

Vol. 3.]

[No. 2.]

BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. I.]

APRIL, 1829.

[No. 2.]

Contents.

I. REVIEW OF THE ARGUMENTS AND THEORIES OF ANTITRINITARIANS. - - - - -	159
II. THE MOSAIC HISTORY ACCORDANT WITH THE EXISTING STATE OF THINGS. - - - - -	189
III. HISTORY AND RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THE DRUSES. - - - - -	210
IV. FOUR DISCOURSES, BY JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D.	225
V. WITSIUS ON THE COUNCILS OF THE HEBREWS.	252
VI. LIFE OF ERASMUS. - - - - -	267
VII. STUART'S HEBREW CRESTOMATHY. - - - - -	294

PRINCETON, N. J.

CONNOLLY & MADDEN, PRINTERS.

1829.

No.	Date	Description
1	1870	...
2	1871	...
3	1872	...
4	1873	...
5	1874	...
6	1875	...
7	1876	...
8	1877	...
9	1878	...
10	1879	...
11	1880	...
12	1881	...
13	1882	...
14	1883	...
15	1884	...
16	1885	...
17	1886	...
18	1887	...
19	1888	...
20	1889	...
21	1890	...
22	1891	...
23	1892	...
24	1893	...
25	1894	...
26	1895	...
27	1896	...
28	1897	...
29	1898	...
30	1899	...
31	1900	...

REVIEW OF THE
ARGUMENTS AND THEORIES OF ANTITRINITARIANS,
BEING THE SECOND SECTION OF
FLATT'S DISSERTATION
ON
THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

[Translated from the Latin.]

BEFORE I proceed to examine in detail the particular tenets of conflicting sects, it may be well to take a preliminary view of some *general* arguments, which have been urged in opposition to the Deity of Christ, though not in support of any definite hypothesis. These are of two sorts, *philosophical* and *scriptural*—both of which have been the means of misleading many candid, acute, and so far as we can judge, sincere inquirers after truth, in relation to this subject.

I. Those of the first class may, for the most part, be reduced to this one objection, that the doctrine of the Deity of Christ involves an evident contradiction, or, to say the least, is utterly incomprehensible. And it must be confessed, that some ground has been given for this cavil by the manner in which *personality* and *consubstantiality* have been defined by many orthodox divines. But surely, it is most unfair to charge upon a church the imperfections or absurdities of individual theologians. That the doctrine of our church upon this subject, as set forth in her

confessions, involves no such contradiction, has been shown already. Indeed, the whole doctrine may be reduced to an abstract proposition in this form. *The relation existing between A and B is such, that with respect to C, they are identical; but, with respect to X, distinct.* Now, that this proposition, considered in the abstract, is in perfect harmony with the principle of *identity*, on which the objectors found their argument, and may be applied to the Divine nature without doing violence to the principle,* that there exists in God something not comprehended in the number of his attributes revealed to us, (i. e. in his *ουσια*, properly so called)—appears to me so plain, that I would venture, a priori, to affirm the impossibility of pointing out the slightest inconsistency in the assertion.

It may be said, that we proceed upon the supposition of an *inconceivable relation*, which supposition is absurd, as it must be either a mere quibble or an unintelligible fiction: And we freely admit, that neither the connexion, nor the difference, between the persons in the Godhead can be conceived of, positively; in other words, they can be known, neither by intuition nor analogy. But we deny, that it follows from these premises, that our doctrine of the relation between Father and Son, resting, as it does, upon such high authority, is irrational and absurd. To set down as false or impossible whatever we can form no definite conception of, † is as if a man born blind should denounce, as impossible or false, the description of a painting, merely because he could

* No one can suppose, that our reasoning is at variance with the principle *Quæ sunt eadem uni tertio eadem inter se sunt*, who understands the meaning of this axiom; unless, indeed, he has wholly misconceived the doctrine which we advocate, and confounded things essentially distinct. It has never been pretended, that the Father and the Son are identical in all points, or in precisely the same sense in which they are said to differ. See *Remarques sur le livre d'un Antitrinitaire Anglois*—Works of Leibnitz, Vol. I.

† See Ulrich's *Institut. Log. et Metaphys.* p. 302, &c.

form no image in his own mind of the object. To deny the possibility of any relations except those which exist among external objects, or such as may be inferred from them, evinces but a slight acquaintance with philosophy, and a lamentable ignorance or want of recollection, with respect to the limits of the human understanding. The truth is, that from the partial knowledge which we have, even of things subject to the cognizance of our internal and external senses, we have no right to conclude that the only relations of which they are susceptible are such as exist between external objects.* How then can it be thought surprizing that there should be some relations beyond our comprehension, in the nature of the Deity; a nature so immeasurably far removed from all created things, that even of those attributes

* For example, who can demonstrate the propriety of that division, by which all things (as well phenomena as things *οὐτως ὄντα*) are classed either as *substances* or *accidents*? See Ulrich's *Instit.* p. 341, and Heilmann's *Comp. Theol. Dogmat.* 2nd ed. p. 98.

Those who adopt Kant's doctrine in relation to the categories, are of all others, the last who should take offence at our position, that the relation between the Father and the *Λογος* is one which does not exist in the exterior world. Nor indeed, can those who maintain the empirical origin of the categories, or at least believe that they are to be classed among the *οὐτως ὄντα*, in any way demonstrate, that there is not some species of relation within the comprehension of superior intelligences, of which, in our present state, we can form no definite conception.

“Il faut avouer,” says Leibnitz, “qu'il n'y a aucun exemple dans la nature, qui réponde assez à cette notion des personnes divines. Mais il n'est point nécessaire qu'on en puisse trouver et il suffit, que ce qu'on en vient de dire, n'implique aucune contradiction ni absurdité. La substance divine a sans doute, des privileges, qui passent toutes les autres substances. Cependant, comme nous ne connoissons pas assez toute la nature, nous ne pouvons pas assurer non plus, qu'il n'y a, et qu'il n'y peut avoir aucune substance absolue qui en contienne plusieurs respectives.” (*Remarques sur le livre d'un Antitrinitaire Anglois*, Leibnitz' works, Dutens ed. Vol. I. p. 26.)

which are revealed, and which Natural Theology teaches, it is impossible to form any adequate conception.*

If this be so, the perfect consistency of our opinion with the principles of sound philosophy is a priori so apparent, that a detailed examination of the arguments and sophisms which the wit of man has coined, for the purpose of establishing the contrary, would be altogether useless. I shall content myself, therefore, with selecting two from the mass, by way of specimens. The first is the argument of *F. Socinus*, and is in these words: "There is no man so stupid that he cannot see the repugnance of these two propositions, that *God is one* and *God is three*, (of which three, every one is God himself.) They say, indeed, that though as to his essence he is *numerically* one, he is at the same time, *personally* three—a distinction utterly repugnant, since there cannot be a plurality of persons where there is only one individual essence. For what, indeed, is a *person* but an intelligent, individual, essence? Or what distinguishes one person from another but the diversity of individual essence? This doctrine implies that although the divine *essence* is numerically one, the divine *person* is more than one, whereas the divine essence and person are one and the same thing."

Now, it is clear that this objection turns entirely on the meaning which Socinus supposes to be attached to the words *persona* and *essentia*: and as he was led to attach that meaning to the terms by a mere misconception of the phraseology employed in common parlance and in the writings of some orthodox divines, the objection has of course, no weight. Where will be the supposed contradiction, if

* I could easily show, were this the proper place, that every writer who has attempted to illustrate by comparison, or explain by reasoning, the relation between the Father and the Son, has missed his aim entirely; not even excepting Seiler. (See his work *über die Gottheit Christi beides für Gläubige und Zweifler*, Leipzig. 1775. p. 105, &c.)

the words be understood in the sense proposed by us above?

The second argument which we shall cite, is that of *Taylor*,* and more plausible than the foregoing. He denies that there can possibly be any real difference between the Father and the Son, unless each possesses something which the other wants. "Now, this property," says he, "which each possesses to the exclusion of the other, must be reckoned among the divine *perfections*, unless it be admitted that there are *imperfections* in the Deity. Consequently each is destitute of some perfection; and as the idea of a God involves that of absolute perfection, it follows that neither Father nor Son is God."

This argument, however, specious as it is, will be found on impartial examination, to have no weight whatever, in opposition to the doctrine laid down in our former section. We have there maintained, that the Father and the Son are identical in essence, and expressly defined the word essence, as implying the aggregate of all those perfections which Natural Theology ascribes to God; such as eternity, necessary existence, infinite power and wisdom. Now, that either the Father or the Son is destitute of the necessary perfections, or, in any sense inferior, can by no means be argued from the fact that each possesses a distinctive character not belonging to the other. For we hold that there may be such a distinctive character, apart from the *ousia*, properly so called; and as to the doctrine, that the peculiarity by which Christ is distinguished from the Father is to be reckoned a *minor* or *inferior* perfection,† we regard it as a mere gra-

* See the *British Theological Magazine*. Volume I. No. 4. (1770.) p. 111.

† Even assuming the *generation* of the Son—if we understand the term as meaning nothing more than this, that the distinctive character of the Son has some necessary dependence upon that of the Father, it

tuitous assumption. If any one, however, understands by *ουσια*, the *substance* or *nature* of the Deity generally, including the *ουσια*, strictly so called, and the distinctive personal characters alluded to, he can have no difficulty in admitting that the Son and the Father are the same in substance, at the same time that he holds them to be really distinct.

II. Some attention is now due to the other class of arguments employed to overthrow our doctrine respecting the Deity of Christ.

It is an admitted fact, that there are many passages in the New Testament which would seem to ascribe divine honors to the Father, exclusively of Christ; (such as John xvii. 3. 1 Cor. viii. 6. &c.,) or else to ascribe to Christ something utterly irreconcilable with the idea of a nature divine and infinite, (such as John xiv. 28. 1 Cor. xi. 3; xv. 27, 26. Mark xiii. 32. Heb. v. 7. Matt. xxviii. 18.) And we freely admit that from all these passages the inference is fair, that, in one respect, Christ is inferior to God. But as to the assertion that the language of these texts militates against the doctrine demonstrated in the preceding section, we deny it boldly, as incapable of proof, hermeneutical or otherwise, unless upon the supposition, that the doctrine of the word of God is inconsistent with itself. But in order to show more clearly, that the texts above referred to, are perfectly reconcilable with our doctrine, we shall premise a few general observations tending to explain the apparent contradiction, and then make an application of them to the passages themselves.

1. In the first place, then, we hold, agreeably to scripture, (see John i. 14, compared with 1—3,) that *Christ was*

does not follow, that the perfection of the Son is finite, or inferior to the perfection of the Father. Who, for instance, will infer that the will of the Father is inferior to his intellect, from the fact, that will, presupposes intellect.

*man, as well as God.** Assuming this, and considering that the language of the scriptures is conformed to colloquial usage, and not to the subtle technics of philosophy; it is, evidently, just as natural and proper, that Christ should be described sometimes in a divine, and sometimes in a human character,† as that man should be called, at the same time, mortal and immortal.

2. But it is necessary that this observation be taken in connexion with another, of no less importance in relation to this subject. It is, that the word *πατηρ* is most commonly employed in the Sacred Scriptures‡ to denote the nature or substance of God generally, and that *θεος*, for the most part, is used in the New Testament, in the same sense, though sometimes employed to designate a particular person in the Godhead. Both these propositions may be readily demonstrated. For proof of the former we may refer to the general usage of the sacred writers respecting the words *אב* and *πατηρ*, or more particularly to those passages in which this name is ascribed to God,§ as the creator and preserver of mankind at large, or as the special benefactor of individuals with whom he has deigned to hold an intimate communion. And that this interpretation is equally applicable to those passages where he is called the Father of Jesus Christ, may be argued from the fact, that the man Jesus owed his origin to an immediate act of divine power, (on which account he

* See Less' *Vers. einer. prakt. Dogmatik*. Art. VIII. Sect. I. n. viii. x. xi. Doederlein's *Instit. Theol. Christ.* P. II. † 251, p. 768. (1st ed.) Zachariae *Bibl. Theol.* P. III. † 156. seqq.

† See Baumgarten's *Untersuch Theol. streitigkeiten*. Volume I. 1762. p. 238. seqq.

‡ See Doederlein's *Inst. Theol. Chr.* P. I. † 104, p. 312. (1st ed.)

§ See Mal. i. 6; ii. 10. Deut. xxxii. 6. Ps. lxxxix. 27. Isaiah lxiii. 16; lxiv. 7. Matt. v. 16, 48; vi. 4; vii. 11. John viii. 41, (compared with v. 54.) Rom. i. 7. Eph. i. 2.

is called the Son of God, Luke i. 35,) and sustained a peculiar relation to the Deity.

As to the word Θεός, the assertion that it has a variety of meanings in the New Testament,* can scarcely be disputed or disproved by those who are themselves in the habit of ascribing to it a diversity of senses, far more inconsistent with each other than those assumed by us. To an impartial mind, therefore, there can be no difficulty in perceiving that these passages of scripture, which, in themselves considered, would appear to militate against Christ's Deity, may be readily and fairly reconciled with those which describe him as God, identical with the Father. It may be well, however, to illustrate more particularly, the general observations which have here been made, and to view them in application to the most important texts cited by our opponents to oppugn our doctrine.

1. It has often, and in various ways, been proved, that those passages which describe the Father as the Most High God, at the same time distinguished him from the Son, are not inconsistent with the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. For example, in these words of Christ himself; (John xvii. 3;) *And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* The words, *only true God*, are designed to contrast the Father with the idols of the heathen, not with Christ; for the context† seems to intimate distinctly that the first clause of the sentence, [*thee the only true God,*] has reference particularly to the Gentiles, and the latter, [*Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,*] to the Jews, or, perhaps to both. Whether, therefore, we consider μονον as referring to the subject or the predicate,‡ the expressions of this text cannot

* For example, John i. 1. (ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον.)

† See Noessett's *Progr. paschale*, 1732; and Storr *über den Zweck*, &c. p. 462.

‡ See Miller's *Compend. Theol. Polemicæ*. Lips. 1768. p. 90, &c.

be understood as denying to Christ the character and dignity of the true God.

Again, the words of Paul, (1 Cor. viii. 6,)—*To us there is but one God, the Father, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, and we by him*—contain nothing incompatible with our doctrine. It is plain that the preposition εἰς, [*in,*] is to be taken in connexion, not with πατηρ, but with Θεος, and is used to express a contrast with Gentile polytheism, (see v. 5.) And as to the circumstance of Christ's being here distinguished from the Father, that is certainly no proof that what is asserted affirmatively of the latter, is asserted negatively of the former. Is there not just as obvious a distinction drawn in John v. 20, where notwithstanding, the same power and operations are ascribed alike to both? Or, waving that, why may we not suppose, that it was the design of Paul to set God, generally, [πατερῶρα,] and Christ particularly, in successive opposition to the imaginary beings, called among the Heathen, Θεοὶ and Κυριοὶ, Gods and Lords? Or even admitting the hypothesis of Clarke,* that πατηρ denotes only the first person in the Godhead, the case is just as plain. Can any one suppose, that because Christ is called εἰς κυριος, † the κυριότης or *Lordship* of the Father is denied? If not, how

* See *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*. London, 1712. P. I. ch. I. § 1. p. 5; also, P. II. § 9. p. 245.

† Clarke assumes, upon mere conjecture, and in the face of facts, that Θεος (v. 5.) denotes *the superior Deities*, and κυριος *the inferior deities*, and that, consequently, κυριος, in v. 6, must also mean an *inferior deity*. (*Script. Doct.* p. 6.) Teller, in explaining κυριος by *Magister*, (See his *Dictionary of the N. T.* under the word *Herr*.) appears to have disregarded altogether the connexion between the *fifth* and *sixth* verses. But, even admitting this interpretation, it does not follow, that the Deity of Christ is denied in the text before us. It is clear from the consideration above stated that the apostle may have intended to distinguish Christ, merely as a man, from God.

can we argue, that because the Father is here called εἰς Θεός, the Θεῖος or *Godhead* of the Son is so denied?

It has been maintained by many, that the words δι' αὐτοῦ (a phrase, be it observed, which is sometimes used in relation to the Father, as in Rom. xi. 36, and Heb. ii. 10,) is to be understood in this case as implying the inferiority of Christ; but no proofs have been adduced in support of the assertion.*

With respect to those passages, which expressly describe Christ as inferior to the Father, or ascribe to him actions and affections incompatible with Godhead, we hold that they may all be fairly understood as referring, either generally to his human nature, or particularly to the man Jesus' state of humiliation and exaltation. That the language of John, xiv. 28.† Mark xiii. 32.‡ Heb. v. 7, and other kindred

* In Matt. xix. 17, it is probable, that Christ accommodated his expressions to the notion that he was a mere man, and meant to say nothing more than this: *If you deny that I am God you ought not to call me good.* As to Eph. iv. 6: consult Miller's *Comp. Theol. Polem.* p. 91.

† The words, *If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father,* render it probable, that Christ intended to contrast, not his own nature with the nature of the Father, but the humble condition in which he himself then was, with the celestial glory of the Father, in which he expected shortly to participate. (See John xvii. 5, 24.) That the *usus loquendi* will justify this explanation of μὲν, as denoting a happier and more glorious condition, has been shown, from a comparison of Gen. xxvi. 13, by Storr (*über den Zweck, &c.* p. 460.)

‡ It is by no means a happy explanation of this passage, which many have borrowed from the words of Hilary, (de trinitate, ix.) "Id, quod nescit, non nesciendi infirmitas est, sed aut tempus est non loquendi, aut dispensatio est non agendi. Ea nescit quae, aut in tempore non sunt confitenda, aut non agnoscuntur ad meritum." As to the conjecture of some respecting the genuineness and origin of this verse, (which has no parallel in the other gospels,) though specious,

passages, will bear this explanation, can scarcely be doubted, if it be admitted that Jesus was a man, and that his condition while on earth, was by no means an exalted one. On the other hand, we believe that in Phil. ii. 9, &c. Math. xxviii. 18. 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28,* and the like, the state of glory to which the same man Jesus, after his passion, was translated, is either alluded to, or explicitly described. But

it is not necessary for the vindication of our doctrine. I think it a supposition perfectly reconcileable with a belief in the Deity of Christ, that the *man* Jesus, while upon earth, though united with the *λογος*, knew nothing about the time of the last judgment,

* The language of Paul in the 28th verse falls, probably, within the number of *things hard to be understood*, mentioned in 2 Peter, iii. 16. I think, however, that the chief difficulty of the passage arises from a comparison with Heb. i. 8, and Luke i. 33, and is, besides, common to us with the Arians and Socinians. Let them explain, with any show of probability, the meaning of *υποτασσεται*, and the import of the phrase *παρεδωκεν την βασιλειαν*, in v. 24, and we will undertake to show, that the expressions so explained, may be applied to the *man Jesus*, without impeaching the divinity of the *λογος*. For example, let us take up the interpretation of Th. Emlyn, who, in his *Humble Inquiry into the Deity of Christ*, thus paraphrases the 27th verse: "Then the Son himself shall be subject;—that is, his subjection shall be then manifested by an open solemn acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognise the supremacy of the Father in that public act of surrender. (Collection of Tracts relative to the Deity, worship, and satisfaction, of the Lord Jesus Christ. London, 1731. Vol. I.) Now, it is evident, that this explanation of the terms may be made to harmonize fully with the sentiment of those who believe them to relate to the *man Jesus*, and not to some other spirit, as supposed by Emlyn. Emlyn adds, indeed, that "as there is no intimation of any distinction between the pretended two natures of the Son here; so there is enough in the words to show, that they are spoken of him, under his highest capacity and character." Now we deny that there was any occasion for such an explicit intimation as he here alludes to, though we admit what he afterwards asserts; viz. that the words in v. 27, are spoken of the man Jesus, *under his highest capacity and character*.

besides these, there are some texts in the New Testament which describe Christ generally as a man, or indicate his peculiar relation to the Deity. Such are 1 Cor. xi. 3, and other parallel passages; as well as many of those in which Christ is called the Son of God. For we hold it to be clear from the import of the terms employed, and from the context* of innumerable passages, that this name (*the Son of God*;) is applied to Jesus *as a man*, and applied to him for this reason and for others, that he was the *image of the invisible God*, and intimately united with him as well as the object of his special favor. Every child knows, that in the Sacred Scriptures men are often called the sons of God, on account of some remarkable connexion with the Deity; or because they were the objects of God's special favor; or because they, in some sense, resembled God himself.† Now, is it not evident, that all these reasons join in one, to render the name in question pre-eminently applicable to that man, who sustained a relation to the Deity, which no prophet ever had sustained, (John i. 14; x. 38; xiv. 10,) and who, as the scriptures explicitly inform us, was the image of the Father, (Col. i. 15,) and beloved above all the other sons of God? (Math. xvii. 5. Col. i. 13. John iii. 35.) There can be no doubt, therefore, that the title, *Son of God*, would have been perfectly appropriate to Jesus, considered merely as a

* We admit, that in some cases, (such as John i. 14, 18. Matt. xxviii. 19,) the name *υιός θεού* though properly belonging to Christ's human nature, is used to designate the *λογος* which dwelt in him, for the purpose of distinguishing it from the first person of the Godhead. As to those, however, who imagine that the words *υιός θεού* in such cases are designed to indicate the relation of the second person to the first, they can only repel the objections of the Homoeusians and Arians, by denying that they hold the relation indicated by this phrase, to be a relation of inferiority, or by adopting that definition of *generation* mentioned in a former note. (See p. 163, note †.)

† e. g. Gen. vi. 2. Ps. lxxxii. 6. Luke xx. 36. John i. 12. 1 John iii. 1, &c.

man. And it is no less clear, that this interpretation harmonizes fully with the context of many passages;* such as Heb. i. 5. Rom. viii. 29, 32; but particularly John x. 31; a text often cited to oppugn our doctrine. In the latter, Jesus repels the charge of blasphemy which the Jews brought against him, by arguing thus:—any ordinary man may call himself the son of God, without being guilty necessarily of blasphemy—how much more, he who has claims to the title in its highest sense, and on the strongest grounds. He first proves from the sacred writings of the Jews, that some mere men had been properly called *Gods* and *sons of God*, citing for this purpose, Ps. lxxxii. 6, where God himself says to the Jews, *I have said ye are אלהים and בני עליון*. And the conclusion which he draws, that even a mere man, if united by resemblance to the Deity, may be called a *son of God*, is strengthened by the fact, that in the Psalm from which he quotes, the Judges, who are dignified by this high appellation, are censured and condemned. Now if the name—he argues, in v. 36—be applicable to such magistrates, how much more justly may it be applied, in its widest and most elevated sense, to him *ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγίασε και ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, whom the Father hath sent into the world to be revered as one wholly distinguished from all others.† In calling himself *ἡγιασμενον*, Christ had reference here to his intimate conjunction with the Deity, as appears from the 37th and 38th verses, as well as from the language of parallel passages. In those two verses he is evidently urging, that his miracles ought to lead the Jews to repose implicit confidence in all his declarations, but espe-

* See Doederlein's *Instit. Theol. Christ.* P. I. § 105. Obs. 1. p. 313. (1st ed.)

† It is well known, that according to the Hebrew idiom, of two words, placed in juxta-position, the latter often determines, and qualifies the former.

cially in what he had asserted (v. 30,) respecting his own connexion with the Deity. And this supposition is confirmed by John v. 20, (and the following verses,) a passage so parallel to this, that it may serve as a commentary on it. At the same time it is not improbable that he had reference in this case to his previous discourse with the Jews (recorded in chap. v.) and on that account expressed himself with greater brevity.

Enough has now been said to show that the difficulties with which our doctrine respecting the Deity of Christ is encumbered, are not sufficient to outweigh the arguments in its favor. In order, however, that it may appear more clearly how much that doctrine is to be preferred to the various theories which have been proposed in opposition to it, we shall now turn our attention to the latter, briefly stating the arguments which have been used in favor of the principal hypothesis, and the objections which may be urged against them.

1. The first who present themselves to our attention are such as deny both the *personality* and *consubstantiality* of the *λογος*, (or at least the former,) and maintain, that Christ was a mere man, who had no individual personality before he was born of Mary, but from the time either of his birth or of his entrance into the office of a teacher, was intimately united with the Deity, endowed by him with extraordinary gifts and virtues, and invested by him, after death, with the power and glory of the Godhead. It is probable that most of those who have held, with Noetus* and Praxeas†, that the Deity generally—or with John Leclerc‡ and

* *Epiphaniï panar.* lvii.

† *Tertullian contra Prax.* cxvi. p. 229. Semler's ed. xviii. p. 231.

‡ Leclerc, in his book called *Libenii de sancto amore Epist. Theolog.* (Irenop. 1679,) p. 18, says: "Since God being infinite, can think of various objects at one and the same time, we can conceive of there being in God, *the Father*—i. e. the divine nature think-

others that God *certo modo cogitans*—was united personally with the man Jesus, have been led to that conclusion by a comparison of the passages which declare the unity of God, with those which assert the divinity of Christ. We have already shown, however, that these passages (upon which the Noetians and Modalists founded their hypothesis) do not militate against our doctrine, and that the latter harmonizes much the best with John i. 1, 14, 18; xvii. 5, and many other texts. These we believe to be sufficient reasons for considering our doctrine as the better of the two; though at the same time, we cheerfully admit, that, as a promotive of piety, and a source of internal peace and comfort, it has no advantage over that of the Noetians and the Modalists.

2. At a much greater distance from our doctrine stands that of the Socinians generally, (not to mention Sabellius, Artemon, and others in detail,) who have followed Photinus in regarding Christ as a mere man born of Mary,* but endowed with extraordinary gifts, and, after death, exalted by the Most High God to almighty power and supreme command.

Those who hold these sentiments, however, are divided among themselves, as to the worship due to Christ, some

ing in one particular way—the Son, and the Holy Spirit, i. e. the same, nature thinking in two other different ways. In this way, we can properly conceive of there being one God, i. e. one divine nature, but various modes of thinking pertaining to that nature, and in this way conflicting passages of Sacred Scriptures may readily be reconciled. And in fact, the scriptures indicate no difference between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, except in the mode of acting or thinking, for with spirits, thought and action are identical." He adds, on p. 21, that in his opinion, the divine and human natures were so far united in the person of Christ, that the names and qualities of both may be ascribed to him, just as mental and corporeal qualities may be ascribed to man.

* See the chapter of the *Racovian Catechism* on the person of Christ, p. 120. ed. Oeder and Joh. Crellius de uno Deo patre libri duo. Irenop. 1656.

holding with Socinus and Blandrata, that he ought to be worshipped though a mere man, while C. Franken and others maintain the contrary.* To draw a fair comparison therefore, between their doctrine and our own, we must examine, first, those points upon which Socinians all agree, and then those on which the contending parties differ.

In the first place, then, the opinion common to all Socinians respecting the nature of Christ, and the power conferred upon him after death, if brought to the standard of right reason, is encumbered with difficulties far more serious than those which attend our doctrine. We have already shown, that the charge of contradiction, brought against us by the disciples of Socinus, is a mere assumption and incapable of proof. The incomprehensibility of that relation which as we believe, exists between the Father and the Son, cannot be urged as an argument against it, least of all by the Socinians, if they have any desire to appear consistent. For what can be more incomprehensible than that a mere man should be exalted so far as to become a partner in the Divine power and government, an association really impossible without a participation in the nature of the Deity. If you ask for scriptural proofs, you will find in the writings of Socinians† such a vast accumulation of authorities, that if the controversy were to be determined by number instead of weight, they would undoubtedly prevail. Thus they appeal to all those passages, already mentioned, in which the affections and infirmities of human nature are attributed to Christ, or which represent his extraordinary prerogatives above the rest of men as having been bestowed upon him by the Father merely as rewards. (Phil. ii. 9, &c.)‡ But

* See the controversy between Faustus Socinus and Chr. Franken *de honore Christi* in the *Bibl. Frat. Polon.* T. p. 767, &c.

† See the book of J. Crellius, quoted above.

‡ We can scarcely think it strange that Jesus should have spoken less clearly and explicitly than his apostles after him, respecting the

when we consider that all these passages, without exception, may be explained conformably to our opinions, without doing violence to the principles of interpretation ; whereas, on the other hand, the language of Christ and his apostles, which was cited and discussed in the former section, is utterly irreconcilable with their hypothesis, we cannot but conclude that the doctrines, held by Socinians in common, are wholly at variance with the word of God. And this conviction of the falsehood of those doctrines becomes stronger, when we come to observe the mutual disagreement of Socinians themselves, on the point above mentioned,—*the worshipping of Christ*.

As to those who hold with Franken,* that adoration is not due to Christ, the impossibility of reconciling their opinion with such passages as John v. 23. Heb. i. 6. Phil. ii. 10, 11,

relation which he bore to God the Father, and that he never declared himself the creator of the world (an argument apparently in the Socinians' favor), when we consider that a different method would have been unworthy of the divine wisdom, which required that the Jews should be drawn off, *by slow degrees*, from their too contracted notions respecting the unity of God, and gradually imbibe just sentiments in relation to the person of the Messiah. Besides, it was the design of the Almighty, that Jesus should, for our sakes, spend his days on earth in a state of humiliation, which evidently forbade his manifesting, clearly and habitually, the glory of the Godhead which dwelt in him. (Phil. ii. 6.) But when he had undergone the sufferings imposed upon him, for the good of men, and had received his recompense in being raised to the highest dignity, having become a participator in the Divine power, and clothed with supreme command over the most exalted spirits, then, indeed, it was altogether proper, that the Divinity of Christ should be exhibited, even among men, in all its brightness.

* Among the modern advocates of this opinion may be mentioned Lindsey, whose arguments have been refuted in a book called "Remarks on Mr. Lindsey's Dissertation upon praying to Christ, in which the arguments he there proposes against the lawfulness of all religious addresses to the Lord Jesus, are examined."

(comp. Isa. xlv. 24,) has been ably demonstrated by Socinus himself.*

* See the controversy between Socinus and Franken, before cited; also Socinus' Letter *de Invocatione Christi*, in the *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 353. "From this passage, (John v. 23,) we learn, that God would have all men honor the Son as they honor the Father: it is clear, therefore, that the same sort of honor is due to Christ that is due to God himself, and that he must, consequently, be adored. For adoration is, unquestionably, the sort of honor which we owe to God. The word *as* does not, indeed, necessarily, imply a perfect resemblance, but it certainly must imply a peculiar resemblance of some sort. For if a mere general resemblance were denoted consisting in the fact that both are to be honored, the addition of the words—*as they honor the Father*—would be superfluous and nugatory. Nor let any one suppose, that this ascription of equal honors to both, means nothing more than this, that the instructions and commands of Christ are to be as much regarded as the instructions and commands of God. For the reason assigned is, that God has *committed all judgment* unto Christ; i. e. the whole control and management of the church. It appears, then, from these words of Christ himself, to be God's will, that he should be worshipped and receive divine honors; which exposition of the divine will is equivalent to a command. It follows, therefore, that we are *commanded* to worship Christ. Besides, you will perceive from the very words themselves, that the power and authority bestowed on Christ is such as of itself to intimate, that he should be adored. We have another authority expressly to the same effect, Heb. i. 6, where the words of Ps. xcvi. 7, are obviously applied to Christ, for the purpose of showing his pre-eminence above the angels, from the fact that he is entitled to their adoration. It need not here be proved, that even if the words are addressed in the Psalm to God himself, the Divine writer was at liberty to make an application of them to Christ, unless, indeed, we question his authority, as well as that of the other writers of the sacred volume. Now if Christ ought to be adored by all the angels of God, how much more by men, over whom he is more properly Lord and King." It is scarcely necessary to observe, that these and other arguments adduced by Faustus Socinus, may, with a few slight alterations, be employed with equal force, by the advocates of our opinion against the same hypothesis. With respect to John v. 23, see Storr *über den Zweck*, &c. p. 198.

Those, on the other hand, who maintain that he should be worshipped, at the same time denying his divinity, involve themselves in a difficulty equally perplexing. The Old Testament teaches most explicitly, that religious worship is due to none but Jehovah, the creator of the heavens and the earth. (Isa. xlii. 8; xlviii. 11. seqq. Jer. x. 11, &c.) No *v.* is it credible, that God himself, or Christ, or Christ's apostles, after recognizing, so distinctly, the divine authority, and confirming so expressly the doctrines of the Prophets, would have stooped to the inconsistency of claiming divine honors for "a creature, by exhibiting a man, *μη ποσειδοντα Θεον*, (Gal. iv. 8.) as an object of worship to the Gentiles? The weight with which this difficulty bears upon those who hold the doctrines of the Racovian Catechism, is apparent from the very ingenuity of the arguments, offensive and defensive, which Socinus has invented for the purpose of evading it. That acute controvertist argues,* that, even admitting the exclusive application of the command respecting worship, to God alone, as originally given by the mouth of the prophets, it does not necessarily follow, that it continued equally exclusive *after Christ's glorification*. But he maintains that no such concession need be made, because the command to worship God alone, may be understood in such a way, that the word *alone* will not exclude such beings as are *subordinate to God*: Besides, the adoration of Christ will appear less derogatory to the honor of the Most High, when it is considered that all worship rendered to the Son, must redound to the honor of the Father from whom he derives his power, and that the worship due to God, and the worship due to Christ, † though generically the same, are by no means identical.

* See Socinus' Letter, *de Invocatione Christi*. in the *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* p. 354.

† See the Letter quoted above, and the *Racovian Catechism*. Qu. 245. p. 447. ed. Oeder.

It is easy, however, to perceive, that there is much more ingenuity than truth, and very little consistency withal, in this reasoning of Socinus and his followers. For how can it be asserted with any appearance of truth, that a divine decree, not local or temporary in its nature, but derived from the very nature of the Deity, and implied in the very idea of creation, was abrogated even after Christ's exaltation, when, in fact, it is most clearly taught after that event, by the apostles of Christ himself? (Gal. iv. 8, 9.*) As to the assertion that the command to worship God alone, is to be understood as not excluding those subordinate to God; it appears to me, to be irreconcilable with God's design of drawing the Israelites off from every form of polytheism—as well as with the explicit declarations of the prophets, (Jer. x. 11, Isa. xliii. 10. &c.) and the plain expressions of the New Testament. (Matt. iv. 10.† Gal. ix. 8, 9. Rev. xix. 10.) Not a whit more plausible is the argument added by Socinus and the Racovian Catechism respecting the difference between the honors due to Christ, and those due to God himself.‡ It is notorious, that the very same expressions which are used in the Old Testament in claiming divine honors for Jehovah, are used in the New Testament respecting Christ, (compare

* To which may be added, Rev. xix. 10.

† If the hypothesis of Socinus be correct, Christ ought not to have derived his answer to the tempter, from the precept which he quotes, but from this consideration, that as the tempter was not *subordinate* to God, (that is, one whom God had made his minister,) nor clothed with such power as he pretended, he was not entitled even to a subordinate degree of worship. For it is wholly incredible, that Satan who himself derived his power from a superior, meant to demand the worship due to the Supreme Being. (See Luke iv. 6.)

‡ The general idea of *divine honors* is defined in the Racovian Catechism, (Qu. 212—215, p. 432. ed. Oeder,) in a way which can scarcely be reconciled with the doctrine of the same book respecting the honor due to Christ, (Qu. 236. p. 442,) and the difference between that honor and the honor due to God, (Qu. 245. p. 447.)

Heb. i. 6, with Ps. xcvi. 7, and Phil. ii. 10, 11, with Isa. xlv. 23, 24,) nor is there any thing in the context which requires that the words should be understood as implying an inferior sort of worship.

But admitting that the words in question do not denote the highest sort of worship, and that the exegetical and philosophical principles upon which Faustus Socinus and his followers build their hypothesis respecting the nature of Christ, and the worship due to him, are altogether valid—I would ask, how can it possibly be proved, consistently with those principles, that the highest sort of worship is due to the Father, or that none at all is due to angels? In proof of the former proposition, they cite 1 Cor. viii. 6. (But, to borrow the Socinian mode of interpretation,) may not $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ signify some inferior and created Deity? May it not be gathered from this passage, that the Father is merely $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \text{ ΗΜΩΝ}$, and not the Most High God? That cannot be, say they; for he is also said to be $\text{ΕΙΣ } \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, *the one God*, $\epsilon\grave{\xi} \omicron\upsilon \tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$, *of whom are all things*. But is not Christ in this very same verse (compare Eph. iv. 5.) called $\text{ΕΙΣ } \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *one Lord*, without excluding the idea of a superior Lord? And is it not clear from John i. 3, and Col. i. 16, that the phrase $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ in many cases does not mean *all things* in the very widest sense?

Again, they appeal to the language of Christ himself, in John xvii. 3. But the word $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$, Socinians themselves being judges, is often used, especially in relation to Jehovah; in such a way as to exclude only idols or false gods.

In addition to these and other passages,* in which the Father is expressly mentioned, they bring forward many others

* Such as Eph. iv. 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5, &c. It is unnecessary, however, to consider these texts separately, not only because they afford less striking evidence than John xvii. 3, and 1 Cor. viii. 6; but also, because what is said in relation to the latter, will apply as well to them.

which apparently ascribe the highest sort of worship to *God* or *Jehovah*. But may not the command to worship Jehovah and him alone, have been a mere temporary institution? Or even waving that objection, how can it be proved, agreeably to Socinian principles, that προσκυνειν and λατρευειν in Matt. iv. 10, (compare Deut. vi. 13, and Heb. i. 6,) denote the highest sort of adoration, or that the words αυτω μονω, are not merely exclusive of the false gods of the heathen, but imply that worship is due to no one whatever but Jehovah? It may be answered, that the highest worship is unquestionably due to Him who is the creator of the universe, and who, *of himself*, has omnipotent authority over us; and we freely grant it. But how will the Socinian prove, that the being called Jehovah or the Father, is the creator of the universe, and of himself, possesses divine power? May not those passages which are generally interpreted as relating to the creation of the universe, be understood in relation to a mere renovation of the *earth*? May it not be supposed that the creative power exerted by Jehovah, as well as the power which he exercises over men and spirits, is derived from some superior Deity? For that the words ברא and κτισειν often mean mere *reformation*, and that the attributes of God may be imparted to a creature, no Socinian can consistently deny. It appears, then, that Socinus and his partisans are utterly unable to demonstrate the great fundamental doctrine of their creed, that the Father alone is God in the highest sense, and is alone entitled to the highest sort of worship.

But they involve themselves in another difficulty, which appears to me inextricable. They deny that it is lawful to render to angels any species of religious worship. In this very denial, however, they seem to be at variance with their own principles. For if worship is due to Christ, not on account of his essential nature, but because of the power which he possesses,* and which Socinians regard as absolute,

* See *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* Tom. II. pp. 769, 775.

but inferior to God's, and consequently finite, why may not the angels who are also clothed with power—inferior, indeed, to Christ's, but notwithstanding, great* be adored in a proportionate degree? Is it because the glory of the Most High God would thereby be diminished? No, for the honor rendered to the angels on account of the power conferred on them by God, must redound to the glory of God himself. Is it because we are commanded in Matt. iv. 10, (compare Deut. vi. 13,) to worship God alone? No, for Socinians themselves understand the word *alone* as not excluding those who are *subordinate to God*. For the same reason, their favourite argument derived from the words of the angel to John, forbidding him to worship him, and commanding him to worship God alone, is futile. For who could use this argument, if like F. Socinus, he interpreted the command to worship in a different manner from the angel who conversed with John. It is true that the worship of angels is no where

* That angels are clothed with extraordinary power, and exercise no small authority over the earth and its inhabitants, is plainly taught in various parts of the Sacred Scriptures, particularly in the Apocalypse, the divine authority of which, is acknowledged by Socinians. It appears, indeed, to have been admitted by Faustus Socinus, who (*Bibl. Fr. Pol.* Tom. I. p. 791,) after asserting that the angels are possessed of great glory, and some authority, proceeds as follows: "As to the argument, [urged by those who deny that the words of God, in Gen. i. 26, were addressed to angels,] that it is not allowable to make the angels in any sense, partners of the Deity, in the creation of the world; we reply, that such reasoning is perfectly irrelevant, since nothing is more certain, than that God does communicate his own peculiar attributes to such of his creatures as he makes his instruments. We read, that man was first formed from the dust of the earth, and that afterwards the breath of life was breathed or blown into his face, (or rather nostrils). Now, although this is said to have been done by God himself, it can scarcely be doubted that he did it by the agency of angels. It is evident, indeed, from the expressions, *formed and breathed.*"

enjoined upon Christians in the scriptures. But that a thing may be lawful, though not positively commanded, is self-evident, and can scarcely be disputed by Socinus, who maintains that the *invocation* of Christ (which he distinguishes from *adoration*,*) though not commanded, is allowable; and that, if no command existed to the contrary, adoration itself would have been due to him.

But to pursue this any longer would carry us too far. Enough has now been said to demonstrate the inconsistency of those Socinians who admit that worship is due to Christ. On the whole, we feel ourselves justified in saying, that the higher Socinians place Christ, the more they are inconsistent with themselves and sound philosophy—and the lower they place him, the more they are at war with the plainest declarations of the New Testament.† There can be no doubt, therefore, that, all things considered, our doctrine is more rational and credible than that maintained by Socinians of either class.

3. We must now consider briefly the sentiments of those who believe, with us, that a personal distinction existed between the Father and the Son before Jesus was born of

* *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 354.

† S. Przipcov entertains higher views of Christ than F. Socinus. He declares (in his works, p. 452, &c.) that Christ partook of both the divine and human nature, but that both did not co-exist in him at once; the nature of the Son of God, who now reigns in heaven, being not human, but celestial and divine. But if this be so, it necessarily follows, that the human soul of Christ was annihilated, and a spirit substituted for it, endowed with all the attributes of God; a supposition, I need scarcely say completely at variance with the declaration of the Sacred Scriptures, that the same man Jesus, who was, on earth, now reigns in heaven, as well as with the doctrine of the unity of God, which cannot be reconciled with Przipcov's hypothesis, that all the peculiar attributes of God, and all the eternal concomitants of the divine essence and nature, are inherent in Christ since his exaltation.

Maty, but define the nature of that distinction in such a way as to reject the idea of consubstantiality. To this class belong, 1. the *Tritheists*, if any such there are, who believe that the *ουσια* of the Father and the Son are precisely equal, but not numerically identical. 2. Those who hold that the nature of Christ is super-angelic as well as super-human, but regard the Son as inferior to the Father. The former hypothesis is so palpably inconsistent with the doctrine of the unity of God, that it needs no refutation. In examining the latter, we shall pass by the rigid Arians, and confine ourselves very much to those who hold, with the ancient *Homoeusians*, that the Son is *similis κατ' ομοιωσιν* to the Father, or, with Clarke* and others, that the Son partakes of all the

* "The Father alone," says Clarke, "is self-existent, underived, unoriginated, independent; made of none, begotten of none, proceeding from none. (*Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*. P. II. § 5.) The Father is the sole origin of all power and authority, and is the author and principal of whatsoever is done by the Son or by the Spirit. (ib. § 6.) The Father alone is in the highest, strict, and proper sense, absolutely supreme over all. († 7.) The Son is not self-existent, but derives his being, or essence, and all his attributes, from the Father, as from the supreme cause. († 12.) In what particular metaphysical manner the Son derives his being or essence from the Father, the scripture has no where distinctly declared; and therefore men ought not to presume to be able to define. († 13.) The scripture in declaring the Son's derivation from the Father, never makes mention of any limitation of time; but always supposes and affirms him to have existed with the Father from the beginning, and before all worlds. († 15.) Whether the Son derives his being from the Father, by necessity of nature, or by the power of his will, the scripture hath no where expressly declared. († 17.) By the operation of the Son, the Father both made and governs the world. († 26.) Concerning the Son, there are the greatest things spoken in scripture, and the highest titles ascribed to him; even such as include all divine powers, excepting absolute supremacy and independency, which to suppose communicable is an express contradiction in terms. († 27.) The Son, whatever his metaphysical essence or substance be, and whatever divine greatness and dignity is ascribed to him in scripture; yet in

communicable attributes of God, but in the mode of his existence and the order of his operation, is inferior to the Father.

The advocates of this doctrine are of opinion, that the language of such passages as John xiv. 28. 1 Cor. xi. 3; xv. 28. Col. i. 15. Phil. ii. 6, &c., can in no way be reconciled so well with those which ascribe the creation of the world and the possession of the highest divine attributes to Christ, as by supposing that the *λογος*, though endowed with the attributes of Deity, is in some way generated or produced by the Father, and subordinate to him in all his acts. And it must be confessed, that among the many texts which speak of Christ, if you except Rom. ix. 5, there is scarcely one which may not be readily explained on the Homoeusian and Clarkian hypotheses, and that some, when considered in themselves without reference to the context, admit of a more satisfactory explanation upon the principles of Clarke than those of the Homoeusians. But since there are none at all which may not be reconciled with our doctrine without doing violence to the principles of interpretation,* the whole con-

this he is evidently subordinate to the Father, that he derives his being and attributes from the Father, the Father nothing from him. (§ 34.) Every action of the Son, both in making the world and in all his other operations, is only the exercise of the Father's power, communicated to him after an ineffable manner. (§ 35.)

* As to Col. i. 15, on which Harwood and others lay such stress, the words *πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισως* may be understood in application to Christ's human nature, exalted above all creatures on account of its union with the Deity, or in reference to the *λογος* in the same sense in which God himself (as Wolf observes,) is called by the Jews *primogenitus mundi*. (See Doederlein's *Instit. Th. Christ.* P. II. p. 257. 3d ed.) And as to Phil. ii. 6—8, though I do not agree with those who regard it as an argument for the Deity of Christ, I think it has been clearly shown by some celebrated interpreters, that this passage may be readily explained in accordance with our doctrine, by referring the expressions in v. 6—8, (or at least in v. 8,) to Christ's human

troversy evidently resolves itself into the question, whether the hypotheses of the Homoeusians, and of Clarke, are more consistent with themselves, with the scriptures, and with sound philosophy, and are encumbered with fewer difficulties than our doctrine. That they are not, we have already shown. (p. 2.) But admitting for a moment, that the arguments which we have urged are not conclusive against the objections of the Homoeusians; admitting, that the unity of the creator or Most High God is not so clearly taught in the scriptures, as to destroy the force of their arguments against it; still we may demonstrate the inconsistency of their hypothesis, by applying to it, with a few modifications, the arguments which we have urged above against the Socinians, who admit that Christ is to be worshipped. For let it be granted, that the passages which inculcate the worship of one God, are not to be understood exclusively; that the words which signify adoration, are sometimes used to denote a subordinate species of worship; that the divine attributes are communicable to a spirit distinct from the Most High God—granting all this, how can it after all be proved, that the being called Father and Jehovah in the scriptures, is, indeed, the supreme and independent God? Can it be inferred from the phrase, *one God*, applied to him in 1 Cor. viii. 6? Is not Christ in the same verse, called *one Lord*, though according to the Homoeusians and Arians, subordinate to another Lord?*

nature. (See Zacharia's *Bibl. Th.* III. Th. p. 201. Doederlein's *Inst. Theol. Chr.* P. II. § 231. obs. 4. Storr's *Dissert. in Epist. ad Philipp.* Tübingen. 1783. p. 18.) On the other passages see our remarks above, (p. 164, &c.) in addition to which we have only this to say, that there is not a passage in the Bible, which asserts, that any perfection or dignity was *bestowed* upon Christ by God before his incarnation.

* That the fourth verse is not more favorable to the Homoeusian and Clarkian hypothesis, will be apparent on a comparison of that verse with Isa. xliii. 10, 11, and xlv. 6—8. As to the supposition,

Or from Christ's repetition of the words of Moses in Deut. vi. 4? (See Mark xii. 29.) But it must be admitted, even by those who maintain the Deity of Christ, that these words are to be understood in a restricted sense. Why then, may we not suppose, that they were intended merely to exclude the false gods of the Gentiles, or to assign to Jehovah the highest place among the θεοὶ ἡμῶν, or gods who *pertain to us*. It is easy to draw the same conclusion, with respect to the other passages adduced by Clarke in his scripture doctrine of the Trinity, (P. I. Ch. I. § I.) But, say the Homoeusians and the followers of Clarke, the creation of the world is referred to the Father as a primary cause: for the Father is said (Heb. i. 2,) by the Son to have made the worlds. But even admitting that the Father was the primary agent in the creation of the world, how can it be inferred from this, that he is the supreme and independent God—by those too, who believe that an inferior spirit may be endowed with all the attributes required in the creator of a world? It follows, therefore, that the hypothesis of the Homoeusians and of Clarke, is inconsistent with itself;* a conclusion greatly

that, in all these texts the unity of the *Supreme God* is asserted, without denying the existence of a plurality of *true Gods*, I do not see how it can consist with the drift and context of the passages. In I Cor. viii. 6, particularly, those who are called *Gods* are placed in opposition, not to the *Supreme God*, as such, (for most of the Gentiles acknowledged one Supreme being,) but to the one *true God*. (See Gal. iv. 8, 9.)

* The same objection may be urged against the theory proposed by Paul Maty, though certainly ingenious and well calculated to remove some exegetical difficulties. He assumes, that the *λογος* is a finite Spirit, produced by the infinite and uncreated Spirit called the *Father* in the scriptures, and personally united with him, before the creation of the world. (See Mosheim's *Modesta inquisitio in novam dogmatis de S. Trinitate explicatione, quam cl. P. Maty nuper proposuit*. Helmst. 1735, and Anton. Driessen's *Examen sententiae quam D. P. Maty proposuit Groningae*. 1733.) Now I cannot see how it is

strengthened by the philosophical arguments which we have adduced above.* It may be observed in addition, that they are involved, in no small difficulty respecting Christ's *exin-
anition*, as it is called. For besides that, it is unscriptural† to suppose such a change in the *λογος* as Arians and Homo-
eusians for the most part believe him to have undergone when he *was made flesh*; it is certainly quite as hard for human reason to comprehend how an exalted spirit could be thus thrust down into a state of infantile ignorance and weak-
ness,‡ or how the divine wisdom could allow it, were it pos-
sible,§ as it is to understand the mysteries involved in our hypothesis. || We have no hesitation, therefore, in drawing

possible for Maty to demonstrate his proposition respecting the *Father*, without contradicting himself. For suppose some one should contend that the *Father*, as well as the Son, is a finite spirit, and is called God (in 1 Cor. viii. 6) merely on account of his intimate union with the Deity, affirming that this hypothesis harmonizes better than that of Maty, with the baptismal formula in Matt. xxviii. 19. Can the followers of Maty possibly refute such a theory with any show of consistency? Besides, as Maty assumes the union of three natures, God, the *λογος*, and the man Jesus, his doctrine is certainly not less *mysterious* than ours.

* To which may be added, those adduced by Toellner, in his *Theol. Untersuch.* I. B. 1st. St. p. 33.

† See Heb. i. 12. *Συ ο αυτος υ.*

‡ This difficulty is not at all diminished by the hypothesis suggested by an anonymous author in Priestley's *Theological Repository*, Vol. I. p. 431, and in the *British Theological Magazine*, Vol. III. p. 802, that the *λογος* was changed into a human soul.

§ See Lardner's letter against the Arians, in the *Brit. Theol. Mag.* Vol. III. p. 731.

|| The Homoeusians, whom I have read, are not very happy in their explanation of those passages which relate to Christ's exaltation. I do not see how the supposition, that the reward of Christ consisted in the pleasurable consciousness of his own merits, (See *Br. Theol. Mag.* Vol. III.) can be reconciled with some expressions used by the apostles, descriptive of Christ's glory, (such as Phil.

the conclusion, that the hypothesis of the Homoeusians and of Clarke respecting the divinity of Christ, plausible as it is, and in a practical point of view so nearly allied to ours, must, nevertheless, yield to the latter as being more harmonious with the whole tenor of the scriptures as well as more consistent with itself. That it is not, after all, wholly free from difficulties, can give offence to no one, who remembers the words of Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 9.) ΕΚ ΜΕΚΡΟΥΣ ΓΙΝΩΣΚΟΜΕΝ, *we know in part*.

ii. 9. compared with Eph. i. 20. Heb. i. 3; x. 12. &c.) And as to the hypothesis of Clarke (Scripture Doctrines, P. II. § 47.) that the *λογος*, who before his incarnation merely participated in the honors of Jehovah, was permitted, after death, as a reward for his services, to be worshipped as personally distinct from Jehovah, it would seem to imply that Christ enjoyed higher honors *before* than *after* his incarnation.

THE MOSAIC HISTORY ACCORDANT WITH THE EXISTING
STATE OF THINGS.

1. It is remarkable, in the history of man, that his body is covered with artificial clothing; while all other animals have a natural covering suited to their condition and climate. Now, if man really needs clothing, why did his Creator place him in this wide world, unprovided with a natural covering, suited to his wants? It will not be satisfactory to answer, that man was endowed with reason, and was capable of providing clothing for himself; for reason would be too slow in its operations, for his comfort; it would have been long before he could discover the proper materials for clothing, and then, how could he, without instruction, have formed these materials into convenient garments? Upon mere principles of reason, there is something altogether unaccountable in this abandonment of man to the slow process of discovery.

But there is another remarkable circumstance connected with the artificial clothing of the human body, and that is the shame of nakedness, which is found in every tribe and nation under heaven, except a few miserable savages, who have by long separation from the rest of the human family, lost every particle of the common traditions of our race. Clothing for the purposes of warmth and defence, is not necessary in all climates; but every where, an attention is paid to covering the body, for the sake of decency. Reason dictates nothing of this kind. Among the other animals, there is no vestige of any such feeling. How then shall we account for these universal facts? In no other way,

than by referring to the Bible, which fully explains this whole mystery. Here we learn, that man was provided with no natural clothing, because, when created, and as long as he remained innocent, he needed no other garments, than the innocence of his character. He was placed in a garden, where the temperature was exactly adapted to his body;—where no chilling blasts, no pinching frosts, no desolating storms, disturbed his tranquillity; and as he needed no clothing for protection, so he felt no shame on account of his nakedness. In Paradise, man was richly provided with every thing necessary and comfortable, and was exposed to no dangers or accidents from the elements. We see then, that the munificent Creator did not turn man, his noblest work, loose upon the wide world, without the means of protecting himself. This event did, indeed, take place, but it was in punishment of man's disobedience; and even then, he furnished him with clothes, from the skins of animals, and thus taught him how to provide for himself. But the origin of artificial clothing is given in the Bible, with such simplicity and beauty, that it will be worth our while to hear the whole narrative, as related in the sacred record.

“And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.”

“And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew, that they were naked, and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.”

“And the Lord God called unto Adam and said unto him, where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked. And he said, who told thee, that thou wast naked?”

“Unto Adam also and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them.”

Here we have the true origin of artificial dress, and of the reasons which led to its use, which are sufficiently mortifying to male and female vanity, if they were duly considered.

There is much in this simple narrative which will serve to provoke the scoffing infidel to shoot his envenomed arrows of ridicule at the book of God ; but they will strike upon the shield of truth, and will fall harmless to the ground. He may ask with an air of triumph, how the eating of a certain tree could open the eyes of the first pair, to know that they were naked ? How could they be ignorant of their nakedness, if they had only the understanding of children ? But this is a mere perversion of the meaning of the inspired historian. In the figurative language of the Bible, the eyes are said to be opened, when a new feeling is introduced into the mind, causing us to see things as with new eyes. God has so constituted the human mind, that transgression produces the feelings of remorse and shame ; and he had so ordered things, in regard to our first parents, that as soon as they eat the forbidden fruit, a deep feeling of shame on account of nakedness, overwhelmed them. Why this particular effect was connected with their transgression, it is not necessary for us to know. We have the fact, and that fact seems to explain a circumstance in the history of man which would otherwise be inexplicable.

Many fanciful theories have been invented to account for these peculiar feelings, found in all branches of the human family ; but I will not pollute my paper by an exhibition of them here. The simple narrative of the Bible is enough, and exactly and remarkably accords with the facts universally observed to exist.

All nations make use of artificial clothing, for purposes of decency, if not for protection from the weather ; though no other species of animals is led by instinct to provide any clothing except that which nature furnishes. This remarkable fact inexplicable upon mere natural principles, is satisfactorily explained in the Mosaic history.

2. Among all nations, whether civilized or barbarous, we find existing, the institution of marriage ; and, almost uni-

versally, this compact is entered into with some solemnity or formality; and its violation is considered a crime of so serious a nature, that its punishment is very severe, and among some barbarous people, even capital. This universal existence of marriage does not appear to be the result of reason, but has been received by tradition; its origin is as ancient as the union of the first pair in Paradise. The Bible is our key to the universal fact. There we read, that when the Lord God had formed the woman out of the rib of man, he brought her to him, and "Adam said, this is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman; because she was taken out of man; therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh."

It appears very evident, that in this divine institution, it was intended that marriage should include no more than one woman: for the great Creator, in furnishing a model for future imitation, instituted the first marriage between one of each sex. Polygamy, therefore, which began to be practised before the deluge, and prevailed, and still prevails, extensively in the East, was a departure from the purity and simplicity of the original institution.

The history of those families and nations in which polygamy has been allowed, furnishes a strong argument in favor of the wisdom of confining man to one wife; for domestic strife, and innumerable other evils, have been occasioned by the practice.

The same thing is also demonstrated by that remarkable dispensation of providence, by which the number of the respective sexes, in all ages and countries, is very nearly equal:—the males generally being a small majority, that by the surplus, provision may be made for the greater waste of life in that sex, by their greater exposure to dangers. It has, I am aware, been asserted by some travellers, that in the countries where polygamy prevails, no such equality be-

tween males and females exists; the female sex being far more numerous than the males. This assertion, however, has never been verified by an appeal to any authentic documents; and there is reason to believe, that it has no foundation in fact. If true, it would be the strangest anomaly which can be found in the whole circle of providential events.

One great end of marriage is the nurture and good education of children; but it would be easy to show, that polygamy is destructive of this end, and is not even friendly to population. The prophet Malachi seems to refer to this subject, when he says, "And did he not make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore, take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth."

3. On any principles except those contained in the Bible, it is impossible to explain the origin of articulate speech, among all the nations and tribes on the face of the earth. If men are of entirely distinct races, and language is a human invention, is it not extraordinary, that every one of them should have made this important discovery? Indeed, if we examine the common philosophical theory of the invention of articulate speech, we shall find it encumbered with so many and great difficulties, that we will be pleased to find some other method of accounting for the possession of this wonderful faculty.

Previously to the use of language, the mind of man must, from its very constitution, have been in such a state of ignorance and incapacity, that he was no more able to invent a language, than to build a ship of war. How could savage man, supposing him to have possessed a degree of intellect which could not have belonged to him, have known that he possessed the capacity of forming that variety of articulate sounds, necessary to a language the most limited? Moreover,

language could only be formed by common consent to employ certain sounds as the signs of certain ideas or things ; but before language existed, how could such an agreement be made ? And this formation of language, by men in the lowest state of improvement, or rather destitute of all improvement, appears more incredible, when we analyze the languages of the world, and find that their structure is indicative of profound wisdom. Even the languages of some of the wandering tribes of America are complicated, and in a very high degree, artificial.

Again, let it be considered, that if human language were the invention of men, it would have been long in a very imperfect state ; and we might expect to be able to mark the steps of improvement, from the first rude and awkward attempts, up to that perfection which language has attained ; and according to this theory, the more ancient languages would be found less artificial and less complete in their grammatical structure, than the more modern. But the facts are not so. The oldest languages known are as complete in their structure, and as artificial in their grammatical inflexions, and even more so, than those languages which have been more recently formed.

Besides, how can we reconcile it with the beneficence of the Creator, who has enriched human nature with so many other gifts, that he should place man in this world, without giving him, from the beginning, the use of speech, so necessary to his comfort as a social being ?

Now all these difficulties are removed at once, if we resort for information, to the simple narrative of Moses. He informs us, that man, as soon as created, was endowed with speech ; for he was capable of understanding the words in which his Maker communicated to him his will. His possession of articulate speech is most apparent in his giving names to all the animals, which were brought in review before him, for that purpose. When the woman was brought

to him, he spoke distinctly, and said, "This now is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh." The woman also was from her first creation, endowed with the faculty of speech. And the whole history of the world, until this time, accords with the account given in the Bible. All nations and people wherever found, have the use of speech, and yet articulate language is not natural to man. Those persons, however intelligent, who are born deaf, remain dumb. If a thousand children were brought up together, without hearing an articulate sound, I believe they would remain dumb all their lives. And if men were adult when they are supposed to have invented language, it is probable, that the organs of speech, for want of use, would have become so rigid, that they would have been incapable of articulate sounds, in any variety, even if they had had the opportunity of learning them from others.

From a full consideration of this subject, we are under a necessity of adopting some such hypothesis as that which is given to us in the Bible.

4. Another remarkable phenomenon in the history of man, is the *diversity* of human language. Between some of the existing languages there is so great an affinity, that we can safely determine, that they are radically the same : but between others, the difference is so great, not only in the sound of the words, but in the idioms and grammatical structure, that we know not how, on any hypothesis, they can be referred to the same origin. That the language of nations widely separated from each other, although originally the same, will by degrees be changed, not only in the pronunciation of the words, but by the loss of some and addition of others, is a fact easily understood, and of which we have many examples in history. But in such changes, the radical structure of the language is not altered : a similarity very striking can still be observed in all the dialects. In regard to all the existing languages of the world, however, no such analogy

exists. Not only are the radical words different, but the whole structure of one language is founded on principles totally different from those observed in others. Some etymologists, indeed, by the help of a fertile imagination, have discovered, or pretended to discover, many words in all known languages, which are from the same origin: but conceding the fact of the identity of those words, it is easy to account for it, without supposing that all existing languages in the world have been derived from one original. In the various commingling of the nations, by conquest and emigration, it could not be otherwise, but that words of one language would be transferred often to another. Now, supposing the fact to be as just stated, that all the known languages of the world can never be traced to one original tongue, philosophy has no method of accounting for this diversity. It must remain an unexplained phenomenon, upon principles of mere reason.

But let us now turn to the Bible, and we shall find a full and satisfactory explanation of this whole matter. There, we read, "That the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass as they journeyed from the east that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, &c." (to the 9th v. of the xi. chap. Gen.) Critics, it is true, have differed in their interpretation of this transaction; and some men, eminent for their learning, have entertained the opinion, that the confusion produced at Babel, was not, properly, of language, but of counsel; and that the diversity of language has gradually arisen from the dispersion of the nations. Others, again, admit, that God did confound the language or speech, so far, as that a change of dialect or pronunciation occurred, while the language of the different families continued radically the same. But, if by miracle, the language of the builders was confounded, which is the obvious meaning of the passage, it is as easy to believe, that God originated at this time, several languages entirely new,

as that he multiplied the dialects of the original tongue : and although our knowledge is far from being complete on this subject, it may be asserted, that so far as facts have been ascertained, the plain and obvious signification of the passage, is supported by the radical and total diversity existing between some of the languages of the earth.

Here, again, the Bible becomes a key to explain an important phenomenon in the history of man.

5. The greatest of all difficulties to natural reason, is the existence and extensive prevalence of natural and moral evil, in our world. Why is the race of man subjected to so many grievous calamities? And why are all men, the good as well as the bad, doomed to inevitable death? If from any necessity of nature man must die, why is his death so painful, and often lingering? In this respect, all other animals have greatly the advantage of him. But a greater difficulty than this, is, the general and prevailing wickedness of men, in all ages, as is attested by all history, sacred and profane, and by all laws and governments, the sole object of which is, to set up barriers against the injustice and violence of wicked men.

Did God create man in this state of moral corruption? or did he make them so frail, that in the circumstances in which they are placed, all become sinners, and the greater number fall into egregious acts of iniquity? These facts, on the principles of natural religion, have no solution; and they have been the means of driving many speculative men from theism to atheism.

But in the Bible, we have a key to this mystery, also; not that every thing relating to the origin of evil is fully explained, for this would require a knowledge of the whole plan of the universe, which is too vast for our comprehension: but we have here explained as much as it is needful for us to know on this subject. From this ancient and sacred record we learn, that God made man upright, and

stamped upon him his own image ; and giving him an equitable law, placed him in a state of probation. Life and death were set before him ; and he had every reasonable motive to induce him to continue in obedience : but he sinned, and thus lost his innocence, corrupted his whole race, and incurred for himself and them the penalty of death. It was distinctly threatened, in the day thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, thou shalt die. And after the transgression, the sentence was repeated in this form, " Until thou return to the ground, for out of it wast thou taken ; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

The deist may invent many objections and cavils against this account of the origin of sin and death ; but every candid rationalist must acknowledge, that it is the only explanation of natural and moral evil, which has the least plausibility. And the more we contemplate the principles, on which God now governs the world, the more shall we become reconciled to the history of the fall of the first man, and in him, the ruin of all his race ; and if we are sincere lovers of truth, after exploring every other hypothesis, we will finally adopt the theory of Paul the apostle, " That by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death hath passed upon all men, because all have sinned." " In Adam all die." " The wages of sin is death." If the first man had never sinned, death would have been unknown in the world.

6. It is an universal fact, that females of the human race bring forth their offspring with excruciating pain. Now, these distressing pangs of parturition, are not experienced by other species of animals ; or, in so small a degree, that this remarkable peculiarity in the human species needs to be accounted for, by some special reason. Mere men of reason have failed in assigning any satisfactory cause for this event. It is felt to be a heavy calamity on our race, which is always attended with danger, and often takes away

the life of the sufferer. To prevent this evil, no remedy, of any efficacy, has ever been discovered. It continues unaltered and unmitigated from generation to generation, and is submitted to, as one of the inevitable calamities of human existence. And, commonly, for evils so uniform and universal, men do not trouble themselves to inquire the reasons. But in this as in other similar cases, the Bible affords the requisite, and, indeed, the *only* information. In this extraordinary book, so much neglected by Philosophers and despised by infidels, we read, that this was a special curse inflicted on the female sex, in consequence of the transgression of the first woman. "And to the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

And it is worthy of remark, that the latter part of this minatory prediction has been universally verified by the fact; for in all countries, and in all ages, except so far as Christianity has relieved them from the curse, the female sex have been ruled over by the males in a most tyrannical manner. They have, in all heathen and Mohammedan countries, been mere slaves, held in a state of abject subjection: which degraded condition is not improved by their being made subservient to the gratification of the stronger sex; since those who are selected to administer to the pleasures of their Lords, are in that state which of all others is the most degrading to rational beings.

7. The antipathy felt by most men to the serpent, which leads them to take pleasure in bruising its head, is a fact which ought not to be passed over without some notice, as the origin of such a feeling can be traced directly to the transaction recorded in the Bible, in which the serpent was made to bear so remarkable a part. It will not be in place to refer, here, to the degradation of the serpent from the high station which he held in the animal creation,

to go upon his belly, and necessarily to swallow the dust, as this would be to assume a fact, which all deists, and many Christians, would not receive. And although the curse denounced against the serpent, had doubtless a mystical and much more important meaning; yet that is no reason why it may not also have had a literal accomplishment. The whole passage is worthy of profound consideration. "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

8. Another phenomenon in the natural history of the earth, for the explanation of which we must look to the Bible, is the abundant and spontaneous production of thorns, briars, thistles, and other useless and noxious weeds and shrubs, while those grains and fruits needful for the sustenance of man, are obtained only by much care and toil. For while the ground teems with the former, without any aid, and, indeed, in opposition to all the efforts of man to subdue and extirpate them, the latter can be acquired, commonly, in no other way than by "the sweat of the face," from day to day. Why is this? The naturalist will answer, it is one of nature's laws. But I ask, why was such a law established? Would it not have been as easy for the Author of nature to make a law that the earth should spontaneously and copiously produce those things which are necessary for the subsistence of man? To this question, reason makes no reply. She cannot tell, why such an order of things should exist. Sometimes, indeed, a feeble answer is attempted, by saying, that it is beneficial to man to gain his bread by the sweat of his brow; but this comes with a bad grace from the mouth of an unbeliever, since the only reason why it is useful for him to be under the necessity of constant and severe labor, is that it re-

strains his tendency to iniquity. With this explanation, I am willing to admit the validity of the reason; but still it is an awful curse upon man—a being naturally capable of high mental improvement, and of sublime pleasure in the contemplation of his Maker and of his works—to be doomed to wear out his life, in digging the ground for the subsistence of his body.

Let us then hear what the Bible says on this subject; “And unto Adam he said, because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground.”

If the Bible is not a record of truth, these numerous striking coincidences between its declarations and the phenomena with which we are conversant every day, must be considered the most extraordinary thing in the world. But the Bible is true, and its truth is demonstrated by the fact, that it exactly corresponds with all other known truth. Every family, every field, every laborer, and every thistle and thorn, bears testimony to the authenticity of the Mosaic history.

9. If time would permit, I might show that the almost universal prevalence of bloody sacrifices, with their accompaniments of flour, and salt, and frankincense, and libations of wine; together with the apparatus of priests and pontifical robes, of altars, and temples, and *adyta* inaccessible to profane inspection, were all derived from the divine institution of sacrifices in the family of Adam, and from the sacred institutions by Moses, in the wilderness. The attempts of some learned men to account for this widely-spread practice, from mere principles of reason; or rather from the grossness of

the ideas of ancient worshippers, are altogether unsatisfactory. Besides, the analogy between the ancient heathen rites of sacrifice, and those recorded in the Bible, is so striking, and extends to so many points, that a full comparison by the induction of particulars, would amount to something like demonstration that they must have had a common origin.

But my prescribed limits will not allow me to pursue this subject. I can only recommend it to the attention of the inquisitive reader; who will be at no loss for helps to aid him in his investigation of the facts relating to the case.

10. In a dissertation of this kind, it would be unpardonable to pass without notice, those phenomena of our world, manifest in every country, by which it is indicated, that this whole globe, to the tops of the highest mountains, was at some former period submerged under the waters of the ocean. Though the general fact is undisputed, various theories have been invented to account for those appearances; but none of them are sufficient to explain all the phenomena, except the simple unadorned narrative of Moses. No part of sacred history has, perhaps, met with more learned and virulent attacks from the pens of infidels; and no other part of the Bible finds more corroborative proof from the natural world. Every mountain and valley, and almost every cave, deep pit, and mine, can be produced as an impartial witness of the truth of the flood of Noah. Such a deluge must have existed since the earth was inhabited; for innumerable bones of animals, deeply buried in the earth and accumulated in caves, remain to attest the fact: and these phenomena cannot be accounted for by the encroachment of the ocean in one part, and its gradual subsidence in another—a gratuitous hypothesis—for in many places the bones and exuvizæ of marine and terrestrial animals are so mingled together, that this theory cannot explain the facts. And skeletons of animals not yet deprived

of their hides and hair, found in high northern latitudes, where such animals cannot subsist, prove, that the waters of a deluge have, at some time swept over our globe. Moreover, the external appearance of the hills and vallies, and the interior appearance of their strata and mineral veins, clearly prove, that a deluge has passed over them with tremendous violence. A single fact here will be sufficient. It has been observed by experienced geologists, that in mountains now separated by deep ravines or vallies, there is an exact correspondence in the strata and mineral veins; from which it is evident, that a disruption has taken place; and that mountains which are now broken, were once continuous; and they inform us, that in some places, the course which the mighty current pursued, can be traced.

But in the absence of these witnesses of a deluge from the natural world, the histories and traditions which have come down to us, through a hundred distinct channels, are sufficient, to establish the fact, with all reasonable men. It is only in the Bible, however, that we have an authentic and satisfactory history of this awful catastrophe, and of the moral causes which brought it about. Here we learn the mortifying fact, that fallen man became so desperately wicked, that God, speaking after the manner of men, declared, that, "it repented him that he had made man on the earth." "And the Lord said, I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth."—"And God looked upon the earth, and it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth."—"All the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights."—"And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven, were covered: fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered."—"And the waters prevailed upon the earth, a hundred and fifty days."

Thus we see, in another remarkable instance, how much we are indebted to the Bible for the explanation of the most common appearances in the natural world: yet there are among us many men, learned in other sciences, who have not paid so much attention to the Bible, as to know what it contains.

11. In connexion with the mention of the flood, I feel disposed to take some notice of that splendid phenomenon, so closely connected with this great event, in the sacred history. I mean the rainbow. In this celestial arch, which is enriched with all the vivid colors of light, and which commonly makes its appearance immediately after a storm, there is something so beautiful and attractive, that all persons, from childhood to old age, experience pleasure in gazing upon it. The natural causes of this singular phenomenon, have been successfully explored. But the question still recurs, had the great Creator no particular end in view, in encircling the heavens with this splendid arch? Is it merely a phenomenon without further use than to excite a momentary pleasure in the minds of beholders? The proper answers to these questions cannot be learned from the book of nature, however carefully it may be studied. We must again resort to the Bible for a key to this remarkable phenomenon of the natural world. By this we are taught, that the bow in the clouds is the sign of a covenant, or solemn promise made to Noah and to his posterity, immediately after the deluge, in token of God's acceptance of the sacrifice which by faith the patriarch offered, when he forsook the ark. The object of this promise was, to assure the patriarch and all his descendants, that the world should never again be destroyed by the waters of a deluge. Such an assurance was greatly needed, to allay the fears and compose the minds of those who had been the witnesses of a catastrophe, so tremendous. When Noah and his family entered the ark, they left behind them a world peopled

with human beings, and innumerable animals ; when they came forth from the ark, they beheld a world in ruins, without a living creature on its surface, except the few which had been preserved with them. The patriarch, who had lived six hundred years in the old world, could now turn his eyes to the site of splendid and populous cities, which, a year before, were all alive with the hum of business and the riotous dissipations of the rich and voluptuous ; but O what a change ! Silence and desolation now reigned every where. Upon every appearance of a threatening cloud, and especially, when the heavens poured down abundance of rain, the human family, now reduced to a few persons, must have been filled with distressing anxiety and trepidation, lest the waters of the deluge should return again, had not God given them some solemn assurance that a similar disaster should never recur.

The rainbow, then, is the token or sign of a covenant, in which we are included and interested, as much as Noah and his sons. And it is to us, not merely the sign of a promise given, but of a covenant faithfully observed for more than four thousand years. Viewing this pleasing spectacle through this medium, how much more interesting does it become ? How well is it calculated to confirm our faith in all the promises of a covenant-keeping God, and to fill our minds with the sincerest emotions of love and gratitude ? The narrative of this institution is in the following words : “And God said, this is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations. I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud, and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh : and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh, And the

bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant, between God and every living creature, of all flesh, that is upon the earth."

But the natural philosopher will tell us, that the rainbow is produced by natural causes, and must have existed before the deluge, as well as after it; since the rays of light falling on drops of descending rain, would then have been separated into their primitive colours, as well as now; so that this brilliant phenomenon could not have had its origin after the flood. Be it so; yet God might appoint the bow to be a token of a covenant, entered into at this time. When a particular day of the week or month was consecrated to some special purpose of religion, no alteration took place in the day itself. When water is used as a sacramental sign in baptism, or bread and wine in the eucharist, the elements of water, bread, and wine, are the same after they are made the signs of a covenant as before. And so, the rainbow might have existed whenever the circumstances necessary to its appearance occurred, and yet have been selected afterwards as the token of God's solemn promise to all living creatures, that the earth should no more be overwhelmed with the waters of a deluge.

But I confess that I cannot persuade myself, that this view of the subject, however probable in itself, is consistent with the narrative of Moses without putting some force on his words. He introduces God, as saying, *I will set my bow in the clouds*; the obvious import of which is, that a sign would henceforth be exhibited in the clouds, which had never been seen there before: a thousand persons of plain good sense would, every one, give this meaning to the words, as is proved by experience. And as to the philosophical difficulty, it need not trouble us. The laws of nature, probably, underwent some change during the flood. Certainly a temporary alteration must have occurred in the atmosphere, when the heavens poured down an incessant torrent for forty days

and forty nights; and some permanent effect was also produced, for the air was less favorable to longevity after the flood, than before. How any change which now took place, could be the cause of the bow in the clouds, it is not necessary, nor perhaps possible, to know. This, however, we do know, that in the beginning, when the earth was created, it was not watered by rain, but by mist. "For the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth".—"But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." And for ought that appears, the earth was thus watered until the time of the universal deluge; in which case, there could have been no place for the rainbow. But if this be not admitted; yet when it rained, the whole horizon might have been uniformly overspread with clouds, as is now most commonly the case: and we know that a rainbow can never appear to any man, unless the sun is shining in one part of the heavens, while it is raining in the opposite part; a circumstance which now does not happen oftener than once in a hundred times, when it rains, and which might never have occurred before the flood.

It is adopted as a principle, without sufficient reasons, that the laws of nature have continued uniformly the same, since the creation. Without doubt, important changes occurred when man fell from his innocence, and was expelled from Paradise; and we are under the necessity of supposing some change at the time of the flood, in consequence of which, human life has, ever since, been so greatly abridged.

12. The early and common division of time into weeks, deserves also a short notice, in an essay of this kind. Other periods of time, such as months, and years, are measured and regulated by the heavenly bodies; but, the division into weeks, seems to be entirely arbitrary, seeing there is nothing to indicate it, or correspond with it, in the revolution of the heavens.

Where this hebdomadal period originated, profane history

cannot inform us. It can, however, be traced as far back as to the Chaldeans. Some have supposed, that, as each day of the week comes down to us with the name of the sun, moon, or one of the planets, and as these are seven in number, that the septenary division of time originated from the consecration of one day to each of these heavenly bodies. But this theory is unsatisfactory. It would have been a strange and unnatural conceit to make a regular period of seven days, constantly recurring, for no other reason but because there were seven planets, including the sun and moon. It is far more probable, that the Chaldeans or Egyptians, or whoever gave the names to the days of the week, found this period of time already established, and then imagined, that each day was under the influence or government of one of these luminaries, or deities, as they probably conceived them to be.

This supposition is strengthened by the fact, that among many ancient people, the seventh day was sacred.

But these facts, involved in so much obscurity, as far as reason and profane history are concerned, become clear, as soon as we look into the Bible: for there we learn, "that in six days God made the heaven and the earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

I know, indeed, that many Christians have adopted the opinion, that the Sabbath was not instituted until the time of Moses; and that the mention of it in the second chapter of Genesis, is by way of *prolepsis*: but this theory is altogether inconsistent with a fair interpretation of the sacred history. The words of Moses are, "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." And in the fourth precept of the decalogue, the institution of the Sabbath is closely connected with the work of creation. But how forced is the interpretation, that at the time of

the exodus from Egypt, God blessed the seventh day, because in it he had rested from all his work. Surely, if his resting from the work of creation, was the reason of the institution, it is no how probable that he would have deferred its appointment, for more than two thousand years; especially, when it is considered, that the celebration of the work of creation was as much incumbent on those who lived before this period, as afterwards. And that we read nothing of the sanctification of the Sabbath during the patriarchal ages, is an objection of little force, when we consider how many other things are unnoticed, in this concise history; and especially when we find a similar omission, during a period of five or six hundred years, after the Israelites took possession of Canaan.

THE Druses, or as they call themselves the Unitarians [*Mowahhidûn*], of Mount Libanus, have, for several hundred years, been the subject of much curious speculation among European travellers and antiquaries. The attention of the Christian world was first attracted to their character and history, towards the close of the fifteenth century, when one of their hereditary chiefs took refuge in Italy from the storms of his own country. An opinion was soon broached by some fanciful theorist, and propagated throughout Europe, that the Druses were the remnant of the Christian colonies established in the Holy Land at the time of the Crusades; a hypothesis countenanced, and perhaps suggested, by the coincidence of the name with that of Dreux in France, and the traditionary story of a Count de Dreux who had actually made a settlement not far from Mount Libanus. There was something romantic in this supposititious pedigree which awakened the sympathies and amused the fancy of all Christendom, an effect greatly heightened by the conduct of the Syrian refugee, who, with the singular complaisance peculiar to his nation, professed a strong attachment to the Christian faith, and a firm belief in his own European extraction. And here it may be observed, that much of the misconception and erroneous theory which have prevailed in relation to this people, has arisen from the strange trait in their character and manners just alluded to, a remarkable facility in conforming externally to the rites and opinions of those with whom they come in contact. Whether this policy has been adopted from motives essentially connected with their religious system as requiring

strict secrecy in relation to their creed and ritual, or whether it has been suggested altogether by a dread of the persecuting spirit which characterizes all orthodox Mohammedans, and especially the Turks, is a doubtful and disputed question. It is a fact, however, that they do not hesitate in practice to humour, as it were, the prejudices of their neighbours. An intelligent traveller informs us, that the mosque at Deir-el-Kamr, though sedulously garnished and well filled, whenever visited by a Turkish officer, is for the most part totally deserted, the minaret being only used to proclaim lost cattle and announce the current value of provisions.* We learn from the same authority, that the hereditary chiefs are circumcised and carefully instructed in the forms of prayer prescribed by the moslem ritual, while on the other hand, they do not scruple to drink wine and eat pork, very often go to church when one is within reach, and sometimes by way of a compliment to a Maronite monk or bishop, suffer their children to be publicly baptized. This compliance with the forms of Christianity, it must be owned, seems to be suggested less by a dread of persecution than a wish to elude investigation, and may indeed be regarded as a circumstance unparalleled in the history of other sects. In view of such an anomalous spirit of toleration and conformity, we can scarcely wonder at the discrepancy which appears in the various opinions that have been prevalent in relation to this people, both in Europe and the East. By some they have been classed as a society of Mohammedan schismatics, by others as a spurious variety of Christians, while many have regarded them as nothing else than a race of disguised idolaters. To the same cause we may perhaps ascribe the exaggerated statements which their own immediate neighbors have in past times propagated with respect to their moral character as a community, and the

* Niebuhr's Voyage. Vol. II. p. 353. Amst. 1780.

impure rites performed at their religious celebrations. There can be no doubt, it is true, that the moral principles established in their system, and the moral practice thence arising, are by no means unexceptionable. But the inquiries of enlightened travellers have clearly proved from the testimony of unbiassed Mohammedans and Christians, that the dark shade of the descriptions often given of their moral character, is attributable, in a good degree at least, to the malignity of hatred or the credulity of ignorance.* That their real sentiments and character are as little known to the other oriental sects, as to the inhabitants of Europe, may be gathered from the fact, that the native Christians of Aleppo, on observing the private and mysterious meetings of the English masonic lodge established there, immediately concluded that the Druses were no less than an order of Free Masons.† It is, therefore, not at all surprizing, that the history and character of this peculiar race, though so long the subject of inquisitive research, have been involved in such impenetrable mystery, and are even now so little understood. Mere obstinate refusal to disclose their secret would probably have failed of accomplishing the end, particularly if combined with an austere and fastidious separation from every other sect. But this singular practice of assuming any garb and professing any creed which convenience or interest recommends, without, however, giving up their own distinctive system of belief, has served as an impervious veil for the concealment of their mysteries. We shall endeavor to assign some reasons for this characteristic anomaly, after a brief review of the authenticated facts which constitute the history of the Druses so far as it is known. The authentic information on this subject, though it amounts to very little, is scattered through a number of miscel-

* See the travels of Niebuhr, Volney, and Burckhardt, in Syria and the Holy Land.

† Niebuhr. Vol. II. p. 356.

laneous books of travels, geography, and history. Nothing more will be here attempted than a connected exhibition of these facts, with some additional illustration derived from Mohammedan authorities.

It is a remarkable circumstance, though one which can scarcely be disputed or denied, that almost all the heterogeneous and conflicting heresies, which have mangled the religious system of Mohammed, since the time of its foundation, may be traced to their primary source, in political divisions and commotions. As might have been expected from the character of the system itself, a multitude of fanatical separatists and metaphysical neologists arose, even before the death of the false prophet. But the seeds of total and radical disunion were first sown in the violent dissensions which arose on the choice of the first Khalif or *successor* of Mohammed. The claims of Ali, as the first who had espoused the new religion, and as a kinsman and confidential friend of the impostor, were so obvious and imposing, that the preference given to another could not fail to create a powerful and zealous party in his favor. His death and the abdication of his son, instead of allaying this violence of feeling, served only to enlarge the breach, so that the whole series of Khalifs posterior to Ali had to encounter a perpetual opposition on the part of these malcontents, more or less formidable in proportion to their strength and the weakness of the government. When the family of Abbas obtained the supreme power, the number and influence of the followers of Ali were felt to be so great, that an attempt was made to deduce the pedigree of Al Abbas from one of Ali's sons. This genealogy, however, was so obviously strained, that the pretension was abandoned by the reigning family; but the tacit acknowledgment which had been given of the prior right of the Alides fixed forever the division of the two great parties of Shialis and Sonnīs, the former maintaining the divine right of Ali, and the latter the legitimacy

of the first three Khalifs. This, however, by no means continued the only matter in difference between them. A marked diversity of character was soon exhibited and constantly increased; and though each of these great sects was, in process of time, subdivided by a multitude of petty schisms, the same generic character pervaded all. Nor is the state of things, in this respect, materially different at the present time. The Shiahs, even now, have a manifest leaning towards wild speculation and fanatical enthusiasm, and the Sonnis towards the opposite extreme of blind or hypocritical formality. This fact admits of an easy historical solution. The sect of the Shiahs, though its date is for the most part referred to a later period, had its origin, no doubt, in the party heats with which Islam was inflamed on the death of the false prophet. The zeal of the partisans of Ali, originally warm, and fomented by the successive elevation of three pretenders to the regal and pontifical authority, gave a character of violent extravagance to the sect which perpetuated their sentiments and feelings, and this characteristic spirit soon infected their doctrinal opinions. As the fundamental principle upon which they built, was the priority of Ali and his offspring to all other families and individuals, their great object naturally was the exaltation of his merits and claims to pre-eminence of rank. In the prosecution of this end, they were not contented with asserting the advantage which his peculiar relations to the Prophet gave him over his competitors. They soon began to call in the aid of the marvellous and preternatural—ascribing to Ali a super-human nature, and ending at last in a direct apotheosis. This last doctrine, it is true, has never been espoused in all its length and breadth by the great body of the Shiahs, but it has always prevailed extensively among the members of that sect, and is indeed nothing more than their avowed opinion carried out to all its consequences. It is easy to imagine the effects of such a spirit, when once it

became prevalent among the Arab sectaries. No extravagance was thought too wild, no absurdity too gross to be pressed into the service of the son of Abu Taleb. By degrees Mohammed seemed to lose the supremacy to which his prophetic character entitled him, and to yield the first place in the eyes and hearts of the Shiabs to his son-in-law and Vizir. The eternity of the Koran was denied by pontifical authority in the reign of Almamun, the *Sonnah* or canonical traditions were rejected, or to speak more properly, gave way to a new traditionary code of a different complexion; the names of the first three Khalifs were recited in the mosques only to be cursed by the officiating priest, and in a word, the Shiabs and Sonnis learned to regard each other as worse than heretics, idolaters, and infidels. The policy of the Sonnis obviously was to fly to the opposite extreme—to reject all mystical interpretations and visionary theories, and by adhering strictly to the *letter* of the Koran and the *Sonnah*, to counteract the licentious extravagance of the schismatics. In this course they have persevered unto this day, counting the letters of the Koran, while the Shiabs converted them into cabalistic symbols, and illustrating the text by puerile traditionary comments, while the Shiabs enveloped it in the smoke of their mystical metaphysics.

We have already said, that the great subject of contention between these sects, was the divine right of Ali to the Khalifat—the Shiabs considering the claims of his family to pontifical authority as unalienable and exclusive, the Sonnis maintaining that the office was purely elective, and denying the existence of any hereditary right. There are two Arabic words which are used to denote the head of the Mohammedan religion—*Khalif* and *Imâm*. The first meaning merely a *successor*, has been applied indifferently to all who have united the spiritual and temporal authority. The other is exclusively appropriated by the Shiabs to the

legitimate princes of the house of Ali. Of these they reckon twelve, the first and second being Ali and his first-born Hassan who renounced the Khalifat about the fortieth year of the Hegira. The last of these twelve Imams, whom they call all *Al Mohdi* or the great director, is, according to the prevalent opinion of the Shiahs, still alive, and living in concealment, but is to reappear at some appointed period, not yet arrived. This wild conceit has been the fruitful source of many impositions, usurpations, and destructive wars throughout the west of Asia, as nothing could be easier among a people so disposed to believe things marvellous and new, than to personate this mysterious character who is constantly expected by the Shiahs to appear and restore the honor of the house of Ali. We find accordingly in oriental history innumerable instances of bold attempts to represent Almohdi for the purpose of corrupting the allegiance of the Faithful to their Khalifs and transferring their affections to some rival dynasty. The majority of these attempts were unsuccessful, though they assisted to shake the throne of Bagdad during the decline of the house of Abbas. In some instances, however, the results have been more serious, as in the case of the Fatimites who reigned in Egypt for above two hundred years, and whose history is the more deserving of attention, as it leads directly to that of the Druses.

About the close of the tenth century, Abu Mohammed Obeidallah assumed the title of Almohdi, and created a strong party in the African provinces against the reigning Khalif, Al Moktader Billah. The rank which he claimed at first, was that of Sultan or Khalif of Khairwan; but in a few years he assumed the style of Emîr Al Mumenin or Commander of the Faithful, and declared himself a lineal descendant of Ali, by his wife Fatimah, the daughter of Mohammed. From this circumstance, was derived the name of Fatimites, ever afterwards applied to him and his successors. After a protracted period of sanguinary conflict, he succeed-

ed in laying the foundations of an independent monarchy, which the third of his successors, Al Moezz, established finally in Egypt, A. H. 362, (A. D. 972,) where it remained unshaken amidst the repeated and violent attacks of the Bagdad Khalifs, until ultimately and completely overthrown by Saladin. Whether Obeidallah the founder of this dynasty, was really of the house of Ali, is one of the most doubtful and disputed points in oriental history, The Mohammedan historians have given such contradictory accounts of his parentage and extraction, that it seems impossible to separate the truth from the mass of exaggeration with which political and religious prejudice has adulterated and disguised it. But be that as it may, it is agreed on all hands, that from the time of his first asserting these pretensions, he fully espoused and uniformly promoted the temporal and spiritual interests of the followers of Ali. To this, merc policy would have impelled him as a means of widening the breach between him and the reigning family, and we find accordingly, that from the first foundation of the Fatimite Khalifat in Egypt, the Shiah doctrines were zealously professed, and established by authority, in the capital of Egypt. We have already seen how propitious the principles and spirit of that sect have always been to fanatical extravagance, and wild theological speculation. And we now find in perusing the contemporary annals of the Eastern and Western Khalifats, that while heretic after heretic was strangled in the dungeons, or burnt in the streets, of Bagdad, for maintaining the incarnation of the Deity in Ali, or preaching the mystical pantheism of the Sufis—the propagators of the self-same doctrines were in Cairo revered as prophets, and rewarded as public benefactors. From the time that Al Moezz made his entrance into Egypt, the extravagance of the Shiahs was allowed full scope. So many heterogeneous absurdities had been propagated and exploded, and the popular credulity burdened with so many

conflicting novelties of faith and practice, that the minds of the vulgar began to be unsettled and the people seemed disposed to throw off the trammels of religion altogether, when at length under the auspices of Hakem Biamrillah the chaos was reduced in some degree to order and wrought into the semblance of a system.

The notorious prince just mentioned, was the fifth Fati-mite sovereign after Obeidallah, and the third who reigned in Egypt. He ascended the throne A. H. 386,* at a very early age, and after some years of fickle and inactive government, began to exhibit symptoms of the wildest madness, combined with the most extravagant impiety. His official acts at this period of his reign, as recorded by Makrizi, are pitiable specimens of mingled folly, insanity, and wickedness. In one of his edicts he commands all the dogs of Cairo to be massacred; in another he forbids the women of the city to leave their homes on any pretext or at any time. On one day he required that the names of the first three Khalifs should be cursed at public worship, and on the next revoked the order. In one decree he would regulate with minuteness and precision the distinctive dress to be worn by Jews and Christians, and before the change could well be made, would issue another altering the fashion and requiring strict obedience upon pain of death. As his malady increased, he grew restless, and passed whole nights in pompous marches through the streets of Cairo, requiring the bazars to be kept open and the shops to be illuminated. With an intellect thus crazed, and under the influence of the wild speculations of the wildest Shiah, it is not surprising that the unhappy monarch became a tool in the hands of ambitious and fanatical impostors, who availed themselves of his insanity, to forward their own schemes of proselytism or aggrandizement. Of these the most conspicuous were Mo-

* A. D. 996.

ammed Ibn Ismail El Durzi, and Hamza Ibn Ali. The former, who also bore the name of Darar, is supposed to have been an emigrant from Persia, whence he imported into Egypt the mystical jargon of the Sufis, who, then as now, prevailed extensively in the former country. He is considered the founder of Ismailis, a sect still existing in the west of Asia, and is said by modern writers to have given name to the Druses of Syria themselves. Hamza was the coadjutor and successor of El Durzi, and is regarded by the Druses as the prophet or apostle of their faith. Under the influence of these two men, the impiety and madness of the Khalif reached its acme. In the year of the Hegira 408, he went so far as to deify himself, declaring that he was God incarnate, and forbidding the use of the customary phrase *God be propitious to him*, on account of its obvious impropriety when applied to God himself. In the same spirit, he changed his surname *Biamrillah*, (*by the appointment or command of God*,) into *Bidhâtihi*, (*by his own essential nature*,) and in short laid claim without reserve, limitation, or exception, to the honors of the Most High. By degrees, the confused and incoherent doctrines connected with and flowing from this absurd apotheosis, were reduced by Hamza into something like a systematic form and clothed in the mysterious garb of an unintelligible jargon. The doctrine of the metempsychosis, which was already common to many of the Shiahs, was set forth in prominent relief, the true believer being taught to trace the transmigrations of certain high intelligences immediately subordinate to Hakem or the Deity, though almost all the prophets recorded in the scriptures, to the person of Hamza and some five or six of his devoted satellites. The ceremonies of the new religion were performed with great solemnity, the Faithful being frequently assembled to receive instruction in the doctrines of their creed and moral exhortations from the Da'is or public teachers. And it may be remarked as a

singular feature in the system, that its privileges were extended to both sexes, particular provision being made for the instruction of the women, and some sacred writings still preserved being specially addressed to them. But besides these assemblies, which had necessarily something of a public character, there were secret meetings held, of a more mysterious nature, to which none could gain access but by passing through certain initiatory rites. The initiated too were divided into various ranks, each successive gradation enjoying its own privileges and maintaining its own order, holding for that purpose separate meetings, and performing diverse acts. At these nocturnal meetings, the tradition of the East affirms, that the decencies of life were scandalously outraged, a promiscuous and incestuous communion of the sexes being not only allowed, but enjoined as a religious duty. How far these imputations may be explained away as the results of malignant prejudice, or of vulgar credulity excited by the mystery which shrouded these assemblies, it is by no means easy to determine. Suffice it to say, that even allowing all that ought to be allowed in such a case, the acknowledged character of the men who prompted and regulated these proceedings, is by no means such as to justify the expectation of unspotted purity in any of their acts, particularly those performed in secret, and under the influence of blind fanaticism. In the meantime, the mad monarch continued to enjoy his arrogated honors, and to preside over the rites of his false religion with insane complacency. He was not, however, long permitted to continue the exhibition of this impious farce. In spite of his magnificent pretensions to perfection and omnipotence, a successful attempt was made to cut short his wild career, and the deluded wretch was slain with his vicegerent and prophet, by the emissaries of a party created by the influence and arts of his own sister. This catastrophe may be added to the many proofs which history affords of the utter impossi-

bility of giving permanence and general diffusion among common people, to a system of over-strained and ultra mysticism. All the patronage of Hakem, all the intrigues of El Durzi, all the jargon of Hamza, were unable to force the absurd extravagance of the new doctrines upon the lower classes. They preferred the cold emptiness of orthodox Mohammedanism, with all its restrictions and formalities, or at least the more moderate varieties of the Shiah heresy; and accordingly, they not only rose in opposition to the Khalif when the signal of revolt was given by the Benu-Korra, but resisted all attempts made after the death of Hakem to resuscitate the suppressed ceremonies and reorganize the abandoned lodges. Nor has any success attended such attempts at any subsequent period. The great mass of the Mohammedans continue to adhere to the religion of the Koran; and though a tincture of the spirit which characterized the worshippers of Hakem has been imparted to some unimportant sects, it has never since been popular or diffusive. The only community that is known to have preserved the system of Hamza and El Durzi, in its principles and details are the Druses of Mount Libanus, and even among them it is a secret at this day.

The circumstances which attended Hakem's death are enveloped in extraordinary mystery, rendered more remarkable by its contrast with the minuteness of detail, which for the most part characterizes the Arabic historians. An attempt was made by the high priests of the new religion to inspire a belief among the people, that he had only disappeared, like Al Mohdi, his progenitor, and like him would reappear at some convenient season. It was the less difficult to fabricate this tale, from the fact, that the Khalif was assassinated, in a private place, to which he retired at stated periods, to hold secret converse with the prophets and apostles. But subsequent events completely falsified this pious fraud, except in the eyes of the

most credulous among his blinded worshippers. The political changes which succeeded, sufficiently evinced that the unhappy monarch had undergone the process which all oriental sovereigns have reason to expect, and which most of them actually experience. Among these changes one of the most important was the abolition of the public, and suppression of the secret, rites connected with the worship of the murdered Khalif. The dispersion of the priests and devotees was a necessary consequence, and as Eastern revolutionists do nothing by halves, Hamza and his adherents who continued faithful, soon found themselves compelled to betake themselves to flight as the only means of safety, so that few months had elapsed before Egypt was completely cleared of every vestige of the obnoxious heresy.

At this point, a considerable chasm occurs in the history of the fanatics, which is only supplied—and that very imperfectly—by detached and confused traditionary anecdotes. The circumstances of their overthrow in Egypt might indeed lead us naturally to expect the absence of any continuous authentic record of their subsequent migrations. Persecuted, as they no doubt were, by the orthodox or less heretical believers, wherever they were found; hated at home, and suspected elsewhere, they were compelled to make their movements cautiously and in secret. The same circumstances would, of course, induce them to prefer the society of one another to that of the indifferent or persecuting multitude; a feeling strengthened probably in most of them, by the same spirit of fanatical enthusiasm which made them refuse to abandon their new faith. These facts, considered in connexion with the fragments of traditionary information already mentioned, give no small degree of probability to the opinion which identifies the Druses with the Egyptian refugees. Another circumstance, which adds to this probability, is the derivation of the name by which the sect is known, from the surname of Mohammed Ibn Is-

mael. An etymology suggested and maintained by a native of Syria* no doubt on good authority. Whether the fugitives immediately organized a separate society, or whether they amalgamated with another race, at that time occupants of Mount Libanus, we have no historical means of ascertaining. There is so much confusion and obscurity about the statements of the Mohammedan historians in relation to this period, that they furnish no satisfactory results. The first mention which we find of the Druses, as an organized community, is in the *Itinerarium* of Benjamin of Tudela, who travelled to the East in the 12th century, while the Europeans had possession of the Holy Land, a circumstance which clearly disproves the assertion, that they were a Christian colony. It may be thought extraordinary, that a society so singular in its character and habits should have attracted so little attention during such a lapse of time, and still more, that a sect of proscribed and persecuted heretics should have been suffered to reside in the midst of Mussulmans unmolested, and for several centuries almost unknown. This phenomenon, however, is sufficiently explained by a reference to the history of the Ottoman Empire, and the date of the first Turkish conquests. Though Mohammedans in their religious faith and practice, the Turks are of an origin entirely diverse from that of the other Moslem nations. It is generally agreed, that the first Turks were a horde of migratory Tartars, who penetrated into Asia-Minor through the Persian territory, and it is by no means an improbable conjecture, that they picked up the religion of the Koran in the progress of their march. They had consequently, at first, none of the same deep-rooted prejudices, one way or the other, which at that time characterized the Arabs and their colonies, and if at the present day they are the strictest and most bigotted of all the Sonnis, it has arisen

* M. Mitchel, French dragoman at Saïde.

in a great degree, from a spirit of political animosity towards the Persians, who are Shiah. The invasion of Syria and the Holy Land, therefore, by the Ottomans, wrought a change in the character of the whole population. The strangers, feeling none of the instinctive prejudices cherished by their predecessors, and disregarding probably, the vague traditions respecting the origin and character of the Druses, suffered them to remain in quiet possession of their territories, and in fact, seem to have wholly overlooked them, till the Druses emboldened by this tolerant contempt, committed such depredations on the adjacent regions as effectually roused the attention of their masters. A series of petty wars between the Turkish soldiery and the mountaineers terminated at length in the subjection of the latter, near the end of the fifteenth century. They were not, however, exterminated or even expelled. The only important change which was made in their condition, was the substitution of a monarchical form of local government, for the somewhat republican system which prevailed before—the numerous Sheikhs or petty chieftains of the Druses, being united under a single Emir. They soon, however, renewed their depredations with different degrees of impunity and success, and their history from that period till 1770, so far as it is known, consists of little else than a succession of revolts and conflicts with the Turks. It was at one of these stormy periods, that the prince, before alluded to, who had fought with great success against the provincial Turkish troops, and raised the power of his nation to its highest pitch, fled to Italy to escape the more formidable preparations which the Sultan was making to destroy him. In the year last mentioned, the famous rebel Ali Bey having been expelled from Egypt, renewed his disorganizing measures in Syria, where he had taken refuge, and as the war between the Porte and Russia required nearly all the Turkish troops upon the Northern frontier, the Pasha of Tripoli was forced

to have recourse to the Druses for assistance. They accepted his proposals, but in order to render their aid more efficacious, he compelled the reigning Emir, Al Mansur, to resign, and appointed in his room the Emir Yusuf, a nephew of Al Mansur, who had made himself conspicuous as a military chieftain, in several of the petty wars, so common in the east. Under his command, they marched upon Ali Bey, who, meeting them with a few small pieces of artillery obtained from Russian ships, routed them entirely, and wasted a considerable portion of the Emir's territory. The loss sustained in property and men, was serious to the Druses, and though we know few authenticated facts, in relation to their subsequent condition, there is reason to believe that they have never since been possessed of any great degree of power. It would even appear, that the Turks have in latter times, directly interfered in the local government of Mount Libanus, by assuming the right of nominating the Emir or chief Lord. It is stated by Mr. Jowett, in his Christian Researches, that the present Emir is neither a Moslem nor a Druse, but a Christian, who only complies with the outward form of the Mohammedan religion, to secure himself from injury. It is probable, however, that this is a misconception arising from the illusive practice of external conformity already mentioned as a characteristic of the nation in all ages. We have now given as full a view of the most probable opinions respecting the rise and progress of this people, as our means of information would permit. It remains to collect some of the scattered, and by no means perfectly consistent, statements which have been given in regard to their religion. The reader will recollect, that the educated Druses have always refused to impart information on this subject, and that what is known has been discovered by fraud or accident, or guessed out from the mystical jargon of their sacred books.

The Druses call their own religion *Tawhîd*, a word de-

noting *unity*, or rather a relief in the doctrine of Unity. This term is of common use among the Mussulmans, who apply it to their own faith as contra-distinguished from Christianity on the one hand, and polytheism on the other.

It is by no means certain, whether this is the sense in which the Druses employ it as descriptive of their system. It may, indeed, have allusion to their notions respecting the metempsychosis and the kindred doctrine of successive incarnations, and be intended to imply the Deity, though so frequently revealed in different forms, was, notwithstanding, *one*. But from some expressions which occur in their sacred writings, it seems more probable, that this appellative is founded on another peculiar dogma of their creed—to wit, that all the religious systems which have ever existed, however heterogeneous or contradictory, are sealed, consummated, and centred, in the religion of the Druses. Their prophet Hamza, and the other authors of their sacred books, delight in representing the new system as a grand universal medium between all extremes, and at the same time as the topstone of some mighty edifice, which had been building from the beginning of the world. This doctrine runs through all their writings, and serves to explain more than one of their peculiarities. It is on this ground, that they are so completely tolerant, never offering any opposition, nor expressing a dislike to the doctrines or services of any other sect. It is on this ground too, that they wholly abstain from all attempts to convert or proselyte their neighbors, nay, peremptorily refuse to receive any other than a native Druse into their communion. These two peculiarities, which are wholly unparalleled in religious history, can only be occasioned by a belief, that their system is the sum and substance of all other creeds, and an expectation that it will at some future day be universal. If this supposition is correct, the *Tawhid* properly denotes the unity of all religions, rather than the unity of God,

though the latter may, indeed, be included in the former. The truth is, that the doctrine just described is the only one which seems to be consistently and uniformly taught from the very beginning, in their sacred books. In other respects the system appears to have been formed gradually and at random. The earliest of Hamza's writings which have seen the light, are very moderate in their tone and spirit, and seem removed to no great distance from strict orthodoxy. The Koran is quoted or alluded to, in almost every sentence—a blessing is pronounced as usual, upon Mohammed, as the seal of all the prophets—and Hakem himself is represented as merely the vicegerent of the Deity. By degrees, however, this character is changed—Mohammed is forgotten, and Hakem is advanced till his Deity is explicitly asserted. For this change the books themselves account, by declaring that the deity did not enter into Hakem, until the year 400 of the Hegira, a chronological fiction, contrived, no doubt, to correspond with the change of plan or feeling in his fanatical advisers. After the deification of the Khalif, the sacred books are all confusion. Long, desultory, moral lectures, are intermingled with mystical personifications, transmigrations, and allegories, exhibiting very few, if any, indications of a uniform consistent system. To one of the most intelligent, and accurate observers among modern travellers*, we are indebted for the substance of a book purporting to contain a true account of the religion of the Druses, and to be itself the composition of a Druse. Though the circumstances in which the MS. was first brought to light, argue little for its perfect authenticity,† yet as it fur-

* Carsten Niebuhr.

† “ On me disoit qu' un *Jesuite* qui possédoit parfaitement l'Arabe, qui avoit logé une nuit chez un Druze, qui étoit fort hospitalier, avoit trouvé ce livre dans un coin de sa chambre à coucher et qu' il l'avoit d'abord copié la même nuit.” Niebuhr's *Voyage*, Tom. II. p. 354.

nishes a more connected view of the doctrines of the sect, than is easily found elsewhere, and is probably of modern origin, we shall content ourselves with borrowing its statements, and adding a few others from later authorities.

With respect to the Deity, they hold, according to the MS. just mentioned, that he has been ten times incarnate, first under the name and form of Ali—and last under the name and form of Hakem. Among the ten persons who are thus supposed to have been God incarnate, are several of the Fatimite Khalifs, who preceded Hakem on the throne of Egypt. The date of the Deity's first entrance into Hakem, we have already stated to be about the year 400 of the Hegira, or 1009 of the Christian era. They believe, however, that this incarnation was concealed from men, until 408, the year in which Mohammed Ibn Ismail began to preach his doctrines. In the following year, which they call the year of affliction, they say that the divinity abandoned Hakem, but returned to him again in 410, and continued in him until he disappeared.

Immediately subordinate to Hakem, the system recognises five intelligences or spiritual beings, who bear a great variety of titles in the books, though they are generally known under those of, the Mind or Intelligence—the Soul or Spirit—the Word—the right Wing—and the left Wing. These, like the Deity himself, are supposed to have dwelt successively in various human forms, migrating from one body to another, like the souls of men. Of these five beings, who are called the ministers of the Tawhid, or Religion of Unity, the first above mentioned, also bears the names of the *Will*—the *Command*—the *Cause of Causes*—and many others equally appropriate and significant. He is said to have appeared eight times in the flesh; 1. in the time of Adam, under the name of *Shat*. 2. In the time of Noah, under the name of *Pythagoras*. 3. In the time of Abraham, under the name of *David*. 4. In the time of Moses, under the name

of *Jethro*. 5. In the time of Christ, under the name of *Eleazar*. 6. In the time of Mohammed, under the name of *Salman* the Persian, (who is supposed by many to have aided the impostor in the fabrication of the Koran.) 7. In the time of Said, under the name of *Saleh*. 8. Last, and above all, in the time of Hakem, under the name of *Hamza* and the official title of *Kaim-el-zeman* or Lieutenant of the age. In like manner, the other mysterious essences, above enumerated, are traced, though a series of migrations to the persons of four followers of Hamza, the most eminent of whom is *Boha-eddin*, the author of many of the pieces which compose their sacred books. It is observed by Niebuhr, that the book from which he gathered the statements, which he gives in relation to the Druses—and the same is true of their more ancient writing—makes little mention of Mohammed Ibn Ismael, as the founder of the sect, but speaks often, and in high terms, of Hamza. This circumstance may be explained upon the supposition, that Mohammed Ibn Ismail was not properly the founder of the sect, though he may have been the first who breathed its peculiar sentiments, but an easier explanation is afforded by the fact, that most of the books in question were composed by Hamza himself. Be that as it may, it is certain that the Druses pay extravagant respect to the memory of Hamza, even supposing him to have written the New Testament, and to be himself the true Messiah, in consequence of which, says Neibuhr, they regard Christianity with peculiar favor. The doctrine of a future state is distinctly taught by Hamza in his early writings, and pretty much in the language of the Koran; but as he also recognized in the same compositions, the divine legation of Mohammed, and the subordinate rank of Hakem, it is hard to draw any definite conclusions from expressions which would seem to have been used merely as words of course, or to have been abrogated by posterior revelations. Certain it is, that the Druses do anti-

cipate a second advent of the vanished Hakem, to destroy his enemies, and elevate their sect above all false religions. In that day of retribution they believe, that most favor will be shown to Christians, and least to the Mohammedans—and it is remarkable, that they look forward to the triumph of Christianity over Islam as a sure prognostic of the great and glorious catastrophe.

As to their practical or moral doctrines, so far as they are known, they may be summed up in few words. The positive requisitions of their law are: 1. A belief in the divinity of Hakem. 2. A belief in the metempsychosis. 3. A blind submission to the Akils in spiritual matters. 4. Alms and benevolence in general towards their brethren. 5. The instructions of their wives in the doctrines of their faith. They are forbidden, 1. to swear. 2. To reveal the doctrines of their faith to strangers. 3. To eat with strangers or with those of a lower caste among themselves. 4. To commit adultery. Polygamy is allowed, but seldom practised by any but the Emirs. It is also said, that they consider marriage lawful between the nearest relations. Murder seems not to be prohibited; and indeed it would seem from Niebuhr's statements to be their ordinary mode of adjusting differences, and revenging insults.

A few observations will be necessary on the internal polity of the Druses, so far as it has reference to their religious peculiarities. They are divided into the two great classes of *Akils* or Ecclesiastics, and *Jahils* or Seculars. The former word properly means *wise*, and the latter *ignorant*, but usage has applied the one exclusively to those who devote themselves to a religious life, and the latter to all others, not excepting even the hereditary chiefs of the highest dignity. In many respects, the Akkal of the Druses bear a strong resemblance to the Christian priesthood, of the Roman church. Like them, they are the sole depositaries of the mysteries of faith and spiritual authority, and like them

they form a society distinct from the body of the people. In some points, however, the resemblance fails. The Akils of the Druses regard even the highest of the Jahils as their inferiors, and consider themselves polluted by merely eating with a Jahil, though he be the chief Lord or Emir of the tribe. In fact, there seems to be as broad a line of demarcation between the Akils and the Jahils, as between the Jahils and other sects. There are three *Sheikhs-al-akkal*, or superiors of this privileged order, whose authority they acknowledge. Of the secular chiefs, though politically the most powerful, they are independent. Their pride is, indeed, so great, that they scorn to act as secretaries to the chiefs, or as instructors to their children, offices filled exclusively by Christians, a circumstance which accounts for the number of Maronites residing on the mountain and apparently amalgamated with the Druses. But even this is not all. The Akils are not only thus independent of the Jahils. They are the sole depositories of the secret doctrines handed down by tradition, or in writing, from the days of Hakem and of Hamza. One of the duties most strictly enjoined upon the Jahils, is entire confidence in all the declarations of the Akils on religious subjects. They are all, therefore, considered as infallible, and deal forth their stores of spiritual knowledge, more or less profusely at their own discretion. It appears too, from the statements of some travellers, that the ignorance of the seculars, not excepting the nobility, upon these subjects, is scarcely less than that of total strangers. They have, indeed, no opportunities of gaining information. The meetings of the Akils for religious purposes are altogether private and exclusive. It is true, that like the founder of the sect, they admit their wives to a free participation in their own peculiar privileges. But then it must be recollected, that they never intermarry with the Jahils. In a word, the distinction between these classes is as great, and as scrupulously perpe-

tuated, as that between any of the castes in India. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Druses, with whom travellers for the most part come in contact, are unable to give any satisfactory intelligence respecting the faith which they profess to follow. And when we consider that the great mass of them are excluded altogether from religious worship, we can scarcely be surprised at Burckhardt's statement, that they are mere deists, with few sentiments or feelings, and no exterior forms, of a religious nature. In the opinion of the same traveller, we must also be content to acquiesce, that little can be known with certainty, respecting their religion, till some of their ecclesiastics shall be prevailed upon to make a full disclosure. In consequence of this exclusive appropriation of religious knowledge to a single order, the character of the nation at large has been formed by political, rather than religious, circumstances. In language, and in many of their habits, they strongly resemble the Arabs. Like them, they are hospitable, generous, vindictive, adepts in horsemanship, and fond of military exercises; while the comparative liberty which they enjoy, and their total exemption from the capricious tyranny which grinds the faces of their miserable neighbours, has given them a character of frankness, dignity, and independence, which is equally unknown to the oriental Christians and their Moslem masters. They are all tillers of the ground, but are able to raise on an emergency a militia of forty thousand able-bodied men. Their manners are characterised by primitive simplicity combined with a delicate politeness, occasioned probably by their elevated notions respecting the female sex. In a word, in whatever light we view this singular race of men, we cannot but regard their history and manners as among the most interesting objects of inquiry which the Eastern world presents.

REVIEW.

Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ; and on the Atonement and Redemption. By JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D. London. B. J. Holdsworth. 1828. pp. 316. 8vo.

THE author of these Discourses has long held a distinguished place among the Dissenters, in England, as a learned and orthodox theologian and accurate biblical scholar. As an able writer, also, Dr. Smith is well known to the religious community, especially by his important work on the divinity of the Saviour, entitled, *SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH*. And it is to us a matter of some surprize that this production has never been re-published in this country; as the subject treated is of the highest importance, and one earnestly discussed among us.

It is known to our readers, that Dr. John Pye Smith is professor of theology, in the Academy at Homerton, where a large number of the pastors in the Independent churches of England, receive their education. This important station he has filled, with great respectability and usefulness, for many years. In his theological opinions, he may be denominated, without impropriety, a moderate Calvinist; though his creed is not derived from any human system or human authority, but from a careful, critical, and conscientious study of the Scriptures. The trait in his character which appears most conspicuously in his writings, is an ardent love of truth. To this he seems to be willing to pay supreme deference; so that he will avail himself of no argument or interpretation unless he is convinced that it is sound. Under

the influence of this noble disposition he is sometimes led to concede some points, which others on the same side have strenuously maintained; and has thus appeared, occasionally, to weaken his own cause. But after all, it is probable, that he gains more than he loses by such a course. Truth needs no aid from error and sophistry; and every defender of truth should be scrupulous, not to admit any suspicious auxiliaries. It has a mighty influence to disarm the prejudice and conciliate the favour of the reader, when an author makes it manifest, that he would not willingly mislead him, if he should have it ever so much in his power.

Dr. Smith appears to be extensively acquainted with the writings of the best theologians, both of ancient and modern times. He has not overlooked, in his various reading, the celebrated writers of the new school of theology, or rather neology, in Germany. The opinions of these subverters of pure Christianity, he treats, as they deserve, with little respect; but he does not disdain to derive aid from the profound and critical researches of these indefatigable scholars.

The first of the Discourses in the volume before us, was originally published as early as the year 1813, and was well received by the public, and highly esteemed by the friends of sound doctrine, notwithstanding that it followed the learned and popular work of Dr. (now Archbishop) Magee, on the same subject. On the general doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, Dr. Magee's Discourses and Dissertations, produced an extensive and salutary impression on the public mind. Perhaps, no publication, in the English language, for a century past, has had a more beneficial operation, in settling the sentiments of men on this important doctrine. But excellent as this work is in establishing the main point relative to the atonement, yet if we look to it for satisfaction on a number of subordinate but important points, we shall be disappointed in our expectation. Clear and definite ideas of the necessity, nature, and end of the

atonement, are much more satisfactorily exhibited by Dr. Smith, in these Discourses, than in the more popular work of the Archbishop. In our own opinion, however, the old work of Dr. Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, is superior to both of them, in just and accurate views, on this important subject. This valuable treatise has been long known to the learned, and within a few years, has been rendered accessible to the English reader, by the translator of Calvin's Institutes.

Dr. Smith has adopted a practice in the citation of testimonies from the Scriptures, against which we feel constrained to enter our protest. Instead of quoting the words of the authorized version, he gives us his own private interpretation. In his preface, he has assigned his reasons for pursuing this course, but we are not satisfied with the apology. If one person may use this liberty, so may every one, and the consequence would be, interminable confusion. Every smatterer in Greek and Hebrew literature, and every wild errorist, would come forward with their *improved* versions, of such parts of Scripture as they wished to turn to the advantage of their own cause, and thus the word of God would be rendered contemptible, and the confidence of the people in it as a fixed and infallible standard would be greatly shaken by seeing the sense of the same passage so differently represented. We do sincerely hope, therefore, that this example will not be followed. We do not say, that our English version of the Bible is infallible, or that it has any authority, where it departs from the true meaning of the original; but the correct method of proceeding, in our opinion, is, to cite testimonies, in the words of the commonly received version; and then, if the writer is of opinion that the sense is not fairly or fully given, let him exercise his critical skill, as much as he pleases, in endeavouring to elicit and establish the true meaning.

The style of these Discourses is, for the most part, perspicuous, and sometimes forcible and animated; but in our

judgment, too much minute and dry criticism is introduced into them, which should have been referred to the Notes and Illustrations. As they are now constructed, they cannot possibly be of any use but to the learned reader; whereas by throwing the greater part of the critical discussion into the Notes, the principal argument would be level to the capacity of any intelligent person.

We think it also a fault, that the learned author, by endeavouring to render his definitions very accurate, in the abstract, often introduces obscurity into a subject, otherwise plain. Of this we have a remarkable example, in the Third Discourse, (p. 183.) where he formally gives the definition of *holiness* and *sin*. "Holiness," says he, "is the respecting of the *due relations*, or the objects of intended reference, which *ought to be*, in the performance of actions." And, "Sin is the absence of respect to the due relations of actions." Now, we believe, that these definitions are accurate; but do they elucidate the subject? If the words defined were removed, would any mortal be able to divine, what the subject of the definitions was? It would answer just about as good a purpose, to exhibit holiness and sin in algebraic signs.

Indeed, the greatest defect which we have observed in this truly learned and respectable author, is, too great a fondness for abstract reasoning, in cases, where the simple declaration of God is of more weight than all the reasonings in the world.

Our object, in the review of these Discourses, is merely to bring them to the notice of our readers, to furnish them with a general analysis of their contents, and to give some extracts of sufficient extent, to enable them to judge for themselves, not only of the author's style, but of his theological views.

The text on which these Discourses is founded, is, Heb. ix. 14,—*The blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God.*

In the first Discourse—which in this edition extends through 82 pages—the subject treated is, *THE NATURE OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST*. In discussing this important point, the author considers the following particulars. 1. The general nature of sacrifices. 2. The symbolical character of the ancient sacrifices. 3. The reference of these to the sacrifice of Christ. 4. The proper value of the sacrifice of Christ. 5. The efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ.

The views of the learned author, relative to the nature and origin of the ancient sacrifices, will be best learned from the following extract:—

“A sacrifice, properly so called, is the solemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to the Deity, as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed mean of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government.

“The practice of offering sacrifices to the true God, or to fictitious divinities, is known to have been a custom, in the most complete sense, universal and ancient. The records of the early history of nations, and the narratives of modern discovery, equally show the prevalence of sacrificial rites, in all countries where they have not been superseded by Christianity. The manner in which men performed those rites showed their strong apprehension of importance and interest in them. The inferior and less serviceable animals were not generally devoted to this purpose; but the animals of most utility to man were the usual sacrifices, and these often in large and costly numbers. Such profusion proved the serious earnestness of those who used it: yet, in instances without number, more horrid proofs were given. On great occasions of terror, or of expectation, human beings were the victims of this dire immolation. Unhappy and bewildered mortals have sought relief from the pangs of guilty dread, and have hoped to atone for past crimes by committing others still more awful: they have given their first-born for their transgression, the fruit of their body for the sin of their soul.

“The remote antiquity of these observances is attested by the most venerable remains of classical and oriental composition: and the most ancient and authentic of documents, the sacred history, carries them back to the first family of man.

“It is the opinion of some, that, in allusion and accomodation to these practices, and with a view to facilitate the reception of Christianity by gratifying the prejudices of the Jews, the New Testament represents Jesus Christ as having offered a sacrifice to God; though, in a real and proper sense, he did no such thing. These interpreters affirm that, as the Jews had a profound veneration for their temple, their priesthood, and their altar, the first Christian teachers endeavoured to ingratiate themselves and procure acceptance to their system, by finding in it likewise a priest, a sacrifice, and an altar. To this mode of representation we object, that, as an hypothesis, it is defective, and that it is contrary to the testimony of Scripture.

“It is defective, as an hypothesis, in that it leaves the previous fact unaccounted for; the existence of sacrifices, their origin, and their design. An attempt is made to remove the difficulty, by alleging that the worship by sacrifices ‘was of the nature of a present, by way of homage to the Supreme Being.’*—On this supposition, must we not deem the bloodless, innocent, and more natural offering of Cain, the fruits of the earth, more rational in itself, and more likely to be agreeable to the Deity, than that of Abel, which appears revolting to the feelings of humaity, a useless waste of animal life, and, as an act of worship, manifestly absurd? But, passing by the grossness of the invention, what conceptions must those form of the blessed God, who imagine that with such services HE could be gratified?

“We also object that this notion is inconsistent with the plain language of the Scriptures, in regard both to the ancient sacrifices, and to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Evidence for both the parts of this remark we shall presently submit to the reader’s judgment.

“A doctrine, the reverse of that to which we have referred, appears to us the dictate of the divine oracles and of impartial reason. This is, that the ancient sacrifices were themselves only *allusions*; and that they were intended as a REPRESENTATION of the sufferings and death of the Messiah, or as a DECLARATION of the doctrine included in that grand future fact, and taught by it.

“In the communication of knowledge from man to man, the living voice is a very imperfect instrument. The extent of its use is narrowly circumscribed by infirmity and death. The advantages of man’s primitive longevity were opposed by prevailing and increasing corruption and practical wickedness must in time have effaced right impressions of religious truth. The tongues of patriarchs and pro-

* Dr. Priestly’s Notes on Scripture, Vol. i. p. 13.

phets were soon silent in the grave : and the mere memory of their instructions, however for a time affectionately cherished, was a hazardous channel of communication for truths of infinite concern. Hence a *language of mute signs* must have appeared to possess incalculable advantages, as soon as the idea of such an instrument was entertained. Such a representative of language might be of two kinds, the *symbolical* and the *arbitrary*. The latter kind is alphabetical writing : and an admirable contrivance, whether it was entirely the fruit of human ingenuity, or, as some have supposed, originating in divine communication. It is probable that the first extensive use of this invention nearly coincided with the considerable increase of population, and the reduction of the length of human life to its present standard. The brevity, ease, and universal application of this method, have given it an almost exclusive prevalence among the cultivated nations which have been founded to the west of the original seats of the human race.

“But we have reason to think, that a more remote antiquity may be claimed for the other kind of signs, the *symbolical*. This was a system of natural significancy, in which visible objects or their pictures, and actions performed with this express design, were used to represent and convey information. This plan was prevalent in the earliest periods, and among the most ancient nations. Even at this day, a written language, which is understood by about one third part of the human race, is of this description : the Chinese. It is founded upon the principle of employing characters, not as representatives of sounds, but as types or symbols of ideas ; and it is familiarly understood by nations whose spoken dialects differ greatly.

“Of this kind we conceive the rite of sacrificing to have been : a *symbolical action*, adapted and intended to convey important instruction. We shall offer our reasons for regarding sacrifices as thus intentionally significant ; and then shall inquire into the particular ideas and moral sentiments which were so represented.

“Our arguments in favour of the notion that sacrifices were intended as a species of symbolical language, will be drawn from their very Nature and Form, from their Origin, and from the Sentiments of those who practised them.

1. “The nature, form, and circumstances of a sacrifice carried an obvious import upon their very first aspect. The selection, presentation, and immolating of the unoffending animal, the regard paid to its blood, its consumption by fire, the solemn ceremonies which accompanied, and the particular confessions and supplications of the

worshipper,—must have powerfully impressed the ideas of sin and guilt, the desert of punishment, the substitution of the innocent, and the pardon of the transgressor. When men were accustomed to symbolical actions, such a significancy would be more readily apprehended and more solemnly felt, than under our circumstances and habits. The refinements of advanced society, and the general use of letters, have made us far less sensible to the language of living signs than the ruder children of nature have always been. How much more must the impression on the heart have been increased, when *the first* sacrifice was offered: when the parents of our race recent from their guilty fall, were abased by the divine rebuke, driven from their blissful seat, and filled with dismay at the threatening of DEATH! A threatening piercing through their souls, but of the nature and effects of which they could form none but vague ideas. But when, directed by stern authority, to apply some instrument of death to the lamb, which, with endearing innocence, had sported around them,—an act of whose effects they as yet knew nothing,—they heard its unexpected cries, they beheld the appalling sight of streaming blood, and struggling agonies, and life's last throes,—they gazed upon the breathless body,—and they were told, THIS IS DEATH:—how stricken must they have been with horror such as no description could ever paint! When, further, they had to go through all the other process of the sacrifice, their hands reluctant, and their hearts broken, and all their soul crushed down by the sad consciousness that these horrid things were the fruit of their sin, and yet contained the hope of their deliverance;—who can imagine the extremity of their feelings?

2. “The origin of sacrifices we have good reason to regard as from Heaven, and not of men. In the institutes of the Levitical law, the express divine sanction is indisputable: and if we go back to the remotest times, we shall find indications of the same authority. The approbation of God is solemnly recorded to the sacrifices of Job and Abraham, Noah and Abel. But, in religious institutions, the Most High has ever been jealous of his prerogative. He alone is competent to prescribe the terms on which he will hold communion with sinful beings; and he regards as vain and presumptuous, every pretence of honouring him which he hath not warranted. The sacrifice of blood and death, if an idea so revolting could have sprung up in a sinner's mind, could not have been offered to God without impiety, nor would he have accepted it, had not his own authority previously pointed the way by an explicit prescription.

“The goodness which pitied our first parents, in their fallen and degraded condition, furnished them with clothing from the skins of animals. It cannot, by any reasonable presumption, be supposed that those animals had been killed for food. The strong probability, therefore, is that the gracious Being who promised the Messiah as the woman's seed, confirmed the promise, and illustrated the doctrine of forgiveness through him, by the institution of sacrifices.

“Now all divine institutions are marked by the wisdom of their Author. The sabbath, the passover, the rite of baptism, and all other ordinances of worship, are significant and instructive: it is fair to infer that sacrifices were so too.

3. “The sentiments of those who practised sacrificial rites are in favour of our position.

“The ancient heathens universally attributed to sacrifices both significance and efficacy. The oldest representations of their sentiments and manners bear this testimony. Of the classical productions of the western nations, the works of Homer are the most ancient: and who, that has read his two exquisite poems, can be ignorant that by sacrifices, performed or promised, the gods were to be appeased, and the pardon of offences procured? The primitive idea of atonement, buried as it was under idolatrous corruptions, disgraced by superstitions, and polluted with atrocities, was not totally lost. Some of the philosophers, disgusted with the vulgar notions, or shocked at the apparent absurdity of a practice, the meaning and intent of which they knew not, expressed their surprise and disapprobation at so strange a mode of seeking the favour of the Deity: but tradition, uniting with the consciousness of guilt and the dread of punishment, had fixed the notion and practice in the minds of all nations too strongly to be eradicated by philosophic speculations. It was a doctrine held even by some of the Pythagoreans, that the purification of the soul, and its union with God, were effected by sacrifices and sacrificial fire.

“The modern Jews, through their aversion from Christianity has led them in various important points, to abandon the theology of their ancestors, have recognized statements on this subject which we may justly esteem valuable concessions. As a specimen of passages which might be adduced, the following is submitted to your attention from one of their most learned and approved writers, Isaac Abrabenal. ‘The blood of the offerer deserved to be shed, and his body to be burned, for his sin: only the merey of the [Divine] Name accept-

ed this offering from him as a substitute and propitiation, whose blood should be instead of his blood, and its life instead of his life.'

"These inferior authorities are valuable, inasmuch as they may be regarded as the distant emanations of primitive truth, communicated at first by the Author of truth himself. To this high source let us now carry our appeal. If, in his holy word, we find pointed declarations of the absolute inefficacy of the legal sacrifices, except connected with moral acts and dispositions; declarations addressed to the people whom he had commanded thus to worship him, and who could not neglect the observance without incurring his awful displeasure;—can we avoid the conclusion, that they were intended to inform the mind, and assist the faith, of the worshipper? Instances of such declarations in the Old Testament are obvious. 'For what purpose to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah. I am disgusted with the burnt-offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts: and in the blood of bulls and lambs and goats I delight not.' 'I hate, I despise your festivals; and I will not accept the odour [of sacrifices and incense] on your solemn days. Though ye present to me sacrifices and offerings, I will not accept them.'—'Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not:—burnt-offering and sacrifice for sin thou dost not require.'

"By these considerations it appears satisfactorily established that the intention and use of the ancient sacrifices was to be a SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATION of spiritual and important truth, and that in this view they were understood by those who practised them."

Our next extract is from that part of this Discourse, in which the author undertakes to show, that all the objects which the typical sacrifices represented, are really effected by the sacrifice of Christ. This being a cardinal point in the system, an opportunity will be afforded to the reader, of forming an accurate judgment of Dr. Smith's method of treating the subject, and of his theological opinions, by what follows:—

1. "It is a demonstration of the most momentous and interesting truths, respecting the PERFECTIONS and GOVERNMENT of GOD.

"He is here manifested as the MOST HOLY ONE, irreconcilable to sin, of purer eyes than to behold evil, and in whose presence nothing that defileth shall ever stand. Had sin been pardoned and its guilt

cancelled, by the exercise of sovereign will, or by an act of mere power; it might have been doubted whether the Almighty were indeed infinite in moral rectitude; it might have been surmised that sin was not so extremely odious in his sight as his word represents, nor holiness so absolutely necessary to the happiness of a rational being. But no such injurious apprehensions can be entertained by those who devoutly study the divine purity as it appears in the doctrine of Christ crucified. Sin is pardoned, but it is not palliated. On the contrary, it is branded with a deeper and more awful mark of Jehovah's abhorrence than if no interposition of grace had been vouchsafed, but the weight of vengeance had fallen on the heads that deserved it.

“The JUSTICE of Heaven is displayed. This perfection of the Divine Nature is, indeed, but a necessary exercise of its essential and unchanging rectitude. ‘Justice is goodness directed by wisdom,’ says the judicious Bishop Stillingfleet. The same inspired word which tells us that God is love, tells us also that God is righteous, who taketh vengeance. And the positions are in perfect harmony. It is a necessary and honourable part of the goodness of God that he sets himself against sin. It is in the sufferings of the Saviour, as a sacrifice for the sins of those whom he hath loved, so as to give himself for them, that sin is most clearly shown to be deserving of all the detestation which the word of God expresses. The sincere Christian's abhorrence to sin is confirmed and increased, by every discoveries of its intrinsic demerit: but such discoveries he makes, in the most convincing and affecting manner, in looking to Jesus, who knew no sin, yet was made sin for us; the spotless and unblemished Victim, who bore our sins in his own body on the cross. Here, too, the persevering transgressor may meditate terror; for if God spared not his own Son, when, by a constitution of wise and holy mercy, he was numbered among the transgressors, what will be the end of those, whose personal and persevering guilt equally tramples on the authority of his law, and insults the grace of his gospel? ‘If these things were done in the green wood, what shall be done in the dry?’

“The LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY of God is brought to view in its rightful honours. His law is shown to be of the most reasonable character, and of indissoluble obligation; for it is holy, just, and good. It is the expression of his own moral perfection, and he cannot permit it to be depreciated with impunity. It is the most moderate demand that can in any reason be imagined, of excellence which deserves thus to be honoured, and of dominion which requires thus

to be obeyed. A lower requirement cannot be conceived, without charging God with indifference to his perfection and dereliction of his honour. What does his law demand, but that HE should be loved and honoured *proportionably to his merit*? More he does not enjoin: less, it would be infinitely dishonourable in him to require or to accept. The righteousness of the requirement, and the correspondent equity of its sanction, are shown forth in their just glory by the obedience unto death of Jesus the Son of God. Put under the law, he hath magnified it and made it honourable, and is become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

“The glory of eternal wisdom is here manifested, in the formation of a moral constitution, by which the guilt and punishment of sin, so far as was necessary for the purposes of sacrificial atonement, were assumed by the sinless Victim; and the worth of his obedience and his sufferings becomes imputable, on grounds of right and reason, to the sinner who is brought to a cordial acquiescence in this plan of holiness and grace. The foundation of this divine constitution is laid in a *union* of nature and covenant relationship, between the meritorious Sufferer and those for whom he suffers, so that a reciprocal proprietorship is made to exist. Striking resemblances to such a constitution of things are not wanting in the visible government of providence: and whoever has attentively considered the amount of human knowledge on the subject of cause and effect, must, I think, of necessity admit that this doctrine of a moral union between Christ and his people rests upon an unshaken foundation of philosophical truth.

“Thus a way is opened for the exercise of MERCY and GRACE in a manner perfectly honourable to the attributes and government of God. He appears a just God and a Saviour: he is just, and yet he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus. And of all the condescensions of mercy, of all the gifts of divine generosity, can any be esteemed comparable with this? ‘God commendeth his love towards us, in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son, to be the propitiation for our sins!’”

2 “By the sacrifice of himself, Jesus Christ voluntarily SUSTAINED that suffering which was the marked PUNISHMENT of sin, and expressly with this view, He was ‘made a curse for us.’

“We have seen that the idea of substitution, or vicarious suffering, was essential to the theory of sacrifices, as understood and practised by profane and sacred antiquity, and as we have abundant reason to believe, originally instituted by God himself. Let us now

inquire whether the Scriptures do not, in clear and express terms, attribute the same idea to the suffering and death of our blessed Redeemer.

“The passages quoted under the foregoing head of this discourse, are all strictly in point as evidence for our present purpose; and their testimony appears to me so full, particular, and strong, that I am unable to conceive how it can be eluded in any other way than by assuming principles which would nullify the use of language, and destroy all means of moral certainty. I need not repeat those quotations; and the addition of further testimonies might seem superfluous. But different testimonies present the same truth in different points of view, so as to serve the purpose of mutual illustration: and these varied aspects are highly useful in their adaptation to men’s different mental constitutions. Let us keep in sight the precise point, for the evidence and illustration of which the following are adduced, and the preceding texts recollected: that, in virtue of the *union* constituted by the wisdom and grace of God, between the Saviour and mankind, he voluntarily *put himself in their place* and suffered as if he had been a transgressor, in order that they might be delivered from the guilt, or legal condemnation, of their sins, and, by consequence, from the pollution and practical power of sin.

“The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. I am the good Shepherd: I lay down my life for the sheep: therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment have I received of my Father.—This is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, the blood shed on the behalf of many, for the remission of sins.—To feed the church of the Lord which he hath acquired to himself by his own blood. In whom we have redemption by his blood, the forgiveness of our offences, according to the riches of his grace. Who gave himself for us, that he might ransom us from all iniquity. Who gave himself a ransom for all. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Who himself bare our sins, in his own body, on the cross: by whose stripes ye are healed. If one died for all then (*ἅπα*, in effect) did the all die;’ that is, upon the constitution of mediatorial grace, and relatively to the great ends of law. ‘Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. For him that knew no sin, [God] hath made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.—They fell down before the Lamb:—

and they sing a new song, saying, Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood!

“Such is the current of the Scripture testimony to the nature, design, and end of the sufferings of Jesus the Messiah. These passages have been recited in their briefest form, and detached from their respective connection: but if the candid inquirer will study each of them in its proper place, and with the closest regard to the continuity of sentiment, it is my serious conviction that the impression made by this insulated representation will be confirmed and increased. A writer of eminence in the polite world, who knew extremely little of theological systems, but who, emerging from a careless infidelity, read the Scriptures with attention and good sense, has described, with regard to our present subject, the effect produced on his mind by such an unbiassed study of the sacred books. ‘That Christ suffered and died as an atonement for the sins of mankind, is a doctrine so constantly and so strongly enforced through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will seriously peruse those writings, and deny that it is there, may with as much reason and truth, after reading, the works of Thucydides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any facts, relative to the histories of Greece and Rome.

Indeed, I must sit down in hopeless scepticism, and abandon all reliance on evidence and reasoning, if I refuse to admit it as the doctrine taught in Scripture, that the Saviour of mankind voluntarily yielded himself a sacrifice of expiation, bearing the guilt and punishment of sin not his own: when prophets, and apostles, and his own supreme authority, concur in bearing this testimony to his sufferings and the glories that should follow.

“‘Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things?’ That is, was it not fit, proper, and necessary, in the eye of that All-perfect Being who had constructed the plan of human salvation; and who had so constructed it as to meet all the exigencies of the case, both with respect to the wants of the sinner, and the regards due to his own righteous government. The Saviour came to suffer. The chief part of his humiliation was his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. Throughout his mortal course, he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: but especially the closing scenes of his life were the accumulation of woe. Then was the hour of his enemies, and the power of darkness. We are incompetent to form a proper conception of the precise nature and the degree of suffering,

to which the dying Redeemer submitted. Excruciating were the pains inflicted on his bodily frame, which could not but be delicate and susceptible to a very high degree. But all these were light, compared with the distress of his holy soul. We may be assured, that the severity of his mental sufferings unspeakably exceeded the most affecting ideas that we can form. His agony and bloody sweat, his pungent sense of the triumphs of wickedness and the keen insults of finished malignity, the piercing of his heart by those whom he so generously loved, the bitter cries and supplications and tears which the wondrous Sufferer poured out to his Heavenly Father,—we, alas, can but very feebly and unworthily appreciate! Yet those were but the index of his internal and silent sorrows!

“With respect to the degree of intensity in the sufferings of Jesus, it could not have been less than it actually was, or assuredly it would have been. When the Righteous Father was pleased to crush him with that dreadful and fatal stroke, he still ceased not to delight in the Son of his love. One shade of grief would not have passed over his soul, which infinite holiness and wisdom did not perceive to be necessary. ‘It BECAME him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.’

“It is, I humbly conceive, worse than improper to represent the sufferings of Jesus Christ, in their last and most terrible extremity, as the same with those of condemned sinners in the state of punishment. In the case of such incorrigible and wretched criminals, there is a leading circumstance which could not, by any possibility, exist in the suffering Saviour. They ‘eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices.’ A most material part of their misery consists in the unrestrained power of sinful passions, for ever raging but for ever ungratified. Their minds are constantly torn with the racking consciousness of personal guilt; with mutual aggravations and insults; with the remorse of despair: with malice, fury, and blasphemy against the Holy and Blessed God himself; and with an indubitable sense of Jehovah’s righteous abhorrence and rejection of them. No such passions as these, nor the slightest tincture of them, could have place in the breast of the Holy Jesus. That meek and purest Lamb offered himself without spot. His heart, though broken and bleeding with agonies to us unknown, ever felt a perfect resignation to the hand that smote him, and a full acquiescence in all the bitterness of the cup which was appointed him to drink: the resignation and acquiescence of love and conviction. He suffered in

such a manner as a being perfectly holy could suffer. Though, animated by the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross and despised the shame; yet there appear to have been seasons in the hour of his deepest extremity, in which he underwent the entire absence of divine joy and every kind of comfort or sensible support. What but a total eclipse of the sun of consolation, could have wrung from him that exceedingly bitter and piercing cry, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?'—The fire of Heaven consumed the sacrifice. The tremendous manifestations of God's displeasure against sin he endured, though in him was no sin: and he endured them in a manner of which even those unhappy spirits who shall drink the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God, will never be able to form an adequate idea! They know not the HOLY and EXQUISITE SENSIBILITY which belonged to this immaculate Sacrifice. That clear sight of the transgressions of his people in all their heinousness and atrocity, and that acute sense of the infinite viltness of sin, its baseness, ingratitude, and evil in every respect which he possessed, must have produced, *in him*, a feeling of extreme distress, of a kind and to a degree which no creature, whose moral sense is impaired by personal sin can justly conceive. As such a feeling would accrue from the purity and ardour of his love to God and holiness, acting in his *perfectly peculiar* circumstances; so it would be increased by the pity and tenderness which he ever felt towards the objects of his redeeming love. A wise and good father is more deeply distressed by a crime which his beloved child has perpetrated, than by the same offence if committed by an indifferent person.

"It should also be considered that our doctrine concerning the design and the effect of the sufferings of Jesus, has not produced those sufferings. They are the same, and the facts are unalterable, whatever opinion be set up concerning their reason and moral cause, under the divine government. Which hypothesis, then, is the most worthy of the wisdom and benevolence of God; the one which attributes to the sufferings of our Lord, an effect beyond all description important and valuable, conferring infinite good upon innumerable myriads of beings, and spreading its beneficent influence through all eternity; or the other, which regards *the same* sufferings as nothing more than a proof of the sufferer's integrity, and an example of patient endurance, to be imitated by other sufferers if they should be so disposed?—Neither could the sufferings of Christ, if their expiatory quality be put out of the consideration, be of any service as a declaration of the general mercy of God, and his readiness to pardon sinners

upon repentance: for how could the analogy or the argument be constructed? Surely it would, in all reason, bear the contrary way. If that pure and spotless One, in whom the Father was ever well pleased, was pressed down with a load, so dreadful, not of outward sufferings only, but of an inward and mysterious anguish, the intense-ness of which we have no means nor power of computing; what must be expected to fall upon us, who are conscious of transgressions innumerable and unspeakable against the law and majesty of Heaven.

“Here let us pause, and admire, and adore. The sacrifice of Christ is not merely a great fact in history, nor merely a foundation for interesting reasonings on theological science; but it touches the most intimate feelings, it affects the highest welfare of every heart. How malignant must be that evil, that enormous and detestable evil, which the unerring wisdom of God sees unfit to be pardoned without this astonishing expiation! O that we may hate it with perfect hatred, and resist it with unremitting vigour! With what lowly adoration and admiring praises should we contemplate the eternal and infinite love of God, in providing such a sacrifice! Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace embrace each other.—Who can unfold the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge? This is the bread of life, which came down from heaven; his flesh which he gave for the life of the world. How great, beyond expression, was the condescension of the eternal Son of God, assuming our nature, bearing our griefs and sorrows, the penal consequences of our sins, and yielding up his own invaluable life under agonies unspeakable, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, from the guilt and power of our ruinous apostacy! ‘Hereby perceive we his love, that he laid down his life for us.—Unto him that loveth us, and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood,—be glory and dominion, for ever and ever!’

“We proceed to state a further effect of this great measure in the grace and government of God.

3. “The sacrifice of Christ is a full and perfect SATISFACTION to the honour and justice of the divine government in pardoning and saving sinners. In other words, it has effected a perfect RECONCILIATION and harmony between two apparently incompatible principles; on the one hand, the equity and wisdom of God’s moral legislation, in all the propriety of requirement, and the veracity of denunciation; and, on the other, the exercise of his benevolence, in rescuing from ruin, and restoring to holiness and happiness those of mankind whom,

out of a principle of sovereign and absolute grace, (not indeed arbitrarily, but for reasons infinitely weighty, though not revealed to mortals,) he may judge proper thus to bless.

“That some instances of sin, though only between fellow-creatures, have a real and proper *desert* of suffering as a penalty, few can so violate the dictates of reason and moral feeling, as to deny. In the universal estimation and the ordinary language of men, acts of deep and malicious injury, of enormous cruelty, perfidy, and ingratitude, call for *condign* punishment. If we were considerate and impartial enough to extend our views to the whole moral universe, including *in a due manner* its glorious and infinite Sovereign, we should be convinced that HIS claims on the entire affection and devoted obedience of his rational creatures are infinitely superior to those of an earthly parent, friend, or benefactor, under any conceivable circumstances; that a violation of those claims has a *proportionate* criminality; and that on the principles of equal justice, every such violation deserves an adequate punishment. On the question, *what* punishment is *adequate*, can any one be so bold as to deny that God alone is the perfect, competent, and unexceptionable Judge? And if, in his accredited revelation, he has informed us of the result of that unimpeachable judgment, is it wise, or safe, or pious, for us to entertain a different opinion? The Scriptures are full of solemn declarations of God’s punitive justice. He has both affirmed the claim of eternal righteousness, and declared his resolution to carry it into execution. ‘Wilt thou, forsooth, condemn UNBOUNDED JUSTICE?—According to a man’s work, will he render unto him: and according to the ways of a man shall it befall him. Woe unto the wicked! Ill to him! For the retribution of his works shall be done to him. The judgment of God is righteous, and according to truth. He is righteous in taking vengeance. Vengeance is mine; I will repay; saith the Lord. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.’ He will treat sin, and deal with sinners *as they deserve*, but not *beyond* the measure of their desert. ‘Justice and judgment,’ not blind passion, ‘are the foundation of his throne.’ The most cursory reader of the divine word, must be aware how much and how strongly it speaks of the deep, fixed, unalterable, and infinitely terrible DISPLEASURE of the great Jehovah against sin. The most vehement expressions are borrowed from the affections, actions, and language of mankind to set before us this all-important idea. We are assured, in the most awakening terms, of the anger, the indignation, the wrath, the fury, of God against sin and sinners. Every one must admit that this is the

language of condescension to the weakness of human conceptions, under the necessary circumstances of a primitive language, when men had not proceeded to the invention of more abstract and philosophical terms; and that it must be understood in a manner congruous with the perfection of the Divine Nature. No agitations or emotions, no mutability of knowledge or will, can be for a moment admitted. A careful survey of the whole testimony of the Scriptures, in this view, will show us that the design of these awfully sublime expressions is to represent to us God's necessary and infinite abhorrence of moral evil; and his determination to give all suitable evidences or expressions of that abhorrence. Those expressions must be *public*, or they would not answer the end of vindicating the divine righteousness: and they must be of such a kind, and enforced to such a degree, as shall be *adequate* to all the purposes of divine wisdom. But it is evident that, of the measure which shall constitute adequacy, God alone can judge, and fix it with the perfection of rectitude.

That sin, then, should be punished according to its desert, the supremacy, holiness, justice, and veracity, of the Most High absolutely require. But how can it be consistent with those perfections to punish the innocent?—Unquestionably it would be wrong to punish the innocent, as innocent, and irrespectively of any relative or compensative arrangement by which the party, though personally blameless, might suffer to the advantage of the whole case in judgment, and without ultimate injury to himself or to any. If such an instance as included these conditions could be found, the objection would in that case be disarmed. What parent would not undergo the severest labours, difficulties, and sufferings, to save a dear child from calamity or death?—And, even with regard to the affairs of the present life, the all-wise dominion of Providence not infrequently exhibits instances of individuals plunged into extreme distress and acute sufferings, in consequence of faults, in the commission of which they had no share: and still more commonly and extensively, are men, even to a remote posterity, benefited by the virtues of others, to which they have not contributed in the smallest degree. Though such cases fall infinitely short of a parallelism to the grand instance of Redemption by the Sacrifice of Christ, yet they serve to show that the notion of moral substitution has its foundation in the constitutions of nature, as fixed by the Almighty Author.

The second of these Discourses, is ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST. The former part of it contains a critical expli-

cation of all the titles given to Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews. These are, A PRIEST—A HIGH PRIEST—A GREAT PRIEST—A MESSENGER—A MINISTER OF THE SANCTUARY—THE LORD—A SANCTIFIER—A BROTHER—A SURETY—A MEDIATOR—AN AUTHOR—A SAVIOUR—AN INTERCESSOR—A SHEPHERD—THE SON OF GOD. This extended series of critical remarks, will be considered by most readers, as tedious and uninteresting. We had particular reference to this Discourse, in the remarks before made, respecting the structure of these Discourses.

Under the appellation, MEDIATOR, the learned author attempts an exegesis of two of the most difficult passages in the Bible. The first is, Gal. iii. 20. *Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.* The paraphrase of this text, which is the result of Dr. Smith's critical investigation, is given in the following words:—

“(V. 19.) In the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, an intervening agent between God and the people was employed, namely, Moses. (v. 20.) But such an intervening agent does not belong to any single party. Had the revelation made on Sinai been a promulgation of simple law, there could have been no such interposer; for in the declaration of authoritative commands, the superior person acts a part purely sovereign. He issues his mandate, and he expects unqualified obedience. Had, therefore, the declaration from Sinai been such, God would have given it immediately from himself. But, on that occasion, he was pleased to act as ONE of two parties treating with each other. (See Deut. v. 5, 23, 27, 28.) So that the employment of Moses in this service of intervention between Jehovah and the Hebrew nation, was a kind condescension to the distress and the fears of the people, was an act of special grace, and was an intimation of still greater mercy to be shown to sinners. (v. 21—24.) Therefore the Law of Sinai is not contradictory to the design of the Gospel: for, though it could not give pardon and spiritual blessedness, it was admirably adapted to serve as a preparatory arrangement for the introduction and illustration of that glorious and effective grace which shines in the Gospel of Christ.”

The other passage explained, is, Heb. ix. 15—17. On this, the remarks of the author are too long and too undecisive, to make it proper to insert them here.

The latter part of this second Discourse, considers *the properties and descriptive characters* which are attributed to the Priesthood of Christ: These properties are, 1. *It is unique.* 2. *Perfect.* 3. His sacrifice was *expiatory and propitiatory.* 4. Is continually *presented*, by his intercession, and is therefore *ever valid and efficacious.* 5. The effects produced by this glorious arrangement of divine wisdom, holiness, and grace, are stated to be the following:—

1. "Ratifying the gospel-covenant, that is, the revealed purpose and plan of God for the salvation of sinful and justly-condemned mankind. vii. 22. viii. 6. ix. 15. x. 7—9.

2. "Christ's enjoying the rewards due from the righteousness of the divine government, to his meritorious obedience. Of these rewards, the most grand and gratifying to his exalted benevolence is, the *right of conferring infinite and everlasting blessings* upon an inconceivable multitude of sinful and otherwise lost men, in unison with securing and displaying the brightest glory of the divine perfections; v. 9. vii. 25. ix. 14, 15, 28. x. 10—18; besides other passages and the general tenour of the Epistle, all leading us to continue 'looking unto Jesus, the Author and the Finisher of our faith, who FOR THE JOY that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.' xii. 2. 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of RIGHTEOUSNESS is the sceptre of thy kingdom! Thou hast loved righteousness and hast hated iniquity: THEREFORE, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy companions!' i. 8, 9. See also Matt. xi. 27. Joh. i. 12. xvii. 2.

3. "The legal *reconciliation* of God and all sinners who cordially receive the Gospel method of salvation. This all-important idea is presented under two aspects.

(1.) "*Expiation or atonement.* This denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a *just ground or reason* in a system of judicial administration, for *pardon*ing a convicted offender.

(2.) "*Propitiation:* any thing which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the ex-

piation; *i. e.* to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender.

“Expiation, therefore, regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. We can conceive cases in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it; *i. e.* might not be *propitious* to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We can also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender; but unable to gratify its gracious disposition, because it can find *no just grounds* for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of just reason, would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonour upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example throughout the whole community.

“It is also obvious that *the same* thing may be, and is most naturally fit and likely to be, *both* an expiation and a propitiation; *i. e.* be both a valid *reason* for pardoning and determining *motive* to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason.

Now, in applying these terms, to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our Judge, the infinitely Perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed.

(1.) “Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles, which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries.

“The first is, the Immutability of God. His moral principles, that is his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy *will*, can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the ABSOLUTE PERFECTION of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear, or read, without unspeakable disapprobation and regret, representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour’s sacrifice, into a different temper, a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace.

“The second foundation-principle is, that the adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and

merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, if even it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine word: *e. g.* Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7. John iii. 16. vi. 39. x. 17. Eph. i. 3—10. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

(2.) "This great concern is entirely one of Law and Administrative Wisdom. The great God is, in the unalterable nature of things, and from the necessary volitions of an infinitely perfect mind, the Righteous Ruler of the universe, intellectual as well as physical. Over the latter he rules according to certain fixed principles, some of which he has enabled mortals to discover; and they have called them *Laws of nature*. Over the universe of intellectual beings, who act from volitions and are governed by motives, he rules also according to certain fixed principles; and these are the *Laws of the moral world*. Our knowledge of them is derived from himself; partly as he has implanted them in the moral instincts of our mental nature, partly as he has made them discoverable by our reasoning powers, and partly as he has given them clear expression by the voice of revelation.

"The question, whether sinners shall be pardoned, is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government, and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God's disposition to show mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing is needed to *render* him propitious. But the way and manner, in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account, that he should show mercy, *none but HIMSELF is qualified to determine*. To deny this would be manifest folly and impiety. Now we have found, and the design of this volume is to present the evidence on the case, that *HE has determined*, and has given us to know that pardoning and restoring mercy shall be exercised in the way of *mediation and expiation*.

"From these facts it clearly follows, that a phrasology derived from the administration of government and law is proper and necessary, in all our considerations upon this, the most momentous and interesting of all concerns. 'God is the Righteous Judge: and God is angry [with the wicked] every day.' But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of the JUDGE; it is his *necessary* love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity. In this his rectoral capacity, therefore, the maintenance of law, the enforcement of equity in relation to the unchangeable distinction of right and wrong, is not a matter of neutrality or of

option; and it involves the necessity of marking sin with a *suitable* demonstration of its moral evil and of the displeasure with which it is regarded by the Eternal Jehovah; and *this* is *punishment*. The execution of such punishment, which having been determined by unerring goodness and wisdom, cannot but be strictly proper, must follow in the regular course of moral antecedents and consequents. The promulgation of this course is a *threatening*; and it is rendered proper by a regard equally to the honour of the government and to the benefit of the governed. Threatening and punishment impress justly and necessarily with the idea of the displeasure of the Lawgiver and Judge. Pardon, when, on any consideration, it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a *change*: but that change, in the great case, before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler; but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate *cause*. This cause lies in the whole Mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death; and these have constituted the EXPIATION.

“Let it also be remembered that this method of ‘*grace reigning through righteousness*’ has not come from any extraneous influence, in its invention, suggestion, or operation. It is the pure and sole emanation of the FATHER’s *infinite, eternal, and unchangeable LOVE*. It is the exercise of *free and sovereign beneficence*.

“It also follows that the terms *anger, indignation, wrath, sentence, threatening, punishment, remission, reconciliation, propitiation*, and similar expressions, are, under all the circumstances, most proper to be employed, and are the best calculated to produce a just sense of the evil of sin, and many other salutary feelings; yet that we should be careful to understand them as expressing *modes* of the divine administration, and *effects* of the divine counsels, but *not affections operating upon* the Divine Nature, nor *changes* in it. A creature who is under the guilt and dominion of sin, stands in that position, with respect to the necessary and unchangeable attributes of God, which is fitly expressed by terms denoting the strongest displeasure and abhorrence. A change of state and character, so as to be brought into a new set of relations to the divine attributes, is as fitly expressed by the language of love and approbation. For example: ‘God is jealous and the Lord revengeth, the Lord revengeth and is furious, the Lord will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.—Who can stand before his indignation?—The Lord is good, a strong

hold in the day of trouble, and he knoweth them that trust in him.' Nahum i. 3—7. 'And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee; for thou wast angry with me; thine anger is turned away, and thou hast comforted me!' Is. xii. 1. Upon a different application of the same general principle, the varied dispensations of God's righteous providence towards his sincere yet imperfect people are represented by similar expressions, yet all referring to modes and effects of the divine administration. 'O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away!' Dan ix. 16. 'Thus saith thy Lord, Jehovah, even thy God who pleadeth the cause of his people, Behold, I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, the dregs of the cup of my fury; thou shalt not drink it any more.' Is. li. 22. Yet we are not warranted to understand such passages as these, as indicating a real change in God; any more than we should be to believe that he is the subject of hope, of fear, of precarious expectation, of wishes, of disappointment, and of regrets, because, in condescension of human infirmity, and to the state of mental culture in the infancy of the human race, the external forms of the divine dispensations are described in language borrowed from those affections in men: *e. g.* Gen. ii. 19. iii. 22. vi. 6. Deut. xxxii. 19, 27, 29. Is. v. 4, and many other passages.

The *change* by which a guilty and polluted sinner becomes freed from the sentence of condemnation, pardoned, regarded with complacency, and qualified for the noblest employments and delights, *is not in God*; but it is in the *relations* under which the sinner stands towards God, and in the state of *his own mind and character* consequent upon those altered relations."

The title of the third Discourse, is, ON THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST. But this will furnish the reader with no correct idea of the subjects treated. It should have been entitled, THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF GOD'S MORAL GOVERNMENT, as will appear by the following table of its contents;—The divine moral government—The spirit of the moral law—Its grounds and reasons—Nature and distributions of holiness—Nature of sin—Essential principles of happiness—Obligations to obedience—Disobedience—Effects of violated obligation—Justice of the divine government—Punishment, natural and positive—Depravity and

guilt of the human race—The conceivable results of the moral condition of man—A compensation and Mediatorial system.

This Discourse gives evidence of a mind accustomed to profound and just thinking. It is replete with sound doctrine; and the truths here presented, are traced to their first principles. Our only objection has already been stated. Every thing is rendered too abstract. Principles of reason are resorted to, rather than the plain unequivocal declarations of Scripture. It may be alleged, indeed, that those with whom our author contends, will not admit our interpretation of the plainest texts which speak of atonement; but will they more readily acquiesce in the conclusions derived from abstract reasoning? But we would not be understood, as expressing dissatisfaction with this able Discourse. It is, upon the whole, truly excellent. But our limits will not admit of making any extracts; and indeed, the principles exhibited, are so connected together, that it must be preserved entire, and read in connexion, in order to see the bearing and force of the argument. But we would earnestly recommend the careful and repeated perusal of this Discourse, to theological students. It contains, undoubtedly, the true principles on which the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings or atonement of Christ, is founded.

On some points, disputed among the orthodox themselves,—the author speaks in a vague and unsatisfactory manner; but these are things of small importance, when compared with the great radical doctrine, which is so ably sustained, in this Discourse.

The fourth and last of these Discourses, is, ON THE REDEMPTION EFFECTED BY CHRIST. The object of the learned author, here, is to vindicate from the cavils and objections of opposers, those numerous words and phrases, in which allusion is made to pecuniary or commercial transactions. This Discourse is short, and, for the most part, critical.

The words referred to above, are taken up in detail; their import ascertained; and the common objections made to this mode of representing the work of Christ and blessings of salvation, are answered.

The remainder of the volume—about 100 pages in small type—is occupied with notes and Illustrations, replete with learning and criticism, and calculated to shed light on the points discussed in the preceding Discourses.

WITSIUS

ON THE COUNCILS OF THE HEBREWS.

[TRANSLATED AND ABRIDGED.]

IN the history of the Hebrew commonwealth, we read of three kinds of judicial assemblies, which may be distinguished as the Least, the Greater, and the Greatest.

The first of these courts consisted only of the Judges of the tribes ; and it is agreed among the Jews, that it could not be composed of an even number of persons, since in that case, it might be sometimes impossible to decide a question. The least number, therefore, must be three.* This triumvirate had authority in those cities, the population of which did not exceed a hundred and twenty families, and was competent to determine controversies within that circle. We are informed, however, by Maimonides, that it was deemed proper and honourable, on certain occasions, to admit additional members, to investigate the cause and be witnesses of the sentence, and that the number of these might, in case of dissension, be increased to eleven.

This court was constituted either by public authority, or by the private consent of the parties concerned. The Great Sanhedrin had the supervision of justice in the several towns and villages, agreeably to the command, Deut. xvi. 18. Judges were also chosen *pro re natâ*, partly by the

* Maimonides, de Sanh. c. iv. § 4. Buxtorf. Sex. Talmud. col. 2518.

compromise, or mutual consent of the litigants, partly by the determination of an individual, as when an act of voluntary jurisdiction was to take place. Thus Maimonides says, "Pecuniary cases are judged by three. Each of the parties selects one arbitrator, and both together agree upon a third. This is the opinion of Rabbi Meir; but the wise men have decreed that the two Judges should elect a third."*

There was less strictness in forming this court, than was observed in the case of the superior Judges; yet there were some qualifications necessary. "In the Judges of the triumviral colleges, while all those things which are required in the elders of the higher courts are not strictly demanded, yet all must possess these seven requisites; viz. 1. Wisdom. 2. Modesty. 3. Fear (of God.) 4. Hatred of a bribe. 5. The love of truth. 6. The affectionate respect of the public. 7. A good reputation."† By an express canon of the Jewish law, certain characters were excluded from this dignity; such, for instance, as gamblers and usurers. These persons might indeed be thus honoured, when they had given tokens of sincere repentance.

The causes which were tried before the Court of Three, were generally cases of a pecuniary nature; also cases of damage and trespass, in which the amount of remuneration was to be determined, and sometimes cases of violence and seduction.

The *Greater Council*, or *Court of Twenty-three*, is next to be considered. Maimonides gives cabalistical reasons for this precise number.‡ There was a court of this kind in each of the larger towns, that is, in those which contained more than 120 families. At Jerusalem there were two; one of which was held on the mount of the temple, and one in the court of the temple. The first of these was composed of eminent men from the smaller cities, who were,

* Sanh. c. iii. § 1. † Naim. Sanh. c. xl. ‡ Sanh. c. 1. § 6.

from time to time, transferred to the second. Only the most highly qualified persons, answering to the conditions proposed to Moses by Jethro, could sit in this council. Causes of all sorts were here determined, with the exception of a few, which were reserved for the Great Sanhedrin.

The members of this court sat in the form of a semicircle, with the President in the midst. At the right sat the Vice-President, and at the left, as we are told, some man eminent for his wisdom. At each extremity of the semicircle was placed a Scribe. Below these were seated three rows of such persons as were called the Disciples of the Wise; in such a manner that the disciples equalled the Judges in number, and were arranged according to their respective attainments. In cases of difficulty, the highest in rank of the disciples was called to the bench, and his place was supplied by the next below him, the lowest vacancy being filled from among the people. In this manner also, seats vacated by death or sickness were occupied. Josephus and the Talmudical writers are at variance, with respect to the number of persons constituting this court. By the former, it is fixed at seven, and no satisfactory explanation of the discrepancy has been given.*

All that has been said, however, is merely preparatory to the consideration of the *Great Council*, or *Sanhedrin*. Let it be observed, then, that these courts were independent of one another, and that there was no appeal from the lower to the higher. Each had its peculiar jurisdiction, and the three were in other respects, co-ordinate bodies. The Court of Three took cognizance of pecuniary claims, and crimes which were not capital. The Court of Twenty-three decided upon cases of life and death. Set while the litigants could not appeal to the highest council, the Judges were permitted to send up difficult questions for decision.

* v. Grotius on Matt. v. 21.

John Selden, that prodigy of learning, has fully discussed these subjects in his work, *de Synedriis Hebraeorum*, yet not in a manner such as to be profitable to ordinary readers. John Leusden has also given us a dissertation on the councils of the Hebrews, in his *Philologus Hebraeo-mixtus*, a work which deserves to be recommended to all students.

The Sanhedrin (or Sanhedrim,) is supposed by the Jews to be indicated by various names in the Scriptures, and other Hebrew writings. The word מְחֹקֵק (Me Ho Kek) which is translated *law-giver* in Gen. xlix. 10, is derived from a verb which signifies primarily to *engrave* or *write*, and hence, to *decree*. Isa. x. 1. It may mean either a Scribe or Legislator. Moses is thus designated, Num. xxi. 18, and the princes of the people, Jud. v. 9. They are elsewhere called *the elders of Israel*. Ex. iv. 29; xv. 3. Deut. xxxi. 9.

No person could be elected to either of the higher councils, who had not previously been set apart by the laying on of hands. "The same regulation," says Maimonides, "extends both to the lower Sanhedrin, and the triumviral court, that it is necessary for every one who is elected to that council, to be constituted by the imposition of hands, by one who has in like manner been previously constituted. Moses our master thus ordained Joshua, according to that which is written, Num. xxvii. 23. 'And he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge.'" This is that imposition of hands by which any one was constituted an elder; and Paul is supposed to have alluded to this, 1 Tim. iv. 14. However this may be, we find "the Sanhedrin and the eldership of the people," mentioned in connexion, Acts iv. The whole Jewish council was called the "Presbytery," or all the estate of the elders," Act xxii. 5, and "the eldership of the people," Luke xxii. 66. All who were thus set apart were not necessarily members of the council, but he-

came eligible to that body. They were likewise called *Shofetim* or Judges; whence the Syrian and Carthaginian *Suffetes* as Grotius supposes.*

The more recent names of this council are, בית דין הגדול, "the house of the great judgment," and סנהדרין the *Sanhedrin*, a word most clearly of Greek origin, although the Jews have various fanciful derivations from the Hebrew. Συνοδριον, signifies in Greek either the Jewish council itself, Matt. xxvi. 59. Acts v. 21, or the place of court, or place of assembly.†

The Sanhedrin is entirely distinct from the *Great Synagogue* to which belonged Ezra, Daniel, Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi, and other illustrious men of that day. The latter consisted of a hundred and twenty persons, and was not an ordinary institution, but ended with Simon the just, the person who met Alexander the Great, about forty years after the building of the second temple. It had for its single object the restitution of the Scriptures, and the deliverance of the church from Babylon.‡ There have been some learned men who have even denied the existence of any such synagogue.

The institution of the Sanhedrin is thus related by Grotius, and other learned men, both Jews and Christians, who maintain its antiquity. We read, of "Elders of the children of Israel," even in Egypt, men who seem to have been appointed to represent those who accompanied Jacob. The Greeks and Romans also derived the names of their senators from the circumstance of age. At the instance of Jethro, Moses chose "able men out of all Israel, who judged every small matter," Ex. xviii. 21. Still the original seventy are continued; the same who drew near to God,

* Deut. xix. 17. 2 Chron. xix. 5, 8. Deut. xvii. 9. Jud. xii. 6.

† Herodian de Pertence. Lib. ii. c. iii. Lib. iv. c. x.

‡ Buxtorf. Tiberia. P. I. c. 10.

and feasted in his presence, Ex. xxiv. When at last Moses complained that he was unable to bear so heavy a burden, he was directed to institute a council of seventy men. These had already been officers over the people, but men now set apart, with a new inspiration of God; and this is believed to be the first solemn and divine institution of the Sanhedrin.

The unanimous tradition of the Jews, is, that every great council consisted of seventy men, over whom was placed a President, as the representative of Moses, thus making the whole number seventy-one. There was no preference given to any tribe, yet the members of the Sanhedrin were generally priests. The tribe of Levi was less occupied with agriculture,—more at leisure to become familiar with the law, and, from the annual tithes, more able to labour without emolument in this court, than other tribes; while they were also frequently called to Jerusalem, where this assembly met. Yet the Levites and Priests, as such, had no precedence of their brethren, and even the High Priest was not a member of this Council, by virtue of his pontificate, but only when qualified, and duly called. So that if Priests and Levites were not found with the necessary attainments, “it was good and lawful, even for the whole Senate to consist of Israelites of three tribes.”*

“The King of Israel was not a member of the Sanhedrin, because it is unlawful to dissent from him, or to contradict his word. The High Priest, however, may be a member, if his wisdom correspond with his dignity. The Kings of the house of David, though not admitted to the Councils, sat and judged the people by themselves.† From the Talmud it appears that Proselytes might attain to this honour. The qualifications requisite in Judges are laid down both negatively and positively, by the Rabbins. 1. A man decrepit

* Maim. Sanh. c. i.

† Sanh. c. ii. † 4.

from age was excluded. 2. An unfortunate order of men whom the ancients supposed to be peculiarly cruel: thus Claudian;—

———Eunuchus nulla pietate moventur,
Nec generi nativæ cavet: clementia cunctis.
In similes, animasque ligant consortia damni.

3. A childless man. 4. A mere youth. 5. A man without useful employment. 6. A man remarkably deformed. The following were the positive qualifications. 1. Height of stature. 2. Eminent wisdom. 3. A pleasing form. 4. Maturity of years, verging towards old age. 5. Skill in magic. 6. Acquaintance with the seventy languages, so that he should not need an interpreter.—This skill in magic is well satirized by Cunaeus, and the knowlegde of the seventy languages is not only incredible, but, silly, absurd, and altogether laughable. It is known, however, that the Jews supposed this to be the exact number of human languages.

The manner in which members were introduced into this court, is thus described. Certain members, persons belonging to the Sanhedrin, were sent through the whole land of Israel, to discover such men as were wise, exemplary, merciful, sagacious, and of good report. A man of this character was made Judge in his own town. Thence he was called to the court of Twenty-three, at the entrance to the Mount of the temple; and afterwards to that which was held at the gate of the court, and was finally promoted to the Sanhedrin. The appeal was sometimes made to public suffrage, and even to the lot. The initiation, or ordination of persons thus elected, was celebrated by the imposition of hands; which is to be distinsuished from that by which they were constituted elders. In later ages, this was exchanged for the singing of a solemn hymn.

The principal office of the Sanhedrin, was the President, who is called *The Chief in every place*, or simply *The*

Chief, or the *Head*, or *The Admirable*. At his right hand sat the Vice-President, or *Father of the House of Mercy*. To these some add a third, called *Hakim*, or *Wise Man*, whose place was on the left of the President.

The authority of this council was by far the greatest, whether we consider the subjects investigated, the persons brought to trial, or the weight and efficacy of the sentence pronounced. It took cognizance of every description of case, private and public, ecclesiastical and political. It was the duty of its members to travel through Judea, to appoint magistrates in the towns, and to deliberate on matters pertaining to war and peace. The Talmudists ascribe to them the power of making kings, and the regulation of the whole subject of religion. Persons of every rank were amenable to their jurisdiction, not excepting, if we may believe the Rabbins, either Prophet, High Priest, or King. Concerning false prophets, we find this provision of the Jewish law. "A false prophet shall not be condemned to death in the council of his own city, or in the council of Jabneh, but shall be brought to the Great Council, which is at Jerusalem, and be kept until some feast, and shall be executed during the feast." This throws light upon the words of our Lord, Luke xiii. 33. A High Priest also could be capitally convicted only by the Sanhedrin, by whom he was likewise sometimes sentenced to stripes. Corporal chastisement seems to have been viewed by the Jews, as not more disgraceful than fines among us: the Talmuds inform us that kings themselves were thus punished, by order of the Great Council.*

The sentence pronounced by the Sanhedrin could not be reversed, even by the king. In order to insure justice, a crier always went before the convict to the place of execution, declaring his name, his crime, and the witnesses against

* Selden. Lib. iii. c. ix.

him, and giving notice that any one now had an opportunity to appear in his defence. In case of additional testimony a criminal might enjoy the benefit of a new trial several times, and was favoured with the counsel of two of the disciples of the court.

The punishment of beating, in cases of contumacy, was far more severe than the legal infliction of stripes, which could never exceed forty. The beating of the contumacious person was a species of examination by torture, in which staves were used, and which might be continued even to death. An obstinate disobedience to a decree of the Sanhedrin in important cases, was a capital offence, and their judgment was authorized, as the Jews suppose, by Deut. xvii. 12. A member of the council itself might be punished with death, if he obstinately opposes their decisions.

The place in which this court was held was different at various periods. In the time of Moses, it was at "the door of the tabernacle." Num. xi. 24. After the entrance into Canaan, it followed the tabernacle to Shiloh, Mizpah, Gilgal, Nob, Gibeon, the house of Obed Edom, and finally to Jerusalem. A short time before the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, the chamber of the Sanhedrin was near to the eastern gate of the temple, above the chamber of the door-keepers. Lightfoot infers this from Jer. xxxv. 4, and Chron. ix. 17, 18.* We are told, however, by Maimonides that there was an apartment of hewn stone for this purpose, in the court of Israel, at the southern part of the temple.† There is little certainty as to this point, but we know that there was in the second temple an apartment called the chamber of hewn stone, which took its name from a pavement of costly stones. During the forty years which preceded the destruction of the temple, the Sanhedrin is said to have changed its place of session ten times. The reason

* Descript. Templ. c. ix.

† Selden. Lib. ii. c. 15. § 4.

given for this, is, that while they were in the paved chamber they considered themselves bound to decide upon every case presented, and their judgments were obligatory upon the whole nation. But when they were subjected to the Roman yoke, their power was diminished, they could no longer enforce obedience, and they thought it politic to remove to a less sacred place. It is the opinion of Selden that the *Gabbatha* or *Lithostraton* where Pilate held his tribunal was this hall of the Sanhedrin. John xix. 13. This opinion, though adopted by Lightfoot, seems to be without foundation, especially as we learn from Josephus that the court of Pilate was held in the great Stadium.

The Sanhedrin, like the Court of Twenty-three, sat in semicircular order. In the middle sat the President, at the right hand the Father of the House of Judgment; at his left the Hakim. The remaining judges sat in the order of their rank. At the ends of the semicircle were placed two Scribes, to whom Rabbi Jehudah adds a third. The culprits was introduced through a door which was not upon holy ground. At his right hand was the *Master of Controversy*, either to accuse or defend him, Ps. cix. 31, Zech. iii. 1. The sentence was pronounced by the oldest Judge, the parties being introduced. No member was ever permitted to say, after sentence had been pronounced, that he had dissented from it.

The Sanhedrin sat every day; on the Sabbath, however, in the Synagogue of the Mountain, that it might not be supposed to meet for judicial purposes. They continued in session from the morning until the evening sacrifice. It was not thought necessary that all the members should be present, except in important cases. Twenty-three were sufficient to transact ordinary business.

The history of the Sanhedrin is involved in obscurity. As has already been observed, its origin is fixed by the Jews at the time of the journey in the wilderness. After the death

of Joshua, extraordinary Judges were raised up by providence, but Selden supposes that there were many intermissions in the continuance of these councils.* During the time of Eli, Samuel and Saul, there is no mention of the Sanhedrin in the Bible, but the Jews teach that Samuel received the instruction in the law from Eli and his council, and David from Samuel and his council. Under the reign of Jehosaphat, there is a supposed reference to this body; 2 Chron. xix. 8. Under Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, the princes of Judah are said to have held an assembly *in the entry of the new gate of the king's house*; Jer. xxvi. 10, 11. Under Zedekiah, the authority of this council seems to have been so great that the king himself could do nothing against them; Jer. xxxviii. 4, 5. Ezekiel describes the seventy elders with their President Jaazaniah; Ez. viii. 11. The same is intended, it is thought by the Jews, (whose opinions we are now detailing) by the princes and officers of Jehoiakim; 2 Kings xxiv. 12. According to Grotius, the seventy elders retained their authority during the Babylonish captivity; Ez. i. 5. viii. 16. ix. 1. The Rabbins make Ezra the President after the return from Babylon. The Sanhedrin retained authority until the time of Herod the Great, after which it suffered a great diminution of power. It was divided by Gabinius into five parts; it was almost done away by Herod, was injured by frequent removals, and by the Romans despoiled of power in capital cases. In Judea, as well as other provinces, the provincial Senate could not pronounce sentence of death, without the consent of the governor. This is thought by some to explain John xviii. 31. When Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus, the Sanhedrin, according to Grotius, came to an end. But the Jews think otherwise, and have a tradition that upon the destruction of the temple, Rabbi Johannes, the son of Zac-

* Lib. ii. c. 5. † 1.

cheus, and Rabban Gamaliel the Second, presided over the Sanhedrin; and that it existed during the reign of Antoninus Pius. It is also supposed that the aged Simeon, who took our Saviour in his arms, was at that time President, and that he was succeeded by his son Rabban Gamaliel, who was the instructor of Paul.*

Hitherto, all that has been said rests chiefly upon Talmudical authority. There have been men of learning who have denied the existence of any such council in the Jewish commonwealth prior to the time of the Asmonean princes. It is not to be supposed that there are any persons versed in the Talmuds, who are willing to suspend their faith upon the mere testimony of the Rabbins, especially when they speak of events which occurred many ages before their time. Of the early monuments of the nation of Israel, the only remains are in the Scriptures. It is therefore an inquiry of primary importance, whether they contain any notices of such a Council, and of its continuance. The Jews and many learned Christians have maintained that they do, but upon grounds altogether insufficient.

It is affirmed that seventy, or seventy-three persons were set over the people, who had such a superintendence of their affairs as was compatible with the royal authority; and that this was in memory of those whom Jacob brought down into Egypt. The Scriptures, however, afford no authority for this statement. Moses speaks indeed of "the elders of Israel," whom he was commanded to address, but adds no hint that they were invested with authority, or were seventy in number, or were instituted with any reference to those who accompanied the patriarch. In every age, men venerable for their years and wisdom, have been highly honoured, and the elders of Israel were, in all probability, counsellors, rather than magistrates. This opinion is also

* For a catalogue of the alleged Presidents from the captivity, see Witsii *Miscellanea Sacra*. Vol. I, pp. 556-7-8.

confirmed by the fact, that when the nation had obtained freedom, the e persons had no pre-eminence, and that Moses alone was the Judge of controversies. Those who are called *the officers of the children of Israel*, (Ex. v. 14,) were not Judges chosen by the people, but servants of the Egyptian tyranny, appointed by the task-masters themselves that they might be responsible for the performance of the labour demanded.

It must be acknowledged that *the seventy elders* are mentioned, Ex. xxiv. 1, 9. Let it be observed, however, that they are called "seventy of the elders of Israel," which implies that there were others who had the same appellation, from the number of whom these were elected, not as authorized officers, but as companions of Moses in this solemn covenant. The very words of Moses evince that they had no power as magistrates; "And he said unto the elders, tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you: and behold Aaron and Hur are with you; if any man have matters to do, let him come unto them," v. 24. Nothing, therefore, has hitherto appeared, which resembles the Sanhedrin.

We can gather nothing decisive from the account of the Judges, whom Moses appointed in consequence of the advice of Jethro. These correspond neither with the Council of Three, of Twenty-three, or of Seventy, but were able men out of all Israel, placed over the people as rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, and rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens, Ex. xviii. 21, 25.

A more plausible argument is derived from Numbers xi. 16, where Moses is directed by God to institute a council of seventy men, who should assist him in bearing the burden of the people. We must here examine whether this council agreed in all points with the Sanhedrin of the Talmudists; whether it was made a perpetual institution; whether it was in fact, continued for so many ages by a regular succession of Senators; whether it was invested with authority over

High Priests and Kings ; and whether it was the appropriate tribunal for the reserved cases specified by the Rabbins. And on all these points we find a total silence in the Scriptures, while the Jewish traditions are scarcely worthy of our belief. These elders were appointed to share the responsibility of Moses, and to allay the discontents of a murmuring people. Ordinary decisions of judicial nature were secured by the existing provisions of the law : and upon the death of Moses, and the possession of Canaan, it is reasonable to suppose that this temporary council was discontinued, as we find no subsequent mention of it in the Bible.

We can deduce no argument for a great and perpetual Council; from the precept in Deut. xvii. 9. "Thou shalt come unto the Priests, the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days," &c. The priests are here mentioned as versed in the law, and the Judges, whether ordinary or extraordinary, as persons qualified to decide ; while there is no proof of a uniform and continual Senate, or of causes submitted to their determination. The very controversies here cited, "between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke," were not the cases reserved for the Sanhedrin, but those upon which any magistrate was competent to pass judgment.

From the convention of the elders, judges, and officers, called by Joshua in his old age, (Jos. xxiv. 1,) we learn nothing of a regularly constituted council, for these persons after the discourse of Joshua, were dismissed, "every man unto his inheritance." The Jews have many traditional fables, concerning the councils in which Eli, Samuel, Saul, Jonathan, and various monarchs presided, but they are inconsistent with the frequent assertion, that Kings could not sit in the Sanhedrin, and are too ridiculous to merit even a refutation. Jehoshaphat "set judges in the land, throughout all the fenced cities of Judah," but this is so far from establishing the existence of the Councils, that it plainly shows

that there were none in existence, especially as the members of those bodies supplied their own vacancies. It is scarcely necessary to add that the seventy elders seen by Ezekiel have no similarity to the Great Sanhedrin.

On the other hand, there are many reasons for believing that there was no such Council in the ancient commonwealth of Israel. There was none in the age of Joshua, who governed the nation, in peace as well as war, without the aid of a Council. There was none during the time of the Judges, who had authority from God himself. Samuel judged Israel for many years, and appointed his own sons his successors ; and in the important transactions which led to the change of government, he consulted not with any Sanhedrin, but with God alone. There was none under the Kings, nor do we find any monarch constituted, censured, or deposed by such an assembly. There was none under Zerubbabel, Ezra, or Nehemiah, who were authorized by Kings of Persia, but are never said even to have consulted the Sanhedrin.

From all these particulars, it seems probable, that the Sanhedrin of the Hebrews, as described in the Talmud, had its origin at the time when the Jews were under the power of the Macedonian Princes, the successors of Alexander the Great : and hence the name *Synedrion*, for the Macedonians called the Senators, by whose counsels the affairs of their government were administered, *Synedria*.* The reader may consult with advantage, the French letters, in which are presented the opinions of certain Dutch theologians concerning the *Critica Sacra* of R. Simon, Lett. x. also Lett. vi. of their Apologist. See also Conringii Exerc. de Rep. Ebraeorum, § 21. The most useful work, however, upon this subject is of later date, by Joh. Vorstius, de Synedriis Hebraeorum.

* Liv. l. lxxv. Cap. xxiii.

REVIEW.

Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam. Mit einleitenden Betrachtungen über die analoge Entwicklung der Menschheit und des einzelnen Menschen. Von Adolf Müller. Eine gekrönte Preisschrift. Hamburg, bei Friedrich Perthes. 1828. pp. 394. 8vo.

ON the third of August, 1826, the Philosophical faculty in the University of Berlin, offered a premium for the best work upon the life and literary influence of Erasmus. The prize was awarded in the following year to the work before us, composed by a young man of Berlin, of whom we know nothing, but the fact which he mentions in the preface, that he is totally blind. Of this volume, eighty-six pages are occupied with a treatise on the analogy between the progress of human society, and that of the individual man. That this disproportionate mass of abstract disquisition is wholly irrelevant and foreign from the subject, we have the author's own authority for saying. He apologizes, in his preface, for this large excrescence, confessing that it was appended to his book precipitately, and before he had allowed himself to see that it was inappropriate. It is clear, too, although he does not say it, that the discovery when made, was made too late, and that his parental fondness, as an author, forbade the sacrifice of his misplaced abstractions. With these Prolegomena we shall not meddle, but proceed to the life itself. Even on that, however, we shall offer little in the way of criticism, but rather avail ourselves of its assistance, in pre-

senting a compendious view of the life of the great man, whom it commemorates. The biography of Erasmus is, by no means, a new subject; but must always be an interesting one. His merit as a writer and a scholar, in itself considered, would suffice to give him a high rank among modern literati, an elevation much enhanced by the part which he bore in the revival of letters, and the relations in which he stood to the Reformers and the Reformation. In the different accounts of his life and character which have been given, there is some discrepancy, confusion, and obscurity. Erasmus was too deeply involved in the absorbing and momentous controversies which disturbed his times, to maintain the pacific neutrality at which he aimed. He was not without enemies, nor without imprudent friends. His picture has, therefore, been often overdrawn. Malice has exaggerated all his faults; partiality has softened all his foibles, and both at the expense of historical and moral truth. It is gratifying, therefore, to find the subject treated dispassionately and impartially, by one who has given much attention to the subject, and in a work which comes recommended by the preference and sanction of a learned faculty in one of the first Universities of Europe. It was not to be expected that any thing essential or important could be added to the facts already known; nor is such the case in relation to this work. But that doubtful questions should be solved, contradictions reconciled, falsehoods detected, obscurities elucidated, and the truth exhibited at equal distance from the opposite extremes of favour and dispraise, were all desiderata. How far they are accomplished in the work before us, we shall not pretend to say, but shall make use of what it has accomplished, to exhibit an impartial, though concise, account of the subject to our readers. In so doing, we shall state the leading facts chronologically, without unnecessary disquisition, or minute and scrupulous detail.

Erasmus was the illegitimate son of one Gerard, a young man of respectable connexions at Gouda, a considerable village near to Rotterdam—and of Margaret, the daughter of a neighbouring physician. The intended marriage of his parents was opposed with great violence by Gerard's relations, who used every method to induce him to become a monk. At first, however, they succeeded only in driving him from home by their opposition to his wishes. To avoid their importunities, he betook himself to Italy, where he was residing when his celebrated son was born at Rotterdam on the 28th of October, 1467. After this event, the unfortunate mother seems to have experienced more favourable treatment from the family, as we find her afterwards engaged in bringing up the infant, in amicable union with the mother of Gerard. To Gerard, meantime, information was conveyed, that his mistress was no more ; in consequence of which intelligence, he instantly took orders. Returning, however, on a visit to his friends, he found to his astonishment, that he had been deceived ; but refused to abjure or violate his vow. He thenceforward devoted his attention to the child, whom he called after himself, Gerard. This title his son afterwards exchanged for *Desiderius Erasmus*, Latin and Greek words, equivalent in meaning to his Dutch baptismal name.

From the circumstances which attended this illicit amour, and especially the efforts made to drive Gerard into a convent, the manner in which it was finally accomplished, and the consequent prevention of his marriage with the mother of Erasmus, there naturally resulted in the minds of both, a deep and embittered hatred to monastic institutions. This feeling would, of course, insinuate itself into the lessons which they taught their child ; and to this source our author very plausibly attributes the invincible dislike to monks and monasteries, which Erasmus manifested from a boy, and which was abundantly confirmed and strengthened, by his own personal experience.

Bayle and other writers have insisted warmly that Erasmus must have given, and actually did give, in his infancy, the clearest tokens of superior genius. Yet we find him, in his fifth year, admitted a singing-boy into the choir of the Cathedral church at Utrecht. Why such a situation should have been selected for a child which exhibited so early, indications of extraordinary aptitude for learning, is a point which these writers have left involved in mystery. For our own part, we incline to think with the author of the work before us, that the best explanation of the fact is furnished by the tradition still prevalent in Holland, that so far from exhibiting a precocity of intellect, the infant Erasmus was singularly stupid and unpromising. Even to this day, the parents of dull children comfort themselves with the recollection, that the great man of Rotterdam was at first apparently a dunce. It is probable, therefore, that the contrary hypothesis has rather been deduced by a fanciful analogy, from subsequent events, than founded upon fact.

But whatever may have been the child's capacity for other studies, he seems, at least, to have been destitute of musical abilities. After four years of unprofitable residence at Utrecht, in the study of an art, for which, as he says himself, he was not born, he was removed to the celebrated school at Deventer, where his mother also took up her abode, in order to be with him. This institution was established in the fourteenth century, and at the time of which we speak, was among the best existing, though involved in a portion of the darkness which still brooded over Europe. It was in the hands of a number of ecclesiastics, who lived together in society, though they were bound by no vow, and formed no regular religious house. The principal was Alexander Hegius, and among the teachers was John Sinsheim, memorable for his efforts to import into his native country the reviving zeal for letters, which had already been enkindled in Italy. The school was also visited occa-

sionally by Agricola, the most learned German of his time, and one whose whole soul was devoted to the propagation of learning and the sciences among his countrymen. These two distinguished men soon discovered the abilities of young Erasmus. The attention of Agricola was first excited by a Latin theme presented by the lad, when he was on a visit to the school; on which occasion he is said to have predicted, with great confidence, his future greatness; and our author seems inclined to think, that the impression which this prophecy originally made, and the recollection of it afterwards, largely contributed to its accomplishment. For notwithstanding Erasmus's frequent disavowals of all ambition and love of praise, it is certain that in this, and many other instances, he shewed himself both pleased and proud *laudari a laudato viro*. During the two years which he spent at Deventer, he completed the circle of scholastic philosophy, Logic, Physics, Metaphysics, and Ethics, and committed to memory the whole of Horace and of Terence. The latter author was his favourite, and he has somewhere said, that the elegance and purity of the Latin language can in no way be better learned than by perusing Terence.

He was thirteen years of age when the plague deprived him of his mother; and as the whole household was infected, he returned to Gouda. There, he soon after lost his father, who is said to have died of grief, and with his death began the trials of Erasmus. The estate which Gerard left, though moderate, was quite sufficient for his son's support. Unluckily, however, he committed it to men who shamefully abused the trust. As they were also the guardians of the heir, they proposed that he should go into a convent. This he peremptorily declined, and insisted upon being sent to complete his education at some university. These conflicting schemes resulted in a constant struggle, similar to that maintained by Gerard with his relations. Every art was made use of to subdue the invincible aversion of Erasmus

to the cloister, but without effect. Persuasions, promises, and threats, were alike unavailing; and at last, his guardians, weary of the contest, sent him to Bois-le-duc, in Brabant, where a society of ecclesiastics educated children, with a special view to create, in them, a taste for the monastic life. Their assiduities, however, were wasted on Erasmus. The instinctive antipathy which, as our author expresses it, he had imbibed with his mother's milk, could not be overcome by the cajoleries of these good fathers. They could neither seduce him by their flatteries and promises, nor frighten him with tales of ghosts and apparitions, and of men, who, attempting to escape from convents, had been carried off by dragons and devoured by lions. He lived, or to use his own expression, *lost* four years at Bois-le-duc, without, in the least, relaxing his stubborn opposition to his guardians' wishes, at the end of that period, he fell sick, and was brought back to Gouda, where he remained three years in open war with his ungenerous and selfish guardians. At the end of that period, he fell in company with one Verdenus, who had been his school-fellow at Deventer, and who, at this time, was a monk in the religious house at Stein, near Gouda. This young man gave Erasmus such a flattering description of the comfort and liberty which he enjoyed, the advantages for study which the cloister offered, and the literary riches of the convent-library, that his repugnance seems to have been vanquished, and his scruples to have disappeared at once. An end was now put to the contest which he had maintained for six years, with his guardians, by his final compliance with their wishes, in 1486, the nineteenth year of his age.

From this event, our author draws an unfavourable inference, with respect to the character of Erasmus; on the ground, that nothing but an utter want of stability and moral firmness could have overcome, so suddenly, and on such a slight occasion, the resolution, which for six years, he had stubbornly adhered to. At the same time, he seems dis-

posed to censure the tenacity with which he first refused to give into the scheme, ascribing his aversion to monastic life, to mere restlessness of disposition, and impatience of controul. From these conclusions we dissent. That there may have been some admixture of this spirit in the motives which led him to refuse at first, and that there was something wild in the abruptness with which he afterwards consented, we admit. But we do not believe, that this mutation of his views was the mere-result of caprice and fickleness. The whole tenor of his history evinces, that from the time when his mind was first developed, he was literally an enthusiast for learning. It was his distinguishing characteristic throughout life, and runs through all his acts and writings. While we agree, therefore, with our author, that his prejudice against monastic institutions may have been derived, in some degree, from the instructions and misfortunes of his parents, we believe that it is chiefly attributable to his love of letters. In his conflicts with his guardians, he expressed but one desire, which was, to be sent to the University. By degrees, he became accustomed to contrast as opposites, the college and the convent, a religious life, and the pursuit of learning. Of course, as his thirst of knowledge became more intense, his aversion to the cloister grew proportionally, so that his literary ardour, which is allowed on all hands, to have been extraordinary, is alone sufficient to account for his obstinate resistance to his guardians wishes, even apart from other causes which did really exist. Such being the motives of his conduct in the first instance, it is easy to explain the alteration which took place without impeaching his consistency or courage. By the statements of Verdenus, the monastic life was presented to him in a novel point of view, and one which produced a revolution in his sentiments. He was brought to regard the convent, as an agreeable retreat, where his studies, instead of being thwarted, and discouraged, would enjoy facilities

that could not be had elsewhere, and be aided by a ready access to learned society and well stocked libraries. That he gave ear to this flattering description somewhat rashly, may be true; but if he did give ear to it, and suffer it to influence his movements, it follows, that the self-same motives which impelled him to hold out against his guardians for six years, induced him finally to acquiesce in their interested scheme. At the same time it must be remembered that Erasmus was an orphan at thirteen; that his frame was weak, his temper pacific, and his feelings sensitive; all which may have co-operated, and we doubt not, did, with the cause assigned above, to overcome his obstinate resistance to his guardians.

Whether Erasmus was already so well known, that the monks of Stein were anxious to secure him as a brother, or whether they were governed by the influence of his guardians, we know not. Certain it is, however, that during his noviciate, he was treated with singular indulgence, conventual rules being relaxed or dispensed with, to suit his convenience, and gratify his whims. But notwithstanding this strange policy, he could not reconcile himself to such a life, and it required all the art and authority of his guardians and the monks combined, to prevent his abandoning the monastery at the close of his noviciate. After all, they appear to have succeeded, only by working on his sense of shame, and by representing his continuance as a matter of necessity. Overcome at last by importunity, and weary of contention, he made his profession, in a fit of desperation, took the vows, and became a canon regular.

Every day, however, he grew more disgusted with his situation, and impatient to escape from it. Verdenus, to whom he was indebted for his cowl, appears to have been a very selfish friend, whose only object was to profit by the instructions of so ripe a scholar, in supplying or covering his own deficiencies. A more congenial spirit, was a young ecclesi-

astic from his own town, Gouda, by the name of William Hermann, a scholar and a poet, known subsequently as the author of *Dearum Silva*. With him he lived in habits of strict intimacy, and appears to have derived from his society, the only satisfaction which his residence afforded him.

Five years had now been spent in this disagreeable abode, when an unexpected incident gave him an opportunity of bettering his condition, and it need scarcely be said, that he embraced it joyfully. Henry à Bergis, Bishop of Cambrai, who, at that time, was intriguing for a red hat, found it necessary to proceed to Rome in person; and was anxious to procure a secretary who could speak and write pure Latin. This post he offered to Erasmus, whom he knew by reputation, and obtained permission for him from the Bishop of Utrecht, and the Friar of the convent, to accept the offer, which he did, A. D. 1491, in the twenty-fourth year of his age.

During his residence at Stein, Erasmus did not, as he has himself confessed, escape the contagion of corrupt example. But although the licentious lives of the recluses led him into some immoralities, we believe his own assertion, that he went not far astray, and so far from going to the same excesses with his older brethren, detested and despised them from his soul. He wrote while in the convent, many pieces, both in prose and verse. Among the rest were Hymns to Christ and the Virgin Mary, elegies, odes, satires; a funeral panegyric on a pious widow; a discourse on peace and discord, and a treatise *de contemptu mundi*, in which he describes freely, the corruption of the world, and, still more freely, the corruptions of the cloister. Of this date also are the earliest of his epistles extant. They are addressed to Cornelius Aurotinus, a priest of Gouda, in defence of Laurentius Valla, of whom Erasmus was a zealous and enthusiastic advocate. Our author, indeed, thinks, that the character and conduct of this illustrious Italian, were the models upon which Erasmus formed his own.

Erasmus, though in orders at the time when he left Stein, was not ordained priest till the following year, on which occasion, he became acquainted with the Abbot of St. Bertin, and the learned Jacob Battus, with the latter of whom he afterwards maintained a correspondence. In his hopes, however, of visiting Italy, he was wholly disappointed, the Bishop being forced to relinquish his designs by the want of pecuniary resources. He retained Erasmus, notwithstanding, in his house, and treated him for five years with respect and kindness. This period, however, seems not to have been a productive season as to literary matters, from the fact, that there are extant no productions of his pen, not even letters, of the date in question. At length, in 1496, he obtained permission of the Bishop to repair to Paris, at that time the most celebrated school of scholastic theology in Europe. A place had been procured for him in one of the colleges, where he could reside without expense, and the Bishop promised him a pension; a pledge which he was unable, or neglected to redeem. In consequence of this disappointment, Erasmus was reduced to utter want. He was not only unable to provide himself with books, but was driven by his poverty into a situation, the miseries of which he has described in the most revolting terms. He was now compelled to seek the means of subsistence by instructing private pupils, though it was an occupation which he seems to have disliked, probably because it consumed the time which he wished to devote to his own improvement. Among his pupils, at this time, was a young English nobleman, Lord Montjoy, who gave him an annuity of a hundred dollars, and continued his friend and patron throughout life. At his request, Erasmus wrote his treatise on Epistolary composition, which drew upon him afterwards the censure of the monks, because he expressed in it a preference of matrimony to celibacy. About this time he refused an invitation to become the private tutor of a rich young Englishman.

who had given up a bishoprick from a sense of incapacity, and now wished to qualify himself, by study, for another. In the beginning of the year 1497, he left Paris, to recruit his health, which was very much impaired. After visiting the Bishop at Cambrai, he proceeded to Berges, where his friend Jacob Battus was engaged in teaching the young prince of Burgundy. In this way he became acquainted with the prince's mother, the Marchioness de Vere, distinguished for her liberality to monks and learned men. From her, besides many other favours, he received a yearly pension, which was punctually paid. At her request, he composed a moral treatise for her son, a prayer to Christ, and several to the Virgin Mary. The latter he professes to have written, merely in compliance with her wishes, and against his better judgment. His health being now restored, he took a journey into Holland, and then returned to Paris; but was forced to leave the city, not long after, by the appearance of the plague. He remained three months at Orleans, where he was hospitably entertained by the Professor of Canon Law, J. Tutor. On his return to Paris, he appears to have abandoned the serious study of scholastic theology, and devoted himself to classical literature, particularly Greek, a complete knowledge of which, was then a rare accomplishment. As he had never had a teacher in this language, he adopted the practice of translating into Latin entire Greek works, in order to fix his attention and extend his acquaintance with both tongues. These versions he afterwards committed to the press, a fact which accounts for the large number of classical translations extant among his works. The health of Erasmus, which had been improved by his residence abroad, had failed once more, and continued still precarious. And our author takes occasion in this part of the biography, to expose the inconsistency with which Erasmus gravely attributes his recoveries, from illness, to the care of St. Genevieve, while in his *Christian*

Soldier's Manual, composed about this time, he ridicules and censures the invocation of saints, as a heathen superstition. As the plague still raged in Paris, Erasmus determined to accept an invitation which he had repeatedly received from his pupil, Lord Montjoy, to visit him in England. With his first visit to that country, he appears to have been singularly pleased. The climate, scenery, and manners of the people, but especially the state of learning, and the reception which he met with among learned men, delighted him. Among the distinguished characters with whom, on this visit, he became acquainted, the celebrated Sir Thomas More, and Dr. John Colet, Professor of theology at Oxford, may be particularly mentioned as his most intimate associates. During his stay at Oxford, he perfected himself in the Greek, by attending the instructions of Latimer and Grœcyn, who had succeeded in reviving the study of that language. He was also introduced to the young Duke of York, afterwards Henry VIII. to whom he addressed a Latin poem, and with whom he corresponded till his death. After a stay in England of about a year, he returned to Paris, and notwithstanding a disagreeable adventure at the Dover custom-house, whereby he lost twenty pounds, he appears to have gone home with impressions very favourable to the country and its inhabitants. On a visit, which he soon after paid to Holland, he became acquainted with Vitrier, a Franciscan monk, devoted to the study of the Fathers, who encouraged him in a design which he had previously formed of publishing the Fathers, with translations of their Greek works into Latin. The next memorable incident in his biography, is a quarrel with his former patron, the Bishop of Cambrai. They were never reconciled; yet on the Bishop's death Erasmus wrote four epitaphs upon him, one in Greek, and the rest in Latin, for which he received six florins, a munificence of recompense, which he ridicules in his epistles with some bitterness. The occasion of this quarrel was probably

the unwillingness or inability of the Bishop to yield him such pecuniary aid as he expected. From the same cause he became displeas'd with his friend, the Marchioness, who, after his mishap at Dover, transmitted him eight franks, two of which, he says, he took to pay the post. He appears indeed, throughout his life to have given much vexation to his friends by constant importunities for money. In the year 1500, he published his *Adagia*, though incomplete, for the purpose of relieving his necessities. He dedicated it to Lord Montjoy, and added a panegyric upon England. In 1502, we find him studying theology, at Louvain, under Adrian, who was afterwards Pope Adrian VI; at the same time prosecuting, with great zeal, his study of the Fathers, and of Greek. He still kept up his early practice of translating into Latin, and indeed continued it through life, a fact, which, as LeClerc has well observed, evinces that he must have been endowed with as much patience as refinement and acuteness. His favourite among the Fathers was Jerome, among the Greek writers Lucian; though he also expresses a lively admiration of Plato and Plutarch. About this time, he began to study Hebrew; but soon abandoned it, because, as he says himself, it was so new and strange, and because he was unwilling to dissipate his powers by grasping at too many objects. In 1504, he published a work of Laurentius Valla, which he found in a convent library at Brussels. It was a critique on the vulgate, comparing that translation with the original Greek text. To this Erasmus added a discourse, intended to demonstrate the necessity of a new version, and recommend the study of the original tongues.

The reputation of Erasmus, as a classical scholar, and an elegant writer, was now so well established, that the States of Brabant fix'd upon him, to pronounce a panegyric oration in their name, before Philip the Fair, on his return from Spain. He accepted this honourable office, though reluc-

tantly, being conscious that he wanted the confident address and self-possession which an orator should have, and at the same time afraid of being branded as a flatterer and sycophant. The oration, however, was delivered in the palace at Brussels, on the sixth of January, 1504; and although, as he had himself foreseen, his motives were misconstrued, his reputation was increased by the performance. Philip, himself evinced his satisfaction by a handsome present, and an invitation to reside at court. The offer was declined; but Erasmus seems from this time to have lived in greater ease and comfort. Still, however, he had not the means of accomplishing his favourite design of seeing Italy, and taking the degree of Doctor at an Italian university, till 1506, when he found himself enabled to defray the charges of this long projected journey, by the liberality of English friends. With a view to this event, he came to England, near the end of the preceding year, and after a short stay in London, visited, first Cambridge, and then Lambeth, where he was presented to Archbishop Warham, Lord High Chancellor, by his friend and instructor Grocyn. He had previously prepared a Latin version of the Hecuba of Euripides, with a dedication to his grace, which he put into his hands, when introduced. To his great surprise, however, the Archbishop treated him with coldness and suspicion, and made him, in return, a very frugal present. This conduct, however, was explained by Grocyn, to arise from a suspicion, that the book had been inscribed to other men before, a trick, not uncommon, as he said, among hungry authors. Surprised and hurt at this imputation on his honour, Erasmus, as soon as he returned to Paris, sent his translation to the press, with another from the same tragedian, and dedicated both to the Archbishop. By this step, he not only proved his own sincerity, but secured the favour of his grace, who from this time, loaded him with benefits. From Orleans, Erasmus was accompanied to Italy by the son of

the King of England's chief physician, whose literary ardour made him an agreeable companion. The first place in Italy at which he tarried any length of time, was Turin, where, in September, 1506, he received the degree of Doctor in Theology, an honour to which he had long been looking forward.

From Turin, he proceeded to Bologna, to which place Pope Julius was at that time laying siege. He passed on to Florence, therefore, but returned in time to witness the triumphal entrance of his Holiness into the conquered city. At Bologna he became acquainted with a number of distinguished scholars, particularly with the Greek Professor, Paul Bombasius. In January 1507, he reached Rome, where he was present at the second triumph of the Pope over the conquest of Bologna, which he appears to have regarded with disapprobation and disgust. On his return to Bologna, he acted as tutor to Alexander, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, a natural son of James IV. of Scotland. At the same time he pursued his own private studies so intensely that he remained in utter ignorance of the Italian language, character, and manners, a circumstance, which sometimes led him into absurd and dangerous situations. One of these adventures is detailed at length, by most of his biographers. The only circumstance attending it, which we shall mention, is its consequence, which was a dispensation from the Pope permitting him to exchange his friar's habit for the dress of a secular priest.

After residing about a twelvemonth at Bologna, he repaired to Venice, for the purpose of putting his *Adagia*, which he had employed himself in enlarging and improving, into the hands of Aldus Manutius, the most celebrated printer of the age. Aldus received and entertained him with the most profound respect, and forthwith put his book to press. When this job was completed, he engaged Erasmus to correct a new edition of Plautus and Terence, for which service he presented him with twenty dollars, a moderate sum certainly

compared with the rewards which are sometimes given, in the present age, for intellectual labour. The merits of Erasmus appear to have been fully estimated by the Venetians. He was allowed the free use of private libraries and valuable MSS., so long as he resided there, and at last could scarcely obtain the consent of his friends to his departure.

His next removal was to Padua, where the young Archbishop was residing, thence with his pupil to Sienna, thence to Rome. In the latter city, he seems to have met with the most flattering reception. John de Medicis, afterwards Leo X., the Cardinal Grimani, and the general of the Augustines, vied with each other in their courteous attentions to the stranger. The Cardinal Grimani, in particular, made him offers, which, if not mere compliments, were certainly extravagant. He urged him to reside in Rome, and share with him a palace, one of the most magnificent in Italy, and a library, inferior in value, only to the Vatican. These and similar proposals, it is probable, would not have been despised, had not circumstances led Erasmus to look forward to an honourable settlement in England. Henry VII. died in April, 1509. His successor was a personal acquaintance, friend, and correspondent of Erasmus. We have already seen, that he was partial to the country, and had more respect for the English literati, than for any others. He knew, too, that freedom of opinion was more tolerated there, than elsewhere, and that the condition of society, and manners of the people, were more favourable to his own independent and capricious temper. Such being his opinions and feelings on the subject, the intelligence of Henry's death excited his attention to the probable effect which it might have on his own condition. In this state of mind, he received communications from Montjoy and other friends, inviting him to England, and promising him great things, in the name of the King, and his patron,

the Archbishop.* These letters appear to have determined him at once. The proposals of the Roman dignitaries were respectfully, but peremptorily, declined, including an offer from his Holiness himself, of a place among his *Penitentiaries*, an honourable post, and one affording easy access to the highest dignities. Leaving Rome, Erasmus passed through Tuscany and Lombardy, across the Alps, and along the Rhine, to Holland, whence, after a short stay, he sailed for England.

What were the actual impressions made upon Erasmus, by his residence beyond the Alps, with respect to Italy and its inhabitants, it is hard to ascertain. His letters from that country are all full of exaggerated eulogy, while in those of a later period, he runs to an opposite extreme. As the former were written in the full tide of his popularity at the Papal court, and the latter, when his reputation as a Catholic was somewhat on the wane, we may safely conclude, that both pictures are considerably over-drawn. For whatever may have been the virtues of his character, it cannot be dissembled, that fearless, frank, sincerity, was never one of them.

On his arrival in England, he took up his abode with his friend Sir Thomas More, for whose amusement he composed his *Praise of Folly*, which was sent to France and printed there, and had such sale, that within a few months, seven editions were exhausted. Notwithstanding its popularity, however, it brought upon its author the displeasure of the Romish clergy, whose iniquities it sacrilegiously exposed. Indeed it is said, that from the date of this publication, he began to be regarded as a heretic.

The high expectations of profit and preferment, with which Erasmus came to England, were, as might have been

* It is a curious fact, that Archbishop Warham backed this invitation by a remittance of five pounds, to defray the expenses of a journey, over land, from Rome to London!

expected, disappointed. In fact, Lord Montjoy, in the letter before mentioned, had given pledges in the name of other men, without authority, presuming on the good will of the King and the Archbishop towards his friend. Erasmus, of course, therefore, found his prospects of aggrandizement and wealth overclouded. He was hospitably entertained, it is true, and provided with a sufficiency for his support. But either from the want of all economy, or his enfeebled health, which multiplied his wants, he was unable to procure himself subsistence. We find him in one of his letters to Dean Colet, suing for fifteen angels as the price of a dedication. He refused a profitable living which was offered to him by Archbishop Warham, professedly from conscientious scruples with regard to sinecures; and yet seems to have wearied the patience of his patrons by his constant importunities.

Our author seems disposed to think, that this discontent with his abode in England, sprang neither from a want of patronage, nor from his own extravagance; but from a restlessness of disposition, which rendered him incapable of strong and permanent attachments. That he was treated with all honour and respect in England, there can be no doubt. His society was courted by the most distinguished men, and his merits talked of, even by the vulgar. At Cambridge he was appointed Professor both of Divinity and Greek, and the lectures which, as such, he occasionally read, were heard with flattering attention and applause. Notwithstanding all this, however, he grew more and more dissatisfied, and multiplied his complaints and importunities, till at last his English friends and he were heartily weary of each other. Such was the position of affairs, when political commotions and the prospect of a war with France, diverted the attention of the King and the nobility from letters altogether, and Erasmus, of course, began to be neglected. This circumstance, together with his gradual decline in

health, increased his desire to leave the country, which is manifested very unequivocally in his letters to the Cardinal Grimani, and other friends at Rome, which at this period contain the most fulsome panegyrics upon Italy, Italian learning, and Italian learned men. His regret at having left that country was increased, too, by the elevation of his friend, the Cardinal de Medicis, to the pontifical office. Such were his feelings, when in 1513, Bishop Fisher was appointed, by the King, to represent England in the Lateran Council. Erasmus instantly resolved to leave England in his suite; and although the Bishop was not sent, he persevered in his determination, which indeed, was strengthened by an invitation to the court of Charles, Archduke of Austria. After taxing his English friends for money to defray his charges, he accordingly set sail; and after much distress about the apprehended loss of his baggage, and especially his manuscripts, arrived at Calais.

During his residence in England, besides many smaller pieces, religious discourses, hymns, and prayers, he composed his treatises *de copia verborum ac rerum*, and *de partibus orationis*, elementary books in rhetoric and grammar, intended for the use of a school, established by his friend, Dean Colet. He was chiefly employed, however, in the reading of Greek authors, and in making preparations for his critical edition of the New Testament.

On his return from England, he repaired to Brussels, where he was received with great distinction, and appointed a counsellor of State, with a pension of four hundred florins. The Archduke also gave him a Sicilian bishopric; but unfortunately, it was afterwards discovered, that the right of presentment belonged to the Pope, and had been exercised in favour of another. This mistake, instead of grieving, seems to have amused Erasmus, who, in his private letters, laughs, as well at the nomination, as the disappointment. The only duty which he seems to have performed as a

counsellor of state, was the composition of a treatise for the benefit of Charles, then fifteen years of age, entitled *Institutio Principis Christiani*. This work proved both beneficial and acceptable to Charles, and his younger brother, Ferdinand, and procured for the author additional honours and rewards.

The chronology of this period of his life is somewhat confused, and differs considerably in the different accounts. We find him, however, in the early part of 1516, at Basle, where he went to have his New Testament printed, by John Froben, the most celebrated printer of the day, excepting Aldus. In the course of the same year, the work was published, with a dedication to the Pope, and met with such success, that a second edition was issued in 1518, and a third in 1522. This will not be thought surprising, when it is considered, that the Greek text had never yet been given to the world; that the revival of classical learning had directed the attention of the learned to the subject; that Erasmus was the most celebrated scholar of his times; and that his edition had the sanction of pontifical authority. The text was accompanied by a Latin version, altogether new, and varying in many cases from the Vulgate, with annotations, which, though ostensibly mere critical remarks upon the text, abound in declamation and invective against scholastic theology and the monks. To his second edition, he prefixed the recommendation of Leo X. under his own hand; an appendage of great service, at a time, when his orthodoxy was suspected, and the church divided into zealous parties. To the third he prefixed a vindication of vernacular translations of the scriptures. His next publication was his paraphrase of the New Testament, of which Melancthon's eulogium is well known. Our author, however, while he admits its elegance, seems to question its utility.

With his brief residence at Basle, Erasmus seems to have been much delighted. With the learned printers, Amerbach

and Froben, and the sons of Ammerbach, who were Hebrew scholars, his time was very pleasantly spent. He also became acquainted with Beatus Rhenanus, Oecolampadius, Berus, and the Bishop of Basle, who used every effort to induce him to remain there.

On his return to Brussels, he was urged to accompany King Charles to Spain, but could not be prevailed upon. Soon after, he received a pressing invitation to reside at Paris, which was communicated to him by Budaeus from Francis I. himself. This offer, though he gave no positive refusal, he did not accept. His roving habits had become so fixed, that he was now unwilling to accept of any offer, which would lay him under obligations to forego the capricious independence which was his delight. From the same motive he declined repeated invitations to reside in different countries, and among the rest, an application from the Duke of Bavaria, who wished to give respectability to his new university at Ingolstadt, by the name and influence of so great a man, and who, with this view, offered him two hundred ducats yearly, without requiring any other service in return, than residence at Ingolstadt. The five years intervening between 1516 and 1521, he appears to have passed in constant motion, sometimes in Flanders, sometimes in England, and seldom many months successively in either. Our author mentions here, the impossibility of tracing the movements of Erasmus accurately, by the dates and contents of his letters; it being notorious, that in his printed correspondence the dates are often falsified, and the epistles mutilated. During the period in question, his external circumstances were more comfortable than at any former time. He mentions incidentally, himself, that he enjoyed a constant income of three hundred ducats, besides the benefactions of his patrons, and occasional supplies from other sources. During the same period, he published his *Querela Pacis*, and began his edition of

the Works of Jerome, which he dedicated to Archbishop Warham.

The last of the three sections, into which the work before us is divided, contains a view of the relations which Erasmus bore to the Reformation. On a subject so familiar as the origin of that great revolution, detail must be unnecessary. Our author has rendered this part of the subject interesting by inserting facts and extracts, which exhibit in a clearer light the sentiments and feelings of Luther and Erasmus towards each other, at an early period. It appears, that the latter took no notice for some time, of the dispute about indulgences, regarding it as nothing more than one of those dissensions, which were constantly arising in the bosom of the church. The Reformer on the contrary, had watched Erasmus, keenly, and with great anxiety, and in his letters had expressed opinions in relation to his character, evincing great sagacity, and fully verified by subsequent events. While he gave him all due praise for classical learning, eloquence, and wit, he appeared to doubt the soundness and firmness of his principles ; and although he coincided with him in opinion, respecting the abuses and corruptions in the church, which Erasmus had exposed, he disapproved in toto of the unbecoming levity with which the latter had described and ridiculed them.

When the dispute with Tetzal grew more serious, and threatened to produce momentous consequences, the attention of Erasmus was attracted to the subject, and he seems to have regarded it with lively interest. Our author here suggests a supposition, which we think affords a satisfactory solution of the fickle and capricious conduct of Erasmus during this eventful period. It is, that he at first imagined Luther to be just such another as himself, a reformer in the same sense, and with the same design ; that is, a zealot in the cause of learning, and an enemy to superstition for the sake of learning. Under this impression, he appears to

have applauded the first movements of the reformation, as a mere continuation of his own proceedings; for it must be owned, that the exposure of the gross abuses which existed in the Romish church, was made in the first instance by Erasmus, though with motives very different from those which subsequently governed the Reformers. When at length he discovered his mistake, and was aware, that Luther acted upon principles and with intentions wholly diverse from his own, and that he was engaged in an enterprize which if unsuccessful, must be ruinous, he instantly drew back. The interests of religion manifestly had no place among his motives, or at least no influence upon his conduct. He acknowledges himself that he, at one time, was opposed to Luther, because he thought his movements were inimical to learning—a sufficient explanation of his whole history. For our own part, we believe, that there is not on record an instance of more deep and exclusive devotion to an object, than that of Erasmus, to the interests of Greek and Roman learning. We need not go back to his early life, for proof of the assertion. All his motions seem to have been regulated by a reference to this ruling passion. Such, indeed, was the intensity with which he clung to his favourite pursuits, that although he changed his residence so often, and enjoyed such opportunities of intercourse with different nations, he actually lived and died in ignorance of the English, French, German, and Italian languages. In fact, if we leave out this circumstance, his history is an enigma, and his character a riddle. It is not surprising, therefore, that when consistency and conscience, came into contact with the god of his idolatry, he chose to sacrifice the former, as he did, when he endeavoured to retract his first opinions, and entered the arena of religious controversy, as the antagonist of Luther. But it was too late. The treatise on free-will which he composed, (in compliance with the wish repeatedly expressed by the Pope, the King of England, and innumera-

ble friends, that he would write against the heretics,) not only drew upon him a tremendous castigation from the hand of Luther, but actually exasperated the resentment and suspicion of those whom it was intended to conciliate. Do what he would, he never could persuade the monks and common people that he was not an accomplice of the reformers. He was denounced from the pulpit and the press, and held up to execration, even in his presence. His early writings could not be forgotten. It grew into a proverb, that Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it, and he had the mortification to hear prayers put up for the conversion of Luther and Erasmus, the persecutors of the church. At the same time the reformed regarded him as a temporizing hypocrite, a very Gallio, who cared not for these things. Rejected, thus, by both parties, he would have sunk into insignificance, but for a reputation independent of religious controversy. For it is a curious fact, that amidst the very heat of this contention, while Luther was heaping him with coarse, but just reproach, on one hand, and the Sorbonne were burning his productions on the other, he continued to receive most pressing invitations and attractive offers, from the Emperor, the King of England, and the Pope himself!

In 1521, he had removed to Basle, where he continued to reside, with occasional interruptions, till 1529, when the magistrates and people of that city made a public renunciation of popery. On this event, Erasmus found himself compelled to change his residence; not that he apprehended violent or unkind treatment on the part of the inhabitants, but because he thought that his remaining there would be construed into an adhesion to the new opinions. He accordingly removed to Friburg, where he was received with great distinction—and lodged in a palace built for Maximilian, and once occupied by the Archduke Ferdinand. He had in view, at first, nothing more than a temporary stay, but was so well pleased with the city and the people,

and felt himself so weakened by disease and age, that he bought a house and took up his abode there.

Our author gives detailed accounts of several disputes, in which Erasmus was involved during his residence at Basle, of which we shall only say, that he owed them all to his disingenuous and timid policy of siding with the strongest, and that they all resulted in a partial diminution of his dignity and influence. His principal literary labours during the same period, were, his edition of the works of Hilary, and his celebrated *Colloquies*; afterwards condemned by the Sorbonne and the Inquisition.

At Friburg, he continued to dispute, and write, and publish, as at Basle, without ceasing. His most important publications at this period, were editions of the Fathers and the classics, with introductions, notes, and a correct text. Each of these he inscribed to some distinguished man, and seldom failed to receive a handsome present in exchange. This was, indeed, an honour which the great men of the day prized extravagantly high, as a passport to immortal fame. In the mean time, Erasmus still maintained a correspondence with the crowned heads and learned men of Europe, some of whom testified their friendship in a way more substantial than mere letter-writing. But while thus receiving honour at the hands of Kings, he once more sacrificed his peace and dignity by entering the lists with Luther, in reply to a letter of the latter, printed probably without his knowledge, and containing much severe reproach upon Erasmus. From this affair neither party reaped much honour, and Erasmus certainly deserved none.

In 1535, he yielded to the importunities of his imperial patrons, and agreed to visit Flanders; but first paid a visit to Basle for the purpose of saluting his old friends, and of putting to press, his *Ecclesiastes*, then just finished. He was detained, however in that city, a whole winter, by ill health, after which he never left it. While at Basle, he re-

ceived a letter from Pope Paul III. in answer to an epistle of congratulation, which he had addressed to him on his election. At the same he received intelligence from Rome, that his Holiness designed to offer him a Cardinal's hat, and other ecclesiastical preferments. But although the yearly income of the office was fifteen hundred ducats, independently of other revenues, which would have been bestowed upon him, he declined it, probably from a conviction, that his end was near. The circumstance, however, serves to show, the light in which the court of Rome regarded him, after his disputes with Luther.

In the spring of 1536, he was seized, in addition to his old disorders, with a dysentery, which continued an unusual length of time, and carried him off upon the 12th of July. He retained his gaiety and love of study, to the very last, endured his sufferings with patience, and expired with these words on his lips, "Domine Jesu, miserere mei." He died and was buried, without any Popish ceremony, though a multitude thronged to behold his body. The coffin was carried by students of the University, and followed by the Magistrates, Senate, and Professors, to the Cathedral church, where his monument still stands, and where his ring, seal, pencil, knife, and sword, his portrait, (a master-piece of Holbein,) and his autograph of the New Testament, are still exhibited to strangers. At Rotterdam, his native place, his memory has been perpetuated by statutes, medals, and inscriptions, with as much zeal as at Basle, and in both cities, there are colleges which bear his name. In his will, he constituted Ammerbach his heir; but left many legacies to other friends, and several bequests for charitable purposes. When he died, he was not quite sixty-nine years old.

In the rapid sketch, which we have given, in the foregoing pages, we have attempted nothing more than a succinct view of the subject, in the order adopted by the author of

this work, with a notice of such views and sentiments suggested by him, as appeared entitled to attention from their novelty or force. His extended criticism on the writings of Erasmus we have left untouched, because it can neither be abridged nor analyzed. His views in relation to the moral character and literary merits of Erasmus, we have partially exhibited, although their full development engrosses a large space in the original. On this point we have little more to say, than a reiteration of the fact, that his characteristic quality, was a supreme, exclusive, and unwavering devotion to the cause of literature, to which may be added, the remark of Luther, who appears to have known him better than he knew himself, that Erasmus was quick to detect error, but slow to learn the truth. In drawing a parallel between these celebrated men, our author becomes eloquent, and contrasts with a species of enthusiasm, the heroic consistency of the one, with the time serving policy of the other. He exhibits, indeed, a manifest dislike to the character and conduct of Erasmus, which has freed his work from the excess of extravagant and undue partiality, so common in biography, without, however, warping in the least, his fairness as a critic and historian.

REVIEW.

A Hebrew Chrestomathy, designed as the first volume of a course of Hebrew Study. By Moses Stuart, associate Professor of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Institution at Andover. 1829. pp. 243.

THE publication of Professor Stuart's smaller Hebrew Grammar, of his Chrestomathy, and of Professor Gibb's Manual Lexicon, has placed in the hands of the Hebrew students of our country, a set of books eminently adapted to facilitate their acquisition of a knowledge of the Hebrew language. There is little doubt also, that they will tend to make this study more general, by removing many of the difficulties by which the path of the student of the original language of the Old Testament, has hitherto been beset. This is a result, in which all the friends of truth and of sound theological knowledge will rejoice. It may be considered as one of the favourable characteristics of the present day, that zeal for the study of the original Scriptures, is every where reviving. Still, it may be doubted, whether theological students generally adequately feel their obligation to make this one of the main objects of their attention. There are so many other subjects which appear to have a more immediate bearing on the practical duties of the ministry, and are to most minds, at least in the first instance, more inviting and interesting, that it generally happens, that the sacred languages, and the Scriptures themselves, are made but secondary objects. It may be too, that the importance of intellectual culture generally, in the ministers of the Gos-

pel, is not properly appreciated. There are, doubtless, many theological students who are not sufficiently aware how intimately the interests of religion are connected with the stand assumed by its ministers. This is peculiarly the case in our country. For here, influence is only to be obtained by mental and moral superiority. Among unenlightened nations, the mere fact, that a man is the minister of religion clothes him with moral power over those around him. Here ministers are men, and have little influence which does not arise from their personal character. They have no splendid revenues, nor lordly titles, which in most European countries secure for religion and its officers, the external respect even of the great and the worldly; but are dependent on themselves for their power to do good. Experience proves that where the clergy are ignorant, religion is degraded and in disrepute; but where they have maintained an equality in intellectual improvement, with the best educated portions of society, the respect which the world could not withhold from them has been extended to religion itself. If the interests of religion be thus united to the character of its ministers, the solemn obligations to cultivate to the utmost the talents which God has given him, cannot be denied by any theological student, who properly appreciates the nature of the office which he seeks.

That the objects of his attention should be mainly professional, need scarcely be remarked, and that every department of theological knowledge should receive its due proportion of time and study, will be readily admitted. This we think with respect to the Hebrew, and indeed, the Scriptures generally, is rarely the case. The importance of this branch of theological education is not properly appreciated, and therefore, the sense of duty (which it is to be supposed regulates the conduct of candidates for the sacred office,) does not secure for this subject, the amount of attention it really deserves. That it is a matter of duty, for every

man who seeks to enter the ministry, to qualify himself for the work in the best manner which his circumstances will admit, will not be denied. The only question therefore, is, whether a knowledge of the Hebrew be of such importance, that a man neglects a serious duty, who fails to make this acquisition, when the Providence of God has placed it within his reach. This would seem a question of very easy decision. Are not ministers appointed to explain, enforce, and defend the contents of the sacred volume? Can this be done as well without a knowledge of the languages in which this volume was written, as with it? The neglecters of the Hebrew, if they act conscientiously, must answer this question in the affirmative, and must maintain that the English version is adequate to teach them, all a minister need know of the revelation of God. But the least reflection is sufficient to show that this cannot be the case. No version, from the nature of the case, can in all instances be an exact exhibition of its original; because no two languages exactly correspond. Indeed, beyond some few classes of words, such as the names of natural objects, the essential relations in life, the signs of simple ideas, &c., few words can be discovered which in one language have precisely the same signification with the nearest corresponding term of another. The correspondence is, in the great majority of instances but partial, the one will generally admit of applications foreign to the other. Hence the version will often express more or less than the original, will admit of interpretations which the former cannot bear. Thus we often see men urging arguments founded upon some possible or even common use of the terms of the English version, entirely foreign to the usage of the word or phrase for which it stands in the original. Admitting, therefore, that the translation was the best possible, yet from the nature of language—from the difference between the modifications of thought and feeling in every nation of which their respec-

tive languages are the representative, there always will be a great difference between the version and the original. There is always a mind interposed between the reader and his author—the thoughts and feelings of the latter come transmuted and modified to the former, by passing through the process of translation. Homer in the language of Cowper, Pope, and Voss, is by no means the same. The facts of the poems are retained in all, but in each it is mainly with the mind of the translator that the reader has communion.

But a version is not only from the nature of the case inadequate, it is in every instance, more or less faulty. No translation is given by inspiration, and therefore, none is infallibly correct. Of the thousand versions of the Sacred Scriptures, there are no two which exactly agree. Now, shall the minister of the Gospel, place himself under the necessity of taking the meaning of the word of God upon trust? Shall he expose himself to the constant danger of adopting for himself, and of urging on the consciences of others as the truth of God, what may be the mere misapprehensions of fallible translators? Yet this is what is done every day, and in some cases, it may be, to even a fatal extent. Is there no moral obligation then, on the public expounders of the word of God, to make themselves acquainted with that word, and not to take the version either of Protestant or Catholic, as their rule of faith and practice.

But besides the essential inadequacy and frequent inaccuracy of every translation, it may further be urged as a reason for studying the original languages, that the knowledge of them is essential to our being able properly to expound the word of God. There are two great means of ascertaining the meaning of any author. The one is the logical connexion of his thoughts, the other the signification of the individual words and phrases which he employs. With regard to the former, it may be admitted, that it may be applied with much the same success by the reader of a good

version, as by the student of the original. But with the regard to the latter, the case is very different; for it is evident it will avail us little to ascertain even the biblical *usus loquendi*, of a certain word or mode of expression in our English Bible, since these are by no means always employed to answer to one and the same phrase in the original. To understand the sense of the terms used by the sacred writers, we should avail ourselves of the light thrown upon them by their etymology; by their use in the age in which the author wrote, in other parts of the sacred volume, and especially in other passages of the same writer; by tracing the word in its cognate dialects, &c. &c. These are the only proper means of ascertaining its import. It may be said that this process has already been gone through by the translators who have given us the result. But this method of investigation is often as necessary in the work of exposition, as in that of translation. A translation can give us but one of the various senses of which a passage may be susceptible, whether, that be the best supported or not we are entirely unable to judge. And if any young man would shrink from the idea of adopting opinions as to the doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, for which he is personally responsible, on the authority of another, why adopt on authority the sense of passages of the Sacred Scriptures on which such opinions must ultimately be founded?

As the original Sacred Scriptures are the only standard recognized by all classes of Christians, to them the appeal is made on all matters of controversy. A minister is set for the defence of the truth. For this business he is bound to prepare himself. He ought seriously to consider whether it be consistent with his duty to place himself in circumstances, in which not only his character, but the interests of the truth may be deeply involved, when the point in dispute may at any moment be carried beyond his depth, by a reference to the standard which all parties acknow-

ledge. No objection, or argument is more frequently in the mouths of disputants of all classes, than "this is a wrong translation," "the original properly means, &c." Now, let any man lay it to his conscience whether the sacred cause of truth may not require of its advocates, not to allow themselves to be silenced, by such arguments as these.

As the best exegetical, doctrinal, polemical, and even practical works of a theological character, refer constantly to the original Scriptures, it is evident that ignorance of the sacred languages must debar us from the best sources of theological knowledge. We greatly limit therefore our means of improvement, and consequently of usefulness when we fail to make the acquisition in question.

It is, however, unnecessary to argue this point further, as it is one generally admitted in theory, however, much it may be neglected in practice. The importance of a knowledge of the Hebrew is so obvious, that it is made one of the requisites for admission into the ministry, by almost every denomination of Christians. If this part of our statute-book, should become a dead letter, it will be a reproach and proof of degeneracy, in whatever section of the church it may occur. The requisition was made in the purest period of our ecclesiastical existence, and stands an abiding testimony to the high value which our forefathers set on the true word of God. The reformers felt this subject so deeply, and that some of them considered the very existence of the Protestant church as depending on the continued cultivation of the sacred languages; and Luther declared that he would not part with his knowledge of the Hebrew for all the treasures of the world.

The suggestion may be made, that there are many men eminent for usefulness in the church, who have attended little, if any, to this subject. Such men, however, would humanly speaking, be still more useful had they added familiarity with the Hebrew to their other attainments. Their

views of the meaning of God's word would be still more clear; their opinions founded upon still more solid evidence, and defended with still greater force. In urging the importance of the Hebrew, it is not maintained, that warmth of piety, strength of intellect and eloquence, are worthless without it. But it is simply asserted, what few will deny, that a man's ability to understand, explain and defend the word of God, is so much increased by this acquisition, that it is a matter of serious duty for every student of the Sacred Scriptures to make it, to whom God has given the opportunity.

We would only further remark, that this is by no means, comparatively, a difficult acquisition. The language itself is easy. The system of the points is, at first view, intricate and repulsive. But there are few young men of ordinary talents, who do not, with any suitable degree of attention, surmount this difficulty after a few months study. When this is once effected, future progress is easy and pleasant. One great objection, has hitherto been the want of books. The Grammars most accessible, have been either so defective as to afford but little assistance, or so large and complicated, as utterly to bewilder the solitary unassisted student. Professor Stuart has done much to remove this difficulty. His shorter Grammar is complete, without being perplexingly minute, and his Hebrew Chrestomathy will still further smooth the path of the student of this sacred tongue.

Works of the nature of that last mentioned, are commonly designed to furnish matter for reading, adapted to the progress of the student, in those cases where books are expensive or difficult of acquisition. And in such cases they are almost essential. How few Arabic students can find access to works adapted to the acquisition of that language. The number, actually in print is comparatively small, and seldom to be met with. Hence, those zealous for the promotion of this branch of literature, have extracted, arranged

and published parts of works, manuscript and printed, in the form of Chrestomathies. With regard to the Hebrew, however, this difficulty does not exist. The Hebrew Bible may be easily procured and must form a part of the library of every one who pretends to study the language. Nor do we think that the mere selecting and arranging passages of gradually increasing difficulty, would compensate for the time and labour it would require. Such a selection, however, is a small part of the work with which Professor Stuart has presented the Hebrew student. It contains in the first place, a list of words designed as examples to assist the student in declining the various classes of verbs and nouns; then, of short sentences; thirdly, of select portions of prose; fourthly, portions of poetry, and fifthly, of several parables occurring in different parts of the Old Testament. The notes are designed to explain every thing which the student would wish to have explained; and to refer him to those parts of the Grammar where the appropriate information is to be found. The exegetical remarks are short, but to the point. It will be seen at once that this is a very different work from the common Chrestomathies either of the Hebrew, or Arabic, or Syriac. Most of the latter, are either mere selections of matter, or attended with a translation and biographical, historical, and critical remarks, illustrative of the subject much more frequently, than of the language, or its Grammar. Such a work is the excellent Arabic Chrestomathy of De Sacy. Professor Stuart's book is mainly intended to teach the Grammar of the Hebrew language; and for this purpose it is, if faithfully used, admirably well adapted. We say, if faithfully used, because we should fear that if the student content himself with what he finds stated in the notes, without seeking out, and reading the sections referred to in the Grammar, it would make him slight his work. The only query on the expediency of this mode of instruction which we feel disposed to make, is as to the propriety of telling the

student so much, as to leave little for his own ingenuity or labor to discover. It may be questioned whether the progress of the learner would be so sure and satisfactory, if he had a teacher constantly at his elbow who should answer all the purpose of Lexicon and Grammar, telling him at once every thing about each word as it occurs ; as if left to himself to find out the reason of the peculiarities of form which he might remark ; provided his teacher, in the recitation room, would be careful to see that this had been actually accomplished, and to explain whatever the student had failed to remark, or had not been able to account for. In this way, the point to be explained is brought more definitely before the mind, it remains much longer a subject of thought, and, what is of most importance, in seeking the solution of one difficulty, the principles which apply to other cases are learned or familiarized. We should think, therefore, that it would be safer for the student not to resort to the notes, until he had failed in discovering for himself the solution of every question that occurs. As far as we know, where languages are taught *viva voce* in this manner (i. e. by the teacher explaining every thing,) such instruction is attended by so many exercises, demanding personal investigation on the part of the student, that the oral instruction becomes the least important branch of the system. We have not, however, the least doubt that the work of Professor Stuart will be a very valuable assistant to learners and teachers: all we wish to impress on the mind of the student is, the importance of searching for himself, as much as possible the explanation of every change in the form or pointing of every word. As far as we have had an opportunity of remarking, the great mistake made by most young men in studying Hebrew, is neglecting at the outset the habit of minute and accurate analysis. This work is at first so irksome, the changes of the points appear so arbitrary, that many men of excellent minds refuse to submit to this distasteful drudgery.

The result is, that the foundation is not well laid, the forms of the various classes of words never become familiar ; the student cannot tell where a word is to be found, and consequently cannot determine its proper meaning. Reading Hebrew, when this is the case, cannot become easy or pleasant, and is, therefore, thrown aside as soon as it ceases to be a matter of regular recitation, and all the time and labor bestowed upon it is lost. It very seldom happens that where a student once sets out wrong, that he retraces his steps. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the habit of the strictest accuracy should be formed from the beginning. If it be a duty to learn Hebrew at all, it is a duty to learn it well ; and it is to be wished that theological students would reflect on the waste of time and effort, which is consequent on neglecting the requisite accuracy, in the first stages of their Hebrew studies.

Professor Stuart states in his preface, that if the necessary encouragement be afforded, he intends "to go on with the selection of other appropriate parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, so as to complete a full course of exegetical study in the Hebrew language." We are rejoiced to hear this announcement, and have no doubt that the requisite encouragement will be met with. At the same time we would respectfully suggest, whether he might not employ his valuable time and talents more effectually in promoting the study of the Hebrew Scriptures, by preparing regular commentaries on entire books of the Old Testament. We think that fragmentary reading is not so pleasant nor so useful, as that of entire works. It may be well enough in Greek, where the field is so large, but in the Hebrew we think there is less necessity for such a course. Young men address themselves to this study, not so much for the sake of the language as for the sacred truths which it contains ; and the sooner the direct study of the Sacred Scriptures, with the design of accurately investigating their meaning, can be entered upon,

the sooner will zeal in the search of the truth come to the student's aid in his philological studies. Is it not probable that this zeal will be more effectually excited in the study of entire books, than of detached portions? Let this suggestion pass for what it is worth. We sincerely hope, that the enlightened efforts of Professor Stuart, to revive the study of the original Sacred Scriptures will meet with success, beyond his most sanguine expectation. He is engaged in a cause worthy of all his zeal and talents ; and it may be questioned whether any individual could render a greater service to the American churches, than he is doing in turning the attention of their youth to the accurate study of the word of God in their original languages. We know that many persons are accustomed to point to Germany as a warning against the zealous cultivation of this department of theological knowledge. But we would ask, did not infidelity triumph in France, where the original Scriptures were almost entirely neglected, as completely as Rationalism has done in Germany? The causes which have produced the late defection from the truth, in the latter country, are in a great measure foreign from the critical study of the Scriptures. And the reformation, which is now going on in that section of the church, is mainly to be ascribed to this study. This is almost the only way in which the truth is brought to operate on the minds of the learned portion of society. It is seldom they come under the influence of preaching, even when students of theology. They either rarely frequent places of worship, or if they do, they hear little of the Gospel. Were it not, therefore, that they are required to study the word of God for themselves, they would, to a great extent, live beyond the power of its truths. At an earlier period in the history of that church, when vital piety had become almost as rare as it is at present, the exegetical study of the Scriptures had sunk into neglect. The first effort of the Spener and Franke, who were laboring to revive the spirit of reli-

gion throughout the churches, was to revive this study. They placed the greatest confidence in the salutary effects which it would produce, and they were not disappointed. It is true, that where irreligious men turn their attention to the study of Theology, and become its teachers, no matter what particular branch they may select, evil must result; but the evil lies not in the subject of study, but in such men finding access to the ministry, and the seats of theological learning. The truth need not fear the word of God. Let the spirit of piety be maintained, and the Bible cannot be studied either too accurately or too extensively.

The ordinance of the Trustees of the Theological Seminary at Andover, by which, in future, students are required to pass an examination on the Hebrew, previously to entering the Seminary, will have a tendency to introduce this study into the New-England colleges. This will be a valuable point gained. It would be difficult to name any valid argument why Greek should be a part of a regular classical education which would not apply with equal force to the Hebrew. It furnishes the same exercise of mind, it presents, to say the least, as much matter for the cultivation of the taste, and what is of far more importance, the moral influence of the truths embodied in this language is salutary, while that of the contents of classics is decidedly the reverse. Erasmus has some where said that the man who constantly reads the works of the heathen, will be a heathen. And if there were no tendency in such works to leave their impress upon the mind, there would be little use in studying them. In our zeal for the refinement and cultivation of the intellectual powers of the young, we have too much lost sight of the baneful tendency on moral feeling of the works in question. It is altogether impossible that a mind, expanded and moulded under the influence of Horace and Lucian, should be in the healthful state, of one formed by the spirit of David and Isaiah. Who would not prefer to have a son

imbued with the spirit of the sacred writings, than with that of the purest and loftiest models of heathen antiquity? It is certainly little to the honour of the Christian world, that while among Mohamedans, whatever language they may speak, or however rich the literature that language may contain, their youth are educated by their sacred writings, we place our Scriptures on the shelf and commit our youth to be formed by heathen minds. That the study of Latin and Greek is an excellent means of intellectual improvement; and that they are absolutely essential to professional men, may be good reasons why they should not be neglected, but they are no reasons why we should either shut our eyes on the evils attending them, or throw our equally improving sacred writings, entirely out of use, in a course of liberal education. It would, therefore be a matter of rejoicing, to see the Hebrew language a subject of regular instruction in our colleges; and we hope that the time may one day come, when it will not be considered beneath the dignity even of the general scholar, to make himself acquainted with the language of the ancient prophets of God.

LIST OF AGENTS.

LITTELL & BROTHER, Philadelphia
J. LEAVITT, New-York.
MALTBY & Co., New-Haven.
CROKER & BREWSTER, Boston.
C. WHIPPEL, Newburyport, Boston.
ALFRED HAMILTON, Pittsburgh.

NOTICE.

As all the pecuniary responsibility of this work, now rests upon the Editors, the Subscribers will see the necessity of complying, as soon as possible, with the terms of their subscription.
