa quidem didici; sed cur Navalis in ære,

Altera Signata est, altera forma Biceps?

This was, but because Noah saw the Two Worlds; the Old & the New. Furthermore, After the Flood, the Lord established His Covenant with Noah; the Name, Covenant, is no less than Seven Times repeted, after his Egress: hence Janus was feigned the Præsident of all Covenant and Concord. Add, That Janus was called, by the Syrname, of Pater; and considered, as the Father of all the Hero’s who have obtained a Place among the Gods. Hee was therefore denominated, Consivius; à Conserendo, i.e. a Propagine generis Humani, que Jano Authore conseritur. How well does all this agree to Noah! Janus was also called, Chaos, who imprægnating of Terra, begat us all. This Terra was but the Wife of Noah; and there was an Occasion for this Fancy fetched from the Text [Gen. 9.20.] where Noah is called, Vir Terre. You know /ça/ denotes an Husband, as well as a Man. And this Wife of Noah, is therefore styled among them, Aretia; which is but from the Hebrew Word /ça/ for, Earth. Finally, tell mee why the Mythical Writers

“Latini” – no doubt, a common enough Euhemerist endeavor to identify the mythical origin of the Romans with the descendents of Noah.

Dickinson, “Diatriba” (4–7). The Hebrew word ˜yIyÆ (Yahyin) [Strong’s # 3196] does signify wine.” The Greek Ὄινωτριος (Oinotrios), or “Wine-bringer” appears in its association with Italian vineyards in many Greek texts – here, for instance, in Dionysius Halicarnus (Antiquitates Romanæ 1.2.1–2) and in the fragment by Antiochus of Syracuse (below). Perhaps because of such loose linguistic associations Sir Walter Raleigh vehemently objected to the “fiction, That the Italian Janus was Noah” (History of the World, bk. 1, ch. 8, § 5). Dickinson identifies De Originibus, by the Roman orator and historian Marcus Porcius Cato, aka. Cato the Elder (234–149 bce), as his source, but the citation does not appear in Cato’s text. At any rate, the Latin citation reads, “Janus first discovered grain and wine, and because of this he was called the Ancient Wine-bringer.” Dickinson’s Greek citation from a fragment by the ancient Greek historian Antiochus Syracusanus (fl. 5th c. bce), appears in Fragmenta (Frag. 3, lines 4–5). The Thuscians (citizens of a N Italian province), depicted the double-faced (Lat. “bifrons”) Janus on their coins. Ovid (Fasti 1.229–30) describes this coin as follows: “I have learned much indeed; but why is the shape of a ship stamped / On one side of the copper coin, and a two-headed figure on the other?”
tell us, that in the Reign of Janus, all the Dwellings of Men, were well hedged with Religion and Sanctity; if the exact Righteousness of Noah [Gen. 6.9.] bee not therein referr’d unto. Hence Janus in their old Rituals, is called, Cerus Manus; which is as much as to say, Sanctus, Bonus: For Cerus, in the old Latin was the same with Sanctus; whence came, Ceremonia, the same with Sanctimonia: And Manus, or Manuus, was the same with Bonus; whence Dij Manes, are Dij Boni, so confessed, a suppticiter eos venerantibus, propter metum mortis; as Immanes are the Contrary. This by the way, explains a most obscure Passage in Leander Albertus, who sais, that in a most ancient Chronicle, hee found it written, Post Universale Diluvium, ducentis viginti quinque annis, maxima multitudo Hominum, in hunc Tractum, nunc Italicam dictum, sub Ducibus BONO, TUBAL, CAMEBISE (perhaps it may bee read, Camese) et alijs adnavigavit. BONUS, was Noah, whose Mystical Name, was Manus.116

Another of Noah’s Names; was

V A D I M O N, and V E R T U M N U S.

The Thuscians, after his Death, call’d him Vadimon. But Vado signified the same that Vertu; and hence they called him likewise Vertumnus. Yea, Xenophon intimates that hee was the first, Proteus; which from the Egyptian Proto, was of the same Signification. Janus was thus denominated, because hee taught the Rules of Astronomy, & the Turns of the World; et ob id illum existimârunt habere divinam Naturam, et movere atque Veitere Cœlos, et elementa, et cuncta Vertibilia. Whence hee was counted, Vertentis Anni Dominus. Or, because, being the first builder of Temples in Italy, and Institutor of Sacred Rites, after-ages worshipped him with such Rites, ut rem Inchoatam benè verteret, ad finemque fæliciter perduceret.117

116 Dickinson, “Diatriba” (7–10). The Roman senator and praetorian prefect Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius (fl. 400 ce) explains in his celebrated Saturnalia (1.9.16) that Janus is revered as “Consivius” (a derivation of “conserendo,” i.e., “sowing”), because “from the propagation of the human race, which was sown by Janus as the author.” Instead of “vir terrae” (“man of the earth”), the Vulgate calls Noah “vir agricola” (“farmer” or “husbandman”) and the Hebrew text calls him yish (iysh), suggesting “man” and “husbandman” [Strong’s # 0376]. The Hebrew noun גַּגְרָא (erets) signifies “earth” [Strong’s # 0776]. Mather’s “Mythical Writers” include Macrobius’s Saturnalia (1.9). The “Dij Manes” and “Dij Boni” were called “good souls” and “good spirits, by those who worshipped them humbly, out of the fear of death.” The Latin citations are from Joseph Justus Scaliger’s edition of De verborum significatu (1575), by the Roman lexicographer Sextus Pompeius Festus (fl. late 2nd ce). The “obscure Passage” is adapted from Descriptio totius Italiae (1557), “Umbria Italicae Regio Tertia,” p. 129, by the Italian Dominican historian and topographer Leander Albertus (1499–1552), and translates, “two-hundred and twenty-five years after the Great Flood, a very great multitude of people sailed into that region which is now called Italy, under the leadership of Bonus, Tubal, Cambyses and others.”117

117 Dickinson, “Diatriba” (10–11), draws on the infamous forgery, by Johannes Annius of Viterbo (Giovanni Nanni), whose Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII cum commentaria (1498) incorporated supposedly rediscovered manuscripts by such ancient historians as the Babylonian Berosus, the Egyptian Manetho, the Persian Metasthenes, Q. Fabius Pictor, and others. Dickinson is not the only one who falls prey to Friar Annius’s forgery; Johann Heinrich Alsted includes him in his famous Scientiarum omnium encyclopaediae (1649) 1:103; and Athanasius Kircher, in his De arca Noë (1675), lib. 3, pars 3, cap. 5–7, pp. 204–22. Mather was
A Third of Noahs Names, was

**G A L L U S.**

Hear the Remarkable Words of Xenophon. Ogyges plures fuere, Primus Atavon Nini (that is, Noah) quem Babylonij Gallum Cognominant. Quod in Inundatione etiam superstes, alios eripuerit, et genuerit. Hinc sage, apud quos navigio salvatus est, et ereptus, Ratem vocant Gallerim, qua undis salvet. The Thuscians therefore called, Ships, by the Name of Gelee. You must know, that /Gal/ signifies, Fluctum et Aquarum copiam. So Noah was called Gallus, for the Rains & Floods wherein hee was concerned. And Pliny tells us, that the Gracians called the Ancient Italians, Umbrios (απο του ὀμβρου) quod Inundatione Terrarum Imbribus superfuisissent. But Solinus tells us, that the Umbri, were the Offspring of the old Galli; and Cato tells us, that Janus came out of Scythia, cum Gallis progenitoribus Umbrorum. From his Grandfathers Name of Gallus, did Gomer also come to wear the same Name; whence came the Nations of the Galli, & the Galate, of whom Josephus reports, that they were once called, Gomerites. Jerom tells us, that the Galatians to whom the Apostle wrote, were a Colony of the ancient Galli; and Livy tells us, that they were the Posterity of the Celtæ who were the same; and it seems, in Pauls time, they spoke the same Language, that the Gauls or French, did, in Tiers. Ammianus Marcellinus assures us, Gallos Graecus Sermo Galatas appellat. Probably, from /Rain; (whence the Welsh Word, Glau,) as if they had been called, Impluviati, or, Inundati.  

aware of this forgery, but does not hesitate to excerpt the story of Noah’s travels to Italy, from Dickinson, who himself had accepted as authoritative Curzio Inghirami’s forgery *Etruscarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta* (1606). See E. N. Tigerstedt, “Ioannes Annius and Graecia Mendax” (2:293–310), and W. E. Stephens, “Berosus Chaldaeus” and “Etruscans.” The passage from Annius’s forgery “Xenophon de aequivocis,” in *Antiquitatum* (148), pp. d–iii(r) – d–iii(v), translates, “there were several Ogyges; the first was Atavus Nini (the great-great-great-grandfather of Noah), whom the Babylonians call Gallus. Because, surviving even in the flood, he rescued others and reproduced. Hence those (along with whom he was saved and rescued by the vessel) rightly call the boat, which rescues people in the sea, Gallerim.” The Hebrew word קַל (kal) signifies “heap, wave, billow,” “rolling waves” (Gen. 31:48) [Strong’s # 1530]. The science of etymological and philological derivations was still in its infancy in the seventeenth century, and homonymic similarities between sounds of different languages were frequently taken as evidence of their linguistic kinship. The Latin explication of the Hebrew “Gall” signifies “fluctuation and copious water.” The Latin adaptation (with Mather’s Greek parenthesis from Dickinson) appears in Pliny (3.14.12) and reads, “The Umbrians (from the ombrou ["a storm of rain"]) for having survived the rains after the flood [inundation of the earth].” Solinus makes the Umbrians the offspring of the Galli, in his (*De mirabilibus mundi*, cap. 2). Marcus Porcius Cato (*De originibus* [proem]) argues that Janus came out of Scythia, “with the Umbrians the offspring of the Galli.” Josephus
One more of Noah's Names, was, 

**XISUTHRUS.**

Possibly the Greeks framed this Name, from the Hebrew Zuz, ingeminated; which signifies, Postis, Porta, Limen; and such, you know, Noah was unto the World. Alexander Polyhistor, has told us, that in the Days of Xisuthrus, there was a great Flood; but that Xisuthrus, by being warned of it, escaped, with all Birds, Reptiles, and Cattel, in an Ark, whereto hee was directed. So much is by Cyril quoted from him. And from the same Author, Abydenus adds, That hee sailed into Armenia, and that when the Storm, which made the Flood, was abated, hee sent forth certain Birds, to discover whether any Part of the Earth were yett above Water; but the poor Birds having no Dry Place to light upon, returned again unto him. The Greeks tell us, That hee who thus premonished Xisuthrus, was Κρόνος, (or Saturn,) by whom they meant, the True God, the Ancient of Dayes. Hence, Damascius relates, that the Phœnicians and Syrians, called Saturn, by the Name of EL; or as ha's been learned out of Sanchoniathon, by the Name of IL: to whom also, tis added, the Seventh Day was consecrated. Whence tis, I suppose, that the Greeks report Saturn, to have been worshipped among the Jewes.\(^{119}\)

There was a Fifth of Noah's Names; & that was 

**OENOTRIUS.**

---

\(^{119}\) Dickinson, "Diatriba" (14–5). From the Hebrew root “Zuz,” suggesting to Dickinson (Lat.) “door post,” “gate,” and “threshold,” Dickinson derives “Zizus,” leading to “Zisuthrus” or “Xisouthros,” tenth king of the Chaldeans, according to Berosus’s Sumerian King-List. According to Berosus, King Xisuthrus (Noah) is awarded immortality after Kronos (Saturn) revealed to him in a dream the impending flood (Babylonika 2), in Berosus and Manetho (49). Dickinson’s source is Cyrilrus Alexandrinus (Contra Julianum 1.7.4–7), who excerpts a fragment from Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor (Fragmenta F4a # 273). Likewise, Cyril Alexandrinus (Contra Julianum 1.7–8), quoting from an excerpt of Abydenus (fl. 2nd–3rd c. ce), relates that Xisuthrus (Noah) sailed to Armenia and sent out birds from the Ark to test if the waters had subsided. The Neo-Platonist Damaskios (c. 458–c. 533 ce), last principal at the Athenian Academy, relates that the Phoenicians and Syrians call Kronos (Saturn) by the name “EL” and “Bel,” as well as “Bolathen,” in Photius (Bibliotheca, Codex 242, Bekker page 343b, 21). According to a fragment of (Herennius) Philon of Byblos (Fragmenta [Jacoby] F 3c, 790, F fragm. 2, line 99), the supposed pre-Trojan historian Sanchoniathon, relates that Kronos (Saturn) was called Ήλεων or “IL”; hence the seventh day, Saturday, being named after the Graeco-Roman god.
This was fetched from Οίνον, as That is from יין Jajin, which is Wine, in the English Word, from thence also derived. You know the Story herein referr’d unto. And hence Tuscany, yea, all Italy, was once called, Oenotria.\textsuperscript{120}

A Sixth of Noah’s Names, was

\textbf{O G Y G E S.}

Hence, in the Epitaph of Ninus, his Great Grandfathers Grandfather, Noah, is distinguished, by the Name of Cælius, Phoenix, OGYGES. And Xenophon reckons the First Great Flood, \textit{Sub prisco Ogyge}; it was the Ogygian Flood. Now Ogyges, as Bolducus would have it, is a Word corrupted, of the Hebrew נוֹאָה Oghose, which signifies, \textit{Sacrificator panis subcineritij}. Or, if you will, from Ogy, redoubled, which is the same, \textit{Subcineritij panis, in sacros usus aptator}. This agrees well enough, to Noah, that Renowned, Sacrificer. Whence, in the Annals of Eutychius Alexandrinus, Noah dying, charged Shem, to advise Melchisedec, \textit{Neque aliam ibi offerat oblationem, quàm Panem et Vinum, quæ Deo offerat}. And so Janus is hee, who, they say, first Invented and Applied Corn, for Sacred Uses.\textsuperscript{121}

Among the rest of Noah’s Names, was,

\textbf{D E U C A L I O N.}

And this, not the Thessalian, but the Scythian, Deucalion. Lucian gives us a Narrative, That when all Mankind perished in a Flood for their daily Wickednesses, Deucalion alone was left, \textit{in Secundam videlicet generationem, prudentie simul et pietatis gratià}. Hee sais, Deucalion went into a great Ark, with his Wife and Children; and at the same time, Two of all sorts of Creatures that live upon Earth, came unto him, without Hurting of him; and Jupiter producing an exact Concord among them, thus præserved them all. Plutarch also sais, Deucalion by sending forth a Dove out of his Ark, learn’d how the Weather was abroad.

And what ha’s Moses himself written plainer of our Noah? Well might Philo then assure us, that the Chaldeans call him Noah, whom the Greeks call, Deucalion; ἐφ’ οὗ τὸν μέγαν κατακλυσμὸν συνήβη γενέσθω.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{120} Dickinson, “\textit{Diatriba}” (15–16). In Dickinson’s etymology, the Etruscan name “Oenotrius” (Noah) is derived from the Greek “Oion” (or rather, Οἶνος); i.e., “wine.” In this manner, then, Dickinson links “Oion” (wine) with its Hebrew equivalent “yayin” (“wine”) [Strong’s #3196]. Through this linguistic somersault Dickinson and his peers link the bibulous Noah in Italy with the name “Oenotria.” Well, there it is.

\textsuperscript{121} Dickinson, “\textit{Diatriba}” (16–18). For the “Epitaph of Ninus,” Dickinson relies on Annius of Viterbo’s forgery of Xenophon’s \textit{De æquivoxìs}. Solinus also associates Ogyges with Deucalion (hence Noah), in his \textit{De mirabilibus mundi} (ch. 11). So, too, Jacobus Bolducus, aka. Jacques Bolduc (d. 1646), French Capuchin theologian, in his \textit{De Ecclesia ante legem} (1626), asserts that the name for the legendary King “Ogyges” is derived from the Hebrew word “Oghose,” which signifies “sacrificer of bread baked under embers,” or (better yet) “adaptor of bread baked under embers for holy use.” Finally, Dickinson’s citation from \textit{Contextio Gemmarum, sive, Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales} (1656) 1:6, has the dying Noah charge his son Shem to advise Melchizedek, “neither to make any offering to God other than bread and wine.”

\textsuperscript{122} Dickinson, “\textit{Diatriba}” (18–20). Mather, via Dickinson, distinguishes between the Thessalian Deucalion, ruler of the Phthiotis, son of Prometheus and Klymene, and spouse of Pyrrha (Ovid, \textit{Metamorphosis} 1.318–94; Apollodorus, \textit{Bibliotheca} 1.7.1–2; 3.8.1–2; 3.14.5) and
Furthermore, consulting Diodorus Siculus, you’ll see among the Names of Noah, SOL and COELUM.
The Father of the Egyptian Pan, that is, of Cham. This was, as Macrobius tells us, the Name of Janus; and hee was Noah. Hence Ennius, quoted by Lactantius, tells us, *Initio primus in Terris Imperium Summum Coelus habuit.* Noahs teaching of Astronomy, and foretelling of Events, was the reason of his having this Name. Hence, hee was a Bifrons, yea, a Quadrifrons, unto them that call’d him, Janus; as being Lord, not only of the Rising and Setting Sun, every Day, or the Diespiter; but also of the Four Seasons in the Year. Moreover, also from Heaven and Earth all things proceed; so from Noah, & his Wife, Titaea, that is, Terra; called also, Ῥeña, which is but the Anagram of Ἑρα, the Earth. But lastly, SATURN, must also come in, among the Names of our Noah. Saturn, I say, who was in the *Orphæan Hymns* παγγενέτωρ, and γεναρχης; the Husband of the Newly mentioned Rhea; the Vir Terra. And unto him, did Husbandry use to be ascribed, as you may see at large in Plutarch, and Macrobius. Yea, The Vineyard, and the Drinking of Noah, ha’s made Saturn the Patron of such Matters, in the Ethnic Religions and you are not Ignorant, what were the Employments of the Saturnalia. Add, Saturn, and his Wife, were born ex Oceano, et Thetide: Why so, but because Noah, with his Family survived the Flood.

dickinson, “Diatribe” (20–23) and Delphi (38–39). Diodorus Siculus (1.10.4; 1.2.6; 1.18.2) relates that the Egyptians were well familiar with the story of Deucalion’s flood (Noah); that Helios (Sol) and Pan (Coelum) were among the first gods who established cities in Egypt; and that according to one Egyptian tradition, the inhabitants of the Thebaid region revered their god Pan and gave his name to one of their cities called “Chemmo,” which signifies “City of Pan.” Macrobius (Saturnalia 1.7.19–5; 1.9.1–18) relates that Janus and Cameses were co-rulers over Italy when the land was called Camesene, that Janus had two faces (forward and backward looking), and that he also minted coins, especially one with a ship on its reverse side, commemorating the arrival of Saturn, whom Janus made co-ruler and honored by instituting the Saturnalian rites. Lactantius (Divinarum institutionum 1.13) [PL 6. 189B], quoting the Roman poet and dramatist Quintus Ennius (239–169 bce), points out that “In the beginning, Coelus first had the supreme power on the earth” (ANF 7:26). In Mather’s interpretation, then, Noah is not only a “double-faced” but also a “four-faced” Janus or the “Diespiter” (dies pater, i.e., Father Day), which is another name for “Jupiter” (Varro, De lingua Latina 5.66; 9.75, 77). Thus Noah’s wife (Deucalion’s Pyrrha) is by Diodorus Siculus (3.57.1–2; 5.66.2) called “Titaea” (Titaea), whose name was changed to “Ge,” and by Dickinson associated (via “Ges” or “Gaia”) with “Terra” (“Earth”), also called “Rhea” from the anagram “Era” (“Earth”).
Q. Upon the Coming of Noah out of the Ark, we have a New World begun. The Restitution of the World, will afford unto us, various and excellent Matters to be discoursed on? v. 29.

A. The Pagans, and especially the Stoicks, had their Traditions of a Great Year, that should bring a Revolution upon the World, wherein it should both εξυδατουται, and εξαυχμουται: both, Exaquesere, and, Exignescere. But, there is little Occasion for us, to trouble ourselves, with the Stoical Notions about the, παλιγγενεσια of the World. It is enough to repeat what Seneca saies, [Nat. Quæst. L.III. c. 30.] Rejectus è nostris sedibus in sua secreta pelletur Oceanus; et antiquus ordo revocabitur. Omne ex integro animal generabitur, dabiturque terris homo inscius scelerum, et melioribus auspicijs natus. Sed illis quoque innocentia non durabit, nisi dum novi sunt. Citò nequitia subrepit; virtus difficilis inventu est, rectorem ducemque desiderat. Etiam sine magistro vitia discuntur.125

124 Dickinson, “Diatriba” (24–26). In Orphica (Hymni 4.1; 13.8), Saturn or “Ouranous” (Uranus) is called “paggeneretor” (“father of all”) and “genarches,” (“begetter”), hence husband of Rhea, the “husband of the Earth.” Plutarch (Aetia Romana et Graeca 275 A–B), Plutarch’s Moralia (4:73–74), and Macrobius (Saturnalia 1.7.25) ascribe the invention of husbandry to Saturn (Uranus). The Saturnalian rites – instituted by Janus – were celebrated among the Greeks and Romans (December 17–22) in honor of the God Saturn and involved rites similar to our modern Mardi Gras, along with exchanging gifts, eating, drinking, and related merriments. See for instance Lucian’s Saturnalia (5, 13–19.25–35; Works 6:94–95, 106–15, 122–35). According to Plato, Uranus (Saturn) and Ges (Gaia); i.e., heaven and earth, were born of the Ocean and of Tethys, and in their turn procreated Phorcys, Kronos, Rhea and the rest of the Titans (Timaeus 40e–41a). All these curiosities and more can be found in Edward Dickinson’s Delphi Phoenicizantes and in its appendix “Diatriba de Noae in Italiam adventu” (1655). Much of the same material appears in An Historical Treatise of the Travels of Noah into Europe (1601), which Richard Lynche excerpted and translated from Annius of Viterbo’s forgery Antiquitatum variorum (1498).

125 Here, Mather returns to mining Johann Heinrich Heidegger’s Historia Sacra Patriar-charum (1:381–82, Exerc. XIX, § 1). According to Diogenes Laertius’s biography of Zeno (Vita Philosophorum 7.141–2), the Stoics, the disciples of Zeno of Citium (335–263 bce), maintained that the world as a living entity is mutable because its constituting parts are constantly changing, dissolving, and recombining; hence its elements can turn into water (“exydatoutai”) or turn into fire (“exaychmoutai”) or regenerate themselves (“palingenesia”). The Greek words appear in Diogenes Laertius (Vita philosophorum 7.141.9) and in Philo Judaesus (De aeternitate mundi 21.D7.1, 7), suggesting “dissolution by water,” “conflagration,” and “regeneration” (Works 719); the Latin translations appear in Censorinus (De die natali liber 18.11). Seneca (Naturales questiones 3.30.7–8) is again put to good use here: “The Ocean will be ejected from our abode and driven back to its own secret dwelling-place, and the ancient order of things will be re-established. Every living creature will be created anew and the earth will be given men ignorant of sin, and born under better auspices. But their innocence, too, will not last, except as long as they are new. Vice quickly creeps in. Virtue is difficult to find; it needs a director and guide. Vices can be learned even without a teacher.”
The Renovation of the World upon the Coming of Noah out of the Ark, is now to be considered. And it is Remarkable, That the First Thing done in this our World was, An Action of Piety; The Offering of a Sacrifice unto GOD; with an Eye to the promised SEED of the WOMAN, upon whose Account alone, the World is at all preserved. Josephus tells us, That the Fear of another Flood made Noah offer this, as a Sacrifice by way of Deprecation. But there is no Intimation of any such Matter in the History. Wherefore, as Heidegger saies, Nihil hoc Josephi commento utimur. However, the Pagans had some Tradition of this Noetic Sacrifice. Only they made it a Peace-Offering, whereof Part was burnt on the Altar, but Part was Cutt-off, (call’d, Precium, and, Prosicium,) to be eaten by the Sacrificers. They say, Prometheus, (the same with Noah,) was the Author of this Custome.126

The first mention of an Altar occurs on this Occasion. Tho’ that Adam also used an Altar, there is no Reason to make any Question. The Matter and Figure of the Altar must remain unknown to us; But probably Chrysostom is in the right, when he calls it, Ὁσσωστηριον ἐσχεδιασμενον, Altare tumultuariâ operâ constructum.127

The Reparation of the World, is owing to the Antitype of that Sacrifice which Noah offered; the Object of Noahs Faith, when he offered.

There ensued a Promise, That the Order of Nature in the World should not fail. And, That an Universal Flood should no more drown the World. That Clause, that seems to assign the Cause of this Promise; For the Imagination of Mans Heart is Evil from his Youth; ha’s tortured Interpreters. But in the Particle, [For] there is, Remotio illius cause, que maledictionem Terre invexit; It is as much as to say, Notwithstanding.128

Among other famous Occurrences on this Occasion, There is the Law of Slaughter. It runs in these Terms; Surely, Your Blood of your Lives will I require; At the Hand of every Beast will I require it; and at the hand of Man, at the hand of every Mans Brother will I require the Life of Man; whoso sheddeth Mans Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed: for in the Image of GOD made He Man. It will hardly be worth our while, to recite either the Jewish, or the Grotian Interpretation of this Law; or the Controversies which learned Men have managed with

---

126 Heidegger (1:383–84, Exerc. XIX, §§ 3–4). The disquisition on Noah’s fear appears in Josephus Flavius (Antiquities 1.3.7), but Heidegger dismisses the story, saying that “this comment of Josephus is of no use to us.” That which the priest cut off was called the “Precium,” which suggests “cutting,” and the “Prosicium,” the “cutting for the sacrifice.” (Mather erroneously spells “Procium” instead of “Prosicium.”)

127 Heidegger (1:385, Exerc. XIX, § 5). Joannes Chrysostom (In Genesim homiliae 1–67) [PG 53. 242, line 23] explains that Noah is more concerned with a person’s intent than the manner of execution; hence Noah was “building an altar from what lay at hand” (Homilies in Genesis 27.5, p. 166).

128 Heidegger (1:385–87, Exerc. XIX, §§ 7, 8). Heidegger (1:387) asserts that the particle “for” entails “a removal of that cause which brought a curse upon the earth.”
them thereupon. It shall be enough, to observe, with our Heidegger, That in this Law, we have Three Things to Countenance and Influence the Instauration of the World. First, That no Man may seek the Life, or shed the Blood of another Man. Secondly, That who ever shall shed the Blood of any Man, shall, whether it be Man or Beast, have the Pæna Talionis executed on him. Thirdly, That the Executioner of this Punishment, shall be Man in Authority; or, if he fails, it may be expected, that GOD Himself will do it, by His own immediate Hand. Or, by some Hand and Plague of His Providing. The Observation of Heidegger upon it, is this; Ejus Comminationis veritas, rebus ipsis et tot experimentis, quibus Deus, vel per Magistratum, vel per Singularia Judicia, homines ultus est, cognita est, ut prolixiori explicatione minimè indiget.129

Thus ha’s the Great GOD consulted the Tranquility of Humane Society. And Men proceeding according to the Rules of Reason, may | transfer this Law, to some other Crimes, besides Formal Murder. For, as Grotius observes; Sunt quaedam quae Vita equiparantur; ut, existimatio; pudor Virginalis, Fides Matrimonij, aut sine quibus vita tuta esse non potest, ut Imperij Societatem Continentis Reverentia; Adversum qua qui faciunt, ij Homicidis meliores non videntur.130

But the Restoration of the Church in the World, was the great Thing to be now considered. The Promise of the Blessed Seed of the Woman, that was to break the Serpents Head, was not yett accomplished. And almost all the Seed of Eve, was now destroy’d in the Flood. Wherefore, the Great GOD, now enters into a Covenant with Noah, That the World should be destroy’d with a Flood no more. The Church of God ha’s a peculiar, a singular Concernment in this Covenant:

129 Heidegger (1:394–96, 400–01, Exerc. XIX, §§ 17, 18, 22). The italicized proscription against the shedding of blood appears in Gen. 9:5–6. The rabbinic commentary on these two verses is manifold. Rashi (from Midrash Rabbah, Gen. XXXIV.13) interprets the opening of Gen. 9:5 as a proscription against suicide; Ibn Ezra reads it as a prohibition against the murder of a fellow human being; Ramban distinguishes between the mere spilling of blood (through a wound) and the shedding of blood (murder) that represents the soul. Furthermore, Rashi and the Targum Jonathan (Etheridge 1:18–84) make intentional murder and accidental killing a capital crime to be avenged by the next of kin, especially if the person who commits involuntary manslaughter does not go into exile or ask pardon (Mikraoth Gedoloth: Genesis 1:119–90). R. Bechai (Bachya) ben Asher adds that even those who do not practice procreation also commit murder, for according to the Talmudic tractate Yevamot 63 (and R. Akiva), the person who abstains from procreation “is guilty of diminishing G’d’s image in the world” (Midrash Rabbeinu Bachya, 1:191).The renowned Dutch legal scholar Hugo Grotius addresses the “Law of Retaliation” or “Jus Talonis,” in his De Jure Belli ac Pacis (1625), lib. 1, cap. 2, art. 5; lib. 2, cap. 20, art. 8; Rights of War and Peace (1:190–94, 2:966–71) Finally, Heidegger’s observation (1:401) translates, “The truth of this threat – since the very means by which God has punished men, either through a magistrate, or through singular justice, have been tried so many times – is known, such that a longer explanation is hardly necessary.”

130 Heidegger (1:401, Exerc. XIX, § 22). Grotius observes, “there are some Things which we prize equally with our Lives; as Reputation, Virgin-Chastity, conjugal Fidelity; and those Things without which our Lives cannot be safe, as Reverence for our Sovereigns; against which those who offend are to be accounted as bad as Murderers” (De Jure Belli ac Pacis, lib. 1, cap. 2, art. 5; Rights of War and Peace 1:19).
which the Prophet *Isaiah*, has not obscurely intimated. [See Isa. 54.9, 10.] The Churches coming to Righteousness, by the Messiah, and to the Inheritance of the Righteous, lies enwrapped in this Covenant. And that Passage, *Neither shall all Flesh be cutt off*, carries an Intimation, that God will become the God of All Nations, and bring some of All Nations into His Kingdome. [Compare, Heb. 11.7.] The Preservation of all the Creatures, is for the Sake of the Church, as that of the Church is for the Sake of a Glorious Christ. [Ponder, 1. Cor. 3.21, 22, 23.]

And the Rainbow given as the Sign of this Covenant, leads us to think of the Saviour, whom we find appearing with a Rainbow about His Head [Rev. 10.1.] when the Flood of Antichristian Ignorance and Wickedness is going off the World. Ambrose gives us a Mystical Exposition of the Bow in the Cloud, which renders the Matter more obscure than it is. He will not have the Rainbow intended; but, *Virtus Invisibilis Dei*, A secret Efficacy of God, Extending sometimes, and sometimes Remitting, the Exercise of His Power, & Justice, and Mercy in the Government of the World. *Quam ideò in Nubibus dicit poni, quià tunc maximè opus est Divina auxilio prudentiae, quando agmina Nubium in Procellas Tempestatesque coguntur.* The Lord saies, *I will place my Bow there, not, my Arrow.* Hear Ambrose glossing upon it; *Ideò Dominus in Nubibus Arcum magis quàm sagittam ponit; id est, non illud quod Vulneret, sed quod habeat Terroris Indicium, Vulneris Effectum habere non soleat.*

We need not go to *Suidas*, for a Definition of a Rainbow; That it is, *Νεφους υγρωτης κατ᾿ εμπτωσιν νηλου πεποικιλμενου, οιον τον τοξον· Iris est Nubis Humiditas variata ob Solis Incursum, Arcus instar.* Every body knowes the Rainbow, the Figure, and the Colour of it. The Natural Signification of the Rainbow, is thus delivered by Seneca; *Non easdem, undecunque apparuit, minas adfert. A meridie ortus, magnam vim Aquarum vehet. Vinci enim non potuerunt, nisi valentissimo sole: tamum est illis Virium. Si circà occasum refusit, rorabit et leviter impluet. Si ab ortu circàve surrexerit, serena promittet.* By the Poets, it was called, *υετοματος, Pluvius Vates.* But Pliny makes the Signification much more Dubious; *Nam ne pluvios quidem, aut serenos Dies, cum fide portendunt.* The Supernatural Signification of the Rainbow, is much more determined: Namely, That there shall not come another Universal Flood upon the World; but that God will preserve a Church in the World, and make it Righteous, and bring it to Inherit the World;

---

132 Heidegger (1:402–03, Exerc. XIX, §§ 25, 26). Heidegger argues that “Therefore He said that this [the rainbow] was placed in the clouds, because then there is the greatest need for the help of divine wisdom, when armies of clouds are gathered into gales and tempests.” Ambrose’s gloss in *De Noë et Arca* (cap. 27, § 104) [PL 14.408B] seconds this interpretation: “Therefore the Lord placed a bow in the clouds rather than an arrow; that is, not that which wounds, but that which has the sign of fear, and is not accustomed to have the effect of a wound.”
and all this for the sake of the Messiah; whom we afterwards find appearing with a Rainbow about Him.133

Some will have, the Rainbow, to be a Sign, (of the Covenant made with Noah,) of that sort, which they call, at least, Quodammodò Naturale; inasmuch, as it is only seen, when the Clouds are so thin, as to give no apprehension of Showres enough to make another Flood: Qui enim possit (as Valesius expresses it) cum neque Cælum totum obductum nubibus sit, neque que adsunt, sunt valdè dense. Thus, Thomas Aquinas, and Cajetan, and Javel, and Cardan, and among the Hebrewes, R. Levi Ben Gerson, who is also followed by Vossius. But our Heidegger will not subscribe to this. For the Flood was accomplished, not by mere Showres, but by some Supernatural Circumstances.

The Rainbow was a Sign, purely by Institution: as Water is in Baptism; as Bread and Wine, in the Eucharist.134

133 Heidegger (1:403–04, Exerc. XIX, §§ 27, 28). The quotation from the medieval lexicon Suda (Alphabetic letter iota entry 598, lines 1–2), along with its Latin translation, signifies, “a rainbow is the wetness of a multi-colored cloud against the sun’s onset, resembling a bow.” Seneca (Naturales quaestiones 1.8.8), commenting on Virgil (Georgics 1.30), does not deem the rainbow as an auspicious sign at all, for “it offers different threats depending on where it appears. When it rises in the south it will bring a great rainstorm; for the rains cannot be dispersed by the strongest sun, so great is their force. If it shines towards the west there will be dew and a light shower.” The Greek epic poet Euphorion of Chalcis (b. 275 bce), librarian of Antioch, called it “yetomantos,” a “nimbus” or “arc” (i.e., “rainbow”) associated with an “ominous rain shower” (Fragmenta 89, line 1). Pliny (2.60.150) is more hesitant to attach either a bad or good omen to rainbows, “for they do not reliably portend even rain or fine weather.”

134 Heidegger (1:404–05, Exerc. XIX, § 29). Some interpreters who do also acknowledge the covenantal signification of the rainbow call it “in a certain respect a natural” sign. Francisco Vallesio (fl. 16th century), Italian physician to Philip II of Spain, also discourages such doomsday scenarios in his De Sacra Philosophia (1608), cap. 9, p. 98, arguing, “For who can [think there could be another flood] since the whole sky is not covered over with clouds, and those that are there are not very thick?” Even though Mather quotes Vallesio (Valesius) at second hand from Heidegger (1:404), Mather evidently owned a copy of Francisci Vallesii De Sacra Philosophia (1608); this reprint in the Mather Family Libraries [AAS Library # 0646] bears the signatures of Thomas Shepard (168), of Cotton Mather (no date), and of Samuel Mather (1726). Cotton Mather’s list of authors (here borrowed from Heidegger) does not provide further specifications. However, St. Thomas Aquinas sticks to a purely natural signification of the rainbow, in his Treatise on Vices opposed to Religion (Question 95), arguing that the rainbow sometimes presages fair weather only “in so far as its cause is the cause of fair weather” (Summa Theologica 3:1597–98, pt. 2.2, Q95, A5). Mather also refers to Chrysostom Javellus (1472–1538), an Italian commentator on Aristotle and Aquinas, in his Meteorologica (1527), lib. 7, cap. 3, ult.; to Cajetanus, aka. Giacomo de Vio (1469–1534), an Italian cardinal, who wrote significant commentaries on Aquinas and Aristotle; to Hieronymus Cardanus (1501–76), the renowned Italian physician and mathematician, who published a commentary on, and Latin translation of, Ptolemy, De asteroidum judicis, cum expositione Hieronymi Cardani Mediolanensis medici (168), lib. 2, cap. 2, textu 72; to Rabbi Levi ben Gers(h)on (1288–1344), French rabbi, philosopher, and biblical commentator, whose Hebrew Commentarius in Pentateuchum [Pirush ha-Ralbag al ha-Torah] was first published in Mantua, Italy (c. 1476–79), and to Gerard Vossius, who acknowledges some of the same sources in his De Theologia Gentili (1641), lib. 3, cap. 13, pp 788–89.”
And yet there is in the Rainbow, some Sort of Analogy, with the Covenant, whereof it is Instituted for a Token. The Rainbow is naturally a Sign, that the Rains will not be Great nor Long; and that Fair Weather is anon to be expected. The Covenant of God is accordingly, that the World, shall not be any more so Destructively as once it was, Rained upon; and especially, That the Church in the World shall be preserved. Tho’ the World, and the Church, may be obnoxious to dreadful Judgments of God, and a Flood of Divine Wrath may prevail very far upon it, and rise as it were up to the Neck; yett the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, the Fountains of the Deep, shall not break out, and prevail so far, as utterly to overwhelm it. Our Heidegger carries on the Similitude; That the Three Colours of Red, and Green and Blue, in the Rainbow, intimate the Sweet Mixture of Justice and Mercy, accomplished by the Blood of the Covenant. The Rainbow never fills a Circle, nor makes more than a Semi-Circle. The Kingdom of our Lord, in His Church, is herein a little Represented; Part on Earth, Part Above. Our Saviour was on Earth, when He suffered for us, and began His Kingdom. He went up from Earth to Heaven; and will come down from Heaven to Earth again. The Afflictions attending the Kingdom of our Lord, in the World, & the Enemies not yet all wholly subdued, make the Condition of a Semi Circle too agreeable unto it. The Circle will not be filled up, till the Kingdom be Delivered up unto the Father, and God shall become All in All.\textsuperscript{135}

Was there any Rainbow before the Flood? Aben Ezra thinks, No; And so do many Christians. But our Heidegger saies, Oppidò falluntur. God speaks not of the Rainbow, as a New Thing. He seems to speak of it, as a Thing that had been already placed in the Clouds. He invites us to look on the New Use which He now assign’d unto it. As in all Sacraments, the Things employ’d, were existing before; The Sacramental Importance is afterwards enstamp’d upon them.\textsuperscript{136}

The Pagans had a mighty Opinion of the Rainbow. The Poets made a Goddess of it. Plato and Plutarch, and Apollodorus, make it the Daughter of Thaumas, because of the Admiration which Men agree to behold it withal. In their Theogonie, Iris was the Messenger of Juno. Juno signified, the Air; and the Rainbow indicates the Constitution of it. Acosta tells us, That he found the Rainbow worshipped, even among the Peruvians in America.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{135} Heidegger (1:405, Exerc. XIX, §§ 29–30).
\textsuperscript{136} Heidegger (1:405–06, Exerc. XIX, § 31). Ibn Ezra rejects Saadiah Gaon’s preterite argument that the rainbow existed before the Flood (Commentary 1:25). President Thomas Jackson of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, for one represents those interpreters who argue that if the rainbow existed before the Flood, it would lose its covenantal significance, in The Eternal Truth of Scriptures (1653), in Works (vol. 1, bk. 1, ch. 16, §§ 6, 7, pp. 53–55). Heidegger, disagreeing with those who deny the antediluvian existence of the rainbow, rejects their argument as “rather fallacious.”
\textsuperscript{137} Heidegger (1:406, Exerc. XIX, § 32). Plato (Theaetetus 155d, 4–5), Plutarch (Placita philosophorum 3.5, 894 B, line 4–5) and Apollodorus (Bibliotheca 1.2.6) make the rainbow (“Ourania”) the daughter of Thaumas. According to Hesiod (Theogonia 780–81), Iris, daughter...
Q. On the Conduct of Divine Providence, in the Flood, and following Occurrences? v. 29.

A. I will translate some notable Words of Brentius, which my incomparable Franckius, in one of his Programmata, does recite with a great Remark upon them.

"Initio quum homines multiplicarentur. – In the Beginning, when Men were multiplied, & gave themselves up to their Pleasures, Neglexerunt concionem de Adventu Christi; All preaching about the Coming of CHRIST, was neglected among them. They Planted, saies our Saviour, they Sow’d, they Built, they Married Wives. God therefore said, My Spirit shall not remain in Man; for he is Flesh; they care not for my Spirit, nor for what ha’s been preached about the Coming of CHRIST. Wherefore, that God might Restore Preaching on the Coming of CHRIST, He destroyed the whole World with a Flood; and preserved a Few, by whom the Prophecies about the Coming of CHRIST were propagated. Afterwards Abraham and Isaac and Jacob were made Choice of, that CHRIST might come of their Posterity, and Pregeny. Therefore God permitted no Man to hurt them; He rebuked Kings for their sakes. Anon, Pharaoh must perish, because it was his Purpose to destroy the Israelites, of whom CHRIST was to come. The Canaanites were likewise destroy’d, that so the Nation of Men, of whom CHRIST was to come, might have a Countrey, wherein He might sett up the Preaching about the Coming of CHRIST, and Sacred Rites for such a Purpose. The Nations were destroy’d, that so God might accomplish His Oath unto the Fathers. But the principal Thing in His Oath was, The Seed in which all Nations were to be blessed. Afterwards, when the Babylonians would not release the Jews from their Captivity, and there was danger lest the Race whereof CHRIST was to descend, might be lost, for the Præservation of this Race, that most potent Monarchy must be destroy’d. So was it said of Cyrus; I the Lord, which call thee by thy Name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my Servants Sake, and Israel mine Elect, I have even called thee by thy Name. In short, Omnia Regna Terra necesse habuerunt operam suam conferre, ut conservaretur Genus, e quo CHRISTUS erat Venturus. Et quod Regnum moliebatur huic Familiae exitium, hoc internecione peribat. It was necessary for all the Kingdomes of the Earth, to contribute unto the Præservation of the Family, whereof CHRIST was to come. And whatever Kingdom attempted the Ruine of this Family, Death and Destruction was the Portion of it."138

138 The second-hand citation is extracted from Programmata diversis temporibus (1714), by the Halle Pietist August Hermann Francke, a copy of whose work was available at Harvard in
Having cited this Passage of Brentius, I will add the Elogium which Glassius bestows upon that Interpreter.

Dignissima profecto sunt hujus Insignis Theologi Scripta exegetica, presertim in Veteris Testamenti Libros, quæ diligenter evolvantur ab omnibus, qui Theologiae et Philologiae Sacrae studio addicti sunt: quippe Doctrinae Cælestis omnigene, et observationum variarum ex Hebraeo Textu plena.¹³⁹

Mather’s time (Catalogus 101). Francke paraphrases this passage from Joannes Brentius, aka. Johann Brenz (1499–1570), German Lutheran Reformer, whose Operum reverendi et clarissimi theologi (1576) 1:86–87 and 108–09 appears to be the source in question. See also Brenz’s “Explicatio Epistolae Pauli Ad Galatas” (cap. 3), in Operum (1588) 1:848. Brenz’s jeremiad Etzliche Buss Predigten aus den schrecklichen Historien von der Sündfluth (1595) has much to offer on Mather’s millennialist closure. At any rate, the passage from Brenz (via Francke’s Programmata) relates that “all the kingdoms of the earth inevitably had as their task to unite, so that the race from which CHRIST was to come might be preserved. And the kingdom that was planning destruction for this tribe perished in a massacre.”

¹³⁹ Mather’s elogium, most likely from his own copy of ΧΡΙΣΤΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ [Christologias] Mosaiacæ (1649), by Salomon Glassius, aka. Glass (1593–1666), professor of theology at Jena (Thuringia), states that “The written interpretations of this outstanding theologian [Brentius] are certainly most worthy, especially those on the books of the Old Testament, which most diligently elucidate everything to which theologians and holy philosophers have devoted their studies. As you can see, they are full of heavenly teachings of every kind and of various observations from the Hebrew text.” The copy of Glassius’ work in the Mather Libraries at the AAS [# 0087] bears Samuel Mather’s signature on the cover page, yet without date.
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