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TO THE MOST NOBLE AND EXCELLENT

JEROME BIGNON,

KING'S ADVOCATE-GENERAL IN THE GRAND CHAMBER OF
THE PARLIAMENT OF PARIS, &C. &C.

MOST NOBLE AND EXCELLENT SIR,

I SHOULD offend against justice itself if I should divert to any other object that time which is devoted to the public administration of it, in the exalted station which you hold: But the defence of Christianity (an important part of justice, and consequently of your own office,) gives me courage on this occasion: and indeed the very principle of justice forbids me to address myself to any other person in preference to him whose name, thus prefixed, affords to my book a very proud distinction! I will not say that I petition for a portion of your leisure, as the duties of your office are too extensive and laborious to allow you any leisure; but as a change of employments is, in effect, a relaxation to men of business, my only request is, that the public labours of a court may be succeeded and relieved at a 2,.
proper intervals by a private perusal of these pages.
Nor, by this employment, will you deviate far from
your usual occupations: you will hear the examina-
tion of witnesses, you will ascertain the weight of
evidence, you will pronounce judgement.—Be it mine
to abide by the decision!—Great Sir, farewell!

HUGO GROTNIUS.

Paris, August 27, 1639.
THE FOLLOWING "ADDRESSES TO THE READER"
WERE PREFIXED TO SUCCESSIVE EDITIONS OF
THIS WORK BY THAT EMINENT DIVINE AND
UNIVERSAL SCHOLAR JOHN LE CLERC.

"WHEN the bookseller formed his design of publish-
ing a new edition of this work of Grotius, I app-
prized him of many great errors remaining in the for-
er editions, especially in the passages which are cited from ancient authors, which it would be expen-
dient to have corrected, with a view to his own credit and advantage. I told him also that some little mat-
ters might be usefully added in the notes, and that it would perhaps be agreeable as well as advantageous to his readers to have a short additional treatise in his new edition, pointing out the means of finding, in its greatest purity, that practical system of Chris-
tianity, the truth of which our excellent author has so fully demonstrated. The bookseller pressed me earnestly to render him this service; and indeed I undertook it, not unwillingly, both from my esteem for the memory of Grotius, and from a conviction of the useful nature of my task: It is for you, my candid reader, to judge of the manner in which that task has been performed. I certainly have corrected very numerous errors of the press, and perhaps I should have corrected many more had I been able to dis-
cover all the faulty passages. I have only added some short notes, thinking that the author's annotations were already sufficiently copious, nor did I see occa-
sion for any more from my pen. These notes will be distinguished from those of Grotius by my signature. Finally, I have annexed a little treatise of my own "On the Choice of a Religious Creed among the various Opinions of Christian Disputants," in which I hope that I have advanced nothing which that great man would have disapproved; or, at any rate, nothing inconsistent with truth. The arguments which I have employed are plain, and by no means far-fetched: they are such as should be satisfactory to every person of tolerable capacity and judgement; and the rule which I have laid down is simply this, that Christians ought to act in this affair as every man of the soundest discretion is accustomed to act in temporal affairs of the greatest moment. I have abstained from all violence of controversy, and from all harsh expressions, which ought to be excluded, if our opponents would allow it, from all our decisions on the subject of religion. I have stated my sentiments in simple and unvarnished language, as I thought myself bound to do on so serious a question, where the weight of argument, not the "enticing words of man's wisdom" ought to be the whole and sole object. In this respect I follow the example of my author, as all others I conceive will do, who shall undertake the discussion of such a subject with a mind seriously and deeply impressed with a sense of its importance!

But while these matters were in contemplation, I received the letters which you will see under the head of "Testimonies," from a man of the highest emi-
nence in station as well as learning, to whose singular kindness I have many great obligations, the Ambassador Extraordinary from Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain to His Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Tuscany. These letters, as I thought, might properly accompany the present publication, (with his kind permission,) to show beyond a doubt what sentiments were entertained by Grotius respecting the Church of England, a church which will gratefully receive the sanction of his name, however indignant certain persons may be who throw out imputations of contradictory doctrines, Socinianism, Popery, nay Atheism itself, against a man of his unrivalled eminence in learning and religion: apprehensive, I suppose, of the circulation of his immortal writings, which utterly explode their own absurd tenets. But, in this and many similar instances, they have been hitherto unsuccessful in all their endeavours to injure the fair fame of others, and to sully the brightness of distinguished merit! May God forgive them! (such is the extent of my ill-will.) May he inspire them with better thoughts, that we all at length may be united in the love of truth and peace, and may become "one fold" under "one shepherd" Jesus Christ! It is your duty, my good reader, to join in our earnest wishes and prayers to this effect; and may the blessing of God so attend you, and all who are near and dear to you, as you shall promote and assist the attainment of this end to the utmost of your power! Farewell.

JOHN LE CLERC.

Amsterdam, March 1, 1709.
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

I HAVE nothing to say in addition to my former preface, except that I have now annexed a few short notes to the original work, in this second edition of it; and that I have corrected many more errors in the passages adduced from ancient writers. Farewell.

JOHN LE CLERC.

Amsterdam, June 1, 1717.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

In regard to this Third Edition, I refer my readers to the last preface, and have only to observe further, that it contains a short additional treatise, in which I have strenuously opposed the opinion of those persons to whom it is a matter of indifference, whether they pass their lives as members of any particular society of Christians, or of any other whatsoever! Farewell.

JOHN LE CLERC.

Amsterdam, March 1, 1724.

A FURTHER PREFACE (OR DEDICATION) OF THE SAME DATE.

TO ALL WHO LOVE TRUTH AND VIRTUE.

To you, and you alone, who have a sincere regard for truth and virtue, (if I may say what I verily believe to be true,) the following work of that excellent
man, Hugo Grotius, is addressed and dedicated. Where that regard is wanting, the work cannot be acceptable, because the main object of it is to place in a clear light the truth of the Gospel, totally unconnected with the bias of any party or sect whatsoever; and that solely with a view to generate virtue, evangelical virtue, in the minds of men. But to give due effect to these two great principles, the mind must previously esteem what is true and virtuous, because false and vicious characters are hardened against impressions of that nature: without some prepossession of a right tendency, perhaps even this invaluable little book may be perused unprofitably. "Be ye doers of the word," (says the Apostle James, i. 22) "and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves: for if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was: but whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." He who has read this book on the truth of Christianity, and who has clearly understood the doctrines and precepts which it contains, without any practical improvement, is in a worse condition than if he had never read it: for its object is not only to make us wiser, but most especially to make us better. The Stoic Epictetus, the most eminent philosopher of that sect, made the following reply to a person who thought himself a proficient in philosophy, and who was desirous that
Epictetus should examine him in the tenets maintained by Chrysippus, in his treatise on the "active powers," in proof of the attention with which he had been studying that treatise: "Wretch," (said he,) "that is not the object of my inquiry;—the question is, how you regulate your 'desires and aversions' with respect to good and evil? how you seek the one and avoid the other? how you acquit yourself in point of conduct? how you manage 'the assents of the understanding,' and exercise your powers in self-preparation for all events? Whether you act 'conformably to nature' or contrary to it? If indeed conformably, then show me the proof, and I will allow your proficiency; but if otherwise, depart." In like manner, whosoever shall read this work of Grotius, and the treatises annexed to it, with an actual improvement of his conduct, shall have a right to speak of his proficiency; but if he continue in wrong habits, inconsistent with the precepts of the Gospel here stated, he shall be justly deemed to have made no proficiency, and to be unworthy of their perusal; for their object, as I have observed, is not only to make men wiser by that perusal, but, above all, to make them better, and to fix their perseverance in well-doing to the latest moment of their lives! That this may be the happy effect of them to our readers as well as to myself, I earnestly wish and devoutly pray! Farewell.

JOHN LE CLERC.

Amsterdam, March 1, 1724.

* Diss. book i. § 4.
THE TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

Few works have been so repeatedly and so extensively edited as the Treatise of Grotius on the Truth of Christianity. We are told by the author that it was first written in Dutch verse, when he was in a state of rigorous imprisonment in the Castle of Louvestein, or Lupstein, in South Holland; where he was confined from June 6th, 1619, to March 22d, 1621. Happily, on that day he effected his escape, by means highly honourable to the spirit and affection of his wife. It would be foreign to my purpose to detail the circumstances which led to that imprisonment, as they would require an historical memoir of the civil tumults and religious dissentions which prevailed at that period. Suffice it to observe, that the distinguished situation of Grotius as Pensionary of Rotterdam, his particular intimacy with Barneveldt, and that superiority of talents and virtue which rendered him equally an object of admiration to his friends, and of jealousy to his enemies, pre-
sented him to those enemies among the foremost of their victims, when he stood, arrested and impeached,—a Patriot, opposed to the power and ambition of Prince Maurice,—an Arminian Remonstrant, before a synod of Bigots! Happily, as I have said, the strenuous advocate of toleration and liberty neither bled, like his friend, on the scaffold of Persecution, nor languished without relief in the prison of Tyranny.—In a few months after his escape into France (see his Letter to G. J. Vossius, Sept. 29, 1621,) it appears that Grotius was printing his original work, “Partum Doloris quondam mei,” as he elsewhere calls it in allusion to his prison; and he translated it into Latin prose in the year 1628; chiefly, as it seems, at the repeated request of the French Advocate-General, to whom he dedicated an improved edition of it at Paris in 1639. See page 15 of Mr. Hewitt’s edition. See also the Introductory Section of the First Book. Three editions of the Latin Treatise were published between the years 1628 and 1632, the last with some additions; and the author finally published his work, with the annotations, in 1640, about five years before his death. Prior to this date an English translation had appeared; but it is described in most
unfavourable terms by Bishop Patrick, as being very defective and erroneous; neither did he know the translator's name. We are told by Grotius (see Grotii Epist. ad G. J. Vossium 883, p. 389. ed. Amstel. 1687.) that about the same period there were "two translations into the German language, and one into the French, besides a Greek version by the Chaplain to the English Ambassador at Paris, and another by the Romanists themselves into the Persian tongue, that, by God's blessing, it might convert the Mahometans." Besides other versions of this Treatise into the languages of Sweden, Denmark, China and Malacca, (in addition to the repeated versions of it into the languages already mentioned, especially the French,) there have been, as we are assured, three Arabic translations; and one of them which fell into the hands of Dr. James Spon and Sir George Wheeler, was mistaken by those celebrated travellers for an original work, so as to render the real author suspected of plagiarism.

It is further remarkable, that the history of this little Treatise has been made the subject of another. See "Johannis Christophori Lockeri Dissertatio Epistolica, Historiam Libelli Grotiani de Veritate Religionis Christianæ complectens,"
There is likewise a German translation of this Treatise in verse, by Martin Opitz, who was styled the Father of German Poetry; and soon after the restoration of Charles the Second, our learned countryman Dr. Pococke published his Arabic version, which is said to have obtained for him a liberal reward from that eminent scholar and munificent patron of scholars, the Honourable Robert Boyle, who dispersed a whole impression of it (as he did that of the New Testament in the Malayan tongue) entirely at his own expense. Grotius mentions an interview with Pococke in his Epist. ad Fratrem, 534, p. 914. edit. Amstel. 1687.

An English translation by Mr. Clement Bardsdale, about the date 1669, is mentioned by Bishop Patrick in the Preface to his own version, in the year 1680 (when he was Dean of Peterborough); but, before he was apprized of that translation, he had undertaken the same task on the basis of the old anonymous and imperfect version already noticed, with the addition of a Seventh Book against Popery. But this is now superseded by many later publica-
tions*; and indeed, with all its merit, it has become unavoidably obsolete in point of style,—a circumstance which, with other changes effected by the lapse of time, and with other writers produced by its advance, often consigns to an obscure shelf the most valuable materials and the most venerable names!

Among the principal editions, in order of time, I now advert to those of Mr. John Le Clerc, in the years 1709, 1717, and 1724. To the first of them he added a Treatise on “the Choice of a Religious Creed,” &c., and to the last a short Tract against “Religious Indifference;” to the second he annexed some notes on the text and annotations of Grotius; and these, in an English version, with his Prefaces,

* See, more especially, Archbishop Secker’s “Five Sermons against Popery;” and “The Errors of the Church of Rome detected,” &c. by the Rev. Mr. Smith, a convert from Popery. See also “A Short Defence of the Church of England,” and a subsequent “Letter” of Archdeacon Churton, (to be recommended and applauded utroque pollice!) and Mr. Grant’s “Appendix to the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,” in his “Summary of the History of the Christian Church.”

The Roman Catholics and their advocates have lately occasioned the very seasonable publication of some Episcopal Charges, of unanswerable force; added to other able and conclusive Tracts, in refutation of their tenets and their claims.
and with the Testimonies which he collected in proof of our author's attachment to the Church of England, are included in this volume: the translation is adapted to the late accurate edition of the Latin text by the Rev. Richard Hewitt, of Hertford College, Oxford, printed at the Clarendon Press, 1807.

But here I must expect to be reminded that my office has been long since anticipated by the late Dr. Clarke, Dean of Salisbury; and I must admit that this circumstance involves me in some difficulty, because I cannot sufficiently apologize for the present publication, without a seeming endeavour to depreciate the version which preceded it: nor could I hope to be exempt from this invidious charge, had I not proposed to myself some additional objects in the task which I have undertaken: I mean, more especially, that of giving a fuller and more exact explanation of those various passages in which Grotius has referred, very briefly and obscurely, to the titles and books of ancient writers: I certainly presume to think that this desideratum has been often noticed by the readers of Grotius; and that a new translation, for this purpose amongst others, has been long deemed expedient, if I may not call it necessary.
In further apology I may be permitted to plead that the six books of Grotius were translated above thirty years ago (when the Dean's English version was unknown to me) as an exercise of private improvement, preparatory to my ordination: and when I was apprized of that version, I stated the particular and distinct purpose which still induced me to commit my translation to the press: but the reasons which at that time overruled my first intention of withholding it are not indeed available on this occasion; the chief motives of the present attempt are the leisure of retirement,—my increasing unfitness for the active duties of my profession,—the limited extent of the qualifications required,—and a strong persuasion of the useful nature of my task, if properly performed: but, in fact, the only pleas which concern the public or satisfy the reader, are those of fuller information and additional assistance. If in this light I may claim some imperfect success, I must add, that my pretensions are yet very inferior to my wishes.

There is an Oxford edition of the original work, 12mo. 1675, which contains our author's notes at the conclusion of his text; in which respect I have followed the Editor's example, as b
I apprehend that the general class of readers who wish to peruse an English version would find an interruption from those frequent quotations and references which occur at great length in some parts of the work; while other readers may still consult them on particular passages with very little trouble.

But before I conclude this cursory notice of the principal editions and translations of a work so highly and so justly esteemed, it may be proper to observe, that Le Clerc's last edition of it in 1724 was soon followed by a republication of that work at Leipsic, with another distinct treatise annexed to it, which appears to contain some pointed remarks on the first treatise of the last-mentioned Editor. The name indeed is not expressly noticed, but the title of that treatise is copied in a very significant manner: To the original text and annotations of Grotius "accidunt Ernesti Salomonis Cypriani Analecta, et de eligendâ inter Christianos religione dissidentes sententiae brevis Consultatio." Lipsiae, 1726. The Author strongly argues against a proposition which Le Clerc apparently maintains, where he states the Christian doctrine, sufficient for salvation, to consist in those points in which all Christians agree, ("de
quibus consentiunt omnes Christiani,”) and he elsewhere describes it to be that which is deduced “ex Christianorum omnium sententia.” The German Professor argues on the other hand, that, if this proposition be admitted, it becomes at once a matter of indifference for the attainment of eternal salvation, whether men receive or reject any other points of Christian doctrine which are not universally believed. This rule, then, (he observes) would supersede a very large portion of revealed religion: “Misellus philosophus is foret, qui ea tantum dogmata traderet discipulis, in quibus omnes philosophi consentiunt: Eadem ratio esset Doctoris ea solùm quæ omnes, qui Christianum nomen usurpant, credere se aiunt, docentis. Nihil deträhendum est revelatis fidei capitibus. Quantula autem illius doctrinæ pars ab omnibus recipitur? Quaṃ multa deträhuntur etiam ab iis qui plurima addidère? Non omnes Christiani sentiunt plebi in eucharistia vinum consecratum dari oportere. Ergone luculentissima Christi Institutio non est (tanquam in primis necessaria observatu) inculcanda, quia magna orbis Christiani pars eam corruptit? Totum novum testamentum in eo elaborat, ut Christum pro Redemptore humani generis habeamus, qui sanguine suo divinae justitiae fecis-
set satis:” And more to the same effect in the 4th chapter of his treatise; "Christus enim non aliqua sed omnia sua dogmata discipulis ad credendum proposuit."

The extracts here given will perhaps be acceptable to some of my readers, (where the Leipsic edition may not be at hand,) as affording some insight into one of the chief subjects of that treatise; nor is the writer’s aim, I think, less evident from other passages and other chapters. And certainly, when it is considered how few tenets of Christianity are embraced by all Christians, I should have been inclined to adduce further extracts, if I could suppose that the proposition of Le Clerc was intended to be taken in the strictest sense; but surely the articles of faith which he enumerates, § iv. to which he adds “Hæc et alia cum his necessario connexa credunt omnes Christiani,” cannot fail to exempt him from a just application of these strictures: though, I fear, he must be charged with a gross degree of error in having supposed that all those articles do really constitute the unanimous creed of all Christians. And yet I know not how to doubt the German writer’s intended application of them, when I observe the similar title of his treatise, the date of it, and,
above all, the very words of Le Clerc so repeatedly quoted. At the same time, the "brevis Consultatio" of this edition, from the general purport of the author's observations on the difficult creed of infidels, as well as on the proper use of reason in matters of religion, appears to me to warrant a particular recommendation of it to those who hold themselves at liberty to select from the Gospel as much as they think proper to believe, while they scruple not to reject those tenets which may not coincide with their own prejudices. "Pauca quaedam dogmata a reliquis secernunt, tanquam suffectura, si crederentur, salutem aeternam adepturis: caetera autem omnia indigna ducunt pro quibus decertetur; et jam non ipsam evangelii doctrinam, sed consensum Christianorum, aut, citius dixerim, depravatam rationem, fidei regulam, mensuramque credendorum constituunt, perinde ac si palam dicerent—quidquid omnes, qui Christiani ducuntur, credunt, id creditum ad salutem consequendam sati est."


It is further observable of this edition, that the "Analecta" seem to be a respectable collection of additional notes and apposite extracts
from various authors, placed (with the longer Greek passages) at the end of the Latin text.

And now, in conclusion, let me depurate the censure of those readers to whom this publication will afford neither instruction nor assistance: the whole motive and design of it may be stated in few words. An intimate knowledge of the original treatise is indispensable to every young clergyman, and therefore I have attempted to facilitate the professional study of it: a competent knowledge of the contents of that treatise is highly important to all Christians, and therefore I have attempted to promote the more general perusal of a work which demonstrates the truth of Christianity; and to improve the means of understanding it by explaining some imperfect references, and by adding some occasional information. If, then, my endeavours should conduce to these ends in any reasonable degree, my utmost pretensions will be fully maintained. It has been shown, I hope sufficiently, what unbounded admiration the name of Grotius has excited during a period of two hundred years; proclaiming in all languages, through a great part of that period, the value and importance of this little portion of his labours: Could we duly appreciate the
whole extent of his works, and the whole range of his powers, in general literature,—in civil polity,—in laws human and divine,—the united force of those languages would hardly do justice to his merits.

Spr. Madan.

Ibstock, August 25, 1813.

P. S. In further proof of the variety of means by which this incomparable work of Grotius has been proposed to public notice, there is, I believe, in the Library of Sion College a poetical translation of it, 8vo. 1686: and because the treatise made its original appearance in Dutch verse, (as I have before observed,) another view of it has been exhibited in English rhyme (within my own memory) by the Rev. Charles L'Oste, Rector of Langton in Lincolnshire: it is described by the author to be a "Poem" founded on this treatise, or, at the most, "a translation of much latitude."

I must still allow myself to add, (as every kind of anecdote respecting so great a man as Grotius obtains an interest in our feelings,) that a picture of Hugo Grotius, by Cornelius Jansen, was an article in Dr. Mead's collection;
and that the following distich, written by Dr. Mead, was inscribed under the portrait:

"Unicus, immensum qui cepit mente capaci
Doctrinarum Orbem, Grotius hiece fuit."

See Beloe's Anecdotes of Literature, vol. i. p. 169.

The Grave of Grotius, on the other hand, is said to be distinguished by the following concise and modest epitaph, written by himself:

"Grotius hic Hugo est, Batavum captivus et exul;
Legatus Regni, Suecia magna, tui!"
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VIII. Such were the Jewish sacrifices, which never, in themselves, were pleasing to God.
IX. Such, likewise, was the distinction of clean and unclean meats.
X. The distinction of days.
XI. And the outward sign of circumcision.
SECTION.

XII. And even in these very ceremonies great lenity and toleration were shown towards the Jews by the apostles of our Saviour.

XIII. A refutation of Judaism from the general confession of a promised Messiah, of infinite and unequalled excellence.

XIV. That the Messiah hath already been on earth is proved from the previous indication of the time of his coming.

XV. (Neither can it in reason be supposed that the sins of the people should retard his coming.)

XVI. The same position proved from the present condition of the Jews compared with the promises contained in the law.

XVII. The predictions delivered in respect to the Messiah demonstrate Jesus to be that very person.

XVIII. In reply to those who argue that some predictions remain still unaccomplished.

XIX. To those also who offer as an argument against us, the humble condition in which Jesus lived, and the ignominious nature of his death.

XX. As well as the reputed probity of those who delivered up our Saviour to the cross.

XXI. In reply to the charge of polytheism alleged against the Christians.

XXII. As well as to the charge alleging that they worship a being of the same nature with themselves.

XXIII. A dismissal of the subject, with prayer for the Jews.

BOOK VI. p. 179.

I. A refutation of Mahometanism:—the origin of that religion.

II. An utter subversion of Mahometanism on the ground of its precluding all religious inquiry.

III. The Mahometans confuted from the Scriptures of the Hebrews and Christians; neither are those scriptures corrupted.

IV. From a comparison of Mahomet with Christ.

V. Of the actions also respectively performed by them.

VI. The primitive receivers of each doctrine considered.

VII. The methods respectively employed in the propagation of the two religions.

VIII. A comparison of the precepts respectively enjoined by them.

IX. The Mahometans absurdly object against us for styling Jesus the Son of God.
SECTION.

X. Numerous absurdities in the books of the Mahometans.

XI. A conclusive address to all Christians in general; the foregoing observations affording us a proper opportunity to admonish them of their own duty.

MR. LE CLERC'S TWO BOOKS.

BOOK I. p. 199.

I. It is proper to inquire among what description of Christians the true doctrine of Christ preserves at this day its greatest purity and vigour.

II. We should attach ourselves to those persons who best deserve the name of Christians.

III. They best deserve the name of Christians who, above all others, profess in its greatest purity that doctrine, the truth of which has been proved by Grotius.

IV. On points of agreement and disagreement among Christians.

V. From what source we all ought to derive our knowledge of the Christian religion.

VI. Nothing ought to be imposed on Christians as a duty, but what may be clearly deduced from the New Testament.

VII. The providence of God is truly admirable in his preservation of the doctrines of Christianity.

VIII. An answer is given to those persons who would inquire why God has permitted any divisions and errors to arise among Christians.

IX. They who propose only those points as necessary articles of our faith, our practice, and our hope, which Christians unanimously receive, profess and teach Christianity in the purest manner.

X. It is the duty of all discreet persons to be partakers of the Sacrament in communion with those persons who require nothing more from Christians than a compliance with the plain undisputed purport of the books of the New Testament.

XI. On the subject of church government.

XII. The primitive form of church government was highly esteemed by Grotius, but without any violence of censure against that of a later date.

XIII. All Christian disputants are exhorted to require from each other no points of doctrine as being contained in the New Testament, which are not unanimously admitted and uniformly received as true.
SECTION.

I. Truth must be always an object of regard, but especially in questions of great importance.

II. Nothing is of greater importance than religion, and consequently the knowledge of it demands our most diligent exertions.

III. Indifference on the subject of religion is in its own nature unlawful; it is expressly prohibited by the laws of God; and it is universally reprobated in the Christian world.

IV. We must not hastily impute to those persons who dissent from our own tenets a gross state of error, or an unlawful mode of worship, incompatible with eternal salvation, so that none of them can be objects of divine mercy; neither is it lawful for us, on the other hand, to profess a belief which we do not entertain, nor to comply with practices which our own principles condemn.

V. Error, and even sin resulting from error, may find favour and forgiveness from God; but hypocrisy never can.

Testimonies adduced to show the very favourable opinion which Hugo Grotius entertained of the Church of England, p. 254

Annotations of Grotius, Le Clerc, and others . . 265
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THE

TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY, &c.

TO THE MOST EXCELLENT
JEROME BIGNON,
KING'S ADVOCATE-GENERAL, ETC.

BOOK THE FIRST.

SECTION I.

THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENT WORK.

What may be the purport of my writings, in behalf of Christianity, as they are delivered in my native language, is a question, noble Sir, which you frequently propose to me; you who are a man entitled altogether to every honour which your country can confer, to every commendation which the cause of letters can bestow, and (suffer me to add) to every acknowledgement which my poor services can offer.—The question, I confess, I by no means wonder at from you; for a man of your extensive, or rather universal reading, assisted, at the same time, by the clearest judgement, cannot fail to recollect how highly the subtle disquisitions of 1 Raymonde de Sebonde, the
Various matter of the Discourses of Ludovicus Vives; the infinite erudition as well as eloquence of your own countryman Philippe Du Plessis Mornay, have polished and adorned that subject. It therefore might be thought a more useful undertaking to have translated for my countrymen, some work of the authors above mentioned, rather than to offer them a new treatise.

What others may determine upon this particular, I know not; but a judge of your lenity and goodness will, I trust, readily acquit me if I say, that after having read not only the works we have been speaking of, but all the controversial writings also of the Jews and Christians, (the one in defence of the ancient Jewish; the other in defence of the Christian; dispensation,) I have wished to form a judgement of my own, such as it may be, upon the point in question; and to give that freedom to my mind, which, when I was writing it, my body was forbidden to enjoy.

I was used to consider it incumbent on me to contend for the truth; to contend, indeed, for such a truth, as I myself could inwardly and cordially approve; well knowing how fruitless it would be to attempt the conviction of others in a matter wherein I had not previously convinced myself. I selected therefore, as well from ancient as from modern authors, whatever appeared to me the best and most authentic; having set aside every argument which I thought immaterial in point of weight; and rejected every book which I either knew with certainty, or with reason suspected, to be bad in point of authenticity. Whatever I myself was able to admit upon conviction, I then digested under proper heads, and explained in as familiar a manner as I
could; and in order to assist the memory in retaining it, I turned it into verse. For my design was, to compose something that might be serviceable indeed to my fellow citizens in general, but especially to the sea-faring part of our community; that so they might employ usefully, rather than beguile idly, as too many of them do, the number of leisure hours they must necessarily have upon their hands at sea. And therefore, prefacing the work with some encomiums on the Dutch nation, representing them as easily capable of excelling others in the art of navigation, I urged them to employ that art, as a blessing peculiarly given from above; not only for the service of their private ends and temporal advantage, but also for the propagation of the true, or in other words the Christian religion. Sufficient opportunities, I observed, would constantly present themselves, in the course of long and distant voyages; continually meeting, as they must be, everywhere, either with Pagans, as in China or in Guinea; with Mahometans, as in the Turkish, the Persian, and the African dominions; or indeed, lastly, with Jews, (these also being now become professed enemies of Christianity,) dispersed and scattered, as they are, into almost every country of the known world. Neither will they fail to find everywhere a sufficient number of evil-minded persons, at all times ready to disclose among the simple and unwary those poisonous opinions which fear may induce them to conceal elsewhere. It therefore is my earnest wish that my countrymen may be rightly armed against the dangers that await them; that they amongst them whom God hath blessed with superior abilities, may apply
themselves with strenuous and manly resolution to overcome the errors of other men, while the rest, on their part, may at least be careful to defend themselves.

SECTION II.

THE EXISTENCE OF A DEITY.

In order then to show that religion is a matter of no frivolous or imaginary nature, I begin, in my first book, to inquire into the very foundation of it; I mean, the existence of a Deity. The proof of which I thus attempt. All men must be sensible, and all men do acknowledge, that there are certain things which must have had a beginning. Now those things were not the cause of their own existence, for that which hath no existence can have no agency, neither could the thing itself be before it was. It follows therefore that they must have had their origin from some other pre-existent cause. And this we must admit, not only in regard to those things which we ourselves either do see or have seen, but also in regard to those things whence they derived their origin, still at length, we can arrive at some cause, which never had a beginning, and which existed (as we are wont to express it) not casually, but necessarily. Now this, whatever it may ultimately be, (which shall be the subject of a future inquiry,) is that very essence which is signified by the word Deity or God.—Another proof of the existence of a Deity, arises from the manifest and concurrent opinion of all nations whatsoever, in which reason and morality are not absolutely extinguished by the introduction of downright barbarism.—Now since all the institutions
of man's arbitrary pleasure can never possibly be the same throughout all mankind, and are certain, from their very nature, to undergo continual changes; since, also, this notion (of a Deity) is found to be of the most absolute universality, neither has it been affected by the changes and revolutions of ages (a circumstance remarked even by Aristotle himself, who was a man by no means credulous in affairs of this nature,) it is highly necessary, that some general and universal reason for this fact should be assigned; and this *must* either be, a declaration from God himself, or a tradition which hath gradually descended from the first parents of mankind. The former of which, if we admit it, brings our inquiry into proof; if the latter, no sufficient reason surely can be given, to justify our belief that those first parents should willingly transmit to all posterity a falsehood in matters of the most important moment. This notion, moreover, discovers itself, whether we examine those parts of the world which were intimately known many years ago, or those but newly explored; wherever, as we before observed, the smallest spark of humanity remains yet unextinguished; as well among nations the most eminent either for natural abilities, or for acquired learning, as among those of inferior comprehension. Of the former, it is in no wise credible that they *could all* have been deceived; nor of the latter, that they could ever have found means to practise such a deceit (so universally) upon one another.—Neither is there room here for any one to offer in objection, those few persons, who, during the course of many ages, have either actually or professedly disbelieved the Divine Existence: since the very
smallness of their number, and the universal rejection which their opinion hath met with as soon as their arguments have been understood, sufficiently demonstrate that their idea resulted not from the proper application of that right reason, with which all men are endowed; but that it arose from an inquisitive partiality to all novel assertions, as eccentric as his, who was wont to contend that the colour of snow was black; or from a depraved and corrupt state of mind, to which, as to a vitiated palate, things give not their real relish: and this more especially, since, from all histories and writings whatsoever, we learn that the more good and upright the character of each individual hath been, the more diligent hath been his perseverance in the notion and belief of a God. — Thus, therefore, while this departure from an opinion so anciently received, hath evidently for the most part arisen from the depraved understanding of those men, whose interest it is that there should be no God, that is, no judge of human actions; it is also evident to every one, upon a very moderate degree of consideration, that whether they wish rather to maintain as their position, an infinite general succession without any beginning, or the casual concurrence of atoms, or whatever else they please; it cannot have less, if it hath not greater difficulties, neither can it have greater credibility, than that which is at present established. — As to the objection of them who disbelieve, because they do not see, the Deity; surely, if they see any thing, they must see the disgrace of such an idea to any man who merely believes that he is possessed of a mind; which very mind is equally invisible. Neither are we authorized
to deny, because we are unable to comprehend the nature of the Deity: as every inferior must necessarily, as such, be incompetent to understand those natures which are superior and more excellent. The beasts know not even what man is: much less do they know by what means he is able to institute and regulate societies; to measure the courses of the stars, and to sail upon the ocean. All these things exceed their comprehension. Inasmuch then as the nature of man (and that by no power of his own) is made higher than the nature of beasts, he is fairly compelled to infer, that that power by which he was so made, cannot be less superior to the human, than he is to the brutal, creation; and that therefore some being doth exist, which, as it is of an excellence superior to his, is also of a nature superior to the measure of his comprehension.

SECTION III.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

The existence of a Deity being proved, we come now to consider his attributes. And first, there are not many gods, but one God. This appears from what we before observed, that God is that Being which exists necessarily and of itself. Now every thing exists necessarily and of itself, that can be considered not by way of genus, but by way of actuality; for this actuality implies singularity. Whereas if you admit of many gods, you can now find no necessary cause of existence in any single one; nor any reason for a belief in two rather than in three; in ten rather than in five. Moreover, the multiplication of individuals of the same species de-
pends upon the fecundity of causes, according to which the things themselves are produced in smaller or in greater numbers. But, of God, there is no origin or cause whatsoever. Then again in different individuals are certain singular and respective properties and distinctions; which it is needless to declare of God, who is essentially necessary. Neither are any traces of a plurality of gods any where observable. The entire system of the universe maketh but one world; therein is one most glorious body, the Sun; and indeed in every individual person is one ruling power, the mind.—Besides, if there were two or more supreme governors of the world, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations. The operations of one might consequently impede those of another; whereas the very idea of impediment is altogether derogatory from the Divine Being.

SECTION IV.

THE ABSOLUTE PERFECTION OF GOD.

To enable us to have a knowledge of the other attributes of God, we must understand, that in him is all imaginable perfection. (The Greek expression is Τελειότης.) And that every perfection in the nature of things either had or had not a beginning: that which had no beginning is of God. That which had a beginning necessarily began from something. And since none of those things, which are made, could be made from nothing, it follows, that those perfections visible in the effects, must have existed in the cause; that according to those perfections, the cause might be enabled to produce the effect, and that
therefore they were all contained in the prime cause. Neither could the prime cause be deprived of any perfection at a subsequent period, or by any other means; for that which is eternal dependeth not on other agencies, neither can it be affected by their operations, nor even by its own, since all nature invariably tends towards its own perfection.

SECTION V.

THE INFINITY OF GOD'S PERFECTIONS.

The perfections of God must also be considered as of an infinite degree. Because the attribute of every other being has an end, either from the limited communication which it received from the producing cause, or from the limited capacity of the produced effect; but no nature communicates any thing of itself to God, neither does he himself receive any thing from any other, he being, as we have before observed, necessarily and self-existent.

SECTION VI.

GOD IS ETERNAL, ALMIGHTY, ALL-WISE, AND ALL-GOOD.

It is undeniably evident, that those things are said to be of greater excellence, which have life, than those things which have none. The same must be clear in respect to power, intellects, and goodness. Now it follows, from what we have just been saying, that all these attributes are united in the Deity; and that in an infinite degree. It therefore follows that he is of infinite life, that is, eternal; of
boundless power, that is, almighty; so also that he is all-wise, and entirely and unexceptionably good.

SECTION VII.

GOD IS THE UNIVERSAL CAUSE.

That all things in existence derive the origin of that existence from God, is an inference inseparably connected with the foregoing premises. For we have conclusively agreed, that a being, necessarily and self-existent, must have an "intrinsical and essential singularity." Whence it follows that all other things must be produced from something distinct from themselves. And we have already seen, that all those things which originate from another, originate; mediately or immediately, from that which had no beginning; that is, from God. And not only doth our reason, but our very senses in a manner, evince this truth. For if we behold the wonderful construction, internal as well as external, of the human body, and observe how every the minutest part thereof hath its peculiar use and office, not by any laboured contrivance or diligent design of the parent, but by such exquisite art, that the most skilful philosophers and physicians can never express their admiration of it sufficiently, we cannot but be assured, that the great "Artificer of the world" is infinitely wise and excellent. (See Galen on this subject, particularly where he considers the use of the eye and hand.) Yea, dumb as they are, the very animals speak to us the same truth. For not from any material cause or power, are the component parts of them so framed and fashioned, but for a certain and appointed end.
Nor of the animal creation alone is this appointed end observable, but even, as philosophers have accurately remarked, of the very plants and herbs, Strabo, in particular, hath made the same observation in the disposition of the watery element; for that, if we regard the gravitating quality of matter, ought properly to hold an intermediate place between the earth and air; whereas now it is poured forth and distributed throughout all the terrestrial division; doubtless that nothing might be ordained prejudicial to the fruitfulness of the earth, and to the existence of mankind. Now to act so as to have some one ultimate end in view, is the property of an intelligent nature only: the operation, however, of each natural agent, individually, is not appointed solely with a view to its own peculiar end, but also for the general purpose of the whole world. We find the water mount upward, in contradiction to its innate properties, lest a yawning vacuum should intervene in the compact fabric of the universe; a fabric constituted to support itself by the constant cohesion of all its parts. Never then, is it most evident, could this grand universal end have been designed, never could the adequate power of operation, tending to the completion of that end, have been implanted in the creation, but by that over-ruling wisdom to which this universe must own unlimited subjection.

Furthermore, it is manifest, that the methodical and pertinent line of action which even animals in some instances observe, must certainly originate in a principle of reason. In ants and bees this is most particularly apparent; but in other creatures also it is sufficiently visible, when, wholly unassisted by any
previous experiment, they instinctively shun what would be hurtful, and seek after those things of proper and beneficial tendency. It is at the same time manifest, that they do not independently possess this faculty of discernment and distinction, from the uniform and exact similarity of method in which they all invariably act, and from their total incapacity of other operations in no respect more difficult. Those actions therefore must necessarily proceed from some efficient source of reason, either externallly directing them, or internally imparted to them; which source of reason is, in fact, none other than that which we call the Deity.—Then again, how seasonably calculated for the fertility of the earth, how inconceivably well adapted to the constitution of every living creature, are the motions of the heavenly bodies, and of those chief glories of them, the sun and moon! The equator (it is true) would have been, on other accounts, a plainer and less intricate line of motion; but we see them commanded to proceed in the oblique circle of the ecliptic, that their service to the earth may be the more extensively beneficial. And whereas, to animals in general that earth is made subservient, so especially to the dominion of man all other animals are subject; so that he can subdue the most ungovernable by his pre-eminent faculty of reason. From this consideration, even the Stoics were wont to infer, that the world was made for the sake of man. Inasmuch then as it is utterly beyond the reach of all human ability to enforce obedience from the heavenly bodies, neither is it credible that they have voluntarily bound themselves to observe any
obedience; it follows, that some active principle of superior ability must certainly exist, commanding those bodies, all glorious as they are, to render perpetual service unto man, though his situation be so far beneath them. And what can we suppose this active principle to be, but the Maker of that planetary system, the Maker of the world at large?—

The revolutions in particular of those planets, whereof some are said to be eccentrical, and others epicyclical, afford ample testimony that they arise not from any necessary effect of matter, but at the appointment of a Being altogether free and independent. The fixed stars bear witness of the same, in their different disposition throughout the firmament of heaven; the vast disproportion also of the land and waters. To what other agency is it possible to ascribe the partial direction of the celestial bodies? The beautiful perfection likewise displayed even in the very figure of the world, the manner also in which the parts thereof are comprised, as it were, within the bosom of the heaven, and disposed in the most amazing harmony, sufficiently declare them produced by no casual confluence whatever, but made and appointed by wisdom, and that too of the highest excellence. For what degree of absurdity can induce the expectation of any thing so regularly constructed from chance, as to make a man believe, that by the power of chance the stones and wood will ever grow up together into the form of a house, or that chance will produce a poem from letters promiscuously thrown together; when even he, who saw some geometrical figures in the sand, declared them to be infallible traces of a human perf
istence of two active principles (or prime causes), the one good, and the other evil. Competitors, indeed, may occasion the subversion, but never the establishment, of order. Something, intrinsically good, there undoubtedly is; but, that something should in like manner be; intrinsically and entirely evil, is by no means possible; for evil is a certain defect, which cannot be, but in something in existence; and that very existence is already of the nature of good.

SECTION X.

THAT THE UNIVERSE IS GOVERNED BY GOD.

The affectionate care displayed towards their offspring, not only by the human race, that is to say, by creatures of reason and understanding, but also by the whole animal creation in general, as well of birds as of beasts, under every denomination (for to them also there is a something given in the place of understanding), makes it fully apparent, that the universe is governed by the providence of God. Now this perfection, as it is a species of goodness, we can on no account withhold from God; more especially as he himself is omniscient and omnipotent, and therefore cannot possibly be ignorant either of present or of future transactions; both of which, with infinite facility, himself is able to dispose and govern. To this place is applicable our former observation, on the [Sect. vii.] motion of things, in contradiction to their innate properties, because of the appointed universal end.
SECTION XI.

SO LIKewise ARE THINGS SUBLUNARY.

The great error of that opinion which confines this providence to the system of the heavens, is manifest, as well from the argument just now alleged, the force of which displays itself throughout all things that are made, as also from the appointed courses of the heavenly bodies; appointed, as the ablest philosophers avow, and as experience sufficiently demonstrates, so for the use of man. Now it is but reasonable that the object, for the sake of which any thing is ordained, should receive more attention than the thing so ordained for the use of that object.

SO LIKewise ARE THINGS INDIVIDUAL.

Nor less erroneous is that opinion, which admits a general, but not a particular, Providence. For if, as some profess to do, we make the Deity ignorant of things individual, the very Deity will be ignorant of himself. Neither will his knowledge be infinite, as we have already determined it to be, if it be not extended to every particular.—Now if God hath a knowledge of those particulars, why may not he also have a providence over them? especially since even every thing individual, considered as such, is appointed for a certain end, as well peculiar as universal; and since also the very genera, which these writers themselves allow to be objects of the Divine care, subsist only in individuals; so that if the individuals can perish, totally renounced by the providence of God, so too the genera themselves may in like manner perish.
SECTION XII.

THE PRESERVATION OF EMPIRES A PROOF OF GOD'S PROVIDENCE.

The preservation of states is equally acknowledged by philosophers and historians to be no inconsiderable proof of the Divine Providence over human affairs. And this, in the first place, generally; 22 from the constant continuance of that regulation, wherever it is once established, which teaches command on the one hand, and obedience on the other: often also, in the second place, specially; from the long duration of this or that particular form of government, which is seen to obtain for many ages together: the monarchy, for instance, of the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and the Franks; the aristocracy of Venice. Something, it is true, might be done to this effect, by the sole power of human wisdom; yet, if we properly consider the multitude of wicked and evil-minded men (which every state contains within itself), the dangers also to which it is liable from without; and the vicissitudes which are, as it were, inseparably annexed to the affairs of men, it seems impossible that any empire should subsist so long, but by the peculiar protection of the Divine Being. Still more visibly doth this appear, 23 wheresoever it hath pleased the Deity to bring about the revolutions of empires. For to the instruments he then makes use of, to accomplish his destined purpose (such instruments were Cyrus, Alexander, Caesar the Dictator, 24 Jenghiz-Khan among the Tartars, 25 Nam-cca among the Chinese), success, far above the measure which is generally given by the various for-
tune of all human events, outruns their very wishes. And is not then this wonderful similarity of circumstances, this general conspiracy, as it were, to one appointed end, a certain token of a directing Providence? Chance, indeed, may several times produce the highest cast of the dice; but if the same throw be a hundred times repeated, no man will scruple to pronounce it the effect of art.

SECTION XIII.

PROOF ALSO DERIVED FROM MIRACLES.

The strongest testimony, however, of a Divine Providence, is given us in the miracles and prophecies recorded in history. Fabulous, indeed, are many of the accounts we read; but we are not therefore to reject as impossible the facts which are attested by men of competent authority in their respective ages; that is to say, by men whose ability and integrity are equally unsuspected. For what impediment can a God omnipotent receive, that he should not declare his knowledge, or enforce his will, by means independent of the laws, and foreign to the common operations, of nature; since that nature is by him ordained, in just subjection to the hand which made it?—Now some men may assert that things of this kind may have been effected even by beings inferior to God:—the truth of the assertion shall be granted; but does not this very circumstance prepare the way for a belief, still more implicit, that God can effect them also? Besides, when the actions of those beings are such, we must either esteem them the ac-
tions of God through their means performed, or to them, in his wisdom permitted; since in every well-constituted government, the settled limits of the laws can never be transgressed, unless by the sanction and authority of the supreme ruler.

SECTION XIV.

AMONG THE JEWS ESPECIALLY; WHO HAVE AN ADDITIONAL CLAIM TO OUR BELIEF, FROM THE DURATION OF THEIR RELIGION.

But however we may question the fidelity of other histories, the religion even of the Jews alone may easily convince us that miracles are sometimes in reality observable. The Jewish religion, long since deprived of every human aid, nay exposed to contempt and derision through almost all the countries of the known world, 26 endureth to this day! whereas 27 all other religions (Christianity excepted, which is, as it were, the perfection of the Jewish) have either entirely vanished, and, like the Pagan, have themselves completely lost all power and authority, as empires; or, like the Mahometan, by dint of that same imperial power, they are still kept up, and forcibly continued. And now, should it be inquired, from what cause it ariseth, that Judaism should have taken such deep root in the minds of all the Hebrews, that it cannot possibly be eradicated, none other can be assigned or imagined, than that the present generation should have received from the last, as that did from the preceding, and so backward till we come to that which lived in the days of Moses.
and of Joshua, by sure and constant tradition, those miracles which were wrought for them in divers places; but especially in the Exodus itself, and in the journey from Egypt, and in the entrance into Canaan: miracles, whereof those very forefathers were themselves witnesses.—It is, moreover, incredible, that any other means could possibly have prevailed upon a nation, haughty and rebellious by nature, to take upon themselves a law, so laden with oppressive ceremonials: or that men of sense and understanding, out of the many distinctions which might have been devised for their religion, should select the token of circumcision; a token, which could not be received without excessive pain; a certain object, at the same time, of ridicule from every other people; and, in short, without a single recommendation, save that of its divine origin.

SECTION XV.

FROM THE VERACITY AND ANTIQUITY OF MOSES.

The writings of Moses, which record the miracles we have mentioned, have the fullest claim to our belief; not only from the uninterrupted tradition subsisting among the Hebrews, that the author himself was recommended and appointed to the people as a leader by the voice of the Lord; but also from the certain proofs which he afforded, that no selfish motive of ambition, no partial views of benefit to his family, could have actuated his conduct; that himself should have recorded, when he might have suppressed, his own faults and follies; and, while
his own descendants are reduced to a level with the common Levites, that he should have assigned to others the dignity of the government and of the priesthood.—Hence, then, it must appear most plainly, that he could have no inducement to recite a falsity: neither are the style and language he makes use of by any means such as are in general practised to gain credit to impostures, highly coloured and alluring; but simple and well adapted to the nature of the occasion. An additional claim to our belief in the writings of Moses arises from their undoubted antiquity; a point which none other writing whatever can dispute with them. Of this we have evidence from the Greeks, from whom other nations derived all learning, when they confess themselves to have received certain letters of their language from some other; which letters among them have the same order, the same name, and even the same old character, with the Syriac or Hebrew. In like manner do the most ancient laws of Athens, whence also the Roman were afterwards selected, derive their origin from the laws of Moses.

SECTION XVI.

FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF FOREIGN WRITERS.

The testimonies, moreover, of men who differed altogether in religion from the Jews, may, in no inconsiderable number, be adduced to show that the very earliest traditions prevailing among all nations whatsoever corresponded with the writings of Moses. The accounts left by that writer in respect to the origin of the world, were also nearly the same in
the oldest histories of the Phœnicians, collected by Sanchuniathon, and from him translated by Philo Byblius: partly also in those of the Indians and Egyptians; whence Linus, Hesiod, and many other Greeks, have made mention of a chaos, which others again have signified under the denomination of an egg. Very many writers, and, last of all, Ovid, who took it from the Greeks, have frequently treated of the formation of animals, and lastly of that of man, even after the Divine Likeness; as also of the dominion which was given to man over all other animals. That all things were made by the word of God is declared even by Epicharmus and the Platonists; and before their time by that most ancient poet who was the author, not of those hymns which are extant in that name, but of those verses to which antiquity hath given the appellation of the Carmen Orphicum, not as being the composition, but as containing the traditions of Orpheus. That the sun is not a primitive and original light, but only a receptacle of light (the Δόξημα καὶ Ὀχημα τῆς Πυρός, as an ancient Christian writer expresseth it), was even asserted by Empedocles: Aratus and Catullus pronounced the divine habitation to be higher than the stars; and that therein is light perpetual we are taught by Homer. That before all things were, God is, as not being begotten of any; that the world is of beauty unparalleled, as being the work of God; and that darkness was prior to light, we are instructed by Thales, according to the ancient doctrine: the last article indeed we even find mentioned in the Orphic verses and in Hesiod; and thence the computation of time by nights was
adopted by nations the most tenacious of old customs. Anaxagoras declares that all things were ordained by a supreme mind: Aratus, that the heavenly bodies were made by the Deity: Virgil, after the Greeks, that life proceeded from divine inspiration: Hesiod, Homer, and Callimachus, that man was formed from clay: and finally, it is asserted by Maximus Tyrius to be a tradition unanimously and universally accepted, that there is One Supreme God, the cause of all things. The completion of the work within seven days was a circumstance recorded not only among the people of Greece and Italy, in the particular observance of the seventh day, as we learn from Josephus, from Philo, from Ovid, from Tibullus, from Clemens Alexandrinus, and from Lucian (while at the same time the Hebrew observance of it is universally well known), but also among the Celts and the Indians, who all established an hebdomadal division of time; as appears from Philostratus, from Dion Cassius, from Justin Martyr, as well as from the oldest periodical distinctions. We are even told by the Egyptians, that the primitive state of man was a state of simplicity and of nakedness: and hence arose the golden age of the poets, which, according to Strabo, was celebrated even among the Indians. Maimonides hath remarked, that the accounts of Adam, of Eve, of the tree, and of the serpent, were in his time extant among the idolatrous Indians; and modern writers affirm also, that the same accounts are found among the inhabitants of Pegu and the Calaminsamians, a Pagan people of the same.
Brachmans, and the computation of 6000 years from the foundation of the world is made by the Siamese. The ages of men immediately succeeding the first are recorded by Berosus of the Chaldeans, Manethos of the Egyptians, Hieronymus of the Phœnicians, Hecataeus, and Hellanicus of the Greeks, and by Hesiod among the poets, nearly to have reached 1000 years. Now this is the less incredible, since various historians, and particularly the Graecian Pausanias and Philostratus, and the Roman Pliny, have recorded, that the bodies of men in former times have been found, when their sepulchres were opened, to be of much larger size than those of modern days. Then again, it is related by Catullus, after many Graecian writers, that visions from heaven appeared occasionally unto men before the frequency and greatness of their crimes had as it were excluded the Deity, and the spirits which minister unto him, from all familiar intercourse with mankind. The savage state of giants, as mentioned by Moses, is almost universally spoken of by the Greek and Latin authors. Of the deluge it is observable, that the memory of man in almost all countries terminates in the history of that event; even in those countries which, after having long been totally unknown, were opened to the knowledge of the present day by our more immediate predecessors: whence Varro calls the whole of that period (Ἄδηλον) the dark or unknown age. Poets, it is true, in the right and freedom of fabulous representation, have greatly involved their accounts in obscurity; those accounts, however, were originally given upon authentic grounds; that is to say, agreeably to the
Mosaic relation of them by writers of the greatest antiquity: such were Berosus of the Chaldaeans, Abydenus of the Assyrians, who even mentions the dove which was sent forth, as doth also Plutarch of the Greeks: such too was Lucian, who reports that at Hierapolis in Syria a very ancient history of the ark was extant, together with an account not only of the chosen persons who were thereby preserved, but also of the rest of the animals. The same history was likewise extant according to Molo and Nicholaus Damascenus. The latter indeed expressly mentions the word ark, which also, according to Apollodorus, is met with in the history of Deucalion.—It is further testified by many Spanish authors that some traditional remembrance of the deluge, and of the animals preserved, nay even of the raven and the dove, obtains in parts of America, as in Cuba, in Mehocaecan, in Nicaragua: of the deluge itself also, in that part which is now called Castilla del Oro, or the Golden Castile. Even the observation of Pliny, that Joppa was built before the flood, is declaratory of the parts of the earth inhabited before that event.—The place where the ark rested is shown, by the uniform testimony of the Armenians from the earliest ages to the present day, to have been on the Gordiæan mountains. Japhet, from whom Europe was peopled, and from that word Ion, or, as it was formerly pronounced Javon, of the Greeks, and Hammon of the Africans, are names which appear also in the Mosaic history; and further vestiges of ancient names are noticed by Josephus and others in national and local etymologies. What poet hath not recorded the attempt to scale heaven?
struction of Sodom by fire is related by Diodorus Siculus, by Strabo, by Tacitus, by Pliny, by Solinus. The antiquity of the custom of circumcision has been attested by Herodotus, Diodorus, Strabo, and Philo Byblius: it is attested to this day by the nations descended from Abraham: not only by the Hebrews but by the Idumæans, the Ishmaelites, and others. Accounts of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, and of Joseph, agreeing with the Mosaic, were formerly extant, in Philo Byblius, taken from Sanchuniathon; in Berosus, Hecateus, Damascenus, Aratus, Eupolemus, Demetrius, and partly also in that very ancient author who composed the Orphic verses. Some account of them is even now extant in Justin, taken from Trogus Pompeius. Moses himself and his actions are recorded by almost all those writers. His preservation from the water, and his receipt of the two tables from God, are expressly mentioned in the Orphic verses. To these we may add what is said by Polemon, and frequent passages relative to the departure from Egypt, which are contained in the Egyptian writers, Mantic, Lysimachus, Chæremon. Moreover, it is wholly inconsistent with reason to believe that Moses, hated as he was not only by the Egyptians, but also by many other nations, by the Idumæans, for example, the Arabs, the Phœnicians, should have dared publicly to offer an account of the creation of the world, and of matters of the highest antiquity, when that account might either have been refuted by others preceding, or at least would have had to combat with long-established and general preju-
dices; or, again, that he should have ventured to send forth a representation of the events of his own time, when that representation might have been instantly contradicted by many living witnesses. Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus, and, after them, Dionysius Longinus on the Sublime, have all made mention of Moses: Pliny also and Apuleius, as well as the Talmudists, speak of Jamnes and of Mambres, who made a stand against Moses in Egypt. In some places, but more especially among the Pythagoreans, we find parts of the very laws and ceremonies extant which were appointed by Moses. Proofs so signal are exhibited by Strabo and by Justin, from Trogus, as well of the religion as of the moral justice of the ancient Jews, that it now indeed were needless to adduce the passages which either are or have been discovered, in reference to Joshua and others, correspondent with the Hebrew accounts; for whosoever hath that firm belief in Moses, which, without the greatest indecency, cannot possibly be withheld from him, must acknowledge, from the fullest conviction, that "noble works were done" by the Almighty in the times of old. And this it is the main object of our present argument to prove. The miracles of a later date, those for instance of Elias, of Elisha, and of others, ought so much the less to be thought liable to suspicion, because in their days Judaea was become a country of much greater note, and was, moreover, rendered, by its difference in religion, an object of jealous hatred to all its neighbours; so that they with the greatest ease might have stopped the progress of any spreading imposture. The account
of 144 Jonah, who was three days in the whale’s belly, is given by Lycophron and by Æneas of Gaza; admitting the substitution of the name of Hercules, to whose celebrity it was usual, 145 as Tacitus hath remarked, to attribute generally all great exploits. Julian himself, who was no less an enemy of the Jews than of the Christians, hath actually, by dint of historical evidence, been forced into conviction and confession, 146 that men of divine inspiration did certainly once exist among the Jews; 147 and that fire from heaven did really descend upon the sacrifices of Moses and Elias. And here, indeed, it must be observed, that 148 not only heavy penalties were instituted among the Hebrews for them who should presume falsely to assert to themselves the gift of prophecy; but further, that 149 many kings, who might have established and secured their authority thereby, many of the wisest men also, as Esdras and others were, would never dare to arrogate a title to that honourable function. 151 Neither was it once claimed by any person whatsoever for some ages before Jesus. Much less was it possible that so many thousand persons should be imposed upon by the asseveration of that strange, and, as it were, continual and public sign, 152 the oracular judgement (of the Urim and Thummim) which shone forth perpetually from 153 the breast-plate of the high priest; the duration of which sign until the destruction of the first temple, is always so entirely credited by all the Jews, that it is absolutely necessary that their forefathers must have been convinced of the undoubted certainty of the fact.
SECTION XVII.

THE SAME PROVED FROM PROPHECIES.

Another argument, nearly allied to that of miracles, nor less conclusive of a Divine Providence, arises from that prophetic declaration of future events, which is seen so repeatedly and so manifestly verified among the Hebrews. Such was the prediction which declared that he who should rebuild Jericho should become childless. Such too was that of the destruction of the temple of Bethel by a king, and that king expressly named Josiah, above 300 years before the actual event. Such again was that by Isaiah, of the very name and principal actions of Cyrus, circumstantially foretold: that, likewise, by Jeremiah, of the issue of the siege carried on by the Chaldaeans against Jerusalem: the translation of the empire from the Assyrians to the Medes and Persians, and from them to Alexander, of Macedonia, a part of whose empire should afterwards be divided between the Lagidæ and the Seleucidæ: the ill treatment also which the Hebrews were to experience from all these kings, and especially from the famous Antiochus, were facts so plainly predicted by Daniel, that Porphyrius, who compared the Graecian accounts extant in his time with those predictions, was unable to invent any other subterfuge than that of saying, that the prophecies ascribed to Daniel were written after the events; which is in fact the same as if a man should say that those works which bear the name, and which have always been attributed to the hand of Virgil, were not written by Virgil him-
self in the Augustan age: for the matter we are speaking of has never been any more a point of doubt among the Jews than that was among the Romans. To these we may add the very numerous and striking prophecies among the people of Mexico and Peru relative to the arrival of the Spaniards in those countries, and to the calamities which were thence to follow.

FROM OTHER ARGUMENTS.

163 Hither also may be referred (in confirmation of our assertion) the dreams which, not unfrequently, have happened to men, corresponding with subsequent events which, either in themselves or in their causes, could never possibly have been known to the persons who experienced them; corresponding, I say, with such exactness, that no moderate degree of impi
dence would be requisite to refer them either to chance or to natural causes. 164 Tertullian, in his book De Anima, has collected some remarkable instances of this sort from writers of the highest eminence. The same may be said of 165 apparitions, which not only have been seen, but also have been heard to speak, if we may credit the relations given us by a class of historians very far removed from every impulse and effect of superstitious credulity; as also the testimonies of men of modern times, as well in China as in Mexico, and other parts of America. Neither ought we to despise 166 those public trials of innocence by ordeal fire, which so many of the German nations have not only mentioned in their histories, but actually established by their laws.
SECTION XVIII.

IN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTION, THAT MIRACLES ARE NOT NOW SEEN.

No just objection can possibly be grounded on the observation, that miracles and predictions of this nature are in the present times never known to happen. That they were so formerly is amply demonstrative of a Divine Providence. And this point being once established, it becomes incumbent upon us, of necessity, to believe that the Deity hath now entirely discontinued them on the same principles of providence and wisdom, whereon, in former days, he frequently made use of them. Those laws which institute throughout the universe a course of natural, and yet an uncertainty of future events, could never with reason be lightly or continually transgressed. That only was at length to be allowed when the occasion was of moment sufficient to warrant the transgression. Such was the period in which the worship of the true God, cast out as it was from almost all the world, was yet remaining in one corner of the earth, that is, in Judæa; and new bulwarks of defence became thereupon continually requisite to secure it against the impiety wherewith it was encompassed and besieged. Such too was the period in which the Christian religion (whereof we shall presently proceed in particular to treat) was first commanded, by Divine Will, to be published abroad throughout all nations under heaven.
SECTION XIX.

AND THAT EVIL IS SUFFERED TO ABOUND SO EXCEEDINGLY.

Another observation, which is apt in some men to create a doubt of the Divine Providence, is that of the excessive wickedness, whereof a deluge as it were overwhelmed the whole world. This, say they, it would be the particular business of a Divine Providence, if any such existed, to correct and to repress. Easy and obvious is the answer; for how could it possibly have been consistent with equity that God, after he had created man an agent equally at liberty to do good and to do evil, should still have taken any step for the prevention of evil actions in contradiction to that liberty? This, I say, allowing the evidently-necessary and immutable attribute of goodness, which is solely reserved to the Divine Being, was utterly impossible. No methods, however, of prevention, which can be made use of without counteracting that allowed liberty, (such as the institution and promulgation of law, the means of admonition internal and external, the language of menaces even, and of promises,) are left unessay'd by the Almighty; neither doth he suffer the designs of man to reach that extensive and extravagant degree of wickedness to which they otherwise might rise. And to this it hath been owing that the system of authority and government hath never undergone a total subversion; neither hath it ever been possible to blot out entirely all knowledge of the Divine Laws. Besides, the very evil which some are suffered to commit, faileth not sometimes to bring forth good; when it is applied (as
hath been said when we touched upon this subject) that others in an equal state of wickedness may be thereby punished; that they who have swerved and fallen from the path of virtue may be thereby reclaimed and reinstated; or that the virtuous proficients in that path may thereby be called upon to signalize their patience and their constancy. 168 In fine, it is generally the fate of those very men themselves, whose iniquities appear disregarded for a season, to answer, with accumulated interest, the debt of their suspended punishments, that they finally may tremble at the execution, who have long triumphed in the transgression of the Divine Will.

SECTION XX.

THE FREQUENT AFFLICTIONS OF GOOD MEN AFFORD NO ARGUMENT AGAINST A PROVIDENCE, BUT ARE THEMSELVES RETORTED UPON OUR OPPONENTS TO PROVE A FUTURE STATE.

But if it be observable that wickedness occasionally escapes without punishment, and that good men are sometimes (to the great offence of many weak-minded persons) so cruelly oppressed and injured by the wicked, that they not only pass their whole lives in misery, but even end them often by untimely and perhaps disgraceful deaths; yet we are not therefore hastily to exclude the providence of God from the affairs of man, when the existence of that providence over them is proved, as we have already declared, by such convincing arguments: rather ought we to collect, 169 as the wisest men have done, that,
SECTION XXI.

Since the Deity doth certainly regard human actions; since justice is his attribute; and since, notwithstanding, the facts above mentioned are undeniable, we may well expect after this life that a day of account and retribution will arrive, that neither notorious vice may remain unpunished, or illustrious virtue unnoticed, unrewarded. But it is requisite, in order to establish the foregoing argument, to establish likewise our position, That the soul survives the body:

SECTION XXII.

AND THIS ASSERTION IS CONFIRMED BY TRADITION.

Now this is a tradition of the highest antiquity, gradually descended from our first parents (for whence can it otherwise have been derived?) to almost every civilized people under heaven. This appears from Homer, and from the philosophers not only of Greece, but from those also (the Druids) of ancient Gaul, and from the Indian Brainins; as well as from the accounts given us by many writers, of the Egyptians, the Thracians, and likewise of the Germans.

Moreover we observe, from various instances, that the notion also of divine judgement after death obtained very generally, not among the Greeks alone, but likewise, as Strabo, Diogenes Laertius, and Plutarch inform us, among the Egyptians and the Indians. Add to this the tradition found of old in the writings of Hystaspes and the Sybils, and now also in Ovid, in Lucan, and among the
Siamese Indians, importing the destruction of the universe by a general conflagration. Astrologers establish this idea by their observation of the nearer approaches of the sun to the earth.

It should further be remarked, that the same opinion respecting the future existence of the soul, as well as on the subject of a future judgement, was even found among the natives by the first discoverers of the Canary islands, of America, and of other remote parts.

SECTION XXIII.
NO REASON IN OBJECTION TO IT.

No argument can possibly be drawn from nature to refute this tradition, so anciently, so generally received. The dissolution of all those things which are seen to perish is occasioned by one of the three following causes: By the opposition of a contrary and more powerful nature, as cold is destroyed by any great degree of heat; by the subtraction of that whereon a thing dependeth, as the size of a glass when the glass is broken; by the defect of the efficient cause, as light, when the sun disappeareth. Now none of these causes can be said to affect the mind (or soul). The first cannot, because it is impossible that any thing can be named of a nature contrary to that of the mind. Nay it is the peculiar nature of the mind to receive into itself after its own proper, i.e. intellectual, manner, the most absolute contrarieties, in the same proportion and at the same time. The second cannot, because the nature of the mind is altogether independent. If it had depended upon any thing, it had been upon the human body:
but *that* is plainly not the case, for while the powers of the body are wearied by action, the faculties of the mind alone receive no weariness therefrom: \(^{187}\) so again, the bodily powers are injured by a too great excellence in the object presented to them; as the sight of the eye by the rays of the sun: the mental powers, on the other hand, the higher they direct their operation, as in the contemplation of abstracted and general subjects or ideas, \(^{188}\) the nearer they approach to perfection. The objects of attention and employment which engage the corporeal powers, are, like the nature of the body itself, of finite duration and space: but those objects to which the mental faculties extend are infinite and eternal. The operations of the mind then are clearly independent of the body; and equally independent we may thence conclude the nature of it; for the nature of things invisible can alone be collected from their operations.—The third cause of dissolution is also, in the present question, inadmissible. No efficient cause, no constant source of the mind, can possibly be named. We cannot consider it as constantly proceeding from the parents, because the children usually survive them. If, however, we must have an efficient cause and source of the mind, it can be none other than that original and universal cause which, in respect of power, doth never fail. That it should fail in respect of will, that is to say, that God should will the dissolution of our spiritual nature, is a point altogether incapable of any proof whatsoever.
SECTION XXIV.

MANY ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF IT.

To justify, rather, the reverse of that opinion, considerable arguments may fairly be adduced. Such we must allow that absolute free agency permitted unto man; that "longing after immortality," implanted in his nature; that force of conscience which he feels, affording on the one hand internal consolation for every upright, however irksome, action, and supporting itself with a kind of future hope; but stinging and tormenting itself, on the other hand, for every evil action; especially on the approach of death, as through a sensible apprehension of impending judgement. To stifle that instinctive force, we see, from various examples, how frequently and how fruitlessly the power of the most abandoned tyrants has been exerted, although their utmost wishes, as well as their utmost endeavours, have conspired to attain that end.

SECTION XXV.

THE ULTIMATE DESIGN OF MAN MUST CONSEQUENTLY BE HIS FUTURE FELICITY.

The nature of the soul, then, being such as to exclude of itself all cause of dissolution, and God, at the same time, having given us to understand, by various intimations of his gracious will, that the soul shall survive the body, the ultimate design of man can never be more worthily directed than to the attainment of felicity in that future state. This it is which Plato and the Pythagoreans expressed in their assertion, that the happiness of man consists in his becoming as like as possible to the Deity.
SECTION XXVI.

WE MUST SEARCH OUT THE TRUE RELIGION IN ORDER TO ATTAIN THAT FUTURE FELICITY.

What that happiness may be, and how it may be attained, it is possible indeed for human conjecture to investigate; but wherever we can gain from Divine Revelation any assistance in the search, it is incumbent on us to receive that assistance as absolutely and certainly infallible.

As the Christian religion doth promise, above others, to obtain for us the end proposed, it shall be considered and duly examined, in the second part of this work, how far we may depend upon the truth and certainty of that religion.
BOOK THE SECOND.

SECTION I.

THE TITLE OF THE TRUE RELIGION IS JUSTLY APPLIED TO THAT OF CHRIST.

The purport of this second book, then, it must be observed, is not to canvass severally the particular tenets of Christianity, but only in general to prove the superior truth and singular authority of the Christian religion itself: and this, with hearty supplications unto Christ, who now sitteth on the throne of Heaven, that he will graciously enable us, by a fit portion of his holy spirit, duly to discharge so great an undertaking, we proceed, as follows, to demonstrate.

IT IS SHOWN THAT SUCH A PERSON AS JESUS WAS ONCE LIVING UPON EARTH.

That Jesus of Nazareth was formerly living in Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius the Roman emperor, is uniformly and invariably declared to be a fact, not only by the Christians in every country under heaven, but also by the Jews universally, as well by the present generation of them, as by the writers among them ever since the period to which we refer: Pagan authors at the same time, that is to say, authors who were neither of the Jewish or of the Christian persuasion, such as 1 Suetonius, 2 Tacitus, the younger Pliny, and many others after them, unite in attestation of the same undeniable truth.
SECTION II.

THE SAME JESUS UNDERWENT AN IGNOMINIOUS DEATH.

That the same Jesus did suffer and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judaea, is in like manner acknowledged by all Christians whatsoever, notwithstanding the disgraceful reflections which they, as the worshippers of such a Lord, might bring upon themselves. This also do the Jews acknowledge; conscious, as they must at the same time feel, that all the odium and extreme resentment which they experience from the Christians, under whose dominion they universally dwell, may be chiefly ascribed to this very circumstance, the obstinate demand of their importunate ancestors, whereby Pilate was compelled to pronounce the fatal sentence. The Pagan writers above mentioned have recorded the same sad event; and it was further expressly made apparent by the "Acta Pilati," which were extant for a long time after, and to which the Christians were accustomed occasionally to appeal. Julian and other enemies of Christianity never dared to call in question the authenticity of this fact (the ignominious death of Jesus), and consequently no history can possibly stand upon more certain grounds than this does, as having been attested and allowed, I will not say by the concurrent evidence of jarring individuals alone, but of contending nations.
SECTION III.

NEVERTHELESS HE WAS WORSHIPPED AFTER DEATH BY MEN OF THE MOST ENLIGHTENED UNDERSTANDING.

Still, I say, under all these circumstances this very Jesus is devoutly acknowledged to be "The Lord," through the widest extremities of the world. Now, the worshipping of Jesus is not an institution of modern or of latter times alone, but may be traced backward to that early period immediately subsequent to that of his crucifixion. In the reign of Nero, for example, as it is attested by Tacitus and others, the professors of the Christian worship were frequently condemned, for that sole cause, to sufferings, to torture, and to death.

SECTION IV.

WHICH CAN ONLY BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE MIRACLES WHICH HE WROUGHT.

Among the worshippers of Christ there were always many to be found who possessed a good share of natural abilities and judgement, and a competent degree of acquired learning. Such, for example, (to say nothing of the Jews in this particular,) we may consider Sergius the deputy of Cyprus, Dionysius the Areopagite, Polycarpus, Justin, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Origenes, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and others. When we perceive therefore that men like these, who for the most part acted in despite of all the bias and strong prejudice of education; who, at the same time, were not tempted to
espouse the cause of Christianity by any prospect whatsoever of advantage or of honour; when we perceive, I say, that men like these became the voluntary and devoted worshippers of one who suffered a disgraceful death, it is totally impossible to ascribe their conduct to any other motive than the certain discovery which a diligent inquiry, suitable at once to the wisdom of the men, and to the importance of the subject, had enabled them to make, that "the fame of his miracles, which had gone forth into all the countries round about," was truly, faithfully, and undeniably attested. Thus attested were the cures which he wrought by his word alone, and that too before all the people, in grievous and inveterate diseases; the gift of sight to him who had been born blind; the increase of the loaves, which he more than once commanded, so that many thousands, who could all bear witness of it, "did eat and were filled;" the restoration of the dead to life; and many other acts of equal admiration and of equal truth: so surely and undoubtedly established was the fame of the miracles of Jesus, that 16 Celsus and 17 Julian, when they wrote against the Christians, have neither of them dared to deny that he sometimes exerted a miraculous power, while the 18 Hebrews expressly allow it in their books of the 18 Thalmud.

SECTION V.
WHICH MIRACLES CANNOT POSSIBLY BE ASCRIBED TO ANY NATURAL OR INFERNAL AGENCY, BUT MUST HAVE PROCEEDED ALTOGETHER FROM GOD.

The very appellation of prodigies and miracles, which is given to the facts above mentioned, is a suf-
fficient proof that they were not wrought by any natural effect; neither is it possible that any natural effect should utterly remove the most inveterate diseases, and that too, in an instant, by the sole power of the voice or of the touch. Besides, if it had been possible by any means whatever to have ascribed those works to the regular agency of nature, that surely would have been done many ages ago, as well by the professed enemies of Christ in person, as by the enemies of his gospel. Upon the same principle we find it equally impossible to consider them as tricks and impostures, as they were, for the most part, openly performed, when (according to Saint Luke) "innumerable multitudes of people were gathered together" to behold them; and many in those multitudes were men of sense and information, ill-affected towards Christ, and closely watching him in every action. It should further be remembered, that he repeatedly performed many miracles of the same nature; neither were the effects produced by them momentary, but permanent. After a due consideration of all these circumstances, the obvious conclusion follows, as the Jews themselves acknowledge, that some supernatural power, that is to say; some good or evil spirit, must have been the cause from which those effects proceeded. That they proceeded not from any evil spirit is clearly proved, because this very doctrine of Christ, which those miracles were employed to establish, militates directly against evil spirits; expressly prohibiting the worship of them, and restraining all men from every impurity and wickedness in which such spirits take delight. This again is still further proved by the actual and conse-
quent effects of this doctrine; for, wherever it was received, we find immediately that the worshipping of spirits, and the exercise of "curious arts," fell away together; the worship of one God was introduced; all spirits were holden in abomination; and by the coming of Christ, as Porphyrius himself hath acknowledged, the whole power of them was broken and destroyed. Now it is utterly incredible that any evil spirit should be so impolitic and absurd as to work repeatedly those acts of power which brought, in no single instance, any honour or advantage to itself, but, on the contrary, the utmost disadvantage and disgrace. It is, at the same time, wholly incompatible with the wisdom and the goodness of God himself, that we should believe him capable of suffering the efforts of devilish deceit and subtility to be practised with success upon a set of men acting (as the primitive disciples of Christ undoubtedly were known to act, from the blameless tenour of their lives, and from the many calamities which, for conscience sake, they underwent) in utter abhorrence of all evil ways, and living in the service of that very God with fear. But if, on the other hand, we ascribe the miracles of Christ to the agency of virtuous beings, virtuous indeed, but still subordinate to God, we therein immediately admit that those works were pleasing to the Supreme Being, and conducive to his honour; since virtuous beings can never act otherwise than in conformity with his good pleasure, and for the advancement of his glory. It would here, then, be needless to observe, that the miracles which Christ performed (the revival of the dead, for instance, which he more than once effected,) were, many of them, of such a
nature, that they plainly seemed to indicate the hand of God himself. Miraculous exertions of God's power are never, it is certain, either mediately or immediately displayed without a cause: a wise legislator departeth not at any time from the laws which he hath himself enacted, except in cases of singular necessity. Now, none other cause can possibly be named requiring those exertions, than that which was alleged by Christ; I mean the necessity of them at that period for a testimony of the truth of his doctrine. The eye-witnesses of his miracles could imagine none other; and when, as we have observed, very many of those witnesses were pious and devout persons, it were impious to suppose the Almighty to have acted thus on purpose to deceive them. From this single consideration very many of the Jews who lived about the time of Jesus, and who on no account could be persuaded to relinquish one tittle of the Mosaic law, (such were they who were called Nazarenes and Ebionites,) nevertheless would readily acknowledge that the mission of our Saviour was divine.

SECTION VI.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE SAME JESUS CONSISTENTLY AND CREDIBLY ATTESTED.

The various miracles which Christ performed afford not a stronger argument to recommend his religion, and to propagate his worship, than that which arises from the subsequent event of his actual and personal resurrection from the cross, from death, and from the grave. Christians of all countries and in all ages declare this event not only as an absolute and
undoubted fact, but as the principal foundation of their faith. Now, the first teachers of Christianity could never have been able to have induced their hearers to make this declaration, if they had not convinced them of the truth of the doctrine upon the fullest and most complete evidence; and to men who were possessed of some degree of judgement all evidence must have appeared insufficient and inconclusive, except the solemn affirmation of those teachers, that they themselves had been actually eye-witnesses of the fact. Without this solemn affirmation no man of common sense would have confided in their word; especially in times like those when any expression of that confidence exposed him immediately to the greatest perils and misfortunes. That they positively made and resolutely maintained this affirmation is apparent, as well from their own accounts as from the accounts of others; nay, it is recorded, even, that they appealed to the evidence of five hundred brethren at once, who had all seen Jesus when he had risen from the dead. So general, so extensive an appeal is by no means the usual practice of impostors; neither is it possible that any false assertion should obtain the concurrent testimony of so numerous a conspiracy. If, however, the evidence of those twelve persons, who were the first and most distinguished ministers of the Christian religion, had been the sole evidence adduced, the truth of the resurrection ought still to be admitted. No man is wicked without some inducement to become so. The apostles could have no inducement. Ambition never could have prompted them to attempt an imposture of this kind, when either the Heathens or the Jews,
who branded them with every mark of contempt and of disgrace, had the entire possession of all honours and distinctions. The views of avarice could not have prevailed with them; when, on the other hand, their very profession of Christianity was frequently followed by the instant confiscation of all property, if they were found possessed of any; and even if this had not been so, the propagation of the gospel would still unavoidably oblige them to forgo and to neglect all temporal concerns. It is equally impossible that any other worldly consideration or advantage could have induced them to declare a falsehood, when the very apostolical function of itself necessarily exposed them to hardships, to hunger, to thirst, to stripes, and to imprisonment. The mere applause which they might acquire from their own party was surely not an object of sufficient import, that men of their plain and humble situation, whose principles and practice were equally averse from all pride and ostentation, should have considered it as an ample compensation for such a load of calamities. They must have been conscious, at the same time, of the violent opposition which their doctrine would be sure to meet with universally, as well from the self-interested and narrow views of human nature in general, as from the express authority of every individual state: nothing less, therefore, than the divine promise could possibly have encouraged them to hope for success so rapid and so extensive. It may further be observed, that however great they might imagine this attainable applause to be, they never could have proposed to themselves any long enjoyment of it; as we find most plainly from their own and from all subsequent accounts, (while
God designedly concealed his intention in this respect,) that they looked for an almost immediate destruction and end of all things. We are to conclude, then, that the apostles devised this imposture (in regard to the resurrection) in order to support and protect their religion: But this surely, upon a fair consideration of the matter, can never be imagined or asserted. They must either have believed or disbelieved, in their own minds, the truth of that religion. If they had not believed it to be the best, they never would have preferred it to others, in the exercise of which they might have lived with much more security, reputation, and respect: neither would they have professed that religion, however true they might believe it, if they had not believed also that profession to be necessary: especially as it likewise was easy to foresee, and from experience immediately to learn, that death would be the certain consequence of that profession to whole multitudes of their adherents; whereby they would become in every instance, as being the unjust and unnecessary authors of it, undoubtedly guilty of the crime of murder. If, on the other hand, they were convinced of the truth and of the superior excellence of their religion; were convinced also of the necessity which obliged them to profess that religion, even when their master was no more; they could never possibly have been so convinced had their master deceived them in the promise of his resurrection. To every man, in his right reason, the breach of such a promise must have been sufficient to have made him disavow instantly every article of his faith, in spite of all prejudice and preconception whatsoever. All kinds of religion, but,
above all, the Christian tenets, prohibit lying and false-witnessing, particularly in matters of a sacred nature. The apostles, therefore, from a motive of regard to religion, and especially to a religion like theirs, could never have been induced to assert a falsehood. They were men, moreover, whose morals and behaviour their very enemies were unable to censure; nor is any circumstance ever urged in objection to them, that plainness and simplicity alone excepted, which naturally removed them as far as possible from every inclination to invent a falsehood. There was not one of them who did not endure the severest trials and distresses, because of their professed belief in the resurrection of Jesus. Many of them even actually underwent the most uncommon and extraordinary kinds of death on account of their positive affirmation and evidence of the fact. A person in his right senses, it is true, might possibly undergo such sufferings in support of some favourite object of his firm belief; but it is altogether incredible that not one alone, but that many persons should endure them voluntarily, for the sake of any falsehood, when they knew it to be a falsehood, and could have no interest in obtruding that falsehood on the world. That the apostles, however, were neither fools or madmen, is very evidently shown, as well by their lives as by their writings.

What has been said of the first apostles may be said also of St. Paul, who publicly declared that Christ "was seen of him also" sitting on the throne of heaven. Now Paul was a man who had been "taught according to the perfect manner" of all Jewish learning, and to whom the highest offices and
honours had been open had he walked in the steps of his ancestors: nevertheless he esteemed it a duty incumbent on him, for the sake of that profession, to subject himself to the abuse and hatred of his own kindred; to undertake arduous, hazardous, and laborious expeditions, both by sea and land, into all parts of the world; and even to endure ultimately an ignominious death.

SECTION VII.
AN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTION WHICH IS FOUND ON THE APPARENT IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE RESURRECTION.

We are, doubtless, unable to disbelieve the truth of any fact when it is established upon evidence so numerous and so conclusive, unless it can be urged that the fact itself is absolutely impossible. Now all things, it is said, are impossible which imply a contradiction. The resurrection, however, cannot be considered in that light. We might say so, it is true, if we should hear it asserted that the same person was alive and dead at the same time; but there can be no reason to think it impossible that a dead person should be restored to life, especially by the power of that Being who first gave life to all.

Men of great wisdom have thought it not impossible; for Plato records an instance of it in regard to Er the Armenian; Heraclides of Pontus tells us of a woman who was restored to life; Herodotus relates the same of Aristæus; and Plutarch gives us another instance. Now, whether these accounts be true or false, they still serve to show that very learned men have believed it a possible event.
SECTION VIII.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS BEING GRANTED, THE TRUTH OF HIS RELIGION MUST BE UNDENIABLE.

Since, then, the possibility of the resurrection can no longer be questioned, and since the reality of it is attested by credible and sufficient evidence, in somuch that Bechai, one of the Jewish rabbins, confessed himself perfectly convinced thereby, that Jesus did truly and certainly return to life: since, also, it is allowed by all parties, that the same Jesus did, as by Divine command, propose and introduce a new religion to mankind, that religion must consequently be true, as it would be wholly repugnant to the divine attributes of justice and of wisdom, that God should recommend in so distinguished a manner a person who had imposed upon the world in a matter of such high importance; more especially as Christ himself, previously to the event, had foretold the approach and the manner of his death, and had also foretold his resurrection; actually adding, at the same time, that these things would therefore come to pass, that the truth of his religion might be confirmed and established throughout all nations.

SECTION IX.

THE SUPERIOR EXCELLENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

The arguments hitherto adduced arise from the facts themselves; the arguments which arise from the nature of the religion remain to be considered.
And indeed we must either reject altogether every species of divine worship, (which no person will ever think of doing who believes the existence and providence of a God, and who considers also that man is a being endowed with an excellent intellectual faculty, as well as with a power of election in moral good and evil, whereby he becomes a proper subject of reward and punishment,) or else we must admit the tenets of Christianity; and this, not only because of the outward evidence of the facts before mentioned, but also because of the intrinsic and essential properties of the religion itself; since none can possibly be produced by any age or nation more excellent in respect of the proposed reward, more perfect in respect of the enjoined precepts, more admirable in the means of its appointed dispensation.

SECTION X.

THE EXCELLENCE OF THE PROPOSED REWARD.

To begin, then, with the reward or ultimate design of man, (that being, as we say, the first object in intention though the last in execution,) we find, if we recur to the express covenant of the law, that Moses promised nothing to the Jews, in the institution of their religion, beyond the blessings of this present world; the blessings of a "fruitful land;" of "plenteous storehouses;" of long and healthful lives; of rising and hopeful generations. All beyond this is either hidden in mysterious darkness, or discoverable only by learned disquisition and abstruse reasoning. Hence it was that many, who professed their observance of the Mosaic law, (the sect of the Sad-
ducees in particular,) disclaimed and rejected every expectation of reward after death. Among the Greeks, who derived all their learning from the Chaldeans and Egyptians, the few philosophers who entertained some imperfect ideas of another state after the dissolution of this visible existence, still spoke of it as a matter of the greatest doubt and uncertainty, as we may perceive by the dissertations of Socrates, and by the writings of Tully, Seneca, and others; and in spite of their diligent endeavours to find arguments in support of the opinion, they were able to advance little or nothing upon certain grounds; for the arguments in general which they adduce hold good no further in respect to the human, than to the brute creation. No wonder, then, that others, in consequence of this observation, devised the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. Others again, seeing that this doctrine could be supported by no certain evidence or proof, and unable, at the same time, to deny altogether any ultimate design of man’s existence, were driven to this desperate assertion, that virtue was its own reward, and that wisdom alone was an ample security for happiness amid the keenest tortures of the brazen bull of Phalaris. Others however, not without reason, condemned also this opinion, sufficiently convinced that felicity, and especially supreme felicity, could not possibly consist in any thing attended with dangers, with misfortunes, with tortures, and with death; unless indeed we could contrive to regulate our feelings by the sound of words, and totally discard every real sensation. They conceived, therefore, that the supreme good and ultimate design of man must certainly be found in sensual gra-
ifications. Men, however, abundantly and effectually refuted this doctrine, as a doctrine destructive to every seed of honesty and virtue implanted in the human heart; reducing, in effect, the upright and sublime views of man to a level with the low and grovelling condition of the brute creation. Such was the wandering state of ignorance and doubt in which mankind were lost at that period when Christ introduced amongst them the true knowledge of their final object: he promised unto all his followers a life to come; a life not only exempt from any future death, anxiety, and trouble, but attended also with the highest bliss. Nor was his promise limited only to the soul of man (the future felicity of which they had been led partly upon wild conjectural, partly upon obscure traditional, authority in some measure to expect); but it was extended also to the body: and this surely on the strictest principles of justice; that the body, which is often doomed for the sake of the divine law to suffer hardships, tortures, and death, may not fail in the end to receive a compensation. Furthermore, the blessings which are promised are of no vile and sordid nature, like the banquets of which the grosser Jews expect their heaven to consist; they are not the lustful indulgences which the Mahometans promise to themselves as their paradise; (for these are the mere means of relief peculiarly provided against the frailties of this mortal existence; the one for the support of life in single individuals, the other for the continuance of their respective kinds,) but they are the blessings of a spiritual, incorruptible, and glorious body; the blessings of a soul of infinite perfection, to know even God and his divine providence,
and to comprehend all things that may now be unrevealed to us; the blessings of a will replete with complacency and joy, but, above all, continually occupied in the contemplation, in the admiration, and in the praise of God. Blessings, in short, far greater and more excellent than any which the most exalted comparisons in this world can enable us to imagine, or the heart of man can possibly conceive.

SECTION XI.

WE WILL SHOW, BY THE WAY, THE ABSURDITY OF THE ASSERTION, THAT OUR BODIES, AFTER DISSOLUTION, CANNOT BE RESTORED.

Beside the objection which we have already answered (Sect. vii.) it is further frequently denied, on the ground of absolute impossibility, that the human fabric, when dissolved, should ever be identically re-compacted. But the argument is groundless and absurd. Is it not determined by philosophers in general, that matter, whatever changes it may undergo, does still remain existent, and capable of various appearances? And can we then doubt or deny the sufficiency of the knowledge of God in discovering the material particles of man, however distantly and widely scattered? Can we doubt or deny the sufficiency of his power in re-collecting and restoring those particles? May not God in his own universe produce that effect which chymists are seen to produce in their furnaces and vessels, when they select and consolidate the homogeneous, however disunited, parts? The course of nature supplies us, further, with examples in the seeds of the vegetable and animal
creation, that how much soever the appearance of the matter may be changed, it may still revert to that identical form from which it has originated.—Nor is it impossible to resolve the difficulty which some men have contrived to raise by their assertion, that as, in the first place, the human bodies are converted into the food of beasts and cattle, so again these afterwards become the food of man. Now the greatest part of our food does not form any part of our bodies, but passes off in the secretions or accretions of the body, as in the instances of phlegm and bile; and a great part of that which hath a nutritive effect is afterwards carried off by distempers, or consumed by the internal heat and circumambient air. Hence, therefore, it is probable that God, who so careth for the dumb animals that he suffereth not one of them to perish without him, may regard the human bodies with peculiar care, so as to prevent any part of them, which may become the food of other human bodies, from being turned into their material substance, any more than poisons or medicines are; and this more especially, as we seem instinctively to know from nature that human flesh was not intended to be made human food. If this however be not so, and if our future bodies must lay aside every particle which they may have by any means acquired in addition to their first and original constitution, the identity of each particular body will still remain unaffected; since, even in our present bodies, we perhaps experience a greater variation of our component particles; nay, the very butterfly may be comprised in the worm, and the substance of a vegetable or a liquid in some most minute part of matter, whence they may after-
wards be increased respectively into their proper size and quantity. Since, therefore, these and many other positions may without impropriety be advanced, the re-union of our bodily parts, when dissolved, cannot reasonably be thought impossible: and men of the deepest erudition, as, for example, 57 Zoroaster among the Chaldeans, Theopompus among the 58 Peripatetics, and almost all the sect of the 59 Stoics unanimously have believed in an event which not only might possibly, but would actually, come to pass.

SECTION XII.

THE EXCELLENT SANCTITY OF THE CHRISTIAN PRECEPTS IN REGARD TO THE DIVINE WORSHIP.

The second article wherein we may observe the superiority of the Christian religion over all other institutions which either are, have been, or ever can be introduced, is that of the excellent sanctity of its precepts in respect to the Divine worship, as well as to the other particulars enjoined. In almost all parts of the world, as 60 Porphyrius has shown at large, and as our modern voyagers assure us, the religious rites of Paganism were replete with acts of cruelty. The expiatory virtue of human sacrifices was believed so strongly and so generally, that neither Grecian literature or Roman jurisprudence have been able to overcome the prejudice. This appears from the accounts which are given us of the 61 victims that were offered up by the Grecians to Bacchus Omestas and of the 62 sacrifices that were made by the Romans of the Grecian and Gaulish men and women to Jupiter Latialis. Even their most sacred mysteries, whether
of Ceres or of Bacchus, (whom they styled Liber Pater,) abounded with all kinds of obscenity; as appeared when the oath of religious secrecy was once broken, and the transactions began to be divulged, as they are very fully by Clemens Alexandrinus and others. The days set apart for the honour of the gods were distinguished by such games and public spectacles, that Cato was ashamed to be present at them. The Jewish religion, it is true, contained nothing in its principles of an illicit or immoral tendency; but still, lest a people prone to idolatry, as the Jews were, should revolt from the true religion, it was necessary to load them with strict and ceremonious injunctions, which were in themselves of a nature totally indifferent and immaterial: such, for example, were the animal sacrifices prescribed to them; the law of circumcision; the express prohibition from all manner of work upon the sabbath days, and the restrictions that debarred them from several kinds of food. Some of these ordinances have been borrowed by the Mahometans, who have added to them a total abstinence from wine. We are taught, on the other hand, by the Christian religion, that "God is a Spirit; and that they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" and in all those "reasonable services," which, without any injunction, are obviously and intrinsically excellent. It requireth "the circumcision of the heart and not of the flesh;" it instructeth us to "keep the feast," not by abstaining from every work, but from unlawful works; to make a sacrifice not of "the fat of bulls" or of "the blood of goats," but of our own blood, if occasion should require it, in testimony of the truth of
Christ. It teacheth us to believe, that when we give alms of our goods unto the poor, we lend unto the Lord." It enjoineth us not to abstain from any particular kinds of meat or of drink, but so to use them in temperance and moderation, that they may conduce to our well-being. It commandeth us to subdue the body by occasional fastings, in order to keep it in subjection to the mind, that we may thereby be enabled to pursue with more alacrity all spiritual exercises. The main points, however, of Christianity are shown every where to consist in a devout and holy faith, whereby being disposed to a steadfast obedience, we rely wholly on God, and "stagger not at his promises;" and hence ariseth hope and perfect love towards our God and towards our neighbours, so that we obey the commandments of God not "in the spirit of bondage again to fear," but that our service may be "acceptable unto God," and that we may have him, through his unbounded goodness, our Father and Rewarder.—Furthermore we are commanded to "continue instant in prayer," but not for the acquisition of riches or of honours, or of any of those things "which many covet after" to their own destruction; but, first, for the things which may conduce to God's glory, and for the supply of those temporal concerns which the wants of our frail nature may require; submitting all beyond this to the Divine Providence, and resting patient and content whatever may befall us: but more especially we are commanded to pray with all earnestness for the spiritual concerns of our eternal welfare, the forgiveness of sins past, and the future blessings of his holy spirit, that we may continue unshaken by threats, un-
seduced by temptations, "in a steadfast course unto the end."

Herein consisteth the worshipping of God enjoined by Christianity; and surely none other can possibly be imagined more worthy of his divine nature.

SECTION XIII.

IN REGARD TO THE DUTIES WHICH WE OWE TO ALL MEN, WHETHER FRIENDS OR ENEMIES.

Equally excellent are the principles of Christianity in the duties which they enjoin us to observe towards our neighbours.—Born in arms, and cradled in the shield, the religion of Mahomet can only breathe forth slaughter, and live by war. The constitution of Sparta, extolled as it was above all the establishments of the other Grecian states, and distinguished even by the sanction of oracular approbation, was directed wholly to the purposes of martial science and exploits; and, as Aristotle remarks with censure, the splendour of her name consisted solely in the splendour of her arms. Nevertheless it is asserted by the same philosopher, that a state of war against Barbarians is justified, if not established, by the law of nature: whereas, on the contrary, we doubtless were designed by nature to live in universal friendship and social intercourse. Surely then it is altogether unjust and indefensible that we should punish with death the murderer of a single individual, while the murderer of nations is known to glory in his deeds, and to boast of them in public triumph, as of great and meritorious exploits. From what other source, however, did the illustrious Romans acquire
their celebrity than from the wars in which they were engaged? 88 wars frequently and manifestly unjust, as their own historians, in regard to those that were maintained in 89 Sardinia and in 90 Cyprus, do not scruple to allow. And indeed, generally speaking, according to the accounts of the most celebrated annalists, the political principles of almost all nations never held it by any means disgraceful, to subsist by 91 plunder and depredation upon all who lived beyond the limits of their own territories. 92 An unforgiving spirit of revenge is actually laid down by Aristotle and Cicero as a requisite and commendable principle. The public diversions of the Pagans consisted in the bloody acts of mutual butchery committed by 93 their gladiators: the exposing of their children was a common and even daily practice. Among the Hebrews, it is true, a juster system of legal polity obtained; a purer discipline: nevertheless, among a people of ungovernable passions, occasional violations of the law were winked at, and indeed allowed; as at the time when they were justly sent 95 "to smite and utterly destroy" the seven nations in the land of Canaan. Not satiated with this, they 96 persecuted all who opposed or dissented from them with the most implacable cruelty, of which even now we may observe sufficient proofs in their prayers and imprecations against all the professors of Christianity. Their very laws allowed them to avenge every injury by 98 strict retaliation; and "whoso meeteth the murderer of his kinsman shall slay him."

The law of Christ, on the other hand, teacheth us that we 99 revenge not injuries received either by word or deed, lest the evil which we condemn in others we
afterwards approve by our own example. We are to love indeed and to assist the virtuous, but we are to love also and to assist the wicked, even as God maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust.

SECTION XIV.
IN REGARD TO THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE.

The union of the sexes, whereby the human species is continued, is a subject well worthy of the highest legal consideration. We cannot wonder at the great neglect and disregard which the Pagans showed in this particular, when we read of the rapes and adulteries committed even by the gods, the objects of their worship! Nay, was it not their practice also to defend and justify, by example from the gods themselves, the very crimes of a still more infamous, because unnatural, connexion? Was it not for this meritorious act that Ganymede of old, and Antinous after him, were enrolled in the number of those gods? The practice of this scandalous enormity is frequent among the Mahometans, and is even thought allowable by the Chinese and other nations; while the Grecian philosophers, it seems, have taken great pains to affix a fair appellation to a foul crime. The promiscuous enjoyment of all women in common, so highly extolled by the greatest philosophers among them, was, in effect, the conversion of the whole state into one common brothel; while some, even of the brute animals, are seen to observe a sort of conjugal obligation. Far more just
and reasonable it is, therefore, that man, the most excellent and most distinguished of all animals, should not be suffered to derive his origin from casual and uncertain parents, to the total extinction of those mutual ties, the filial and parental affections. The Hebrew laws prohibit indeed all impurity and uncleanness, but allow a plurality of wives, and authorise a man to put away his wife upon any, however frivolous, pretence, as the Mahometans at this day often do, and the Greeks and Latins did to such a licentious excess, that we find the Roman Cato, and the Spartans in general, occasionally lending out their wives to other men. — That most perfect law, the law of Christ, on the contrary, reacheth to the very root of all vices; it teacheth us that “whoso hath attempted the chastity of any woman, or hath looked on a woman to lust after her,” thereby cometh guilty; for God, “unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known,” considereth the lustful criminality of the will, independent of the actual perpetration of the deed; and as, by all real friendship we intend a perpetual and indissoluble union, he justly enjoined us to consider in the same light that union which includeth a full participation and mutual connexion both of soul and body. The superior advantage of this institution, in respect to the proper education of children, is a truth as obvious as undeniable. Monogamy was even the established custom of some particular Pagan nations; among the Germans, for example, and the Romans: and herein the Christians also follow their example, on a principle of justice, in repaying, on the part of the husband, the entire and undivided affection of the
wife; while, at the same time, the regulations of domestic œconomy may be better preserved under one head and mistress of the family, and all those dissensions avoided which a diversity of mothers must create among the children.

SECTION XV.

IN REGARD TO THE USE OF OUR TEMPORAL POSSESSIONS.

On the subject of worldly goods, as they commonly are called, it is observable, that theft in some Pagan countries, as among the Egyptians and the Spartans, was a practice permitted and encouraged. Others again, though they punished an act of this kind in individuals, had rarely any scruple of committing it themselves, in a public and corporate capacity: to this purport, a Roman orator was used to observe of his own countrymen, that if a general obligation should take place among them to restore to every one his own, they would presently find themselves reduced to their original huts and cottages. The Hebrews, it is true, had no such allowed practices; but still, that the law might in some degree adapt itself to the temper of the nation, they were allowed to lend upon usury to strangers; and on the same account were riches, among other inducements, proposed as a recompense to the righteous and obedient. Christianity, however, not only expressly prohibiteth all manner of injustice against any persons whatsoever, but further enjoineth us not to fix our attention upon objects so frail and so precarious as worldly possessions: evidently, because the mind
cannot possibly pay a due consideration to two distinct matters of inquiry, when each of them is sufficient, singly, to engross the whole man; and when, jointly, they must often lead him into jarring and repugnant counsels: the care, moreover, and the deceitfulness of riches, as well in the pursuit as in the possession of them, are generally productive of a state of slavish and tormented anxiety, which embitters all their promised pleasures; whereas the real wants and even wishes of our nature are neither numerous, difficult, or extravagant. Not that it is incumbent upon us to cast into the sea, as some philosophers absurdly did, all further indulgences which God may be pleased to bestow upon us; neither ought we to hoard up our money uselessly, or to squander it away unprofitably: we should apply it rather to the relief of the wants of others; we should "give to him that asketh us, and from him that would borrow of us we should turn not away;" for so it behoveth them to do, who consider themselves not the absolute disposers of these things, but the managers and stewards of God, the Supreme and Universal Father. We should regard a well-placed act of charity as "treasure laid up for ourselves in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." The primitive Christians displayed in genuine and undissembled colours a singular example of this Christian charity, when "they of Macedonia and Achaia made a certain contribution for the poor saints which were at Jerusalem," as if the whole world were to them as one united family. We are cautioned, at the same time, to let no views of ostentation or of recomp-
pense destroy the beauty of beneficence, for it 126 loses all merit in the eye of God if it regard any other object than himself. Lest any one, however, (which is sometimes the case,) should allege, as a cloak to his avarice, the future apprehensions of infirmity and age; or the fear of eventual misfortunes, whereby he may actually be reduced to want the assistance of his present superfluities; the 133 law of Christ professes a special and peculiar care of all who shall observe its precepts; and, in order to confirm their faith in God, reminds them of his manifest providence in feeding 134 “the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the earth;” and in clothing the grass and the lilies of the field. Disgraceful thought! that man, then, should watch with jealous caution the goodness and the power of God; and should only trust him as a fraudulent debtor, as far as the pledges in possession will secure and indemnify his suspicious creditor.

SECTION XVI.
* IN REGARD TO OATHS.

PERJURY, indeed, is forbidden by all laws whatsoever; but the law of Christ enjoineth us further, that, except in cases of unavoidable necessity, we 135 “Swear not at all;” so, adhering to the strictest truth in all our communications, that an 136 oath may never be required or exacted from us.

SECTION XVII.
* IN REGARD TO OTHER MATTERS.

There is, in short, no precept of particular excellence recommended either by the writings and philo-
sophical works of the Grecians, or by the opinions of the Hebrew or of any other nation, which is not comprised in the doctrine of Christianity, and indeed authorized as by divine sanction: such, for example, is the frequent exhortation to modesty, to temperance, to goodness, to honesty, to prudence: such again are the precepts which concern the relative duties of magistrates and subjects; of parents and children; of masters and servants; of wives and husbands: such, especially, are the injunctions laid upon us to avoid those vices which, by a semblance as it were of virtue, so frequently misled the Grecians and the Romans; the vices, I mean, of pride, vain-glory, and ambition. But truly and most completely excellent is that sum of all instruction, that short but comprehensive precept, which teacheth us, that we should love God above all things, and our neighbours as ourselves; in other words commanding us, that "whatsoever we would that men should do unto us, we should do unto them likewise."

SECTION XVIII.

IN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTION WHICH IS GROUNDED ON THE CONTROVERSIAL DISPUTES SUBSISTING AMONG THE PROFESSORS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The great diversity of opinions which have been advanced, and the infinite variety of sects which have consequently arisen among the Christians, may perhaps be an argument with some men against the boasted excellence of the Christian precepts: But here it is obvious to reply, that the same effects are.
observable in almost all the arts and sciences; partly arising from the natural imbecility of the human faculties, and partly from the unavoidable impediments which obstruct the judgement in deep and learned disquisitions. That diversity of opinions, however, is always confined within certain limits, upon which all parties are originally agreed, and from which they set out in quest of speculation and argument. The mathematician may dispute upon the possibility of squaring a circle, but it can be no matter of dispute with him whether or not, when equal parts are taken from an equal whole, the remainder will be equal? And the same is observable in respect to the study of natural philosophy, of medicine, and of other sciences. In like manner we may say, that the different opinions of the Christians can never shake the authenticity of those fundamental principles, the precepts of Christianity, which have furnished the grounds of our highest panegyric: and herein especially the truth of them is evident; because, however ingenious in the search of new controversial matter the heated disputants may at any time have been, none have ever dared to deny that Christ was the author of this doctrine, which, notwithstanding, in their practice they have not scrupled to reject. And indeed the absurdity of such a denial could only be equalled by that of the philosophers who cavilled at the colour of snow: for, as the dispute in the one case is instantly settled by an appeal to our senses, so the presumption in the other is universally exposed by the concurrent testimony of all Christian nations, and of all the books which have been written, as well by the first teachers of Christianity and by their immediate
successors, as by all subsequent professors of it; by men who have even laid down their lives in defence of the Christian faith. Every impartial mind therefore must heartily and entirely believe in the truth of this doctrine, when it is so strongly and positively authenticated by all these persons, just as we believe in the tenets of Socrates upon the authority of Plato, Xenophon, and his other scholars; or in the sect and opinions of the Stoics, upon the credit of the accounts which are given us by Zeno.

SECTION XIX.

THE EXCELLENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IS FURTHER PROVED; AND FIRST, FROM THE EXCELLENCE OF ITS DIVINE AUTHOR.

A THIRD instance of that superiority which the Christian religion claims over all other institutions that either are, or ever can be thought of, arises from the manner in which it was delivered and promulgated. And here we shall naturally direct our first inquiry to the actual cause and founder of it. The greatest and wisest philosophers of Greece were wont to confess openly their inability to make any material progress upon grounds of any real certainty: they declared that truth was hidden as it were in a well; and that the mental eye is foiled and dazzled by the contemplation of divine objects, as the eyes of an owl are by the light of the sun. There was, moreover, not one among them all who was not personally addicted to some particular vice or failing; to servile flattery; to ungovernable passions; to churlish or cynic impudence. Their mutual jealousy and hatred are plainly shown in the animosity
with which they disputed about words and trifling matters; nor is their indifference in religious worship less apparent when, although they believed in one God, they were contented to set that God aside, and to worship other objects, even though they did not consider them entitled to divine honours; when, in short, they only squared their tenets of religion by the rules of political interest or of local custom. We may perceive how little they could say with certainty in respect to the reward of virtue, even from that last disputation of Socrates at the time of his approaching death.

Mahomet, the founder of a religion so extensively established, is allowed even by his followers to have been a man whose whole life was devoted to the most profligate and abandoned practices. In respect to the future reward, which he said would assuredly be found to consist in the sensual enjoyments of feasting and of women, he gave no proof whatever in confirmation of that promise; since his own body is not even reported to have returned to life, but at this present day lies buried at Medina.

Moses, the founder of the Jewish law, a man of exemplary character, is nevertheless not entirely exempt from censure; as in the instance of his great reluctance to obey the express command of God in undertaking his embassy to Pharaoh; and again, in that of his distrust in God, which the Hebrews allow him to have shown in respect to the promise of water from the rock. Harassed as he was continually by murmurings and seditions in the wilderness, he himself attained very few, if any, of those rewards which, by his institution, he promised to his
people: 168 Neither did he ever reach that main ob-
ject of his views, the happy land of Canaan.

Christ, on the other hand, is described by his dis-
ciples as 164 "one without sin;" and to his enemies
he hath justly said, 165 "Which of you convinceth me
of sin?" 166 Whatsoever he commanded that others
should observe, he strictly regarded in his own prac-
tice. He faithfully executed every article of that
commission intrusted to him by his father: 167 his
whole life was blameless and without guile; of 168 in-
finité patience under injuries and tortures, as he
showed in his death upon the cross; of infinite love
to all men, even to his enemies and murderers, unto
whom he besought his father 169 to extend his mercy
and forgiveness. The reward which he promised to
his followers, he himself is not only reported but
proved to have obtained in the fullest and most emi-
nent degree: for 170 many, after his resurrection, be-
held him, heard him, and even touched him; 171 he
was carried up into heaven in the sight of the twelve;
and it is clearly evident that he there attained the
supreme dominion over all things, as he afterwards
endowed his apostles with the use of all 172 languages
whatever, and with other 173 miraculous powers, ac-
cording to his 174 promise when he departed from
them. It is wholly impossible, then, after these
things, to question the faithfulness or the ability of
Christ in giving us the promised recompense. And
thus have we exemplified in one point the superior
excellence of the Christian religion above all other
institutions; for Christ, the founder of it, illustrated
his precepts by his practice, and proved himself em-
powered by his own example to realise his promises.
SECTION XX.
FROM ITS WONDERFUL AND EXTENSIVE PROMULGATION.

Let us now proceed to examine this doctrine in regard to its progress and effects: and indeed, if these particulars be properly considered, it will be totally impossible to call it any other than a divine institution, if we only admit a providence over human affairs. That providence would necessarily promote and encourage to the utmost the most excellent system of morality and virtue: Christianity then hath certainly received that promotion and encouragement, since we find it propagated throughout all Europe, the most northern recesses of it not excepted; nor is it less so throughout all Asia and the Asiatic isles; throughout Egypt also and Ethiopia, and some other parts of Africa; and, lastly, throughout America. It is plain, moreover, from the histories of all ages, from the Christian accounts, from the synodical decrees, and from an ancient tradition which is still preserved among the Barbarians, in regard to the expeditions and miracles of Thomas, of Andrew, and of other apostles; it is plain, I say, from these concurrent evidences, that this extensive promulgation of Christianity is of no modern date, but of the highest antiquity. Clemens, Tertullian, and others, remark how universally the name of Christ was celebrated even in their day, among the Britons, the Germans, and other the most remote nations. Where is the religion then, which, in point of extensive reception, can be compared with
that of Christ? The term Paganism is one general description of men, not one particular religion. The Pagan adoration had no single and exclusive object: the stars, the elements were worshipped by the Pagans; particular kinds of animals were idolized by some of them, and imaginary deities by others; they were not governed by one and the same law; they were not instructed, as we are, by one and the same master. The Jews, it is true, are widely dispersed; but yet they are a single nation; neither did their religion receive any great increase, in point of numbers, after Christ's appearance; their very law, on the contrary, is indebted for its principal notoriety to the Christians rather than the Jews. Mahometanism is in many places extensively, but in few exclusively, established: for Christianity obtains in the Mahometan countries, and in some parts more generally than the national religion itself; while, on the other hand, Mahometans are very rarely to be met with in the Christian world.

SECTION XXI.

FROM A CONSIDERATION OF THE WEAKNESS AND SIMPLICITY OF THE FIRST TEACHERS OF THIS DOCTRINE.

Let us next consider by what instruments or means this rapid progress was effected, that, in this point also, Christianity may stand the test against all other institutions. Mankind in general, we perceive, are naturally inclined to imitate the examples of their princes and superiors: and this they do more especially when legal or compulsory methods are at hand
to enforce that imitation. To this the Pagan, to this
the Mahometan religion is indebted for its whole ad-
vancement: whereas the primitive teachers of Chris-
tianity were not only destitute of all authority, but
were even men of the most abject fortunes; such as
fishermen, weavers, and other mean mechanics. The
Christian religion notwithstanding, in a period of about
thirty years, was by their means extended throughout
all parts of the Roman empire, and even to the
Parthians and the Indians. And not in the com-
mencement alone, but in the continuance of it for
nearly three hundred years, it was so successfully
supported and promoted, solely by the means of
private individuals, without menaces, without bribes,
and in direct opposition to the utmost efforts of all
civil power and authority, that, before Constantine
embraced Christianity, it obtained in at least half
the countries of the Roman world. Among the
Grecians, all who offered any moral precepts and in-
struction to mankind attracted at the same time the
public notice and regard by their eminence in some
particular branch of literary science; the Platonists,
by their attention to geometry; the Peripatetics, by
their skill in natural philosophy; the Stoics, by their
subtilties in logical disputation; the Pythagoreans, by
their proficiency in harmony and numbers. Many,
moreover, had every collateral assistance which the
finest elocution could bestow: such were Plato, Xe-
ophon, Theophrastus. No arts like these had the
first Christian teachers to recommend their precepts;
their language was plain, simple, unadorned; they
openly and bluntly delivered their instructions, their
promises, their threats. And since it is impossible
that these means could ever have effected the progress that was made by Christianity, we must un-
avoidably infer that the glorious undertaking was accomplished, either by the immediate interposition or by the secret benediction of God himself; or rather by the joint operation of his miracles and his favour.

SECTION XXII.

FROM THE VERY GREAT IMPEDIMENTS OPPOSING THE RECEPTION, AND FROM THE VIOLENT DIS-
COURAGEMENTS SUPPRESSING THE PROFESSION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

It should also be remembered, that the first converts to the doctrine of these poor mechanics were a people not previously devoid of any certain system of religion whatsoever, as the first receivers of the Pagan and Mahometan institutions were known to be (for in that case they perhaps might easily have been induced to receive any that might offer); much less were they prepared for it by any antecedent institution, as the Hebrews were for the Mosaic law, by the ceremony of circumcision, and by the knowledge of one only God; but they were, on the contrary, a people biased by opinions, and influenced by that second nature, the prejudice of customs, repugnant in the strongest manner to the novel precepts of Christianity: they were, I say, early educated and fixedly established, as well by legal as by parental authority, either in the Pagan solemnities or in the Jewish rituals. Another and an equal disadvantage to this doctrine, consisted in the extreme severity of those calamities which the converts to Christianity
were obliged, as such, to endure frequently, and to apprehend incessantly. Since therefore we are all by nature averse from such a state of sufferance, it necessarily follows, that the introduction and reception of those tenets, to which such calamities were consequent, must have been attended with the greatest difficulty. The Christians were long debarred from all offices and civil honours. Amercements, confiscations, banishment, composed a trifling part of their afflictions: they were condemned to labour in the mines; they were tortured by all the inventions which the most refined cruelty could suggest: the punishments which they underwent, so continually terminated in death itself, that, according to the historians of those times, the fatal effects that were produced by them were never equalled, at any one period, by the ravages of famine, of pestilence, or of war. The manners of their deaths, moreover, were as uncommon as they were barbarous; the unhappy sufferers were either burnt alive at the stake, suspended on the cross, or executed by some other means of equal inhumanity, of which we cannot read or even think without the greatest horror. These enormities, however, (practised as they were, with very few and then only with partial intermissions, throughout the Roman empire, almost until the time of Constantine, and in other places even till a later period,) were so far from diminishing the numbers of the Christians, that the blood of the martyrs might be called, on the contrary, the very seed of the church; so quickly and abundantly new proselytes sprang up, to supply the place of those who were cut off. Here again let us draw the comparison between the Christian and every
other system of religion. The Grecian and the rest of the Pagan histories, exaggerated as they generally are, very rarely mention any instance of martyrdom in support of a particular doctrine; some indeed of the Gymnosophists (or Indian philosophers) are recorded as instances of this kind; and Socrates, but very few others, may be added to the number: men however of their consequence and character may, doubtless, fairly be suspected of having been induced, in some degree, to make this sacrifice of ambition and ostentatious pride; and the sure prospect of posthumous celebrity. The Christian martyrs, on the other hand, were in general men of the most obscure and humble situations in life; women also, and young persons of both sexes, who could neither desire or expect reasonably to immortalize their names: and indeed it is observable, in the martyrlogies, how small is the number of those persons whose names are expressly recorded, in comparison with the number of those who suffered in the same cause, and who are only mentioned in collective and undistinguished heaps. Besides, by any trifling show of conformity, as by the immaterial act of throwing frankincense upon the altar, the Christians, most of them, had it in their power to obtain a remission of their sentence: but this cannot be alleged in favour of those persons who certainly scrupled not, in all outward actions, to conform implicitly to the manners of the people at large, whatever sentiments they inwardly and secretly entertained. The Jews and Christians therefore are, strictly speaking, almost the only instances of true and religious martyrdom. Nor even to the Jews
can we ascribe this merit after the commencement of
the Christian era; and indeed to few of them before
that period, if we only compare them with the Chris-
tians, of whom a greater number suffered death in
support of their religion within a single province, than
the Jews were ever known to do; while, at the same
time, almost all the Jewish sufferings of this nature
are comprised within the times of Manasses and
Antiochus.

Since therefore, in this point also, we perceive the
infinite superiority of the Christian religion, it as-
sumedly behoveth us to give it the just preference
above all other institutions whatsoever; and we may
reasonably conclude, further, from the immense mul-
titude of persons of all ages, nations, sexes, and con-
ditions, who have cheerfully and gloriously fallen in
defence of Christianity, that there must have been
some great supporting cause of their astonishing per-
severance; nor can any other be imagined than the
light of truth, and the blessing of God's holy spirit.

SECTION XXIII.

IN ANSWER TO THOSE WHO DEMAND ADDITIONAL
AND MORE CONCLUSIVE ARGUMENTS.

If the arguments hitherto adduced in favour of the
Christian religion should be thought, by any person,
insufficient for the purpose of conviction, and still
more positive and decisive proof should be required,
ought to be remembered, that the different de-
grees of proof must depend upon the nature of the
different subjects in dispute. There is one kind of
deliberative questions, and a fourth in regard to facts; in which last kind of question the judgement must be formed upon plain and unsuspected evidence: for, if this sort of proof were deemed inadmissible, all the use of history would instantly vanish; the science of medicine would in great measure become useless also; and as the parent and the child can be mutually known by none other means, all the sacred duties of parental and filial affection would be totally destroyed.

God, however, hath thought proper to decree that those articles, wherein he requireth our implicit faith as a part of that unconditional obedience which we owe to him, should not be made known to us with that degree of certainty which we can obtain in respect to the immediate objects of our senses, or to such questions as admit of mathematical demonstration: it hath pleased him rather to make them only so far discoverable to us, as in reason may suffice to create faith, and to produce conviction, where the mind is not obstinately steeled against the force of it; that so by the gospel, as by a touchstone, he may try the temper and explore the qualities of the human heart. The arguments that have here been offered have been found so sufficiently convincing to many thousands of the wise and virtuous part of mankind, that the observation of this circumstance alone must make it evident to others, that the cause of unbelief consisteth not in the insufficiency of proof, but in the willful blindness of wicked men, when they are required to admit the truth of any doctrine which militates against their passions: it is difficult, I say, to treat with indifference and contempt the dazzling honours and the various allurements of the
world; yet this, they know, must be expected of them if they allow the truth of Christianity, and consequently think themselves bounden to obey the precepts of it. That this is the real ground of incredulity we may plainly discover from the ready credit which they give to many other historical narrations, supported solely by authoritative power, without any positive marks of their veracity at this day remaining; whereas the writings which relate to Christ can still produce undoubted traces of their authenticity, as well in the confession of the present Jews as in the existence of those Christian assemblies which are found in all parts of the world; and which, of necessity, must have been established upon some real and original foundation. Since then it is utterly impossible to ascribe to any human power the wonderful duration and the extensive promulgation of the Christian religion, we must consequently attribute these effects to the miracles of God; or, if these be not admitted, we must surely allow it to exceed all miracles, that a work of this kind, independent of any supernatural assistance, should ever be so lastingly and so universally established.
BOOK THE THIRD.

SECTION I.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BOOKS WHICH COMPOSE THE NEW TESTAMENT.

If the arguments already offered, or any which might still be added, should be found (as they surely must be) sufficiently conclusive of the superior excellence and truth of Christianity, I would recommend, in the next place, as the means of ample information in every particular, a thorough acquaintance with the most ancient writings which contain that religion; I mean the books of the New Testament, or Covenant, as it may more properly be called. It is asserted by every Christian that the tenets of his religion are comprehended in those books: this, therefore, cannot be disputed without singular injustice; for, as we credit the Mahometans in regard to their Koran, so ought we, in reason, to credit all sects whatsoever respecting the identity of the books which they declare to comprehend the tenets of their respective systems. Since, then, the preceding section hath proved incontestably the truth of Christianity; since also it is declared expressly that these books contain the Christian tenets, the authenticity of the books by this circumstance alone is sufficiently established: but if a more particular demonstration be required, we shall previously request the observation of that common rule which is constantly laid down
by all impartial judges, that he who shall presume to attack the authenticity of writings that have stood the test of ages unsuspected, shall, in the first instance, be required to take upon himself positively the whole labour of the proof; and, if he fail therein, that such writings shall be still declared to be authentic, as being of intrinsic and independent authority.

SECTION II.

THE BOOKS WERE ACTUALLY WRITTEN BY THEIR REPUTED AUTHORS.

We conclude, then, that those writings of which the Christians never entertain a doubt, and to which some nominal author is affixed, are in reality the respective compositions of those authors by whose names they are distinguished: Justin, Irenæus, Clemens, and other writers, successively extol them under those very titles; and moreover, Tertullian declares that even the original manuscripts themselves were, some of them, in his time extant; besides, before any general assembly or synod had been holden, they were universally received as such by all the churches. Neither have the Pagans or the Jews ever urged it as a ground of controversy, that these books were not the actual compositions of their reputed authors: nay, Julian confesses plainly that the works which we ascribe to Peter, Paul, Matthew, Mark and Luke, were certainly written respectively by those very persons. No man in his senses has a doubt of the identity of the works which are attributed to Homer and Virgil; because of the perpetual testimony of the Latins in the one instance, and of the Grecians in
the other. How much the rather, then, ought we to believe the identity of the authors of these books, when they are supported by the concurrent testimonies of almost every nation in the universe!

SECTION III.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF SOME OF THOSE BOOKS WAS FORMERLY, BUT UNJUSTLY, SUSPECTED.

Some parts of the New Testament, as it now stands, were not originally received in like manner with the rest. — Such are, for instance, the 2d Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of James, and of Jude, and the 2d and 3d Epistles of John the Elder, the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews: still, however, they were so received as to be acknowledged by many of the churches, as appears from the sacred light in which they were considered by the primitive Christians, who appealed to them as to authentic and religious testimonies. It is therefore probable that the churches which did not at the first make use of these particular portions of the New Testament, were either totally ignorant of them, or in some degree doubtful of them; but that, afterwards, upon proper information of the truth, they began to receive them as the other churches had done, and consequently we now find them almost universally admitted. It is, moreover, impossible to assign any reasonable inducement to a forgery of this kind, since nothing can be collected from these writings which is not abundantly comprehended in those other books of the New Testament which never have been subject to the slightest shadow of suspicion.
SECTION IV.

THE AUTHORITY OF THOSE BOOKS WHICH DO NOT SPECIFY THE NAMES, IS ESTABLISHED BY THE QUALITY OF THE WRITERS.

It is by no means in itself a sufficient ground of disbelief in respect to the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the name of the writer is not precisely known: neither can it be a more reasonable matter of objection against the two Epistles of John, and the Apocalypse, that some have a doubt whether John the Apostle, or another of that name, were the writer of them. The sufficient qualifications of an author, in respect to his veracity and his proper knowledge of the facts related by him, are much more to be attended to than his mere discriminative title. And hence it is that we regard the information of several historical books, of which the authors are unknown to us: thus, in the instance of Caesar's Alexandrian war, we read it well assured that, whosoever the writer may have been, he must have been alive at that period, and conversant with those transactions. We ought in like manner to rest satisfied with the proofs which are given us by the authors of the books in question, that they were alive at that early age of Christianity, and endued with the apostolical commission and powers. Now if any person should assert that these qualifications in this instance may have been counterfeited, and that the very names also which are affixed to the other writings may have been in like manner fictitiously assigned, he would assert a most incredible position: viz, that they who instil into our minds at every word the earnest love
of truth and virtue, have chosen voluntarily and unnecessarily to involve themselves at once in all the guilt of forgery; a crime not only detested by all good men, but even capitally punished by the laws of Rome.

SECTION V.

THESE AUTHORS WROTE THE TRUTH, BECAUSE THEY HAD A THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF THE PARTICULARS OF WHICH THEY TREATED:

Every false assertion must either originate from ignorance or from a bad intention; and since it is most clearly evident that the books of the New Testament were written by the persons whose names are prefixed to them, or by men who really were what they profess to be; since, further, it is not less evident that they knew the particulars which they relate, neither had they any design of telling an untruth, it follows that their record must be true. Matthew, John, Peter, and Jude were of the number of the twelve whom Jesus had selected, that they might more immediately bear witness of his life and doctrine; so that they could not possibly be ignorant of the facts which they relate. The same may be said of James, who was either an apostle, or, as some will have it, a near kinsman of Jesus; and bishop of Jerusalem by apostolical appointment. Paul could not be suspected of ignorance in respect to those tenets of Christianity which, as he assures us, were revealed unto him from heaven by Jesus Christ himself; neither was it possible that he, or Luke the constant companion of his travels, should be deceived in the particulars that were transacted by himself. Luke, moreover, might easily be assured of the truth of his
accounts in relation to the life and death of Jesus, having been born in the same part of the world, and having actually travelled through Palæstine; where, as he relates, he conversed with the very persons who had been eye-witnesses of the facts recorded. Exclusively of the apostles, whom he knew intimately, there were, doubtless, many others at that time living whose infirmities and diseases had been healed by the saving hand of Jesus, and who had seen him as well before his crucifixion as after his resurrection.

If then, relying upon the diligent inquiries of Tacitus and Suetonius, we scruple not to trust them, in regard to the occurrences of times long prior to their own existence, how much more justly may this writer challenge our belief, who declares that he derived personally the whole of his information from the identical witnesses of the actual transactions! Mark has always been described as the inseparable companion of Peter, so that his writings may be considered in the same light as if Peter, who could not be ignorant of those transactions, had dictated the contents of them: besides, almost all the particulars related by Mark are contained in the accounts which are given us by the apostles.—It is equally impossible that the writer of the Revelation could be deceived in those visions which he affirms to have been sent down to him from heaven; or that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews should have been deceived in the particulars which he professes to have received, either from the oral instruction of the Apostles themselves, or from the blessed inspiration of God's holy spirit.
SECTION VI.

AND BECAUSE THEY HAD NO INTENTION TO DECEIVE.

We have in the second place asserted, that the writers of the New Testament had no design of telling an untruth; and this part of our assertion is intimately connected with what we have before observed (see particularly the 6th, 7th, and 10th sections of the second book) when we undertook to establish generally the truth of the Christian religion, and of the resurrection of its divine Author. It is highly just and necessary, that all who shall impeach the validity of an evidence, on the score of intentional deceit, shall adduce some credible and sufficient reason in support of such impeachment. But, in the present instance, what reason can possibly be adduced? If it be alleged that the witnesses had an interest in the cause, it will be right to consider in what respect they could have that interest. We cannot, surely, ascribe their conduct to the hopes of any advantage, or to the fears of any danger; because, on account of that profession, there was no advantage which they would not forfeit, no danger which they would not undergo. We cannot, therefore, consider it as their own cause, except, indeed, in respect to the interest which they had in promoting the worship of the Deity; and this surely can induce the assertion of a falsehood in no instance whatsoever; especially in that whereupon the eternal salvation of mankind is immediately dependent. 15 The perfect purity of their religious tenets, and the unexceptionable tenour of their own lives, which even their most inveterate
enemies were unable to arraign in any single instance, make it wholly impossible to suspect them of such consummate wickedness; neither was there ever any one ground of objection preferred against them, except that of their simplicity and inexperience; circumstances, above all others, the least likely to produce either an inclination or a power to deceive. In addition to these arguments, it may fairly be supposed that if, in the smallest degree, they had been capable of a breach of faith, they never would have been the voluntary means of recording to the latest ages the instances of their own misconduct and disgrace; as they have been, in respect to their desertion and flight, when Christ was apprehended; and in Peter's repeated denial of his Lord.

SECTION VII.

The credibility of these authors derives additional confirmation from the signal miracles that were performed by them:

So far from a just imputation of any breach of faith in the conduct of the Apostles, God himself hath afforded the most illustrious testimonies of their veracity and faithfulness by the miracles that were performed, according to the confident and public declarations of themselves or their disciples: they scrupled not herein to state expressly the names and other circumstances of persons and of places; so that the civil powers were fully enabled, by the slightest attention and inquiry, to ascertain their veracity, or to detect their impostures. And here, among the rest, the constant and public assertions which they made in respect to their immediate and familiar
use of every language, previously unknown to them, before many thousands of men "out of every nation under heaven;" their assertions also in respect to the instantaneous cures administered in the sight of all the people to corporal infirmities: these instances, I say, are proofs of their veracity which deserve our particular observation. They knew, but they disdained to fear, the inveterate hatred of the Jewish magistrates at that period, and the active severity of Roman prejudice against them; so that both the Jewish and the Roman nation, considering these men as the authors of a new religion, were likely to neglect no ground of criminal accusation that could possibly be brought against them. Still, however, neither Jews or Pagans, in the times immediately subsequent to those transactions, ever dared to deny that miracles were performed by the Apostles. Nay, Phlegon, the freed-man of the Emperor Adrian, hath recorded in his Annals the miracles of Peter; and the Christians themselves, in the books in which they justify the motives of their faith to the emperors, the senate, and the governors, assert these facts as matters of the most perfect notoriety, and of the most undoubted authenticity. They even publicly affirm, that a miraculous virtue remained inherent in their sepulchres for some ages after their decease, though they must have been aware of the easy detection to which such a declaration, if false, would be exposed, and of the disgrace and punishment which they would consequently bring upon themselves. So frequently, however, and so numerously attested were the miracles performed at the sepulchres above mentioned, that they have extorted even from Porphyrius an acknowledgement of their reality.
SECTION VIII.

As the truth of their writings doth, from the many particulars contained in them, which the event hath proved to have been derived from divine revelation.

The arguments already offered ought, doubtless, to suffice, but others in abundance concur with them in recommending the New Testament to our full and implicit confidence. Numerous are the prophecies observable in those writings, which human knowledge, of itself, could never have attained, and which, in an amazing manner, are eventually accomplished: such, for example, are the prophecies importing the sudden and extensive propagation of Christianity; the perpetual duration of it; the rejection of it, generally speaking, by the Jews; the reception which it was to meet with among the Gentiles; the hatred which the Jews manifested against the professors of it; the persecutions and extreme cruelties to be endured by those professors; the siege and destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem; the singular calamities of the Jewish nation.

SECTION IX.

Then again, from the care which God would think it expedient to take on this occasion to prevent all false and supposititious writings.

If, moreover, we admit the interposition of a Divine Providence in the affairs of men, in those affairs especially which immediately concern the honour and
worship of the Deity, it is impossible to suppose that Providence should ever have allowed so many millions of men (whose only design was to do God service) to be deceived by the writings of impostors. It is, further, an argument of no inconsiderable weight in proof of the total deficiency of all just objections against these books, that we find hardly any single sect, among the many to which Christianity gave birth, refusing to receive them all, or at least the greatest part of them, with very few and immaterial exceptions; although, at the same time, such violent degrees of mutual animosity subsisted between those sects, that whatsoever was approved by any one of them, was for that single but sufficient reason disapproved by all the rest.

SECTION X.

IT IS ABSURDLY OFFERED IN OBJECTION, THAT SOME MEN REJECTED MANY OF THESE BOOKS.

There were some indeed, but very few, among those who were willing to be accounted Christians, who nevertheless thought proper to reject such books of the New Testament as seemed to militate against those tenets which they exclusively adopted. Such were they who, either through their hatred of the Jews, were accustomed, on the one hand, to blaspheme the God of Israel, the Maker of the world, and to abuse the Jewish law; or, through a base fear of the misfortunes to which the Christians were exposed, were, on the other hand, anxious to conceal themselves beneath the cloak of Judaism, because the profession of that religion was admitted without
molestation. These very persons, however, were universally disowned by all other Christians, even during that period when, as yet, all differences of opinion were tolerated with great charity and forbearance, according to the express apostolical injunctions, without the imputation of heresy or irreligion. The vile corrupters of Christianity, to whom we first alluded, are sufficiently refuted, we conceive, by the arguments which proved, in a former part of this undertaking, (see book i. sect. 3. and seq.) the existence of one true God, the creator of the whole universe: and, indeed, the very books that are received by these heretics, in order to preserve in some degree the appearance of Christians, make it fully evident, as we see especially in the Gospel of Saint Luke, that the same God, whom Moses and the Hebrews worshipped, was preached also by Jesus Christ.—We shall find a proper opportunity to refute those of the second denomination, when we shall commence our attack upon all descriptions of Judaism whatsoever, as well real as ostensible.—In the mean time, I cannot help observing the astonishing impudence of those who would depreciate the authority of St. Paul, when there was not one of the apostles who founded a greater number of Christian churches than himself; not one by whom so many miracles were said to have been done at that very period, when, as we have just before observed, the truth of the facts might have been easily ascertained or denied. Now if he really wrought miracles, how can we reasonably question the veracity of his relation in respect to the visions which appeared to him from heaven, and the commission which he received from Christ? And then it
unavoidably follows, that, if Christ bestowed on him such distinguished tokens of divine favour, he could not possibly have been a promoter of any doctrine displeasing to Christ, as all false doctrines must certainly have been. The dispensation that was given to the Jews, releasing them from their observance of the formal rites and ceremonies which the Mosaic institution had commanded, was the sole ground of objection against Paul: but what other motive than the force of truth could induce Paul to preach that dispensation, since he himself had undergone the ceremony of circumcision, and was for the most part a voluntary observer of the Jewish law? He was, moreover, at all times prepared in his own person, for the service of Christianity, to perform greater difficulties than any which that law enjoined him, and to endure greater hardships than any to which that law exposed him: his disciples likewise, by his authority and example, were instructed to act and to suffer like himself. Hence then it is evident that he sought not to please the ear or to consult the convenience of his audience; when, instead of the observance of the sabbath only, he taught them "to continue daily in the temple;" instead of the trifling charges which their law imposed upon them, he taught them to bear patiently the loss of every earthly possession whatsoever; and instead of the sacrifice of the blood of bulls and of goats, he taught them to dedicate even their own blood to the service of their God. Paul himself also openly affirms, that "when Peter, and John, and James, perceived the grace which was given to him, they gave to him the right hand of fellowship;" and this assertion, if it had
been false, he never could have dared to utter, as those very men were at that time still living, and consequently able to convict him of a downright falsehood. Exclusively then of these two particular descriptions of men above mentioned, who can scarcely be accounted Christians; in consideration also of our late remarks upon the miracles performed by the writers of the New Testament; in consideration, further, of the special interference of God's providence in affairs of this nature; on these additional accounts, I say, the very ready reception which these books universally met with from the many remaining Christian sects, ought certainly to entitle them to a sufficient claim upon the faith of all impartial persons: for all other histories whatsoever, though unsupported by testimonies like these, are constantly received as authentic, unless some strong ground of positive objection can be alleged against them; and not a single shadow of any fair objection arises, we are well assured, against the books in question.

SECTION XI.

IT IS WITH EQUAL ABSURDITY ALLEGED, THAT THESE BOOKS CONTAIN FACTS WHICH ARE IMPOSSIBLE:

In respect to the supposed impossibilities contained in these books, that objection, if it should be made, must fall immediately to the ground; since it hath been already shown that there are certain things which, though they be with men totally impossible, are nevertheless easily possible with God; that is to say, those things which do not in themselves imply a
contradiction; and since it hath been also shown that those particular objects of our greatest admiration, the exertions of a supernatural power, and the restoration of the dead to life, are, among other things, within that description.

SECTION XII.

OR INCONSISTENT WITH REASON.

Nor are those cavillers more entitled to our attention, who assert these books to be incompatible with the principles of right reason: an assertion of this kind is, in the first place, refuted by the infinite number of able and wise persons in all ages, who have, from the very earliest period, implicitly relied on their authority. Then again, whatsoever points of doctrine we have proved to be consistent with right reason in the first part of this work,—the existence, for example, of a Deity; his unity, his infinite perfection, his eternity, his attributes of unbounded power, and wisdom, and goodness; the proofs also that that Deity created all things; that he extendeth his providence over all his works, and over man especially; that he is able, even after this life, to reward the faithful and obedient; that it is incumbent upon us to curb our passions; that all men are related to each other as the children of one father; that all men ought, consequently, to “love one another;” —all these doctrinal points, I say, are abundantly and explicitly contained in the New Testament. To assert any thing beyond these as certain and infallible, respecting the nature or the will of the Deity, by the sole guidance of human reason, is
sufficiently shown to be an attempt of danger and uncertainty, as well by the many jarring determinations of scholastic disputants, as by the self-contradictory opinions of particular philosophers. Nor is this a matter of surprise; for if men fall into opinions so erroneous, and so widely different in respect to the nature of their own souls, how much more unavoidable it is, that they should err when they attempt in any instance to define the nature of that Supreme Being, so infinitely above the reach of human comprehension! The skilful politician declares the danger and absurdity of attempting to investigate the counsels of kings: where then is the man whose penetration is sufficient to justify a hope of his success in discovering, by his own casual conjecture, the counsels of the King of kings, in respect to the disposal of those things over which his authority is absolute and independent? Wisely then was it affirmed by Plato, "that the will of the gods can never be attained by man without an express oracular declaration of that will." No oracular declaration however can possibly be produced, the reality of which can be established by more authentic testimonies than those which are contained in the books of the New Testament. It hath not been asserted even, much less hath it been proved, that God hath ever communicated unto mankind any particulars of his own nature repugnant to the tenor of these books: nor can any later intimation of his will be produced to which our credit can be reasonably given. Then as to the observance of any practices or customs which were either manifestly immaterial, not absolutely necessary, or not positively wrong, and which nevertheless were commanded or
allowed before the Christian era; in things, I say, of this description, there certainly can be nothing repugnant to the doctrine of the New Testament; for, in matters of this nature, all former laws are virtually repealed by those of a later institution.

SECTION XIII.

THE INCONSISTENCIES WHICH MAY BE FOUND IN THESE BOOKS AFFORD NO JUST GROUND OF OBJECTION AGAINST THEIR AUTHENTICITY.

The occasional points of difference which are here and there observable in the sense of certain passages, are so far from being, as some are apt to make them, any ground of objection against the books of the New Testament, that they must, on the other hand, be allowed by every impartial judge to be so many additional arguments in their favour. The writers of these books unanimously and universally agree upon all material points of doctrine or of history in the clearest manner possible: in a manner no where else observable among writers of any single sect or profession whatsoever; whether Jews, Grecian philosophers, physicians, or Roman lawyers. These, all of them, nay even persons of the same sect (as Xenophon and Plato were) are not only chargeable with numberless contradictions of each other, but also with frequent contradictions of themselves, as if they had forgotten what they had asserted, or knew not what they should assert. The writers in question, on the other hand, inculcate always the same articles of faith, enjoin always the same moral duties, and give always ex-
actly the same account, in every main point, of the life, and death, and resurrection of Christ. Then in regard to the trifling and immaterial points of difference which occur in them, these, very possibly, may be capable of receiving an easy and exact reconciliation, although we, through the similar events of different periods, the ambiguity and plurality of the names of men and places, and through other causes of the like nature, may be unable to discover the means of reconciling them. Nay, these very points of difference ought alone sufficiently to vindicate these writers from every suspicion of imposture, because it is the constant practice of false witnesses to concur, by previous agreement, so exactly in their several depositions, that there may not exist, even in appearance, the faintest colour of a difference. Besides, if any slight, yet totally irreconcileable, matter of disagreement were sufficient to destroy the credit of whole books, there would not be a single book, especially in historical matters, which could ever be read with the smallest degree of confidence. Since, however, in the essential matter of their respective histories, we allow the authenticity of Polybius, of Dionysius, of Livy, and of Plutarch, although we detect them in certain incoherent passages; how much more reasonable it is, that a circumstance of this kind should not be suffered to invalidate our confidence in men, who were always, as their writings prove them, the strictest and most diligent adherents to piety and truth.
The Testimonies of Foreign Nations Confirm Rather than Disprove the Authority of These Books.

But however a question may be supported by evidence on the one side, there yet remains a possible mode of refutation by external testimonies adduced on the other. No such testimonies however in the present instance, I am bold to say, can possibly be found; unless indeed it should be thought allowable to consider in that light the assertions of men who were not born till long after the events; of men too by no means entitled to appear as witnesses herein, because of their open and declared aversion from the cause of Christianity. The very reverse of this objection is, however, in the present case the truth; for we frequently find (although this additional proof be not wanted) the collateral evidence of other books strongly confirming particular parts of the accounts of the New Testament. Thus, for example, the crucifixion of Jesus, and the miracles performed by him and by his disciples, are at once recorded by the Hebrews and the Pagans. The celebrated writings of Josephus, published about forty years after Christ's ascension, and extant at this present day, make mention of Herod and of Pilate; of Festus, of Felix, of John the Baptist, of Gamaliel, and of the destruction of Jerusalem; with these also agree the accounts which are received among the Talmudists in relation to the period above mentioned. The cruel persecutions of the Christians under Nero have been transmitted to posterity by Tacitus: books also have in former times
been extant, (as well private compositions, like that of Phlegon, as general compilations, like the public acts to which the Christians frequently appealed,) establishing by their concurrent testimony the truth of our accounts in respect to the appearance of the star at the nativity of Christ, as well as of the earthquake, and preternatural eclipse of the sun, when the moon was at the full, about the time of our Saviour's crucifixion.

SECTION XV.

THE SCRIPTURES NEVER HAVE BEEN CHANGED OR ALTERED.

What further can be offered in objection to these books, in truth, I know not; unless perhaps it may be said with that design, that they have not remained always as they were originally written. They have been exposed, I must confess, as all other books have been, and have suffered by having been exposed, to that inattention as well as awkwardness, which, in a variety of copies, must naturally render unavoidable some casual omissions, additions, and changes in particular letters, syllables, and words. Nevertheless, because of any difference of this kind, which in a long series of years could not fail to arise among the copies, it surely were unjust to controvert the validity of such a record or book as the New Testament; when we are at once directed in these cases, as well by custom as by reason, to prefer uniformly that reading which is supported by the most numerous and most ancient copies! To say that all the copies were corrupted, by wilful design or by any other means, and that too in any of the material points of doc-
trine or of history,) is a mere assertion incapable of proof; neither is it supported by any later record, or by any witnesses living at the time. And as to the assertions of men who, as we have just observed, were born long after the events, and who openly declared the most inveterate hatred to the Christian name, these surely cannot be considered in the light of impartial evidence, but in that of prejudiced and malicious calumny. Enough then hath been already said to silence that objection which attacks the identity of the Scriptures; because, in an assertion of this nature, especially when levelled at a Scripture so long and so extensively established, the whole business of the proof may be fairly thrown upon the assailants; still however, in order to expose further the absurdity of that assertion, we will prove, affirmatively, that this pretended fact of theirs is not only false but impossible. In a former section we have shown incontestably, that these respective books were really written by their reputed authors; and if this position be admitted, it follows unavoidably that they are not supposititious. Then again I affirm, that no material change has taken place in them. A change of that sort must have been made with some design, and must have produced some considerable disagreement between the part so changed and the other passages and books which did not undergo the same alteration. Now this disagreement is no where visible. On the contrary, as we have before remarked, that perfect and universal harmony so prevalent throughout, is not more wonderful than it is observable. Besides, whenever any work was first published, either by the Apostles or by others under their commission,
the zealous piety of the Christians, and their anxious desire of transmitting the entire truth to their posterity, would doubtless prompt them to preserve frequent copies of it for themselves; which copies, consequently, were dispersed as far as the Christian name extended, throughout Europe, Asia, and Egypt, where the Greek language was in use; nay, even some of the original manuscripts themselves, as we remarked in the second section of this book, were extant at the close of the second century. Any book, therefore, so repeatedly transcribed, so extensively circulated, and so carefully preserved, as well by the private care of individuals as by the general protection of the churches, was utterly exempted from the possibility of an interpolation. We are to remember also, that, in the ages immediately subsequent to that period, the books of the New Testament were translated into the Syriac, the *Æthiopian*, the Arabic, and the Latin tongues: these versions are at this day extant; neither do they differ in any one material point from the Greek original. Then, again, we have the writings of those men who received their information either from the Apostles themselves, or from their disciples; and these we find exactly corresponding, in frequent quotations from these books, with the modern acceptation of their meaning. Besides, an individual member of the church in those times was never possessed of authority sufficient to enforce his commands, had he wished and endeavoured to introduce an innovation: this we may collect very plainly from the free and open manner in which Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian dissented from the most eminent men in the Christian church. In the times subsequent to those
of which we have been speaking, many characters arose of the highest eminence in learning and in judgement; these, all of them, after a strict examination of the subject, received and embraced these books, as remaining still in their original purity. Applicable, in this place, is the same observation which we lately made upon the different sects of Christianity; that all of them, at least all which acknowledge God as the creator of the universe, and Christ as the author of a new law, receive and use the New Testament as it is established amongst us. Now if any of them had discovered an intention of making an interpolation, the rest would have accused them of an act of forgery. Besides, that no sect ever rose to such a pitch of licentious proceedings as to alter and adapt, at will, the purport of these books to their own particular tenets, is sufficiently apparent from this single observation; that all of them deduce severally, from this very source, their arguments against the rest. Nor less applicable upon this occasion, as well to the material passages as to the books at large, is the hint which we have already given in respect to the Divine Providence (see sect. ix.), wherein we represented the inconsistent part which the Deity would be supposed to act, were we to believe him capable of suffering so many millions of devout and pious men, who were seeking with the utmost earnestness the means of their eternal salvation, to be betrayed into an error which they could not possibly avoid.

Suffice, then, what hath been advanced in defence of the books of the New Testament; books amply sufficient of themselves (were they alone extant) to lead us to the certain knowledge of the true religion.
SECTION XVI.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

And now, since God hath graciously thought fit to leave in our possession the records of the Jewish, which was once the true religion, and which still remains a testimony of no inconsiderable consequence in the cause of Christianity, it will not be improper to establish also, in this place, the title which they have to our belief. That the books of the Old Testament were respectively written by their reputed authors, is a fact that will admit of the same degree of proof as we have already given in relation to the New. Now these reputed authors were either prophets, or men equally entitled to our fullest confidence, from their singular integrity. Such was Esdras, for example, who, while the prophets Aggai, Malachi, and Zechariah were still living, is said to have collected all the sacred writings into one volume. I shall not here repeat what hath been said in recommendation of Moses, (b. i. sect. 15.) but while his earlier history, as we have already shown, is supported by numerous vouchers from the class of Pagan writers, the sacred historians of a later period are by no means less so: thus did the Phœnician annals make mention of the names of David and of Solomon, and of the leagues into which they entered with the Tyrians. And Berosus made as frequent mention as the Hebrew accounts have done, of Nabuchodonosor and other kings of the Chaldæans. The Egyptian king Vaphres, as Jeremiah calls him, is the same with Apries mentioned by Hero-
dotus. The Grecian histories abound with the names of all the Persian kings, from Cyrus the first, to Darius (Codomanus) the last, emperor of the Persian monarchy. Josephus also, in his writings against Appion, adduces many other particulars in relation to the Jews; to which might be added, further, our former quotations from Strabo and Trogus Pompeius. It is, however, altogether impossible that we Christians, as we profess to be, should ever call in question for a moment the credit of those books, when the proofs of a continual and almost universal reference from the books of the Christian to those of the Jewish dispensation are, in the former, so expressly apparent. Christ, when he reprimanded upon various accounts the doctors of the Jewish law, and the Pharisees of his own time, never once complained of any wilful or ignorant falsehoods practised either by themselves or others in regard to the books of Moses and the prophets: and, after his departure, if we will consider duly the extensive, or rather the universal, dispersion of the Jews, who, whithersoever they were driven, still carefully preserved, and jealously protected, those books, we shall find the supposition as unworthy of credit, as it is otherwise incapable of proof, that any corruptions can ever have obtained in the material passages of Scripture. In the first place we are to remember the abduction of the ten tribes; (by Salmanasar king of Assyria, about the year 721 bef. Ch.) and afterwards that of the two remaining tribes; (by Nebuchadnezzar, the second of that name, king of Babylon, about the year 598 bef. Ch.) Of these, when Cyrus, after 70 years, had restored them to liberty, and allowed them to return,
many settled in foreign countries. Thousands of them were prevailed upon by the advantageous offers of the Macedonians to migrate to Alexandria. The cruelty of Antiochus, the civil dissensions of the Hasmonæans, the foreign wars of Pompey and of Sossius, dispersed great numbers of them. The country of Cyrene, the cities of Asia, Macedonia, and Lycaonia, the islands Cyprus, Crete, and others; all these, I say, abounded with Jews. The immense numbers of them which lived at Rome may even be collected from Horace, from Juvenal, and from Martial. Scattered, therefore, and dispersed as they were, no deceit could possibly be practised upon them all; neither were they able, for the same reasons, to contrive on their part any general plan of imposition. We are further to remember, that, through the care and attention of the kings of Egypt, the Hebrew original was translated into Greek by the Seventy Interpreters, as they are called, almost three hundred years before our Saviour. At that period, therefore, the Scriptures became likewise in the possession of the Greeks; in a different language it is true, yet still in point of sense nearly, if not entirely, the same. Hence were they again rendered still less liable to any alteration. Translations also were afterwards produced in the Chaldaean and Semi-Syriac languages; the latter of which was the language of Jerusalem. Of these translations some were almost immediately precedent, others almost immediately subsequent, to the coming of our Saviour. Then followed the other Greek versions of Aquila, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion, wherein, when Origen and others after
him conferred them with that of the 70 interpreters, no difference in point of historical fact, and indeed no material difference of any kind, was ever observable. Philo, who flourished in the reign of Caligula; and Josephus, who lived still later, to the days of Vespasian and Titus; these, both of them, cite the same passages, as we read them at this day, from the books of the Hebrews. Christianity, moreover, began at this period to extend itself daily; and this very religion was embraced by many of the Hebrew nation: many also, who were not Jews, had learnt the Hebrew language. These therefore, if in any material part, I say, the Jews had admitted any falsehood, would doubtless have been ready to detect and expose the innovation, as they might easily have done, by comparing the suspected passage with that of earlier editions. We do not, however, find this to be the case in any single instance; nay, in all their quotations from the Old Testament, they plainly and continually agree with the Hebrew acceptation of the same passages: now the Hebrews, we may well imagine, might sooner be convicted of any crime whatsoever than of that, I will not say of wilful deceit, but of casual neglect, in regard to these books; since they actually were used to copy and compare them with such reverential care, such scrupulous exactness, that they even numbered the several repetitions of every particular letter.—One additional argument, of no despicable force, to exculpate the Jews from the charge of having purposely altered the Holy Scriptures, I shall here take occasion to offer in conclusion, by observing, that, from the very same books which are read and received by all the Jews, the
Christians also, as they trust, *incontestably*, do prove their own master Jesus Christ to be that very Messiah who was promised of old to the forefathers of the Jewish nation. The possibility of such a proof the Jews, no doubt, would have prevented to the utmost, when dissensions had arisen between them and the Christians, if they ever had been able to alter, as they thought proper, the passages of holy writ.
BOOK THE FOURTH.

SECTION I.

A PARTICULAR REFUTATION OF THE SEVERAL RELIGIONS WHICH DIFFER FROM THE CHRISTIAN.

There is a certain selfish satisfaction very generally prevalent in the human breast, arising from the sight of others in a state of danger, when we ourselves are placed above the reach of it: from this consideration I design, in the present book, to show, that the main business of a Christian in this life ought indispensably to be of such a nature, that he may not only congratulate with himself, as far as he is personally concerned, upon his own discovery of the way of truth, but that he may extend also to others, yet wandering in the mazes of error and perplexity, the benefits of that discovery, and may render them partakers of so great a blessing. This we have already in some measure attempted in the preceding books, inasmuch as every demonstration of truth includeth, virtually, a refutation of error. Since, however, each particular religion opposed to Christianity (the Pagan, for example, the Mahometan, and the Jewish,) since each of these, I say, exclusive of the errors which they have in common, has others also peculiar to itself, and usually meets us upon certain singular and distinct grounds of argument, it will not, I believe, be thought foreign or digressive, to institute a special
discussion of the subject with each of them; be-
speaking solely the candid attention of our readers,
totally unbiased by any previous study, unprejudiced
by any inveterate habit, (for these I consider as im-
pediments to a perfect judgement,) that so they may
attain a more competent understanding, and form
thereupon a more just determination of the point in
question.

SECTION II.

AND FIRST, A REFUTATION OF PAGANISM, BY THE
PROOF OF ONE SOLE GOD.—CREATED SPIRITS
ARE EITHER GOOD OR BAD: BUT EVEN THE
GOOD ARE ENTITLED TO NO WORSHIP, UNLESS
IT BE PRESCRIBED BY THE SUPREME BEING.

In the first place, then, as a full and ample con-
futation of that absurd idea, the Pagan plurality of
gods eternal and coequal, we appeal to the doctrine
established in the very beginning of this work, re-
specting the existence of One God, the sole and
universal Cause.—If, however, the Pagans apply the
appellation of gods to those created spirits which are
superior to man, they must necessarily call them
either good or evil. If they call them good, they
ought first carefully to ascertain the propriety of the
appellation, lest haply they commit a dangerous
mistake by receiving enemies as friends, and trea-
cherous deserters as faithful ambassadors: they ought,
secondly, to consider how reasonable and requisite it
is that some manifest distinction should be made be-
tween the Supreme Deity and these inferior beings,
in the act of religious worship: they ought to under-
stand, further, the relation and order of these beings
in respect to each other; the particular good to be expected from them severally; and the determinate portion of divine honour allowed to each of them by their supreme ruler. From the total deficiency of the Pagans in all these necessary points of information, we may plainly perceive how doubtful and ignorant they are in every particular of their religion: we may see too, how much more safely they would act, if they would entirely transfer their adoration to its only proper object, the sole Sovereign of heaven and of earth! This even Plato hath declared to be incumbent upon every wise man: and the more so, doubtless, we shall think it, if we only will consider, that as the good spirits are at best no more than humble attendants upon the will of the Most High God, whosoever obtaineth the gracious favour of the latter, cannot fail to secure the devoted service of the former.

SECTION III.

WHEREAS EVEN THE WORSHIPPING OF EVIL SPIRITS IS PROVED TO BE THE PRACTICE OF THE PAGANS: A PRACTICE UTTERLY DISGRACEFUL AND IMPIOUS.

It is sufficiently evident, however, that the objects of the Pagan worship were not good, but evil spirits. In the first place, so far from referring their worshippers to the adoration of the Supreme God, they abolished all adoration of him to the utmost of their power; or wished at least to give themselves, in every respect, an equal degree of worship. In the next place, they injured and oppressed as much as possible the worshippers of the One Supreme Being, by
exciting against them the power of the magistrates and the passions of the people. The poets recorded with impunity the acts of murder and adultery which had been committed by the Pagan deities; the Epicureans denied without molestation the interposition of a providence; in short, every religion or sect whatsoever,—the Egyptian, the Phrygian, the Grecian forms of worship; the Tuscan rites and mysteries of Rome; all these, I say, how different and opposite soever, were readily allowed and tolerated. The Jews alone (as we may perceive from the satires and epigrams of those poets) were a constant and universal subject of derision: sometimes, indeed, they were even driven into banishment. The Christians moreover were sentenced to the cruellest and severest punishments; nor can any other reason be assigned, possibly, for the rigid treatment of these two sects, than that of their adherence to the worship of One God: which worship the Pagan deities, jealous rather of him than of each other, counteracted and opposed by every endeavour. In the third place, the modes of worship were of a nature little suited to a Being of goodness and of purity:—human sacrifices; naked races up and down the temples; games and dances replete with obscenity: instances whereof are seen even at this day among the savage natives of America and Africa, who are still lost in the thick clouds of Paganism. Some nations, moreover, undoubtedly have been and are still known to be avowed and intentional worshippers of evil spirits. The Persians, for example, had their Arimanius; the Grecians their Cacodæmons; the Romans their Vejoves; and certain Ethiopians and Indians wor-
ship others at this day. Proceedings more impious cannot possibly be imagined; for what is all religious worship, but a testimony and acknowledgement of the highest goodness inherent in the object to which it is addressed? When offered therefore to an evil spirit, it is an act of falsehood and hypocrisy: nay, it is an act of absolute rebellion, whereby we not only deprive our legal sovereign of his just homage, but even transfer that homage to a base apostate and an open enemy! Some indeed are weak enough to imagine that God, as a being of infinite goodness, will never be provoked to punish this rebellion: a spirit of revenge, say they, is wholly incompatible with the attribute of perfect goodness. A fatal and absurd idea this! The powers of Mercy must be limited, that her actions may be just: and when wickedness becomes excessive, punishment as it were unavoidably arises out of justice. Others again, not less absurdly, attempt to palliate their iniquity in worshipping, by their cowardice in fearing evil spirits. But God, who is of a nature infinitely good, is also of a nature infinitely communicative; and consequently every other nature is produced by him. It follows then, that God hath an absolute authority over all natures whatsoever; they being as it were "the work of his hands," so that not one of them can forcibly counteract or contradict his will. Hence then it is easy to collect, that whosoever enjoyeth the favour and protection of Almighty God, infinitely great and infinitely good, hath nothing to apprehend from all the powers of darkness; since they only are able to prevail against him, as God himself for some good purpose may think fit to suffer them. Nothing, moreover, can our
315 prayers obtain from evil spirits, which we ought not to reject utterly; for vice beneath the mask of virtue is then most dangerous; and the gifts of an enemy are "a deceitful snare."

SECTION IV.
AGAINST THE PAGAN WORSHIP OF MEN AFTER DEATH.

There have been, and there still are Pagans, who professedly worship the spirits of departed men. Now here again it were in the first place highly requisite, that a plain and manifest distinction should be made between the worship of these spirits, and that of the Supreme Deity. To offer up our prayers to them is a gross absurdity, unless they have a power of granting our requests. Of this however their worshippers are by no means assured; neither have they any single reason to believe, rather than deny, the existence of that power. But the most shocking consideration of all is, that the very persons thus deified are found to have been eminent and notorious in the practice of the greatest vices. Bacchus was addicted to the love of wine; Hercules to the love of women; Romulus was guilty of an impious act against his brother; and Jupiter against his father: so that the worshipping of them is, in fact, the dishonouring of the true God, and the greatest affront which we can offer to that holiness wherein he delighteth; while it affords at the same time, as an additional encouragement to vices sufficiently alluring of themselves, the plausible pretext of religion.
SECTION V.
AGAINST THE WORSHIP WHICH WAS PAID TO THE STARS AND ELEMENTS.

The worshipping of the heavenly bodies and of the elements, as we call them, of fire, water, earth, and air, is a still more ancient practice; but a very considerable error in the Pagan system of religion. Prayer constitutes the chief and principal article of religious worship; but how, without the greatest absurdity, can prayer be addressed to any other than intelligent beings? That the elements are not of this description, is in some degree a sensible and obvious proposition: and any assertion of a contrary nature with respect to the description of the heavenly bodies, were at best an assertion without proof. Their operations, whereby they indicate their natures, will afford no argument in support of it; nay, the very reverse of the assertion is sufficiently evident from the appointed and determinate course to which the heavenly bodies are confined, instead of that variety of motion which free and independent beings would adopt.—It hath already been demonstrated in a former chapter, that the courses of the heavenly bodies are adapted to the use and benefit of man: hence, therefore, man surely should discover that he approacheth, in his better part, to a nearer resemblance of the Deity than they; that he standeth in a higher estimation with his Maker; and consequently ought to know that "a servile subjection to those objects which God hath given for his service, is highly
derogatory from the dignity of his nature: rather is it his duty on the other hand, to offer up to God thanksgivings and praise on their account, which they either are unable or uninstructed to offer for themselves.

SECTION VI.

AGAINST THE WORSHIPPING OF BRUTE ANIMALS.

A practice into which some nations (the Egyptian in particular) have fallen, is that of worshipping the various insensate animals which form the brute creation. A practice, of all others, the most disgraceful to human nature! Some of them, indeed, occasionally discover in their actions a certain shadow as it were of intellectual reasoning: nevertheless, if we compare it with the faculties of man, that very shadow becomes instantly unseen, if not forgotten, as it neither can enable them to articulate or describe the ideas that arise within them; they still, we see, remain incapable of performing different kinds of actions; they still remain unable even to perform the same actions after different manners; much less can they ever attain to any knowledge of numbers, of geometrical proportions, or of astronomical observations. Man, on the other hand, by the ingenuity of his nature, circumvents and overpowers every kind of animal, however furious and strong; "the wild beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea." He even subjects them, in some instances, to his service and obedience; the elephant, for example, the lion, the horse, and the ox: he derives even from the most noxious animals a benefit to himself, as by acquiring the means of health from
the very vipers themselves. One general benefit; moreover, of which they are utterly insensible, he certainly derives from all of them; by his capacity to examine and observe the formation of their bodies, and the disposition of their respective parts; comparing, at the same time, as well the species as the genus of one animal with another; and hence acquiring also the knowledge of his own superior excellence, from the nobler and more perfect structure of the human frame: whosoever will consider these particulars will be so far from worshipping other animals as gods, that he will rather imagine himself a kind of deity as it were appointed over them, in subordination to the great and Supreme Governor of all things!

SECTION VII.
AGAINST THE WORSHIP OF IDEAL AND IMMATERIAL OBJECTS.

We find it recorded of the Grecians, the Romans, and others, that they worshipped things that have no real existence, but are only accidental effects produced by other causes. To say nothing of those creatures of their barbarous imagination, their $^{21}$

$^{21}$ Febris, their Impudentia, and other similar deities, I shall only observe that Health, which they revered as a goddess, is, in fact, neither more nor less than a due and proper temper of the parts and organs of the body; so again, good fortune is no more than a similarity or concurrence of the actual event with that which was anxiously desired. The passions, in like manner, of love, fear, anger, hope; and other similar affections, which arise from the consideration
of any good or evil, any favourable or unfavourable circumstance, are nothing more than certain emotions occasioned in the heart; for there in particular, by means of the blood, the soul is most intimately connected with the body: these affections, therefore, are not free and independent, but subject entirely to the will; which acts, as it were, like a mistress over them, at least as far as may pertain to their duration and direction. The virtues, under all their different denominations, that of prudence in the choice of what is useful, that of fortitude in a state of danger, that of justice in abstaining from another's property, that of temperance in the moderate enjoyment of pleasure; these, I say, and others like these, are certain inclinations towards goodness, which grow up within us by long exercise and habit; and as on the one hand, they are capable of constant improvement, so on the other, they may be diminished by neglect, and may even become utterly extinct within the mind of man. Honour (for to this also we find temples dedicated) is nothing but the decision of other men upon the actions of any individual whom they consider as endued with virtue. This, consequently, from the natural fallibility and erroneous determinations of man, is often given to the unworthy, and withheld from the worthy.— These things, therefore, as they have no real existence, and as, on that account, they cannot be compared, in point of excellence, with the things which do exist, can neither be sensible of any prayer, or conscious of any adoration that is offered to them: to worship them as deities, then, is an action altogether foreign
to every principle of reason; while, at the same time, it is our indispensable duty, on account of these qualities, to reverence that Being who is able to bestow and to preserve them by his gracious benediction.

SECTION VIII.

IN ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT FOUND ON THE MIRACLES WHICH ARE SAID TO HAVE BEEN DONE AMONG THE PAGANS.

The Pagans, in order to promote and recommend their cause, are apt to introduce the assistance of miracles. To these, however, numerous exceptions may be made. Many of them are rejected by the wisest of the Pagans themselves, as being either insufficiently attested, or obviously counterfeited. Several, also, of the reputed facts were done either "in a corner," or by night, or in the presence only of one or two witnesses, whose senses and credulity might easily be imposed upon by crafty and designing priests. Others again are such, that all the admiration excited by them was solely the result of ignorance in the spectators, respecting the natural effect of things, especially in regard to occult properties:—display the powers of the magnet to a people ignorant of those powers, and the same degree of admiration may any time be raised: and of this nature were the tricks and impostures, in which Simon and Apollonius Tyanaeus are repeatedly said to have displayed such singular dexterity. Some effects, I confess, of a more extraordinary kind, which could not have been produced from natural
causes by the sole power of human ingenuity, may possibly have been observed among them: still, however, they were such, that the operation of an absolute and truly divine power, the hand of Omnipotence itself, I say, may not have been requisite for their production: they may have been performed by spirits of an intermediate nature between God and man; the activity, the power, and the subtilty, of these spirits, may easily have enabled them to astonish and confound the dull faculties of mortals, by a sudden transposition of far-distant objects, and by reconciling the effects of opposite or discordant qualities. Nevertheless, we have already seen that these spirits are not good spirits; and that this religion, consequently, is not a good religion: in confirmation of which, it may further be observed, that the Pagans declare themselves subject to the power of charms and incantations, whereby they are compelled to act against their inclination; although, at the same time, the wisest (even of the Pagans) were convinced, that words cannot really contain a compulsive, but only a persuasive power; which power is proportioned to the meaning conveyed by them. As a further proof of their being evil spirits, we find them undertaking to mislead and bias the affections of men, in contradiction to their earnest endeavours; thereby becoming the ministers of wrong, either by delusive promises, or by effective injuries: whilst even the prohibitory laws of all civil society consider such practices in the light of witchcraft. We cannot, in the mean while, be surprised at the passive conduct of the Supreme Being, in regard to
the miraculous power of these daemons, since they, who had previously revolted from the service of the true God, were little worthy of protection from "the lying wonders and deceitful workings of the devil." At the same time it is a proof of the real impotence of evil spirits, that no essential benefits were ever effected by their means. If any were visibly restored to life by them, that life was only of a very short duration, and of a very imperfect nature.

— But now, to consider this subject in another point of view, I will admit that miracles, really proceeding from the true fountain of all power, have occasionally been wrought among the Pagans. Still, however, it never was predicted that those miracles should happen as a mean of establishing and approving their religion; and therefore we may fairly argue, that God perhaps effected them for other purposes, and with very different designs. To illustrate the probability of this supposition by example;—the miraculous restoration of sight to a blind man, recorded of Vespasian, (if it really were done) was done with a design to facilitate his advancement to the throne, by raising the admiration and respect of the people in his favour; he being a chosen minister of God's wrath, denounced against the Jewish nation. And thus, in other instances, the miracles that have been performed, may possibly have arisen from causes of a like nature, without any interference or connexion with matters of religion.
SECTION IX.

As also to that which is founded on their oracles.

The same observations are also for the most part applicable, in answer to the argument which oracles are thought to furnish on the side of Paganism; but especially our late remark, respecting the propriety and justice of the punishment to which those men are abandoned, who disdain to accept those means of information which natural reason and tradition the most ancient afford to every individual. Oracle sentences, moreover, are in general ambiguous, and easily capable of an interpretation correspondent with the event, whatever that event may afterwards prove: and if, in any instances, a more express prediction hath been given, it is nevertheless by no means conclusive of its being the result of an omniscient mind; the event perhaps being either ascertainable from natural preexistent causes (as future diseases have been sometimes foretold by experienced physicians), or else obvious at least to probable conjecture, from the issue generally arising out of similar circumstances; the latter mode of prophecy, we find, has frequently been practised with success by skilful and profound statesmen. Admitting, however, that God did at times think fit to render even the productions of a Pagan writer prophetic of particular events, the completion of which could solely be dependent on his will, it tended not in any instance to the confirmation, but rather to the subversion, of the Pagan system. Such are the prophecies contained in Virgil; when, in his fourth eclogue, taken
from the verses of the Sibyl, he unknowingly delineates the event and the benefits of the coming of our Blessed Saviour.

So again, in the same prophetic verses it was written, that he who, of a truth, should be our king, as such should be acknowledged; and that a prince should arise out of the East, who should have dominion over all things. We find in Porphyry a declaration of the oracle of Apollo, that other gods indeed are spirits of an ætherial nature, but that the One Sole God of the Hebrews is the proper object of all worship. Now if the worshippers of Apollo conform to this declaration, they can be no longer his worshippers; and if they do not conform to it, they in fact pronounce their own deity a liar. Moreover, if the good and happiness of the human race had been the end proposed by those spirits in their oracular communications with mankind, they would have endeavoured above all things to establish universally in the world, the rules of morality and religion; and would have given to all those who should regulate their lives thereby, the strongest assurances of an ample recompense. No proposition of this nature did they ever make; no recompense of virtue did they ever promise. Numberless, on the other hand, are the instances which prove incontestably that the oracles have often been employed in praising the most abandoned tyrants; in decreeing divine honours to wrestlers and to prize-fighters; in tempting and seducing men to the indulgence of illicit passions, to the gratification of their avarice, by every rapacious and dishonest act, and even to the commission of the crime of murder.
SECTION X.

PAGANISM FELL AWAY, OF ITSELF, WHEN HUMAN SUPPORT WAS WITHHOLDEN FROM IT; AND THEREFORE CANNOT BE THE TRUE RELIGION.

And now, exclusively of what has been already offered, we are furnished by the Pagan religion with a very considerable argument against itself, in the sudden dissolution which it has constantly and universally undergone, wheresoever the assistance of human power (as if it thereby lost the sole prop of its existence) has ceased to support it. If we cast our eyes around throughout the various kingdoms in which the Christian or the Mahometan religions are established, where can we discover, except indeed in books, the smallest vestiges of Paganism? Nay, history itself informs us, that even in those very times, when the despotism and cruel persecutions of a Nero or a Domitian, or when, afterwards, the subtlety and great abilities of a Julian, were the instruments employed to uphold the Pagan cause, even then, I say, it was found, notwithstanding, to decline daily: not through any violence exerted by its opposer; not through any means of hereditary greatness or of distinguished birth, for Christ was generally considered as the son of a mechanic; not through any literary eminence, or the flowery embellishments of language, for the primitive teachers of Christianity were utterly devoid of these advantages; not through any lavish distribution of bribes and presents, for they had none to offer; not through any flattering inducements proposed by them, for they plainly declared on the contrary, that the cause of Christianity
would require its adherents to forgo with cheerfulness every comfort and convenience, and to suffer with resignation every possible calamity. Judge, then, the feeble constitution of Paganism, when the efforts of an enemy so totally unarmed could bring it to the ground!—The Christian dispensation, however, it should here further be observed, not only dispelled the clouds of Pagan ignorance and credulity, but at the name of Christ, even the spirits of uncleanness came forth, were rebuked and put to silence; and when the cause of that silence was required of them, they found themselves compelled to own that all their powers failed, at the invocation of that sacred name.

SECTION XI.

A REFUTATION OF THAT ABSURD OPINION WHICH ASCRIBES THE RISE AND FALL OF A RELIGION TO THE INFLUENCE OF THE HEAVENLY BODIES.

Certain philosophers have declared that the origin and decline of all religions are occasioned by the heavenly bodies. Astrology, however, notwithstanding their pretensions to a perfect knowledge of it, is in itself a science which is treated and set forth under systems so various and contradictory, that the uncertainty of the truth is the only article of certain information. But here I speak not with regard to those effects which result from natural and necessary causes, but to those only which depend upon the human will. Now the will I consider as a principle of such absolute and innate freedom, as to be utterly incapable of any outward restraint or violence whatsoever. If the act of the will were made necessarily
subservient to any outward impression of a forcible nature, the faculty of deliberate reasoning and the power of decisive election would at once become useless endowments; all legal justice also, and the equity of rewards and punishments would be instantly annihilated: for how can any act of unavoidable necessity be either culpable or meritorious? But, further, it is evident that certain acts of the will are of an evil nature: if then these actions originate from any irresistible planetary influence, inasmuch as we believe that God himself is the giver of that influence to the heavens and to all the constellations thereof, we consequently declare that a God of infinite perfection and goodness is the true cause of moral evil: and since he hath positively and expressly asserted his utter detestation of evil, at the same time endowing it with efficient and irresistible power in the original constitution of nature, we charge him with having a contrariety of wills, approving and condemning the same action, and rendering that effect sinful which was prompted and produced by divine impulse. It is argued by others with a greater show of probability, that the atmosphere is first affected by the heavenly bodies, and that, afterwards, our bodies are affected by the atmosphere; and thence they imbibe certain qualities which may then become greatly instrumental in raising correspondent affections in the mind: these affections, say they, continually solicit the compliance, and frequently bias the direction, of the will. This argument, however, admitted in its full extent, is foreign to the present question. It is the great business of Christianity to divert the human mind as much as possible from the sensual objects
which delight the body; and therefore this system of religion cannot possibly originate from any bodily affections, and consequently cannot be produced by any planetary influence; as, according to our first position, it is by those affections only that the heavenly bodies act upon the mind. The sagest astrologers, we observe, 55 exempt all such as are really wise and virtuous from the influence of the heavenly bodies: now (allowing the authority of these sage astrologers much greater weight than the present more enlightened times can seriously admit) the first converts to Christianity are proved to come under this exemption in an eminent degree, by the whole tenor of their lives; and if, further, we admit that literary eminence and deep erudition can be instrumental towards the prevention of these contagious affections of the body, the advocates of Christianity have, some of them, in all ages been entitled, upon this ground also, to considerable distinction and applause. Add to this, it has always been admitted by the ablest opinions, that the influence of the heavenly bodies is only local in its effect, and temporary in its duration; but the Christian religion endureth at this day, through a period of $5^*1600$ years; and that not locally, or in one place only, but in regions the most distant from each other, and in climates of the most opposite nature.
SECTION XII.

THE MEN OF EMINENCE AND LEARNING IN THE PAGAN WORLD VERY PLAINLY APPROVED THE MAIN POINTS OF CHRISTIANITY; AND IF THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM CONTAIN ANY THING NOT EASILY CREDIBLE, THE PAGAN IS ATTENDED WITH EQUAL DIFFICULTIES.

Our Pagan opponents are in a great measure disarmed of all offensive power in their attacks upon Christianity, because such is the integrity, and so great is the excellence of every individual part of that system, that by its own intrinsic lustre, as it were, it flashes immediate conviction on their minds; insomuch that the instances are numerous wherein heathens are observed to have inculcated, severally, the very same principles and duties which are collectively enjoined by our religion: they teach us, for example, that religion consisteth not in ritual observances, but in a pious disposition of the heart: that the intentional adulterer is guilty of the actual sin of adultery; that we ought not to requite an injury; that a man should be the husband of one wife; that the marriage-covenant should be inviolable; that all men should do good to all, but especially to the poor and needy; that we should abstain as much as possible from oaths; that in our food and our apparel we should limit our desires by the wants of our nature. But further, suppose that we admit that matters, not easily reconcilable to our belief, are contained in the doctrine of Christianity: the same objection may be made with equal justice against the doctrines and opinions of the
wisest Pagans; and this we have already exemplified (see book i. sect. 22. and book ii. sect. 7.) in respect to the immortality of the soul, and the possible resurrection of the body. Thus Plato, according to the Chaldaean system, distinguishes the Divine Nature into three heads: 1st, The Father; 2dly, The paternal mind, which he elsewhere denominates an emanation from the Deity, whereby the universe was made; and 3dly, The soul, whereby all things are preserved, established, regulated. Julian, that inveterate enemy of the Christians, believed the possibility of an union between the Divine Nature and the human; and cited Æsculapius as an instance of the fact, representing him as one come down from heaven to teach the art of medicine to mankind.

The cross of Christ becomes a "stumbling stone and a rock of offence" unto many; but to reconcile their minds to this circumstance, I would only wish them to observe the strange accounts that are given us in the mean time in regard to the Pagan deities. Of these some were the slaves of kings; others smitten by a thunderbolt; others cut in pieces; others wounded and disabled. It must further be remarked, that the most learned of the Pagans themselves declare, all of them, that virtue, in proportion to the trials and sufferings which it endureth for the sake of virtue, hath the greater cause of triumph and rejoicing.—I cannot better conclude my observations on this subject, than by repeating the declaration, which Plato, with prophetic inspiration as it were, hath delivered in his second book De Republica: wherein he saith, "that in order to approve the reality and perfection of a man's integrity, it behoveth him
totally to divest his virtue of all outward attractions and apparent merit whatsoever; so as to become accounted wicked in the eyes of others; to be treated by them as an object of derision and abuse; and to be brought, ultimately, to an ignominious death." And, doubtless, upon these terms alone was it possible to exhibit to the world a pattern of consummate patience!
BOOK THE FIFTH.

SECTION I.

A REFUTATION OF JUDAISM; WITH A PREFATORY ADDRESS TO THE JEWS.

The light of Judaism, like the glimmering and doubtful ray which gradually opens on our first advances from a cave of darkness, now dawns upon our sight, as we struggle into day from the black and horrid night of Paganism. The Jewish dispensation, however, as it still remains a part, so was it originally the beginning of the truth. I could wish, therefore, to bespeak the candid attention of the Jews, that neither animosity or prejudice may influence their judgement. They are the descendants, it is well known, of a holy and devout generation; a generation, visited at sundry times by the Divine Favour, as well by the prophets as by the angels of God. From that nation arose the Messiah himself, and the primitive teachers of Christianity: to them belongs the tree whereon we are ingrafted: to them was intrusted the keeping of the oracles of God, which, equally with them, we value and revere; sending forth, with Saint Paul, our sighs and our prayers unto God for them, that speedily the day may come when "the veil being taken away" from before their eyes, they shall clearly behold with us the "fulfilling of the law;" and when we, according to the prophecies of old, "the inhabitants of another city," shall
"Take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew," saying, Let us go up with one accord, and let us worship together that true and only God, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.

SECTION II.

IT IS EVIDENTLY INCUMBENT ON THE JEWS TO ADMIT THAT THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST ARE SUFFICIENTLY ATTESTED.

In the first place, then, we would request the Jews, that they will not esteem any circumstance unfair in the instance of another, which they would esteem reasonable in their own. If a Pagan should inquire of them the grounds of their belief in the miracles of Moses, what answer can they make but this? That such and so invariable the accounts thereof have been, that the testimony of actual eye-witnesses can alone have given rise to them. So again, the miraculous increase of the widow's oil by Elisha; the sudden cleansing of the leprous Syrian; the restoration of the dead son of the Shunamite to life, and other similar events; are, all of them, implicitly believed by the Jews, solely because they are transmitted to posterity by credible and proper witnesses. They readily admit the ascension of Elijah by a whirlwind into heaven, upon the single evidence of Elisha; as they deemed it the evidence of a man altogether unexceptionable. We, however, produce twelve witnesses, of irreproachable lives and characters, in proof of the ascension of our Blessed Saviour; and indeed a far greater number in respect to his appearance upon earth after death. Now if these things be true, the doctrine of Christ must necessarily be true also;
and nothing, we perceive, can be adduced on the side of Judaism, which may not be applied, with equal or with stronger force, on the side of Christianity. Independently, however, of the weight of testimony, the very Talmudists and the Jews themselves confess that miracles were wrought by Christ; and this very circumstance ought, doubtless, to suffice: as it is not possible for God to mark his approbation of any system promulgated by man, by a method more effectual, than that of the performance of miracles.

SECTION III.

A REFUTATION OF THOSE WHO ATTRIBUTE THESE MIRACLES TO THE ASSISTANCE OF INFERNAL AGENTS.

The miracles of Christ have been attributed by some, to the co-operation and influence of evil spirits: but this infamous assertion hath already been refuted (book ii. sect. 5.) by observing that wheresoever the light of Christianity appeared, the whole power of evil spirits was broken and destroyed. Then as to the assertion of some others, accusing Jesus of having studied witchcraft and the magic arts in Ægypt, this surely carries with it a much fainter air of probability, than that similar accusation of the Pagans against Moses, which we meet with in 12 Pliny and 13 Apuleius. Now it does not appear that Jesus ever was in Ægypt, except from the writings of his disciples; and these, at the same time, particularly mention his return from that country, while he was yet an infant: whereas, that 14 Moses did actually pass a considerable period of his riper age in Ægypt,
is told us by himself and 15 others as a certain fact. The Mosaic, however, and the Christian dispensations very strongly exculpate their respective authors from the crime in question, as both the one and the other 16 expressly prohibit all such arts and practices, as being "an abomination to the Lord." But further; if we should admit that, in the time of Christ and his disciples, such magic powers did actually exist, in Ægypt or elsewhere, sufficient to effect those miracles which are recorded of Christ; sufficient, I say, to make the dumb to speak, the lame to walk, and the blind to see; still, however, the Emperors 17 Tiberius, 18 Nero, and many others, who spared neither pains or expense in inquiries of this nature, must inevitably have detected the source of those miracles: besides, 19 if the Jewish accounts be true, that the members of their great Sanhedrin were conversant in the magic arts, to the certain discovery and conviction of offenders; if likewise we consider the inveterate hatred of those very members against Jesus, and the jealous eye with which they watched that increasing honour and authority which his miracles in particular procured to him, they themselves, doubtless, would either have employed the same arts to work similar miracles, or at least they would have taken care to render it unquestionably evident to the world, that all his pretended miracles resulted not, in fact, from any other cause.

SECTION IV.

OR TO THE POWER OF MYSTERIOUS WORDS.

There is an assertion, as impudent as false, which nevertheless prevails among certain of the Jews,
ascribing all the miracles of Jesus to the mere operation of some mystical name, which (as they tell the story) was deposited by Solomon in the temple, and was there guarded by two lions, for more than 1000 years; till at length Jesus found means to convey it secretly away: now with respect to this very singular and surprising circumstance of the two lions, not a single syllable about the matter do we find, either in the books of Kings or of Chronicles; Josephus also makes no mention of it; neither was any thing of the kind discovered by the Romans, who entered the temple, under Pompey, sixty-three years before the birth of Christ.

SECTION V.


The Jews themselves confess that miracles were wrought by Christ; and this single proposition being once admitted, I maintain that all men are consequently bounden, by the very law of Moses, to believe in Christ. It hath been declared by God, in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy, that he would raise up other prophets also, after Moses; and unto them “shall my people hearken,” saith the Lord; at the same time denouncing very heavy punishments, in case of disobedience to this injunction. Now the surest indications of a prophet, the most excellent proofs of a divine mission that can possibly be imagined, are 20 miracles. It hath also been declared,
in the 13th chapter of the same book, that if any one should appear amongst us as a prophet, and should give "signs and wonders" unto us, nevertheless we should not hearken unto him, if ever he entice the people, saying, "Let us go after other gods, and let us serve them;" for God permitteth those signs and wonders to be given, merely that he may prove the sincerity and firmness of his people in the worship of the true God. From a due collation of these passages, the 2 Hebrew expositors very properly infer, that it is our duty to believe in every one who worketh miracles, unless indeed he seek to mislead us from the worship of the true God: because, in that case only, we are cautioned not to trust in miracles, however specious and authentic they may seem. Jesus, however, so far from being in any instance a seducer of the people to the worship of false gods, expressly prohibited on the contrary every practice of that nature, as being the greatest of all possible sins against God; and strictly enjoined us also to reverence the writings of Moses, and of the prophets who came after him; no just objection therefore can possibly be raised against his miracles.

SECTION VI.

AN ANSWER TO THAT OBJECTION WHICH IS FOUNDED UPON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LAW OF MOSES AND THE LAW OF JESUS: POINTING OUT THE POSSIBILITY OF ANOTHER SUBSEQUENT INSTITUTION, MORE EXCELLENT THAN THAT OF MOSES.

For, though some may think proper to allege the partial disagreements which occur between the law
of Christ and that of Moses, we shall prove that ground of argument to be futile and insufficient.

It is a rule, laid down by the Jewish Rabbins themselves, that every precept whatsoever, except that which regards the worship of one God, may be broken without fear of punishment, 24 when a prophet (by which is understood a worker of miracles) shall authorize the violation. The power of legislation which God independently possessed, and which by the hand of Moses he exerted, did not afterwards depart from him; and, doubtless, every independent legislator, whatever laws he may enact, is still at liberty, at any future period, to repeal and to reverse those laws. In objection against this, it is no argument to say that the Divine Being is immutable; for the question here does not concern the intrinsic nature, but the works of God. The element of light, the periods of youth and age, the seasons of the year, are the works of God; yet all these are subject to perpetual changes. The Almighty permitted Adam, heretofore, to eat of all the other fruits of Paradise, but charged him 26 to abstain from the fruit of one particular tree. Does man presume to ask the reason? In the will of the Almighty he shall find his answer. The general commandment of God is, “Thou shalt do no murder:” nevertheless the Lord 26 commanded Abraham to slay his son. Of the sacrifices also, which were offered unto him apart from the tabernacle, it pleased him to accept 27 some, and to reject others. Independently, however, of these and other instances, in which the will of God has occasionally deviated from the general tenor of that will, although we may allow
the law of Moses to be good, we do not thereby exclude the possibility of greater excellence in some future institution. The fond parent frequently descends to the imperfect language of his infant-children; overlooks the little faults of their early years; and bribes them, with cakes and sweetmeats, to listen to instruction: but then, as they gradually attain a riper age, he carefully corrects that language, instructs them how to speak with propriety, instils into their minds every precept and principle of goodness, and places in their view the beauty and the rewards of virtue.—But now, in order to demonstrate that the precepts of the first covenant "are not faultless," it will be sufficient only to observe, that many pious men of those times did actually exhibit in the tenor of their own lives, a more perfect rule of conduct, a more excellent system of moral and religious duties. Moses, for example, while his people were permitted to take personal, as well as judicial, vengeance for any injury received, still made himself, in his own instance, an earnest intercessor for his enemies, under all their most cruel abuses and most injurious persecutions. So again, we see the ready disposition of David to save and to pardon his rebellious son; we see also his exemplary patience and forbearance, when insulted by the curses of Shimei. Not a single instance do we find, of any good man availing himself of the custom of divorce, although the laws would have warranted the practice. Laws, in short, must be adapted to the temper of the people at large; and consequently the condition in which the Jews then were, made it requisite that some things should remain unnoticed for the present; the entire reform-
ation of which was to be the work of a more perfect institution, at that future period, when God should be most graciously pleased, by a more powerful operation of his spirit, to collect unto himself a new people out of all the nations of the earth. I cannot help observing further, that even those rewards which are openly proposed by the Mosaic dispensation, are only of a limited and temporal nature; all men, therefore, must admit the possibility of some better future institution, holding forth, as the law of Christ hath now done, the better promises of eternal and immortal rewards; and these, not shown to us "as through a glass darkly," but by open and express revelation.

SECTION VII.

Jesus, while on earth, conformed strictly with the law of Moses; and only the mere ceremonies enjoined by it, which of course had no intrinsic moral goodness in them, were afterwards abolished.

In order to evince the injustice and infamy of those Jews who were contemporary with our Saviour, it ought here, by the way, to be observed, that all that cruelty of treatment, that severity of punishment which they made him undergo, was wholly unprovoked on his part by any single offence against their laws. He was circumcised as they were; he observed the same restrictions with regard to food, and the same customs with regard to dress, which the Jews themselves did; he sent the lepers whom he cleansed to the priests; and kept, with
religious observance, their passovers and other solemn feasts. If indeed he healed any on the sabbath day, he justified the action not only on the ground of law, but on that of general and received opinion: and it was not till after his ascension into heaven, that he first began to publish to the world the abrogation of particular Jewish ordinances; at that blessed period, having triumphed over death, he gave to his apostles that eminent and distinguished miracle, the gift of the Holy Ghost, thereby proving that he had obtained the absolute dominion over all things, and consequently possessed an independent right of legislation; according to the prophecy of Daniel, which declared, that, soon after the destruction of the kingdoms of Syria and of Egypt, (the latter of which happened in the days of Augustus,) unto a man, lowly in appearance, and of no reputation, "should be given dominion and glory and a kingdom; that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; that his dominion should be an everlasting dominion, and that his kingdom should not be destroyed." It is further observable, that all that part of the Jewish law which the coming of our Saviour made useless and unnecessary, was of no real or intrinsic worth; consisting merely of ceremonial matters, indifferent in themselves, and consequently having no claim to an immutable observance. If indeed any moral or religious principle had originally rendered that observance necessary, God would undoubtedly have pronounced it to be an universal, not a partial obligation; and instead of suffering a period of more than 2000 years to elapse, previously to the institution, would certainly
have ordained it from the first foundation of the world. To Abel, to Enoch, to Noah, to Melchisedec, to Job, to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, who were, all of them, pious men and distinguished objects of the divine favour, this portion of the Jewish law was for the most part, if not entirely, unknown; and yet they received not, on that account, the less encouragement to their reliance upon God, or the less manifestation of his love towards them. We do not find that Moses at any time exhorted his father-in-law Jethro to adopt these ritual observances, or that Jonas recommended them to the Ninevites; neither do any of the other prophets, when they write to the Chaldæans, the Ægyptians, the Sidonians, the Tyrians, the Idumæans, the Moabites, ever reprove them for neglecting to adopt these ordinances, although they enumerate with great accuracy the several particulars of their offences and misconduct. These institutions then were peculiarly appropriated to the Jews; established, it may be, with a view to counteract some national propensity, and to divert them from some favourite vice; or perhaps intended either as a trial of their obedience, or as a typical indication of future events. The abolition of them, therefore, is an act of power not at all more wonderful or extraordinary than the act of any regal authority whatsoever, abolishing particular municipal institutions, in order to establish one uniform code of laws throughout a whole kingdom. We have no sufficient reason to believe, that God ever pledged himself to the Jews, that he would, on no account, make any future alteration in these ordinances; for as to their being called perpetual, 47 we find the same
expression continually in use, to signify merely that the edicts so described, are not dependent upon annual institution, or adapted only to particular occasions, as in the instances of war, of peace, or scarcity; and yet this expression, all the while, by no means prevents the legislature from changing or reversing those edicts, when the service of the state shall render such a step expedient. The divine institutions, in like manner, which were appointed for the Jews, were, some of them, of a temporary nature, intended only for the time of their continuance in the wilderness; others, again, local, confined to their possession of the land of Canaan. These therefore, for the sake of distinction, God indefinitely calls perpetual; thereby intending an injunction upon all the Jewish nation for their constant and unremitted observance of them, unless they should receive some future indication of his pleasure to the contrary. Universally familiar as this manner of expression is, the Jewish nation of all others ought never to be surprised at it, as they must be conscious that their own laws adopt the very same language, expressly calling that right and that servitude perpetual, which they mean only to continue from one year of Jubilee to another. Nay the Jews themselves call the coming of the Messiah the fulfilling of the year of jubilee, or, in other words, the great jubilee. Now this they undoubtedly derive from their prophets, who declare the promise of a new future covenant. "Behold the days come," saith the Lord, according to the prophet Jeremiah, "that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel; I will write my law in their hearts; and they shall teach no more
every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them: I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." The gracious declaration here made may fairly suggest to us, in striking colours, the picture of a king, who, in consequence of the violent animosities and quarrels of his subjects, should resolve to abolish all distinction and variety of laws among them, and, in order to effect a permanent and lasting peace, should establish one perfect and universal code of laws for their general observance; at the same time encouraging their future amendment by the promise of an act of oblivion and indemnity for all past offences. Enough hath now been said to prove the point in question; nevertheless we shall proceed to show, by examining severally the abrogated parts of the Mosaic law, that they are, all of them, of such a nature, that they could not possibly possess any intrinsic recommendation in the sight of God; neither ought they, in point of expediency, to have been irreversible.

SECTION VIII.

SUCH WERE THE JEWISH SACRIFICES; WHICH NEVER, IN THEMSELVES, WERE PLEASING TO GOD.

The principal and most obvious article of the abrogated law, is that of sacrifice: many of the Jews are of opinion, that sacrifices were originally devised by human invention, before they became of divine institution. The Jews, doubtless, were a people remarkably eager after rites and ceremonies:
God, therefore, with sufficient reason, appointed a great number of them, to gratify this prevalent inclination, were it only to prevent their relapsing into the worship of false gods, from a remembrance of their practices at the time of their abode in Egypt. Afterwards, however, when their descendants began to look upon these ceremonies in too high a light, conceiving them to be really and intrinsically pleasing to the Divine Being, and a necessary ingredient in true piety, we find them censured by the prophets on this account: "I will not reprove thee, saith the Lord, because of thy sacrifices and burnt-offerings; that they shall be continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thine house; nor he-goat out of thy folds. For all the beasts of the forest are mine; and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls upon the mountains; and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee, for the whole world is mine, and all that is therein. Thinkest thou that I will eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows to the Most High." Psalm L.

Some among the Jews pretend to understand this, in reference to the irreligion and impiety of those who offered up the sacrifices, and not as relating to the offerings themselves: but the cited passages convey clearly another meaning, expressive of the utter incapacity of the act itself to afford any pleasure to the Supreme Being. Besides, if we consider the whole tenor of the psalm, we shall find that God addresses that part of it to his devout worshippers; he had previously said, "Gather my saints together
unto me:” and afterwards he adds; “Hear, O my people.” Herein he speaks as their instructor. In the verses subsequent to those above cited, he changes his discourse, as usual, to those of an opposite description: “but unto the ungodly saith the Lord.” The same sense is evident in other passages. See Psalm li. ver. 16, 17. See also in Psalm xl. ver. 8, 9, and seq.—“Hear the words of the Lord,” saith Isaiah also, in chap. i. ver. 10, 11, and 12, “Give ear unto the law of our God, To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of rams, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts?”

Then again, in Jeremiah, this passage is at once repeated and explained: “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Ægypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you.” See chap. vii. ver. 21 and seq.—In Hosea also it is written, “For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings.” See ch. vi. ver. 6.

So again in Micah, when the question is proposed, “Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the High God? Will the Lord be
pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousand of rivers of oil? or shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old?" The answer of the Lord is, "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good. And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Chap. vi. ver. 6, 7, 8.

Since, then, it is evident, from all the passages above mentioned, that sacrifices are by no means a primary object of God's will, or conducive in themselves to his real satisfaction; since also superstition and idolatry had gradually crept in among his people, insomuch that they considered those external observances as the principal part of true devotion, and believed that the blood of victims was a full compensation for their sins; can we wonder that God at length should think fit to abolish an institution, indifferent and immaterial, it is true, in its own nature, but rendered vicious by a perverted application? Can we wonder at this, I say, when Hezekiah likewise brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had set up, because the people had begun "to burn incense to it," and to treat it with divine honours?—That predictions also are not wanted, importing the abolition of the sacrifices in question, must be plain and obvious to every man, from a little consideration of the law of Moses, wherein the office of the priesthood is granted solely to the posterity of Aaron, and the place of its administration is limited to their native land. In the cxth Psalm there is likewise a prediction, that a ruler over divers countries should be sent out of Sion; and that the
same should be a king and a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.—So again Isaiah tells us, that "In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt; and not only the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation, but Assyria also, the work of mine hands, and Israel mine inheritance." Chap. xix. ver. 19 and 25.—So, too, in the lxvith chapter of the same prophet, "I will gather all nations and tongues, saith the Lord; and as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord, so shall all flesh come and worship before me. I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord." Verses 18, 20, 21, 23.—Now all these predictions could never come to pass whilst the law of Moses remained in full force: To these may be added the prophetic declaration of God's wrath against Israel, in the words of Malachi, "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." Mal. chap. i. ver. 10, 11. "He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease," saith Daniel in his relation of the angel's prediction, respecting the Messiah. Chap. ix. ver. 27.

It is not, however, by prophecies like these, it is not by verbal declarations alone, that God hath signified his pleasure, that the rites and sacrifices of the Mosaic institution should no longer be continued: the divine disapprobation is sufficiently made known.
to us by the evidence of facts themselves, since God hath suffered the Jewish nation to remain, for a period of more than 1500 years, without a temple; without an altar; without any accurate numbering of their respective tribes and families, so as to ascertain that primary and important question—by whom the office of the priesthood could be lawfully administered?

SECTION IX.

SUCH, LIKEWISE, WAS THE DISTINCTION OF CLEAN AND UNCLEAN MEATS.

Let us now proceed in like manner to canvass the prohibitory law, with respect to certain kinds of meats. Immediately after the universal deluge, God evidently gave to Noah and to his posterity the free and unlimited use of all meats whatsoever. (See Gen. chap. ix. ver. 2, 3.) This permission, consequently, was not confined to Ham and Japhet only, but was extended also to Shem, and transmitted to his descendants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But when the Jews afterwards by living in Ægypt had contracted the idolatrous and superstitious notions of that country, God then prohibited, for the first time, the eating of particular animals; whether it might be because those animals were chiefly reserved by the Ægyptians for sacrifice to their deities, and dedicated to the purposes of divination, or because, among the typical expressions and allusions so generally prevalent throughout the Jewish law, particular descriptions of animals might be designed as emblematical of particular kinds of vice. With regard to the extent of these injunctions, they are
evidently not intended to be universal: this appears from the instance given in the xivth chapter of Deuteronomy (see ver. 21.), wherein we read, "Thou shalt not eat of any thing that dieth of itself; thou shalt give it to the stranger that is within thy gates, that he may eat it." The Jews, at the same time, are commanded to show every act of kindness and regard to that stranger, as to one recommended by the divine favour. The ancient Jewish Rabbins have given an express tradition that the prohibitory law of meats was to cease at the coming of the Messiah; when the flesh of the sow and of the ox should be equally accounted clean. And doubtless, when God was pleased to collect unto himself one people out of all the nations of the earth, it was far more consistent with his equity as well as wisdom, to admit the Jews to the general state of liberty, in matters of this nature, than to subject and reduce all men to their particular restrictions.

SECTION X.

THE DISTINCTION OF DAYS.

We come now to consider the Jewish festivals. These, all of them, were in general appointed as memorials of God's kindness to that nation, in their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and in their subsequent conveyance to the promised land. Now, a future period is foretold by Jeremiah in his xvith and xxiiiid chapters, when the remembrance of that kindness shall be rendered so inconsiderable by new and far greater kindnesses, that the bare mention of it shall almost be forgotten. And here we may re-
peat what has already been observed on the subject of their sacrifices; that the people had begun to entertain a similar confidence in this particular; as if the commission of all other offences whatsoever were a matter of very little consequence, provided that they paid a regular and strict attention to these formal institutions. Hence it is that God thus expresseth himself in the first chapter of Isaiah, "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them." See ver. 14. With regard to the Sabbath in particular, it is usually objected, that the observance of that day is an universal and a perpetual commandment; not given and confined to one people only, but declared from the beginning to the first parent of mankind. To this I answer, agreeably to the opinions of the most learned of the Jews, that the precept respecting Sabbaths is twofold; a precept of commemoration, as in Exod. chap. xx. ver. 18.; and a precept of observance, as in Exod. chap. xxxi. ver. 31.—Now the precept of commemoration enjoins nothing more than a religious remembrance of the creation of the world: the precept of observance consists in a strict abstinence from every employment except that of worship. The former was given from the beginning, and, no doubt, carefully obeyed by those devout persons who lived before the law, such as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: among the latter of whom, while we frequently read of their travelling to distant places, we no where find their journeys interrupted by the Sabbath; a circumstance which, after the Exodus, is constantly observable: for the first day of security experienced
by the Israelites after their deliverance out of Egypt, and their happy preservation and passage through the Red Sea, was the regular Jewish Sabbath; and thereon they sang a song of triumphant rejoicing to the Lord; who thenceforth enjoined them to observe that day as a day of perfect rest; which we find first mentioned in the gathering of manna; see Exod. chap. xvi. as also in chap. xxxv. ver. 2.; and in Levit. chap. xxiii. ver. 3. To this purport also the deliverance out of Egypt is given as the cause of the law respecting Sabbaths; see Deut. chap. vi. ver. 15. A provision likewise is hereby made, as may be seen in the places above cited, against the cruel severity of masters towards their servants, in allowing them no respite from labour. The obligation, it is true, extended even to all inhabitants and sojourners in the land; but this was evidently in order to preserve one uniform appearance of rest throughout the whole nation: it is, at the same time, sufficiently clear that other nations were not included in this law, were it only from the frequent mention of it which occurs in scripture (as in Exod. chap. xxxi. ver. 13, 16.) under the appellation of "a sign" and even of a special and "perpetual covenant" between God and Israel. We have shown, moreover, in the beginning of this section, from the promise (which is there alluded to) of far greater kindnesses to come, that the festivals appointed by the Israelites as memorials of their deliverance out of Egypt, were by no means such as would require an everlasting observance: besides, had the sabbatical law of rest been enacted from the beginning, and so enacted that it never could on any occasions have been broken or repealed, it must
necessarily have prevailed in the conflict, whensoever it should clash with other institutions: this, however, was far from being the case; 72 for infants, it is certain, might legally receive circumcision on the Sabbath-day (see John, chap. vii. ver. 22); and 73 while the temple remained, victims were slaughtered as much upon that day as upon any other; see Numb. chap. xxviii. ver. 9.

That this law was not immutable, is plain from the Jewish doctors themselves, when they admit, that any work whatsoever might be carried on upon the Sabbath without the smallest impropriety, under the sanction and authority of a prophet; and this they exemplify by the taking of Jericho on the Sabbath-day, at the command of Joshua. Some also of the same Rabbins afford us, rather happily, a very strong demonstration that the coming of the Messiah would destroy all distinction of days, from that passage of Isaiah, which declares (see chap. lxvi. ver. 24.) "that it shall come to pass, that all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord, from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another."

SECTION XI.

AND THE OUTWARD SIGN OF CIRCUMCISION.

CIRCUMCISION, the next article proposed to our consideration, is an institution of higher antiquity, it is true, than Moses; as the observance of it was enjoined to Abraham and to his posterity. Nevertheless, this self-same precept was the basis of the covenant delivered by Moses. The Lord said unto Abraham, as we read in Genesis, "I will give unto thee and..."
to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, even all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised;” see chap. xvii. It is already shown, however, in the viith section of this book, that a new covenant should afterwards supersede the old one; a covenant of universal extent and general obligation: and consequently this mark of distinction, this seal of singularity, must thenceforth become unnecessary. In the precept of outward circumcision, it is further evident that a certain mystical and superior meaning is contained: this the prophets clearly indicate when they enjoin the circumcision of the heart; and to this spiritual signification tend all the precepts of our Saviour. In like manner we ought therefore to consider in a figurative sense, the promises annexed to the law of circumcision, as expressive of some higher purposes: we must regard, for instance, the promise of an earthly inheritance in Canaan, as typical of a truly eternal inheritance in heaven; which never can be more clearly revealed than it was by Jesus Christ: so again, with respect to Abraham being made “a father of many nations,” we must consider it in reference to that future period wherein it was to come to pass that nations, not limited in number or extent, but innumerable and universal, should follow the example of Abraham in his eminent degree of faith in God: an event which is alone verified and effected by the gospel dispensation!—What wonder
can there be, then, that the shadow should be now made void, by the coming of the substance?

77 The sign of circumcision, we are well assured, can boast no intrinsic or peculiar right to a portion of God's gracious favour, since we see that not only persons before Abraham, but that Abraham himself also, 'yet being uncircumcised,' became acceptable unto God; and though the ceremony was discontinued by the Israelites during the whole time of their remaining in the wilderness, God never ex-postulated with them on account of that omission.

SECTION XII.

AND EVEN IN THESE VERY CEREMONIES, GREAT LENITY AND TOLERATION WERE SHOWN TOWARDS THE JEWS, BY THE APOSTLES OF OUR SAVIOUR.

OBLIGATIONS of the highest nature undoubtedly entitled our Saviour and his apostles to every acknowledgement from the Jewish nation; inasmuch as their releasement from ritual bondage was brought to them by Christ himself, and their liberty assured to them by benefits and miracles, 79 at least not inferior to those which they received from Moses. Nevertheless, the primitive teachers of our religion exacted not even this trifling return of gratitude for the happiness thus offered; but readily allowed them, in indifferent matters, 80 a full liberty of living as they pleased, provided that they only would adopt the truly amiable and excellent precepts of Christ Jesus; under this singular and very reasonable restriction, 81 that they should not compel strangers to an ob-
servance of their ritual law, unto whom that ritual law was never given. Toleration and indulgences like these are alone sufficient to demonstrate the injustice of the Jews in making their ceremonial institutions a plea for rejecting the tenets of Christianity.——And now, having thus resolved almost the only objection that is in general alleged against the miracles of Jesus, let us proceed to such other arguments as are adapted to the further conviction of our Jewish adversaries.

SECTION XIII.

A REFUTATION OF JUDAISM, FROM THE GENERAL CONFESSION OF A PROMISED MESSIAH, OF INFINITE AND UNEQUALLED EXCELLENCE.

It is admitted jointly by Jews and Christians, that, exclusively of many distinguished benefactors, of divine appointment, to the Jewish nation, One infinitely superior to the rest is foretold and promised by the prophets; unto whom, indeed, in common with others, the title of Messiah is applied, but unto whom alone that title is singularly and eminently applicable.—That he came long ago into the world, is the profession of our faith; while the Jews, on the other hand, believe him still to come. To determine the dispute between us, we have only to consult the evidence of those books to which both parties equally allow a sufficient and decisive authority.
SECTION XIV.

THAT THE MESSIAH HATH ALREADY BEEN ON EARTH, IS PROVED FROM THE PREVIOUS INDICATION OF THE TIME OF HIS COMING.

Daniel, to whose righteousness and singular integrity Ezekiel hath borne witness, neither practised any intentional imposture in our instance, or experienced any from the angel Gabriel in his own. Nevertheless, we have his written declaration, authorised by the word of that angel, that "from the going forth of the commandment of Cyrus to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem," a period of 500 years should not elapse before the coming of the Messiah. See Dan. chap. ix.

Upwards of 2000 years, however, are now expired, and still the expected Messiah of the Jews is not arrived: neither can they name any other person than Christ Jesus, whose coming would agree with the period foretold; whereas it so exactly applies to him, that Nehumiah, a Jewish ruler, who was born about 50 years before him, even at that time declared openly, that the appearance of the Messiah, pre-signified by Daniel, could not possibly be protracted beyond those 50 years. Another epocha, already touched upon (see book i. sect. xvii.), coincides with the foregoing; in relation to a future Universal Kingdom, of divine origin, the commencement of which should follow the extinction of the Syrian and Egyptian monarchies; the last of which expired with Cleopatra not a great many years before the birth of Christ. A third collateral point of time we meet with also in the ixth of Daniel (see ver. 26,)
wherein it is foretold, that "the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary," after the event of the Messiah's coming shall have taken place.—Now this prophecy respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, is referred by Josephus himself to his own time; and consequently the predicted period of the Messiah's appearance must then have been already past. Again, in the second chapter of Haggai, when Zorobabel, governor of Judah, and Joshua, the son of Josedech the high priest, were sorrowful to see that the temple which they had raised, was "as nothing in comparison" of the greatness of the first temple, God consoles them with a promise "that the glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former:" which promise, it is plain, from the sacred historians, as well as from the writings of Josephus, in relation to these times, collated with the history of the temple of Solomon, cannot possibly be understood in reference to the size or materials, the workmanship or ornaments of the building. Besides, it is remarked by certain Jewish Rabbins, that the second temple was deficient in two most essential endowments of the former temple: these were, a singular degree of effulgent brightness, expressive of the divine majesty; and a gracious communication of the Holy Spirit from above. But the point of preference and superiority in the latter house, God briefly declares to be the gift of his peace; that is to say, the gift of his grace and blessed favour "in that place," as being about to establish himself therein, as it were, by a sure covenant. The prophet Malachi goes on more expressly to the same purpose, "Behold I will send
my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple,” (now Malachi lived in the time of the second temple,) “even the messenger of the covenant, in whom ye delight.”—The Messiah, therefore, was necessarily to come, while the second temple was yet standing: under which description, according to the Jews, is comprehended the whole of that period from Zorobabel to Vespasian: because, in the time of Herod the Great, the temple was not absolutely rebuilt out of ruins, but gradually repaired and altered, so as to make it still retain the appellation of the same temple. And, indeed, so constantly and generally was the Messiah expected by the Jews and by their neighbours to appear in those days, that Herod, and Judas of Galilee, and others, who lived about the time of Christ, were all, severally, mistaken for the true Messiah.

SECTION XV.

(NEITHER CAN IT IN REASON BE SUPPOSED THAT THE SINS OF THE PEOPLE SHOULD RETARD HIS COMING.)

Conscious of the weight and forcible conviction of these arguments respecting the appearance of Messiah, the Jews, in order to elude them, are sometimes absurd enough to say, that the sins and offences of their own nation were the occasion of his non-appearance at the time appointed.

Not to mention the express language of the prophecies aforesaid, pronouncing the decree independent of all conditions, and subject to no single
reservation, how could it be possible that the sins of the people should have deferred his coming, when we might collect from the same prophecies, that the heinousness and number of those sins would occasion the destruction of their city, shortly after the time of the Messiah? Moreover, for this very cause the Messiah was to come; to heal the transgressions of an impious generation, and to bring, together with his precepts for their future amendment, his pardon for their past iniquity. Hence it is that Zechariah saith, in speaking of that period, "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness," (see chap. xiii. ver. 1.); and among the Jews themselves, the appellation of "Isch. eopher," i.e. the appeaser, is generally received as a term for the Messiah. Without further argument, however, it is an obvious insult, a palpable affront to reason, to assert that a remedy, precisely intended for any particular disorder, should, merely because of that disorder, be delayed in the application:

SECTION XVI.

THE SAME POSITION PROVED, FROM THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE JEWS COMPARED WITH THE PROMISES CONTAINED IN THE LAW.

"Common sense alone might surely be sufficient to convince the Jews of the truth of our assertion, that the Messiah came long ago into the world. In the covenant which God made with the Israelites, by the hand of Moses, he promised them a happy possession of the land of Palestine, so long as they..."
should live conformably with his commandments; but threatened them with exile and with various calamities of a like nature, in case of their rebellion or wilful disobedience: nevertheless, he continued to assure them, that had they, at any time, beneath the weight of their afflictions, and through a sense of sorrow for their sins, returned to their obedience, he should ever be found ready to compassionate his people; and should "gather them from all nations," however distantly and widely scattered, to restore them to their native land: (see to this effect the xxth of Deuteronomy, and the first of Nehemiah, as well as other parts of holy writ.) A period, however, of more than 1500 years hath now elapsed, during which the Jewish nation can boast no country of their own; no temple for their general resort; and if ever they attempted to build one, they were constantly obliged to abandon the design: nay, we find it recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus, a writer not of our persuasion, that even balls of fire burst forth from the foundations, and destroyed their labours.—In former times, we find, when the children of Israel had defiled themselves with crimes of every denomination and degree; when the practice of offering up their sons and daughters in sacrifice to Moloch, was everywhere adopted; when adultery was become familiar; when they spoiled the widow and, the fatherless, and poured forth abundantly the blood of the innocent, (with all which crimes they are upbraided by the prophets); the sentence of exile, it is true, was put in execution against them; but the short period of 70 years was the whole term of that exile, and during its continuance God failed not
to address them occasionally by the mouth of his prophets; and not only to comfort them with the future expectation, but even to apprise them of the certain date of their return. In later times, however, when once ejected from their native land, we see them remaining to this day an outcast and derided people: no prophet to address them; no intimation given of any future return: while, seized as it were with a giddy spirit of infatuation, their rulers, all of them, are fallen from the real word of God into idle absurdities and ridiculous opinions, which the books of the Talmud so abundantly contain; books, which they impudently call their Oral Law; and which they have not only the assurance to compare with, but even to prefer before, the books of Moses. So absurd are the accounts there given of God's penitence and tears for having suffered the destruction of their city; of his daily application to the study of their law; of the Behemoth, the Leviathan, and various other matters; that the very mention of them is irksome and offensive. Still, however, in so long a period, the Jews never have been found to turn aside towards their former idols; never do they defile themselves as heretofore, with slaughtered sacrifices; no charges of familiar adultery are now alleged against them; but they labour earnestly with prayers and fastings to appease the wrath of God: nevertheless, their fastings are ineffectual, and their prayers are disregarded. Upon these grounds, therefore, which truly represent their situation, the alternative becomes unavoidable; that either the covenant declared to them by Moses is entirely at an end, or that the whole Jewish com-
munity do still remain beneath the bondage of some grievous sin, of which they have constantly been guilty for so many successive ages:— the nature of that sin I call upon themselves to name; or, if they cannot declare it, let a Christian be for once believed when he assures them, that it certainly consists in their impious contempt of the Messiah, who was to come into the world, before the commencement of those calamities under which they have so long laboured.

SECTION XVII.

THE PREDICTIONS DELIVERED IN RESPECT TO THE MESSIAH DEMONSTRATE JESUS TO BE THAT VERY PERSON.

Thus have we now established our assertion, that the Messiah has already made, many ages ago, his appearance in the world.—Our next position is, that Jesus is that same Messiah. The pretended or reputed claimants of that sacred title, have all, in their turns, died away and are forgotten, without ever having left any sect behind them as converts and adherents to their cause.—Where shall we now look for the professed followers of Herod, the zealous advocates of Judas of Galilee, the learned dupes of Barchocheba, that famous impostor in the days of Adrian? To Jesus, on the other hand, from the time of his appearance to the present moment, multitudes ever have been, and ever are, willing to apply the glorious appellation of Messiah; and this, not in one country only, but in every quarter of the known world.—It would here be easy to aduce many other particulars foretold or believed of
the Messiah, which, while they are not even pretended to in other instances, we believe to be undoubtedly verified in Jesus. His descent, for example, \(\text{117}\) from the house of David; \(\text{118}\) his more immediate descent from an immaculate virgin; \(\text{119}\) (an event communicated from heaven to the husband of that virgin, who, on finding her with child, would otherwise have put her away privately;\) \(\text{120}\) the place also of his birth at Bethlehem; \(\text{121}\) the commencement of his preaching in Galilee; \(\text{122}\) the miracles displayed by him in healing all diseases, in making both the blind to see and the lame to walk;—it is easy, I say, to adduce these and similar events, but I readily confine myself to the observation of one single circumstance, as amply sufficient for the proof required, the effect of which endureth to the present hour; I mean that strong and very manifest intention of the prophecies of \(\text{123}\) David, \(\text{124}\) Isaiah, \(\text{125}\) Zechariah, and \(\text{126}\) Hosea, announcing the Messiah as a future ruler, not only of the Jewish nation, but of "the Gentiles also, unto the end of the earth;" \(\text{127}\) through him were "all the idols to be utterly abolished;" through him were "the strangers, the inhabitants of many cities, to be joined to the Lord."

The universe, before the coming of Christ Jesus, was sunk, for the most part, in superstition and idolatry; but after that event, those miserable effects of ignorance and error began gradually to disappear; and not only private individuals, but kings also, and whole nations, were converted to the worship of the One true God. These blessed revolutions were effected, not by the Rabbins of the Jewish nation, but by the disciples of Jesus, and by their successors.
Thus did they become a people of God, “who were not his people;” and thus was fulfilled the prophecy of Jacob (in the xlixth chapter of Genesis); that the civil power should not depart wholly from the posterity of Judah until Shiloh come: by whom, according to the Chaldean interpreter and others, is intended the Messiah; “unto whom also should the Gentiles seek.”

SECTION XVIII.

IN REPLY TO THOSE WHO ARGUE, THAT SOME PREDICTIONS REMAIN STILL UNACCOMPLISHED.

The general objection of the Jews upon this occasion is, that some particular prophecies respecting the times of the Messiah, are not yet come to pass. The instances adduced, however, are either of an obscure nature, or of an ambiguous interpretation: surely, then, we ought not, on account of these, to neglect those manifest and striking truths, which all must understand, and none can misinterpret. The sanctity of the precepts enjoined; the excellence of the reward proposed; the plain and simple language in which it is set forth; these, I say, together with the miracles which Christ performed, ought, doubtless, to recommend his doctrine to our warmest and heartiest embrace. To understand, indeed, the more obscure prophecies, the language of “the book closed up and sealed,” as they are sometimes called, we have frequent occasion, it is true, for certain portions of the divine assistance; but that assistance is deservedly withdrawn from those who wilfully disregard what is open and obvious to all. The Jews
themselves are conscious, all the while, that the passages produced against us admit of various expositions: and whosoever will compare the ancient interpreters, either in the time of the Babylonian exile, or about the commencement of the Christian æra, with those who wrote afterwards, when the Jews had contracted their violent aversion against the Christian name, will frequently perceive the original explanation of passages (when that explanation was sufficiently agreeable to the sense in which the Christians understood them) supplanted by some other of a later date, which the spirit of party has been industrious to discover. They cannot but be conscious also, that the scriptures are not always to be taken in their strict literal expression, but often in a figurative sense: as when they speak of God "coming down" from heaven; or describe him (ad sensum mortalem) as a Being possessed of the parts and organs of the human body. What objection can there then to a similar explanation of several predictions in relation to the times of the Messiah, as when, for instance, it is said, "that the wolf shall dwell with the lamb; that the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling, together: that the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp; and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den: that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: that all nations shall flow unto it, and all flesh shall worship before the Lord?" —Other instances there are, moreover, wherein a tacit condition is included in the promises, either by
the words antecedent or subsequent, or even by the very sense and meaning of the promises themselves. Thus did God make many promises to the Jewish nation, upon condition that they would receive the Messiah when sent amongst them, and would faithfully observe his will. Wheresoever those promises have failed, themselves have been the guilty cause.—If, further, there be other promises, express and unconditionate, which as yet are unaccomplished, the completion of them may be still expected; for even by the Jews themselves it is allowed, that the reign or kingdom of Messiah is fixed upon the basis of eternity.

SECTION XIX.

TO THOSE ALSO WHO OFFER, AS AN ARGUMENT AGAINST US, THE HUMBLE CONDITION IN WHICH JESUS LIVED, AND THE IGNOMINIOUS NATURE OF HIS DEATH.

The lowness of our Saviour's situation in the world, is a frequent matter of offence. It is, however, not more frequent than unjust. Hath not God assured us in almost every page of scripture, that he raiseth up "the poor and lowly," and bringeth down "the proud in spirit" to destruction? When Jacob passed over Jordan, he carried with him nothing but his staff; when he returned thither, he had camels and asses, and "much cattle." So likewise Moses, in exile and in poverty, was keeping the flock of Jethro, when God appeared to him in the bush, and appointed him the leader and deliverer of his own peculiar people. David, in like manner, was called from the sheepfold to the throne;
and various other instances of the same nature are abundantly supplied by holy writ.—With respect to the Messiah, we are even told that he was to come, 146 “to preach good tidings to the meek;” no strife, no ‘cry of his,” 147 “was to be heard in the streets,” but, in the fulness of his lenity, “the bruised reed should not be broken, neither should he quench the smoking flax.”—But as the lowness of our Saviour’s fortunes, so also the various calamities of his life, and even the ignominious manner of his death, can never be a just occasion of offence to any man. The instances of 148 Abel, who was slain by his brother; of 149 Isaiah, who was “sawn asunder;” of the mother and the 150 seven brethren of the Maccabees, who expired under tortures, are sufficient to convince us, that God often hath been pleased not only to subject the righteous, like 151 Lot in Sodom, to the persecutions of the wicked, but hath even suffered them to die beneath their violence. “The dead bodies of thy servants have they given,” (say the Jews themselves, in their constant repetition of the lxxixth Psalm,) “to be meat unto the fowls of the air; and the flesh of thy saints unto the beasts of the land; their blood have they shed like water round about Jerusalem, and there was no man to bury them;” (see ver. 2, 3, and seq.)—Then, as to the Messiah himself, the necessity of his sufferings and death, previous to the attainment of his kingdom, and of the power of distinguishing his Church by his best and choicest blessings, can never be denied by any man who will seriously attend to the language of the 152 iii’d chapter of Isaiah; “Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord
revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgement; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the hand of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he hath done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travel of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he
shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, 158 and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."— What king, what prophet hath been born, to whom these expressions can apply? None, doubtless, can be found!— The later Jews pretend, indeed, to understand this chapter as a prophecy relating wholly to their own nation, in the general dispersion of them into all countries, for the purpose of obtaining everywhere, as well by their example as their arguments, many converts to their cause.

This interpretation, however, is, in the first place, altogether repugnant to the evidence of the sacred writings, which loudly and repeatedly declare, 160 that all the miseries and punishments inflicted on the Jewish nation, have been always not only justified by their iniquities, but greatly inferior to their deserts. The whole tenour of the prophecy, in the second place, is incapable of such an explanation. "For the transgression of my people was he stricken," saith the prophet; speaking either in his own person (which seems the better reading of the passage), or else as the representative of God. Now the people of Isaiah, or even the peculiar people of God, are certainly the Jews: and consequently, the subject of those sufferings which are thus represented by Isaiah, can never be the same people. The ancient Jewish Rabbins admitted, more wisely, that these expressions did really relate to the Messiah; and some of their descendants, in consequence of this, 161 have
pretended to make two Messiahs; the one they call
the son of Joseph, by whom various calamities and
a cruel death were to be endured; the other, the son
of David, with whom all things should succeed and
prosper. 161 Far more easy to themselves, and far
more consonant with the writings of the prophets,
would it be, to acknowledge and receive One only
Messiah, who was destined to pass through misery
and death to the attainment of his blessed kingdom.
This important truth, in the firm belief of every
Christian, was verified in Jesus; a truth established,
beyond all contradiction, by its own intrinsic evidence.

SECTION XX.

AS WELL AS THE REPUTED PROBITY OF THOSE,
WHO DELIVERED UP OUR SAVIOUR TO THE
CROSS.

There are, doubtless, many of the Jews who
would readily embrace Christianity, were they not
kept back by some early prepossession in favour of the
virtue and integrity of their ancestors; and especially
of those very priests, whose prejudice waited not the
forms of trial to pass sentence against Jesus, and re-
ject his doctrine. That I may not, however, be
supposed to speak ill of them upon personal or
private authority, I could wish the present race of
Jews to receive the general and real character of
their ancestors, as the language of their law and of
their prophets hath expressly drawn it. 162 "Their
ears and their hearts are uncircumcised," saith the
prophet Jeremiah: 163 "with their lips" and outward
ceremonies "do they honour God," saith Isaiah,
"but they have removed their hearts far from him."

—Their ancestors were they, who had nearly carried into execution that bloody conspiracy against their brother Joseph, which ended not, at last, without the actual disposal of him for a slave in Egypt. Their ancestors were they, whose continual seditions drove Moses to complain that his life became a burthen to him; Moses, their leader and deliverer, to whom earth, and sea, and air, were in obedience: their ancestors were they, who loathed the bread of heaven, and "while the flesh of quails was yet between their teeth," murmured against God, as if left in the severest want. Their ancestors were they, who, in open violation of their duty and allegiance to that great and excellent king David, ungratefully espoused the cause of his rebellious son. Their ancestors were they, who cruelly murdered Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, "even in the court of the house of the Lord:" nor was the sanctity of the priesthood itself sufficient to protect him from their impious barbarity. Then, if we consider the chief priests in particular, we find the supporters of that sacred character conspiring the death of Jeremiah by a false impeachment: and, doubtless, their design had been effected, had not certain of the elders interposed their authority: still, however, they exerted a permission to detain him in captivity, until the very moment of the taking of Jerusalem. But now, should it ever be imagined that the priests who were contemporary with Jesus, were men of better principles, that error may be soon removed by reading, in Josephus, the description of their flagrant enormities, as well as their unexampled punishments:
and yet, he himself is of opinion, that the severity of the latter, after all, was greatly inadequate to the guilt of the former. Their Sanhedrim itself is entitled to no higher estimation; especially as the members of it were at that time not chosen as formerly by votes, expressed by the imposition of hands, but in servile obedience to the nod of power: the pontifical office, in like manner, was now no longer a perpetual, but an annual dignity, and frequently procured by money. No wonder then, if men of boundless arrogance, of insatiable ambition and avarice, were driven into transports of rage and indignation at the sight of One, the difference of whose conduct, by inculcating precepts of the utmost purity and virtue, was in itself a satire on their own lives.—Nor was the purport of their charge against him any other than what the best of men, in all preceding times, had constantly experienced: thus, we see, the prophet Michaiah, in the reign of Jehoshaphat, was thrown into prison for having boldly asserted the truth, in opposition to four hundred false prophets. Ahab objected against Elijah, as the priests did against Jesus, that he was the disturber of the peace of Israel: the charge also which was brought against Jeremiah, as it was likewise against Jesus, was the prophecy respecting the destruction of the temple. The record of the ancient Rabbins ought here to be remembered, wherein it is declared that, in the times of the Messiah, there would be found men impudent as dogs, obstinate as asses, and savage as wild beasts.—God himself, who long before had seen what the Jews in general would be at the time of the Messiah's coming, had declared that it should come to pass,
they who were not his people, should become his people:” and that “one of a city and two of a family” among the Jews, should scarcely be found to go together to his sacred mountain, but that strangers out of every nation should supply their places: in like manner he foretold that the Messiah should be “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence” to the Jewish nation; nevertheless, he hath assured us, that “the same stone which the builders refused, shall become the head-stone of the corner.”

SECTION XXI.

IN REPLY TO THE CHARGE OF POLYTHEISM, ALLEGED AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS.

We are now to answer two remaining charges with which the Jews at once attack us on the points of doctrine and of worship. In the first place, they accuse us of worshipping a plurality of gods. This, however, is no more than an exposition of some foreign tenets maliciously wrested to such an application. For why should this be urged as an objection against the Christians, rather than against Philo Judæus, who has frequently established a Trinity in the Deity; and who calls the reason or word of God (the original expression is ἄγωγ) the name of God; the maker of the world; neither unbegotten, as God the Father of all is; nor so begotten as the human race are? The same is also called, both by Philo himself, and by Moses the son of Nachman, an angel or messenger, regarding and protecting this universe: why against the Christians, I say further, rather than against the Cabalists,
who consider the Deity as three distinct *Lights*; and some, indeed, adopt the very same appellations that we do, of Father, Son or *Word*, and Holy Spirit? —But now, to avail myself of a fact universally and especially admitted by the Jews, that Spirit, by which the prophets were impelled, is a something *Uncreate*; yet is mentioned as a *distinct* essence from that which sent it: and the Jewish *Schechinah* is, again, considered as a similar distinction. It hath, moreover, been recorded by several of the Hebrew writers, that that *Vis Divina* (that *Divine Energy*) which by them is called *Wisdom*, was to dwell in the Messiah: and hence the Chaldaean paraphrast gives to the Messiah the appellation of “the Word of God;” hence also he is called, in David; in Isaiah; and elsewhere, by the august titles of God and Lord.

SECTION XXII.

**As well as to the charge alleging that they worship a being of the same nature with themselves.**

With equal readiness we meet their second accusation, which charges us with rendering that worship to a creature, which alone is due to its Divine Creator. But here we must deny our offering to the Messiah any other homage, any other worship than what we are enjoined by scripture to perform. See Psalms ii. and ex. The first of them, imperfectly fulfilled indeed in David, is yet acknowledged by David Kimchi himself, a strong opponent of the Christians, to belong in a more excellent sense to

175
the Messiah. The latter cannot possibly be explained of any other person: for as to the pretended explications of the later Jews, who refer it, some to Abraham, others to David, and others to Hezekiah, they are all frivolous and absurd forgeries. We learn from the Hebrew superscription, that the psalm itself is written by David; how then is it possible to apply his expression of "The Lord said unto my Lord," &c., either to David himself, or to Hezekiah, who was one of the 195 descents of David, and a man of not more distinguished excellence than his pious progenitor? As to Abraham, he never was possessed of any priestly office of distinction; nay, we find him in the light of an inferior receiving a blessing from Melchisedec; whereas, both the passage above mentioned and the subsequent expression, 197 that a rod of power should come forth out of Sion, and should extend to the remotest corners of the earth, are jointly and evidently accomplished in the Messiah, 198 as similar passages demonstrate, which treat of him expressly, in terms not to be mistaken: besides, the more ancient Hebrews and paraphrasts have never understood them in any other sense. For myself, indeed, I could readily believe the fact, that Jesus of Nazareth is the proper and identical object of these prophecies, from the perfect integrity of his own disciples, if it rested solely upon their affirmation; in the same manner as the Jews believe the single and unsupported evidence of Moses, in regard to those commissions and directions which he said were immediately communicated to him from God himself; but, exclusively of this testimony, we have numerous and most 199 convincing proofs of that Su-
preme Power, to which we affirm Jesus Christ to have attained; he was personally seen by many upon earth after his resurrection; he was seen also "carried up into heaven:" by his name alone evil spirits were cast out, and diseases were no more: the gift of tongues also, which Jesus himself had promised as a sign of his attainment to that power, was "poured out" on his disciples: moreover, his sceptre, that is to say, the tidings of the gospel, gone forth out of Sion (exactly as the Psalmist had foretold), went out into the uttermost corners of the earth; and this, not effected by the weak aid of man, but solely by the power of God: unto that sceptre even nations bowed, and kings became obedient. I cannot conclude without observing, that the Jewish Cabalists maintain the doctrine of a certain intercessor, as well in nature as in office, between God and man; subsisting, as they tell us, in the person of a son of Enoch: not a single instance, however, hath this sort of Enoch ever given of a power so transcendant! With how much greater justice, then, do we assign that character to him, who hath proved himself to us by such signal miracles, such certain and undoubted tokens!—And when we place him in this exalted point of view, we by no means derogate thereby from God the Father; because it is from him alone that this power is derived unto Jesus, and to him alone it will return, and to his sole glory and service it is utterly devoted.
SECTION XXIII.
A DISMISSION OF THE SUBJECT, WITH PRAYER FOR THE JEWS.

To engage in any nicer disquisition of these matters, would exceed the limits and design of the present undertaking: nor should we indeed have proceeded thus far, but that we were willing to elucidate this truth to all; that nothing either impious or absurd is contained in the doctrine of our Saviour, so as to afford the least excuse to any man for not embracing a religion, at once distinguished by miracles so wonderful, enjoining precepts so amiable, and promising rewards so glorious! For as to any special matters of inquiry respecting this religion, it becomes immediately incumbent upon all who may embrace it, to apply for information and assistance to those sacred books, wherein are fully comprehended, as we have already shown, all the principles and duties of Christianity. To accomplish in the Jews this blessed end, vouchsafe, O Lord, to enlighten all their hearts and understandings with the peculiar spirit of thy grace, thereby rendering those prayers effectual, which Christ himself, when even dying on the cross, poured forth for their forgiveness!
BOOK THE SIXTH.

SECTION I.

A REFUTATION OF MAHOMETANISM:—THE ORIGIN OF THAT RELIGION.

As we now professedly commence our attack upon the followers of Mahomet, we intend, by way of preface to the present book, to trace the progress of God's judgements against the Christians down to the immediate origin of the sect above mentioned: to observe, that is to say, how all that real and pure piety, which had flourished among the Christians in the days of their severest persecutions and oppressions, gradually degenerated into coldness and indifference, from the period in which Christianity was rendered, by Constantine and by succeeding emperors, not only a profession of safety, but of honour: a period, when all the world were driven as it were by force into the Christian church; it was then that Christian princes became first engaged in bloody and perpetual wars: though the blessings of peace were now within their power; it was then, that prelates, regardless of the sacred character, were seen to give a loose to ambition and to avarice, by all the most desperate extremities of mutual animosity: it was then (as heretofore, the tree of knowledge was fatally preferred before the tree of life,) that the prying efforts of learned speculation were in higher estimation than piety, and men made a trade of their religion: like the builders of the tower of
Babel, they consequently fell, by a rash affectation of sublimity, into dissonant harangues and jarring sentiments: the common people, continually bewildered in this scene of contradiction, retorted all the blame upon the scriptures, and began to shun them as a baneful poison.—The inward purity of true religion, by a gradual revival as it were of Judaism, universally became converted into outward ceremony: prescriptive formalities, which rather exercise the body than improve the mind, together with a zealous and unbounded fury, in defence of parties once adopted, were declared to constitute religion; till at length, Christianity was everywhere supported by many nominal professors, but by few, very few in fact.—God suffered not his people to commit these enormities unnoticed; but pouring forth the swarming inhabitants of the utmost corners of Scythia and of Germany, he deluged, as it were, the whole Christian world with the barbarous invaders: and when all the havoc and excessive slaughter which they committed, were still insufficient to bring back the survivors to their duty, with just indignation he permitted Mahomet to plant a new religion in Arabia; a religion directly combating, in fact, every principle of Christianity, but somewhat ostensibly adapted, in theory, to the lives of the generality of Christians. The Saracens, who had revolted from the emperor Heraclius, were the first embracers of this doctrine; by their arms Arabia, Syria, Palæstine, Ægypt, and Persia, were speedily subdued; they then proceeded to infest Africa, and even crossed over into Spain. But, as other nations, so in particular the Turks, who in themselves were also a very warlike people,
became afterwards possessed of the Saracen power: having long waged war against the Caliphate, they at length listened to a treaty of alliance; and presently adopting a religion which was fitted to the manners and customs of their own nation, they at last transferred upon themselves the whole authority of the empire: the cities of Asia and of Greece were unable to withstand them; and as their conquests became more extensive, even Hungary and the German territories experienced the power of their arms.

SECTION II.

AN UTTER SUBVERSION OF MAHOMETANISM, ON THE GROUND OF ITS PRECLUDING ALL RELIGIOUS INQUIRY.

Evidently established upon sanguinary principles, the religion of Mahomet delighteth much in rites and ceremonies; and, utterly prohibiting all freedom of inquiry, demandeth the most absolute and implicit faith; in consequence of which, all books that are accounted sacred, are strictly prohibited and carefully withheld from the profane eyes of the common people. A prohibition like this is, in itself, an immediate and plain indication of iniquitous proceedings: a commodity, thus blindly and forcibly obtruded upon any man, is deservedly an object of suspicion. All men, it is true, possess not equal abilities or equal judgement: pride, passions, and the strength of habit, will severally force them into error: but that the path which leadeth to eternal salvation cannot possibly be known by those who seek it, uninfluenced by views of advantage or
of honour, with a total surrender of themselves and of all that they possess, to the will of the Almighty, imploring him to aid and to direct their endeavours; this, I say, the infinite goodness of the Divine Being forbids us to believe: and certainly, since God hath implanted in the mind of man, a faculty of reason and discernment, it cannot be employed in the search of any truth more worthy of its whole exertion, than that wherein a state of ignorance unavoidably endangers our eternal salvation.

SECTION III.

THE MAHOMETANS CONFUTED, FROM THE SCRIPTURES OF THE HEBREWS AND THE CHRISTIANS; NEITHER ARE THOSE SCRIPTURES CORRUPTED.

The divine mission of Moses, as also that of Jesus, and the sanctity of the primitive dispensers of the gospel, are admitted by Mahomet and his followers as undoubted truths: The Koran, however, which is the law of Mahomet, very evidently and frequently contradicts the accounts which Moses and the disciples of Jesus have delivered down to us. To select one instance out of many; the real crucifixion of Jesus, his resurrection on the third day, and his subsequent appearance unto many upon earth, are facts established in the strongest manner by the full and united evidence of all the apostles and disciples of our Saviour: the doctrine of Mahomet, on the other hand, affirms, that Jesus was secretly withdrawn into heaven, and that an effigy of some kind or other was nailed upon the cross in his
stead: that, therefore, Jesus never died, but that the public eye was blinded by a gross imposture.—Here, then, our antagonist, as the only evasion that can possibly be devised, thinks proper to assert, that the books originally written as well by Moses as by the disciples of Christ, have since been variously altered and corrupted. This falsity, however, hath already been refuted; see book iii. sect. 15.—What if we should say that corruptions had obtained in the Koran? The Mahometans of course would contradict us, and would urge the sufficiency of their simple negation against any affirmation that we could offer, unsupported by proof: not that the Mahometans are able to adduce those voluntary proofs in favour of the purity of their Koran, which we do on the side of scripture, in regard to the immediate and universal dispersion of the sacred copies (not written, truly, like the Koran, in one language only), as well as in the faithful and unanimous preservation of those copies, by so great a variety of sects, so widely dissentient about other matters. The Mahometans have a notion that in the xivth chapter of St. John, where he speaks of the sending of the comforter, some passage, which the Christians have erased, was originally extant in relation to Mahomet. But here I should be glad to ask them, whether they would choose this alteration of scripture, antecedent or subsequent to Mahomet's appearance? The latter was evidently impossible, because numerous copies of more than one version of the scriptures were, at that time, already extant in all parts of the world, not only in the Greek language, but in the Syriac, the Arabic, (and that too in places far distant from
Arabia,) the Æthiopic, and the Latin.—These, all of them, without any variations in the text, coincide in the passage above mentioned. Then, as to any prior alteration, what reason could there be for making it, since nobody could possibly divine what future opinions would be started by Mahomet? Nay, if nothing had been really contained in his doctrine contradictory to that of Christ, why should the Christians have been more averse from the reception of his books than they were from the reception of the books of Moses and the Hebrew prophets?—

But now, for the sake of argument, let us mutually suppose that nothing was ever written in regard to the doctrine of the one or of the other: a principle of equity would, in that case, direct us to consider as the several doctrines of Jesus and of Mahomet, those precepts and opinions which are ascribed to each of them distinctly, by the unanimous consent of their respective followers.

SECTION IV.

FROM A COMPARISON OF MAHOMET WITH CHRIST.

To ascertain, therefore, the title to a preference thus severally claimed, let us now proceed to a comparative inquiry in regard to the properties and qualities of each particular doctrine; beginning with a brief comparison of their respective authors. 23 That Jesus was the promised Messiah whom the law and the prophets had announced, is a truth admitted even by the personal confession of Mahomet: 24 by the same confession is he styled the Word, the Wisdom, and the Mind of God. And again, in another
place it is allowed by Mahomet 27 that Jesus had no earthly father. The Mahometans themselves, on the other hand, ascribe not the existence of their leader to any preternatural effect; 28 he was born and be-gotten like themselves. The whole tenour of our Saviour's life was spotless and irreproachable: that of Mahomet was long engaged in 29 violence and rapine; and addicted, throughout, to 30 lust and debauchery; and while Mahomet himself acknowledges that 31 Jesus, after death, was carried into heaven, his own mouldering remains are, at the present hour, imprisoned in an earthly sepulchre. Who then can hesitate to say unto whom the preference is due?

SECTION V.


Let us next consider their respective actions.— 32 Through Jesus did the blind receive their sight; through Jesus did the lame "leap up and walk;" through Jesus were the sick made whole, and, as Mahomet himself confesses, the very graves gave back their dead.—The pretended missionary of Arabia, on the other hand, asserts the authenticity of his credentials, 33 not with a miraculous but with a martial power. There are some indeed of his bigoted adherents, who maintain that he was also a miraculous agent. But what are the nature and extent of his miracles? They are such only as are easily effected by human art alone, like that of 34 the dove flying down to his ear; or else, like the prodigy of the camel addressing him by night, they are simple
unattested assertions of his own: while the intrinsic absurdity of other miracles recorded of him, is alone sufficient to evince their falsity: of this number is that memorable story which assures us, that a considerable portion of the moon fell down into his sleeve, which the wise impostor happily replaced, in order to restore the former rotundity of that unfortunate planet!—Surely then, in any doubtful cause, (if this can be considered in that light,) we should regulate our judgement by the tenour of that law, which is able to adduce in its behalf more certain attestations of a sanction from above!—But now, proceed we to examine, further, the general character of those men, who originally embraced the respective tenets of Jesus and of Mahomet.

SECTION VI.

THE PRIMITIVE RECEIVERS OF EACH DOCTRINE CONSIDERED.

The comparison may be given in a word: the first converts to Christianity were men, who, living in the fear of God, and in singular simplicity of manners, were, therefore, morally secure of the divine protection against every delusive story, and every pretended miracle: the first followers of Mahomet, on the other hand, were a lawless and desperate banditti, estranged altogether from the ties of humanity and the duties of religion.
THE METHODS RESPECTIVELY EMPLOYED IN THE
PROPAGATION OF THE TWO RELIGIONS.

We come now to represent the means, by which each religion was promoted in the world.—In regard to Christianity, the continual and extensive progress which it made, resulted, as we have frequently before observed, from the miracles performed, not only by our Saviour himself, but by his disciples also, and by their successors; nor was it in a slight degree assisted by the very circumstance of that unshaken constancy displayed by them under every calamity, persecution, and torture. But where are we to find any miracles performed by the impotent disciples of Mahomet? where are we to find any grievous calamities endured, any death of torture undergone by them, for the sake of their religion? a religion obsequiously following the career of victory, and simply the result of conquest: a religion, in defence of which the very teachers and professors themselves have nothing more to offer than that very fallacious and insufficient argument, derived from the successful issue of their wars and the extensive limits of their empire. Do not they themselves exclaim against the rites of Paganism? And yet it is notorious what amazing victories were gained, what extensive empires were possessed, by the successive powers of Persia, Macedonia, and Rome! The Mahometans, moreover, were by no means constantly victorious: repeated overthrows in various parts are known to have befallen them by land and sea; the whole sect of them in Spain was utterly expelled the kingdom.

* The fate of war,
then, subject as it is to continual vicissitudes, and capable of serving indiscriminately the cause of virtue and of vice, can never be a certain token of the true religion: and this more especially in the present instance, as the arms of the Mahometans were employed in oppression and injustice; directed frequently against a people which never had molested them; against nations known to them by no single injury on their part: the pretext of religion, therefore, was all that they could offer to palliate their aggressions; a conduct, in itself, the highest act of irreligion! The only worship of the Deity is the free and voluntary worship of the heart: now the powers of the will are to be won insensibly by the alluring voice of instruction and persuasion; but never can be gained by menaces or force. Compulsion and fear may indeed enforce hypocrisy, but never can induce conviction: an inclination to extort compliance by violent or intimidating measures is, in fact, a confession of distrust in the fairer field of argument. After all, however, this very pretext of religion is, again, destroyed by the Mahometans themselves, since they tolerate all kinds of religion in the people subdued by them; and sometimes even openly admit the sufficiency of Christianity itself to place its adherents in a state of salvation.

SECTION VIII.
A COMPARISON OF THE PRECEPTS, RESPECTIVELY ENJOINED BY THEM.
Let us now proceed to a comparison of the precepts also, which Christ and Mahomet respectively
inculcate. On the one hand we find patience, on the other hand revenge, to be a precept of religion: and whilst we are taught by Christianity to love even our declared enemies, the sullen Mahometan, in the malice of his heart, sits brooding on some future vengeance. The Christians are commanded to preserve indissoluble the sacred obligation of the marriage vow, by mutual concessions, and mutual forbearance; separation and divorce are the avowed practice of the licentious followers of Mahomet. The Christian husband bears an equal part in all the duties of the married state, and his wife is instructed, by his own example, in the only proper object of her whole affection. The Mahometan sensualist, on the contrary, has wives and concubines at pleasure; continually provoking, by some new incitement, the keenness of his brutal appetite. By the precepts of the one, religion is restored and inwardly implanted in the heart, that there, by due cultivation, it may bring forth good fruits, to profit and instruct mankind: by the precepts of the other, the whole virtue of that sacred plant is nearly wasted and consumed in outward ceremonial applications, in the rites of circumcision, and in other matters of an indifferent nature. The one regards not what we eat or drink, within the bounds of temperance; the other is absurd enough to pronounce the flesh of swine unlawful food, and totally forbids the use of wine; whereas wine is undoubtedly a blessing, if moderately used, intended for the good and comfort of our minds as well as bodies. It is not to be wondered at, indeed, that childish elementary instructions, as it were, should have preceded the introduction of an infinitely
perfect law, like that of Christ; but after the promulgation of that express law, to return to typical and figurative meanings, is the height of all possible absurdity: neither can any shadow of a reason be assigned, to make the introduction of another subsequent religion either requisite or expedient; when the world was already blessed with Christianity, by far the most excellent of all possible religious systems!

SECTION IX.

THE MAHOMETANS ABSURDLY OBJECT AGAINST US, FOR CALLING JESUS THE SON OF GOD.

The followers of Mahomet pretend to take offence at our assigning unto God a Son, when he never had a wife; as if the name of Son were incapable of being understood (when speaking of the Deity) in a sense more adapted to the divine nature. Mahomet himself, however, when he tells us of the coldness of God’s hand; of his own sensible experience of it; of God’s being carried about in a chair, and of other similar absurdities; is surely representing God in a manner altogether as unworthy of him, as if we were to speak of him as having, in reality, a wife. But when we apply the appellation of the Son of God to Jesus, we mean exactly what Mahomet himself intends by calling him the Word of God; for, by a peculiarity of generation, as it were, a word is the offspring of the mind.

But the filiation of our Saviour is yet further justified, upon the ground of his immediate descent from a pure virgin, by the sole operation of the Divine Essence, in place of the natural means of generation;
as also upon that of his ascension into heaven, effected by the power of his Divine Father. Hence then (and Mahomet expressly admits the truth of these very particulars) it is evident that Jesus, with a singular degree of right, not only may possibly, but must indispensably, deserve the appellation of The Son of God.

SECTION X.

NUMEROUS ABSURDITIES IN THE BOOKS OF THE MAHOMETANS.

It were a tedious undertaking, on the other hand, to enumerate the various particulars, recorded in the writings of Mahometans, in open violation of the truth of history; and the various absurdities therein asserted, in direct opposition to common sense.—Such is the story which they tell us, of a beautiful woman, whom a set of drunken angels had instructed in a particular form of incantation, whereby she was enabled to mount into the air and descend again at pleasure; till at length, during one of these sublime expeditions, she was suddenly apprehended by the Deity, who fixed the fair trespasser for ever to the spot on which he found her: to which happy incident, the world is indebted for the planet Venus. Such, again, is the story of a mouse in Noah's ark, which arose from the dung of an elephant; while a cat, on the other hand, sprang up, all at once, from the breath of a lion. Such, more especially, is that of the future transformation of death into a ram; under which description this mortal enemy of ours is then to be confined, as in a fold, in some intermediate space between the upper and the lower
regions. Then again, the preposterous ideas, entertained by them, that, in the next life, the secretions of the body will be carried off by perspiration; and that the joys of Paradise are intended to consist in the sensual delights of a Turkish seraglio.—These and similar absurdities are surely of so gross a nature, that nothing but a voluntary state of stupefaction, a criminal and wilful ignorance, can actuate the blind abettors of them; especially when the clear and unerring light of the gospel-dispensation is lavishly diffused around them.

SECTION XI.
A CONCLUSIVE ADDRESS TO ALL CHRISTIANS IN GENERAL; THE FOREGOING OBSERVATIONS AFFORDING US A PROPER OPPORTUNITY TO ADMONISH THEM OF THEIR OWN DUTY.

Having thus dismissed the final disputation in which we were engaged, we proceed to the concluding branch of our whole undertaking; and here we no longer now address ourselves to Pagan, Mahometan, or Jewish disputants, but to Christians of every denomination and degree; presenting a summary display of the use of the foregoing observations, in teaching them at once the practice of all good, and the utter abhorrence of all evil. Be it, then, their first care to lift up their hands in purity unto that God who out of nothing created all things visible and invisible; with a full and certain confidence, that God “careth for us all,” seeing that a single sparrow falleth not upon the ground “without our Father.” Moreover, “be they not afraid of them
which kill the body only, rather than of him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Let them, also, have "access with confidence" not alone in God the Father, but likewise in his Son Jesus Christ our Lord; for none other name under heaven is given unto men, whereby they must be saved. Nor can that confidence be otherwise attained, than by a recollection that eternal life belongeth not to every man who calleth, with his lips, the one Father, and the other Lord, but only unto him who keepeth, with a willing heart, the tenour of their joint commandments. And further, we exhort them earnestly to keep with all diligence and care, as a treasure of inestimable value, the sacred precepts delivered by our Saviour; to this end, frequently examining the purport of those holy writings, by which no man can ever be deceived, except he shall have previously deceived himself. The writers of that sacred volume, they may well assure themselves, were men too faithful to the trust reposed in them, fully enlightened by divine inspiration, to wish us ever to remain in total or in partial ignorance of any necessary truth; and therefore we ought rather to bring with us a mind submissive and obedient in all things, for thus we cannot fail to become wise unto salvation, by knowing every object of our faith, our duty, and our hope; hereby stirring up and cherishing within us the gift of that spirit, the earnest of our future happiness. It hath also been the business of the present pages, to render the imitation of any Pagan practice a matter of abhorrence to the Christian world; as well in regard to the worship of false gods; of idols which are no-
thing;" mere instruments employed by evil spirits to turn us from the worship of the One True God; (for we cannot be "partakers of the things which the Gentiles sacrifice," and profit at the same time by the sacrifice of Christ;) as also in regard to the habits of excess and immorality in which the Pagans live; subject solely to the dictates and lawless desires of the flesh.—With infidels, like these, what fellowship can Christians have, when the latter are expressly told that it is incumbent on them, not only to be far superior in goodness to the heathen, but also, that, "except their righteousness exceed the ostensible and external righteousness of Scribes and Pharisees, they shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven?"

Then as to the errors of the Jewish nation, we have further shown, that it is not "the outward circumcision of the flesh that now availeth any thing," but "the inward circumcision of the heart;" the keeping of the commandments of God; the being made a "new creature;" the assurance of "a faith which worketh by love:" these are the distinctions that bespeak a man "an Israelite indeed:" "a Jew in the spirit and not in the letter;" in other words, a faithful member of the church; by whom God is truly glorified.—At the same time we have shown that the formal distinctions, established by the Jewish dispensation, in respect to meats and sabbath-days and festivals, are all only "shadows of the things" which should be realized, by the author and professors of the Christian faith.

Then again, the errors of the Sect of Mahomet have given us occasion to admonish all the followers,
of Christ, of the positive prediction delivered by
our blessed Lord; assuring us, that after his time
false prophets should come into the world, pretendi-
ing to be sent from God; but that, if "an angel
from heaven" should appear to us, we ought never
to receive any other doctrine than that of Jesus
Christ, approved to us by testimonies so strong and
so conclusive: God indeed, at sundry times and in
divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers,
but hath graciously been pleased, "in these last
days, to speak unto us by his Son, the Lord of all
things, the brightness of his Father's glory, and
the express image of his person; by whom all
things are created, whether they be things past, or
things to come;" who governeth and upholdeth
all things by his power; and who, by his blood
having washed out our sins, ascended into heaven to
the right hand of the Father, and hath there ob-
tained, far above the angels, a throne of majesty, a
crown of glory!—And is it, after all, still possible
to look for any future lawgiver, whose mission should
exceed in grandeur and importance the mission of
our Saviour! From the same topic, we have further
been enabled to remind every Christian, that the
soldiers of Christ are commanded to be armed,
not with that armour to which Malthomet referred the
justice of his cause, but with the special armour of
the spirit, "proper to the pulling down of strong
holds; casting down imaginations, and every high
thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of
God;" putting on "for a shield, faith, whereby we
may repel the fiery darts of Satan; for a breast-
plate, righteousness," or true integrity; "for an
helmet," (as the best protection of the weakest part) "the hope of salvation:" 109 for a sword, "the quick and powerful word of God," which pierceth even to the innermost recesses of the heart.—Moreover, in the next place, we prefer a general exhortation unto all, that they keep, one toward another, 110 that harmony and concord, which Christ, at his departure, so earnestly enjoined to his disciples: that they ought not to receive amongst them 111 "many masters, for one is our master, even Christ:" 112 that all Christians are baptized in the same blessed name; that therefore, 113 no schism or divisions should exist among them; and in order to administer, at length, some remedy to these dissensions, we would wish them to remember how strongly the apostles reprobate the vain conceits of human wisdom; commanding all men never to "think highly of themselves;" but 114 "soberly 115 according to the measure of that knowledge, which God hath given unto every one."

—116 "Him that is weak in the faith," according to St. Paul, "receive ye, and bear with his infirmity; that thus he may incorporate with us 117 in peace;" but "not to doubtful disputation." 118 If any man excel others in the measure of his knowledge, it is just that he excel them also in the measure of his diligence; but they 119 "who in any thing are minded otherwise" than we are, would do well to wait with patience until God discover also unto them, the latent truth: 120 in the mean time, "whereunto we have attained, let us all "hold fast our profession;" let us all, as far as we are able, be "doers of the word." 121 Now know we in part; but the time cometh, 122 when it may be given us to
know with certainty the full manifestation of all things.

To every individual we likewise add our entreaties, that he keep not unemployed, the talent intrusted to his care; but like a faithful servant, that he labour with unwearied diligence to gain also other converts unto Christ; not only adopting, to this end, the means of godly conversation and verbal admonitions, but likewise, by a newness of life, affording in himself "a pattern of good works:" that so, the goodness of the servants may approve the goodness of the master, and the purity of their lives the purity of his law.

And now, returning to the object of my first address; to all my countrymen I finally appeal, beseeching them, if any thing in these my labours, may be found conducive to the cause of virtue and religion, to render unto God the praise: "If any thing offend," I entreat them to consider, as well the general propensity to error, inherent in our nature, as also the particular circumstances of time and place, under which I thus hastily present them with a work, the true and honest effusion of my heart, rather than a studied and elaborate performance of my pen.
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MR. LE CLERC'S TREATISE

ON

THE PROPER CHOICE OF A RELIGIOUS CREED,
AMONG THE VARIOUS OPINIONS OF
CHRISTIAN DISPUTANTS.

SECTION I.

IT IS PROPER TO INQUIRE AMONG WHAT DE-
SCRIPTION OF CHRISTIANS THE TRUE DO-
TRINE OF CHRIST PRESERVES AT THIS DAY
ITS GREATEST PURITY AND VIGOUR.

A SINCERE and competent inquirer after truth, who
shall read with attention the books of the New Testa-
ment, will find himself compelled to admit that all
the evidences or marks of truth which Hugo Grotius
has stated and explained in the second and third
parts of his Treatise, are in them collected and
united. Consequently, he will perceive, as he feels
the value of a blessed immortality, how much it is
his duty to embrace what those books have proposed
to his faith,—to do what they prescribe to his con-
duct, and to confide in what they offer to his hopes.
It is otherwise a plain inconsistency; that a man
should disclaim all doubt of the truth of Christia-
nity, and should at the same time argue that its doc-
trines, its precepts, and its promises, are not entitled
in all respects to his ready faith and grateful accept-
ance: such a man would contradict himself, and
would show too plainly that he is not a Christian at heart.

Now we read among the precepts of Christ and his Apostles, that we must profess ourselves disciples of Christ before men, if we wish that he should acknowledge us as his own, when quick and dead shall finally receive their doom: that if, on the other hand, we deny him as our master before men, he also, in his turn, at that last awful appearance of the whole human race, will deny us to be his disciples! Truly it was not the intention of our Saviour, that they who believe in him should be his disciples in a clandestine manner, as if they were ashamed of his religion, or as if they thought more of the esteem and favours, the menaces and punishments of mortal men, than of his immortal precepts, and the promises of life eternal! Rather does he require them to be Christians openly, and in the face of all the world, that they also may induce other men to embrace the truth as the truth is in Jesus, and may, even in defiance of the keenest tortures, (if such be the divine will,) render back to God that life which they have received from him, publicly avowing that no earthly consideration can stand in competition with his precepts! It is thus, moreover, that St. Paul teacheth, that we shall obtain salvation if we shall confess with our mouths the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in our hearts that God hath raised him from the dead: for with the heart (saith he) man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation: for the Scripture saith, whoever believeth on him, shall not be ashamed.
bent upon every man who believes the Christian religion to be true, to affirm and avow that conviction of his mind, as occasion may require, with inflexible constancy and courage.

It is further incumbent upon him to seek an intercourse with those who hold the same faith, and to cultivate with them a singular degree of harmony and friendship, for "by this (saith our Saviour) shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another;" thus mutually performing all offices of charity and goodwill! Nor has he failed to exhort his followers to meet together in his name, that is, to assemble in Christian communion, having promised that "where two or three are gathered together in his name, there will he be in the midst of them." Matt. chap. xviii. ver. 19, 20.—Now, besides the mutual love and the stricter bond of friendship which Christians, by thus "assembling together," must promote and improve, they also secure by these means the continuance of their tenets from age to age: an object which could hardly be attained if each individual should form his sentiments in a separate and selfish manner, nor communicate his ideas to others without a bribe or bargain; for tenets so concealed sink gradually into oblivion, and are at length totally destroyed and lost: our Blessed Saviour, on the other hand, would have his doctrine maintained, and the congregations of his followers continued, from generation to generation; perpetual as the benefits of the gospel to mankind!

Whosoever, therefore, has derived a knowledge of the Christian religion from the New Testament, and admits the truth of it, is in duty bound to profess his
faith, and to unite with those of the same profession. But as there is not at this day (nor has ever been) one single description of men, nor one sole congregation of those who assemble in the name of Christ, so is no man to be deemed truly Christian from his wish to adopt that sacred title, neither ought he on that account to unite himself, without examination, with any nominal congregation of Christians. The first object of inquiry is, whether their doctrines agree with that "form of sound words" which our minds have conceived from an attentive perusal of the New Testament. We may otherwise mistake for a Christian congregation a set of men who are only Christians in name. No prudent man, therefore, will attach himself (unalterably at least) to a religious society of any denomination whatever, unless he shall perceive in it the cultivation of that doctrine which he deems true Christianity; so that he may never be required to say or do any thing which he believes to be repugnant to the instructions and commandments of Christ.

SECTION II.

WE SHOULD ATTACH OURSELVES TO THOSE PERSONS WHO BEST DESERVE THE NAME OF CHRISTIANS.

Among the dissensions of Christians (alas! worse than dissensions), among their mutual denunciations and rancorous proscriptions, it were not only an imprudent but a very rash and wicked line of conduct to take part with any of them without an examination of their tenets; or to apply those tenets, not duly weighed, to the condemnation of others. A society,
which rejects, even partially, that true religion which a man delineates to the satisfaction and conviction of his own mind, which that society consigns him to perdition for believing it, cannot possibly be regarded by him as a society truly Christian in all respects, nor can it ever obtain the actual consent and concurrence of that man, in its votes of exclusion, and its sentence of condemnation.

It is therefore the first object of a prudent and impartial inquirer to ascertain, amongst these unhappy dissensions, the worthiest "namers of the name of Christ," and to attach himself to their communion. Suppose there should exist no society of Christians, who may be thought to teach beyond dispute the genuine doctrines of Christianity; none absolutely free from the imputation of laying a restraint on private judgement in any instance whatsoever; and suppose we should be asked what the turn or tendency of the Christian religion would in that case enjoin us to do; the answer is, that where a man has detected errors he must use his best endeavours to reclaim others from them—a task indeed which requires our utmost candour, as well as prudence and firmness; lest on the one hand we should give offence to no purpose; or on the other hand should despair too soon of persuading men to embrace truth, or to observe moderation. Meantime what we deem to be true, should be proposed in a discreet and modest manner; not should the opinion of one man, who may seem competent to think properly, be condemned as erroneous, on the mere judgement of another. God hath never so deserted, and will never so desert, the Christian name, that there shall be left no remnant of true
Christians; of those at least who may be fully reinstated in the right path; and with whom (if others will not be reclaimed) we may still have it in our power to cultivate some closer bond of union, and even to avow a formal secession (but not till everything has been tried in vain) from our obstinate and perverse opponents; if we may not speak our sentiments amongst them candidly and fairly, nor be excused from joining them in pronouncing the condemnation of others, against the dictates of our own judgement.—Christianity forbids all dissimulation, falsehood, or uncharitable censure: nor can any man be unacceptable to God who, in reverence and esteem for that divine doctrine, shall be willing to suffer any thing rather than transgress it: such a sentiment, resulting from the knowledge of his duty and from the most ardent love of God, cannot fail to be in the highest degree pleasing to the Almighty.

Hence, as I observed, while the professors of Christianity are thus divided, our duty is to examine diligently whose tenets are the best, that is, the most consonant with Scripture: nor should we ever venture to condemn others but upon the fullest and clearest conviction; attaching ourselves to those who neither require us to believe any doctrines which we think false, nor to condemn any which we think true. If these terms cannot be obtained from any existing society of Christians, we ought then to secede from them all, with those whose sentiments agree with our own, that we may not intentionally betray the truth and assert falsehood.
SECTION III.

THEY BEST DESERVE THE NAME OF CHRISTIANS, WHO (ABOVE ALL OTHERS) PROFESS IN ITS GREATEST PURITY THAT DOCTRINE, THE TRUTH OF WHICH HAS BEEN PROVED BY GROTIUS.

But it is an inquiry of no trifling importance or difficulty, what society of Christians, among the many now existing, shall be found to entertain those tenets which are most consonant with Scripture, and therefore shall be best entitled to the Christian name. All Christian churches, as well those which have long seceded from the Church of Rome as that of Rome itself, lay claim to this preference; and if you set aside, without discussion, all the reasons which they offer, there is nothing to determine your belief in one more than in another: for it were absurd to form a preference, in such a case, by mere chance, and to cut short, as it were, by the cast of a die, all controversies on the subject.—Now Grotius proves the truth, not of the peculiar tenets of any modern sect of Christians, but solely of that doctrine which Christ and his Apostles delivered to mankind; and therefore that Christian society which, above all others, maintains the primitive doctrine which they taught, is above all others entitled to a preference. That religion, in short, is altogether genuine Christianity, which unmixed with "philosophy and vain deceit," "the rudiments of the world," "the commandments and doctrines of men," can be shown to originate alone from Christ.—With that religion do those evidences of truth, which are fully stated by Grotius in his Second Book on the Truth of Christianity, exactly
correspond; neither do they agree with any other
system of religion, except where any other may agree
with that of Christ.

But if any man "diminish aught" from the doctrine
which Christ delivered, or "add thereto," he de-
parteth from the truth, in exact proportion to such a
diminution or addition: when I speak of Christ's
doctrine, I intend what is clearly and universally re-
ceived by Christians as the doctrine of Christ: that
is, what all Christians admit to be expressly contained
in the books of the New Testament, or resulting by
necessary inference from them alone. With respect
to tenets, delivered (as some think) by the mouth of
Christ and of the Apostles, which have descended to
after ages by other means, preserved, for instance, by
oral or ritual institution, as they imagine, and not
committed to writing till a late period, I shall here
pass no judgement upon them further than to say
that they are not authenticated, as the books of the
New Testament are, by the universal consent of
Christians. I will not call them false, unless repug-
nant to right reason or to express revelation; I only
would observe that their authenticity is not universally
established, but is matter of dispute and controversy
among Christians; who still are unanimous in respect
to those tenets, the truth of which has been demon-
strated by Grotius. Should we then lay a stress
upon those points as being certainly true, in which
we see some occasion of doubt and uncertainty (espe-
cially in matters of great moment), we could expect
no man of sense or candour to approve our conduct.
SECTION IV.
ON POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT AMONG CHRISTIANS.

Controversies (it is true) maintained with virulence and agitated with the utmost animosity, unhappily prevail in the Christian world; and complaints are heard on all sides against the obstinacy of disputants in denying propositions which are plain and evident: nevertheless, some points are so clear that they are equally admitted by all parties. Nor is it a slight argument for the truth of those points, that they should be so admitted, unanimously, even by parties the most eager to cavil, and almost blinded by their passions. Not indeed that all other points, now disputed, are therefore ambiguous or obscure, because Christians disagree about their purport or their origin; for a case easily becomes obscure to some men, which otherwise would be clear, if their minds were not shackled by prejudice. But it is improbable, nay impossible, that a point, really doubtful or obscure, should ever be received, with unanimous consent, by opponents the most inveterate, inflamed with all the rage of disputation.

In the first place, then, all Christians at this day unite in opinion respecting the number and the truth of the books of the New Testament: and if, among the learned, some question may be entertained in regard to some of the Apostolical Epistles, the controversy is not of great moment; and it is admitted by all, that nothing but what is true is contained in those Epistles, neither is the slightest alteration produced in the tenets of Christianity, whether those Epistles be
retained or rejected. This unanimous consent is of no small consequence, when the object of our inquiry is the undoubted source of divine revelation, under the New Covenant: whereas the rest of the records or vestiges of ancient revelation, which, as some think, are preserved, are regarded by others in a doubtful light.

The professors of Christianity are not less unanimous in many of those articles which embrace points of faith, of duty, and of hope. To mention here some articles of principal importance, all Christians who are in their senses agree, for example, in the first place, in the belief of one God, eternal, omnipotent, of perfect goodness and holiness, endued, in short, with every attribute of excellence, without the slightest mixture of imperfection; they believe in that God as the creator of the world and of all things which are therein, and consequently of the human race: the universal ruler and most wise governor of his works! Secondly, they believe in Jesus Christ as the only Son of that God; born at Bethlehem of the Virgin Mary, without earthly father, in the latter days of Herod the Great, when Augustus Caesar was Emperor of Rome: they believe in his subsequent crucifixion and death, during the reign of Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was Procurator of Judaea; in the authenticity of the Gospels recording his life; in his mission from the Father for the express purpose of teaching to mankind the way of salvation; "that he might redeem us from all iniquity," and "reconcile us to God by his own death;" and in the confirmation of that mission by innumerable miracles; in his death (as I have said) and in his resurrection, and in his visible
and repeated appearance afterwards to many "infal-
liable" witnesses, who even conversed with him and
touched his person, and before whose eyes he was
taken up into heaven, where he now reigneth, and
whence he will hereafter return to pass a final judge-
ment according to the Scriptures upon all who "are
alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," and
upon the dead, who shall all arise out of their graves;
they agree, moreover, that an implicit faith is due to
all his doctrines, and an implicit obedience to all his
precepts; whether they inculcate the religious wor-
ship of God, or the moral duties of temperance in
restraining our passions, or of charity in befriending
our fellow-creatures: that those precepts cannot be
surpassed in sanctity, in goodness, in utility, in effects
suitable to human nature; that, nevertheless, all men
(except the Man Christ Jesus alone) do violate those
precepts; neither can they possibly attain unto salva-
tion but through the mercy of God: Thirdly, they
unite in a belief in the Holy Ghost, by whose inspi-
ration and miracles the Apostles of Jesus Christ
were assisted and countenanced; and by whose divine
influence the pious mind is disposed to a constant
obedience towards God, and fortified against all the
calamities of human life! To that Holy Spirit, which
speaks by the Apostles, they hold themselves bound
in faith and obedience, equally and universally, as to
the Father and the Son: they further unite in believ-
ing that the origin and preservation of the Christian
church, from the time of Christ unto the present day,
must be ascribed entirely to the Father, Son, and Holy
Spirit; that all who shall embrace these articles of
faith and shall obey the precepts of the Gospel will
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hereafter obtain mercy from God, and will be thereby made partakers of a blessed immortality, the dead in Christ before his coming being raised from their graves: that, on the other hand, all they who shall have disavowed and disobeyed that Gospel, shall endure the miseries of eternal perdition ("suffering the vengeance of eternal fire"); the graves in like manner giving back their dead! Finally, they believe, that it is the duty of Christians to profess their faith in all these articles by receiving the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—the former testifying our wish to lead a life purified from sin (as much as the corruption of our nature will allow) according to the precepts of the Gospel; the latter commemorating the death of our Redeemer (as he hath commanded us) "until he come;" and showing our desire to be called by his name, and to walk as brethren with all the partakers of that holy ordinance: Sacraments which, if duly and devoutly received, are moreover believed to be the means of conveying to us the blessing of divine grace, the influence of the Holy Spirit!

These and other articles of necessary connexion with these (for it were foreign to our purpose to detail every particular) are points generally believed by the professors of Christianity: the distinctions and dissensions amongst them are altogether occasioned by the various additions which some men are fond to introduce; which are requisite (as they think) to explain or enlarge by way of supplement the doctrines above mentioned; and which they conceive to be transmitted to posterity, not indeed by any written apostolical directions, but by oral tradition or ecclesiastical
usage, or by the writings of later ages. Upon these additions I shall only repeat my observation, that they are not established by the universal consent of Christians, as the points above stated are; points which are placed beyond the risk of cavil by their own clear evidence, if we only admit the authority of holy writ, which no Christian in his senses will presume to deny.

Let any man, with due attention to these points of doctrine, examine closely those arguments by which the truth of Christianity is demonstrated, and then he will perceive (what is of high importance to be well observed) that the whole force of the arguments is directed to these points, and not to those controverted matters which, as we have already hinted, unhappily divide the Christian world.

SECTION V.

FROM WHAT SOURCE OUGHT ALL TO DERIVE OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

In this state of discordant opinions, prudent men will think that we cannot act with greater safety than by deriving a knowledge of Christianity from that source which is least liable to suspicion, and which indeed is allowed by all to be uncorrupted and pure at the fountain-head. That source is not the creed or confession of any single and peculiar church, but solely those books of the New Testament which are allowed on all hands to be genuine. Some, I must confess, are apt to say that those books cannot be understood but according to the tenets of their own church, and others constantly retort or deny the assertion; but here I must be permitted to observe, that any opinion
may be fairly questioned which rests solely on the evidence of its abettors, and of those who are particularly interested in representing it to be true. Others plead for the necessity of an extraordinary aid of the Holy Spirit, not only to produce a due faith in the sacred writings, (which plea may be admitted without difficulty,) but also to make the sense of the words intelligible, which is a proposition, I think, not so easily proved. But let this likewise be admitted; if it only be acknowledged that all who read the books of the New Testament, with a pious and sincere pursuit of truth, obtain that spiritual aid from the divine goodness; there can be no occasion for further dispute on this point. Every one therefore may prudently and safely seek the knowledge of Christianity from those sacred books, still employing those helps which are either necessary or useful for a right understanding of such books; but it is not our present business to consider those means of collateral assistance. Whosoever, then, shall believe that the books of the New Testament give a faithful account of the revelation of God's will, delivered to the world by Jesus Christ, must of necessity embrace as points of faith, of practice, and of hope, all things therein contained, according to his means or power of understanding them; for he who believes in Christ is bound to receive devoutly whatsoever shall appear to him derived from the authority of Christ: he cannot justifiably make any exception, so as to admit some and to reject other articles, confessedly proceeding from that authority. Now such are all those doctrines which I have before stated, and in which (as I observed) all Christians agree. With respect to other points which
are matters of controversy, since they may not be so perfectly clear, a serious and devout man may properly deliberate, and indeed ought so to do, withholding a decisive opinion till greater light shall be thrown on them: for it would be rash in us to receive or to reject what we do not sufficiently know to be either true or false: nor was the promise of eternal salvation given in the books of the New Testament to the advocates of this or that point of controversy, but to him who faithfully believes, and conscientiously practises, the sum and substance of Christianity, as we have described it.

SECTION VI.

NOTHING OUGHT TO BE IMPOSED ON CHRISTIANS AS A DUTY, BUT WHAT MAY BE CLEARLY DEDUCED FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

16 This, then, is the only rule by which Christians can be properly required to act; that they should embrace every article of faith and practice, which they believe to be contained in the books of the New Testament; that they should obey the precepts which are there enjoined, and abstain from acts which are there forbidden. If anything further be required as a necessary duty, it is required without authority; for who can reasonably or justly expect a Christian to believe that any tenet has been enjoined by Christ, which he does not find in those only faithful and undoubted records (as all admit them to be) in which the religion of Christ has been continued down even to the present day? Other tenets also may be true (to concede something in this re-
spect); but still they cannot possibly be received as true by him who takes a middle path among Christian disputants, and who admits no certain record of the Christian revelation except the books of the New Testament. While this is his rule of faith, nothing else can be justly required of him; and this will be his rule, no doubt, until it shall be clearly proved to him that a knowledge of the Christian religion may be safely derived from some other source; which, I conceive, will never happen. If any person therefore should attempt to take away from Christians the books of the New Testament, or to add to them anything, the truth of which is by no means ascertained, he cannot be entitled to the smallest attention, as he requires from us what no man of common sense would grant, that we should believe what we are by no means convinced of, or abandon that which is universally acknowledged to be a sure record of evangelical revelation! It is not necessary that all controversies should be singly and minutely sifted, an undertaking almost endless, and only to be accomplished, if at all, by men of the greatest learning and of abundant leisure. He, who exacts from us an indispensable belief of anything which we cannot possibly believe, drives us, in fact, away from him; for faith cannot be extorted by forcible means, neither will any man, who lives in the fear of God and in the love of truth, submit to profess a faith in tenets which he does not believe, in compliment to any being upon earth.

But some, who think differently, are known to argue, that if every one be left at liberty to form his own judgement on the exact sense of the books of
the New Testament, there would soon be as many religious creeds as there are individuals; and that, consequently, truth, which is one simple principle, would be constantly overwhelmed with numberless errors. But it seems to me that, before they controvert an opinion established on clear and just arguments, they ought to overthrow the grounds on which that opinion is founded; for, so long as they remain firm, the whole superstructure remains unshaken, as we see in this instance: for, whatever inconvenience may arise from what has been advanced, the truth of my propositions must be admitted, until it shall be shown that they are not well founded. But, not to press this matter any further, it is by no means true that the Revelation of the New Testament is so far obscure, that the whole purport of the Christian religion cannot be deduced from it with certainty by any person of sound mind, studious of the truth: and experience proves that it may be so deduced, because all Christians, as we have shown, agree on the sum and substance of Christianity, according to the observation already made by Grotius. Some few exceptions; in the case of weak or wicked individuals, are here of no account, when whole societies of Christians agree on this point, though so apt to indulge too great a fondness for controversy on other points, to the utmost extent of contradiction and schism.
SECTION VII.

THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD IS TRULY ADMIRABLE IN HIS PRESERVATION OF THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

In this, as in numberless other instances which relate to the government of human affairs, the good providence of God demands our highest admiration. Notwithstanding all the schisms which have formerly prevailed, and which unhappily prevail at this day, that providence has still preserved to us, in an uncorrupted state, the books of the New Testament, that, by these genuine documents, the true religion of Christ may be restored as often as corruptions shall happen to creep into it; nor has it only transmitted down to us so great a treasure, "pure and unadulterated," but has likewise guarded so effectually the whole system of Christianity itself, amidst all the heat of doubtful disputations and divisions, that the Christian world have never suffered the main substance of religion to lapse from their remembrance.

The Protestant part of Christendom, neither contemptible in number nor in learning at this day, maintained that many errors, in former ages, have gradually crept into the schools of divinity; and, as this was denied by others, that memorable separation took place in the West, on these grounds, in the sixteenth century of the Christian æra, by which the disputants were divided into two parties nearly equal: nevertheless, in those ages, the errors of which are warmly canvassed by the seceding party, (and their faults, if not vices, to an astonishing extent by both
parties, not indeed without reason,) still the main
substance of Christianity, which I have before de-
scribed, always remained the same: 18*there is no
age involved in such dark clouds of ignorance and
depravity, that the chief points of faith already
stated, might not be easily collected from the sur-
viving works of that period. It must not be dis-
ssembled that many additions and interpolations, fo-
ign and unknown to the original text of the New
Testament, have been indeed obtruded on the prin-
ciples of Christian theology; and hence the good
seed of that sower in the gospel has not produced so
much fruit as it would otherwise have done, had the
field been cleared from thorns, and from noxious or
unprofitable weeds. Many vices and crimes have
been not only practised with connivance or indul-
gence, but even with applause: nevertheless, the
tue and sound doctrine was safe so long as the books
of the New Testament were safe, and so long as
Christians retained common sense: hence it is that
eminent men have arisen from time to time, who
have boldly reproved the errors and vices of their
own age, and stemmed the torrent of corruption.
Thus, by divine interposition, the promise of our
Saviour has never failed; 19*The gates of Hell have
not prevailed" against his church; that is, the con-
gregation of his faithful disciples, among whom his
religion has been safely preserved, have never be-
come totally extinct, though the truth has been
sometimes debased or obscured by spurious and
even contradictory tenets; at other times, more ge-
uine and pure. And here let me observe, by the
way, that unless that system of religious truth had
been really revealed from heaven, it certainly could never have been able to emerge from such a deluge of vices and erroneous doctrines, but must have been at length destroyed and totally extinguished by the overwhelming fickleness and folly of mankind.

SECTION VIII.

AN ANSWER IS GIVEN TO THOSE PERSONS WHO WOULD INQUIRE WHY GOD HAS PERMITTED ANY DIVISIONS AND ERRORS TO ARISE AMONG CHRISTIANS.

Perhaps it may be here objected to us, that Divine Providence would have consulted the preservation of Christianity more effectually, by preventing the present and the past errors of the Christian world, and by promoting among them, through his almighty power, the perpetual influence of that truth and harmony which are its natural and proper attendants. But it does not become us to teach the Divine Being in what manner he ought to act for the better government of human affairs: it is our duty, on the contrary, to presume that the Almighty had the wisest reasons for having permitted what has been permitted, although we should be unable even to conjecture the ground of those reasons: but if probable causes may be suggested to account for the present state of things, we surely become bound to believe that for these causes, or for others even more important, God has permitted those events which are daily seen to happen. But to form an opinion on the sure evidence of fact, "to reason from what we know," it must first be laid down as an undeniable
truth, that God intended to create men free agents, and to let them remain so to the last; that is, that they should neither be so good as to be always necessarily good, nor so wicked as might induce them to think that a perpetual subjection to their vices was matter of necessity; but of a nature capable of change, so as to have the power of passing from vice to virtue, and, in like manner, from virtue to vice, with more or less difficulty in proportion to the time of their continuance in virtue or in vice. Such, we perceive, were the Jews formerly, and such also were the Christians afterwards; neither were driven to virtue or to vice by any irresistible impulse, but were only restrained by laws which announced rewards to the good, and punishments to the wicked; to which laws, indeed, various incitements to virtue, and discouragements from vice, were added by Divine Providence: but in neither case did they deprive men of the innate liberty of acting obediently or disobediently towards God, which is proved by actual experience; for good and wicked men have always existed, though the divine laws have alike enjoined virtue, and forbidden vice, to all: that this would be the case among Christians, we are sufficiently informed by two parables of our Saviour: one of them, in relation to the tares which an enemy sowed among the growing wheat; another, in relation to the net which alike contained good and bad fish; to intimate that, in the Christian church, the wicked would be always intermixed with the good: so evident it is that Christ foresaw plainly the evils that would arise perpetually in his church. St. Paul also forewarned the Corinthians that "there must be he-
resies in the church of Christ, 23 that they which are approved may be made manifest." 24 And, indeed, unless there had been dissensions in the Christian church on certain points of doctrine, there would have been little room for the exercise of free-will, nor for the display of that species of virtue which gives an exclusive preference to truth: consequently, in this respect also, the divine wisdom appears in a distinguished light, in having made our very vices, as it were, conducive to the cultivation of a virtue of no common excellence.

But if it be objected 25 (as some indeed object) that the total absence of this virtue would be preferable to the presence of its contrary vices, from which so many terrible acts of wickedness, so many calamities, and such dreadful miseries, have devolved on the human race, and so many punishments hang over men, even after this life, our answer will then be, that the wisdom of God has determined that these evils are not of such magnitude as to induce him, on that account, to withhold the exercise of his power in giving freedom of choice and action to his creatures. If this had not been actually done, his power of doing it would have been universally disbelieved: God himself, indeed, would have been denied this freedom, had he not himself, by his own almighty power, implanted that belief of it in the minds of men which, otherwise, they never would have conceived from his works: neither could he have engaged them in acts of worship, unless it also were a worship prescribed by fate, and by no means free, if they had believed that all things were done and are done by him, not from his voluntary good-
ness, but from a sort of fatal necessity. Now, the vices and miseries of this life, or the next, cannot bear a comparison with so great an evil as that of our utter ignorance of God, and the consequent extinction of all virtue. If, in any other respect, we should find ourselves perplexed by the present state of things, it behoves us to remember the infinite goodness and justice, and power, and wisdom, of that God who will never act inconsistently with his own immediate attributes, and who is thus able, without any impediment, to devise and to adopt the means of doing so; eventually proving to all intelligent beings, that he is "righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works!" Meantime, till that day shall dawn in which all the clouds of our ignorance shall be dispelled, God has so far instructed us in the knowledge of his being, and convinced us of the perfection of his nature and attributes, that, by a right consideration of them, we are enabled (as our duty requires) to confide in him without reserve, and to await his will with cheerful resignation.

We might offer more remarks on this subject; but they would divert us from the object more immediately proposed to our inquiry, and would draw us aside to matters which are foreign to our present purpose.
SECTION IX.

THEY WHO PROPOSE ONLY THOSE POINTS AS NECESSARY ARTICLES OF OUR FAITH, OUR PRACTICE, AND OUR HOPE, WHICH CHRISTIANS UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVE, PROFESS AND TEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE PUREST MANNER.

To leave, then, these matters, and to resume our subject, (the determination of our choice among the jarring opinions of the Christian world,) it seems to be our safest and wisest way, in the present state of things, to enroll ourselves in that Christian society in which the New Testament, without any mixture of human edicts and decrees, is acknowledged to be the sole rule of its faith; satisfied that every one should deduce his creed from that source, form his morals by its precepts, and regulate his hopes by the promises contained in it. If this be done cordially and ingenuously, the result of the inquiry will be that self-same "form of sound words" which, as we have shown, has always remained invariable, amidst the manifold and great commotions of error and dissension, the lapse of so many ages, and all the revolutions of states and kingdoms. In the New Testament are contained all things that are necessary for our faith and morals; to which, indeed, it is allowable to make such additions as may be requisite, according to particular circumstances of time and place; provided those additions be not imposed as matters of imperious necessity, (which it is the sole province of the Supreme Legislator to impose,) nor any points of doctrine obtruded, which are at variance with those of holy writ. To Christians im-
pressed, as we have said, with this sense of their duty, it is not lawful to yield implicit obedience to any human opinions, nor to profess a belief which they do not really entertain; nor to adopt any practice which they conscientiously disapprove, as thinking it contrary to the precepts of Christ. Consequently, they hold it incumbent on them to withdraw from any place where that Christian liberty, which I have described, is disallowed and denied: not, indeed, withdrawing from others who think differently, in an uncharitable temper of resentment and reprobation, but on this just principle,—that every one is indispensably bound by the dictates of his own conscience, not by those of others; whether it be to do what, on conviction, he thinks best to be done, or to avoid what he believes to be wrong.

SECTION X.

IT IS THE DUTY OF ALL DISCREET PERSONS TO BE PARTAKERS OF THE SACRAMENT, IN COMMUNION WITH THOSE PERSONS WHO REQUIRE NOTHING MORE FROM CHRISTIANS, THAN A COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLAIN UNDISPUTED PURPORT OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Since Christ has instituted two signs or tokens, as it were, by which his disciples are distinguished, "that is to say Baptism and the Supper of the Lord," it was not, indeed, optional, in the first instance, that we should be baptized among those who embrace Christianity (as it seems to us) in its greatest purity; for, by reason of our tender age, we could form no
judgement of this matter: but as we do not receive the other sacrament till we come to riper years, it is optional, in the second instance, that we should duly consider in what society of Christians we shall wish to receive it: and if we did not act in this manner when we first became partakers of it, it will still be our duty to do so afterwards.

The Eucharist, in its original institution, is a symbol or pledge of mutual peace, and universal charity, entertained by Christians; but some rather regard it as a certain standard of dissension, excluding from it all persons who do not think it safe to submit to any other yoke than that of Christ; or to receive, as necessary, any matters of faith, or practice, or hope, besides those which they believe to be contained in the books of the New Testament; and who, on that account, scruple to admit any other forms of faith in addition to that which I have mentioned. Now, we are allowed and required to live on terms of peace and good-will with persons of this description; but it must surely appear to every devout and discreet Christian, an act of gross impiety to celebrate that holy rite on terms which admit of any other rule of faith and morals than that of the New Testament; and which exclude from the church all persons who are unwilling to allow those terms. At the same time, every true Christian is not only warranted, but required, in point of duty, to join in communion with those worshippers who have acknowledged no other means of salvation, than those which are recorded by Christ and his apostles in the books of the gospel covenant (as they may be under-
stood by every individual); for all who thus acknowledge the books of the New Testament as the only rule of their faith and practice, are not only admitted, but invited, by them to meet at this table; all who sincerely form their morals by that rule; who, in short, allow no kind of idolatry whatsoever, nor treat others with severity, to obtain from them a pretended belief of certain tenets which, in fact, they disbelieve. It is clear, indeed, that no communion can be encouraged with one who forcibly imposes his own tenets on others; who has any other object of worship than the One True God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; who shows, in his life and actions, a contemptuous disregard to the precepts of the gospel; or who acknowledges other means and conditions of salvation, than those prescribed by the everlasting covenant itself: whereas, by the reverse of such conduct, a man becomes entitled to hold communion with all Christians, and deserves to be preferred to others who maintain a contrary opinion. 29 No human being, nor indeed an angel from heaven, can impose a new gospel on the faith of Christians: now, according to this gospel already received, that man is a true disciple of Christ, who heartily, and indeed exclusively, embraces his doctrine, in perfect sincerity and obedience, to the utmost of his power, allowing for the imperfection and weakness of our present state; who is the worshipper of One God; and who loves his neighbour as himself; leading, in all other respects, a sober moral life. If any thing be taken away from this system, the conditions or terms of the covenant, which God alone has power to remit, are rendered imperfect and defective: if any thing be added, that addition is
a vain and needless yoke, which cannot be reasonably nor justly imposed on the disciples of Christ. Laws of that nature can only be received by them from God himself, the sole arbiter of eternal salvation! Perhaps it may be asked, by what name, after all, those Christian societies which I have described, may be distinguished from the rest? To this I answer, that the nominal distinction, or formal appellation, is quite immaterial:—let me be understood by my readers to include all churches in which they shall find what I have stated. Wheresoever that only rule of faith, and that liberty which I have described, shall exist, there, they may assure themselves, true Christianity exists: nor let them be inquisitive about the unimportant distinction of a name. I believe that there are many societies of that character; and I implore the God of all goodness and power, that they may daily become greater in number and extent: that at length the coming of his kingdom may be seen throughout the world, and his will alone obeyed by the whole human race!

SECTION XI.

ON THE SUBJECT OF CHURCH-GOVERNMENT.

Some difficulty seems here to present itself with respect to the form of church-government, and of ecclesiastical discipline, as it is called; for no society, like this in question, can subsist without order; and, therefore, it was necessary to establish in it some form of government. But the question among Christians is, what may be the form which the apostles sanctioned; for that which was originally in-
stituted by them, seems entitled to a preference; and therefore, of two churches in which the gospel is, in other respects, taught with equal purity and sincerity, that church is to be preferred which retains the apostolical form of government; though this alone, without the substance (that is without the gospel,) is an empty shadow of a church. But there are, at this day, two forms of government: one, in which the church governs under one bishop, who alone possesses the right of ordaining presbyters or spiritual ministers of an inferior order; another, in which the church-government is administered by presbyters of equal authority: to whom are added, some laymen of known discretion and good morals. They who have read without prejudice the writings which remain of the oldest Christian authors, have been sufficiently convinced that the first of these forms, which is termed Episcopal, such as now exists in the southern part of Great Britain, universally prevailed in the age immediately subsequent to the time of the apostles; whence we may collect, that it is of apostolical institution. The latter form, which is termed Presbyterian, was established in many parts of France, Switzerland, Germany, and the Low Countries, by those persons who seceded in the 16th century from the Church of Rome. To the more attentive readers of the historical accounts of that period, it is well known that this latter form of government was only introduced because the bishops refused an amendment of alleged corruptions to those separatists who urged the necessity of a reform in the doctrine and the morals of Christians: otherwise,
if the bishops of that age had been willing, everywhere, to do of their own accord what was done soon afterwards in England, the Episcopal form of government would, doubtless, have continued, even to the present day, in all those Protestant countries which seceded from the Romish Church; and innumerable calamities which ensued, on the general confusion and convulsions of the continent, might have been prevented. For, if the matter be duly weighed, the sole cause of the change of system was this, that under the old form of government, no equitable redress of grievances could be obtained: hence, the Presbyterian form was established to a very great extent; and, this once done, it was so far the interest, and is still the interest, of all persons possessing the civil power in places thus circumstanced, to prevent any change, that no change can possibly be made; unless it should be thought advisable to throw all the states, in which Presbytery is now established, into the most dangerous struggles and divisions on this account, which no prudent man will admit; nor is a change to be wished on such terms. A form of ecclesiastical government was originally established to preserve Christianity, not to disturb the civil power; and, indeed, civil commotions can hardly ever prevail, without hazarding the interests, and the very existence, of religion. Men of sense and moderation, therefore, though preferring the apostolical form, and wishing for a complete uniformity of church government, have thought it better that things should be left in their present state, than that the danger always attending revolutionary measures should be incurred on this account: meanwhile, all thinking and well-prin-
cipled persons have abstained (and will abstain) entirely, in this respect, from that hatred, proscription, and condemnation of others, which more violent men are too apt to indulge; as if eternal salvation were dependent on either form; a proposition not to be deduced from any part of the apostolical writings, neither can it be inferred from the genuine temper of our divine religion.

SECTION XII.

THE PRIMITIVE FORM OF CHURCH-GOVERNMENT WAS HIGHLY ESTEEMED BY GROTIUS, BUT WITHOUT ANY VIOLENCE OF CENSURE AGAINST THAT OF A LATER DATE.

All who have perused the writings of that excellent man Hugo Grotius, and who have made due inquiry into the faith and practice which he maintained, have been convinced of his just conception of that "form of sound words," the truth of which he has demonstrated, and of his belief in it as the only true system of religion. But when he had diligently examined the writings of Christian antiquity, and had satisfied himself that episcopacy was the primitive form of church-government, he highly approved of it just as it is practised in this country, which is clear from his own express words. It is therefore beyond a doubt, that if it had been at his own option or in his own power, and had he not been so excessively harassed by adverse circumstances, and so undeservedly exasperated and persecuted by most malicious and abusive enemies, he would have joined in communion with that Church, which maintained the ancient form of government, and which would have required of him nothing more than the particulars already stated as
the sum and substance of Christianity, the truth of which he has himself so admirably demonstrated. The proofs of this assertion are so strong and so important, that it has been deemed expedient, to place them at the end of this little tract. See testimonies adduced, &c. page 254.

SECTION XIII.

ALL CHRISTIAN DISPUTANTS ARE EXHORTED TO REQUIRE FROM EACH OTHER NO POINTS OF DOCTRINE AS BEING CONTAINED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH ARE NOT UNIVERSALLY ADMITTED AND UNIFORMLY RECEIVED AS TRUE.

IN this state of things it is impossible to refrain from offering an earnest exhortation to all parties to bear in mind this rule; that those points which are capable of proof, by the arguments adduced by Grotius, constitute alone the true sum and substance of Christianity; not those controverted points which are reciprocally denied, and which have occasioned so much mischief in the world! I would remind them further, that nobody who shall devoutly read and attentively consider the New Testament can possibly be induced to admit of any other lawgiver than Jesus Christ, on whose laws our eternal salvation is dependent; and that no man under this impression either can or ought to persuade himself that there is any point of faith or practice necessary to salvation, unless it be contained in the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles: or any tenet to be received as true, which he deems contrary to that doctrine: consequently I
would infer that there is no remedy of all disputes more certain and immediate than this,—that nothing should be imposed on Christians as an article of faith, except those plain points which every one receives to the full conviction of his own mind, as matter of express revelation: nor is any inconvenience to be apprehended from this rule, since the uniform experience of all ages, from the commencement of the Christian æra down to the present day, has shown that no person of sound intellect has ever rejected that sum or substance of the Christian religion which has been before stated. 34 Were this alone required as necessary from Christians at this day, all dissensions would soon cease; and if any difference of opinions should remain, it would not affect the main body of the respective Churches, but merely the sentiments of individuals, each of whom must be accountable to God respecting his own conscience. Did they only understand that a general agreement obtains amongst them, as in fact it does obtain, in regard to the main substance of Christianity, and did they exercise a reciprocal forbearance in secondary matters, nor endeavour to draw others over to their own systems of doctrine and of discipline by threats, by force, and by other wrong methods, a state of harmony would prevail as much as it can ever be expected to prevail on earth. 35 In our present state of ignorance and imperfection, impeded by such various passions, no man of due reflection can suppose that a perfect conformity of faith and practice can possibly become universal, either by means of force or of arguments. Men of more liberal and enlightened minds can never sanction the use of force, which is
the attendant of imposture, not of truth: and men of
less proficiency, blinded as they are by passions, by
the prejudices of education, or by other causes (who
will always constitute a very great majority), do not
sufficiently comprehend the weight of arguments;
and yet they are by no means to be compelled to say
or do any thing against their real sentiments. Let
all men, I adjure them in God's name, let all who
have authority in any religious society of Christians,
be satisfied to know, that the Gospel is the object of
their faith, that that faith is preached to them as the
only necessary object, while obedience to the sole
precepts of that Gospel is the rule of their practice,
and their hope of salvation founded on a conscien-
tious observance of its laws—let this be so (in faith
and practice) and all will then be well! But so long
as things human shall be placed on a footing with
things divine, and so long as things doubtful, to say
no worse of them, shall be equivalent to things cer-
tain, there will be no end of controversies, nor any
hope of that peace and harmony which it is the duty,
of all good men to make the object of their general
prayers, and to promote as much as possible by their
own endeavours!

[This principle of conduct is well described by the late
Archdeacon Paley, in the dedication of his "Natural Theo-
logy" to the Lord Bishop of Durham, in whose example he
observes an "earnest, active, and unwearied solicitude, for the
advancement of substantial Christianity: a solicitude, never-
theless, accompanied with that candour of mind which suffers
no subordinate differences of opinion, when there is a coin-
cidence in the main intention and object, to produce any
alienation of esteem or diminution of favour."—See also
Paley's "Moral and Political Philosophy," vol. ii, p. 344.]
The present Bishop of Lincoln, in one of his immortal works, supplies us with a passage particularly apposite to the subject of the two preceding sections. In the "Elements of Christian Theology," on the xxiiid article, his Lordship says, "I shall conclude this subject with the following testimony of the learned Mr. Le Clerc, a divine of the Church of Holland, in which the presbyterian form of government prevailed, and therefore he cannot be considered as prejudiced in favour of episcopacy:" 'I have always,' says he, 'professed to believe that episcopacy is of apostolical institution, and consequently very good and very lawful; that man had no manner of right to change it in any place, unless it was impossible otherwise to reform the abuses that crept into Christianity; that it was justly preserved in England, where the Reformation was practicable without altering it; that therefore the Protestants in England and other places where there are bishops, do very ill to separate from that discipline; that they would still do much worse in attempting to destroy it, in order to set up presbytery, fanaticism, and anarchy. Things ought not to be turned into a chaos, nor people seen everywhere without a call, and without learning, pretending to inspiration. Nothing is more proper to prevent them than the episcopal discipline as by law established in England; especially when those that preside in church-government are persons of penetration, sobriety, and discretion.'" — S. M.
MR. LE CLERC'S TREATISE
ON
RELIGIOUS INDIFFERENCE.

SECTION I.

TRUTH MUST BE ALWAYS AN OBJECT OF REGARD, BUT ESPECIALLY IN QUESTIONS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE.

I perfectly agree with the original observation of a certain writer, who says that there is "an eternal amity between truth and reason," the effects of which (he observes) may be sometimes, as it were, suspended and interrupted, through the fickleness and passions of mankind, but are never totally destroyed. No man wishes to be deceived; all men are desirous, rather, on every subject, to know the truth than to remain in error, especially on any subject of importance: and this holds good even in abstract matters of speculation. We are by nature fond of truth, and averse from error and deception: we would embrace with the greatest readiness any known means by which truth might be certainly discovered. Hence it is that men of the highest eminence, universally esteemed, have been found, in all ages, devoting their whole lives to the investigation of truth. Incredible are the labours which men have undergone, with this view, in numberless instances (and indeed it is the case at this day) in researches of natural philosophy and
geometry; and they have declared that they never have experienced greater pleasure in their lives than when they have thought themselves successful in the discovery of some truth, eventually, which has been the object of a tedious and difficult pursuit! Indeed, this natural love of truth, and the actual perception of it in the human species, may be justly added to the many other proofs which establish our superiority over the brute creation. But as, on the one hand, all truths are not of equal consequence, and many theoretical points, however true, may be disregarded because we can derive little or no advantage from a correct knowledge of them, and therefore are unwilling to bestow much pains on them,—so, on the other hand, there are some of such importance, that we properly consider the attainment of them worth any expense of labour and application: such are those which concern the right and happy conduct of human life: points which we all think it of the highest consequence to know, and the knowledge of which we are very earnest to obtain. If, further, we reflect that, after this short period of existence, that right and happy conduct of the present life will determine the question of our eternal happiness (for what is right, or, in other words, what is agreeable to truth, must always be deemed happy)—if, I say, we reflect on this tenet of the Christian revelation, which all its members, of what sect soever, profess to embrace as an article of faith, it must be admitted beyond a doubt that we never can purchase at too dear a rate the knowledge of those means which lead to so important an end!
SECTION II.

NOTHING IS OF GREATER IMPORTANCE THAN RELIGION; AND CONSEQUENTLY THE KNOWLEDGE OF IT DEMANDS OUR MOST DILIGENT EXER-
TIONS.

We do not here concern ourselves with those persons who hold all religion in contempt, since they have been sufficiently confuted by the foregoing work of that eminent man Hugo Grotius; a work which cannot fail to prove to every earnest inquirer after truth the BEING OF A GOD, who requires the worship of his creatures (and now indeed requires that worship agreeably to those directions which are given us by Christ), and who promises, moreover, to those who worship him "in spirit and in truth," a life of everlasting happiness, when this transitory state shall terminate in death!

Thus circumstanced, we surely cannot doubt the infinite importance of religion; and since the great body of Christians is unhappily divided into numerous sects, it therefore becomes highly necessary that we should use our best endeavours to ascertain that system of religion which is most consonant with the doctrines and precepts of our Saviour. Not that we can place these numerous sects indiscriminately in the same point of view; for some are so widely at variance with others both in doctrine and discipline, that they charge each other with the grossest errors and with a corrupt system of divine worship; and indeed some go so far as to withhold from their opponents the possibility of eternal salvation! Now if this exclusion could be proved, we should doubtless with-
draw, as soon as possible, from men of that description; and we should all, if we wish to be accounted Christians, attach ourselves solely to that Christian society, which is justly entitled to pass such a sentence against the rest. For the question would not merely have a reference to this short life, which at best is liable to evils and troubles without number, but a reference also to the reality of those punishments which God has denounced against the unbeliever; and to the possible attainment of that perfect and eternal happiness which he has promised to the faithful.

There are some, however, (not, indeed, men of sound learning, nor much accustomed to an attentive perusal of the Scriptures with a view to understand the points in dispute among Christians, and to ascertain the side of truth, for nothing can be further from their thoughts,) still, I say, there are some who draw such an inference from these disputed points, that they think it quite the same thing, whatever opinions they may adopt, and whatever mode of worship they may observe. They think it a matter indifferent and immaterial, to what sect of Christians we may attach ourselves, or at least may profess to attach ourselves: nor am I here speaking of the lower orders of society; whole kingdoms, not the common people only, but the nobles and personages of the highest rank, shall have made at one time a secession from the See of Rome; shall have renewed, at another time, their allegiance to that See, under a new reign; and then again, eventually, shall have supported their Sovereign, in opposition to that very See. In En-
gland, in the time of Henry VIII., many acts were passed, not merely by the king’s authority, but with the sanction of parliament, in defiance of the Papal Power: at the same time, the king’s resentment against that power was excited by a circumstance which few, if any, will be disposed to justify. On the death of Henry, when his son, Edward VI., had espoused the cause of that party, which had not only renounced all allegiance to the Papacy, as his father had previously done, but had even embraced other tenets which had incurred the Pope’s anathema, the council of regency, and the two houses of parliament, openly avowed also their approbation of that step. In a few years, on the death of Edward, when queen Mary (a most bigoted devotee to the Pope) had succeeded her brother on the throne, many of the same noble persons supported the queen’s measures against those opponents of the Papal See, who had been in power during the preceding reign. Mary was succeeded by Elizabeth, who happily embraced, and, by her long reign, completely established, the tenets of her brother Edward; so that the Protestant cause, even at this day, stands on the same foundation which was laid so long ago by that illustrious queen. If we read the history of those times, we shall detect such fluctuating principles in the conduct of the English nobility and others, that we can hardly, if at all, persuade ourselves that they were not of the number of those persons who think it exactly the same thing in regard to our salvation, whether we embrace the tenets of one sect of Christians, or those of another. When such changes of opinion are partly attributed to the
influence of fear, I do not mean to controvert the assertion; but when I consider that characteristic firmness, that fortitude, that contempt of death, by which the English nation are so frequently distinguished, I am much inclined to think, that such frequent changes are chiefly to be ascribed to temporal motives of present interest, and to a total indifference about religion, especially in the higher classes of the community.

SECTION III.

INDIFFERENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGION IS, IN ITS OWN NATURE, UNLAWFUL: IT IS EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED BY THE LAWS OF GOD, AND IT IS UNIVERSALLY REPROBATED IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

To place religion in the number of those things which are, in their nature, indifferent, so that we may change it as we do our garments,—now zealous to profess, now strenuous to deny, its tenets, on principles of convenience or expediency, is an error of the grossest kind, as may be shown in various lights: some few of the principal arguments to this effect, it is here my intention to enumerate; arguments derived from the nature of the thing itself, as well as from the positive laws of God, and from the general consent of all Christian communities. First, then, it is base to assert a falsehood, especially in a matter of such high importance, when a false assertion is not, indeed, allowable on lighter occasions; unless, perhaps, it should be, beyond all doubt, more conducive than truth would be to some good
end. But, in this great concern, men cannot assert an untruth, nor even practise any art of dissimulation, without a serious offence and injury; for thus they establish a falsehood, as far as may depend on them, in a matter of the most sacred nature, to the actual suppression of the opposite truth, which is, therefore, consigned altogether to oblivion. An example of this kind has the worst possible effect, especially when it proceeds from men in an elevated station; as their inferiors are always too prone to an imitation of their actions, and consequently, they are not only guilty of an offence themselves, but they also cause others to offend, by means of their example; than which, nothing has a more powerful influence on the lower classes of society, whose attention is always much more engaged and governed by the conduct of their superiors, than by their advice. It is also base, and utterly unworthy of a man of proper spirit or principle, to speak an untruth for any consideration which this short life can offer; choosing rather to incur the displeasure of God, than that of man. And hence, the more eminent philosophers preferred certain death, to the commission of any act which they thought displeasing to the Deity; as we see in the example of Socrates, who chose rather to swallow a dose of poison than, by desisting from his wonted study of philosophy, to purchase the continuance of life. Others, also, have chosen to live in a state of exile, rather than abandon the tenets which they had begun to espouse, under a conviction of their truth. Heathens, moreover, have afforded some noble examples of fortitude and morality; which cast a forcible reproach on their
own times, greatly preferring death to a slavish adulation of tyrants, and to a mean desertion of their principles. Such were 5 Thrasea Pætus and 6 Helvidius Priscus, who chose rather to die than to approve, or even to connive at, the vices and crimes of their emperors. If, then, such examples could be given by men who only had, at best, a doubtful and imperfect expectation of "another and a better life," when the present life should terminate, much more ought those examples to be given by the Christian world, supported as they are by a far more evident, and more certain hope, of a joyful resurrection to eternal life!

All ages have seen, with admiration, the conduct of those heroes who, for the sake of their native soil on earth, have encountered death with intrepidity. If this be so, is it possible to withhold our admiration from those Christian heroes who have postponed the terrestrial to the celestial country, this state of mortality to that of immortality, which the sacred writings have revealed to us? Who must not censure and upbraid those sordid souls, seeking to retain a life which we hold in common with the brute creation (and which, after all, we cannot long retain,) rather than obtain as soon as possible that higher life which never can be lost? We see instances of soldiers who fearlessly approach the greatest dangers, not so much on a principle of patriotism, as with a view to gratiate themselves, or their surviving families, with the kings and princes whom they serve; and who even find the wounds thus acquired a source of self-satisfaction, though conscious that those wounds must eventually prove fatal. Nay, the merest hire-
lings, for a paltry amount of pay, fight with the utmost bravery, and freely sacrifice their lives; yet are there many men who refuse to incur a risk, I do not say of life, but barely of some transitory powers or frail honours, in the firm defence of truth,—immortal truth,—that object so dear above all things to the Deity, and to which are attached the highest possible rewards! The thing, then, speaks loudly for itself: the duty is highly urgent that we should incur every risk, and endure every suffering, in the cause of truth and virtue, rather than compound, by a cowardly neglect of them, for the continuance of a life thus rendered unworthy of a rational being, and for the enjoyment of a few short-lived acquisitions. This, therefore, is the injunction, and these are the very words of our Saviour,—"Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven: but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I deny also before my Father which is in heaven;" Matt. x. 32, 33. By which our Saviour intimates, that he will hereafter acknowledge as his disciple, and, in the final judgement, will reward that disciple with eternal life, who never shall have dissembled nor disowned his doctrine in the sentiments and actions of his present state of existence. It is true that Christ himself has elsewhere affirmed the obligation of performing this duty with discretion: he says, 8"Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine:" but then, that discretion by no means extends so far as to warrant a constant system of dissimulation, nor even to justify a false assertion (if circumstances should induce the necessity), in order
to avoid the rage and malice of mankind; but it means only to prevent our fruitless endeavours to reclaim men, unseasonably, from obstinate and invererate errors. Our Saviour, indeed, plainly tells us, in continuation of his remarks on the subject of religious confession, that cases will sometimes occur when this duty must be discharged, at all events, even under the utmost resentment of our nearest connexions, and the imminent danger of inevitable death. 9 "He that loveth father or mother more than me (saith our Blessed Lord) is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me;" Matt. x. 37. Such is he who dissembles or prevaricates respecting the tenets and precepts which we have received from Christ, from a time-serving principle or selfish consideration of kindred, sect, or party: nor has Christ neglected to assure us, with respect to this religious constancy, that death itself must be resolutely endured without swerving from our fixed resolution; and that he who shall sacrifice the present life on this principle, shall gain, in a future state, a blessed immortality. 10 "He that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." "He that findeth his life (here) shall lose it (hereafter); and he that loseth his life (on earth) for my sake, shall find it," that is, in heaven; a life, too, infinitely more happy, as well as a life eternal.

This doctrine is so plain, that it forms no subject of dispute or disagreement among any sect of Christians at this day: Roman Catholics and Protestants, of every denomination, all argue, with one voice, against the wickedness of dissembling our religious
sentiments in discussing any point of principal importance, and when the avowal of them may be made without any act of sedition or violence; for, doubtless, on those lesser points which are not essential to the security of our faith and morals, it is better to conceal or suppress any particularity of opinion, to prevent the continual irritation of dispute among Christians; since there are very few men, of much proficiency in learning, who think exactly alike on all points:—to conceal or suppress (I say), not to deceive, for to withhold an opinion is not to assert a falsehood; whereas, to declare your belief of any thing which, in fact, you disbelieve, amounts to a direct and positive falsehood. I would further observe, that if the law should expressly sanction any tenet which you deem erroneous, it is highly expedient that you should be allowed to testify your dissent in a modest manner; but without contentious or violent conduct: otherwise, instead of enjoying and practising those mild principles of government which obtain in Christian churches, not excluding all religious dissent, provided it be coupled with Christian charity, we should suffer or inflict a mere system of despotic tyranny, which would make no allowance for the most trifling difference of opinion. Numberless points of a theoretical nature are obscure, especially to those who are not versed in studies of that sort; in the discussion of which points, Christian liberty of conscience ought to be entirely unmolested: to this proposition, even all denominations of Christians profess their assent; since there are innumerable passages of Holy Writ, and a great variety of theological opinions, on which learned men have always
disagreed (and still do disagree) without any molesta-
tion; even among those very persons who, in other
particulars, require assent and conformity of opinion
with an unreasonable degree of strictness.

SECTION IV.

WE MUST NOT HASTILY IMPUTE TO THOSE PER-
SONS WHO DISSENT FROM OUR OWN TENETS, A
GROSS STATE OF ERROR OR AN UNLAWFUL
MODE OF WORSHIP, INCOMPATIBLE WITH
ETERNAL SALVATION, SO THAT NONE OF THEM
CAN POSSIBLY BE OBJECTS OF DIVINE MERCY;
NEITHER IS IT LAWFUL FOR US, ON THE OTHER
HAND, TO PROFESS A BELIEF WHICH WE DO
NOT ENTERTAIN, NOR TO COMPLY WITH
PRACTICES WHICH OUR OWN PRINCIPLES CON-
DEMN.

NEITHER seceders from the Church of Rome, nor
adherents to that Church, are, indeed, perfectly una-
nimous in their respective tenets; but, in the opinion
of some men of the greatest erudition, there is no
point of dissent wholly inconsistent with the faith
and worship due to God: they upbraid, indeed, the
Romish Churches with many points of doctrine, as
well as worship, which they deem manifestly erro-
neous and unlawful. It is not our present object to
consider the propriety or impropriety of this opinion,
but even the Church of Rome herself thinks it clearly
unlawful for men to profess an approbation of things
which they disapprove; neither does she admit into
her communion any person professing to dissent from
her in those respects.
There are, however, among those persons who dissent from the Romish Church, very eminent and learned men who, although they deem it utterly unlawful to join her communion, on account of tenets and worship in which they widely differ from her, still hold it by no means justifiable to exclude all who live and die in that communion, learned and unlearned, from the attainment of eternal salvation. They, indeed, who think that there is something in those tenets, or that worship, altogether contrary to the very fundamental principles of Christianity, conceive that their assent would be on no account allowable, as they cannot pretend to approve of points which, in fact, they do not approve of, without the utmost degree of criminality; such as would exclude them, in their own judgement, from a state of salvation, if they should be guilty of such conduct, and should persevere in it to the end of their lives. But those members of the Romish Church who do really and truly embrace these points, as being in their belief agreeable to the tenour of Divine Revelation, or certainly not so hostile to it as to subvert any part of Christian faith and morals, whether it be from the early prejudice of education, or from the want of proper knowledge and judgement: I say, Papists of this description they do not venture to pronounce excluded from salvation; because, say they, we mortals are not competent, in such cases, to determine the extent of Divine Mercy. Innumerable are the circumstances of place and time, and those mental impulses unknown to us, which lighten the sins of wretched human beings, in the all-seeing eye of God, and possibly induce him to pardon sin in some
instances, when it would be condemned and punished in the case of other offenders more advantageously circumstanced: hence they justly determine it to be the part of Christian equity and prudence, while they reprobate those tenets and that worship as erroneous, to leave the individual worshippers to the sentence of that wise and good God, whose "ways are not our ways, nor his thoughts our thoughts;" though they are fully persuaded, at the same time, respecting their own conduct, that they should transgress the divine law, if they countenanced those tenets or adopted that worship!

No man, surely, can infer from this, that a person, educated in other principles, and accustomed to read the holy Scriptures as a Protestant, may hope for the pardon and acceptance of God, if, merely to promote some temporal interest, such a person should do or say against his own conscience, what he believes to be unlawful and false: supposing him to die in this habit of doing and saying what he inwardly disapproves, and to be still ready to act and speak in the same manner if his life should be prolonged. There is not, and, we trust, there never will be, a sect bearing the name of Christ, capable of holding out to any such person the possibility of salvation! Let hypocrites, therefore, take care what they are doing when they treat so contemnuously the combined lights of reason and revelation, that they venture to withstand their force, and to set at defiance the judgment of every description of Christians! Nor let it be supposed that these dissemblers are men of real learning, acting on a proper and mature consideration of the subject; they hold in contempt all theological
science, nor have they ever applied themselves to that study without which it is impossible to form a just decision on a subject of that nature: they despise no less that noble philosophy, which was holden in such high esteem by the most distinguished characters of ancient Rome, as being derived from the light of nature; for they require that indulgence of the passions which even Pagan philosophy disapproves. Thus, then, unconcerned about the sentiments of former ages, despising the present, and not very anxious about the judgement of posterity, they act rather like brutes than rational beings, for in them reason becomes useless! Persons, guilty of such deceit and falsehood, can deserve no notice nor consideration whatsoever: nor are they entitled to any degree of confidence in matters of a temporal nature, since they thus venture to insult both God and man with such an instance of duplicity, in a point of the highest moment! Some of these hypocrites have the effrontery to assert, that the religion of the state should always be the rule of our faith, and that the latter should vary with the former: nor can we be surprised that they should hold so mean an opinion of the Christian faith, when they are devoid even of all principles of natural religion, and are equally uninfluenced by right reason and by virtue. Ill-fated are the kings and states confiding in such men, who are under no controul of religion whatsoever, whether natural or revealed! Men, in short, who are thus destitute of all acquired learning, who reject the judgement of learned men (be they ever so distinguished), who show no regard to truth, and who live in one uniform series of hypocrisy and deceit,—such men, doubtless,
are utterly unworthy of any kind or degree of confidence in matters which concern the public welfare! Still, however, these very characters, with all their contempt of truth and virtue, are apt to think themselves better members of society, and of better talents, than their neighbours; whereas, they neither have, nor can they have, a right to think so, when totally indifferent about truth and falsehood, virtue and vice, and ready to say and do any thing conducive to their own private interests: now, such men have renounced all principle of conscience and morality, and deserve nothing but universal contempt and avoidance!

SECTION V.

ERROR, AND EVEN SIN, RESULTING FROM ERROR, MAY FIND FAVOUR AND FORGIVENESS FROM GOD, BUT HYPOCRISY NEVER CAN!

Such is the condition of human nature, that there are many men, not of bad character in other respects, who (either from a faulty education, or from a want of instructors and books to correct wrong notions, or even from a want of capacity to form a right apprehension and judgement of religious controversies) pass their whole lives, as it were, in a state of darkness. Men of this description, who, according to their capacities, have embraced the instructions which are given them respecting the Christian doctrines, and have acted with sincerity according to those instructions, allowing for the state and condition of our nature, are surely more deserving of compassion than of censure for their errors. Their religion, indeed, betrays much ignorance; it is imperfect, and con-
tinues defective to this day, but it is, in principle, sincere: and therefore we may reasonably hope, that he "who reapeth not where he hath not sown" may, in his all-perfect justice, remit the sentence of offenders thus unhappily circumstanced, or at least may inflict on them a much slighter degree of punishment!

But when we reflect that there are men who have neither wanted education, nor instructors, nor books, nor capacity, to distinguish truth from falsehood in matters of religious controversy, and who only espouse the side of error because it will promote their attainment of the riches, the pleasures, and the honours of this life, against such men, indeed, it is impossible not to feel indignant; and nothing but the most abandoned impudence can attempt to excuse them, or to justify, assuredly, such motives of conduct. Hence, therefore, when even that imperfect degree of virtue, which the best of us may at present attain, cannot possibly allow us to acquit these men, how much more severe will be the sentence of God's perfect justice against offenders thus wilfully and deliberately preferring falsehood before truth, for the transient and precarious advantages of this mortal life! God, of his unbounded mercy, pardons our ignorance when it does not result from vice; he makes allowance for the imperfection of our best qualities, and especially for those unintentional errors which are exempt from evil motives and from impious designs; but never can he pardon those sinners (as Christ himself has taught us) who, when they have known the way of righteousness, shall have wilfully "changed the truth of God into a lie!" Not even in the sight of man can such hypocrites be acceptable;
for all men would decline the friendship of a person who, for the sake of any trifling advantage, would be ready to trample under foot all the rights of former friendship.

From the foregoing observations, our final inference is this,—that there is no act of greater turpitude, no offence of more perilous consequence, than that of indifference or hypocrisy in religion; where men act with dissimulation, in matters of the highest concern, against the dictates of conscience, and the impulse of conviction, which tell them what is best; while they openly support what they know to be wrong! Reason, unassisted reason, deduces this inference, and the religion of Christ confirms it with the unanimous assent of every sect and denomination of Christians!

THE END OF LE CLERC'S TREATISES.
TESTIMONIES
ADDUCED TO SHOW THE VERY FAVOURABLE
OPINION WHICH HUGO GROTIUS ENTERTAINED
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

TO THE READER.

HAVING in my possession (among many other
obligations to the distinguished kindness of the writer)
the following letters from that excellent and very
learned man, Doctor Henry Newton, Envoy Extra-
ordinary of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain,
at the Court of His most Serene Highness the Grand
Duke of Tuscany, I have thought that the present
publication of them would be acceptable to all ad-
mirers of the name of Grotius, and would confer, at
the same time, no small honour on the Church of
England: they show, beyond a doubt, that the senti-
ments of that very eminent man, Grotius, were, in the
highest possible degree, favourable to the English
Church, and that, if such a step had been in his
power, he would have been perfectly ready to join
in its communion. You will doubtless be gratified,
my candid reader, with the perusal of these letters,
and I trust you will continue to think highly of a
man who has deserved so well of the whole Christian
community. Farewell.

LE CLERC.
Letter from Dr. Henry Newton to Peter Jerome Barcellini, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Eusebius de Urbe.

Excellent Sir,

Having at length returned in health and safety to Florence from Leghorn and Pisa, where I narrowly escaped a fever from the unwholesomeness of the air, and having now the benefit of a very fine library which belongs to the celebrated Magliabechi, I am anxious, in the first place, to fulfil the promise which I made to you on the subject of that eminent man, Hugo Grotius, and to show you from his writings (especially from his letters, which exhibit the candour and integrity of his mind and the real sentiments of his heart without disguise,) what a very high opinion he entertained and expressed in our favour, during his whole life, and at the very close of it, when death and a future state were present to his view! I well know in what terms he has been mentioned by Petavius, the chief or general of the learned order of Jesuits, as well as by Brietius, Valesius, and many other very distinguished members of your communion, who regarded and esteemed him as a man born for the common benefit of the whole Christian world! It is also universally known what ill treatment he experienced from the Calvinists, in respect to property, rank, and reputation, not only in his native country, but in a state of exile, when he had even attained a still higher degree of eminence among foreigners: we know, too, how much his natural temper, which otherwise was mild and diffident, became at length crossed and irri-
tated by the heats of controversy; feeling, as he did, the cruel behaviour of his own friends, while his whole and sole object was to obtain a state of peace both civil and ecclesiastical; and this, wonderful and melancholy to relate, procured him many enemies: nor indeed was he always able to preserve, unruffled, that placid wisdom, which yet was his peculiar characteristic both from nature and from reflection.

These circumstances, however, did not prevent his son Peter, who was himself a great man, from addressing himself as follows, on the subject of his father, to His Majesty King Charles the Second (to whom he dedicated his father's works), and of course the same sentiments were addressed equally to others; at a time, too, when he could have no motive either of flattery or of fear; for he had previously, in the Republic, taken part against the nephew of that monarch, and had now become quite a private character, buried among his books in the country; far advanced in years, and fast approaching to that state which would place him beyond the reach of resentment: in fact, though he published his father's works, he did not live to see the publication; and his own life is actually given to the reader with that of his father.

"Among all the crowned heads of Europe, assuredly," says Peter Grotius, "Your Majesty has been long acknowledged by the sounder, if not the larger, portion of the Christian world, as their sole protector: to the same faithful and able guardian, Christianity itself has willingly intrusted her preservation; as, in your realms especially, there is that sense or interpretation of the Scriptures; that mode of divine worship, that moderation of conduct (restraining the
excess too commonly prevalent in controversies on abstruse points of faith), in which the author, my father, has long ago testified his entire concurrence, and which he has publicly declared in the works now presented to Your Majesty."

But now Hugo Grotius himself shall state to you his own sentiments in a letter dated Paris, 1638, and written to Joannes Corvinus, who was not an Englishman, but a Dutchman, a theologian of a different Church, and a lawyer likewise, (consequently well informed both in spiritual and temporal affairs,) on the subject of that reformed state of religion which had been effected in England in the preceding century. "You see," says he, "how successfully the English reformers proceeded in their correction of erroneous and corrupt doctrines; and, for this reason especially, because the persons who undertook to accomplish that holy work would admit of nothing new, nothing of their own; but steadily directed their whole attention to the faith of earlier and purer ages." Religion was indeed, at that time, in a flourishing state; nor had we then witnessed the dreadful scenes of civil war which followed; neither was the king dethroned, nor in captivity; much less had he been condemned and executed! And, at length, when his son contrary to all human expectation, to the astonishment of Europe, was happily restored to the throne of his ancestors, religion again flourished, and received, as it were, a new life; thenceforward continuing, after various perils and threats and alarms, unhurt, secure, and prosperous, even to the present day!

Nor was it only in reference to himself that Grotius evinced these favourable sentiments of the Church of
England; but also in the instance of his friends and partisans in Holland, the partners of his dangers and his losses (by no means a trifling consideration), he strongly advised them to receive ordination from our bishops; whom, therefore, most assuredly, he himself did not consider in the light of schismatics or heretics, neither did he wish them to be considered in that light by others. He thus addresses his brother on that subject: "I would gladly prevail on them (that is, the Remonstrants) to appoint among themselves, in a superior order, as bishops, some select persons, who should, in consequence, receive imposition of hands from the Irish Archbishop, who is on the spot; and then these persons, so appointed and ordained, should afterwards ordain other ministers."

And this was in the beginning of the year 1645, which, as being the year in which he died, was, indeed, a year of peculiar calamity to learning itself! The bishop (not archbishop) whom he mentions, was, if I mistake not, John Bramhall, at that time bishop of Derry in Ireland, but made archbishop of Armagh at the restoration of Charles II., and the next in succession to that most learned man, Usher, Primate of Ireland: Bramhall was afterwards the author of "a Defence of our Church," published in that country, against Militiere. Grotius also expressed himself, in a letter to his brother, dated April 8th, 1645, in the following terms, on the subject of our public form of divine worship: "Learned men (says he) have always unanimously allowed the superior excellence of the English Liturgy."

It seems extremely probable that this great man, who denominates the Reformation in England "a
most holy work," and who believes that the holy orders conferred and received through the medium of English bishops, and the sacred offices and rites of the established religion of that country, and the appointed forms of public worship, are preferable to those of all other Christian churches, would have wished to attach himself to that communion, not only (as he did) in principle, but also in personal example; and thus, at length, to become, as he was in previous inclination, so also in subsequent practice, a member of the Catholic Church. But this he was unable to accomplish, as his death took place soon after this period: for, in the same year, he went from France to Stockholm, in order to resign his office of ambassador; and, having suffered shipwreck on his return from Sweden, he died at Rostock on the 28th of August, 1645, never to be sufficiently lamented; for the termination of his life was a termination of advantage to studious and learned pursuits: never to be sufficiently commended, on account of the works which he undertook and performed in every branch of literature. He was a most sincere lover of peace, as far as the defence of truth would allow, with due regard to the state of times and the theological controversies of that period: nor was he less sincerely attached to the ancient church government, cleared from all its gradual abuses and corruptions, as it obtained in England from the first introduction of Christianity; and, if credit may be given to ecclesiastical history, from the very age of the Apostles. Finally, he was at all times studiously attentive to the peace and harmony of national government, and their religious establishments, in his discourses,
his example, and his writings. May God, the Lord of All, recompense his labours; and may his name continue in the grateful remembrance of posterity, till time shall be no more!

Farewell.

Florence, April 20, 1706.

No. II.

A LETTER FROM DR. HENRY NEWTON TO MR. JOHN LE CLERC.

I present to you, most learned Sir, a new and very ample testimony respecting the religious principles of Hugo Grotius; a testimony, indeed, still more important than the former, if we take into consideration the very high public station of the author, his extensive knowledge of affairs, and the additional circumstance of his having written this testimony while Grotius himself was still alive. It is an extract from a letter to that eminent Prelate, William Laud, at that time Archbishop of Canterbury (with whom he also had frequent correspondence), dated Paris, October 24, New Style, in the year 1633. I have been lately favoured with the letter from England, by the kindness of that great man, 5John, Lord Somers, who, a few years ago, filled the high office of Lord Chancellor of that very flourishing kingdom; presiding at that time over the laws, as he now does over the literature, of Great Britain. In the letter above mentioned, Lord Scudamore, the English ambassador at the court of France at that period, writes as follows on the subject of Grotius: "Cum primum legatum Grotium videbo, non prastermittam id facere quod mihi de illo mandasti. Sane, Domine, persuasum
mihi est eum ex animo et vehementer amari et revereri
te, et rationem qua te geris. Profitetur se corpore et
animo favere ecclesiae Anglicanae; et hoc fert de ea
judicium, videri illam omnium ecclesiarum, quae hodie
sunt, maxime perennaturam. But as your writings,
Sir, plainly show your great proficiency in the English
language, (writings entitled to our best acknowledg-
ments, and highly conducive to the advantage of
foreigners,) I shall now subjoin, with great pleasure,
a copy of the very words of Lord Scudamore, at the
bottom of my letter.

Farewell.

Genoa, January 13, 1707.

Extract:—"The next time I see ambassador
Grotius, I will not fail to perform your command-
ments concerning him. Certainly, my lord, I am
persuaded that he doth unfeignedly and highly love
and reverence your person and proceedings. Body
and soul he professeth himself to be for the Church
of England; and gives this judgement of it, that it is
the likeliest to last of any church this day in being."

No. III.

IS AN ORIGINAL LETTER FROM 6 FRANCIS CHOL-
MONDELEY, ESQ. TO ALEXANDER FORRESTER,
ESQ.

Vale Roial, June 23, 1707.

As to your desires in relation to the greatest man
almost any age hath brought forth,—H. Grotius,—I
can thus inform you:—I happened to come immediate-
ly after the scene was over to Paris; and being very
well acquainted with Mr. Crowther, (after Dr. Prin-
cipal of St. Mary Hall in Oxon,) who often discoursed with mee, with all assurance, that it was the last advice this great man gave his wife, and thought it his duty so to doe, that she would declare him to dye in the communion of the Church of England; in which hee desired that she herself would still believe: this she manifested accordingly, by coming on purpose to our Church att Sir Richard Brown's house (the King of England's Resident then in France); where, from the hands of Mr. Crowther, Chaplain then to the Duke of York, she received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and this, immediately after her husband's death, as soon as reasons of State did cease to hinder. Archbishop Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, (in vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy, and Grotius, &c., from Baxter's Presbyterian charge of Popery,) hee has these words (p. 21): "In relation to his religion, he was in affection a friend, and in desire a true son of the Church of England; and recommended that to his wife and friends, obligeing them, by his authority, to adhere firmly to it, so far as they had opportunity: and both myself and many others have seen his wife, in obedience to her husband's commands (which she declared publicly to the world), to repair often to our prayers and sacraments, and to bring at least one of his grand-children to Sir Richard Brown's house, to be baptized into the faith and communion of the Church of England, and to be made a member of it, as it was accordingly."

Mr. Mathias Turne, an eminent and intimate friend of Grotius, desiring to know of him why he did not communicate with the Church of England,
his answer was, he would gladly communicate with the Church of England, if his condition of embassador would well permit; expressing an ample approbation of our doctrine and discipline, as also heartily wishing to live and die in that communion. He never did, at any time, in any part of the world, so much as permit himself to be present at any papistical devotions. Now, if any one think that he knoweth Grotius' mind better by conjectural consequences than he did himself, or that he could dissemble with his wife and children, he may enjoy his own opinion to himself, but will find few to join with him: Grotius, in his (1753) epistle to his brother William, says, "Liturgia Anglicana ab omnibus eruditis habita semper est optima."

Give me leave to recommend to you a tract of Arnobius, Polenburgh, &c., in Praefat. Dissertationi Epistolicae, p. 13.

I have given you much trouble; but never myself in being, Sir,

Yours faithfully, &c. F. C.

[FRANCIS CHOLMONDELEY.]


No. IV.

A second letter from Mr. Cholmondeley, dated October 6th, 1707, contains the following passage, in reference to the former:

"I lately told you very fully the particulars which had come to my knowledge respecting the widow of
that great man, Hugo Grotius. It afterwards occurred to me, that I had been personally informed by that truly pious and good man, Sir Spencer Compton, son of the Earl of Northampton, that he was present when the widow of Grotius made a public declaration to the foregoing effect, and received the sacrament.”

THE END OF LE CLERC’S SUPPLEMENT.
ANNOTATIONS

OF

GROTIIUS, LE CLERC, AND OTHERS.
ANNOTATIONS.

BOOK I.

1. Raymonde de Sebonde] Theologia Naturalis, Francof. 1635. See the Latin Edition, Oron. 1607. page 2.—Lucovicus Vives (John Lewis) de Verit. Fid. Christ. Basil. 1555.—Philippes du Plessis Mornay de Verit. Rel. Christ. Herb. Nassov. 1632. Latin. Edit. Anvers. 1581. French. In the time of Grotius, these were the principal writers on the truth of Christianity; but numberless authors (in England and France especially) have since written on that subject, excited to it by his example: and indeed the more modern writers have not only imitated him, but have sometimes borrowed their materials from him. To Grotius therefore, in the first place, redounds the glory of a task so pious and so necessary.—Le Clerc.

N.B. The writers here specified by Grotius, however good their design, had by no means thoroughly digested that noble subject.

2. Till at length we can arrive, &c.] We cannot carry on this process for ever; or, as the term is, ad infinitum: for things must have had their origin from some cause, or from none: if we admit a first cause, that is what we call God; if we deny a first cause, there must be absolutely no cause whatsoever from which things originated; and consequently they must either have produced themselves, or they must have originated from nothing: which is absurd.—Le Clerc.

3. By Aristotle himself.] See his Metaphys. lib. xiv. cap. viii. fin. Du Val. Edit. Paris. 1629; where he observes, after the fabulous accounts of the Gods, that, “if a person would make due discrimination, and would only adopt this primary circumstance, that the Gods were believed to be the first causes, he would consider it as founded on divine revelation; and that probably, while every system of art or of philosophy has been discovered as far as may be, and has then again sunk to nothing, this idea of mankind respecting the Gods, as a relic of original truth, has been preserved to the present day.—Le Clerc.
4. *It cannot have less, &c.*] Grotius might have safely ascribed much greater difficulties to those opinions which maintain the eternal duration of the world, and its existence in the present state from all eternity; or its spontaneous origination from nothing, or its composition from the fortuitous concourse of atoms:—opinions, which are full of palpable contradictions, as many writers, since the time of Grotius, have demonstrated with greater accuracy; among whom, the very learned Ralph Cudworth deservedly claims the first place: see his English work on "The True Intellectual System of the Universe, 1678:" and, indeed, there are others also of that nation very highly distinguished in theology and natural philosophy.—*Le Clerc.*

4*. *Not by way of genus:*] That is, not in the general notion of existence, but as a being actually existing; now a being in actual existence is single. But see Le Clerc's just observation in Note 5.

5. *Actuality implies singularity:*] But so many single agents are so many individual beings; and therefore this argument, perhaps, might be omitted without injury to a good cause.—*Le Clerc.*

See the beginning of Dr. S. Clarke's Boyle's Lectures on this argument for the Unity of God.—*John Clarke.*

6. *One body the Sun:*] So indeed it is to the inhabitants of our Solar System (to use a modern term) as those central globes of fire which we call stars are to other systems.—*Le Clerc.*

7. *Galen on this subject:*] The passage (lib. iii. c. x. De usu partium) is well worthy of perusal, but too long to be transcribed; edit. Lut. Par. 1679. These things, however, have been explained with much greater accuracy, of later years, by many English writers in physics and divinity.—*Le Clerc.*

8. *Strabo in particular:*] See Strabo, book xvii. p. 810. edit. Paris. 1620. After having assigned a distinct agency to Nature (or Matter) and to Providence, he adds the following remark: "By Nature," he observes, "the earth is surrounded by water; since man, however, is not an aquatic animal, but is adapted to the elements of earth and air, and fitted to receive many advantages from light, Providence has therefore in many parts elevated, and in others, depressed, the surface of the earth, that the valleys may receive the water, or at least a great proportion of it, so as to conceal the subjacent land, while the hills rise above it, and the waters, in their turn, are concealed by the land; except, indeed, as far as the waters themselves may be useful to man, and to the animal and vegetable productions which conduce to his service." Similar observations have been made by Rabbi Judah (Levita) on Genesis, and Abenesdra among the Jews; and by St. Chrysostom among Christian
9. *Lest a yawning vacuum.*] Our excellent author here argues on the principle of the Peripatetic philosophy, which attributed the ascent of water in pumps to nature's abhorrence of a vacuum: The effect is now universally accounted for by the laws of gravitation: but this more modern explanation equally displays the wonderful order of creation, and the infinite wisdom of its Creator!—*Le Clerc.*

10. *Externally directing them.*] Rather, I should say, those actions are directed by a soul subsisting in brutes, which, to a certain extent, partakes of reason, but no further. Otherwise we must substitute God himself for that soul, which will hardly be admitted by sound philosophy. There is nothing which hinders the possible existence of various orders of sensitive and intelligent natures, the lowest class of which may exist in brutes: for nobody, I believe, has seriously adopted the theory of René des Cartes, who reduced the bodies of brutes to a mere machine. But then, you will say, what becomes of those souls when the brute animals die? That indeed I know not; but the existence of their souls is not the less true for my ignorance. It is not necessary that we should know every thing, nor are we to deny every thing which we cannot explain. Our proper line is to admit what is sufficiently clear, and to be patient under the privation of that knowledge which we are unable to attain.—*Le Clerc.*

11. *The Stoics were wont to infer.*] This doctrine is maintained by Cicero, in his first book De Officiis, § 7; and again in his 2d book, § 69, De naturâ Deorum. Edit. Gruter. Hamburg. 1618.—*Grotius.*

12. *The revolutions of the planets.*] Maimonides treats this subject learnedly in his “Ductor Dubitantium,” part ii. ch. 24. edit. Basil. 1629; but if the perpetual motion of the earth be established, we come, in other terms, to the same conclusion.—*Grotius.*

13. *Eccentrical, &c.*] All these particulars, and others that follow, are given on erroneous opinions formerly received, but now exploded. There is, however, an equal display of the divine Power in these constant motions of the planets in their elliptical orbits round the sun, through a vortex of the most subtle kind of fluid, never approaching their central sun, nor receding from it beyond their stated limits, and always cutting the equator with the same degree of obliquity.—*Le Clerc.*

Sir Isaac Newton has demonstrated that there are no such vortices, but that their motions are better explained without them.—*John Clarke.*
Ptolemy, an Egyptian philosopher who flourished about 138 years before Christ, first taught this doctrine of a number of circles, called eccentrics and epicycles, crossing and interfering with one another, in order to account for the motions of the heavenly bodies, according to his system, which the Peripatetics maintained universally, till Copernicus restored in 1530 the Pythagorean or true system of the universe.

13*.] Some late editions omit the word rotunda, which is to be found in the original, as the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton was decidedly confirmed by experiment in the year 1736, that the figure of the earth (or world) is not a perfect sphere, but an oblate spheroid.

14. The form of a house.] Or of a ship, or great engine, of complicated structure.—Grotius.

15. The progressive improvement of the arts, &c.] Tertullian treats of this subject from history in the 30th section of his book De Anima. "We find," says he, "in all commentaries of human antiquities, that mankind increased by degrees exceedingly," &c. Soon after he says, "The world is evidently more polished every day, and more knowing than heretofore." These two arguments have caused Aristotle's opinion to be exploded (that the world never had a beginning) among the learned in history, and even among the Epicureans. See Lucretius, V. 325 to 335. More to the same purport follows. See also Virgil in his 6th Eclogue, lines 33, 34. The same in his 1st Georgic, line 133 to 145. And Horace, book 1. sat. 3. line 99.

Pliny, in his 3d book of Natural History, near the beginning, says, "I would therefore wish to be understood in such a manner that the plain and impartial signification should be expressed as in the earliest period, before any great exploits had been performed." He has mentioned the Hercynian Forests as being "coeval with the world;" book 16. 2: and in the 7th book, 16. he says, "to speak generally, the daily decrease of the human stature is matter of observation." In Lactantius, 3. 16. 14, Seneca dates "the first dawn of knowledge within 1000 years." See Tacitus, in his Annals, 3. 26. "In the early ages of the world men led a life of innocence and simplicity: free from irregular passions they knew no corruption of manners; and void of guilt they had no need of laws: in the natural emotions of the heart they found incitements to virtue, and rewards were unnecessary. Having no inordinate desires, they coveted nothing; and pains and penalties were unknown. In process of time, when all equality was overturned, and in the place of temperance and moderation, ambition and violence began to trample on the rights of man, then monarchy was established, in several nations unlimited, absolute, and flourishing at this hour. Some states indeed,
in their first formation, or, at least, soon after they had made an experiment of kings, preferred a government by law; and law in its origin was, like the manners of the age, plain and simple. —Murphy.—Nor has Aristotle established his hypothesis to the satisfaction of others, nor indeed fully to his own, respecting the eternal existence of the human species; for he speaks of it with some hesititation in many passages, as Moses Maimonides has observed in his preface or introduction, part 2, of his "Ductor Dubitantium." In the beginning of the first chapter of his second book "On the Heavens," he calls his proposition on that subject πίστιν, matter of belief, but not ἀπόδεικτι, matter of demonstration; and in his third book "On the Soul," chap. 3, his expression is, that "belief is the consequence of opinion." But his principal argument is founded on the absurdity of a contrary supposition, the "inconsistency" of believing that the heavens and the universe were generated, not created. In book 11. chap. 8. of his Metaphysics, towards the conclusion, he says, "that the same art, very probably, has been often discovered, and again lost." But in the last chapter of book 3, "On the Generation of Animals," he says, "It therefore might not be an absurd conjecture, on the origin of men and quadrupeds, to suppose it to have happened either in the manner by which maggots are brought into existence, or from eggs." After an explanation of each process, his inference is, "that if animals had any beginning, it must have been evidently from one of the two methods above mentioned." The same author says in book 1. ch. 9, περὶ τὸ πιστικὸν, "there are questions on which contradictory arguments may be reasonably urged, as it may be contended that either side is right, from the plausibility of the reasoning employed on both sides. So also in cases where we cannot arrive at certainty; for though the points be in themselves important, we find no reason for coming to a positive conclusion one way or another; as in the instance of the eternal or limited existence of the world, for such things are apt to be disputed." On the same subject, in the beginning of his first book "On the Heavens," chap. 10, he says, "the assertions will also obtain greater credit, if we previously and duly estimate the comparative weight of the respective disputants." Tatian therefore, in § 29, very properly, has not overlooked this observation when he argues for the credibility of the sacred writings, alleging that the account of the first formation of the world is easy to be understood. Admit, then, with Plato, that the world had some beginning, and with Aristotle that it was not produced by generation, and you will have the very opinion entertained both by Jews and Christians.—Grocius.

N.B. The reader is referred to Ovid's Fasti, lib. ii. v. 291 et seq. and to lib. iv. v. 395, in addition to the passages above cited.
from Lucretius, Virgil, and Horace in the former part of this note.—L'Oste.

16. A. capacity of itself, &c.] God indeed foresaw also that this power of free agency would be abused, and that many physical and moral evils would arise from that abuse; nevertheless he chose rather to permit that abuse and its consequences, than not to create beings endued with that power. And why? Because, as the creature of greatest excellence must be a free agent, displaying by that privilege the Creator's power in the highest possible degree, God would not prevent the disadvantages which are attendant on that state from the frailty of human nature; for, when he shall see fit, he can remedy those disadvantages through all future ages by means perfectly consonant (no doubt) with his attribute of goodness, though at present unrevealed. I have lately written much at large on this subject, in the French language, against that disguised advocate of the Manichaean heresy, Peter Bayle.—Le Clerc.

17. Two active principles, &c.] In allusion to the ancient disciples of Zoroaster, and the Manichees.—Le Clerc.

N. B. The Magians, a Persian sect, embraced these tenets of Zoroaster; and in Persia and India the same notions are entertained by man to this day: Manes, a Persian, was the founder of the Manichean heresy, the capital point whereof was that there were two first principles, one the cause of good, the other the cause of evil.—L'Oste.

18. That very existence, &c.] But we are here treating of moral good, whereas the refutation is grounded on existence, which is a physical good: it would therefore have been better to abstain from this mode of reasoning.—Le Clerc.

19. To the system of the heavens, &c.] This was the opinion of Aristotle. See Plutarch on the Sentiments of Philosophers, "Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων τῶν φιλοσοφῶν;" book 11. ch. 3. Lu. Par. 1624. See also Eusebius de Præp. Evangelica, (Atticæ) book xv. 5. initio.—Le Clerc.

20. For the use of man.] If not for the sole use of man, (since other intelligent beings may possibly, or probably, inhabit other planets,) yet certainly for his use in part, and as far as that may be without injury to any other part of creation. Since the sun is indispensably necessary to us, we justly infer that it was created on our account, unless we fancy (which would be absurd) that we have received things by mere accident which are absolutely necessary to our existence. A man might as well stumble on a well-furnished and commodious house, and yet suppose that it was not intended for the use of some human being, by whom alone it could be enjoyed.—Le Clerc.

21. Which admits a general providence, &c.] The Stoics main-
tained that opinion: See the dissertations on Epictetus by Ar-
rian, book i. ch. 12. edit. Cantab. 1655. And Justus Lipsius,
in Physiol. Stoicæ, lib. i. diss. 11. Ant. 1604.—Le Clerc.

22. From the constant continuance, &c.] Because human so-
ciety cannot continue without it; nor without society can the
human race be preserved: Hence we may infer that men were
created by divine providence for social life, and for a state of
legal government, without which society never does, never can,
subsist.—Le Clerc.

23. Wheresoever it hath pleased the Deity, &c.] See Lucretius
himself, v. 1232.—Grotius.

24. Jenghiz Khan among the Tartars, &c.] By Cingis the au-
thor seems to mean Jenghiz Khan, who was a native of Eastern
Tartary, and of the city Caracaram. He not only subdued
Tartary, but the northern provinces of China and India. From
him were descended the Mogul emperors and the princes of
Lesser Tartary. An account of his life was published in French

25. Namcaoa among the Chinese.] In this place Manco Capac,
founder of the Peruvian empire, has a just claim to particular
notice.—Grotius.

—Le Clerc.

See note A in the Appendix.

26. Endureth to this day.] Josephus, in his first book against
Apion, § 22, gives an extract from Hecataeus, showing the in-
vincible adherence of the Jews, before the time of Alexander,
to the laws of their own nation, in defiance of every insult and
injury, the cruellest tortures, and death itself: and again, from
the same author, he gives an instance to the same effect in the
time of Alexander, when the Jewish soldiers inflexibly refused
their assistance in restoring the temple of the Chaldean idol
Bel or Belus. In his second book against Apion, § 30, &c.
Josephus well shows that the principle on which they acted was
a firm conviction of the divine origin of their laws, because they
never dared to make the slightest alteration of those laws, (as
other nations do,) however they might be circumstanced in dis-
tant exile, or under foreign governments; whatever severities
might be threatened to intimidate them; whatever indulgences
might be promised to seduce them! So again, in Tacitus, (where
the profane historian unjustly blames them,) we find the same
evidence of their utter contempt of every earthly consideration,
when placed in competition with their divine law. Book v. § 5.
Hist. “The Jews, (he says) that they may know each other
by distinctive marks, have established the practice of circumci-
sion: All who embrace their faith submit to the same operation.
The first elements of their religion teach their proselytes to de-
spise the gods, to abjure their country, and forget their parents, their brothers, and their children." See also what Porphyry has recorded of their constancy in his second treatise, § 61, on "abstinence from animal food;" and again in the 11th and following sections of his fourth treatise, where he mentions Antiochus, and the constancy of the Essenians in particular, one of the three ancient sects among the Jews.—Grotius.

27. All other religions, &c.] And even that admirable system of laws which did so much honour to Lycurgus; as Josephus has remarked in his second book against Apion, § 31. See also Theodoret, in his ninth discourse, in a series of discourses of which the Latin title is "De Curatione Graecarum Affectionum." pp. 125, 126. ed. Sylburg. 1592.—Grotius.

28. By sure and constant tradition.] To this we justly give credit, because it was a design well worthy of divine interposition, to establish a religious system instructing us in the knowledge of the One true God, the Creator of all things, a spiritual being, the sole object of our worship!—Le Clerc.


29. A token, which could not be received without excessive pain.] See Philo on Circumcision, p. 625. B. ed. Col. Allob. 1618. where he expresses himself to that effect.—Grotius.

30. A certain object of ridicule.] So the same Philo expresses himself, p. 625. A. and the poets have applied some contemptuous terms to the Jews on this account.—See Horace Sat. lib. i. 9. 70. Martial Epig. lib. vii. 82. Juvenal Sat. xiv. 104. Persius Sat. v. 184.—Grotius.

31. The Greeks confess themselves to have received certain letters, &c.] Herodotus in Terpsichore, § lviii. speaks of "the Ionians having adopted letters with some alteration from the Phoenicians, giving them the appellation of Phœnician (as they well might from their origin)." And Timon does the same, according to Sext. Empiricus, adv. Mathem. i. 2. 53. edit. Lips. 1718. See also Zenodotus the Stoic, in Diogenes Laertius, in his Life of Zeno of Citium, vii. 30. [In former editions the reference in this place has been erroneously made to Callimachus.] See likewise Photarch, in Sympos. book ix. probl. iii. t. 2. p. 738. F. ed. Paris. 1624. where he says that Alpha in the Phœnician language signifies an ox; which is very true.—Eupolemus, in book ix. of the Prep. Evang. of Eusebius, " de Judæis regibus et populo; & Grecis Scriptoribus," chapter 26 " de Mose," calls Moses "the wisest of men," and says that "the Jews derived from him those elements of learning which the Phœnicians derived from the Jews." In fact, the Jews and Phœnicians had originally the same, or nearly the same, language.—Lucian, in his narrative, entitled "Αλέξανδρος ἡ Ψευδάρατις," § 13, says that he "astonished the people with a language which they did not understand, using
words like the Hebrew or Phoenician.” To the same effect Chorilus the poet, in Josephus against Apion, book i. 22. describes a people of Jerusalem living near a lake (which I take to be that of Asphaltitis in Syria), whose language was Phoenician. And Plautus in his “Poenulus,” V. i. where Hanno the Carthaginian is introduced, speaking in his native language, gives the speech in two dialects, and from the Latin translation the corruptions may be easily corrected. The Phoenician and Hebrew languages being thus far identified, the most ancient Hebrew letters are the same which are used by the Phœnicians. See on this subject those great men Joseph Scaliger, in his Notes on the “Chronicon” of Eusebius, ann. 1617, and Gerard Vossius, Gramm. lib. i. c. 10. [and especially, says Le Clerc, Sam. Bochart in the second part of his Geographia Sacra, entitled Canaan.] Likewise the first book, § 16. of Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. and the 10th book, ch. 5. of the Præparatio Evangelica of Eusebius.—Grotius.

See also “Prideaux’s Connection,” book v. p. 495.—L’Oste.

32. The same old character.] We must here understand the Samaritan characters, which are the same as the Phoenician, according to Lewis Cappellus*, Sam. Bochart†, and others. I have also treated on this subject myself in the French language. See Bibliothèque Choisie, vol. ii. art. 2.—Le Clerc.

33. The most ancient laws of Athens, &c.] Of this there is one striking example in the case of nocturnal theft, on which subject see my remarks, lib. ii. chap. 1. § 12. de jure Belli, edit. Amst. 1631. There is another instance in that law, recited by Sopater, p. 446. ed. Ald. “Rhetores,” Ven. 1508. “Let the next of kind demand the heiress in marriage.” Hence we find in the Phormio of Terence, I. 2. 75.

“There is a law
That orphan girls should wed their next of kin,
Which law obliges, too, their next of kin
To marry them.”—Colman.

On this passage Donatus calls the law Athenian; deducible from the Mosaic law, in the last chapter of Numbers; on which subject we shall have a future opportunity of speaking more at large. Many other examples, on due inquiry, will present themselves; as that of the Athenian procession †, with vine branches and “boughs of goodly trees.” See Numbers xxiii. 40. and the law restricting the High Priest from marriage with any but a virgin and a citizen; and that kinsmen on the father’s side should inherit next after sisters.—Grotius.

* Cappelli Opera, Amst. 1689.
† Bocharti Opera, Lugd. Bat. 1712.
‡ Compare the Festival of Oschophoria (in Plutarch’s Life of Theseus) with the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles.
The laws of Athens, therefore, coincide, in many points, with those of the Hebrews, because the Athenians received many of their customs from Cecrops, an Egyptian, (who conducted a colony from Egypt into Greece, and was the founder and first King of Athens,) and also because God gave the Jewish nation many institutions similar to those of the Egyptians, to which they had been accustomed, correcting only what might be of a bad tendency; as I have often shown in my commentary on the Pentateuch; and so has Dr. John Spencer before me, in his Treatise on the ritual Laws and Ceremonies of the Hebrews; Edit. Cantab. 1685.—Le Clerc.

84. The oldest histories of the Phoenicians, collected by Sanchoniatho, &c. Eusebius, in book i. ch. 10. of his "Præparatio Evangelica," has preserved the following extract. Sanchoniatho supposes, in the Phoenician Theology, that "the origin of all things was a dark and windy atmosphere, or a blast of dusky air, and a turbid chaos, involved in darkness: that these were infinite and boundless for many ages: but that when this air or spirit, he says, became enamoured of its own principles, a mixture took place, and was called Love or Desire: that such was the beginning of all things; but that this air or spirit knew no date of creation. That from the mixture of that spirit proceeded what he calls Môt, Môt; which some call mud; others the putrefaction of a watry mixture; whence came the seed of all creation, and the generation of the universe." In the account given by Moses you have directly both the Spirit and the darkness. In the word חזה you have a signification of love. [See rather the sense of that word in Parkhurst.] This is illustrated in the Symposiacs, book vii. probl. 1. of Plutarch, by the similitude of a bird:

"The rushing winds impregn a female bird."

But Môt, שז, whence the Greek Μῶθ, answers to the Scriptural expression חזה, Gr. "Αυτος; an Abyss already in comotion: an immense mass of mud, if I rightly understand Ennius, according to Varro, l. i. vi.-v. That mud afterwards became separated into solid and fluid parts—land and water: See Apollonius, Argonautic. iv. 676. His commentator, on book i. l. 498, observes that "Zeno had described that first state of chaos, according to Hesiod, to be water, the origin of all things; and that, as the water subsided, there was a residuum of mud from which, as it became hardened, the solid earth was formed." Now this Zeno, it is observable, was so far a Phoenician, as the place of his birth (Citium in the isle of Cyprus) was originally peopled by a colony of Phoenicians; hence the Hebrew term חזה was given by the Hebrews to all beyond the seas.

Applicable to this passage of Zeno is the account given by Virgil, in his 6th Eclogue, line 35:

"The tender soil, then stiffening by degrees,
Shut from the bounded earth the bounding seas."—Dryden.
Numenius, quoted by Porphyry, about the Cave of the Nymphs, ch. x. says that the prophet, meaning Moses, described the Spirit of God "moving upon the face of the waters." Tertullian employs a phrase to the same effect, concerning Baptism, in the beginning of his ivth chapter. Now the word ἦν properly signifies to sit, as a dove, upon an egg, and therefore it follows, according to Sanchoniathon, that the animated part, such as the heavenly bodies, lay involved in that mud as in an egg; hence that Spirit is described as a dove; and Rabbi Solomon explains that word מַעְרֵם by the similitude of a dove. [Hence Milton, "Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss."] Nigidius Figulus, according to the Scholiast on Germanicus, p. 112. 15. ed. Sanctandr. 1589, says, that "an egg of immense magnitude was there found, which they rolled and ejected upon the earth; and that the dove sat on it, and after some days the Syrian goddess Venus was produced."—So again, in the end of the 3d section of Lucius Ampelius "De duodecim signis," in his "Liber memorialis," addressed to Macrinus: "It is said that a dove sat many days on the egg of a fish in the river Eu phosphates, and hatched a goddess," &c. "See Appendix to Florus, 1680.—Macrobius Saturnal. lib. vii. cap. 16. mentions "an egg as being a resemblance of the world:" and it is called "the beginning of generation" in the Orphics, according to Plutarch,—see the Symposiac. ii. ch. 3. and in Athenagoras, Leg. § 18. Hence, in Arnobius, the Syrian gods are called the offspring of eggs, book i. p. 20. ed. Duc. 1634. "The Gods, by which term he means the Stars: for in the Phcenician theology it follows that "the mud was enlightened, and the sun, and moon, and the stars great and small." You see here, as in the Mosaic account, the light prior to the sun. But that which Moses afterwards calls γῆ, where the dry land plainly appeared above the water, you find described as μῖν ἄρη; and it is thus mentioned by Phercydes, on Syrian authority, (as Josephus in his first book against Apion, § 2, and other authors also inform us), "To that-which the Greeks call γῆβος the name Γῆ, earth, was given, when Jupiter had conferred his favour on it." The passage is in Diogenes Laertius—i. 119. and in other authors. Anaximander called the sea "the remainder of the first moisture." On the primitive confusion of things, as you have the very words of Moses in Chalcidius's Commentary on the Timeus of Plato, p. 372. ed. Hagg. Bat. 1617; so also you find Linus, according to Diogenes Laertius, (see pref. § 4.) instructed or instructing to the same effect; "the early state of universal confusion." See also Anaxagoras, according to Eusebius, in his Præp. Evang. x. 14. Diogenes Laertius, in pref. § 4, and in his Life of Anaxagoras ii. 6. edit. Meibom. 1692. as well as other authors. "All things," says that philosopher, "were confounded together, but οὐκ, the great mind or intellect, separated and disposed them, so as to
produce "order from confusion." The philosopher himself received on this account the appellation $\text{Nuj}$, as we learn from a passage of Timon the Phliasian*, according to Diogenes Laertius, in the Life of Anaxagoras, ii. 6, already mentioned in the preceding sentence. All these particulars are derived and adopted from the Phœnicians, whose intercourse with the Greeks was of a very early date. The ancients tell us that Linus was from that country; so likewise Orpheus has taken much into his writings from the Phœnicians, as in the following passage which Athenagoras has preserved: "Legatio, et de Resurrectione Mortuorum," § 18, (see Justin Martyr, edit. Paris, 1742.) "From the water mud was formed." And again, he speaks of an immense egg which broke into two parts, heaven and earth. From the same Orpheus the following quotations are made by Timotheus: "Chaos and dark night prevailed, involving all things under heaven in darkness." And again, "The earth was invisible on account of the darkness, till the light, breaking through the æther, illumined all creation." See the extracts "Ex Timothee τη $\chiρονογραφε περι κοσμοτοιας," in the first book of the Greek Chronicle of Eusebius (qui Chronographia dicitur) page 4. edit. Amstel. 1658. cum notis et castigatt. Josephi Scaligi, [who observes in his note on the first extract, page 403, "De Timotheo nihil in praesentia memini." ] In a subsequent passage from Sanchoniatho, (see Prep. Evang. i. 10.) night is called "$\betaαυ\nu$," which is precisely the $\gamma ν$ of Moses, Gen. i. 2. And the wind, which is there called κολπα, is the Hebrew $\tau ρ ρ ρ γ$, the voice of the mouth of God!—Grotius.

35. Partly also, in those of the Indians.] Megasthenes, according to Strabo, book 15. p. 713. B. ed. Lut. Par. 1620, thus expresses their notions: "that in many respects they coincided in opinion with the Greeks: that they also maintained a finite origin and duration of the world, and the spherical form of it; that God the creator and governor of it pervades the whole; that all things have their distinct beginnings, and that water is the first principle from which the world was formed." But Clemens, in Strom. 1. 15, has given us the following passage of Megasthenes himself, from the third book of his history of the Indians: "Whatsoever has been said of old about the nature of things we find also said by philosophers who were not natives of Greece, such as the Bramins of India, and Jews, as they are called, in Syria."—Grotius.

36. And Egyptians.] See to this effect the Proemium of Sertius, § 10, and Diodorus Siculus. 1. 7, respecting their opinions. In the former we find that "the beginning was some

* Phliasia, a small district of Sicyonia, in Achaia, a province of Peloponnesus.
material substance, from which the four elements were separated, and some animals perfected." And afterwards, that "as the world had a beginning, so it would also have an end." [The latter extract is too long for insertion, but well worth perusal.] Add to this their notion of God as the creator, who is "the mind" or "intellect" of Anaxagoras, and you will trace many things agreeing with the Mosaic account and the tradition of the Phœnicians; the confused state of heaven and earth; the motion of the air; the mud or abyss, ("the deep" of our Bible;) the light; then the sun, moon, and stars; the separation of the earth, sun, and sea; then the birds, reptiles, and fish; and lastly, other animals, and man himself!

See further Macrobius in his Saturnalia, vii. 16, in a quotation from the Egyptians: "If we grant what our opponents affirm, that things now existing had some date of their existence, nature in the first instance produced each kind of animal in a perfect state, and then established a perpetual law for the successive continuation of each species by procreation: And to prove the possibility of this perfect state of animals in the first production of them, we have in evidence not a few animals, which are to this day produced in that state; witness the mice in Egypt, and in other places frogs, serpents," &c. Aristotle, in his Metaphysics, 1. 3, towards the end, gives a just preference to Anaxagoras before the ancient Greek philosophers, as to a man in his sober senses compared with others in a state of intoxication: because they had regarded the material substance only, whereas he had assigned a primal designing cause; which cause Aristotle terms "Nature," Anaxagoras more happily describes as "Mind," and which Moses declares to be "God." So likewise does Plato, concerning whom see Laertius, iii. 69, where he treats of first Principles according to the opinion of Plato; see also Apuleius on the tenets of Plato, p. 29. ed. Amst. 1624. And Thales, before him, first taught the same doctrine; as Velleius informs us in the first book of Cicero de Natûra Deorum, § 10. "Thales the Milesian, who first inquired into these matters, taught that water was the first principle of things, but that God was that intelligent being who from water created all things." By water we are here to understand the μύδαMud, which Xenophon and others call Earth; all of them with sufficient propriety, if we take them in a right sense.—Grotius.

See Milton's Paradise Lost, towards the end of the third book: see also book the seventh.—L'Oste.

37. Linus.] In the passage cited in Note 34.—Grotius.

38. Hesiod and many other Greeks.] See the Theogony of Hesiod, verse 116, &c. Comparing these lines with what we have before stated from the Phœnicians, we shall perceive a great resemblance; Indeed Hesiod was in the immediate neighbourhood
of Thebes in Boeotia, a city founded by Cadmus of Phoenicia. The Greek Erebus is plainly the γῆ of Moses, to which Night and Day are subsequent. See the Argonautics ascribed to Orpheus, v. 12, and again v. 419, &c. And Apollonius Rhodius, in his poem on the same subject, book 1. 496. Lugd. Bat. 1641. has taken some of his ideas from them. So likewise Epicurus, the most ancient comic writer, (see Laertius in Plato, iii. 10.) relates an old tradition about “the existence of Chaos before all the Gods.” There is a passage to the same purport in “the Opides” of Aristophanes, ver. 694, preserved by Lucian in his Dialogue of “Philopatris,” § 13. and by Suidas on the word Chaos: and it may be easily seen that the purport of it is taken from the accounts of the Phenicians, who had early intercourse with the colonies from Attica which first peopled Ionia. The word Erebus has been already noticed; and Tartarus, in like manner, is the κόσμος of Moses, the “Abyss of Waters.” The word ἔρως was shown to denote Love, (see Note 34.) which is further supported by that line of Parmenides, (in the Symposiacs of Plato, p. 1178 B. ed. Francof. 1602.)

“Love was first form’d of all the Gods;” and by the verses of Simmias, of Rhodes, with the figure of wings prefixed.—Grotius.

Milton, doubtless, had an eye to these old pieces (and to the passage to which the following note refers in the beginning) in his descriptions of Chaos: in one place particularly he calls

“Eldest Night
And Chaos, ancestors of Nature.”—Book ii. 894.—L'Osle.

39. Ovid.] The passage is obvious. See the first lines of his Metamorph. from 1 to 84, which well deserve to be read in this place; they relate nearly what Moses has related in many principal points, and almost in his words: giving and receiving great light with respect to our present subject. They show you the dominion which was given to man over all the inferior parts of the creation, and you see him made after the image of God or the celestials. To the same purport is that passage which Clemens Alexandrinus (in Strom. V. § 5. tom. 2. p. 662. Potter, Oxon. 1715,) has given us from Euryusus the Pythagorean, in his book “Περὶ Τυχῆς,” [more probably Eurytus, who was a scholar of Pythagoras:] “The body of man,” says he, “is certainly like the bodies of other animals, so far as it consists of the same component parts, but framed by that highest Artificer, who, in the formation, took a pattern of himself.” See this sense of the word σωφροσύνη, Wisdom ix. 15. 2 Cor. v. 1. 4. So again Horace, Sat. ii. 2. 79, describes the human soul as “a particle of divine spirit.”

Weigh down this portion of celestial birth,
This breath of God, and fix it to the earth.—Francis.
And Virgil speaks of "the pure mother of the soul" in his 6th Ecceid, line 747. (Pope, line 1013.)

For who that to the sanctity aspires,
Which Ceres, for her secret rites, requires,
Feels not another's woes? This marks our birth;
The great distinction from the beasts of earth:
And therefore, gifted with superior powers,
And capable of things divine,—tis ours.
To learn, and practise, every useful art,
And from high heaven deduce that better part
That moral sense, denied to creatures prone,
And downward bent, and found with man alone;
For He, who gave this vast machine to roll,
Breath'd life in them, in us a reasoning soul."—Gifford.

Remarkably apposite to this point are those fine passages in the Phaedo and Alcibiades of Plato. See p. 1st. 447. and p. 60 of the Phaedo, and elsewhere. See also Cicero de Legibus, 1. 9, and Sallust, in his introduction to the Bell. Catilin; and again Pliny, book 2. chap. 26, all very strongly to the same effect.—Grotius.


41. Platonists.] Amelius, a follower of Plato, says, "And this was that reason or word by which, as it was eternal in its existence, all things existing have been produced, as Heraclitus also thought: and truly that Barbarian believed it to be present with God, both in the order of things at the beginning, and in dignity, and to be God: By this (he said) every thing was altogether made, and from it all created things had their being."

By the term Barbarian he intends St. John the Evangelist, who lived rather before Amelius. Eusebius has preserved the passage in the eleventh book of his Præp. Evang. ch. 19, and St. Cyril, book 8, against Julian, t. 6, p. 283. D. edit. Lutet. 1638. The same passage is also mentioned by St. Augustine, book 10. ch. 29, "De civitate Dei," and in the seventh book of his Confessions, 9. 1. So again Tertullian "adversus Gentes" says, ch. 21. "Among your wise men also it is agreed that the Logos, that is, the Word or Reason, appears to be the Maker of the universe: for Zeno determines this to have been the Creator, who formed all things in their order." The passage of Zeno was in his book "πρὸς σῶμα," where he called the τὸ πρῶτον, the operative cause, by the term Logos; in which he was followed by Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Archedemus, and Posidonius, as we are informed by Laertius in his account of Zeno, 7. 40. Seneca employs the term "Rationem facientem," Reason the acting power, in his
65th epistle. Chalcidius, in his Commentary on the Timaeus of Plato, p. 135, says, "that the Reason of God is God himself, who regards human affairs, and through whom men lead good and happy lives, if they do not 'neglect the gift' (1 Tim. iv. 14.) which is bestowed on them by the most high God.” The same author says elsewhere, p. 373, concerning Moses, “clearly showing the formation of heaven and earth by the preceding spirit of divine wisdom, and the foundation of the universe to have been laid by the same divine wisdom.”—Grotius.

42. Carmen Orphicum.] These verses are extant in one of the treatises of Justin Martyr, addressed to the Gentiles, § 15, and also in his book on the Unity of God. See likewise Clemens Alex. Strom. lib. 5. p. 259. 3d edit. Syllburg. 1592. and Eusebius, lib. xiii. 12. Præp. Evang. from Aristobulus.—Grotius.

43. Empedocles.] Of whom Laertius says, that he pronounced the Sun to be a great mass of fire. See viii. 77. The author who gives us "the Opinions of the Philosophers," see "Προ των αφεξώνων" in Plutarch, book 2. ch. 6.) informs us that "Empedocles thought that the air was first separated, then the fire, and then the earth; that from the violent compression of the latter by the force of its revolution, the water burst forth, from which the air evaporated; and that the heaven was formed from the air, and the sun from the fire." And in the 20th chapter he conceived that there were "two Suns, one of an original, the other of a reflected light." Philolaus, as we read in the same place, pronounced the Sun to be of a vitreous nature, receiving its reflected splendour from the fire that is in the world, and distributing the light to us. Anaxagoras, Democritus, and Metrodorus affirmed the Sun to consist of ignited matter, as we also read in the above place; and Democritus, according to Laertius, ix. 34, shows that these opinions are of the highest antiquity.—Grotius.

44. Aratus and Catullus.] See the “Phaenomena” of the former, l. 359, and in the poem of Callimachus, translated by Catullus, the constellation called “Berenice’s Hair” is made to speak to the same effect, Line 69.—Grotius.

N. B. Grotius published the “Phaenomena” of Aratus in Greek and Latin, with notes; Lugd. Bat. 1600, with the fragments of Cicero’s Latin translation, and the versions of Germanicus and Avienus.

45. Thales.] See Diogenes Laertius, 1. 35. and both Herodotus, 1. 170. and Leander, according to Clemens Alexand, Strom. 1. p. 129. 44, inform us that Thales was of Phœnecian origin.—Grotius.

46. 47. Orphic verses, and in Hesiod.] See, in the former, the beginning of the “Hymn to Night,” and the Theogony of Hesiod already cited, note 38,
48. **Nations the most tenacious of old customs.** We are told by Nicolaus of Damascus, p. 521, in the "Valesii Excerpta," edit. Paris. 1634, (see note B in the Appendix,) that the Numidians in Africa computed their time not by days but by nights. So likewise Tacitus de Mor. Germ. § xi. 3, "The Germans," he says, "do not count the number of days as we do, but of nights: thus they date their legal proceedings; their night seems to begin their day." See the "Speculum Saxonicum" of Eccard, book 1, art. 3. 67, and in other places; see also the very learned Fréderick Lindenbruch, at the word "Noctes," in the Glossary annexed to his "Codex Legum Antiquarum." Franc. 1613. The neighbouring people of Bohemia and Poland to this day preserve the same custom as the Gauls did formerly. Caesar, in his sixth book de Bell. Gall. c. 17, observes, that "they measure all their periods of time, not by days but by nights." Pliny, in the last chapter of the 16th book of his Natural History, remarks of the Druids, that "the commencement of their months and years was computed by the moon." The Hebrew mode of computing time is sufficiently well known. Gellius adds that the Athenians in this respect adopted the Phœnician custom. See book 3. ch. 2. Noctes Atticae.—Grotius.

49. **Anaxagoras.** The words of this philosopher have been already cited (in Note 34) from Diogenes Laertius, who wrote "the Lives of the Philosophers," book 1. 3. See others also to the same effect; and you are told in the same note of an extract on the subject of Anaxagoras (in reference to this opinion) from Timon the Phliasian.—Grotius.

50. **Aratus.** See the beginning of his Phaenomena; and the translation by Grotius, who published an edition of that work, Leyd. 1600, where the passage itself, as well as the use made of it by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 28, must convince us that by the appellation Jupiter we are to understand God. the true Creator of the universe. And the conclusion of that book of Ovid (now lost) "quo οὐσίαν breviter comprehendit," was expressed in terms to the same effect, as we learn from Lactantius, ii. 5. 24. And Chalcidius, in his Commentary on Plato's Timeus, p. 223, at the end, speaks of "the conformity of the Hebrew notions," as they affirm that God, who beautifully adjusted all the works of his creation, assigned "the sun to rule the day," and the moon to rule the night: that he also disposed the other "lights in the firmament of heaven," "to be for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years."—Grotius.

51. **Virgil after the Greeks.** See the 6th Æneid (line 724, &c.) which Servius says is compiled from various writings of the ancients: and see in explanation the 4th Georgic, line 219, &c. of the same poet.—Grotius.
See the "Works and Days" of Hesiod, lines 60, 61. And, the seventh book of Homer's Iliad, line 99.

For all things return to that from which they came. See the "Hypsipyle," a fragment of Euripides, as Stobæus tells us in the Preface, that "the issue of all occurrences must be borne with fortitude." And again in the "Iвесides or Supplices" of Euripides, lines 531 et seq. edit. Cantab. 1694. Observe the happy coincidence of these passages with the account given by Moses, Gen. iii. 19, and with the Ecclesiastes of Solomon, ch. xii. v. 7. Add to this the iambic of Callimachus, where he calls Man "Promethean Clay," according to Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14, cited also by Eusebius in his Pref. Evang. xiii. 15. The term "Clay" is also used by Juvenal, sat. vii. 23, and sat. xiv. 33, as well as by Martial in book x. 39. of his Epigrams; ed. Lugd. Bat. 1661. Censorinus, in his treatise De die natavi, c. 4, observes, that it was the opinion of Democritus of Abdera, that men were first formed of water and clay; and Epicurus was nearly of the same opinion.—Grotius.

Maximus Tyrius, &c.] Maximus of Tyre, in his Dissertation 1. 5. edit. 1624, writes thus: "In all this wrangling and contention and difference of opinions, you may yet perceive one sentiment unanimous and universal,—that there is one God, the King and Father of all: and many other divine beings, sons of God, and partakers of his administration. This is affirmed by the Greek and the Barbarian; by the inhabitant of all places, whether inland or maritime; by the learned and the unlearned." Let me add the passages adduced in my second book 'De jure bellii et pacis,' c. 20. § 45, and that passage of Antisthenes, which is given by Cicero, "De natura deorum," 1. 18,—"that there are many popular gods, but One natural." And Lactantius, book 1. ch. 5. 18, has also cited from the same Antisthenes the following expression: that God alone is "the maker of the universe." There is a passage in Sophocles precisely to the same effect, quoted by Justin Martyr in a treatise addressed to the Gentiles, § 18, and in another on the Unity of God, § 2, by Clemens Alex. in his Exhortations, § 7, and in Strom. v. 14, by Eusebius in his Pref. Evang. xiii. 13; by St. Cyril against Julian, book 1. p. 32; by Athenagoras, Leg. § 5, and by Theodore in his Therapeutes, 7. p. 109. [Vide note 27 of this book.] See also a passage quoted from Varro by St. Augustine, De civitate Dei, book 4. ch. 31.—Grotius.

Josephus.] Near the end of his second book against Apion, Josephus observes, "that there is no city, whether Grecian or Barbarian, in which the customary observance of rest on the se
venth day, which we (Jews) keep holy, does not also prevail."—Grotius.

57, 58, 59. From Philo, from Ovid, from Tibullus.] See Philo on the Formation of the World, p. 15. E. where he says, that "the seventh day is a festival, not in one city or country, but in all." See also Ovid "De arte amandi," lib. 1. line 76. edit. Amst. 1727, and Tibullus, Eleg. 1. 3. 18. edit. Lond. 1715. But Ovid is speaking of those festivals which were also observed by the Roman women.—Grotius.

60. From Clemens Alexandrinus.] See his Strom. v. p. 256. ed. Sylburg. 1592, where he cites a passage of Hesiod respecting the sanctity of the seventh day, "the Περσίστερον εἰρόν ἡμέραν" and similar expressions from Homer and Callimachus. See also an extract from Aristobulus in book 13. ch. 12. of Eusebius. So again, Theophilus of Antioch, (see Justin Martyr, edit. Paris. 1742.) in his second book, § 12, to Autolycus, speaks of "the universal celebration of the seventh day." And Suetonius, in his Life of Tiberius, ch. 32, observes of Diogenes the Grammarian, that he was accustomed to dispute at Rhodes on the sabbath days.—Grotius.

We must take care to distinguish between the seventh day of the month and the last day of the week. See the remarks of John Selden on this subject in his work "De jure naturali et Genthini," book 3. ch. 17. edit. 1726—Le Clerc.

61. Lucian.] He speaks of the custom of boys playing on the seventh day, in his "Παραλογισμος," § 16.—Grotius.

62. Celtic.] This is evident also from the most ancient names of days among the Celtic nations, Germans, Gauls, and Britons; and Helmondus, book 1. ch. 83 or 84. edit. Franc. 1556. and Lubec, 1659, gives a similar account respecting the Sclavonians.—Grotius.

63, 64, 65. Philostratus, Dion Cassius, &c.] See the former, b. iii. ch. 13, speaking of the Indians; and the latter, b. xxxvii. 17, where he speaks of "the day which bears the name of Saturn:" to which he adds, that the custom of computing time by weeks has spread from the Egyptians over the whole world. Herodotus shows, book ii. 82; that this custom is of no recent date, but of the greatest antiquity. See also book v. of the Epistles of Isidorus, (surnamed Hispalensis,) chapters 30 and 33. edit. Paris. 1601, on the subject of the Romans.—Grotius.

It may be feared that they derived the origin of this weekly computation of time from the seven planets rather than from the period of seven days within which the world was created.—Le Clerc.

68, 69. *A state of simplicity and of nakedness.*] In respect to the former, see what I have stated in my second book De jure belli, c. 2. § 2. and in the notes on that passage. In the latter point the opinion of the Egyptians is thus stated by Diodorus Siculus, book 1, 8, "In the earliest ages, before the comforts of civilized life became known, men lived in great hardships, and in a state of nakedness, unaccustomed to houses and fires, and ignorant of the means of dressing their food." Plato says in his "Politica," p. 537. E. edit. Francof. 1602, that "the Deity fed the human race, and was himself their guardian; as the human race now, being a more divine class of animals, give food to other classes inferior to themselves." And again, "being naked, and without beds or furniture of any kind, they lived for the most part in a wild and wandering state." Dicearchus the Peripatetic, quoted by Porphyry in his fourth book, ch. 2, against animal food, and, in point of sense, by Varro also in his first book, 2, 16, "De re rustica," observes of the earliest times, "that, being of near affinity to the gods, men were of the best dispositions, and led such good lives, that they constituted the golden age."—Grotius.

70. *Which, according to Strabo, was celebrated even among the Indians.*] See Strabo, book 15. p. 715, where he introduces the Indian Gymnosophist, Calanus, thus speaking: "Formerly flour and meal were as abundant as dust now is: fountains flowing, some with water, some with milk: others also with honey, and wine and oil: but men, through this abundance, and these luxuries, became insolent, so that Jupiter, indignant at this state of things, swept them all away, and doomed mankind to a life of labour." Edit. Paris. 1620. [but that of Amsterdam 1707 is greatly superior.]—Grotius.

71, 72. *Maimonides has remarked that the accounts of Adam, of Eve, &c.*] In the passages translated by Philo Byblius from Sanchoniathon, the Greek Πρωτόγνος is the Hebrew וֹז; the Greek Α'pν is the Hebrew זַד; the two first mortals, discoverers of the fruits of trees: and in the most ancient sacred rites of the Greeks, the word Εΐζ was pronounced with acclamation, and a serpent at the same time was exhibited. These particulars are recorded by Hesychius, by Clemens in his Exhortations, p. 4. 43; and by Plutarch in his Life of Alexander, near the beginning, t. 1. p. 665. D. ed. Lut. Par. 1624. Chalcidius, in his Commentary on the Timæus, p. 245, at the end, says that, "according to Moses, God forbade the first mortals to eat the fruit of trees from which the knowledge of good and evil would steal
into their minds.” And the same author, in another place, p. 400, says, “The Hebrew accounts agree with these when they say that a soul was given by God to man by divine inspiration, which soul they call reason and a rational soul; but to dumb creatures and to wild beasts a being devoid of reason; live animals and beasts scattered by divine command over the earth; in the number of which was that serpent which ensnared the first of the human race by evil counsels.” See Maimonides, part 3. ch. 29, of his “Ductor Dubitantium.” — Grotius.

73. And modern writers.] See Ferdinando de Mendez de Pinto, [edit. Lond. 1683.] — Grotius.

74. Calamiansamians.] Inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

75. The computation of 6000 years.] The extract from Porphyry, given by Simplicius in his Comment. 46. fol. 123. 19. ed. Ald. Venet. 1527, on Aristotle, book 2, “de Coelo,” agrees well with this computation, stating that the chronological observations collected at Babylon, which Callisthenes sent to Aristotle, made the whole period to that time 1903 years, which differs but little from the date of the deluge. — Grotius.

76. Berosus of the Chaldeans, Manetho of the Egyptians, &c.] Josephus, book 1. ch. 3. 6. 9. of his “Jewish Antiquities,” quotes the books of these writers, still extant in his time, as well as other names, Acusilaus, Ephorus, Nicolaus of Damascus. It is said by Servius in his Commentary on the Æneid, viii. 51, that the Arcadians often reached the age of 300 years. — Grotius.

77, 78, 79. Pausanias, Philostratus, Pliny.] See Pausanias, ch. 22, in his account of the Spartans, where he mentions human bones of a preternatural size, which were shown in the Temple of Æsculapius at Asopus: and one bone in particular, drawn out of the sea, and formerly kept at Pisa, supposed to have belonged to Pelops. See the first book of his account of Elis, ch. 13, in his History of Greece, edit. Lips. 1696. And Philostratus, in his “Lives of the Heroes in the Trojan War,” in the beginning, p. 648. B. ed. Paris, 1608, says, “that many gigantic bodies were discovered at Pallene, either by the effects of rain or earthquakes. Pliny also, book 7, ch. 16, informs us, that in Crete a dead body was found in an erect posture, on the opening of a mountain in consequence of an earthquake, supposed by some to have been the body of Orion, by others, that of Eetion. It is recorded of Orestes, that his body, when dug up by command of the Oracle, was seven cubits long. And Homer, near a thousand years before Pliny, frequently complained of the decreasing size of the human species. So again Solinus, ch. 1. of his Polyhistor, speaks of every successive generation as being less than the preceding in point of stature. The remains of Orestes show the former size of men, for his
bones being found by the Spartans at Tegea, by oracular guidance, in the 58th Olympiad, were said to be, as above, seven cubits long. Other credible writers of antiquity even tell us, that, in the Cretan war, when a flood had torn the banks with great violence, a human body was found among the numerous chasms, as the waters subsided, of the immense length of 33 cubits!! and that L. Flaccus, the Roman lieutenant-general, and Quintus Metellus himself, being extremely desirous of seeing such a prodigy, actually beheld what they had refused to believe on report. See also St. Augustine, book 15. ch. 11, "De civitate Dei," where he mentions the extraordinary size of one of the human teeth called grinders, which he had himself seen. [See Stackhouse's History of the Bible, p. 93, and Genesis vi. 4.].—Grotius.

80. The bodies of men in former times of much larger size.] Josephus, book 5. ch. 2, 3, of his Jewish Antiquities, says, "that the race of giants still remained, whose bodies, in point of size and figure unlike those of other men, were an extraordinary sight, and the accounts of them very astonishing: their bones being shown to this day of a description almost incredible." Gabinus, in his account of Mauritia, according to Strabo, book 17. p. 829. B. said, that the bones of Antaeus, which were found by Sertorius, were of the length of 60 cubits when joined together. Phlegon, of Trallis, in the 11th chapter of his Treatise "De Mirabilibus," edit. Lugd. Bat. 1622, mentions a head dug up on Mount Ida, which was three times as large as the common size. He adds, ch. 12, that in Dalmatia many bodies were found, whose extended arms were sixteen ells in length. And again, ch. 19, he tells us, from Theopompus, that in Cimmerian Bosporus a human skeleton was found, the bones of which, joined together, were 24 cubits long. There is a little treatise of this same Phlegon, on cases of remarkable longevity, which I recommend to the notice of my readers.—Grotius.

That some men formerly, as well as at this day, were of unusual stature, or were taller than the generality of mankind by a few feet, I might not scruple to believe: but that all were of larger size is to me as incredible as the greater height of trees in former times, or the greater depth of rivers. In all these things, and others of a like nature, the proportion and correspondence of size are the same now as they were formerly; and therefore there seems no reason to believe that any change has taken place. On the subject of giants see "Oratio Theodori Ryckii de Gigantibus [post Dissertationem de primis]," at. Lugd. Bat. 1684.].—Le Clerc.

81. Catullus.] See the Epithalamium of Catullus on Peleus and Thetis, lines 397 et seq.

82. The spirits which minister unto him.] See what Plutarch has excellently said on the Egyptian deity Iaxis, t. 2. p. 360. D.
et4&j.f;,i8?elifrewisejtfaximu?.ofTyre,inhisfirstDissertation,
§ l&?ffiA*ifw:'fe,B.l!an(iJulian,in}ln§j-JI^m*)to;W JSijp,
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c{325}i.9.19," by Aristides, in the beginning of, i, p. 19,B.
edit, Paris, 1601, on the Goddess Minerva; by Porphyry de
Abtin, i.18, and elsewhere, i, by Janulichus, on the Mysteries
of the Egyptians, ii. 7, et seq., and in other places, and by a
writer older than any of them, Hostanes, quoted by Minutius,
unl, 1. According to Chalcidius above mentioned, Hesiod
asserts, that deserving objects enjoyed a providential care
through the agency of divine powers.—Grotius.
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See: HomeiV Odyssey, book vii. 1.,208, and "his
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85. Whence Varro, &c.] Censorinus, "De die natai," in the
beginning of ch. xxiii. edit. Hamburg. 1614, says, "Butnow I shall
trast of that period which Varro calls the Historical: for he
states three distinct epochs: the first, from the Creation to the
Deluge, which, from our ignorance of it, he calls the Unknown
period: the second, from that deluge to the first Olympiad,
which is called the Fabulous, from the fables which abound in
it; and the third, from that first Olympiad to the present times,
which is called the Historical, because the events of this period
are faithfully recorded in authentic history. The period which
Varro calls "unknown" the Hebrew Rabbins call "void." It
is observed by Paus, on the Eternity of the World, p. 748. E.
that the marine shells which are found on the tops of mountains
are evidence of the general deluge.—Grotius.

against Apion, observes, "This Berosus, adopting the most
ancient accounts, records the same events with Moses, both of the
Flood itself, and of the consequent destruction of the human
race, and of the Ark, in which the founder of our race,
Noah, was preserved, when it rested on the top of the Armenian
mountains." After giving the history of the Flood, Berosus has added (as the same Josephus tells us in the first book of his Jewish Antiquities, ch. iv. § 6. edit. Basil. 1544.) that "a part of this vessel still remains in Armenia, on the Gordian mountains, and that bitumen is occasionally brought away from it, which is especially employed as a charm."—Grotius.

87. Abdenus of the Assyrians. (Who wrote historical treatises on Cyprus, Delos, Arabia, and Assyria.) The passage is preserved by Eusebius, book ix. ch. 12, of his Præp. Evang.; and by St. Cyril, in his first book against Julian, p. 8. D. He says that, "after others, Sysithrus succeeded to the throne, and that Saturn forewarned him of a great flood to commence on the fifth day of the second decade of the month Desius (or June), and commanded him to place in safe concealment all the writings and works belonging to him in Heliopolis, in the country of the Sippari*. When Sysithrus had obeyed this injunction, he sailed immediately into Armenia, and was soon convinced of the divine prediction of a deluge. On the third day, when the violence of the storm had abated, he sent forth some birds to try whether any land might appear above the water; but they finding an immense tract of waters, and no place of rest, returned to Sysithrus: and after them others were sent out; and on the third trial, as the birds returned with their wings loaded with mud, the Gods took him away from the world: his vessel, however, which remained in Armenia, supplied the neighbouring inhabitants with pieces of wood which were used as amulets and charms. Sysithrus, and also Ogyges, and Deucalion, are names which have the same signification in different languages, as Noah has in the Hebrew language, in which he wrote; so that he expressed proper names in a manner intelligible to the Hebrews: so, for example, Alexander Polyhistor, writing the name Isaac in Greek, termed it Γεώργιος, as we learn from Eusebius, Præp. Evang. 9. 19, and we find many similar instances among all the historians. Philo, on rewards and punishments, p. 707. F. says that "the person in whose time the great flood happened was called by the Greeks Deucalion, and by the Chaldeans Noah." The Egyptians called Deucalion's flood the universal deluge, as we learn from Diodorus, book 1. 10, and Pliny says that it extended even to Italy: book 3. ch. 14. To

* The city of Sipharis was probably Kariath-Sepher, or Dabir. See the account of Sisithrus or Xisithrus, with reference to various authors, in Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. ii. edit. London, 1801, and "Fragments," No. xix. xx. vol. iii.—on the striking conformity between the Mosaic and the Indian accounts of Noah and the Deluge! See also Bryant, vol. ii. 4to. p. 214. Sisithrus, the wood of the Ark "by way of amulet," p. 217. &c.
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return to the translation of names into other languages, there is a remarkable passage to that purport in the beginning of "the Critics" of Plato, p. 1102. F. "that you may not be surprised (he says) if you often hear the names of barbarians expressed in Greek, it is proper briefly to explain the reason, which is this: When Solon proposed to introduce this account into his poetry, he found, on inquiring into the meaning of names, that the Egyptians, who first wrote on these subjects, had translated them into their own language; and accordingly, he ascertained the signification of names, and turned them in like manner into Greek." The passage taken from Abydenus is confirmed by that of Alexander Polyhistor, which St. Cyril has preserved in his first book against Julian, before mentioned, p. 8. C. stating that "Xisuthrus, after the death of his father Otiartes, reigned 18 years (which they term Σατέρον), and that in his time the great deluge happened: that Xisuthrus was saved by the previous communication of that event from Saturn, apprising him of the necessity of constructing for himself an ark, in which he should sail, together with birds and creeping things and beasts."—By the Assyrian and some other nations, the name of the supreme Being was derived from that star which (to use the words of Tacitus), of the seven planets governing the world, was borne aloft in the highest orb, and with the greatest power. At least, the Syriac word ב' which signifies God, [see the root ב in Parkhurst] was therefore translated Κρόνος by the Greek interpreters, because he was called ב' by the Syrians. Philo Byblius translates from Sanchoniatho, the appellation IIus the same, as Saturn. Eusebius quotes him Prep. Evang. 1. 10, and it immediately follows from the same author Philo, that Κρόνος was called Israel, 'Ισραηλ', by the Phoenicians. Now this is an error of the transcriber, who wrote 'Ισραηλ' for 'Ιλλυ which is often put for 'Ισφαηλ by the Greek Christians in that contracted form, whereas 'Ιλλу is (as we have said) the same as the Syriac ב', and the Hebrew ב'.—Grotius.

It is not unimportant to observe, in this history, that Deucalion, who is the same as Noah, is called 'Ανάφω Παράγει (γις) that is παράγει ἐσθ, vir-terre, "an husbandman," as Noah is called in Gen. ix. 20. See my remarks on that passage.—Le Clerc.

88. The dove which was sent forth. See the passage from Abydenus, in Plutarch's treatise on the question "whether superior sagacity and superior cunning be discoverable in land animals or in those of the water?" t. 2. p. 968. F. "They tell you," says he, "that a dove, sent out of the Ark, gave certain evidence to Deucalion of the flood, by its return in the first instance; and of the abatement of that flood in the second instance, when she flew quite away." Both in this extract, and in the passage from Alex Polyhistor in the preceding note, as well as in the books of
Nicolaus Damascenus, and Apollodorus, and in those writers added by Theophilus of Antioch, book 3 § 18, the word Λαόν is worthy of remark, as answering very evidently to the word הָעֵרוּן which is so frequently used for the Ark by Moses, in his account of the Flood; and so indeed that word is always translated by Josephus.—Grotius.

89. Lucian. Lucian has the following passage in his tract, relative to the *Syrian Goddess, § 12. (edit. Reitz. Amst. 1743.) when beginning to treat of the very ancient temple at Hierapolis. "The common report is that Deucalion, the Scythian, founded this temple: the same Deucalion in whose time there was so great a flood. The story is this, as I have heard it from the Greeks themselves: the race of men now existing was not the first: for the first race was totally destroyed. The present mortals are of a second stock, arising from Deucalion, and multiplied to an immense extent. It is reported of the first race, that they were guilty of many impious and unjust actions: they neither regarded their oaths, nor practised hospitality to strangers, nor charity towards the poor: and for these reasons a great calamity befell them. Suddenly the earth emitted vast quantities of water, torrents of rain fell, the rivers overflowed, and the sea rose to such a height, that the waters covered the whole surface of the earth, and all men were destroyed except Deucalion, who alone was left as the root of a second stock, on account of his prudence and piety. He was preserved in this manner: he put his wife, his sons and their wives into a great Ark which he had made; and swine, and horses, and lions, and serpents, and all other creatures, supported by the fruits of the earth, then followed him, by pairs, into the Ark. He received all, and without injury to himself, for they were under divine influence to be tame and gentle: thus they all sailed in one vessel, so long as the waters prevailed. These are the particulars which the Greeks give of Deucalion: but besides all this, there is a marvellous story at Hierapolis, about a vast chasm which opened in the earth at that place, and swallowed up all the waters. In consequence of which Deucalion built altars, and placed a temple sacred to Juno on the very spot: I have seen the chasm myself, and it is now a very small one under the site of the temple: but whether it were not larger formerly, and has become smaller, in course of time, I know not: but what I saw was small. As a memorial of this event there is a custom of bringing water, twice every year, from the sea to this temple. Not only the priests bring it, but all the people of Syria and Arabia;

and many persons go to the sea from the other side of the Euphrates, and all bring water; which they first pour out in the temple, and it runs into this chasm, which, small as it is, receives a vast quantity of water. In this process it is said that the rite or ceremony was instituted by Deucalion, both in remembrance of the general calamity, and of the personal blessing which he received. Such is the tradition about this temple."—Grotius.

90. Molo. [Molo was a philosopher of Rhodes, and it seems doubtful whether he and Apollonius were not the same person under different names.] Eusebius has given us his words, book 9. Præp. Evang. ch. 19. He says that "at the Deluge the person who survived it, with his sons, left Armenia (having been previously driven from his own possessions by his countrymen,) and when he had traversed the intermediate country, he arrived in the mountainous part of Syria, which was then uninhabited."—Grotius.

91. Nicolaus of Damascus] Josephus in the place before mentioned, (Jew. Antiq. book 1. ch. 4. § 6.) gives the following extract from Nicolaus of Damascus. See book 96. of Universal History: “Above Minyas, (which Strabo, book 14. p. 666. C. and elsewhere, calls Milyas; and so does Pliny, book 5. chapters 27 and 32.) there is an immense mountain in Armenia, called Baris, (vel Maris) on which it was supposed that many preserved their lives at the time of the Deluge; but that one gained the summit of it in an Ark, of which many fragments were preserved for a long time: [see note C. in the Appendix.] This person I take to be the same who is mentioned by Moses the Jewish lawgiver.”—To the above may be added Hieronymus, an Egyptian, who wrote an account of the Phœnicians; and Mnaseas; both of whom are mentioned by Josephus, in his Jewish Antiquities, i. 3. edit. Hudson. Perhaps also Eupolemus, who is quoted by Eusebius, from Polyhistor, in Præp. Evang. book 9. ch. 17.—Grotius.

92. 93. In parts of America: and even the observation of Pliny, &c.] In regard to the first, see Joseph Acosta, and Antonio Herrera Tordesillas, 1601. And the observation of Pliny coincides with those of Mela, 1. 11, and of Solinus, ch. 34. Compare the passage before given from Abydenus, note 87.—Grotius.

94. To the present day.] Theophilus, of Antioch, in the close of book 8. § 19, says, that the remains of the Ark were shown in his time. Epiphanius, t. 1. p. 39. C. ed. Paris. 1622, against the Nazareæan heretics, observes, that “to this very time the remains of Noah’s Ark are to be seen in the country of the Cordyceans.” St. Chrysostom, in his oration, see t. 6. p. 748. on “perfect Love,” says, “witness the mountains of Armenia, where the
Ark rested. Are not the remains of it preserved to this day for our admonition?" So Isidore Hispalensis, *Origenes,* &c. Paris, 1691, book 14. ch. 8, speaks of Ararath, a mountain of Armenia, "on which, it is recorded, the Ark rested after the Deluge; and even to this day some remnants of the beams which composed it are visible in that place." Add the words of Haiton, the Armenian, ed. Helmstadt. 1585, in the end of ch. 9. "There is in Armenia the highest mountain in the world, commonly called Ararath; and on the top of that mountain the Ark of Noah first grounded after the Deluge." Reference may be also made to *Geograph. Nubiens. Climat,* 4. part 6, and to the Itinerar. Benjamini, p. 61. ed. Lugd. Bat. 1633.—Grotius.

95. *The Cordyæan mountains.*] Which Moses calls Ararat, and the Chaldaean Expositors have translated Kardu, or Curdu: Josephus calls them Cordyæan; Curtius, Cordæan, (book 4. 40. in the beginning); Strabo, Gordyæan, book 16, in the beginning; so also Pliny, book 6. ch. 27. and Ptolemy, v. 19.—Grotius.

These and other observations which follow, relative to sacred geography, and to the founders of nations, have been examined purposely, and with much greater accuracy, since Grotius published them, by Samuel Bochart in his *Geographia Sacra,* the result of which affords additional weight to the arguments of Grotius.—Le Clerc.

96, 97, 98. *Japhet—Ion or Javon—and Hammon*] 96. Japhet is the very same word as Ἰαφέτ, for some pronounced the Hebrew τ, and others like the Greek φ; and the modern Germans and Dutch observe the same difference of pronunciation. St. Jerome has made this remark on the Hebrew letter, c. 11. fin. p. 596. C. in his Comm. on Daniel.

97. As to Ion or Javon, the word Ἰαος frequently occurs among ancient writers. See in the "Ἀχαρίης" of Aristophanes, v. 104, where the Persian uses the word Ἰαον. The custom of interposing a digamma between two vowels is of an older date; which afterwards began to be written υ, formerly thus Ψ, so αυς, which is now αυς and χα, Aurora; ταυς now ταυς, a peacock. And see the Scholiast on the *Acharn.* vers. 106. (Suidas), where he observes that the Greeks were called ταυς.

98. Then for the word Hammon, the Greeks sometimes use the aspirate, and sometimes omit it, in rendering the Hebrew ח, as תְּרוֹם 'אדרמונטוס or 'אדראומונטוס; so פּה 'אדראומונטוס, in Ireneus, i. 1, and other writers. So again, הָרָה, a female companion, is rendered Ἀρπα by ancient Greeks; הָרָה, 'אנה: הָרָה, Hamno or Anno; הָרָה, Hannibal or Annibal; so also Ḥםרא, Hasdrubal or Asdrubal; יָרָה 'אדּתִירָי; for νο is a Greek termination. The Hammon in our text, the father not only of the
African but of many other nations also, was deified by them as the star Jupiter: see Lucan ix. 517. The sacred writings add Egypt to Ham's portion. See Psalms, lxviii. 51. cv. 23. 27. cvi. 22. "From whom Egypt is called the country of Ham in the Egyptian language to this very day." See the passage in St. Jerome's "Questions Hebraicae in Genesim," tom. 2. p. 514. [edit. Parisiis, 1699.]—Grotius.

99. By Josephus and others.] See Jewish Antiquities, 1. 7. 1. [but the present note, like the preceding, does not properly admit of translation, as it is indispensably necessary to introduce the Greek and Hebrew characters, in tracing the vestiges of ancient names, in national and local etymologies. Consequently it cannot be made intelligible without reference to the original text. Suffice it to state to the English reader, that Grotius adduces many striking examples from various authors to prove the point in view; but it is a case in which the translator's object is defeated, and his office becomes useless! Readers, consulting the original, will here find a curious and satisfactory derivation of cities, people, and countries; rivers, mountains, and islands; from the language of the sacred historian; but to others it can afford no information to be told of as the origin of Τωραζεις; Μαγογ; Μαδος, &c. &c. The very nature of the subject, in this case, (as in the notes above given, 96 and 98,) makes an explanation of it hopeless to a translator; when the original languages themselves are the only means of explanation.] To proceed, however, with note 99, Josephus says that from is derived Τωραζεις, the Gomarites, now called Galatians or Gauls by the Greeks: see Dickinson (Edmund), " de Noae in Italian adventu:" Oxon. 1655. Pliny speaks of the town Comora, situated in that part; and Pomponius Mela, book 1, 2. speaks of the Comari, a people of Asia. Josephus also says that the Magogians, called Scythians by the Greeks, by whom Scythopolis in Syria was built, derived their name from Μαγογ; and another city, Magog, as mentioned by Pliny, (book v. ch. 23.) to which others give the names Hierapolis and Bambyce. The Medes seem to derive their name from Μαδος, and, as we have observed in note 97, Javones, Izones, Iiones, from יא. Josephus derives from הוב the Thobelians, now called Iberians, a people of Asia, in whose neighbourhood Ptolemy fixes the site of Thabialca, a city thus retaining the traces of its Hebrew original: see Ptolemy, v. 12. The city Mazaca, which he mentions v. 6, derives its name from מצל, and is mentioned also by Strabo, book xii. p. 537. D. ed. 1620; by Pliny, book vi. 3; and by Ammianus Marcellinus, book xx. 9. edit. 1693. There are also the Moschi, mentioned by Strabo, book xi. p. 492. D. and elsewhere; as well as by P. Mela, both in book i. ch. 2. and in book iii. ch. 5.: they are called Moschoni by Pliny, book vi. ch. 9; and the
montes Moschici are mentioned by them both: see Mela, i. 19, and Pliny, v. 27. Josephus and other writers unanimously deduce the Thracians from αλαμπάρνα, and indeed the word shows the derivation; particularly when it is observed that the Greek letter ξ corresponded with the Syriac letter ד from the first; which appears from its place in the alphabet. With respect to the derivatives from קַבָּשָׁה, the passage in Josephus is now faulty; but, doubtless, Ascania, mentioned by Homer as a part of Phrygia and Mysia, is derived from that word: see Strabo, book xii. p. 564. D. and Pliny, book v. ch. 32. So, likewise, the lake Ascanius, and from the lake the river of that name, according to the same Strabo, book xiv. p. 681. B.; and according to Pliny, in the chapter above mentioned, book v. ch. 32. There is also "Ascanius Portus," mentioned by Pliny, book v. ch. 30. in the beginning; and "Ascaniae Insulae," by the same writer, book iv. ch. 12. and book v. ch. 31. towards the end. From קַבָּשָׁה Josephus (in the same chapter as before) derives the people of Paphlagonia, whom others call Riphaeans, where the Riphaces are placed by Mela, book i. 2. So from קַבָּשָׁה Josephus deduces Αἰαλάξις, in which the Jerusalem paraphrast agrees with him, substituting Greeks for Eolians, the whole for a part; and Hellas, the name of the country, has a sound rather similar. So likewise from קַבָּשָׁה he derives the people of Cilicia, and quotes in proof of it their city Tarsus or Tarsos; for it frequently happens that the ancient names of nations give rise to the names of cities. I have already noticed the derivation of Κίκριον from סננה. From סננה the Αἰθιοπians call themselves, and are called by their neighbours, Chuseans or Chusites; and this was the case in the time of Josephus, as it is to this day. Hence too is derived the name of a river according to Ptolemy, iv. 1.; and the Nubian or Arabian geographer (edit. Paris. 1619) in Clim. i. part iv. and in Clim. ii. part iv., tells us that two cities of Αἰθiopiai still retain that name. So again, from סננה, (which Philo Byblius terms Μεσορίζω, according to Eusebius in his Præp. Evang. i. 10.) the Mesori, whom the Greeks call Αἰγυπτiains, are so denominated both by themselves and by the bordering nations, and they have a month called Μεσοφί. Cédrenus, in his Annals, p. 9. edit. Basil. 1566, calls the country itself Μεσοπαία. Another just remark of Josephus is this, that there is a river in Mauritania which takes its name from סננה: Pliny also mentions that river, book v. ch. 1. "Phut, and the district near it called Phutensis to this day," says St. Jerome in his "Quæstiones sive Traditiones Hebraicæ in Genesim," p. 556. F. It is not far from Fez, the name even now remaining. The word סננה, as Moses has it, is the same which Sanchoniatheo, and from him Philo Byblius, contracts into וּסֵנְנָה. You will find it in Eusebius, Præp. Evang. book i. ch. 10.—and the country itself is so called:
see Stephanus "de Urbibus," Lugd. Bat. 1694, where he says,
"Xvi, the country of Phoenicia, is thus denominated." And St.
Austin says, in his unfinished "Exposition of the Epistle to the
Romans," § 13. that the country people about Hippo, (where
he was born) if you asked them who they were, would tell you
that they were Canaanites. Both the names Mestraim and Ca-
nan occur also in a passage of Eupolemus, as cited by Eusebius
in Præp. Evang. ix. 17. From דאהיב is derived the name Re-
gema, in Arabia Felix, mentioned by Ptolemy, vi. 7.; which is
done by the change of י into י, as in Gomorrah and other words.
Josephus derives from סבא the name Sabæans, a nation well
known; whose principal city, Saba or Sabe, is mentioned by
Strabo, book xvi. p. 771. D; and where Josephus places the
Sabateni as derived from סבא, there we find in Pliny the city
Sobotale: see book vi. ch. 28. The word סבא differs but little
from the name ליבך, and came from Nepata, a city of
Æthiopia mentioned by Pliny, book vi. ch. 29.; nor from the
Napata of Ptolemy, iv. 7. and viii. tab. 4. of Africa. Neither is
the word מדר ולא very unlike the Pharus of Pliny, book v. 8.
and the Phaurusians in Äthiopia, mentioned by Ptolemy, iv. 6.
From יר we clearly derive Sidon, a city of note with all poets
and historians: so again, from ירבע, the townGerasa, which
Ptolemy speaks of, v. 15. From יראם we have Arca, a city of
Phoenicia mentioned by Ptolemy in the place just cited, and by
Pliny, book v. ch. 18. From יריבא comes the Island Aratus,
which is mentioned by Strabo, book xvi. p 756. D.; by Pliny,
book v. ch. 20.; and by Ptolemy (in Syria), v. 15., towards the
end. Amathus of Arabia, mentioned by Josephus in his Jewish
Antiq. xiii. 13. xiv. 5., and in his Jewish War, i. 6., is derived
from יריבא; as the Elymites contiguous to the Medes (see beg.
of book xvi. of Strabo) derive their name from יריבא: these
people are mentioned also by Pliny, book vi. chapters 25, 27, 34;
and by Livy, book xxxvii. 40. Their descendants in Phrygia
are called Élymi by Athenæus, book iv. 24. We all know the
derivation of Assyrian from יריא, as well as of the Lydians
from יריא, whence also the Latin word Ludi. From יריא those
people derive their own appellation whom the Greeks call
Syrians from the city יריא, for י is sometimes rendered by י
and sometimes by י; whence that city יריא, which the Greeks
call Tyre, is called Sarra by Ennius according to Probus on
Virgil's Georg. ii. line 506, while others call it Sina or Tina.
We find in Strabo, book xvi. towards the end, "The Poet
Homer speaks also of the Arimians, by whom Posidonius says
we should understand, not any particular part of Syria or of
Cilicia, or of any other country, but the whole of Syria itself."
Strabo likewise says, book xiii. p. 627. A., that some understand
the name Arimi to mean Syri, now called Arami. But in
book i. p. 42. A. he had expressly said that "the people whom
we call Syri (Syrians) are called by the Syrians themselves Arammæi." The Septuagint mention the country of Ausanis (Gr. Αὐσανίς) in Job, ch. i. ver. 1. which is deduced from ἀσάνοις, (see this word in the original text); and Aristæus calls it Ausitis, according to Eusebius, Prep. Evang. ix. 25. From असिर comes the city Cholla, which is placed in Syria; see Ptolemy, v. 15. From गिंदर club Gindar is the city, according to Ptolemy, v. 15.; and Gindareni the people (according to Pliny, v. 23.) in Cœle Syria. From एसिया is derived Masius the mountain, near Nisibi, according to Strabo, book xi. p. 527. C. and according to Ptolemy, in Mesopotamia, v. 18. near the beginning. From the names आसिया, एसिया, and एसिया, the Arabian geographers deduce Baisatjaktan, Hadramuth, and Chaulan, respectively, as that very learned man, Lewis Capellus, has remarked. The river Opharus, if I mistake not, shows the derivation of its name from ὀφαρα and the Opharite, a people of Sarmatia, on the borders of the Lake Maeotis, mentioned by Pliny, book vi. 7. It appears too, from collated manuscripts, that the cities which Moses here mentions are of the highest antiquity. In respect to Babylon this is perfectly well known. आराक is Aracca, which Pliny, book vi. 2. places in Susiana, whence Tibullus has his "campi Araccæi" (al. Arectei, lib. iv. eleg. 1. line 142. edit. Cantab. 1702), as was observed by Claudius Salmiasi (or Saumaisi), a man of most extensive reading, in his "Exercitationes Plinianæ in Solinum," p. 1194. col. 1. E. edit. Paris. 1629. Franciscus Junius (see Lat. Bible of Junius and Tremellius, edit. Hanov. 1596), a diligent expounder of the Scriptures, who has also anticipated many other remarks which we have made, agrees with us in thinking it a probable conjecture that Acabene is a corruption of Acadene, from आराक. The town of Callinisus on the Euphrates is deducible from आराक, and had retained that name to the time of Ammianus, as he informs us, book xxiii. 3. अराक is the "Σεναξρ τῆς Βασυλωνίας" according to Histiæus the historian of Miletus, in a passage preserved by Josephus, book i. ch. 4. of his Jewish Antiq, edit. Oxon. 1720, and by Eusebius in his Chron. Can. p. 13, as well as in his Prep. Evang. ix. 15. He wrote a history of Phænicia, which even Stephanus above mentioned had seen, vide v. Φαροτας. But further, by substituting the Greek γ for the Hebrew נ, Mount Singara in Mesopotamia has the same derivation according to Ptolemy, v. 18, in the beginning: but the town Singara occurs in Pliny, book v. ch. 24.; and hence the "Singarana Regio" in the Breviarium of Sextus Rufus, § xxvii. p. 1193. edit. Gruter. Hist. Aug. Minorum, Hanov. 1611.—Nineveh, Nineveh, is doubtless the same word as the more contracted name Ninus or Ninos of the Greeks. It occurs in the epitaph of Sardanapalus ("once a king in his great capital Ninus, now a little heap of dust!") according to Diodorus, ii. 23. edit. Amst. 1745, and Strabo,
book xiv. p. 672. B. edit. Paris. 1620. and Athenæus, viii. 3. edit. Lugd. 1612, and Tzetzes, in his "Chiliades," iii 453. edit. 1546; and in the Scholiast on the "Ωζωπες" of Aristophanes, line 1022. edit. Amst. 1710. The name occurs also in Theognis, in Strabo (a second time), book xvi. in the beginning, and likewise in book vi. ch. 13. of Pliny, where he speaks of "Ninos, built on the Tigris, with a western aspect, once a most distinguished seat of empire!" We have it also in Lucan, book iii. line 215, "Et felix, sic fama, Ninos!" see edit. Oudendorp. Lugd. Bat. 1728. Ptolemy also mentions that name in Assyria, vi. 1.—The "regio Calachena" (as I may translate it from Strabo) derives its name from the principal city תִּרוֹם: see Strabo, book xi. twice in pages 503. D. and 530. C.; and afterwards in the beginning of book xvi.—כַּט is the Resaina mentioned by Ammianus, book xxiii. 5.—The derivation of Sidon is universally known. Nobody can doubt the word כְּתַר (the letter כ being rendered by the Greek γ as before,) to be the Gaza of Palestine mentioned by Strabo, book xvi. p. 759; by Mela, book i. 11, who speaks of it as being large and well fortified; and by Pliny, book v. 13. book vi. 28. and in other places.—חֵסֶד is Heliopolis, a city of the Sippari, in the passage of Abydenus, already quoted from Eusebius in note 87; the Sipphara in Mesopotamia, mentioned by Ptolemy, v. 18.—וֶא is Ur, a castle or town recorded by Ammianus, book xxv. 8.—מַד is the town of Carœ or Carrœa, memorable from the fate of the rich M. L. Crassus and his son.

—Grotius.

100. The attempt to scale heaven.) See the first book of Homer's Odyssey, 312; the first book of Ovid's Metamorph, 152; the first Georgic of Virgil, 280; and the seventh book of Lucan, 145. It is a common mode of speaking among all nations to use the phrase "reaching to heaven" when things are raised to an unusual height: it occurs frequently in Homer; see also the first chapter, verse 28, and the ninth chapter, verse 1, of Deuteronomy. Josephus, in his Jewish Antiquities, i. 4. quotes a passage of some Sybil on that intemperate step, the construction of the Tower (of Babel), where she says, that, "when one language was spoken by the whole human race, some men must needs build a tower of immense height, as if they thought to mount by it to heaven: but the Gods overthrew the Tower by a storm, and gave to each a particular language; from which the appellation Babylon was given to the city." Eusebius in his Prep. Evang. ix. 14., and St. Cyril in his first book against Julian, p. 9. D., have given us the following extract from Abydenus: "We are told that the first race of men, boastful of their strength and size, and thinking themselves superior to the Gods, raised a pile of towers of vast height, where Babylon now stands; and as they advanced towards heaven the
winds assisted the Gods in throwing down the building on their heads; and the name Babylon was given to the ruins: and whereas men had hitherto been of one speech or language, a confusion of various languages was inflicted on them by the Gods. The war between Saturn and Titan afterwards took place.” Berosus has told us that the Greeks erroneously reported Semiramis to have founded Babylon; and so indeed we are told by Josephus in his 1st book, § 20, against Apion: and the same erroneous report is also refuted by Philo Byblius, according to Stephanus of Byzantium, “de Urbibus,” Lugd. Bat. 1694, v. Βασιλείας, as well as by Dorotheus of Sidon, (mentioned by Julius Firmicus, “Mathesis,” ii. 32. Basil. 1551). See Salmasius (Saumaise), “Exercitationes Plinianæ in Solinum,” p. 1227, edit. Paris. 1629. See also what Eusebius has cited from Eupolemus in regard to the Giants and the Tower, in the ninth book of his Praep. Evang. chap. 17. Paris. 1628.—Grotius.

101. The destruction of Sodom by fire is related by Diodorus Siculus.] See his sixth book, p. 98, where, after describing the lake Asphaltites, he says, that “the inhabitants of the neighbouring country are unhealthy and short-lived from the subterraneous fires and fetid exhalations to which it is subject.—Grotius.

See also on this point, my “Dissertation on the Fire of Sodom,” subjoined to the Pentateuch, in my Commentary on the Old Testament.—Le Clerc.

102, 103, 104, 105. By Strabo, by Tacitus, by Pliny, by Solinus.] See Strabo, book xvi., after his description of the lake: “There are many other signs (he says) of the existence of fire in this country: burnt and rugged rocks appear about Massada, and frequent excavations; earth mixed with cinders; drops of bitumen oozing from bare places; hot offensive streams, and scattered remains of fallen habitations; so as to render very credible the reports current in that neighbourhood with respect to the former existence of thirteen cities, (the chief of which, Sodom, was sixty stadia in circumference,) but in consequence of earthquakes, and fiery eruptions, and boiling sulphureous waters, a bituminous lake was formed, and the rocks became heated; while the cities were, in some instances, suddenly swallowed up, and, in others, deserted by the terrified inhabitants, if able to effect their escape.” [103.] Tacitus writes as follows, book v. 7. of his History: “At a small distance from the lake lie those wide-extended plains which, tradition says, were formerly a rich and fruitful country, abounding with populous cities, (Sodom, Gomorrah, Adnak, Zebœum; see Genesis xiv. 2, and xix. 24, 25.) but long since destroyed by fire from heaven, and now a barren desert.”
the ruins which still remain, we are told that the marks of celestial vengeance may be clearly traced; and that the soil, consumed and parched, has lost the powers of vegetation. Whatever the earth produces, whether by the prolific vigour of nature or by the cultivation of man, nothing ripens to perfection. The herbage may shoot up, and the trees may put forth their blossoms; they may even attain the usual appearance of maturity; but with this florid outside, all within turns black, and moulders into dust!—Murphy. [104.] So likewise Pliny describes the lake Asphaltites in his fifth book, ch. 16. and in his thirty-fifth book, ch. 15. [105.] And again, Solinus tells us, in ch. 35. of the edition by Salmasius, (see his Exercit. Plinianæ in Solinum, 1629,) that "at some distance from Jerusalem, a dismal bay or lake opens on the sight, evidently struck by lightning, from the black appearance of the soil, in a state reduced to ashes. There were formerly two towns there, Sodom and Gomorrah; but if any fruit should grow thereabouts, even to a seeming state of maturity, it is still not eatable; for the external rind contains only soot and ashes within, emitting a smoke at the slightest touch, and crumbling into a light powder."—Grolius.

106. Circumcision attested by Herodotus.] See the passage in his Euterpe, § 104; but its purport is in some respects erroneous. "The inhabitants of Colchis, the Egyptians and the Ethiopians, (he says) were the only people who originally practised circumcision; the Phoenicians and the Syrians in Palestine confess that they adopted this custom from the Egyptians. But the Syrians near the rivers Thermodon and Parthenius, and the Macrones of Cappadocia their neighbours, say that they learnt it at no distant date from the Colchi. These, then, are the only people who observe this rite, and they imitate the Egyptians in this respect exactly. But in regard to the Egyptians themselves and the Ethiopians, I cannot say which of them originally learnt this custom from the other." Josephus says very truly that in Syrian Palestine none practised circumcision but the Jews: see his Jewish Antiquities, book viii. ch. 4. and his first book, § 22. against Apion. See Juvenal's remark on them, Sat. 14. line 99. And Tacitus in his History, book v. 5. (see preceding note 26,) says that the Jews established that rite as "a mark of national distinction." See also Strabo, book xvii. p. 824. B. But so far were the Jews from confessing that they ever received this custom from the Egyptians, that, on the contrary, they maintain expressly that the Egyptians learnt it from the Patriarch Joseph: see the author of the Lexicon Aruch, cited by that eminent theologian, John Drusius, in the sixth book of his "Præterita," on i Cor. vii. 17. edit. Amstel. 1632. [See note D in the Appendix.] Not that circumcision was universal among
the Egyptians as it was among the Jews, as we may learn in the instance of Apion, who was an Egyptian, according to the 2d book of Josephus against him, § 13. Herodotus, doubtless, wrote Phoenicians instead of Idumæans, as Aristophanes does in his Play "Ουκρατο, or " The Birds," l. 507, where he calls the Egyptians and Phoenicians, ψωλής, circumcised. Ammonius in his treatise "Περὶ Ομανων," at the word ἴδουαι, says that "the Idumæans were not originally Jews, but Phœnicians and Syrians." But those Ethiopians who received circumcision were descendants of Keturah (Gen. xxv. 1.), as we shall show presently. The Colchi and their neighbours were descendants of the ten tribes carried into captivity by Shalmaneser. Thence some of them passed into Thrace. The scholiast on the "Αχαρίτης", of Aristophanes observes, that "the Odoni are a people of Thrace: they are said to be Jews." Where Jews are improperly put for Hebrews, which is often the case. From the Ethiopians the practice of circumcision was carried across the sea into the new world, if the accounts of that practice, in various parts of it, be true.—Grotius.

The learned have their doubts whether circumcision originated with the Egyptians or with the Hebrews: see my remarks on this subject, Gen. xvii. 10.—Le Clerc.

107, 108, 109. Diodorus, Strabo, and Philo Byblius.] The former says, book i. 55. of the people of Colchis, that "their use of the rite of circumcision exactly like the Egyptians is a strong argument in proof of their Egyptian origin, whose practice in this respect has continued in this colony, as it has also done among the Jews." But, since the Hebrews practised circumcision from very early times, circumcision is no more a proof that the Colchi descended from the Egyptians, than it is that they descended from the Hebrews, according to the opinion which we have advanced. He says again, book iii. 32. that the Troglodytes, who were also a people of Ethiopia, observed the same practice. "The Troglodytes (as Strabo says, book xvi. p. 776. A.) in some instances adopt the practice of circumcision like the Egyptians:" but in p. 761. C. of the same book he ascribes this practice to the Jews. See Philo Byblius, in his strange account about Saturn, according to Eusebius, book i. ch. 10. Ecclesiastical History.—Grotius.

110. By the nations descended from Abraham.] Even Theodotus, a Phœnician historian, in his poem on the Jews, has told us that the precept enjoining circumcision was first given to this very patriarch: see Eusebius, book ix. ch. 22. of his Præp. Evang. —Grotius.

111. The Idumæans, the Ishmaelites and others.] The Idumæans were so called from Esau (who is called Ουρωθ by Philo Byblius; P. E. 1. 10.) for Esau had also the name Edom (in Hebrew
Red: see Gen. xxv. 25. 30.) which the Greek translate ἔρυθραν; hence the Erythraean or Red Sea, because the ancient territories of Esau and his posterity extended to that sea. Writers who were ignorant of the origin of these people, have, as we observed before, confounded them with the Phœnicians. Ammianus says that the Idumæans practised circumcision; and Justin says the same, in his dialogue with Trypho, § 28: and so does Epiphanius, t. 1. p. 160. D. ed. Paris, 1622. against the Ebionites; who also tells us that a part of these Idumæans, the Hœmerites, observed the same practice even in his own time.—Grotius.

112. Ishmaelites.] Circumcision is of a very ancient date among the Ishmaelites, but it was used at the same period of life as in the case of Ishmael, the age of thirteen years. Josephus says, book i. chapters 12. and 13, that a child was born unto Abraham and Sarah in extreme old age; and they circumcised him on the eighth day, which is the age observed by the Jews, after him, for circumcising their children: but the Ishmaelites do not perform that rite till the age of thirteen; for Ishmael, the father of their nation, who was a son of Abraham by Hagar his concubine, was circumcised at that age. Origen, in his beautiful dissertation against Fate, which is also preserved by Eusebius, book vi. ch. 11, as well as in that Greek collection entitled "Φιλοκαλία," ch. 22. has the following passage: "I know not how it can be maintained that almost all the Jews are born under such a configuration of the planets that they must be circumcised on the eighth day; mutilated, lacerated, with an infliction of sores and wounds, so as to have need of medical treatment on their first entrance into life; whereas that of the Ishmaelites in Arabia is such at their nativity, that they must all be circumcised at the age of thirteen years; which is said to be the case with them." Epiphanius, disputing against the Ebionites, has rightly stated these Ishmaelites to be the Saracens, for the Saracens have always observed this custom, and from them the Turks adopted it.—Grotius.

113. And others.] The others who attest the antiquity of this custom are the descendants of Abraham by Keturah: see the following memorable passage from Alexander Polyhistor, preserved by Josephus, book i. ch. 16. and by Eusebius in his Præp. Evang. book ix. ch. 20: "Cleodemus the prophet, who is also called Malcha, writing a history of the Jews, as Moses their lawgiver has also done, mentions the names of three children out of the number of Abraham's children by Keturah: these are Afer, Assur, and Afra. He says that Assyria derived its name from Assur, and that the city Afra and the continent of Africa took their names from Afra and Afer: that they joined with Hercules in fighting against Libya and Antaeus; and that Hercules, having married Afra the daughter, had a son by her
named Dedorus, whose son Sophon was the progenitor of that race of barbarians who were named after Sophon. Here follow other names, which, through the fault of transcribers, neither correspond with the Mosaic account nor with the writings (as we have them) of Josephus and Eusebius, when compared together; but Afer, without doubt, is the of Moses: see Gen. xxxv. 4.

By Hercules we are not to understand the Théban Hercules, but a Phénician of much older date, who is mentioned by Philo Byblius, quoted by Eusebius in the 10th chapter (to which we have often referred) of his first book of Prep. Evang. This is the self-same Hercules who, according to Sallust, led his army into Africa: see ch. 18. of the Jugurthine War. We see, therefore, from what source the Ethiopians, a great portion of the people of Africa, derived their custom of circumcision; which they had even in the time of Herodotus, and which the Christian part of them still retain, not on a principle of religious obligation, but out of reverence towards a custom of such high antiquity.—Grotius.

114, 115. Accounts of Abraham, &c. were formerly extant in Philo Byblius.] Scaliger is of opinion that some particulars which Eusebius has preserved for us from Philo Byblius undoubtedly relate to Abraham: consult Scaliger himself in his “Emendatio Temporum,” corrected and enlarged, with an Appendix “Fragmenta Veterum,” &c. p. 48. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1598. and Col. Allob. 1629. But it still seems to me a matter of some doubt.—Grotius.

116, 117, 118. In Berosus, Hecateus, and Damascenus.] The passage from Berosus is preserved by Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, book i. ch. 7, where he says that “in the tenth generation after the Flood, there lived among the Chaldeans a certain just man, of high distinction, skilful in heavenly matters.” The order of time makes it evident that this account applies properly to Abraham. The book of Hecateus (an historian of Miletus, above 500 years before the Christian Æra,) in relation to Abraham is now lost, but it was extant in the time of Josephus. [But Le Clerc here observes that this book was extant with
reason, suspected to be a forgery: and he refers us to Vossius, book 10. de Hist. Graecis, edit. Amst. 1701.

Nicolaus of Damascus was a distinguished scholar, and on terms of intimacy with Augustus and with Herod: some remains of his works have been lately presented to us by that eminent man, Nicolas Claude Fabri Peiresc, whose death is an incredible loss to the cause of literature, and to all learned men! Josephus in the place above mentioned gives us the following passage from Nicolaus: he says, that "Abraham reigned in Damascus, having come thither a stranger with his army from the land of the Chaldeans, beyond Babylon: and not long after his arrival, migrating from this country also with his people, he went into the land which was then called Canaan, but now Judæa; where he dwelt, and his numerous descendants, of whom I shall give some account in another part of my work. The name of Abraham to this day is recorded with honour in the country about Damascus, where a street is shown as being named after him on account of his place of residence."—Grotius.

119, 120, 121. Artapanus, Eupolemus, Demetrius.] In the 9th book of the Praep. Evang. of Eusebius, chapters 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, we find extracts, in the names of these writers, from Alexander Polyhistor, but they are too long to be transcribed in this place. They were cited by no author before Eusebius; but the account of the Bætylia (or consecrated stones which were objects of Phœnician idolatry), related by Eusebius in his Praep. Evang. book i. ch. 10. from Philo Bybius, was probably derived from the altar which Jacob built at Bethel: see Gen. xxxv. 7.—Grotius.

122. That very ancient author who composed the Orphic verses.] See Strom. 5. p. 259. ed. Sylburg. 1592, of Clemens Alexandrinus, where the passage cannot possibly be understood of any other person than Abraham. See also Eusebius, book 13. ch. 12. The remarkable epithet ἄνικος Ἐχέι is there applied to Abraham, as in Isaiah, ch. li. 2. τις Unicus. We have already seen, even in Berosus, that Abraham was celebrated for his knowledge of astronomy; and according to Eusebius, Praep. Evang. 9. 17. Eupolemus says of Abraham, that "he was the founder of that science; and of the Chaldean system."—Grotius.

I should hardly venture to appeal gravely to these Orphic verses, when Orpheus himself perhaps never existed; and many things are ascribed to him partly by Jews and partly by Christians; besides the idle trash, I know not what, invented by some superstitious heathen: See John Gerard Vossius in his tract De Poetica, ch. xiii. in edit. Amst. 1701.—Le Clerc.

123. Extant in Justin, from Tragus Pompeius.] Book xxxvi. ch. 2. The Jews came originally from a very celebrated part of
Syria, of which Damascus was the capital, where Abraham and his descendants of the race of Jacob were afterwards kings. We find that Trogus Pompeius, as well as Nicolaus, gave them this regal title (see note 118) from the sovereign authority which they exercised over their own families: Hence they are termed Χριστολ, "Anointed," in Psalm cv. 15.—Grotius.

124. Moses—recorded by almost all those writers.] See Eusebius, book 9 before mentioned, chapters 26, 27, 28. The passages there cited from the Hebrew tragic poet, Ezekiel, (who wrote a Greek tragedy on the subject of Moses,) are well founded and true; and they are, in part, preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus, who reports from the books of the priests that Moses by his word slew an Egyptian; and in the same place, Strom. 1. 23. Clemens mentions some circumstances relative to Moses, from Artapanus, which are not quite correct. Justin, from Trogus Pompeius on the subject of Moses, ch. 36. 2. says, that "when Moses was appointed leader of the banished Jews, he took away by stealth the sacred utensils of the Egyptians; and that when the latter endeavoured to recover the spoil by force of arms, they were compelled by storms to return home; when Moses, repairing to his ancient native country of Damascus, took possession of Mount Sina." There is in what follows a mixture of truth and fable: and where we find the name Arvas (as Justin writes it) we must understand him to mean Arnas, that is Aaron, not the son, as he imagines, but the brother of Moses, and a priest."—Grotius.

125. His preservation from the water; the two tables, &c.] These are mentioned in the Orphic verses, as the great Scaliger has corrected them, where, instead of the word υλογεστα, (as quoted by Eusebius from Aristobulus, book 13. ch. 12. of the Præp. Evang,) we are told by Scaliger to read βοογεστα, "by the slight alteration of one letter into another nearly similar; and that very ancient writer of the Orphics, whoever he was, annexes this passage to the observation which he had made relative to the existence of One God, the proper object of worship, the Creator and Governor of the whole world.—Grotius.

126, 127. What is said by Polemon; and frequent passages from the Egyptian writers, &c.] Polemon appears to have lived in the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes: see on this subject the very useful work of the celebrated John Gerard Vossius, "De histor. Graecis." Amst. 1701. Africanus ascribes the accounts of Græcia to him; a work otherwise termed "Ελλαδικων" by Athenaeus, 11. 8. and 13. 8. His words are these: "Under Apis, the son of Phoroneus, part of the Egyptian army went out of Egypt, and they settled in that district of Syria which is called Palestine, not far from Arabia." As Africanus has preserved the passage of Polemon, so has Eusebius preserved that of Africanus.
in his "Chronicon," p. 25. The frequent passages from Egyptian writers are given in the 1st book of Josephus against Apion, 26, 32, 34, but full of falsehoods, as coming from a people who harboured the most violent hatred against the Jews; and from the same source Tacitus also derived his accounts. But it appears, on comparing all these writers with each other, that the Hebrews, from an Assyrian origin, became possessed of a part of Egypt, and there led a pastoral life; till, oppressed by laborious servitude, they departed from Egypt under their leader Moses, accompanied also by some of the Egyptians; and, taking their route through Arabia, they at length reached the Syrian Palæstine, where they adopted certain institutions contrary to those of the Egyptians. But Josephus, in that very learned work, has admirably shown in what manner the Egyptian writers have adulterated this history with false accounts one with another, and how some of them have even contradicted themselves; and by how many ages their accounts are surpassed by those of Moses in point of antiquity.—Grotius.

128, 129, 130, 131. Egyptians, Idumæans, Arabs, and Phœnicians.] The Israelites had departed forcibly from Egypt, and had abolished the institutions and customs of that country. See Philo's works, not only in that against Flaccus, but also in the account of his embassy to Caligula, on the implacable hatred of the Egyptians against the Jews: see also Josephus in both his books against Apion. The Idumæans inherited that ancient animosity which subsisted between Jacob and Esau, inflamed by a new cause when Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border: see Numbers xx. 21. The Arabs are the descendants of Ishmael: (see note 113.) And by the Phœnicians we are to understand the Canaanites and neighbouring nations, in a state of perpetual hostility against the Hebrews.

132. Diodorus Siculus.] In his first book, 94. treating of those nations who ascribe the origin of their laws to the Gods, Diodorus mentions Moses, among the Jews, invoking God by the name Iao: now this appellation is the Hebrew יהוה Jehovah, as it was pronounced both by the Oracles, and in the Orphic verses recorded by the ancients, as well as by the Basilidian and other Gnostic heretics. The Tyrians, as we learn from Philo Byblius, Prepar. Evang. I. 9. pronounced it Ίαω others ιας, as in Strom. 5. 6. of Clemens Alexandrinus. The Samaritans termed it ιας, as we read in Theodoret. quest. 15. on Exodus. The oriental nations indeed use different vowels in pronouncing the same syllable, and hence arises a great difference in the names which occur in the Old Testament. It is justly observed by Philo, on the Life of Moses, p. 476. E., that there is in this word ייהוה a signification of permanent existence. [See Parkhurst.] Of those writers, besides Diodorus, who have mentioned...
Moses, the exhortation to the Greeks which is ascribed to Justin, § 9, recounts the names of Polemon, Apion, Ptolemy of Mendes in Egypt, Hellanicus, Philochorus, Castor, Thallus, and Alexander Polyhistor. St. Cyril also mentions some of these names in his first book, p. 15. C. against Julian.—Grotius.

On the true etymology and signification of this divine title מֹשֶׁה, I have written fully in my Commentary on Exodus vi. 3.

—Le Clerc.

133. Strabo.] The passage is in the sixteenth book of Strabo, p. 760. D., where he adopts an opinion from Egyptian authors that Moses was an Egyptian priest; as appears from Josephus, C. A. 1. 26. Afterwards he states his own tenets (though not without some errors) saying, that "Many who worshipped the Deity agreed with Moses; for he said and taught that the Egyptians had a false notion of the Divine Being, when they made images of wild beasts and cattle to represent the Deity: so likewise had the people of Africa; and the Greeks also, who made representations of him in human shape: that this alone was God who comprehends us all, and the earth, the sea, the heaven (as we call it), and the world, and universal nature. What man, of proper intellects, would dare to liken this Being to any visible object? Consequently, every kind of carved image was to be avoided; and it became us, by setting apart some special place, and a temple worthy of distinction, there to worship him without any earthly representation." This, he adds, is the firm persuasion of good men. He mentions, that sacred rites were instituted by Moses, neither burthensome in point of expense, nor rendered odious by the madness of enthusiasm. He notices the rite of circumcision, the prohibition of particular kinds of food, &c.; and after having shown man's natural desire of civil society, he observes that this desire is encouraged both by human and divine precepts, but with the greatest efficacy by the latter.—Grotius.

134, 135, 136. Pliny, Tacitus, Dionysius Longinus.] Pliny observes, book xxx. c. 1., that there is "another sect of Magicians which sprang from Moses." See also Juvenal Sat. 14. line 101: and the fifth book, § 3, of the Histories of Tacitus, where Moses is mentioned as "Unus Exulum," one of the number "abandoned to their misery in a wild and barren desert," in contradiction to the fabulous accounts of the Egyptians. Dionysius Longinus lived in the time of the emperor Aurelian, and was a favourite of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. After having observed, in his "Treatise on the Sublime," that they who speak of God should be careful to represent him as great and pure and without mixture, he instances the language of the Jewish lawgiver,—no common character,—whose conceptions and whose expressions respecting the Divine Power were of suitable dignity,
where he says, immediately in the introduction of his subject, God said,—what? " Let there be light, and there was light."
" Let the dry land appear,—and it was so;" edit. Toup. Oxon., 1778.—Chalcidius has taken much from Moses, and thus speaks of him, p. 372: " Moses was a man of consummate wisdom; not merely invigorated by human eloquence, but, as they relate, by divine inspiration;" edit. Lugd. Bat. 1617.—Grotius.

Longinus was of too late a date to justify our reliance on his authority; to say nothing of his having addressed himself to Zenobia, a woman of the Jewish nation.—Le Clerc.

137, 138, 139. Pliny also, and Apuleius as well as the Talmudists, &c.] See the passage of Pliny before mentioned, in note 134. 138. See the second part of the "Apology" of Apuleius, p. 320. edit. 1624. [In some editions his celebrated defence against the charge of magic has been divided.] 139. See also the Gemara of the Talmudists, under the title "Oblations," in the chapter on "all the oblations of the Synagogue." See likewise Liber אמרי רמב"ג, Tanchuma, seu Consolatio, which is also entitled יjamnanu: i.e. docebit me, quia eo vocabulo sæpè utitur. Est Miḥrash, seu Comm. in Legem. Verona, 1594. The chief magicians of Pharaoh are there mentioned, and their conference with Moses is related: to which may be added the following passage from the third book of Numenius concerning the Jews, which is given by Eusebius, book ix. ch. 8: "Then Jannes and Mambres, Egyptian Scribes, of the sacred Order, were thought to be inferior to none in the exercise of magical arts, at the time when the Jews were driven out of Egypt; and consequently these men were selected out of all the Egyptians as the most proper to withstand Musæus the Jewish leader, a man of most powerful intercession with God; and they were believed to be the most capable of repelling those very severe plagues which were brought upon Egypt by Musæus. Moses is here called Musæus, a name somewhat similar, and familiar to the Greeks, just as the name Jesus has been sometimes changed into Jason, and Saul into Paul. Origen, in his fourth book, § 51. against Celsus, refers us to the same passage of Numenius: and, according to Eusebius above mentioned, book ix. ch. 27, Artapanus calls these magicians "priests appointed over Memphis;" whom, he says, the king threatened to put to death, unless they performed miracles equal to those of Moses.—Grotius.

139*. See Exod. ch. vii. ver. 11. — "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses," &c. 2 Tim. ch. iii. ver. 8.—Grotius.

the same works, where, § 14, he treats of fish and other animals prohibited as articles of food. See also a passage of He
catus, as given by Josephus, in his first book, § 22, against Apion; and by Eusebius in his Prep. Evang. book ix. ch. 4.— In the
histories of Justin and Tacitus you have the law which enjoins
an avoidance of foreign customs, and that against the use of
swine's flesh, both in Tacitus, and the 14th Satire, line 98, of
Juvenal: see also the fourth Symposiac, ch. 5. of Plutarch, and
the Saturnalia (or collection of Antiquities) of Macrobius: edit.
Lond. 1694. In Plutarch, too, in the above-cited place, you
will find mention made of the Levites and of the Feast of Ta
bernacles. Then, among the Pythagoreans, see the following
passage of Hermippus, in his Life of Pythagoras, cited by Jo
sephus in his first book against Apion, § 22: "These things," he
says, "Pythagoras did and taught, copying and adopting the
opinions of the Jews and Thracians; in truth this man trans
ferred many parts of the Jewish laws and institutions into his
own system of philosophy." "Not to feed on animals that die
a natural death," is a precept of Pythagoras, according to He
rocles, p. 298. ed. Lutet. 1585. and Porphyry in his Epistle to
Anebo, § 26: see "Jamblichus de Mysteriis," &c. Oxon. 1678, and
Bat. 1701: see Leviticus vii. 24. and Deut. xiv. 21'. So like
wise "not to wear images of the Gods engraven on rings," is
another precept of Pythagoras, according to Jamblichus, (who
wrote the Life of that Philosopher,) in his "Hortat. ad Philo
sophiam," edit. Francq. 1598: see § 42; and according to Dio
genès Laertius also, book viii. 17. edit. Amst 1693: a precept
evidently taken from the second article of the Decalogue;
"Take not away what thou hast not placed" is, according to
Josephus, a Jewish maxim (see his second book against Apion);
and a Pythagorean maxim, according to Philostratus. Jambli
chus, in his Life of Pythagoras, § 99, states it as a precept of
that philosopher "not to hurt nor destroy a growing and fruit
bearing tree," which is also a precept of the Jewish laws: see
Deut. xx. 19.—The writer whom I have already mentioned,
Hermippus ascribes to Pythagoras the injunction of not passing
over a place on which an ass has been seen in a kneeling posture;
which may be traced to the account given in Numbers xxii. 27.
It is admitted by Porphyry that Plato also adopted many things
from the Hebrews, as Theodoret observes in his discourse
against the Greeks, i. p. 6: and some of them are pointed out

I suspect, however, that Hermippus or Josephus, in the fore
going extract, should have written "Idaeans" instead of "Jews;
that is, the priests of Jupiter Idaeus in Crete, whom Pythagoras
went to see. See what Sir John Marsham has collected con
cerning these priests, in the tenth Cent. of his "Chronicus
Canon Ægyptiacus, &c." edit. Lond. 1672.—Le Clerc.
Book I.

142. By Strabo, and by Justin from Trogus.] After having given an account of Moses, Strabo says, book xvi. p. 761. C. that "his successors for some time continued to observe the same institutions; just and devout men as they truly were," and a little before, he remarks that "the true disciples of Moses were practical worshippers of the Deity, and men of good moral principles." So likewise Justin, book xxxvi. ch. 2, speaking of the equity and the piety of their kings and priests, says that "it was incredible how much they were united." Aristotle also, according to his disciple Clearchus, in his second treatise on Sleep, transcribed by Josephus, C. A. i. 22, afforded a strong testimony to the wisdom and erudition of a Jew whom he had seen: and Tacitus, among many falsehoods, makes this assertion with truth, "that the object of Jewish worship was that supreme and eternal Being, unchangeable and immortal; that is, God, 'ineffable and invisible,' as Dion Cassius expresses himself, when speaking of the same Jews:" see book xxxvii. 17.—Grotius.

143. Elias.] Eusebius in his Prepar. Evang. book ix. ch. 30, informs us that Eupolemus wrote on the prophetic office of Elias (or Elijah) and in the 39th chapter of the same book he cites a passage likewise from Eupolemus concerning the prophecies of Jeremiah.—Grotius.

144. The account of Jonah is given by Lycophron and by Aeneas of Gaza.] At verse 33 of the passage quoted from Lycophron, Tzetzes, in his Scholia on that Author, edit. Potter, 1697, speaks of the term of "three days being passed within the body of a whale." And Aeneas of Gaza in his dialogue entitled "Theophrastus," p. 26. edit. Gesneri, 1559, mentions an account of "Hercules whose vessel was shipwrecked, and who was swallowed by a whale, and preserved."—Grotius.

145. As Tacitus has remarked.] See his Mor. Germ. 34. and the same remark is made by Servius (Honouratus Maurus) in his Commentary on Virgil: "Aeneid viii. 564. 203. as well as by Varro, and by Verrius Flaccus (the grammarian).—Grotius.

146. 147. That men of divine inspiration did exist; and that fire from heaven did descend, &c.] [146.] See Julian, book iii. p. 106. C. according to St. Cyril: edit. Lutet. 1638. [147.] And in the tenth book, p. 343. C. he says, "Ye refuse to bring victims to the altar and to sacrifice, for fire descends not (he observes) as it did in the time of Moses, to consume them: this indeed once happened under Moses; and again, after the lapse of ages, under Elijah the Tishbite:" see his subsequent observations on the fire from heaven.—St. Cyprian, "de Spiritu sancto igne frequenter apparente: " see book iii. of his "Testimonia ad Quirinum," ch. 101, observes that "in the sacrifices, whatever God accepted, was consumed by fire sent from heaven." Menander, in his account of the Phoenicians, had long before
mentioned that extreme severity of drought which happened in the time of Elijah, that is, in the reign of the Tyrian king Ithobalus. See Josephus, book viii. ch. 7. of his Jewish Antiquities.
—Grotius.

148, 149, 150. Not only heavy penalties were instituted,—but many kings and many of the wisest men also, never dared, &c.] See Deut. xiii. 5. xviii. 20, 21, 22. No king, after David, assumed the prophetic office; and therefore the Hebrews often distinguish the writings of those times in this manner: “Thus far (say they) the Prophets speak; and here the wise men begin.”—Grotius.

151. Neither was it once claimed for some ages before Jesus.

We find, therefore, in the first book of Maccabees, iv. 46, that when the altar was profaned they laid up the defiled stones in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet, to show what should be done with them.” And again, in ch. ix. 27: “so there was a great affliction in Israel; the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen amongst them. You find the same in the Talmud, title “Synagogue.”—Grotius.

152, 153. The oracular judgement which shone forth from the breast-plate of the high priest.] See Exod. xxviii. 30. Levit. viii. 8. Numbers xxvii. 21. Deut. xxxii. 8. 1 Sam. xxi. 2. 1 Sam. xxxii. 10. 13. 15. 1 Sam. xxiii. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10. 11. 12. 1 Sam. xxviii. 6. See also Nehemiah, vii. 65. and Josephus, book iii. 9. This is the Ἠσυχίας ὕπνων (ὑπναίων) of Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 3. for the Greek δηλών properly answers to the Hebrew דָּהַלוֹ, and so the Septuagint render it in the cited passages, Numbers xxvii. 21. 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, and elsewhere δηλοφων, as Exod. xxviii. 30. and Leviticus viii. 8. The same interpreters render דָּהַל by the Greek λέγαον, truth. The Egyptians imitated this original institution, as children do the practices of men. Diodorus, book i. 48, describes their supreme judge as having truth dependent (as an ornament) from his neck. And again, afterwards, § 75, he speaks of “ample provision made by the king for the requisite support and accommodation of the judges; and similar supplies for the chief of that order, who wore round his neck an image composed of precious stones, appended to a golden chain, to which they gave the appellation of Truth; and the legal arguments or pleadings did not commence till after the chief judge had put on this symbol of Truth.”—Elian, in the viith book of his treatises on various history, ch. 34, tells us that “among the Egyptians the judges originally were priests; and of these the senior held the highest office, and pronounced judgement on all; it was incumbent on him to be eminently just and perfectly impartial in his sentences. He wore an image of sapphire, round his neck, which was denominated Truth.”—The Babylonish Gemara, ch. 1. of the book Joma, observes that some things which distinguished the first temple were wanting in the second.
such as the Ark, the Mercy Seat, the Cherubim, the fire that came down from heaven, the Shechinah, the Holy Spirit, the Urim and Thummim. [Consult Parkhurst, under the root א.]

Grotius.

The bright appearance of the oracular judgement from the breast-plate of the high priest is a notion which the Rabbins entertained; but it is not supported by any words of holy writ. It is much more credible that the priest himself verbally pronounced the oracular answers: see on this subject my annotations on Exod. xxvi. 30, and Numbers xxvii. 21.—Le Clerc.

154. Should become childless.] Compare Joshua vi. 26, with 1 Kings xvi. 34.—Grotius.

155. Above 300 years.] Three hundred and sixty-one years, according to the computation of Josephus, book x, ch. 5, of his Jewish Antiquities.—Grotius.


157, 158. From the Assyrians to the Medes and Persians; and from them to Alexander of Macedonia.] See Daniel ii. 32, 39, v. 28, vii. 6, viii. 3, 20, x. 20, xi. 2, (in reference to the former); and again, Daniel ii. 32, 39, vii. 6, viii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, x. 20, xi. 3, 4, (in reference to the latter.)—Grotius.

159. A part of whose empire... between the Lagidae and the Seleucidae.] See again Daniel, ch. ii. 33, 40, vii. 7, 19, 23, 24, viii. 22, xi. 5, 20.—Grotius. 159*.] Ex parte only (says Grotius; for the Macedonian empire was divided into four kingdoms. But the kings of the south, i. e. of Egypt, and the kings of the north, i.e. of Syria, are alone mentioned here, as they alone were concerned with the Jews.


161. Porphyry was unable to invent any other subterfuge, &c.] See generally St. Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel.—Grotius. Porphyry was a rancorous enemy of the Christians; and
wrote a bulky volume against their religion, containing fifteen books: the twelfth was entirely against the prophecies of Daniel. He had carefully studied all the Greek historians who had written of those events of which Daniel had prophesied, and found them all exactly fulfilled, for he was born in the year after Christ 233: considering this, in order to overthrow them as prophecies, he took pains to prove them true; I mean all those relating to facts before the death of Antiochus, that it might be thought impossible that they should be written so long before, and to make them appear to be the work of some other person (under Daniel's name), who, lived after Antiochus Epiphanes. Porphyry asserted, therefore, that all that related to the times before Antiochus was true, and all that related to the times after him was false. This was done with a design to destroy the force of all those arguments which the Christians took from Daniel to prove the Messiah.—See Prideaux to this effect.

162. Prophecies among the people of Mexico and Peru.] We have indeed some wonderful accounts of those prophetic oracles from Inca (i.e. "Incarnum Historia," edit. Lond. 1688); from Jos. Acosta, "de Naturæ Novi Orbis," Colon. Agrripp. 1596; from Herrera, a Spanish historian, 1601; and from others. See also Peter Cieza, "de Rebus Indici," tom. ii.—Grotius.

See also the narrative of Garcilasso de la Vega. [This work is already mentioned by Grotius under the title Inca.]-Le Clerc.

163. Hither also may be referred the dreams, &c.] These arguments do not directly prove the existence and superintendence of God, but only the agency of some invisible powers superior to human beings: if, however, we believe the latter, the belief of the former must be easily admitted. It is, otherwise, not necessary to ascribe to God himself all preternatural incidents, as if God were the immediate agent in all cases which surpass human means or the power of corporeal substances. In a question of this serious nature I should hardly venture to aduce mere stories about apparitions, which cannot be received without suspicion except by men of unbounded credulity! so likewise those trials by fiery ordeal are inconclusive in the greatest degree!—Le Clerc.

164. Tertullian in his book De anima: edit. Lut. Par. 1644.] See his 46th chapter, in which he mentions the remarkable dreams of Astyages, Philip of Macedon, the woman of Himera, Laodice (the mother of Seleucus), Mithridates, Balaris of Illyricum, Marcus Tullius, Artorius (the physician of Augustus), the daughter of Polycrates the Samian tyrant, the nurse of Cicero, Cleonymus Pyctes, Sophocles, and Neoptolemus the tragic poet. Some of these instances are also mentioned by Valerius Maximus, book i. ch. 7. besides that of Calphurnus about the murder of her husband J. Caesar: that of P. Decius and T. Manlius Consula; the dreams also of T. Atinius the...
tribune; of M. Tullius in his exile; of Hannibal; Alexander the
Great; Simonides; Croesus; the mother of the tyrant Dionysus;
C. Sempronius Gracchus; Cassius of Parma; Aterius Rufus the
Roman knight; Hamilcar the Carthaginian; Alcibiades the
Athenian; and a certain native of Arcadia. There are also
some remarkable accounts of this kind in Cicero, De Divinatione,
book i. pages 22 & seqq.; nor ought we to omit what Pliny re-
lates in Nat. Hist. book xxv. ch. 2. of the woman's dream about
her son fighting in Lacedaemonia: and those of Antigonus and Er-
tucules (the father of Osman the founder of the race of the
Osmanidae), in the "Monita" of Lipsius, book i. ch. 5. de Fato,
mon. 5.; and others which the indefatigable Theodore Zuinger
has collected, vol. v. book 4. under the title "Dreams," p. 1368,
in his "Theatrum Humanae Vitae." Basil. 1586.—Grotius.

165. Apparitions not only seen, but heard to speak.] See the
Life of Dion, p. 958. D., and of Brutus, p. 1009. F. in Plutarch;
and Appian, concerning the same Brutus, in the fourth book of
his Civil Dissections, p. 668. B. ed. Paris. 1594; and Florus,
book iv. ch. 7. See also Tacitus concerning Curtius Rufus, in
the eleventh book of his Annals, 21. The same account is given
by Pliny, book vii. epist. 27. with another account of the appa-
rition seen at Athens by Athenodorus, a philosopher of great
wisdom and intrepidity. See other accounts in Valerius Maximus,
book i. ch. 8., particularly in regard to Cassius, a disciple of
Epicurus, who was terrified by the ghost of Caesar whom he had
himself assassinated: and again, in Lipsius, book i. ch. 5. mon. 5.
Many similar accounts were collected by Chrysippus; by Plu-
tarch in his Treatise on the Soul; and by Numenius in his second
book On the Immortality of the Soul; according to Origen in
his fifth book against Celsus, § 57.—Grotius.

166. Those public trials of innocence by ordeal.] See the
evidence on this subject collected by Francois Juret, seventy-
The antiquity of this mode of trial appears from the speech of
the Theban and his associates in the Antigone of Sophocles,
line 270. And the same appears from the reported exploits of
the priests of Apollo, and of the Goddess Feronia in her grove
near Mount Soracte: see Strabo, book v. p. 226. C., and Pliny's
Natural History, book vii. ch. 2., and the Commentary of Ser-
vius on the eleventh Æneid of Virgil, line 787. To these pre-
ternatural cases may be added, I think, the means which we find
to have been often employed to preserve the body from being
wounded by arrows. See also the most authentic testimonies in
regard to the power of speech exerted by men whose tongues
have been cut out under religious persecutions, [see Note E. in
the Appendix]; as in Justinian's Codex, "Quas gratias," book i.
title 27, on the Praetorian office, in the case of a praefect of
AfricawealsothefirstbookofProcopiusinhisaccountof
theVandals, ch. 8., and thefirstbookofVictorofUtica"On
Persecutions," ch. 6., and ÆneasofGazainhisTheophrastus,
p. 48.—Grotius.

167. *How could it have been consistent with equity,* &c.] Ter-
tullianinhisseccondbookagainstMarcion, 6. 7. observes, that
"perfectfree-willis granted to man on either side; that he may
always be foundhis own master, both in doing spontaneously
that which is good, and in avoiding spontaneously that which is
evil; for it was properthat he should do what is right of his own
free choice, though subject in other respects to the Divine will:
neither could the recompense of good or bad actions be made to
him with justice, if he were to prove either good or bad in his
conduct from necessity, not choice." On this ground also the law
was founded, not excluding but proving the free agency of man,
either by his voluntary obedience to it, or by his voluntary
transgression of it: so that a liberty of choice was open to him
in either case to determine the result." Afterwards he says,
that "God consequently would retract the gift of free agency,
and reserve wholly to himself both his fore-knowledge and om-
nipotence; by which means he might have interfered to prevent
man from falling into danger when attempting to abuse his liberty:
for had he interfered, he would have rescinded that freedom
of will which he has reasonably and graciously permitted.”
OrigeninhissfourthbookagainstCelsus, § 3, treatsthis very
subject with his usual ability; and observes amongst other things,
that "if you deprive virtue of free-will and free-agency, you
destroy her very existence."—Grotius.

168. *In fine, it is generally the fate,* &c.] On the whole of
this subject the reader is referred to my former observations;
see note 16 on the eighth section of this book.—Le Clerc.

169. *As the wisest men have done*] The Stoics, for example;
see their tenets in this respect in Seneca’s treatise “De Pro-
See also the dissertations of Arrian upon Epictetus (Cantab.
1655).—Le Clerc.

170. *To establish the foregoing argument,* &c.] The reader
who may wish to see this argument treated more at length, is
referred to St. Chrysostom, edit. Eton, 1612, on 2 Cor. ch. iv.
verses 8 & 9: to his ninth homily in the Moral, t. iii. p. 590, as
well as to t. vi. p. 690. in the latter part, (where he refutes
the notion of the agency of daemons in the administration of human
affairs); and to his fourth discourse “On Providence,” t. vi.
p. 872.—Grotius.

171, 172, 173. *From Homer, from the philosophers of Greece,
and from the Druids of ancient Gaul.*] See particularly in Homer
where he treats of the state of the dead, as in Odyssey eleventh
book (the descent of Ulysses). So also in Virgil on a similar subject, with respect to Æneas, book 6.; see, further, Seneca in Ædipus, act iii.; the latter part of the sixth book of Lucan; the fifth book of the Thebais of Statius; and the account given in the twenty-eighth chapter of the first book of Samuel. Consult also the philosophers Phercydes, Pythagoras, Plato, and their followers. To these, Justin Martyr adds Empedocles and many Oracles in his Second Apology for the Christians, § 18; and Theodoret adds Anaxagoras and Xenocrates in his fifth discourse, p. 73. The Druids taught the immortality of the soul; see Cæsar De bell. Gall. book vi. 13.; and Strabo, in his fourth book, p. 197. D., observes of them, that "both they and others maintain that souls do not die."—Grotius.

See also Lucan, book i. 455.—Le Clerc.

174. From the Indian Bramins.] Strabo thus expresses their sentiments, book xv. p. 713. A.: "The present life is to be considered as the state of an unborn child, whose birth into real life takes place at the period of death, when life becomes happy as well as real to those who have sought true wisdom." See also a distinguished passage respecting their opinions on this subject in the fourth book of Porphyry, § 8. against the use of animal food. —Grotius.

175, 176. The Egyptians, the Thracians, &c.] Herodotus mentions the immortality of the soul as a tenet of the Egyptians, in his Eutèrpe, § 123; and Diogenes Laertius gives the same account of their belief in this respect in his proœmium, § 11. Tacitus, book v. 5. of his account of the Jews, says, that they bury the dead rather than burn them, according to the practice of the Egyptians; and ascribes to them "the same attention and the same persuasion respecting the state of departed souls:" see Diodorus Siculus, i. 85. in regard to the soul of Osiris; see also Servius, in his commentary, in the beginning of the 6th book of Virgil's Æneid; where he says, that a great many things were taken from the Egyptians. In regard to the Thracians, the reader is here referred to the passage of Hermippus concerning Pythagoras, already quoted from Josephus: (note 140.) and Pomponius Mela, book 2d, 2d edit. 1722, speaking of the Thracians, observes, that "Some of them think that the departed souls return; others that, although they may not return, they nevertheless do not die, but pass to a more happy state." And Solinus gives precisely the same account of their opinions on this subject. Hence arose that custom of performing the funeral rites with signs of joy, which is related both by these writers, and by Valerius Maximus, book ii. ch. 6. 12. That circumstance renders credible what we have lately asserted from the Scholiast of Aristophanes: viz. that some of the Hebrews came in early times into Thrace. (See note 106.)—Grotius.
177. As Plutarch informs us.] In regard to future objects of Divine punishment, see Plutarch, t. ii. pages 548, &c.; and concerning the face in the moon's orb, pages 943, &c. See also the admirable passage quoted from his Dialogue on the Soul by Eusebius in his Prœp. Evang. book xi. 96.—Grotius.

178, 179. Among the Egyptians and the Indians.] What Orpheus has related concerning the shades below was taken from the Egyptians, according to Diodorus Siculus, book i. § 96: and here we may remind the reader of our late reference to Tacitus, in note 165. Strabo states the Indians to entertain a notion of "judgements pronounced in the place of departed souls:" book xv. p. 713. C.—Grotius.

180. In the writings of Hystaspes and the Sibyls.] See Justin Martyr in his 2d Apology, § 20; and Clemens in his Strom. 6. 5, whence also is taken the passage cited from the Greek tragedy, Strom. 5. p. 258. edit. Sylburg.—Grotius. I wish that these references had been omitted, as the writings of Hystaspes and the Sibyls cannot possibly be received at this day without great suspicion and distrust.—Le Clerc.

181, 182. In Ovid and in Lucan.] See Ovid's Metamorph. i. 256, and the first book of Lucan, lines 72, &c.; but Lucan was anticipated by his uncle Seneca, in the conclusion of his epistle to Marcia, where he speaks of "the heavenly bodies in dreadful collision, when the whole material world shall be in flames, and the regular lights of heaven confounded in one awful conflagration."—Grotius.

The Stoics generally embraced this opinion: see note in the latter part of the 11th chapter of the 2d book.—Le Clerc.

183. The Siamese Indians.] See an account of the Indians of Siani by Ferdinando Mendez de Pinto, 1663.

184. Astrologers, &c.] See that eminent astronomer, Copernicus, "De Revolutionibus Orbium Caelestium," book iii. ch. 16. Amst. 1617; and Joachim of Rhætia on a former edition of Copernicus, Basil. 1566: and Cornelius Reinier Gemma, or Gem, of Friesland, "De Struct. Rad. Astr. & Geom." ch. 16. edit. Ant. 1584. See also the "Magna Syntaxis Mathematica" of Ptolemy, book iii. ch. 4. edit. Basil. 1588.—St. Cyprian, in the beginning of his Epistle to Demetrian, observes, that the world has lost a portion of its original strength of constitution, as the world itself proclaims; and that its own final destruction is evident from the continual failure of the things contained in it.—Grotius.

The earth approaches nearer to the sun when in its periheles; that is, when it is in the extreme parts of the minor axis of its parabola: and although the earth always observes the same distances in its approach, still it is plain that it may approach
nearer whenever God shall so ordain; and consequently, at the Divine Will, may be consumed by solar heat, as comets are.—*Le Clerc.*

"It were to be wished that the learned remarker had left out this and some other notes of this kind, unless he had studied such sort of things more."—*John Clarke.*

184. *The nearer approaches of the sun to the earth.*] The Translator does not presume to enter fully on the subject; but it is impossible to pass over this argument without observing that, even if the theory had been true, the conclusion would not be very evident.

185. *No argument can possibly be drawn, &c.*] This subject might be treated somewhat more accurately, and by a better mode of reasoning, if our limits would admit of the discussion. In the first place, we ought to define what is meant by the death of the soul: for, if either the substance could be annihilated, or if so great a change should happen to it that all its faculties should be taken away, it must be said to die. This is the case with all material substances when they suffer dissolution, or when they lose their form so entirely that their very species can be no longer faced, as when plants are destroyed by fire or by putrefaction, which happens also to animals of the brute creation. In the second place, it is impossible to prove that the soul perishes, since even bodies are not literally annihilated, but only suffer a separation and dispersion of their component particles: neither is it possible to prove that the soul ceases to think, after the death of the body, and the life of the soul consists in that faculty; for it does not follow that the soul is destroyed when the body is destroyed, because you cannot prove the soul to be material. Neither can the contrary be proved by a true philosophical mode of reasoning, drawn from the nature of the soul itself, because we are in fact ignorant of that nature: we know, indeed, that the soul is not, from its own nature, annihilated; so neither is the body reduced to nothing: to effect this, some special act of the Creator would be necessary: but it is just possible for it to be in a state deprived of thought and recollection, which state (as I have said) might be described by the term death. But then, fourthly, if, on the dissolution of the body, the soul were to remain for ever in that state, at no future period to resume its power of thought and recollection, then it would be impossible to give any account of a Divine Providence, or the reason of its existence: nevertheless, it has been proved to exist by the foregoing arguments of Grotius. The goodness and the justice of God, his love of virtue, his hatred of vice, (which we must admit to be inherent qualities of the Divine nature,) would then become empty names: for, in that case, his beneficence would be confined within the short-lived and trivial ear...
joyned with this world, without any distinction between vice and virtue; good men and bad equally consigned to an eternal destruction; and never witnessing rewards or punishments assigned to the virtuous and the wicked, respectively, for their conduct in this life. In such a case, God would be no longer God; that is, no longer a being of absolute perfection; and, if the Deity be withdrawn, we can hardly give a rational account of anything whatsoever; as Grotius has sufficiently shown in his demonstration of God as the Creator of the Universe. From the proofs, then, of God's existence, and from his love of virtue and his hatred of vice, the immortality of the human soul becomes also established, and its destination to happiness or misery in a future state. But this subject deserves to be treated in a fuller manner.

— Le Clerc.

The proof of the soul's immortality, drawn from the consideration of the nature of it, may be seen in its full force in Dr. Clarke's letter to Mr. Dodwell, and the defences of it.—*John Clarke.*

186. *If it had depended on any thing,* &c. *That there is no such dependence is a point well proved by Aristotle, from the case of old men,* in his book i. ch. 4, on the subject of the soul. *In his third book,* ch. 4, he commends Anakagoras for saying that the nature of the mind is simple and unixed, and is thereby enabled to examine and understand other things.—Grotius.

187. *So again the bodily powers are injured,* &c. *Aristotle observes, book iii. ch. 4, "on the Soul," that it is "evident from the bodily organs of sense, and from the nature of that sense itself, that the mind has not a similar defect of power to think and understand; for the former lose their office when the object presented to them is too powerful, (as in the case of hearing, when sounds are too violent; that of smelling and seeing, when scents are exquisitely strong, and colours excessively bright;) whereas the mind, when it has conceived any thing highly intellectual and abstracted, understands it as well as it does inferior subjects, or perhaps better: and this, because the sensitive part cannot exist without the bodily organ; but the mind is separable from it, and independent." See also a fine passage of Plotinus, which Eusebius has quoted in his Præp. Evang. book xv. ch. 22. *It is further to be observed, that the mind, by its own powers, can overcome the bodily affections and passions, and consign the very body to tortures, and to death itself.—Grotius.*

188. *The nearer they approach to perfection.* *The highest mental exertions are those by which the mind is the most abstracted from the body.—Grotius.*

189. *That absolute free agency permitted unto men.* *And his absolute power over other animals. He has moreover a knowledge of God and of immortal beings; but "no creature merely mortal
[says Sallust the philosopher, ch. 8. edit. Cantab. 1671,) has knowledge of an immortal Being." Now it is a strong indication of that knowledge in man, that his mind may be brought to despise the severest sufferings from a principle of duty towards God. Besides, he is not limited, like other animals, in his powers of understanding and action; but they are indefatigable, and of an extent (almost) infinite, so as to resemble in some degree the Deity. This difference between man and other animals was also noticed by Claudius Galen in his Protrepticon, ch. 1. edit. Lut. Par. 1679.— Grotius.

190. Tormenting itself for every evil action, especially on the approach of death.] See Plato, in his Republic, book i. p. 573. E. The passage is this: "When a person thinks that his dissolution is fast approaching and inevitable, a fear and solicitude come upon him with respect to things not previously considered with due attention!"— Grotius.

191. How frequently the power of the most abandoned tyrants, &c.] Witness that epistle of Tiberius to the Senate: "What to write, O Conscript Fathers! in what terms to express myself; or what to refrain from writing, is a matter of such perplexity, that if I know how to decide, may the just Gods and the Goddesses of vengeance doom me to die in pangs worse than those under which I linger every day!" Tacitus having quoted this letter, adds the following comment in his Annals, book vi. 6.: "We have here the features of the inward man: his crimes retaliated upon him with the keenest retribution; so true is the saying of the great philosopher, the oracle of ancient wisdom, that "if the minds of tyrants were laid open to our view, we should see them gashed and mangled with the whips and stings of horror and remorse. By blows and stripes the flesh is made to quiver, and in like manner, cruelty and inordinate passions, malice and evil deeds, become internal executioners, and with unceasing torture goad and lacerate the heart!" The philosopher to whom Tacitus alludes is Plato, who says in his "Republic," book ix. p. 733. E. speaking of a tyrant, that "he is the worst of slaves;—were his heart and inward sentiments laid open to our view, we should see him stretched on the torture of his mind, distracted by his fears, and goaded by the pangs of guilt." The same philosopher has some similar reflections in his dialogue entitled Gorgias, p. 348. &c. Suetonius introduces the beforementioned epistle of Tiberius, ch. 67. edit. Delphin., by observing that the tyrant, wary at length of his existence, (in the commencement of his epistle,) draws such a picture of his miseries as could only be exceeded by the sad reality!" Claudian also had an eye to this passage of Plato, in the description of Rufinus, in his second poem, verse 594, edit. Delphin.— Grotius.

See a fine passage on the power of conscience in Juvenal; Sat. xiii. 194, 195.
The happiness of man consists in his becoming as like as possible to the Deity.] This maxim was adopted from Plato by the Stoics, as Clemens Alexandrinus observes in Strom. v. p. 253. edit. Sylburg. 1592.—Grotius.

BOOK II.

1, 2, 3. Suetonius, Tacitus, the younger Pliny.] See Suetonius in his Life of Claudius, ch. 25., where Chresto is written for Christo; because the former name was more familiar to the Greeks and Latins. Tacitus in his Annals mentions Christ, book xv. 44. speaking of the punishments inflicted on the Christians: "The name" (says he) "was derived from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius suffered crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, the Procurator of Judæa." Their "crimes and their hatred of the human race" which he there mentions, are simply their neglect of the objects of pagan worship: Tacitus brought similar charges against the Jews, and so did the elder Pliny, who calls the Jews "a people notorious for their contempt of the Gods," xiii. 4. The fact is, that the Romans in general held a sort of civil theology, commended by Seneca, not consisting of a religious influence on the mind, but merely of an external appearance; observing as it were the formal obligations of law, and regarding worship as an outward ceremony rather than as an inward principle of action. See the opinions of Varro and Seneca, the same with that of Tacitus on this subject, in St. Austin, book iv. ch. 31. and in book vi. ch. 10, "De Civitate Dei?" but observe, at the same time, that Jesus who suffered under Pontius Pilate, was acknowledged by many even at Rome, in the time of Nero, to be "The Christ!" Compare what is stated by Justin on this subject in his second Apology, § 48, where he addresses the Emperors and the Roman Senate, who were able to ascertain those circumstances from their public acts. See also the well-known Epistle of the younger Pliny, book x. ch. 97.; mentioned also by Tertullian in his "Apology," ch. 2.; and by Eusebius in his Chronicon, ad Olymp. 221.; where you find that "the Christians were used to sing a hymn to Christ as God, and were solemnly pledged to each other to commit no kind of wickedness whatever, neither thefts, nor robbery, nor adultery, nor breach of promise; nor to withhold any pledge entrusted to them when required to produce it." Pliny blames them for stubbornness and invincible obstinacy in one respect, that of refusing to invoke the Gods, or to suplicate their shrines with frankincense and wine, or to utter blasphemy against Christ; which no tortures could induce them to do. Trajan in his reply observes that any man who invokes the Gods of Rome, is manifestly and certainly not a Christian. We are told by Origen, in his fourth book against Celsus, § 51, that even in the commentaries of Nu-
menius the Pythagorean, mention is made of "a certain History of Jesus."—Grotius.

"Numenius multa inserit à Mosis et prophetarum libris per tropologiam;" and again, "non addito nomine."

4, 5. *This do the Jews acknowledge—and the Acta Pilati, &c.*] The Jews apply the word ἀνες, hanged; and Benjamin of Tudela, in his "Itinerarium," Lugd. Bat. 1633, acknowledges that Jesus was put to death at Jerusalem. The Acta Pilati are mentioned by Epiphanius in his book "Κατὰ τέσσαρες καὶ δεκα τιτῶν.*", § 1. t. i. p. 420. A. edit. Paris. 1622.—Grotius.

But this argument were better omitted, for some inconsiderate Christians were apt to appeal to spurious accounts in this respect; nor indeed is it sufficiently clear that any genuine and authentic "Acts" were ever extant.—Le Clerc.

6. *The widest extremities of the world, &c.*] St. Chrysostom treats this subject more fully in his Comment on 2 Cor. v. 7.; see Homily viii. in the Moral, t. iii. p. 596.

7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.] Sergius, Dionysius, Polycarp, Justin, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Origen, Tertullian, Clemens, &c.] Sergius Paulus, the deputy of Cyprus; see Acts xiii. 12. Dionysius the Areopagite; see Acts xvii. 34. Polycarp, who suffered martyrdom in Asia in the year of Christ 168, according to Eusebius, Chron. Can. ad Ol. 236, 3. Justin Martyr, who wrote two apologies for the Christians, &c. about the year of Christ 142: see again Eusebius, ad Ol. 230, 1. Irenæus flourished at Lyons; bishop of that place in the year 183. Athenagoras an Athenian; flourished about the year 177 or 180. Origen about the year 230. Tertullian,—208. Clemens of Alexandria, about the same time; see Eusebius, ad Ol. 245, 4. 246, 3.—Grotius.

16, 17, 18. *Neither Celsus nor Julian have dared to deny it, while the Hebrews, &c.*] Celsus says, according to Origen, book ii. 48.: "Ye have believed him to be the Son of God, because he cured the lame and the blind." And Julian expressly admits the fact, when he says, what is quoted by St. Cyril, book vi. p. 191. E.: "Unless it be accounted one of the greatest exertions of power to cure the lame and the blind, and to exorcise the daemoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany."

[18.] See the Hebrew Talmud, title Aboda Zara.—Grotius.

19, 20, 21. *Openly performed—curious arts—Porphyry.*] See Acts xxvi. 26. and Luke xii. 1. The books of "curious arts" were brought together and burned (see Acts xix. 19.) at the pious exhortations of the Christian converts: and there is a pas-

* This title applies to a sect who celebrated Easter on a fixed day, the 14th day of the moon which followed the vernal equinox. x 2
age of Porphyry, according to Eusebius in his Præp. Evang. book v. ch. 1., which admits that "no individual has ever been sensible of any public benefit from the Gods, since the worship of Christ commenced."—Grotius.

22. For a testimony of the truth.] Consider too that the event itself, the conversion of so great a part of mankind to Christianity, has been evidently shown to be of such importance in the sight of God, that he therefore confirmed it, in its commencement, by miracles. If he performed so many for the sake of one nation, (and that by no means of great extent,)—the nation of the Hebrews,—how much more consistent was it with his goodness to impart this heavenly light to so great a portion of the human race involved in the grossest darkness!—Le Clerc.

23. On no account persuaded to relinquish, &c.] See Acts xv. and Romans xiv. St. Jerome, in the Chronicon of Eusebius, at the year of Christ 125, when he had mentioned fifteen Christian bishops of the Church of Jerusalem, observes, that "these were all bishops of the circumcision, even to the time of that destruction which Jerusalem suffered under the Emperor Hadrian." Sulpitius Severus in his "Historia Sacra," book ii. § 45. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1665, says, that the Christians of those places and times "believed Christ to be God, under their observance of the law; and their church had a priest of the circumcision." See also Epiphanius, where he treats of the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, t. i. pages 38 and 126. The term Nazarene was not a partial appellation, but all the Christians in Palestine were so called, because their Lord was a Nazarene: see Acts xxiv. 5.—Grotius.

24, 25. The accounts of others—500 brethren at once.] Even of Celsus, who wrote against the Christians: see Origen, book ii. 55. St. Paul in the 1 Cor. xv. 6, says, that some of the 500 were then dead; but their surviving children and friends also might be received as evidence, and testify what they had heard. "The greater part," however, remained alive when St. Paul was writing the account. This appearance happened in a mountain of Galilee.—Grotius.

26. An almost immediate destruction, &c.] See 1 Thess. iv. 15, 16, and 1 Cor. xv. 52. Tertullian in his tract on Monogamy, ch. 3. speaks of time as "drawing to a point;" and St. Jerome, (tom i. p. 94. edit. Paris. 1624,) in his Epistle to Gerontia, al. Agrochia, on the same subject, says, "What is that to us, upon whom the ends of the world are come?"—Grotius.

27, 28, 29. To every man, in his right reason. &c.—The Christian tenets, above all, prohibit lying, &c.—That plainness and

* In monte, ut traditio habet, Thabor, &c.
St. Chrysostom pursues this argument more at length on 1 Cor. i. towards the end, Hom. 5. in the Moral. Against lying, perjury, &c. see Matt. xii. 36; John viii. 44, 55; Ephes. iv. 25; Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. vii. 14, xi. 31; Gal. i. 20; Col. iii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 10 & ii. 7; James iii. 14; Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 14; Luke xx. 21; John xiv. 16; Ephes. v. 9; and other texts. Even Celsus admits the simplicity of character which distinguished the Apostles: see Origen, book i. 27.—Grotius.

30, 31. St. Paul publicly declared, &c. Now Paul was a man who, &c. See 1 Cor. xv. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 4. And further, see Acts, (written by St. Luke, St. Paul's disciple,) ch. ix. 4, 5, 6, and ch. xxii. 6, 7, 8. Note 31 refers to Acts xxii. 3. The Hebrews mention two men of the same name (Gamaliel), who were eminent for their learning: St. Paul had been educated under one of them, and was remarkably well skilled not merely in the Jewish law, but also in the various points of knowledge expounded by his teachers: see Epiphanius, pages 149. 361.—Grotius.

32. The resurrection cannot be considered in that light.] See the seventh answer to objections brought against the Resurrection, in Justin's Works, p. 210. A. edit. Lut. Par. 1615: "An absolute impossibility is one thing, a conditional impossibility is another. It is absolutely impossible that the diameter and the side of a square should be equal; it is an impossibility dependent on particular circumstances that nature should produce a living animal without the appointed means of production. To which of these kinds of impossibility is the Resurrection compared by persons who disbelieve it? If to the former, they argue on a false proposition; for the diameter cannot become equal to the side by a new act of creation; whereas the resurrection is effected by a new creation: If to the latter, nothing is impossible with God, though impossible under other conditions." This distinction between absolute and conditional impossibilities is learnedly treated by Maimonides in his "Ductor dubitantium," part iii. ch. 15.—Grotius.

33. There can be no reason, &c.] On true principles of philosophy, we must all admit that the formation of a foetus in the womb, is a fact as incomprehensible as the restoration of a dead person to life: but illiterate men feel no surprise at those events which are frequent and familiar, and, though they cannot account for them, never think of difficulty in such common occurrences: on the other hand, they think those things impossible which they have never witnessed, though by no means more difficult than matters of daily observation.—Le Clerc.

Evang. book xi. ch. 35. The same account is recorded by Valerius Maximus, book i. ch. 8. De miraculis, edit. Delphin. "Eurus Pamphiliius post decimum diem reviviscens" is the first of his "Exempla externa." It occurs also in the "Protrepticon" or "Cohortatio," among Justin's Works, § 27.; the fifth Strom. of Clemens, § 9, 14.; the second book, 16. of Origen against Cel- sus; the Symposiacs, book ix. 5. of Plutarch; and in the beginning of the Commentary of Macrobius on Cicero's "Somnium Scipionis." — Grotius.

35, 36, 37. Heraclides—Herodotus—Plutarch.] Heraclides of Pontus wrote a book, "Hépsi'Arve," which is mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his Procemium, § 12, and in his Life of Empedocles; and also by Galen, "On parts affected," vi. 5. Pliny (book vii. ch. 52.) speaks of "that celebrated work of Heraclides, among the Greeks, which contains an account of a woman re- stored to life, who had been dead seven days." But Diogenes Laertius, in the latter place above mentioned, states the time to have been thirty days. See likewise the Melpomene of Héro- dotus, § 14. See also Pliny's Natural History, book vii. ch. 52., and Plutarch's Life of Romulus, t. i. p. 35. D., and Hesychius, "De philosophis," Lugd. Bat. 1613, in the beginning. Plutarch gives a similar instance in Thespesius; see his tract "De serà Numinis vindictà," t. ii. p. 563. B., and another instance in An- tyllus, whose case (from the first treatise "On the Soul") has been preserved by Eusebius in his Præp. Evang. book xi. ch. 36. and by Theodoret, Disc. xi. p. 159. Latin title, "De Fine et Judicio." — Grotius.

38. Insomuch that Bechai, &c.*] It were to be wished that Grotius had produced the passage; for though the reasoning, drawn from the resurrection of Christ, by no means stands in need of the approbation of R. Bechai, nor of any other person, still perhaps the sanction of his name might have an influence on the Jews.— Le Clerc.

39. That these things would therefore come to pass, &c.] See John xiii. 19, xiv. 29; Luke xxiv. 46, 47.—Grotius.

40. That Moses promised nothing, &c.] See Deut. xi. and xxviii. and Heb. viii. 6.—Grotius.

41. The Sadducees in particular.] See Matt. xxii. 23. and Luke in his Acts of the Apostles, xxiii. 8. See also Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, xviii. 2. where he says, that "in the opinion of the Sadducees, the soul is annihilated with the body." And elsewhere, in his Jewish War, book ii. 7. he says, that they

* R. Bachai vel Bechai; Elucidatio in Legem, Ven. 1544 vel 1566.
reject the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and that of future rewards and punishments. St. Jerome observes in his comment on the above text of St. Matthew, that "the Sadducees believed that the soul perished with the body."—Grotius.

42, 43. Doubt and uncertainty, as by the dissertations of Socrates, &c.] This is observed by St. Chrysostom, on 1 Cor. i. 25. See i. iii. p. 263. See (for note 43.) the following passage in the "Phaedon" of Plato, p. 48. B.: "I now wish you to understand fully that I hope hereafter to join the society of good men; not that I would affirm this altogether with confidence." And again, p. 68. C.: "If what I say be true, it is well to entertain this belief; but if there be no future state, I shall be, at this very time before death, the less affected by present evils; nor will this my ignorance be of long duration (for that would be grievous), but in a short time it will be at an end!" Tertullian, in the beginning of his tract "On the Soul," observes of Socrates, that all his wisdom on that point resulted from an equanimity studiously acquired, not from any confident assurance of the truth actually discovered." The same is observed of Socrates in the "Parænæsis" or Exhortation, which occurs among the works of Justin, § 36.—Grotius.

44, 45, 46. By the writings of Tully, Seneca, and others.] See the first book of Tully's Tusculan Questions, § 12, where he says, "Explain, therefore, if you can without too much trouble; first, that the soul survives the dissolution of the body, and then, if you shall not establish this point (which is not easily done) you will show that a state of death is an exemption from all evil." Afterwards, § 21, he says, "But I know not what great point they have gained by maintaining the total dissolution of a man, soul as well as body, at the hour of death: for if it be so (which I do not mean to dispute), what occasion of joy or triumph does such a state afford?" And again, § 34, "Suppose then this total dissolution—can there be any pain, or indeed any sense at all, in the body after death? Nobody means to say that there is." Lactantius, in book vii. § 8 and § 9, quotes Cicero again, after his dissertation on the nature and future fate of the soul, where he avows his utter ignorance and uncertainty, and leaves the decision to "some divine being." [See also the end of § 41, of the first book of the Tusc. Qu.] In regard to Seneca, see the last part of his 63d Epistle: "Perhaps," says he, "if we may credit the report of learned men, and there be an appointed place for us after death, He whom we suppose to have perished has been only sent before us to that appointed place." Among others, see Justin Martyr, who observes in general terms, in his Dialogue with Trypho, § 5, "The philos-
phers knew nothing of these matters, nor were they at all able to define the nature of the soul."—Grotius.

47, 48. The arguments hold good no further.—No wonder then, that others, &c.] It is observed, for instance, by Socrates or Plato, that "whatever exerts the power of self-motion is immortal." See Lactantius in the place already cited: and, as to the doctrine of transmigration, it was a tenet of the ancient Bramins, as it is also of the modern. Pythagoras and his disciples adopted it from the former.—Grotius.


50. Felicity could not consist in anything attended with dangers, &c.] See Lactantius, book iii. ch. 12. 7. "Virtue of itself (he says) is not necessarily happy, because its whole essence lies, as I have said, in the endurance of evils." And afterwards he subjoins to a quotation from Seneca, that "the Stoics, whose tenets he (Seneca) adopted, deny the possibility of happiness without virtue. The reward of virtue is consequently a happy life, if virtue makes life happy, as it is rightly said to do. Virtue therefore is not of itself, and merely on its own account, to be desired, but on account of the happy life which is the necessary consequence of virtue. This argument may serve to show them in what the chief good consists. Now this present corporeal state of existence cannot possibly be happy, because the present state of existence, as being corporeal, is therefore subject to a variety of evils."

It is well said by Pliny, in his Natural History, book vii. ch. 40, "No mortal being enjoys happiness."—Grotius.

51, 52. The banquets of the grosser Jews—the lustful indulgences of the Mahometans.] In the former instance, the passages to this effect will be adduced in book v. [But these passages seem to have been omitted.] In the latter, see the Alcoran, Azoara, ii. v. xlvii. liv. lxv. lxvi.—Grotius.

53. Is it not determined by philosophers in general, &c.] If the following observations of Grotius should not be satisfactory to some of his readers, they may be told, in reply to their objections, that it is by no means necessary that the same specific particles of matter which were put into the coffin of a deceased person, should constitute the body hereafter to be raised from death: for, if the soul be the same, the union of that soul with matter to which it never has been previously joined, no more affects the identity of the man, than his decrepid state did in advanced life,
compared with his state in infancy, when he lay crying in the cradle, though perhaps not a single particle of that matter which composed the infant may remain in the old man, from that escape of the bodily effluvia which is continually taking place. We may speak of "the resurrection of the body" with perfect propriety, when a similar body is formed out of the earth by divine power, and becomes united with the surviving soul. It is therefore needless to embarrass ourselves with distinctions of too much nicety, in maintaining with extreme precision the identity of matter.—Le Clerc.

54. In our present bodies a greater variation, &c.] Alfenus in L. Proponebatur. D. de Judiciis. [See Appendix, Note F.] "If any one should think that partial changes make a thing essentially different, we ourselves, by such a mode of reasoning, should not be the same persons that we were a year ago: for, as philosophers would tell you, constituted as we are of very minute particles, these particles are continually detached from our bodies, and others are extrinsically acquired in their stead." So likewise, Seneca observes in his 58th Epistle, "Our bodies are rapidly carried on, like rivers: every thing we see is floating down the stream of time, and nothing remains stationary; while I make this very observation on the changes which take place, I myself am undergoing a change." See the admirable remarks of Methodius on this subject, preserved by Epiphanius, in his refutation of the Origenians (a heretical sect of that name) in the sections xii. xiii. xiv. xv. p. 534, edit. Paris. 1622.—Grotius.

55, 56. Nay, the very butterfly, &c.—In some most minute part, &c.] See the last book of Ovid's Metamorphoses, line 372, to which may be added several passages from Pliny, in his Natural History, see book ix. ch. 51, book x. ch. 9, book xi. chapters 20. 22. 23. 26. 32. 36.—Grotius.

Had Grotius lived in our days (it is observed in the latter note) he would have written more fully on this subject, since it is now agreed that all animals, of what kind soever, spring from an egg in which they are formed, as every plant, however small, arises from a seed; but this does not apply to the case of the resurrection; for our bodies will not rise again from similar beginnings.—Le Clerc.

But see the 53rd note, which is "quite satisfactory" on this subject. "The junction of any matter to a soul seems to constitute sufficiently an identity of person. The soul is the essence of man; the body is only the instrument of its action here, and wherever the intellect is, there is the person. Besides, we are taught that such flesh and blood as we now have 'cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.' 'There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.'"—L'Oste.
57, 58, 59. Zoroaster—Stoics—Peripatetics.] The passage relative to Zoroaster occurs in the 5th stroma of Clemens Alex. p. 255. [In Potter's edition it is in vol. ii. p. 711.] The same author, stroma v. p. 235, relates of Heraclitus, that "he knew, even from the philosophy of the barbarians, that there would be a purification of wicked men by fire (the Εκκατάρισις of the Stoics), by which (as they maintain) every one shall be raised again in his real state, which is tantamount to the doctrine of a future resurrection." So likewise in Origen against Celsus, book v. § 20, the Stoics are said to "maintain a future conflagration of the universe and a subsequent arrangement of it, for ever unchangeable." It is added, that "although they do not employ the term resurrection, they in fact avow the truth of it." Origen here adds the Egyptians. Chrysippus on Providence (quoted by Lactantius, book vii. ch. 23. 3. of his "divine Institutions," ) edit. Gotting. 1736, has the following passage. "This being the case, (says he) it is plainly not impossible that we ourselves, after death, when a certain revolution of ages shall have passed, may even be restored to our present state of existence." The reader may consult at his leisure the "Philosophia libera, adversus hujus temporis Philosophos," Auctore Nathaniele Carpenter, edit. Oxon. 1636, Exercitatio 36. As to the Peripatetics, it is observed by Diogenes Laertius, in the beginning of his book, § 9, that "Theopompus, in his 8th Philippic, declared it to be the opinion of the learned, that men will be restored to life and will become immortal, and that all things will continue under their own proper denominations for ever."—Grotius.

60. Porphyrius.] See the 2nd book of his treatise on "Abstinence from animal food," whence many things were borrowed by St. Cyril, in his 4th book against Julian. pp. 124. 128, &c.—Grotius.

61, 62. The victims offered up to Bacchus Onesta, and the sacrifices made to Jupiter Latarius.] The former are mentioned by Plutarch in his Life of Themistocles, p. 119. A. and by Pausanias in the 9th book, ch. 8, and in the 7th book, ch. 21, of his History of Greece. Similar religious rites of the Messenians, the Pelleans, the people of Lyctus in Crete, the Lesbians, and the Phocænsians, may be found in the "Δόγος προτρητικός πρὸς Ελληνας" of Clemens, p. 12. In regard to the latter, it appears to have been a very ancient custom in Italy to offer human sacrifices. See Dionysius Halicarnassensis, book i. 16. The continuation of it is shown by Pliny, book xxviii. ch. 2, where he says, "Even our age has witnessed the sight of human victims, male and female, whether of Greece or of any other country opposed to us in war, buried alive in the beast market!" and the practice continued to the days of Justin Martyr and Tatian.
The former in his first Apology, § 12, thus addresses the Romans: "To that idol which you worship, not only pouring forth the blood of brute animals, but even human blood; the most noble and most illustrious among you, making this effusion of the blood of your murdered fellow-creatures." And Tatian says, § 29, "I found amongst the Romans that their Jupiter Latialis delighted in propitiatory sacrifices of the human species, and in the blood of slaughtered men." See Justin M. "cum Tatiauo, &c." 1742. Porphyry tells us that religious rites of this description continued to the time of Adrian. We learn from Cicero's Oration in defence of M. Fonteius, ch. 10, and from Plutarch, in his treatise on Superstition, p. 171. B., that the practice of offering human victims was an ancient custom among the Gauls. Tiberius abolished it, according to Pliny, Nat. Hist. book xxx. ch. 1. [See Note G. in the Appendix], where you will also see what he says about the Britons. See also Dion Cassius, in his account of Nero, 62. 7. and Sallust, ch. 22. and consult Helmoldus. book i. ch. 53. on the customs of the Sclavouians, edit. Franc. 1556, and Lubec. 1659. Porphyry, in book ii. § 56, "against the use of animal food," mentions the continuance of human sacrifices to his own times, (he died in the beginning of the fourth century after Christ) both in Arcadia and at Carthage, nay, even "in the great city itself, meaning Rome, and particularly specifies the sacrificial rites of Jupiter Latialis.—Grotius.

63, 64. By Clemens Alexandrinus, and others.] See the former in his Protreptic. p. 5. & seqq., and see especially Arnobius, book v. edit. Duac. 1634.—Grotius.

65. Cato was ashamed to be present.] See the first Epig. of Martial (in the beginning), and the "Noctes Atticae," book x, § 13. of Aulus Gellius, edit. Delphin.; and again, book ii, ch. 10. 8. of Valerius Maximus, edit. Delphin.—Grotius.

66. But still, lest a people prone to idolatry, &c.] Their ceremonial laws and observances are ascribed to this cause by Maimonides in his "Ductor dubitantium," iii. 29. &c. Basil 1629, and his opinion is adopted by R. Josephus Albo. See "Fundamenta Jud. Relig.' Venet. 1612.—Grotius.

67 to 84. These are merely references to texts of Scripture, in the following order:


68.] Romans xii. 1. and Philippians iv. 8.

69.] Romans ii. 28. 29. and Philippians iii. 3.

70.] 1 Cor. v. 8.

71.] 1 Cor. x. 16, Heb. xii. 4. and 1 Pet. ii. 21.
1 Tim. iv. 3. 1 Pet. iv. 3.
74.] Matt. vi. 18. and xvii. 21. 1 Cor. vii. 5.
75.] John xii. 44.
76.] Luke xii. 28. John xiii. 17, &c. Rom. i. 5. 1 Cor. vii.
19. 1 Peter i. 2.
77.] Matt. xxi. 21. 2 Tim. i. 12.
78.] Romans iv. 20. 2 Cor. vii. 1. Gal. iii. 29.
79.] Hebrews vi. 11. Romans viii. 24. and xv. 4.
80.] Gal. v. 6. and 1 Thess. iii. 6.
81.] Romans viii. 15.
82.] Hebrews xii. 28.
83.] Romans viii.
84.] Coloss. iii. 24. and 2 Thess. i. 6.—Grotius.
Le Clerc observes, in addition to the passages there cited
from St. Paul, that we may easily understand the divine precepts
to be most worthy of their author, and so suitable to our nature
that none better, nor indeed equally good for us, can possibly be
imagined. Our obedience therefore should be voluntary from
a sense of gratitude, and from a conviction of the superior ex-
cellence and perfection of these precepts, even though no pu-
nishments were attached to any act of disobedience, except the
disgraceful nature of the act itself. This, in short, it is to re-
der unto God a filial, not a servile, obedience!
85.] Matt. vi. 10.—Grotius.
86.] As Aristotle remarks with censure, &c.] In his "Поли-
tика" or De Republica, book vii. ch. 14. he says that "other sub-
sequent writers have avowed the same opinion: for in their en-
comiums on the Spartan republic, they admire the principle on
which Lycurgus acted, in framing all his laws with a view to
warlike exploits and martial triumphs; a principle which right
reason may easily refute, and which in fact has now been refuted
by the test of experience." But this remark of Aristotle was
indeed anticipated by Euripides in his Andromache, line 724-726.
—Grotius.
87, 88. Altogether unjust, &c.—Ways manifestly unjust, &c.] See Seneca, epistle xcv. and book ii. ch. 8, de Irâ; and St.
Cyprian, epistle ii. See also Petronius Arbiter, p. 45, ed.
Francof. 1629.—Grotius.
89. Sardinia.] See Polybius, book iii. 28, of his Universal
History, edit. Lips. 1789.
90. Cyprus.] See also Florus, book iii. ch. 9, where he says
(in his abridgement of Roman Annals,)
"Such was the report of its opulence (and that very justly) that a people, subduing whole nations and accustomed to the disposal of kingdoms, actually decreed the confiscation of the property of Ptolemy their ally, the reigning king of Cyprus, at the instigation of Publius Clodius their tribune." The same fact is mentioned by Plutarch in his Life of Cato the Younger, p. 776; and by Appian, in book ii. "Πωμαίων Ἐμφυλίων," p. 441. edit. Paris, 1592, Civil Wars. As well as by Dion Cassius, book xxxviii. 30, edit. Hamburg, 1750. See also Florus, edit. 1680, on the Wars of Numantia and Crete.—Grotius.

91. Plunder and depredation beyond the limits, &c.—"The ancient Greeks and the barbarians living in maritime places on the Continent, or inhabiting the islands, when their intercourse with each other increased by means of navigation, became addicted to habits of plunder: led on by men of no mean consideration, with a view to their own advantage and to the support of their infirm countrymen, attacking cities that were not fortified, but inhabited as villages, they seized them, and subsisted chiefly by these means; attaching no idea of disgrace, but rather ascribing a sort of honour to these proceedings: This appears from the conduct of certain inhabitants of the Continent even to this day, who deem it glorious to perform exploits of this nature with address; and the ancient poets also prove it, frequently putting questions in regard to the piratical employment of sailors, not supposing any affront to be conveyed by such questions, nor any reproach to be incurred by making such inquiries. They even plundered each other on the same Continent, and the old custom is still practised in many parts of Greece, as among the Ozoles in the country of Locris, the people of Ætolia and Acarnania, and the adjoining parts." Thucydides i. 5. This question of piracy, which Thucydides mentions, occurs in Homer's Odyssey, book xix. line 3, on which the Scholiast there remarks, that "among the ancients it was not dishonourable, but quite the reverse, to commit these acts of depredation." Justin, book xliii. ch. 3, describes the inhabitants of Phocis as being "more engaged in naval pursuits than in the cultivation of their soil; maintaining themselves by fishing and trading; and even, for the most part, by acts of piracy, which in those days was an honourable employment." See what Plutarch says of the Spaniards in his Life of Caius Marius, p. 408. D. See also an account of the people of Tuscany in the fifth book of Diodorus Siculus, ch. 34; the comments of Servius on the 8th Æneid, line 51, and on the 10th, line 14; the account of the Germans in Cesar's Gallic War, book vi. 22; the Annals of Tacitus xii. 27; and Saxo (Grammaticus), book x._Grotius.

92. An unforgiving spirit of revenge, &c.—See Aristotle's Ethics, 4. 11, where he observes to his son Nicomachus, that
"a person seems to have no feeling of sensibility nor of sympathy who is not susceptible of anger nor desirous of revenge: to refrain from resentment under insults or injuries is to betray a mean and servile disposition". And Cicero in his second book, § 22, "de Inventione Rhetoricā," places revenge among our natural rights, "that so we may repel violence or insolence either by self-defence or by retaliation." He says to Atticus, epistle 12, book ix. "I hate the man and shall always hate him: I heartily wish to be revenged of him." And again, Oratio 1. ad Quirites, cap. 9, he says, "Thus will I take vengeance for each single outrage, according to the provocation which I receive from every man."—Grotius.

93, 94. Their gladiators, &c.—The exposing of their children, &c.] For the first: see Lactantius, book vi. 20. 11, and Tertullian de Spectaculis, ch. 19. For the second: see Justin Martyr's 2d Apology, 27. & seq. Tertullian's Apology, ch. 9. See also Lactantius, book vi. of his Divine Institutions, ch. 20. 19; and the Hecyra of Terence, iii. 3. 49. and iv. 1.—Grotius.

95, 96. To smite and destroy the seven nations, and to persecute all who opposed, &c.] See Exodus xxxiv. 11, 12.; and Deut. vii. 1, 2.: and Rabbi Levi ben Gerson says, that all possible endeavours were to be used to injure their opponents. Bachai says that even "things stolen from them were not to be restored." See R. Bachai (or Bechai) "Elucidatio in Legem," Ven. 1566. —Grotius.

97. Sufficient proofs in their prayers and imprecations.] See a little book of prayers published at Venice, (of the smallest size,) page 8: and a German book, of Antonius Margarita, containing these Jewish prayers; and the Commentary of Maimonides on the Thirteen Articles, in which he consigns all persons who disbelieve them to destruction*. "May sudden perdition be the fate of all sectaries!" is a common imprecation among the Jews. There are similar sayings of R. Isaac in his Bereschith Rabba; and the Thalmud in Babā Kamma, and Baba Bathra.—Grotius.

98, 99, 100. Strict retaliation,—revenge not injuries,—even as God, &c.] See Leviticus xxiv. 20; and Deuteronomy xix. 21. See Matthew v. 38. 44. See Matthew v. 45. —Grotius.

101. Rapes and adulteries committed by their Gods.] See the "Ion" of Euripides, verse 436. & seqq. For a fuller discussion of these matters see Clemens in his Protreptic. p. 5. & seqq.

Note. * Yet this Moses, the son of Maimon, (we are told,) was the most enlightened, Rabbi of his time: the Jews called him "the Eagle of the Doctors," and inferior only to the legislator Moses.
Book II.]


102, 103. Infamous because unnatural, &c.—Antinous, &c.] See Clemens and Theodoret on this subject also in the passages above cited. Antinous is mentioned by Justin in his 2d Apology, 29: by Clemens in his Protreptic, p. 14. 42: by Origen in his 3d book against Celsus, § 36; and in his 8th book, § 8: by Eusebius in his Eccles. Hist. 4. 8: by Theodoret in his 8th book, p. 115: and by the historians of those days.—Grotius.

104. To affix a fair appellation to a foul crime.] Not only Lucian is disposed to do this in his dialogue between Charicles and Callicratidas, entitled "Epores," p. 557. edit. Lut. Par. 1615, (see § 24): but Gregory Nazianzen also, in his third oration against Julian, i. p. 78. C.; and I may add Elias of Crete, (col. 408. D.) and Nonnus the poet: see Greg. Nazianzen, 1630: so likewise St. Cyril, in his sixth book against Julian, pp. 187 & seqq.: and Theodoret, somewhat largely, in his twelfth discourse to the Greeks, pp. 174. & seqq. Nor can I here omit a passage of Philo (who was a great admirer of Plato) in his treatise on a Contemplative Life, p. 694. F. "But," says he, "almost the whole Symposium of Plato is on the subject of love; not merely that of men passionately attached to women, or of women in like manner attached to men, (for by the law of nature these passions obtain indulgence,) but the vile lust of men towards others of their own sex, where the only difference is in point of age! For if any thing appears to be speciously said there about love and celestial passion, it was merely assumed by way of figurative and polite diction." Tertullian, in the beginning of his tract on the Soul, speaking of the preference due to Christian wisdom in comparison with that of Socrates, describes the former "not as introducing new Demons, but expelling old ones; not as debauching the young mind, but training it to modesty and all the good effects of that virtue."—Grotius.

105. The promiscuous enjoyment, &c.] See many passages of Plato, but especially in his "Republic," v. p. 655. & seq.—Grotius.

106. Some even of the brute animals, &c.] Pliny observes, book x. ch. 34, that "the actions of the dove are, for the same reason, particularly noticed." The birds of this species are singularly chaste, and, on neither part, is adultery committed: they preserve inviolate their conjugal fidelity." See also Porphyry on the conjugal chastity of ringdoves, in his third book against the use of animal food, § 11.—Grotius.
107, 108. Allow a plurality, &c.—Authorize a man to put away, &c.] On the latter point see Deuteronomy xxiv. 1, 2, 3, 4; and Leviticus xxii. 14. On the former, see Deuteronomy xvii. 16, 17; xxii. 15; and 2d Samuel xii. 8. So the Hebrews understand the law, and St. Chrysostom on the 1st Cor. 11th Homily, 26, in the Moral, edit. Paris. 1633, page 288; St. Augustine, book iii. ch. 12, on the Christian Doctrine; and other ancient writers. Josephus, who was eminently skilful in the Jewish law, says expressly in the 17th book of his Antiquities, 1, 2. "It was the custom of our forefathers to have at one time a plurality of wives."—Grotius.


110, 111. Thereby becometh guilty.—To consider in the same light that union, &c.] See Matthew v. 28; and Matthew v. 32; xix. 9.—Grotius.

112. Among the Germans and Romans.] Grotius might have added the Greeks also, who for the most part (certainly those in private life) were not polygamists.—Le Clerc.

113, 114, 115. The Christians also.—Repaying the entire affection, &c.—While the regulations of domestic economy, &c.] See 1 Cor. vii. 4; and the sixth book of the Institutions of Lactantius, xxiii. 23; and the 83d Epistle of St. Jerome to Oceanus, Parisiis, 1706. It is well observed by Sallust in his Bell. Jugurth. cap. 80, that "the bond of conjugal affection is slight where the husband has many claimants; for his attention, divided among a variety of wives, has no exclusive object of confidential regard, and he looks upon them all alike with a contemptuous indifference." Ammianus (Marcellinus) speaking of the Persians, book xxiii. 6, observes that "Love is apt to stagnate when flowing through many channels." See also Claudian, in his "Bellum Gildonicum," verse 441. And the points to which the latter note refers will be found well imagined and well expressed by Euripides in his Andromache, verse 464.—Grotius.


119.] See Deuteronomy xxiii. 20.

120.] Leviticus xxvi. 5. Deut. xxviii. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12.

123. Matt. vi. 34. Philipp. iv. 6.
124. 1 Tim. vi. 7, 8.—Grotius.
125. As some philosophers absurdly did.] Laertius relates this of Aristippus, book ii. 77; and so does Suidas: and an anecdote is recorded of Crates, to the same purport, by Philostratus in his Life of Apollonius, i. 10. Paris, 1608.—Grotius.

126 to 148. The notes are merely references to scriptural texts, and are given in the following order:

126. Matt. v. 42.
128. 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18.
130. Rom. xv. 25, 26, & seq. 2 Cor. ix. 1, 2, 3, 4. Phil. iv. 18.
132. Matt. as above.
136. Matt. as above.
137. 1 Pet. iii. 3.
138. Titus ii. 12. 1 Tim. ii. 9.
139. 2 Cor. vi. 6. Gal. v. 22. Coloss. iii. 12. 1 Cor. xiii. 4.
140. Phill. iv. 8. 1 Tim. ii. 2. iii. 4. Titus ii. 7.
142. 1 Tim. ii. 2. Rom. xiii. 1 Pet. ii. 13. 17.
143. Col. iii. 20, 21. Ephes. vi. 1, 2, 3, 4.
148. Matt. vii. 12. Luke vi. 31. This precept was noticed with approbation by the Emperor Alexander Severus: see Dion
The precepts of Christianity.] To these we should add those necessary tenets or doctrines of Christianity on which the practical observance of its precepts depends: I mean those which are contained in the oldest creeds, as we find them in Irenæus and Tertullian, and in what is now called The Apostles' Creed: This has been shown, rather more fully, in my little treatise (annexed to this of Grotius) on "the Choice of a Religious Creed," &c. § 4.—Le Clerc.

150. Truth hidden, as it were, in a well.] This was a saying of Democritus, "Εν βυθῷ Ἄληθείας," as Cicero, amongst other writers, has recorded in his Qustiones Academicæ, i. 12.—Grotius.

151. The mental eye is foiled and dazzled.] Aristotle, book ii. ch. 1. of his Metaphysics, observes that "as the eyes of a bat are affected by day-light, so is our mental eye confounded by the contemplation of the brightest objects in the system of Nature."—Grotius.

152. Not one who was not personally addicted to some vice, &c.] Socrates is an object of the most general admiration and applause: but the extreme irascibility of his temper, which betrayed itself both in his words and in his actions, is represented, in the language of Porphyry, by St. Cyril, in his sixth book against Julian the Apostate, p. 185. B.—Grotius.

153—156.] The "servile flattery" of Plato and Aristippus, and the "ungovernable passions" of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic Philosophy, towards his own sex; and of Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Aristippus, and almost the whole tribe of philosophers, towards the fair sex, are attested by Athenæus, book xii. 21. p. 544; and book xiii. 6. p. 588, 589: by Laertius, book vi. 13. 17; book iii. 31; book v. 3; book x. 4-7; book ii. 74, 75: and by Lactantius, book iii. 15. as well as in other passages. Theognis himself indeed frequently places his own character in this light. The Cynic philosophers, we know, derived that appellation from their canine impudence; and "the animosity with which they all disputed about words and trifling matters" is well exhibited in some extracts from Timon the Phliasian, which you will find in Clemens, Strom. v. p. 235; and towards the conclusion of the Prep. Evang. of Eusebius; and also in the 2d Discourse of Theodoret, p. 24.—Grotius.

157. They squared their tenets by the rules of political interest, &c.] Xenophon in his "Memorabilia of Socrates," 1. 8. quotes an oracle, by which it is enjoined that the Gods should be wor-
shipped according to local laws and customs: see in this place our former quotation of the words of Seneca from St. Austin (in the second note of this book), to which St. Austin adds this remark: that "he worshipped what he disapproved, he did what he condemned, he adored the object of his censure!" Indeed (as Plato has observed in his Timæus, p. 1047. and elsewhere; and Porphyry in a passage which occurs book iv. ch. 8. of the Præp. Evang. of Eusebius) "it was not without danger that the truth on divine subjects was discussed before the common people." The Greek, Latin, and Barbarian philosophers were more influenced by the fear of this danger, than by a sincere avowal of that truth; and this consideration alone is a sufficient bar to our implicit confidence in such guides. Justin Martyr in his exhortation to the Greeks, § 25. observes this time-serving policy in the conduct of Plato — Grotius.

158, 159. Socrates.—Mahomet.] See the 42d and 43d notes of this book, in reference to the sentiments of Socrates on the question of a future state. See the 4th and other chapters of the sixth part of this treatise, respecting the character of Mahomet.—Grotius.

160.] Exodus iv. 2. 10. 13, 14.
161.] Numbers xx. 12.
162.] Exodus xxxiiii. Numbers xi. xii. xiv. xvi. xx. xxv.
164.] John viii. 46. x. 32. 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 22. Hebrews iv. 15. Christ "without sin." It will be shown in the 4th book, ch. 9. that the righteousness of our Saviour's character was extolled even by an oracle of high authority amongst the Pagans.—Grotius.

165, 166. Which of you convinceth me of sin?—Whatsoever he commanded, &c.] His unimpeached character is noticed by Origen in his 3d book, ch. 23. against Celsus: and Lactantius, in the conclusion of his "Divine Institutions," well observes that he not only pointed out the path of virtue, but practically walked in it before us, that we might not be deterred by its apparent difficulty." —Grotius.

167.] See 1 Peter ii. 22.
169.] Luke xxiii. 34.
340
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172.] Acts ii. 3, 4. x. 46. xix. 6. 1 Cor. xii 10. 28. 30. xiii.
1. 8. 1 Cor. xiv. 2. 4, 5. 6. 9. 13. 14. 18. 19. 22. 23. 26. 27. 99.
Grotius.

Romans xv. 19. 2 Cor. xii. 12. Heb. ii. 4. The truth
of this is shown by Justin in his dispute with Trypho, § 85;
and by Irenæus, book ii. 56; by Tertullian in his Apology, ch.
xviii.; by Origen against Celsus, vii. 8; by Lactantius, iv. 21;
as well as by other writers.—Grotius.


175. The most northern recesses of Europe.] See " an Ecclesiastical
History of Bremen and Hamburg," by Adam, a canon
of Bremen, edit. Francof. 1609: see also "Helmoldus," edit.
Francof. 1556; and Lubec, 1659: and the writers on Iceland.
—Grotius.


177. Asiatic Isles.] See Jerome Osorio in his writings on Lu-
Grotius.

178. Egypt.] See the Acts of the General Councils, in ancient
Ecclesiastical History, and particularly the 6th book of Eusebius,
ch. 34; and the Coptic Liturgy.—Grotius.

179. Ethiopia.] See the Travels of Francis Alvarez, 1557: he
was sent as Portuguese ambassador to the king of Abyssinia.—
Grotius.

180. Other parts of Africa.] See Tertullian, Cyprian, August-
tine, and the Acts of the African Councils, especially of that
which Cyprian has annexed to his works.—Grotius.

181. And lastly throughout America.] See the writings of
Joseph Acosta “de Naturâ Novi Orbis,” &c. 1596; and of others
on American affairs.—Grotius.

182, 183. Thomas, and Andrew, &c.] See the “Historia Cer-
taminis Apostolici,” book i. of Ablias; (an absurd legendary
treatise: the writer was a native of Babylon, and pretended to
be one of the seventy-two disciples of our Saviour.) Consult
Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, book i. in the conclu-
sion; and book ii. in the 1st chapter; and book iii. in the be-
ginning: see also Rufinus, book i. ch. 9. edit. Basil. 1528; and
Osorius, edit. Rome, 1592; and Linschotius “de rebus Indiæ
 Orientalis;” and Freita “de Imperio Lusitanorum Asiatico.”
The tomb of St. Thomas is shown to this day in the country of
Coromandel. See also, in regard to St. Andrew, the 3d book of
Eusebius before mentioned, in the beginning; and Origen, in
the third volume of his Commentaries on Genesis, according to
the same book and chapter of Eusebius.—Grotius.
184, 185. Clemens.—Tertullian, &c.] See Clemens to this effect, Strom. 6. towards the end, p. 296; and Tertullian, in his book against the Jews, ch. 7. has the following passage: "In what other person, except in Christ now come, have all nations believed? In Him is united the faith of different and distant people: Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites; and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Armenia, in Phrygia, in Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene; Romans, and sojourners at Rome; Jews, and other nations in Jerusalem; the various inhabitants of Gætulia and Mauritania; all the boundaries of Spain; the different nations of Gaul; parts of Britain which Rome could never conquer, but subject to the power of Christ; the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians; many nations little known, many provinces and islands altogether unknown to us, nor can we well enumerate their names; but in all of them Christ who hath now appeared makes known his name, and establishes his kingdom." He proceeds afterwards to show how much more extensive that kingdom was, even in that early age, the latter end of the second century after Christ, than the ancient empires of Nebuchadnezzar, of Alexander, and of Caesar! "The kingdom of Christ (he says) is extended to all places; His faith is everywhere received. He commands the esteem, the obedience, the worship of those various nations before mentioned. (Tertullian had enumerated the Babylonians, the Parthians; India, Æthiopia, Asia, Germany, and Britain; the Moors, the Gætulians, and the Romans.) He is given equally to be the Saviour of the World!"—Grotius.

186. And others.] Irenæus (who was somewhat earlier than Tertullian) observes, book i. ch. 3. that "though the languages of the world are various, the force or purport of tradition is invariably the same. Neither have the churches which are founded in Germany any other faith, nor do they deliver any other doctrines: nor the churches of Iberia, nor those of the Celte, nor those in the East, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those in the more central countries of the world: but as the sun which God created is one and the same throughout the universe, so also the light of Christianity, the Gospel of Truth, shines everywhere, and illumines all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth." Origen, in his Homily on Ezekiel iv. 1. observes that "even the wretched Jews admit the application of these predictions to the coming of Christ, but they are stupidly ignorant of the person, while they see the completion of the prophecy. For at what time, till the advent of the Messiah, did the people of Britain unite in the religious worship of one God? at what time did the country of the Moors? at what time, in short, did the whole world?"
Arnobius also says, book ii. p. 48. "Those virtues practically shown, and that miraculous power previously unknown, which either Christ himself exhibited, or which his apostles proclaimed through the universe, subdued the violence of human passions, and united countries, people, and nations, of manners most dissimilar, in the reception of One Faith. We might here enumerate and compute with advantage what occurred in India, among the people beyond the Ganges, the Persians, and the Medes; in Arabia, in Egypt, in Asia, in Syria; among the Galatians, the Parthians, and the Phrygians; in Achaea, in Macedonia, in Epirus; in all the islands and provinces which the rising and the setting sun surveys; and lastly in Rome itself, the mistress of the world!"

Athanasius, in a synodical epistle, (see the 4th book of Theodoret, ch.3.) records the Christian churches of Spain, Britain, Gaul, Italy, Dalmatia, Mysia, Macedonia, Greece, Africa, Sardinia, Cyprus, Crete, Pamphylia, Isauria, Lycia, Egypt, Libya, Pontus, Cappadocia. Theodoret, in his 8th discourse against the Greeks, p. 111, thus speaks of the apostles: "During their earthly ministry, they went sometimes into one country, sometimes into another; now preaching to the Romans, and now the Spaniards, and now the Celtae; and when they quitted this mortal state, returning to Him by whom they were sent forth, all people were left in the perpetual enjoyment of their instructions, not only the Romans, and the nations willingly or forcibly subject to their government, but the Persians also, the Scythians, the Massagetae, the Sauromatae, the Indians, the Ethiopians; in a word, all the countries of the habitable globe." Again, in his 9th discourse, p. 129, he enumerates among the converted nations the Persians, the Massagetae, the Tibareni, the Hycranians, the Caspi, and the Scythians.

St. Jerome, in his epistle of condolence on the death of Nepotian, includes among Christian nations the Indians, the Persians, the Goths, the Egyptians, the Bessi (in Thrace), and other fierce and rude people who covered themselves with skins. In his epistle to Læta he mentions the Indians, the Persians, the Ethiopians, the Armenians, the Huns, the Scythians, and the Getæ. In his dialogue between "Orthodoxus and Luciferianus," he names the Britons, the Gauls, the Oriental nations, the people of India, the Iberians, the Celtiberians, the Ethiopians, St. Chrysostom, in the Moral of his 6th Homily on the 1st of Corinthians ii. 1—5, observes: "How should these writings have reached the countries of Barbarians and Indians, and the very boundaries of the ocean, if the writers had not been worthy of credit?" And again, in his last Homily on Pentecost, t. v.

* An advocate of Lucifer, a Sardinian bishop; in some points heretical.
p. 612. 36. he says: "The Holy Spirit descended in the form of tongues, assigning to each of the apostles the regions in which he was to exercise his ministry throughout the world; and by the language given to him, as by an express commission, pointing out to each of them the district confided to his government and his instruction." In the beginning of his admirable discourse on the divinity of Christ, t. vi. p. 622. 43. he further says, "We therefore affirm that it was not within the province of a teacher, merely human, to traverse in so short a time so great a portion of the habitable globe, by land and sea, and to call men thus to such actions: men, moreover, previously engaged in a course of life so adverse to his undertaking, or rather enslaved by such wicked practices: nevertheless, he proved competent to rescue mankind from all these evils, not the Romans only, but the Persians also, and in fact all the barbarous nations!" The subsequent passages are, likewise, highly worthy of perusal.—Grotius.

187, 188. All parts, &c.—At least half the countries, &c.] See Romans xv. 19. Even in his own time Tertullian had made this remark, ch. xxxvii. of his Apology: "We are, (says he) we Christians are a people but of yesterday*, and yet we have filled your whole empire, your cities, your islands, your castles, your municipal towns, your places of assembly, your very camps, your wards, your judicial offices, your palace, your senate, and your forum! Your temples alone are left in your own hands."

—Grotius.

189. Their language plain, simple, unadorned, &c.] This was judiciously noticed by St. Chrysostom in his 3d Homily on 1 Cor. i. 17.; and by Theodoret, after the passage quoted in note 186: see his 8th discourse, p. 111.—Grotius.

190. Burnt alive at the stake, &c.] Domitius Ulpianus, an eminent lawyer, in the high station of principal minister to Alexander Severus, composed seven books on the various modes of punishment which ought to be inflicted on Christians. Lactantius mentions this circumstance in his 5th book, ch. 11. 19.—Grotius.

191. In comparison with those who suffered, &c.] Like the bright assemblage of the three hundred martyrs at Carthage, mentioned in the Roman Martyrology xxiv. of Augustus: A great many suffered in Africa under Severus; under Valerian at Antioch; and in Arabia, Cappadocia, and Mesopotamia; under Maximin in Phrygia and in Pontus; at Nicomedia, in Numidia, at Rome, in Thebais, Tyre, and Treves, under Diocletian; in Persia under Cabades and Sapor: the very names of these num-

* Some editions of this Oratio Apologetica pro Christianis read externi, not hesterni.
barless martyrs undistinguished, unrecorded, in the sad register of their sufferings and deaths! — Grotius.

192. The different degrees of proof, &c.] Aristotle, Ethics, book i. 3. to Nicomachus, observes that "it is sufficient to explain any given subject as far as the matter or nature of it will properly allow, for the same degree of precision is not to be required on all subjects." And in the latter part of the 1st book of his Metaphysics, in the last chapter, he says, "Mathematical exactness is not in all cases to be expected." And Chalcidius on the Timaeus (expressing the sentiments of Plato) observes that "a ready belief precedes every kind of learning; especially where assertions are made, not on the authority of ordinary men, but on that of very eminent men; almost of a superior race of beings."
— Grotius.

193, 194. Mutually known, &c.— God however hath decreed, &c.} See the 1st book of Homer's Odyssey, line 216. This mutual knowledge cannot be founded on mathematical demonstration.— Grotius.

Now, in the instance of Religion, the tenets or doctrines proposed to us are of two kinds; one of which may be philosophically demonstrated, the other not. Of the former kind are the Being of a God, the creation of the world, a divine providence, the sanctity and utility of the precepts which God has enjoined; all which admit of demonstration, and have been so fully proved by Grotius and others, that we must either admit them to be true, or renounce the faculty of reason. Still there are passions in opposition to these truths which lead to the rejection of them, because, if men acknowledged their certainty, those passions must be resisted; which is a task rendered irksome by habits of indulgence. Of the latter kind are matters of historical fact, on which is established the truth of the Christian Revelation, and these have been stated and proved by Grotius on their proper ground of evidence, that of authentic history. This evidence would be valid, to the conviction of unbelievers, (as it is in the case of all histories which they admit to be true without ocular demonstration,) were it not opposed by those reasons which the passions supply to prevent its admission; for, if once it were admitted, they know that their inveterate habits must then be abandoned! The reader is referred to my little French treatise "de l'Incrédulité." — Le Clerc.

195. Wilful blindness of wicked men.] This subject is admirably treated by Chrysostom on the 1 Cor. 3, in the beginning of his 8th Homily, edit. Parisiis, 1732, tom. x. p. 65. The same writer, tom. i. p. 125. observes to Demetrius, that "the authority of God's laws is denied, that men may be at liberty to disobey them." — Grotius.
We must allow it to exceed all miracles, see Chrysostom on the latter part of the 1st ch. of 1 Corinthians, p. 272. 15: and St. Austin, book 22, ch. 5. De Civ. Del.

BOOK III.


2. Clemens.] There is only the Epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians extant; in which indeed passages of the New Testament are quoted, but the names of the writers are not specified: Clemens might therefore have been omitted in this place; and Justin also, who is not in the habit of annexing the writer's name to a quotation.—Le Clerc.

3. Tertullian.] See his "Prescriptiones adv. Hæreticos," ch. 36, where he says: "if you would exercise your curiosity to a better purpose, in the business of your salvation, run through the apostolical churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles are still employed, in their respective places, in governing those churches, and in which the very epistles, the authentic epistles, of those Apostles continue to be read." Why should not the original manuscripts be then extant, when Quintilian, i. 7. tells us that the hand-writing of Cicero was extant in his time: and Aulus Gellius, ii. 3. says the same, in his time, with respect to the hand-writing of Virgil?—Grotius.


See also the Remarks annexed to my "Harmonia Evangelica," in the dissertation on the four Gospels.—Le Clerc.

5. The Second Epistle of Peter, &c.] Grotius himself, however, had his doubts respecting the 2d Epistle of St. Peter, and he has himself stated the reason of those doubts in the beginning of his annotations on that Epistle. But if the authenticity of both could be called in question, the other Epistles would not be rendered doubtful by that circumstance; nor would it invalidate any single article of the Christian Faith, which, in all its parts, is amply revealed to us on other unquestionable authority.—Le Clerc.
6. The qualifications of a writer, &c. Say rather the quality of a writing or a book, (not of a writer or an author;) and it is evident that this was the meaning of Grotius from the subsequent remarks.—Le Clerc.

6*. The Alveandrian and African wars are generally ascribed to Hirtius, who wrote the 8th book of Cæsar's Comm. de Bell. Gall. but Suetonius doubts whether he or Oppius were the author of them.


8, 9. They could not be ignorant, &c.—A near kinsman of Jesus.] See John xv. 27. 1 John i. 1. Acts i. 21, 22. Many others are of the same opinion respecting St. James; Chrysostom in every part of his writings: see also Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, xx. 8.—Grotius.

And you may add Eusebius: see his Hist. Evang. book i. ch. 1 and 23.—Le Clerc.


12, 13, 14. Mark.—The writer of the Revelations.—The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.] See Irenæus, book iii. ch. 1. and Clemens Alex. in his books under the title Τιτονιωτος, (a very objectionable part of his works,) quoted by Eusebius in his Eccles. Hist. vi. 14. edit. Paris, 1659. See the Apocalypse i. 1, 2. iv. 1 & seqq. xxii. 18, 19, 20, 21. see Hebrews ii. 4. v. 14. xiii. 7, 8. 25.—Grotius.

15, 16, 17. The perfect purity of their tenets.—Their desertion and flight.—Peter's repeated denial of his Lord.] Their tenets too were utterly adverse to all falsehood: see John xiv. 17. xv. 26. xvi. 13. xvii. 19. xviii. 37. Acts xxvi. 25. Rom. i. 25. 2 Thess. ii. 10. 1 John i. 6. 8. 1 John ii. 4. 21. 2 Cor. vi. 8. Ephes. iv. 15. 25. Coloss. iii. 9. Apoc. xxii. 15. 2 Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 20. It is also observable how carefully St. Paul distinguishes what he speaks on his own authority from what he speaks "of the Lord:" see 1 Cor. vii. 10. 12. and how afraid he is to say, in relating his visions, whether he saw them "in the body," or "out of the body:" see 2 Cor. xii. 2. see their desertion of

18, 19. Their confident and public declarations.—Their familiar use of languages previously unknown.] See the Acts of the Apostles throughout, and 2 Cor. xii. 12. In regard to the gift of tongues the passages have been already cited, book ii. note 172.—Grotius.

20, 21. The miracles of Peter—Matters of perfect notoriety, &c.] Phlegon in his 15th book, as Origen assures in his 2d book, 14. against Celsus. This Phlegon is the same writer of whose works we have some fragments remaining, on wonderful events, and on particular instances of longevity. Lugd. Bat. 1622. There are numerous passages, particularly in the writings of Origen, (in respect to these alleged matters of perfect notoriety,) and the reader is referred also to the whole purport of the 8th chapter of St. Austin's 22d book de Civitate Dei.—Grotius.

22, 23. Inherent in their sepulchres, &c.—Even from Porphyrius, &c.] The performance of miracles at the tombs of departed saints began to be a matter of pretence and boast just at that period when, on the civil establishment of Christianity, it began to be a matter of emolument to those in whose churches the dead bodies of martyrs and other holy men were buried. I would therefore omit this argument, lest the assumption of doubtful or fictitious miracles should affect the credibility of those which are true. It is notorious how many stories were told on this subject from the commencement of the fourth century: but Origen, in the preceding century, makes no mention of any miracles of this kind; nay, in his 7th book, 8. against Celsus, he observes that "from the beginning of our Saviour's ministry, and after his ascension, the signs of the Holy Spirit were frequently displayed in miraculous power for a time, but seldom afterwards: nevertheless, to this day, traces of it are still observable among the few whose souls are duly purified by right principles, and by correspondent actions." Who then can believe that so many miracles were performed a century or two after the time of Origen, when they were less necessary? It is certainly at least as possible, without the smallest crime, to suspect the miracles of the fourth and fifth centuries, as it is impossible, without the greatest effrontery, to deny the miracles of Christ and his apostles! The latter could not be publicly avowed without danger, the former could not be denied without danger, and the belief of them was a source of sure profit to those by whose artifice perhaps they were counterfeited! Now this consideration alone makes a wide difference between the two cases. —Le Clerc.

27.] See the same passages; and also Matt. viii. 11. xii. 21. xxi. 43.
28.] Matt. x. 17.
29.] Matt. x. 21. 39. xxiii. 34.
31.] Matt. xxi. 33 & seqq. xxiii. 34. xxiv. 20.—Grotius.
32. Accustomed to blaspheme God, &c.] See Irenæus, book i. ch. 29. Tertullian against Marcion, i. 6. and Epiphanius on the same subject, t. i. p. 365. A.—Grotius.
33. 34. Anxious to conceal themselves, &c.—because the profession, &c.] See Gal. ii. 11. vi. 13, 14. Phil. iii. 18. Irenæus, book i. ch. 26. Epiphanius on the Ebionites, t. i. p. 126. A. For the un molested profession of their religion, see Acts ix. 20. Acts xiii. and indeed in many other chapters. See Philo "adversus Flaccum," p. 753. and "de Legatione," p. 785. Josephus in various parts of his writings: to which may be added the general law, and the particular decretum respecting the Decuriones, (a sort of subaltern officers,) book i. C, concerning the Jews. Tertullian observes in his Apology, ch. 18. "But the Jews also read their law in open synagogue; a privilege, for the purchase of which they generally collect a tribute every sabbath day."—Grotius.
35. 36. Disowned by all other Christians even during that period, &c.] Tertullian against Marcion, book i. 21. observes, that "no church of apostolical institution was to be found that did not profess Christianity in the faith and worship of a Creator." See, on this subject of general toleration, what will be said in the conclusion of the 6th book of this treatise. See also the epistle of Irenæus to Victor, in book the 5th, ch. 24. of the Evang. Hist. of Eusebius; and Nicephorus, iv. 39. and St. Jerome's observations on it in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, t. i. p. 287. St. Cyprian ("Sententiae Episcoporum," 87. "de Haæreticis baptizandis," see Consilium Carthaginense, p. 329. edit. Parisiis 1726) has the following sentiment in his address to the Council: "judging no man—excluding no man from a right of communion with us—on account of religious differences."—Grotius.

[His concluding expressions are equally fine, p. 338. And ya
should remember that Grotius was writing under the cruel sentence of perpetual imprisonment.]

37. As we see especially in the Gospel of St. Luke.] Tertullian states that circumstance in the clearest manner in his 4th book against Marcion, ch. 6 & seqq.—Grotius.

38.] See Philipp. iii. 5.

39.] Acts xvi. 3. xx. 6. xxi. 21 et seq.

40.] 2 Cor. xi. 23 et seq.: the Acts of the Apostles in every chapter: see also 1 Cor. ii. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 30. xii. 10.

41.] Acts xx. 29. Romans v. 3. viii. throughout. xii. 12.

2 Cor. i. 4. 8. ii. 4. vi. 4. 1 Thess. i. 6. 2 Thess. i. 6.

42.] Acts ii. 46. v. 42. 1 Tim. v. 5. 2 Tim. i. 3.

43.] 2 Cor. vi. 4. xii. 10.

44.] Romans viii. 36. 2 Cor. iv. 11. Philipp. i. 20.

45.] Gal. ii. 9. 1 Cor. xv. 11. 2 Cor. xi. 5. xii. 11.—Grotius.

46, 47.] See Book ii. § 7: see Matt. xi. 27. Rom. xi. 33, 34.


49. The skillful politician, &c.] See Tacitus, Annals, vi. 8. in that admirable speech of Marcus Terentius on the fall of Sejanus.—Grotius.


51. Former laws are virtually repealed, &c.] “Constitutiones tempore posteriores plūs valent prioribus.” In the Digests of Justinian, lib. i. title 4. “De Constitutionibus Principum,” Modestinus, lib. 2. Excusationum, says, that “Constitutions of a later date have greater force than those which have preceded them.” See Corpus Juris Civilis, tom. i. p. 65. edit. Amst. 1681. And Tertullian says, in the 6th chapter of his Tract, “Exhortatio Castitatis,” that, in his opinion, “subsequent constitutions and decrees of human authority supersede those of a prior date.” And again in his Apology, chap. 4. he says, “You lop off and cut down the old overgrown stock of laws with the new axes of princely rescripts and edicts.” And in his book “De Baptismo,” cap. xiii. “The latest are always conclusive: and the preceding are overruled by those that follow.” See also Plu-
tarch. Symposiac. ix. Quast. xiii. "Both in edicts and in laws, in contracts and in covenants, the later instruments are deemed more binding and valid than the earlier."—Grotius.

52. Whether Jews, Grecian philosophers, physicians, or Roman lawyers.] See the very different opinions of Jewish writers, as in other instances, so especially in the books of Manasses, the son of Israel, (who was eminently skilled in their literature,) on the creation and resurrection. Amst. 1635, 1636.—Grotius.

53.] See the reference already made (in note 48) in respect to the notions and opinions of philosophers.—Grotius.

54.] As to physicians, see Galen "de optimo docendi genere;" and Celsus "de Re medicā," in the beginning, Amst. 1687; to these may be added the writers on chemistry.—Grotius.

55.] In regard to the Roman lawyers, the ancient disputes between the partizans of Sabinus and those of Proculus are notorious. Among civilians of more modern date we may instance the differences which subsisted between Bartolus and his adherents on the one side, and Cujas or Cujacios and other scholars on the other. [Bartolus appears in "Procémio Digestorum" in a dispute about the date of Gymnasium Bononiense: see Sigo-nius, vol. vi. p. 989.] See also "the common, more common, and most common opinions" of Gabriélhus, in his "Sententiae seu Conclusiones," edit. Franc. 1597.—Grotius.

56, 57. As Xenophon and Plato were.] See Xenophon's Epistle to Æschines the disciple of Socrates, p. 1000. D. ed. Lut. Par. 1625. See also Athenæus, xi. 15. p. 504, &c. Laertius (Diogenes) in his Life of Plato, iii. 34. and A. Gallius, book xiv. 3. Many have convicted Aristotle of self-contradictions, as others have done the Roman lawyers.—Grotius.

58. Because it is the practice of false witnesses, &c.] The Emperor Adrian observes to this effect, that it should be noticed how far the testimony given by witnesses may betray a pre-concerted and uniform design. See Justinian's Digests or Pandects, book xxii. title v. de Testibus 3. Callistratus, book iv. de Cognitionibus. "Testium fides," &c. &c. Corpus Juris Civilis, p. 348. edit. 1681: see also Durandus, seu Speculator. Specu-lum Juris, Franc. 1592. lib. i. partic. 4. de Teste, § 1. n. 81. A most exact knowledge of all circumstances is not necessary in a witness. See Luke i. 56. iii. 23. John ii. 6. vi. 10. 19. xix. 14.—Grotius.—See Mr. Beloe's account of Durandus, vol. v. 827.

59. Phlegon and the public acts.] Phlegon says, in the 13th book of his "History of the Olympiads," that "in the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad, the greatest eclipse of the sun that had ever been known occurred; when the darkness of night prevailed at the sixth hour of the day (that is at mid-day), so that the stars became visible, and a great earthquake in Bithynia over.
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turned a considerable portion of the city of Nicaea." This fragment will be found in the "Chronicon" of Eusebius as well as in St. Jerome. And it is also mentioned in Origen's remarks on St. Matthew, treatise xxxv. and in his 2d book against Celsus.
—Grotius.

This event was preternatural, the moon being then at the full.
—L'Oste.

60.] See further Tertullian's Apology, chap. xxi. where he says, "You have in your own arcana (or records) an account of that extraordinary event which befel the world."—Grotius.

61. The appearance of the star, &c.] Chalcidius the Platonist, in his Commentary on the Timæus, p. 219. says, that "there is another history, more sacred and more venerable, which speaks of the rising of a certain star, not portentous of diseases and death, but announcing the descent of an adorable God, with a view to the salvation of man, and to the state of human affairs: which star being seen by some wise men of Chaldaea (sufficiently versed in the contemplation of the heavenly bodies) as they journeyed by night, they are said to have sought immediately the place of the God's recent nativity, and, perceiving the innate majesty of that infant, to have worshipped him, and to have offered their public expressions of adoration suited to so great a God."
—Grotius.

62. Surely were unjust, &c.] On the very immaterial and trifling nature of these differences we have at this day the most perfect satisfaction afforded by the most accurate collection of the various readings of the New Testament, and particularly from the edition of the Rev. Dr. John Mill. How numerous soever these various readings may be, they do not authorise any new point of doctrine, neither do they subvert any doctrine of the received text. [Works of a later date are conclusive on this point.] No history of material import, affecting the truth of Christianity, as it was previously received from the books of the New Testament, is exploded; nor any, previously unknown, supplied by this variety of readings. And what is here said respecting the books of the New Testament may be understood to be equally applicable to those of the Old.—Le Clerc.

63, 64. The proof may be thrown on the assailant—the book exempted from the possibility of an interpolation.] See book vi. of Justinian's Codex, title xxxiii. "De Edicto Divi Adriani tollendo; Scriptus heres," &c. Corpus Juris Civilis, p. 234. No interpolation certainly could be introduced into all the copies; neither could any fraud corrupt all the versions: unprincipled men, indeed, or men perversely bent on the support of their own opinions, might otherwise, here and there, corrupt their own copies; and in fact this was done not only by Marcion, but also by some transcribers of a more orthodox character, as I have
—Le Clerc.

65* Ethiopians.] Under this appellation the Chaldeans and Phoenicians were described by the ancients. Strabo.

65 Esdras.] Esdras, about the year 449 before Christ, restored the law of Moses to the Jews, was therefore called the second Moses, and collected the Holy Scriptures. The Jews, after this, enjoyed a long peace under a sacerdotal form of government.

65* David; Solomon; and leagues with the Tyrians in the Phoenician Annals.] See the quotations of Josephus from the Phoenician Annals, in his History of Jewish Antiquities, book viii. ch. 2. where he adds, that copies of the letters which passed between Solomon and Hirom may be seen on application to the public keepers of the archives of Tyre. [This is not entitled to credit: see my note on 1 Kings v. 3.—Le Clerc.] There is a remarkable passage respecting David quoted from the 4th book of Nicolaus of Damascus, by Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, book vii. ch. 6. It is as follows: "Long after these events there was a certain powerful native of that country, whose name was Hadad, reigning over Damascus and all Syria, except Phoenicia, who waged war against David king of Judæa; and, after various engagements, was finally defeated in a battle near the Euphrates. He was highly distinguished as a king of great strength and bravery. His descendants for ten generations successively ascended his throne; and, like the Ptolemies in Egypt, each of them assumed the name of his ancestor when he succeeded to the government. The third of this name, being the most powerful, and wishing to retrieve what his grandfather had lost, engaged in war with the Jews, and laid waste the country which is now called Samaria." The first part of this history is given in the 2d book of Samuel viii. 5. and in the 1st book of Chronicles xviii; and the latter in the 1st book of Kings, ch. xx. on which see Josephus. This Hadad is called Hader by Josephus; and Adores by Justin, in his Epitome of Trogus Pompeius. Further particulars of David are given us from Eupolemus in the 4th book; ch. 30. of the Præp. Evang. of Eusebius: Josephus also quotes the following passage from the Phoenician History of Dion in the same book, viii. 2. and in his 1st book against Apion, v. 1:

"Abibalus being now dead, Hirom his son succeeded him, who by filling up void places on the east quarter of the town, enlarged the borders, and brought the temple of Olympian Jupiter that before stood apart and at a distance into the compass of the city, enriching and adorning it with golden offerings to a very great value; after which he ordered the cutting down of trees upon Mount Libanus for the use of holy places." He says further,
that "Solomon, the king of Jerusalem, oftensent problems
and riddles to Hirom, upon the forfeiture of a great sum of
money if he failed expounding them; those difficult cases were
afterward not only unriddled by Abdeemonus, a Tyrian, but new
propositions were started by him, which Solomon himself not
being able to resolve, he was obliged to refund the greatest part
of the money." [Clarke's Josephus.] Josephus (in his defence
of the Antiquities of the Jews, book 1.) also gives a remarkable
passage of Menander, a writer of Ephesus, who collected a num-er of the memorials of the lives of the Grecian and Barbarian
princes: "Abibal being dead (Menander says) he was succeeded
in the regal dignity by his son Hirom, who wore the crown no
less than 34 years. This prince joined Eurichorus to the city of
Tyre by means of a large mount which he caused to be thrown
up, and in the temple of Jupiter, in that place, dedicated a pillar
of gold to the honour of that god. He then proceeded to a for-
est on a mountain named Lebanon, where he cut down a large
quantity of cedar to make roofs for temples, of which he pulled
down many old, and built others in their stead. One of these he
dedicated to Hercules in the month Peritius, and another to As-
tartes at the time that he turned his arms against the Tyrians on
account of their refusing to pay their taxes; but he returned as
soon as he had conquered them. At this time there was in the
service of Hirom a young man named Abdeemonus, who lived in
the palace, and was employed in resolving difficult questions sent
by Solomon. The following is a computation from the time of
Hirom to the building of Carthage. Hirom was succeeded by
his son Beleazar, who died in the seventh year of his reign, and
the 43d of his age; after him came his son Abdastartus, who
reigned near nine years; but when he was in the 20th year of his
age he was murdered by the four sons of his nurse, of whom the
oldest reigned in his stead twelve years; and next to him was
Asartes, the son of Abdastartus, who likewise reigned twelve
years, and lived sixty-six. This prince was succeeded by his
brother Aserymus, who reigned nine years, and in the 54th year
of his age was murdered by Phelletus his brother. Phelletus
assumed the government when he was fifty years old, and having
reigned eight months was killed by Ithobalus, a priest of the
goddess Astarta, who reigned thirty-three years, and died at the
age of sixty-eight. He was succeeded by his son Badezor, who
reigned nine years, and lived forty-five. After Badezor came
his son Matagenus, who reigned nine years, and died at the age of
thirty-two. Matagenus was succeeded by Pygmalion, who govern-
ed forty-seven years, and lived fifty-six. Carthage in Africa was
built by his sister Dido, in the seventh year of his reign." [Clarke's
Josephus.] Theophilus of Antioch has quoted this passage, but more
briefly, in his book. § 22. to Autolycus. Tertullian, ch. 19. of
Antiquity.
his Apology, says, "We must open the archives even of the most ancient nations; the Egyptian, the Chaldean, the Phenician; their free citizens must be brought forward to communicate information: Manetho the Egyptian; Berosus the Chaldean; Hirom the Phenician, king of Tyre; their followers also, Ptolemy of Mendes, in Egypt; Menander the Ephesian; Demetrius Phalareus; the second Juba, king of Numidia; Apion and Thallus. Clemens (Strom. 1. p. 140. towards the end) informs us that the Hirom above mentioned, and his contemporary Solomon, were likewise recorded by Alexander Polyhistor, Menander of Pergamus, and Laetus in his accounts of Phoenicia, which enables us to correct a mistake of Tatian, § 37. where Χαῖρος is written for Δανος, and he is said to have translated into Greek the Phoenician writings of Theodotus, Hypsicrates, and Mochus. The memory of Hazael, king of Syria, who is mentioned in 1 Kings xix. 15. 2 Kings viii. 13. xii. 17. xiii. 3. 24. was preserved at Damascus with divine honours, as Josephus tells us in book ix. ch. 2. of his Jewish Antiquities; and the same name occurs in Justin's Epitome of Trogus, xxxvi. 2. There is a passage of Menander of Ephesus, whom we have already mentioned, which is cited by Josephus, in the 9th book as before, ch. 14. on the subject of Shalmaneser, who carried away the Ten Tribes into captivity, as we read in 2 Kings xvii. 3. & seqq. and who took Samaria, as we further read in 2 Kings xviii. 9. It is as follows: "Eluloeus reigned thirty-six years, and the Gittaeans revolting against him, he dispatched a fleet to reduce them to obedience, which service was performed. The king of the Assyrians likewise marched an army against him, and penetrated into Phoenicia, but upon a peace being concluded he drew off his troops. Not long after this the cities of Sidon, Acre, Palæ-Tyrus, and many other places, abandoned their countrymen, and submitted to the king of Assyria, who sent a fleet of sixty sail against the rest of the Tyrians, as the only people that submitted not to his authority. This fleet was conducted by the Phenicians, and had eight hundred rowers; but with only twelve vessels the Tyrians attacked them, threw them all into confusion, and made captives of five hundred of the rowers: a victory which elevated their naval skill to the highest degree of reputation. Thus vanquished the king of Assyria returned, and posted guards on the banks of the river, to prevent the Tyrians getting water, for which they were distressed near five years, during which they had none but what they procured by the digging of pits." [Clarke's Josephus.] Josephus adds in the same place, that the very name of this king, Shalmaneser, remained in the Tyrian archives in his time. The same writer says, book x. ch. 1. that both the name and the expeditions of Sennacherib (who subdued almost all Judæa, except Jerusalem, as we read in 2 Kings xviii. 13. and in 2 Chr.
Book III.]
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... and in Isaiah xxxvi. 1.) into Asia and Egypt were to be found in Berosus's History of Chaldaea; and the same Sennacherib is also mentioned by Herodotus, book ii. § 141. who calls him king of the Arabians and Assyrians. In 2 Kings xx. 12. and in Isaiah xxxix. the name of Baladan, king of Babylon, is mentioned; and Josephus affirms, in book x. ch. 3. of his Jewish Antiquities, that the name of the same person was recorded by Berosus, in his History of Chaldaea. Herodotus, book ii. as before, § 159. mentions in the following passage that battle in Megiddo, in which Nechoh, king of Egypt, defeated the Jews, (as we read in 2 Kings xxiii. 29. and in 2 Chronicles xxxv. 22.) "The Syrian army (he says) were defeated by Nechoh in an engagement in Magdolus." Now the Jews are always termed Syrians by Herodotus, and also by other writers. —Grotius.

66. Nebuchadnezzar.] Josephus has preserved a passage of Berosus, relative to this person, in book x. 11. of his Jewish Antiquities, and in book i. § 19. against Apion. He may be compared with Eusebius, who both in his Chronicle respecting this period, and in his Præp. Evang. book ix. ch. 40. and 41. produces this passage, and the subsequent extract from Abydenus. Nabopolassar being informed that his deputy for Egypt, Cœle-Syria, and Phœnicia, had taken up arms, and being himself too far advanced in years to sustain the fatigues of war, he dispatched his son Nebuchadnezzar, then in the prime of life, to reduce the rebel, and with a powerful army he put the insurgent to flight, and recovered all the revolted provinces. Having reigned twenty-nine years, Nabopolassar died in Babylon. Being informed of his father's death, Nebuchadnezzar adjusted his concerns in Egypt and the other provinces; and after deputing persons in whom he could confide to take care of the captive Jews, Phœnicians, and Syrians, and escort them to Babylon with the army and baggage, he proceeded towards that capital through the desert, with but a small retinue. On his arrival he found the state of affairs much to his satisfaction, the Chaldaeans and the people of eminence in general expressing themselves attached to his interest, and resolutely disposed to establish him in possession of the throne. While the prisoners were upon their journey, he ordered all necessary accommodations to be provided for them in the city. He applied the spoils of war to the embellishments of the temples dedicated to Belus and other deities. He caused a new town to be erected in addition to the ancient city; and that the river on the banks of which it stood might not be diverted from its natural channel in case of a siege, the buildings were enclosed with a triple wall, being partly of brick only, and partly of brick mixed with bitumen. He also erected a noble palace near that of his father, but abundantly
larger, more magnificent and costly. It would be too tedious to
describe this building; but it is worthy remark, that though so
rich and curious a structure, it was completed in fifteen days.
Within this building were a number of artificial rocks resembling
mountains, with nurseries for various kinds of plants, and a sort
of hanging garden, which with a singular degree of skill seemed
suspended in the air. This was done to oblige the queen, who
being educated in the free air among the hills of Media was
highly gratified by so delightful a prospect: but before the
completion of the undertakings above mentioned the king fell
sick and died, after a reign of forty-three years." This queen
was the Nitocris of Herodotus, (Clio, § 185. p. 103. edit. Oxon.
1808.) as the great Scaliger has observed in the excellent Ap-
Genev. 1629. See "Fragmenta Veterum," &c. The reader is
referred to Q. Curtius, book v. 4. & seqq. edit. Delphin. For
further information, and indeed in some particulars, see Strabo,
Amst. 1745. Berosus, from whom these and other matters have
been quoted, was a priest of Belus, after the time of Alexander
the Great. The Athenians erected a statue to him (the tongue
of which was overlaid with gold) on account of his astronomical
predictions, placing it in their Gymnasium, as we are informed
10. p. 639. C. gives his work the appellation of Babylonian; but
it is termed Chaldæan by Tatian, § 36. (who himself also asserts
that Nebuchodonosor was mentioned by Berosus); and so it is
by Clemens in Strom. i. p. 142. From his writings King Juba
professedly borrowed his information on the affairs of Assyria, as
Tatian remarks. Nebuchodonosor is likewise mentioned by
Vitruvius ix. 7. 9.; by Tertullian in his Apology, ch. xix.; and
by the author of the Alexandrian Annals, in the introduction.
Eusebius has further given us an extract, in which the name
is also mentioned, from Abydenus, who wrote a History of As-
syria: see both his Chronicon, p. 41. and his Prep. Evang. in
the latter part of the 9th book. The passage is this: "Megas-
thenes says that Nebuchodonosor was superior to Hercules in
valiant exploits, and that he waged war with Libya and Iberia,
and, having conquered those countries, carried off the inhabitants,
and distributed them in colonies on the right of the coast of
Pontus. It is further related among the Chaldaeans that he once
became inspired by some deity as he was ascending into his
palace, and thus addressed the people: "O Babylonians, I Ne-
buchodrosor foretell a calamity which awaits you, and which
neither Belmus my progenitor, nor Belitis the queen, could per-
suade cruel Fate to avert! A Persian mule shall come and shall
employ your own gods as his auxiliaries, and shall reduce you
to slavery. And his assistant shall be the Mede (or Medus) the
boast of Assyria. How do I wish ere he betray the inhabitants that some whirlpool or sea may swallow him up, or that he may be carried elsewhere and bewildered in desert places, where there are neither cities or human footsteps, and where wild beasts seek their prey, and ravenous birds are wandering about, that he may be seized by them, in total solitude, among the rocks and caverns! How do I wish also that some happy termination of life had befallen me, before scenes like these had been presented to my mind!" Having thus uttered his predictions, he vanished instantaneously. The latter part of this extract should be compared with the accounts which we read in Daniel respecting Nebuchodonosor, (see ch. iv. for the name applies to the same person, though variously spelt) ; and the former part of it we find also in Josephus, from Megasthenes, book x. ch. 11. of his Jewish Antiquities, where he also says that the gardens made by Nebuchodonosor "are celebrated by Megasthenes in the 4th volume of the History of India." Eusebius likewise quotes from Abydenus the following particulars respecting Nebuchodonosor: "It is said that the whole site of Babylon was originally under water, and was called a sea; that Belus drained it, and distributed to every man a portion of the ground, surrounding Babylon with a wall, which was destroyed by time: that the city was again surrounded with a wall by Nebuchodonosor, and that the wall remained, with brazen gates, till the date of the Macedonian empire." And afterwards it is added, that "Nebuchodonosor, on his accession to the throne, encompassed Babylon with a triple wall in fifteen days, diverting the river Armacale, a branch of the Euphrates, and also the river Acracanus, into a new channel. He then dug a trench above the city of the Sipparensians, in circumference 40 parasangæ (or 160 miles,) and 20 fathoms deep, and made sluices by which the surrounding land was watered: these were called ὄρετον ναύσινω, a sort of aqueducts. He also prevented the inundations of the Red Sea by a wall, and built the city Teredon, to check the incursions of the Arabs, and adorned the palace with plantations, which he called hanging gardens." See Daniel iv.30. Another quotation from Megasthenes is given us by Strabo, book xv. p.687. A. where he says "that Nebuchodonosor, whom the Chaldæans held in higher estimation than Hercules, advanced as far as the Pillars," (or Gibraltar). Other writers also, whose names alone are now remaining, have formerly touched upon the history of this king. Dioecles, for instance, in his 2d book of Persian history; and Philostratus both in his accounts of India and Phœnicia: He says that Tyre was besieged by him for thirteen years, as Josephus informs us in the part of his Jewish Antiquities already cited, and also in his 1st book against Apion, § 20, 21. where he gives the following particulars from the Phœnician History: "During the reign of King Ithobal, Tyre
was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar for the space of thirteen years. He was succeeded by Baal, who reigned ten years. After his decease it became customary to trust the powers of government with judges instead of kings. Of these judges Ecnibalus, the son of Ba-leck, governed two months; and he was succeeded by Chelbis, the son of Abdeus, who was ten months in authority; the High Priest Abbar three; Mytgounus and Gerastratus, the sons of Abdelimus, six years: they were followed by Balatorus, who having governed one year, the people sent to Babylon for Merbalus, who was in authority four years: upon his decease he was succeeded by his brother Hiram, who governed twenty years, in the course of which Cyrus completed the conquest of the Persian empire. [Clarke's Josephus].

The agreement of this computation with Sacred History appears in a strong light from the 1st book of Josephus against Apion, already mentioned, § 21.; and Josephus there adds from Hecateus, § 22. "Immense numbers of our people, multitudes, were made captives, and carried into Babylon!" See also a passage of Demetrius, according to Clemens, in Strom. i. p. 146. on the subject of the war of Sennacherib, and the removal of the Jews in captivity to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar.—Grotius.

The authority of Hecateus, as his writings are not genuine, is of no avail. See Gerard John Vossius "de historicis Graecis." 1701.—Le Clerc.

67. Other kings of the Chaldeans as frequently mentioned by Berosus as in the Hebrew accounts.] According to Josephus, referring to the two places already cited, we have the following extract, in addition to those which he has given from Berosus. "Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by his son Evil-Merodach, who became the aversion of the public by his lascivious and oppressive conduct, and in the second year of his reign was destroyed by the treachery of Neriglishtar, the husband of his sister, who, soon after his death, assumed the regal government, of which he held possession four years. He was succeeded by his son Labortsoarchod, then quite a youth, who at the end of a reign of only nine months was destroyed by those who called themselves his friends, who dispatched him because his inclinations were thought to be of a vicious and dangerous tendency. Immediately after his death the conspirators assembled, and chose for their king Nabonadius, by birth a Babylonian (who had also been concerned in this very conspiracy). This prince completed the building of the walls round the city of Babylon. When the king had reigned near seventeen years, Cyrus came out of Persia with a very great army, ravaged all Asia, and then proceeded towards Babylon. He was met in the field by Nabonadius, who encountered him; but being routed, himself and a few of his followers only escaped to the town of Borsippe. Cyrus
advanced to Babylon, and determined to destroy the fortifications, as he saw the people turbulent and unruly, and the city difficult to be taken; but raising the siege, he marched to Borsippe, with an intention of attacking that place. But Nabonadius, declining the hazard of defending it, surrendered to the mercy of Cyrus, who, upon his making that submission, banished him from Babylon, and presented to him an estate in Carmania, where he resided during the remainder of his life, in a retired and humble situation." Ibid. In addition to the particulars adduced on the subject of Nebuchodonosor, we find, in the places-of Eusebius before mentioned, the following passage of Abydenus: "He was succeeded by his son Evil-Merodach, (but the name misspelt,) who was slain by his brother-in-law Neriglissar, leaving a son Labossoarasch. On the death of this son, who was murdered, the crown was conferred on Nabannidach, of another family; and when Cyrus took Babylon, the dethroned king was allowed to govern the province of Carmania." That Evil-Merodach is mentioned in 2 Kings xxv. 27.; and in regard to the other names see Scaliger in his Appendix to the "Emendatio Temporum," p. 14. & seq. mentioned in the preceding note. The particulars relative to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus agree with the following passage of Herodotus, i. 190. "Thus Cyrus marched towards Babylon, and the Babylonian army waited his attack: they fought him on his near approach, but being defeated, they shut themselves up in the 'strong holds' of the city." See Jeremiah, chapter li. verses 20. 30, 31. and we refer to the same chapter, verse 30. respecting the flight to Borsippe. In regard to the channel of the river being dry, we find in the following passage of Herodotus a coincidence with the language of Jeremiah, ch. li 36. "He dug through the banks of the river, drawing off the water to a muddy marsh, so that the old channel became passable as the water subsided." It deserves to be considered how far the account given by Diodorus, book ii. 24. & seqq. respecting Belesis, the priest of Babylon, (who prophesied the fate of Arbaces,) may be applicable to Daniel, to whom the name of Belteshazzar, בֶּלְתֶּשֶׁזָּזָר, was given in Chaldaea. See Daniel i. 7.—Grotius.

The truth of the accounts which we read in Holy Writ concerning the kings of Chaldaea, is remarkably confirmed by the chronology the Astronomical Canon of Nabonassar, according to the " Chronicus Canon," &c. of Sir John Marsham, edit. Lond. 1672.—Le Clerc.

68, 69 Vaphres.—Apries.] The Septuagint and Eusebius translate the Hebrew name יופר (see Jeremiah xliv. 30. Hophra) into Vaphres. He was contemporary with Nebuchodonosor, and is the same with Apres mentioned by Herodotus, book ii. 161.—Grotius.
70. *Cyrus.*—See the passages already quoted: see also *Diodorus Siculus,* book ii. 33. & seqq.: and *Ctesias* in the fragments of his *Persian History,* preserved by *Pho
tius,* book lxii. and *Justin,* book i. ch. 5. & seqq. The foundations of the Temple of Jerusalem were laid in the time of *Cyrus,* and the work was completed under *Darius,* as *Theophilus* of *Antioch* has shown, book iii. 29. according to the testimony of *Berosus.*—*Grotius.*

71. *Darius (Codomanus).*—See the authors above mentioned, and *Eschylus* in his tragedy of *Néosau,* and the historians of *Alexander.* Under this *Darius,* the Jewish high priest was *Jaddua,* (see *Nehemiah* xii. 22.) the same who went out to meet *Alexander* the Conqueror, as *Josephus* tells us, book xi. 8. 5. of his *Jewish Antiquities.* At the same period lived *Hecateus* of *Abdera,* celebrated by *Plutarch* in his book on *Isis and Osiris,* p. 553. B.; and by *Laertius* in his Life of *Pyrrho.* He wrote a book expressly on the Jews, from which *Josephus* has extracted an excellent description of the city and temple of Jerusalem, in his 1st book against *Apion,* § 22. which extract *Eusebius* also has preserved in his *Præp. Evang.* book ix. ch. 4. Both of them have likewise given us a passage of *Clearchus,* (in praise of Jewish wisdom,) personating his master *Aristotle.* In the same book (the answer to *Apion*) *Josephus* enumerates many authors who speak favourably of the Jews, and give evidence of Jewish matters, exclusively of those already mentioned: "*Theophilus,* *Theodotos,* *Mnaseas,* *Aristophanes,* *Hermogenes,* *Euemerus,* *Conon,* *Zopyrion,* and many others."—*Grotius.*

72, 73. *Strabo* and *Trogus.*—Advantageous offers of the *Macedo-
nians.*—See, for the former, the first book, ch. 16. note 141, &c, of this treatise. For the latter, see *Josephus* in his first book against *Apion,* § 22. where the following passage is transcribed from *Hecateus:* speaking of the Jews, he says, "Not a few (that is, thousands, from the context) migrated into *Egypt* and *Phoenicia,* after the death of *Alexander,* on account of a disturbance in *Syria.*" And *Philo,* " adversus Flaccum," vol. ii. p. 523, edit. *Mangey,* 1742, observes that "at least a million of Jews were settled in *Alexandria* and the adjacent country, from the point of descent towards *Africa* to the borders of *Æthiopia.*" See also *Josephus,* book xii. ch. 2. 3. & seqq. book xiii. ch. 4—8. book xviii, 10, and indeed in book xiv. 17. he tells us that "at *Alexandria* the Jews were admitted to the privilege of free citi-
zens."—*Grotius.*

73*. *Hasmonæans.*—The dissensions of the chief Jews about the priesthood had not been long settled by *Ptolemy Philometor,* king of *Egypt,* when *Simon,* the high priest, obtained the royal power; with whom began the new kingdom of the Jews, otherwise called the *Hasmonæan.*
74.] See Josephus, Jewish Antiq. xxi. 10, and elsewhere, mentioning Cyrene, Sardis, and Ephesus. See Acts vi. 9, xi. 20.
75.] See Josephus, xii. 3. xiv. 17. xvi. 4. See also Acts xix.
76.] See Acts xvii.
77.] See Acts xiv. 19.
78.] See Acts xiii. 5.
79.] See Acts. ii. 11.—Grotius.
80.] See Josephus, ch. xviii. 5. See Acts xviii. 2. xxviii. 17...
81.] See Horace, book i. sat. iv. line 143. sat. v. line 100: and sat. ix. 69.
82.] See Juvenal, sat. xiv. 96. & seqq.
83.] See Martial, iv. 4. 7. and elsewhere, as in book vii. 29. 5. and 34. 4. book xi. 95. book xii. 57. 13. See also Rutilius, in the first book of his Itinerary, line 395. &c. where the thought is borrowed from Seneca, who had said of the same Jewish people, that “in the mean time the prevalence of that example which the most wicked nation in the world exhibited was admitted and adopted universally: The conquered have given laws to the conquerors.” The passage is in St. Austin, book vi. ch. 11. de Civitate Dei. The appellation of most wicked is given them merely because they disregarded those laws which condemned the worship of one only God, as we have before observed: as Socrates was abused in the same manner by the Elder Cato. The vast extent of the Jewish name and nation is likewise attested by Philo, in the Account of his Embassy, p. 791. F. “Their population (he says) is immense; they do not occupy, like other nations, the given limits of some particular and appropriate country; but, I may almost say, the whole world: they overflow as it were whole continents and every island, in such a manner that they seem to be, in point of number, hardly inferior to the native inhabitants.” Dion Cassius also observes of the Jewish nation, book xxxvii. 17. that “though often repressed and reduced they have advanced and increased in a still greater degree, so as to have succeeded completely in establishing the open avowal of their religious tenets.”—Grotius.
84. Seventy interpreters.] See Aristaeas’s Hist. of the LXX Interpreters: and see Josephus, book xii. 2. of the Jewish Antiquities.—Grotius.
85. Precedent.] By Onkelos; and perhaps also by Jonathan. —Grotius.
86. Subsequent.] By the writer of the Jerusalem Targum, and by Joseph the Blind, (more properly the one-eyed, Luscus, not Cæcus; see Prideaux’s Connections, vol. ii. part ii. book viii,
87. *Hebrew nation.* Hebrews, or their immediate neighbours, as in the instance of Justin Martyr, who was a Samaritan.—Grotius.

88. *Many also.* Hebraists, as Origen, Epiphanius, but more especially St. Jerome.—Grotius.

89. *They were used to copy and compare them with such care,* &c.] Josephus in his Defence, &c. against Apion, book i. § 8. has the following passage on this subject: "Our actual conduct has sufficiently proved in what high estimation and confidence we hold our sacred writings: for during the lapse of so many ages, no man has ever dared, in the smallest degree, to make any addition, deduction, or alteration." See the Law in Deut. iv. 2. and the Talmud, title Schebuoth.—Grotius.

These accounts are to be understood only in regard to the times subsequent to the age of the Massorites or Masoretes (which age, by the way, is fixed at very different dates); for otherwise, before that period, both when the civil polity of the Jews subsisted, and after its overthrow by the Chaldeans, it is sufficiently evident that they were not so attentive and exact as they are commonly supposed to have been: This appears from the "Critica Sacra" of Lewis Capellus, as well as from the Commentaries of learned Men on the Old Testament, and from the very Annotations of Grotius himself. The same fact has been proved in my own writings on the historical books of the Old Testament, Amst. 1736.—Le Clerc.

BOOK IV.

1. *Lest haply they commit a dangerous mistake,* &c.] See 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14. See also Porphyry, book ii. § 41, 42. against the Use of Animal Food, where he says that "every kind of incantation is performed by the Spirits in opposition to the Gods: for those Spirits (and especially the Chief of evil Spirits) are worshipped by men who study wicked arts, and practise all kinds of illusions: as they have a power of doing very wonderful things to delude mankind. Through their agency wretched mortals prepare their love-potions and charms: every species of incontinence, avarice, and ambition, proceeds from them. Falsehood is their peculiar province; they wish to pass for Gods, and the chief of them would personate the Supreme Being himself." The same writer says in his Epistle to Anebo the Egyptian, § 24: that they (the priests) put it beyond a doubt that there is a set of beings, the willing agents of fraud and mischief, assuming all forms, and practising all tricks, feigning themselves deities, and demons, and spirits of departed men, and thus enabled to put
an appearances of good or evil; but in respect to any real act of spiritual goodness utterly unable to do anything, nor capable of knowing anything to that effect; but indulging vicious idleness, often ridiculing and embarrassing those who may be virtuously disposed; full of pride, and delighting in the fumes and ceremonies of sacrifice.” Arnobius, in the 4th book of his treatise “ adversus Gentes,” p. 127. describes “ the Magi of the soothsaying fraternity, telling us, in their performances, of evil spirits often obtruding themselves for those of a right description; but in fact they are only certain spirits of a grosser kind who affect the higher character of gods.” Edit. Duac. 1634. Not to carry my quotations too far, I shall only observe briefly, that Jamblichus expresses the same sentiments in his treatise against Porphyry’s letter on the Mysteries of the Egyptians, book iii. ch. 31. and again, book iv. ch. 7. and 13. [edit. Oxon. 1678.]— Grotius.


4.] The Etrurians were famous for their skill in auguries and divinations.— Atqui nostrorum augurum & Etruscorum ha-ruspicam disciplinam, &c. says Cicero De Nat. Deor. lib. ii. § 4. — And again, Etrusca disciplina (i. e. divinatio) in lib. vi. ad Fam. Epist. 6.

5. Satires.] The terms circumcised, Sabbatarians, worshippers of the clouds and the sky, friendly to the pigs, &c. were continually applied in ridicule to the Jews.— Grotius.


7. Christians.] See Tacitus, Annal. xv. 44. to which Juvenal also refers in sat. i. line 155. & seqq.— Grotius.

8. Human sacrifices.] See the 2d book of this treatise, ch. xii. notes 61, 62.— Grotius.

9. Naked races.] Such as the sacrifices, &c. in honour of Pan. Livy, book i. 5. Plutarch in his Life of Antony, p. 921. B. and other authors.— Grotius.

10. Games and dances.”] Such as in the festivals and games in honour of the goddess Flora. See Ovid’s Fasti, iv. 945. & seqq, and book v. 183. & seqq. See also Tatian, § 22. and Origen against Celsus, 8. § 60.— Grotius.

11. Arimanius.] Arimanius, the evil god of the Persians: see Plutarch’s tract on Isis and Osiris, p. 369. E.; and Diogenes Laertius, in the preface to his works, § 8.— Grotius.
12. *Vejoves.* The Roman Vejovis or Ve Jupiter was a deity of ill omen: see Cicero ii. 24. de Nat. Deorum; and the Noctes Attice of A. Gellius, v. 12. — *Grotius.*

13. *Mercy must be limited,* &c. *" How shall you love him if you be not afraid of not loving?"* says Tertullian against Marcion, i. 27. — *Grotius.*

14. *Mercy must be limited,* &c. *" How shall you love him if you be not afraid of not loving?"* says Tertullian against Marcion, i. 27. — *Grotius.*

15. Reference is here made to the Fragments of Publius, verse 402. edit. Francof. 1610. (see Appendix, note I.) and to the Ajax of Sophocles, line 674. — *Grotius.*

16. *It affords to vices sufficiently alluring,* &c. See the argument of Chærea in the Eunuch of Terence, iii. 5. 43. And St. Cyprian says in his Epistle ii. § 6. *" They naturally imitate those gods who are the objects of their worship: thus, poor souls, religion itself becomes a snare to sin!"* So again St. Austin observes in his Epistle cccii. *" Nothing has a worse effect upon society, by perverting the moral principle, than a practical imitation of the gods of the heathens, so described in their books as objects of admiration and applause."* Chalcidius, in his Comm. on the Timæus, p. 221. has the following extract, but see the whole passage: *" Thus, says he, it came to pass, that instead of that return of gratitude which is due to Divine Providence, an occasion was given, a door was opened, to sacrilegious conduct!"* — *Grotius.*

17, 18. *The worshipping of the heavenly bodies.* — *Their appointed and determinate course,* &c. There are reasons which induce us to think that the worship of angels, and of human beings after death, was the first step which led to idolatry. See the word *Idolatry* in the Index of Stanley's Oriental Philosophy. (Note 11. of this book.) — *Le Clerc.*

We are told, in the History of the Incas, that this appointed and determinate course of the sun suggested to the mind of a certain king of Peru an argument which convinced him that the sun could not possibly be God. — *Grotius.*

19. *Worshipping animals,* &c. Philo, in the account of his Embassy, p. 783. D. describes the Egyptians as *' converting all sorts of creatures into deities; dogs, wolves, lions, crocodiles, and many other animals of water, earth, and air!'* See also a long dissertation on that subject in Diodorus Siculus, book i. ch. 83. & seqq. — *Grotius.*

20. *Man, on the other hand,* &c. See Euripides in a fragment of his "Æolus:" from Plutarch in his little tract "on Fortune,"
p. 98. E.; and again, p. 958. D.: "On the Degree of Intellect observable in Brutus," edit. Paris. 1624. See likewise the beginning of "Δρογς τει Στράτηγον," sermon. li. p. 360. of Stobaeus, edit. Aur. Allob. 1609: and the line of Antiphon to the same effect, quoted by Aristotle. Hence we derive no bad illustration of the passage in Genesis, ch. i. v. 26. and in Psalm viii. 6. If the reader should wish to see a fuller dissertation on this subject, he may consult Oppian's Poem on Fishing, in the beginning of the 5th book; and the ninth Homily of St. Basil "de Terrestribus," tom. i. p. 80. edit. Parisiis, 1721; the last of his Homilies "Εις την Εξημερων." "Hence it is observable (says Origen, book iv. 78. against Celsus) what a blessing we enjoy in the gift of mental powers; and how much that gift is superior to all the means of attack or defence which Nature has given to wild beasts. Man, so much inferior to them in bodily strength and size, still enjoys a 'dominion' over them by his superior intellect, and makes the unwieldy elephant his sport. Animals, by nature tractable, are tamed by gentle management to our use and service; others, whether intractable by nature, or useless for our purposes, we can manage with security to ourselves, so far as to confine them in dens if we wish to have them; or, if we want any of them for food, their lives are as much in our power as the lives of tamer animals. It is therefore evident that the Creator has formed all things in subjection to rational beings, and to that intellect which is given them by Nature." Claudius of Neapolis, according to Porphyry, in his first book against the Use of Animal Food, describes man as a being who "holds dominion over the brute creation, as God holds dominion over man."

21, 22, 23. See Cicero de Legibus ii. 11. and Livy, book xxvii. 25. in reference to these deities. [See note K. in the Appendix.]

—Grotius.

The principle of this heathen worship may perhaps be thus explained: These qualities or things were not literally the objects of adoration (it may be said), but through them the worship was directed to their divine source, or to certain imaginary views of the divine intellect. Thus the Heathens might be said to have worshipped Fever, not the actual disease called fever, as it affects the human body, but that power of exciting or allaying the disease, which is vested in God. So likewise in regard to Impudence, they did not address perhaps the vicious disposition of human hearts, but that will of God which sometimes permits the daring effrontery of man to prosper, and which is always able to restrain and punish it. The same may be observed respecting the passions of Love, Fear, Anger, Hope, &c. which it is in God's power to excite and to control: and again respecting virtues, which the name of God implies in all perfection, and of which
the human conduct exhibits only a faint shadow of resemblance at the best, produced by ideas of their consummate excellence in the divine Original! So again respecting honour, which is a principle not so much dependent on human estimation as on that divine award by which virtue has a right to be had in honour amongst men. But this favourable interpretation of the motives of heathen worship has never been alleged by the Heathens themselves; and besides, it is absurd to personify the attributes of God, and our ideas of his nature, under names of obscure meaning, by which the lower classes at least may be fatally deceived! Far more simple, as well as more proper, to worship God himself in express terms, without any ambiguous phrases or mysterious conceits!—Le Clerc.

24, 25. Insufficiently attested, or obviously counterfeited. "It is neither my intention to maintain nor to refute (says Livy in the Preface to his Roman History) those traditions which are better adapted to the fictions of poetry than to the genuine memorials of historical fact, prior to the actual or intended building of the city: Antiquity enjoys a sort of privilege or license respecting these traditions, and "some decent mixture of prodigy and fable" [see Gibbon, vol. ii. ch. 7.] has been supposed, in every age, to reflect a becoming majesty on the origin of great cities."—Grotius.

It were much better to be satisfied with giving this general answer, than to concede the actual performance of pagan miracles, or the production of those effects which might pass for miracles with the generality of mankind: I mean, their oracular predictions, their prodigies, and their exhibition of extraordinary cures, which, if they were really authentic, could hardly be distinguished from miracles properly so called; at least by the inferior orders of the community. See my observations on this subject in the Introduction to my Ecclesiastical History, § ii. ch. i. Amst. 1716.—Le Clerc.

26. Tricks and impostures of Simon and Apollonius.] "There are (says Tatian, § 16.) diseased and irregular effects produced occasionally in the materials of which we are composed, and when these occur, these very demons ascribe the causes to themselves."—Grotius.

27. By charms and incantations compelled to act, &c.] See the Oracle announced by Hecate, according to Porphyry, in the Prep. Evang. of Eusebius v. 8. and again in a second passage by the same goddess of magic and enchantments; and that of Apollo, according to the same author. "These," (says Arnobius, book ii. p. 49, towards the end), "these are the rites of their secret arts by which they address I know not what powers;" "making them as it were implicitly obedient to their will by
Book IV.

cantations," as Clemens explains it in his Protreptic, in the beginning of page 18. Jamblicus, in his treatise already cited, in note 1, respecting "the mysteries of the Egyptians," book vi. ch. 5, 6, 7, has preserved one of their menacing formulæ; and Lucan, book ix. 158. & seqq. gives us the same particulars in the words of the younger Pompey: and so does Eusebius from Porphyry, in his Præp. Evang. book v. ch. 10. Other forms of comminution occur in Lucan, where he is speaking of Erichtho, book vi. 730. & seqq.; and in Papinius Statius, in the 4th book of his Thebais, line 500. & seqq. on the subject of Tiresias._Grotius._

28. To mislead and tis the affections of men, &c.] See the Pharmaceutria of Theocritus, 2d Idyllium; and of Virgil, 8th Eclogue: see also the confession of Porphyry, according to Eusebius, book v. of his Præp. Evang. ch. 7. and St. Austin, book x: ch. 11. de Civitate Dei. And again, Porphyry, book ii. 42. against the Use of Animal Food: and Origen against Celsus, book vii. 69._Grotius._

29, 30. Even the prohibitory laws of all civil society, &c.] L. ejusdem. § Adjectio. D. on the Cornelian Law against those "who killed a person with weapons or poison, &c." Si quis, &c. § qui abortionis. D. de Pœnis. See also Paulus, Sententiæ, lib. v. tit. xxiii. or xxxviii. This note is more fully stated in the Appendix, note L. Note 30. I refer the reader to Deut. xiii. 3. 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10. and to Ephes. ii. 2, 3._Grotius._

31, 32. To facilitate the advancement of Vespasian to the throne, &c.] See Tacitus in Hist. book iv. 81. where he says that "many miraculous occurrences evinced the favour and partiality of the Gods on the side of Vespasian:" and in book i. 10. he had previously expressed himself to the following effect: "By a secret fatality, by prodigies, by oracular responses, and subsequently by the fortunate result, the empire, as we believed, was destined for the person and the family of Vespasian." Suetonius introduces his account of the same miracles, ch. 7. in these terms: "In a person so unexpectedly raised to the imperial throne, so new as it were in point of family and distinction, an authoritative influence, a sort of majesty was wanting for so high a station; but with this also he was presently endowed." See a passage of the same writer, somewhat earlier, in ch. v. Josephus also, in "Jewish Wars," book iii. ch. 14. (and in book v. ch. 12.) describes Vespasian as having received "certain impulses and other corresponding indications," and speaks of the "immediate intervention of the Deity," pointing out and prefacing the sceptre which awaited him by various prophetic signs._Grotius._
But see an inquiry into the truth of these miracles which are said to have taken place in favour of Vespasian and Adrian, in the second century of my Ecclesiastical History, year 138.—Le Clerc.

33. Oracular sentences in general ambiguous, &c. See the passages of CEnomaus on this subject in the 5th book of Eusebius, chapters 20—26. Hence the epithet Ἀφραδής was a Grecian epithet of Apollo; Cicero terms his oracles "flexòqua et obscura," in book ii. 36. de Divinatione. "The event (says he) in either case, would have verified the oracular sentence."—Grotius.

Perhaps in many instances oracles have been framed after the events to which they refer; and doubtless there are many reasons to impute a variety of fraudulent practices to these pretended prophets. Fontenelle, on the subject of oracles, has written a very elegant little treatise in French, which may be consulted with advantage; see also the vindication of it contained in my "Bibliothèque Choisie," vol. xiii. See likewise, in particular, the Latin work of Ant.van Dale, "de Oraculis Ethnorum." Amst. 1700.—Le Clerc.

34. As future diseases have been sometimes foretold, &c. Chalcidius, in his commentary on the Timaeus of Plato, observes, that "either by the flight of birds, by the entrails of victims, or by the advice of oracles, men receive previous intimation of events through the aid of some propitious daemon endowed with a knowledge of futurity; just as a physician, by his proficiency in the science of medicine, may predict the dissolution or the recovery of his patient." Earthquakes were foretold by Anaximander and Pherecydes, according to Pliny, book ii. ch. 79.—Grotius.

35. Frequently practised with success by skilful statesmen. The following is an extract from the Life of T. Pomponius Atticus, written by Cornelius Nepos; see Cicero, vol. viii. p. 12. § 16. edit. Olivet. 1746. "In proof of this friendship, sixteen books (beside the other works of Cicero which have been published, and in which the name is occasionally mentioned) were expressly addressed by Cicero to Atticus, from the date of the consulship of the former to the period of his death, which are much in point on the present subject: a perusal of these letters does not leave us much in want of a regular and connected history of those times: so fully has he delineated the views and aims of great men, the faulty conduct of military commanders, the political changes which have taken place, that nothing seems to have been omitted in his account of them; and we are easily induced to think that the virtue of prudence has, in effect, a power of divination: [Nullum numen abest, &c.] For Cicero not only pro...
dieted events which he lived to see accomplished, but matters also, which now ripen into fact, he saw with the eye of a true prophet." In the 6th epistle of his 6th book of "Epistolae familiares" he says of himself with great truth, "There was no disastrous occurrence in that war which I had not foretold: so, according to the practice of augurs and astrologers, since I, a public augur, have established with you the authority of my augury and divination, on the ground of my former predictions, it will behove you to give credit to my oracular wisdom: not that I utter my prophecies for your information from the direct flight of a bird, nor from its foreboding note, whether lucky or unlucky, (as the principles of our art in general instruct us to do,) nor from the rebounding of corn when pecked by the chickens; neither do I avail myself of dreams; but I have other tokens on which I make my observations," &c. Thus again it was foretold by Solon that Munychia would be the cause of the greatest mischief to Athens: and Thales foresaw in a street, obscure and contemptible at that time, the future Forum of Miletus. See Plutarch in his Life of Solon, p. 84. F.—Grotius.

36, 37. The fourth eclogue taken from the verses of the Sybils, in which Virgil unknowingly, &c.] See St. Austin de Civitate Dei, book x. ch. 27.—Grotius.

It is now sufficiently agreed that all the Sibylline prophecies were either ambiguous, or false in point of authenticity; and therefore I would not wish that Virgil, as a Sybil’s interpreter, should be considered as a sort of unconscious utterer of prophecies; like Caiaphas, who predicted what he did not understand. A return of the golden age was foretold by a Sibyl, (we know not who she was,) or rather by some person under the disguise of that title, from some fanciful opinion of a general renovation of the universe, when a recurrence of past times would take place. On this subject the reader is referred to the 2d book of this treatise, chapters 10 and 11, and to the notes subjoined. The Sibyl therefore was no prophetess on the point in question, neither has Virgil borrowed from her any prophecies intended to delineate the coming of Christ. Consult the commentary of H. M. Servius on this eclogue of Virgil, and the interpretation of it by Volusianus in his work "de Sibyllinis et aliis oraculis." Lond. 1684.—Le Clerc.

38, 39. That he who, of a truth, should be our king, &c.—and that a prince should arise out of the East, &c.] See Cicero, in the former instance, book ii. 54. "De Divinatione." And in the latter, see Suetonius, in his Life of Vespasian, ch. 4. and Tacitus in his Hist. book v. 13.—Grotius.

40, 41. We find in Porphyry the oracle of Apollo, &c.] See St. Austin "de Civitate Dei," book xix. ch. 23. and Eusebius,
And again, according to Eusebios, as above, Porphyry says in his book "De Oraculorum Philosophiis," that "the God (that is, Apollo) attested the discovery of true religion in favour of the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, the Chaldeans, the Lydians, and the Hebrews." The author of the Exhortation to the Greeks, in the works of Justin Martyr, cites an oracle to the same purport in favour of the true worship practised by the Chaldeans and the Hebrews. See Section 11. 24. See also Section 38. about the creator of Adam. See also two oracles of Hecate which are applicable to Jesus himself, transcribed from Porphyry by Eusebius, in his "Demonstratio Evangelica," book iii. 7. And St. Austin likewise mentions them from the same Porphyry in book xix. ch. 23. "De Civitate Dei," where he also quotes another oracle, in which Apollo declared that "the pattern or example of all the gods is that Father whom the truly pious Hebrews regard with veneration."—Grotius.

As to Porphyry, these remarks may be addressed with sufficient propriety to him and to all who adopted his favourable opinion of those oracles, and, to use the language of logicians, they may serve as a sort of argumentum ad hominem: but since these oracles have a very slight claim to authenticity, or rather, as their credit and veracity may be impeached on very strong grounds, they cannot possibly have any weight whatsoever among Christians.—Le Clerc.

42.] See the instances adduced by Cenomaus, according to Eusebius, in his Præp. Evang. book v. ch. 32. 35.—Grotius.

43.] See the reference made in the preceding note, ch. 34. on the subject of Cleomedes. And the same instance is mentioned by Origen, book iii. 3. against Celsus.—Grotius.

44.] See chapter 2. note 1. of the present book; where this subject has been sufficiently stated.—Grotius.


46.] Cenomaus recites oracles of this description: see Eusebius, as above, chapters 19 and 27.—Grotius.


47, 48. The spirits came forth and were put to silence; and when the cause of that silence was required, &c.] See Acts v. 16. viii. 7. xvi. 18. See also Tertullian in his Apology, ch. 23. and Lucian in his Narrative of Pseudomantis, § 25. 38. Apollo in Daphne says, "This place, Daphne, is full of dead bodies, and this circumstance prevents the oracular responses." The dead bodies were those of Babylas† and other Christian martyrs. See St.

† Babylas was bishop of Antioch of which place, as well as of Constantinople, the suburb was called Daphne.
Chrysostom against the Gentiles, t. v. p. 460. 13. In the ed. Paris, 1609, the passage occurs at page 763.—Grolius.

49, 50, 51.] On the subject to which note 49 refers, the reader is desired to peruse the excellent dissertation of Bardesan the Syrian, in the Præp. Evang. of Eusebius, book vi. ch. 10. and that which he will find in the Philocalia, collected from Origen, ch. xxiii. ed. Cantab. 1676.—At note 50 we are referred to the work of Alexander of Aphrodisium on this subject, Liber “de Fato,” &c. Ven. 1534. At note 51 see the Præp. Evang. of Eusebius, book vi. ch. 6.—Grolius.

52. All legal justice also—would be annihilated.] See the second Apology of Justin Martyr, § 43. where he observes, that “unless mankind have a power to avoid what is base, and to choose what is good, with an absolute free will, they have no motive of action imputable to their conduct.” See also what is further observed on that subject. And Tatian says in § 7. to this effect: “From this freedom of choice it is that a wicked man is justly punished, as his wickedness is voluntary; and a good man on the same principle is commended, because it is in his own power to obey or transgress the laws of God.” This subject is likewise discussed by Chalcidius in his Commentary on the Ti-mæus, pages 235—280.—Grotius.

53, 54. The true cause of moral evil;—but others with greater probability, &c.] This imputation of moral evil is expressly denied by Plato in his “Republic,” x. p. 763. E. “The cause originates in the voluntary act: no blame is imputable to God.” See Chalcidius in the place above mentioned, p. 245. and this, it is observed in the foregoing work of Justin, § 44. coincides with the doctrine of Moses.—Grotius.

But instead of that greater probability with which others argue, it is well observed in note 54. that they adopt the truest line of argument who deny altogether those effects of atmosphere, nor allow to the heavenly bodies any influence of this nature: their sole properties are heat, light, and gravity, which cannot properly be said to have any influence at all on the human mind in the sense here intended.—Le Clerc.

55. Exempt the wise and virtuous, &c.] In the “Oracula,” of which a collection was edited at Venice, 1593, Zoroaster says, fol. 10. p. 2. “Seek not to enlarge the appointed limits of your fate.” And Ptolemy, in the Syntaxis, Καὶ ποτὶ (Basil. 1553.) E. p. 204. observes, that “a wise man is often able to avert the influence of the heavenly bodies.—Grotius.


56. Religion consisteth not in ritual observances (say the heathens themselves) but in a pious disposition of the heart, &c.] See
Menander’s sentiment, according to Clemens, in Strom. v. p. 258. and Eusebius in Præp. Evang. book xiii. 18. expressly to this effect; and Cicero, both in book ii. 28. “de Naturæ Deorum,” and in book ii. 10. “de Legibus.” “That worship of the gods (says he) is the best, the most genuine, the most holy, the most replete with piety, which uniformly expresses our veneration of them with purity, with integrity, with sincerity of mind and words.” Again (in the latter place) he says, “The law enjoins us to address the gods devoutly, that is, with mental devotion, which is All in All.” See also Persius, satire ii. 71—75. in which passage the poet seemingly alludes to the Pythian oracle, mentioned by Porphyry in his 2d book against the Use of animal Food, § 16. where the offering of piety, whatever it may be, is preferred to becatombs from any other quarter. In the same book, § 19. there is a passage much to the same purport. “Now (says he) they do not think it sufficient for the purity of sacrifices that the worshippers should have a clean garment without cleanliness in their persons also; but if some approach the sacrifices with a smart and splendid appearance as to person and garment, though with souls not purified from wickedness, this circumstance is thought immaterial: as if the Deity were not chiefly delighted with the clean and pure condition of that part of his creatures which is most divine, and which brings them to the nearest connexion with their Creator. On this principle the inscription in the temple at Epidaurus enjoined “all who entered it to bring with them, above all things, devout thoughts and purity of heart.” And a little after, in § 34. he says, “to that God who is above all,” (to use the expression of a certain wise man,) we cannot rightly offer in sacrifice, nor call by his name, any object of our bodily senses: for nothing that is material can be otherwise than unclean to an immaterial being: not even a sentiment expressed in words, or entertained in thought, if internal passions have polluted it.” So again, in the same writer, § 46. “It cannot be that in temples set apart by men for the worship of their gods the utmost external purity should be required, the very shoes on their feet to be without spot, but that in the temple of our supreme Father (as the world may be called) there should not be a necessity of keeping in a state of sanctity the external bodily garb which our souls at present wear, and of living with purity in that Father’s temple!” Nor can I omit another passage of the same book, § 60. in which it is observed, that if a person believe the useless nature of sacrifices with respect to any need of them on the part of those gods to whom they may be offered, and consider the moral habits of the worshipper to be the object of their notice, so that they regard a right estimate of themselves, and a right principle of action, as the best and greatest sacrifice, how can such a person be otherwise than sober, and holy and righteous? In these latter words we must observe almost a literal co-
incidence with the words of St. Paul to Titus, ii. 12. "soberly, righteously, and godly." Zaleucus, in the preamble to his laws, according to Diodorus Siculus, xii. 20. says, "Purify thy soul from all wickedness, since the gods delight not in the sacrifices and costly offerings of wicked men, but in the just and good endeavours of the virtuous." Seneca, quoted by Lactantius in the 6th book of his "Divine Institutions," chap. 25. 3. says, "If you wish to consider the Deity as great, benevolent, and awful in mild majesty, kind, and always ready to befriend you, do not show your veneration of him by sacrifices, and by an effusion of blood, but by the purity of your heart, and by the uprightness of your intentions. The lofty construction of temples is not necessary; in the temple of his own heart let every man raise the true altar of devotion." In Dion (of Prusa) you have the same sentiment: see his 3d Oration, p. 45. ed. Lutet. 1604. And Thucydidcs says, book i. 70. "The only true festival consists in the performance of our duty." And Diogenes to the same effect: "Does not a good man account every day a festival?"—Grotius.

57. The intentional adulterer, &c.] See Ovid. Amor. iii. 4, 5. And Seneca the Elder, in Controversiâ vi. Declam. 8. where he says that "a woman who desires to prostitute herself is a prostitute, though she may not realize her wish." And his son the Philosopher, book iv. 14. "de Beneficiis," observes, that "She is justly ranked among the number of unchaste females whose chastity has resulted from fear, and not from conscience."—Grotius.

58. Not to requite an injury, &c.] See Plato in his dialogue of "Crito," p. 36. E. edit. Francof. 1602. and Maximus of Tyre, in his 2d Dissertation, edit. Heinsii, 1624. (and Reiskii, Lips. 1774:) see also a saying of Menander in Sermo i. of Stobæus, p. 13. edit. 1543. We are told by Plutarch in his "Apophthegmata Laconica," p. 218. A. edit. Lut. Par. 1624. that Ariston the Spartan, when it was observed to him that it became a king to act kindly to friends and injuriously to enemies, replied, "it becomes him indeed to act kindly to friends; and also by kindness to convert enemies into friends." And in the same author, see his Life of Dion, p. 978. F. we read that Dion, the Syracusan, who freed his country from the tyranny of Dionysius, affirmed the true proof of philosophy to consist, not in showing kindness to our friends, but in being placable and merciful under injuries to those who have offended us.—Grotius.

59. The husband of one wife.] See our preceding quotations from Sallust and others on this subject, book ii. ch. 14. notes 114, 115. See also the Andromache of Euripides, ver. 177, &c. and in the chorus of the same tragedy, v. 464. & seqq. there are several passages to the same purport.—Grotius.
60. The marriage covenant imviolable.] This was the case among the Romans, as Valerius Maximus informs us, book ii. ch. 1. 4. till the year of Rome 520. See also a line of Anaxandrides to this effect in the beginning of Sermo lxxii. of Stobæus, edit. Aurel. Allob. fol. 1609.—Grotius.

61. Do good to all.] See the Heautont. of Terence, act i. scene 1. line 25. "By nature we are all, as it were, related to each other," says Florentinus the Lawyer, L. ut vim. D. de Justitìa. [See Appendix, note M.] To the same purport is the adage in the Chilias i. cento i. 69. of Erasmus, "Man is to man a sort of God." From Pliny's Nat. Hist. ii. 7. "Deus est mortali juvare mortalem." Cicero, in his first book "De Officiis," says, that "there is a particular and a general bond of union amongst men." § 16.—Grotius.

62. Especially the poor.] See Horace, book ii. sat. 2. 103. and the Fragments of Publius the Syrian, (Mimorum Scriptor) verse 82. in the Corpus Poetarum, edit. Lond. 1713.—Grotius.

63. To abstain as much as possible from oaths.] In the Life of Pythagoras, by Jambicus, § 47. that philosopher directs that "the name of no god should be improperly used for the purpose of an oath; but that all conversation should be so conducted as to be entitled to credit and confidence without the necessity of an oath:" this very sentiment is largely expounded by Hiérocles in his Commentary on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, p. 29. & seqq. M. Antoninus, in book iii. 5. describes it as a feature in a good man's character, "that he should have no occasion to confirm what he says by an oath." See his work entitled "Τα νεκτα "Εαυτων," edit. Lond. 1707. See also the Œdipus Coloneus of Sophocles, verse 677. We are told by St. Basil, "De legenis Antiquorum Libris," (t. i. p. 498. B. ed. Paris. 1638.) that Clinias the Pythagorean philosopher chose rather to lose a cause, on the issue of which three talents were depending, than to make a true deposition upon oath.—Grotius.

64. In food and apparel to limit our desires by the wants of nature.] See Euripides, in the Deipnosophistae of Athenæus iv. 15. and Sermo v. of Stobæus. [The distich is ascribed to Menander in Sermo i. p. 25. edit. Tiguri, 1543.] See also Lucan iv. 381. And Aristides says that our wants are comprised under three heads, clothes, shelter, and food.—Grotius.

65. Distinguishes the divine nature, &c.] See Plato's epistle to Dionysius, p. 1269. F. See also (Lycius) Proclus on the Timæus, book iii. in his Theol. Platon. ch. 18. & seqq. edit. Hamb. 1618. Plato denominates the first principle "Father;" the second he calls "the Cause and presiding Director of all things;" in the epistle to Hermias, Erastus, and Coriscus: that second
principle is called "the Mind" by Plotinus in his book "on the Three original Substances." Numenius employs the term Δυνατός, the Maker; and likewise the term signifying Son; and Amelius uses the term Δυνατός, or Word. See Eusebius, book xi. ch. 17—19. See also St. Cyril, in his work against Julian, books iii. iv. and viii. pages 97. 145. 274. Chalcidius, in his Commentary on the Timaeus, names the first principle "The Supreme God;" the second, "Mind" or "Providence;" the third, "the Soul of the World," or "second Mind." He afterwards uses this three-fold distinction of them, the commanding Power, the regulating Power, the suggesting Power. In regard to the second the same writer thus expresses himself, p. 135. "The Reason of God (says he) is God taking care of human affairs; and this principle is the cause of our living well and happily if we do not neglect the gift thus conferred on us by the supreme God." Servius, in his note on the 8th eclogue of Virgil, v. 75. observes that the Pythagoreans assign to the Supreme God the number three, which they conceive to imply perfection. There is something much to the same purport on the subject of these same Pythagoreans and their notions in the very beginning of the first book of Aristotle, "on the Heavens."—Grotius.

These matters are discussed more fully by that very superior scholar Dr. R. Cudworth, in the 1st book, ch. 4. of his English work, "The Intellectual System of the Universe," &c. &c. edit. Lond. 1678; a work which the reader will find it well worth his while to peruse with attention.—Le Clerc.

66. Julian believed the possibility of an union, &c.] See the 6th book of his works, p. 200. ed. Paris, 1630. where he considers "Jupiter as having generated Asculapius from himself, among the objects of sense and intellect, and having caused his visible appearance on the earth through the genial heat or vivifying power of the sun: this being, having proceeded out of heaven and descended to earth, appeared in a singular and exclusive character at Epidaurus," &c. &c. In the 8th book of St. Cyril (mentioned in the preceding note) page 287. D. the following passage is ascribed to Porphyry: "There are (says he) gods of a certain description, who, at a proper season, assume the human form." The opinion of the Egyptians on this point may be learned from Plutarch, in his 8th Symposium, quest. 1. And here we may add what happened to Paul and Barnabas at Lystra. See Acts xiv. 11.—Grotius.

67. Plato with prophetic inspiration as it were.] See the original passage, book ii. of his "Republick," p. 594. B. It is (in some measure) to this effect: "He shall be scourged, tortured, bound, blinded with hot iron, and, after having endured every species of misery, he shall terminate his sufferings by crucifixion." Cicero borrowed from this passage that description
which he gave almost literally (see note N. in the Appendix) in the 3d book of his work "de Republica." Having drawn a character of the highest perfection, he supposes him the victim of popular prejudice and brutal rage: He supposes "that good man deeply suffering from mental distress, from personal injury and violence; enduring even the amputation of his hands, and the extrusion of his eyes: condemned, bound with cords, and finally consigned to the flames!" This remarkable passage has been rescued from the fate of that work by Lactantius, in the 5th book of his Institutions; ch. 12. 5. and the same author (book vi. ch. 17, 28.) has also preserved to us the following passage of Seneca: "This is that upright man, who, although he may endure tortures from head to foot, though the lighted torch be thrust into his mouth, and though his hands be extended on a cross, considers not what his sufferings may be, but how to bear them well." Euripides, in his Fragmenta, in Fabulâ Syleo, has also presented us with a similar description of character in Syleus*, according to Philo, in his tract, of which the Latin title is, "Quod omnis probus liber," p. 672. F. edit. Col. Allob. 1613; and also according to Eusebius, Praep Evang. vi. 6. And the passage of Æschylus, noticed by Plato in the place already mentioned, truly agrees with that description.—Grotius.

BOOK V.

1.] See the passages here cited in Romans ix. x. xi. Matt. xv. 24.
2.] See 2 Cor. iii. 14—16.
3.] See Rom. iii. 21. viii. 4. x. 4. xiii. 8. Galatians iii. 24.
5.] See 2 Kings iv.
6.] See 2 Kings v.
7.] See 2 Kings iv.
8.] See 2 Kings ii.
11.] See the notes on ch. 4. of the 2d book of this treatise.—Grotius.

* Philo has quoted this favourite passage of Euripides twice in the tract here mentioned, and once in his "Nòmìn ièròv Ἀλληγορία."


15. And others.] See Manetho, Charerem, and Lysimachus, according to Josephus in his first book against Apion; see also Justin and Tacitus.—Grotius.


18. Nero.] Pliny says of him in book xxx. ch. 2. treating of Magic, that "his passion for music and tragic song was not greater than his passion for magic." And afterwards he says, "No man ever promoted the improvement of any art at greater expense: and for purposes of this nature he wanted neither wealth, nor powers, nor capacity." Presently he gives an account of Nero's introduction to the magic entertainments of Tiridates, king of Armenia.—Grotius.

19. If the Jewish accounts be true.] See their Talmud under the titles "Synagogue" and "Sabbath."—Grotius.

19*. Sixty-three years.] At that period the rapid and extensive progress of Pompey's arms in Asia was interrupted by Aristobulus, who had usurped the priesthood from his elder brother Hyrcanus, and who had refused to obey the summons which Pompey had sent for his appearance. Aristobulus converted the temple into a garrison, but after a siege of three months it was taken, and 12000 of its defenders slain. Pompey entered this great sanctuary (says Goldsmith) with a mixture of resolution and fear; and though he went with an eager curiosity into the Holy of Holies, yet he showed so much veneration for the place, that he forbore to touch any of the vast treasures deposited there.—S. M.

20. Miracle.] To which may be added prophecies, which are in themselves rightly accounted miracles, Deut. xviii. 22.—Grotius.

21. Hebrew expositors.] See Moses Maimonides and others quoted in the "Conciliator" of Manasseh, (sive de convenientia locorum S. S. que pugnare inter se videntur,) edit. Amst. 1633. in quae saeclio iv. on Deuteronomy.—Grotius.

22. Who worketh miracles,] and whose prophecies prove true: With this argument St. Chrysostom reasons very strongly in his
5th Discourse against the Jews, p. 360. towards the end; and in his subsequent pages, edit. Eton, 1612, by Sir Henry Savile; and also in his Discourse on the Divinity of Christ, in the 6th vol. of the same edition, p. 630, &c.—Grotius.

23. Expressly prohibited every practice of that nature, &c.] See Mark xii. 29. 32. John xvii. 3. Acts xv. 20. 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, 13. vi. 9. x. 7. xii. 2. 2 Cor. vi. 16. 1 Thess. i. 9. 1 John v. 21.—Grotius.

24. When a prophet, &c. shall authorize the violation.] See this rule laid down in the Talmud, under the title “Synagogue.” Thus at the command of Joshua the law of the sabbath was violated: see Josh. vi. 14, 15. and the law prescribing the place of sacrifice was transgressed, as in the instance of the prophet Samuel: see 1 Sam. vii. 17, xiii. 8. and in that of Elijah: see 1 Kings xviii. 38.—Grotius.

25. See Genesis ii. 17.
26. See Genesis xxii. 2.
27. See above, note 24.
28. See Hebrews viii. 7.
30. See 2 Samuel xviii. 5.
31. See 2 Samuel xvi. 10.—Grotius.

32. Laws adapted to the temper of the people at large, &c.] Origen in his book iii. 79. against Celsus, speaks of a certain lawgiver who was asked, whether he had framed the very best code of laws that he could devise for the community: his reply was, “not absolutely the very best, but the best that circumstances would allow him to frame.” Porphyry, speaking of legislators, (in book i. 28. “de Abstinentiā Anim.” Traj. ad Rhen. 1767.) has the following passage: “If, says he, they frame their laws with a view to that which is naturally termed the middle class of life, and to what may be within the reach even of great numbers of the community, (to whom external matters, such as good and bad events, and the more immediate concerns of the body are alike objects of consideration,) what injury can be done to society by any person, in bringing forward a law in respect to these things?”—Grotius.

33. Future institution.] Hebrews vii. 19. 22. viii. 6. 2. 2 Tim. i. 10.—Grotius.

34. See Luke ii. 21.
35. See Gal. iv. 4. 5.
36. See Matt. ix. 20.
38. See Luke ii. 41. John ii. 13. 23. vii. 2. xi. 56. xii. 1.
39. See Matt. xii. 5.
40. See Matt. xii. 11.
42. See Acts ii. 36. Rev. i. 5.—Grocius.
43. See James i. 25.—Grocius.
43*. See Dan. chap. iii. and viii. and compare chap. viii. with chap. xi.
44. See Daniel ii. 44, 45. vii. 13, 14. From the term "Son of Man" the Hebrews infer a sense of meanness or comparative insignificance. It is thus applied to prophets in comparison with angels, as Jacchiades has also remarked in his Paraphrase on Daniel x. 16. edit. Amst. 1633.—Grotius.
45. God would have pronounced it universal, &c.] But this was so far from being the fact, that we find some laws (as in the instance of "first-fruits, tithes, the assembling of the people on festivals," &c.) expressly and exclusively applicable to Judæa, where all nations certainly could not be assembled. See Exod. xxi. 19. xxxiv. 2. 6. Deut. xxvi. 2. & seqq. See also Deut. xii. 5. & seqq. xiv. 23. & seqq. and Exodus xxiii. 17. xxxiv. 22—24. Deut. xvi. 16. It has been usual from the earliest times to understand the law which relates to sacrifices in the same light. According to the Talmud (title de Synedrio and title Chagiga) the law was given solely to the Hebrew nation, and not to strangers: see Maimonides on Deut. xxxiii. and Rabbi Bechai. See note 38. of the second book.—Grocius.
46. To counteract some national propensity.] Their immoderate use of ritual observances, for example; and consequently their proneness to idolatry: this is shown by the prophets throughout, and especially by Ezekiel, ch. xvi.—Grocius.
48. Or adapted only to particular occasions.] Thus it is observed by L. Valerius in Livy, book xxxiv. 6. "Laws which are required by particular periods are subject to abrogation, and we see them "mutabiles," liable to change with those times by which they were occasioned: what were enacted in a state of peace are, for the most part, abrogated in a state of war; what were enacted in times of war are abrogated in times of peace."—Grocius.
49. See Exod. xxvii. Deut. xiii. 12.—Grotius.

50. See Deut. xii. 1, 20. xxvi. 1. Numbers xxxiii. 52.—Grotius.

51. That right and that servitude perpetual, &c.] See Exod. xxiv. vi. 1 Sam. i. 22. And in this limited sense Josephus Albo thought that the word מִבְּלָעָל in the ritual law might be understood. See his "Fundamenta Jud. Relig." book iii. ch. 16. edit. Venet. 1612. Even the priesthood of Phineas is called מִבְּלָעָל. Ps. cxi. 30, 31. קְסָכ תַּגְיַי אֵלֹהֵי Ecclesiasticus xliv. 24. לְפָרָוָנָה לָוָנָא, 1 Maccabees ii. 54. i.e. "everlasting," in each of these quotations.—Grotius.

52. The fulfilling of the Jubilee, or the great Jubilee.] See the Pereck Chaleck and elsewhere: and that expression, "the acceptable year" in Isaiah lxvi. 2.—Grotius. The Pereck Chaleck is chapter xi. of the Talmud on Synagogues; but this reference, at least in the text of the Mishna, is incorrectly made by Grotius: He ought to have been more accurate in his quotations.—Le Clerc.

53. See Jeremiah xxxi. 31. & seqq.—Grotius.

54. Sacrifices devised by human invention, &c.] St. Chrysostom says of Abel, in Homily xii. tom. 3. edit. 1609. "Εἰς τὰς 'Ἀνθρώπους," that "he did not offer that sacrifice from any previous instructions to that effect, nor in consequence of any known law respecting first-fruits, but that he did it spontaneously, and solely from the dictates of his own conscience." So again, in Justin Martyr, Πρὸς τὸν Ὀρθοδόξον, &c.; Ἐσωτηρικά κ. 3. we read that "the sacrifice of brute animals, prior to the law, was not a practice of divine institution, although God's acceptance of the offering (it is added) makes it evident that the offerer was an object of divine favour."—Grotius.

55. God therefore, with sufficient reason, &c.] Maimonides, in his "Ductor Dubitantium," book iii. ch. 32. adduces this very reason for the legal institution of sacrificial rites. And Tertullian, ii. 18. against Marcion, edit. Par. 1675, observes on this subject that "Nobody should presume to censure the burthen-
some performance of sacrifices and the troublesome punctilios or scrupulous formalities of religious offerings, as if God were properly, on his own account, in want of such observances, when he exclaims in such express terms, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? And who hath required this at your hands?" Isaiah i. 11. 12. but rather let such cavillers perceive that immediate purpose of the Deity, who sought by these means to bind a people so prone to idolatry and transgression, as the Jews were, to their own true religion; that he thus might withhold them from the prevalent superstition of that age, by enjoining the direction of those offerings to Himself, as if he stood in need of them in order to prevent the sin of idolatry."

—Grotius.

56. Because of thy sacrifices, &c.] Psalm 1. 8. of this and the following quotations the text of Grotius is a paraphrase, not a literal translation. [See Appendix, Note O.]—Le Clerc.

57. Mercy more acceptable than sacrifice.] So also the Chaldee interpreter expounds this passage.—Grotius.

58. To do justly, to love mercy, &c.] The Jews therefore say that the precepts of the law, in number 602, are contracted into six by Isaiah, ch. xxxiii. 17; into three by Micah in this text; into two by Isaiah, ch. lvi. 1.; and into one by Habakkuk, ch. ii. 4. as well as by Amos, ch. v. 6.—Grotius.

59. ] See 2 Kings, ch. xviii. 4.—Grotius.

60. ] See further Jeremiah iii. 16. "In those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, neither shall that be done any more."

—Grotius.

Not even the Jews themselves, from the date of their general dispersion, have been able any longer to observe their own law. It has been impracticable for all the males to appear before the Lord three times in a year at Jerusalem, according to their law, Exod. xxiii. 17. from all the countries which they inhabited. That law could only be prescribed to a people of no great extent in point of numbers, and at no great distance from the Tabernacle.—Le Clerc.


61*.] Now above 1700 years.

62. To Noah and his posterity.] It seems to be an argument against this assertion, that a distinction between clean and unclean animals is mentioned in the account of the deluge: but that di-
distinction was made perhaps, by anticipation, to those persons to whom the law became known; or else by the term unclean we are to understand those animals which are avoided by a natural antipathy as articles of human sustenance, and which Tacitus has called profane or inauspicious, in his Hist. iv. 60. unless indeed it be thought better to apply the term clean to those animals which live on vegetable food, and that of unclean to those which are carnivorous.—Grotius.

63. Whether it might be, &c.] Origen says, in his fourth book against Celsus, § 92, that certain evil demons, of the race of Titan or the Giants, (if that appellation be allowable,) who took an impious part against the true Deity and the heavenly angels, and who consequently were expelled from heaven, are wallowing in gross and carnal matters of uncleanness upon earth: these, having some insight into future events, (as being unencumbered with material bodies, and being conversant with such practices) are desirous of seducing the human race from the worship of the true God; and under the forms of certain animals of the more rapacious and savage kind, or of others of a more mischievous subtlety, they impel them as they please, and when they please to any purpose; or direct the inclinations of these creatures to such flights and motions, that men, being influenced by the divinations which are practised by means of these brute animals, may not address themselves to Almighty God, nor seek a pure and pious mode of worship; but may become debased in their thoughts, and sink to earthly objects, to birds, and serpents, and even foxes and wolves! For it has been observed by soothsayers, that the clearest prognostications arise from animals of this description; nor are these demons able to do so much by means of tamer creatures, as those of a fierce nature can effect in savage animals from their nearer approach to what is vicious, not indeed to actual vice and wickedness, but only in appearance. Hence, if Moses be ever an object of our admiration, he particularly deserves to be so from his discernment of the different natures of animals, whether he derived it from the Deity, with a knowledge of the congenial tempers of the beasts and demons, in different degrees; or whether his own skill in arranging the characters and qualities of animals induced him to pronounce all those creatures unclean which were applied by the Egyptians and others to purposes of augury, and those which were not of that description, altogether clean.” Theodoret, in his seventh discourse against the Greeks, in the beginning of p. 102. has similar remarks; nor is that passage inapplicable which is given from Manetho by Josephus, in the first book of his Defence against Apion, § 26. where he speaks of “many other ordinances in direct opposition to the customs of the Egyptians.” See also what is said by Tacitus concerning
the Jews in his Hist. v. 4. "Whatever is held sacred by the Romans, with the Jews is profane." And again, in the same section, "in contempt of Jupiter Hammon they sacrifice a ram: the ox, worshipped in Egypt for the god Apis, is slain as a victim by the Jews." Murphy.—Grotius.

64. Or because, among the typical expressions, &c.] Barnabas, in his "Catholic Epistle," (edited by Vossius with Latin version, Amst. 1646) says, in ch. viii. that "Moses had three moral precepts in his thoughts, when he said to the Israelites, 'Ye shall not eat the swine, nor the eagle, nor the ospray, nor the raven, nor the fish that hath not fins and scales;' he speaks, in short, expressly in Deuteronomy, 'This people shall observe to do the statutes and judgements which I have commanded:' The prohibition respecting meats is not therefore a literal commandment of God, but the words of Moses had a spiritual meaning; that which relates to swine is, that they should not associate with those persons who resemble swine; for when they riot in high living they forget their master, but when they are in want, they own him: so the hog disregards his keeper while he is well fed, but when he is hungry he makes a noise, and becomes quiet again when he is satisfied. 'Neither shalt thou eat,' saith Moses, 'the eagle, nor the ospray, nor the hawk, nor the raven;' that is, thou shalt not associate with men who know not how to work and labour for their own livelihood, but who seize with lawless rapacity the goods of other men, and lie in wait to deceive, under a mask of apparent sincerity, just as those birds of prey, idle and mischievous in their vile nature, are seeking to devour other birds. 'Neither shalt thou eat,' saith he, 'whatsoever hath not fins and scales, of all that are in the waters,' as the lamprey, the polypus, and the cuttle: that is, thou shalt not resemble, by joining their society, those evil and death-devoted men, to whom these execrable fish are the proper counterpart; as swimming alone in the deepest holes, not floating like others near the surface, but immersed in the mud at the bottom. 'Neither shalt thou eat the hyena;' that is, be not addicted to adulterous, lustful, and corrupt passions, so as to resemble animals that change annually their nature and their sex. Moses too, in his just prejudice against the weasel, intends figuratively to discourage an intercourse with persons of a foul-mouthed and unclean description, as that animal was supposed to conceive in its mouth. In regard to meats, therefore, he applied to them a spiritual meaning in three points of instruction, but they received his precepts literally through their carnal desires. Now David understands the three precepts in a moral sense, when he says, 'Blessed is the man that hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, (in allusion to the fish swimming in darkness at the bottom,) nor stood in the way of sinners, who wallow in sin
(like swine in the mire,) while they profess to fear God; and hath not sat in the seat of the scornful, (that is, as those ravenous birds sit watching for their prey.) Thus have ye the meaning perfectly, and from the best authority. But Moses further said, 'Every beast that parteth the hoof and cheweth the cud ye shall eat.' Why so? because it receiveth its food and knoweth its owner; it is satisfied and seemeth to rejoice. It was well said, with a view to the commandment. He means that we should associate with those who fear the Lord; with those who meditate in their hearts on the precept which they have verbally received; with those who talk of God's commandments and keep them; with those who know that meditation is a joyful employment; and who ruminate on the word of the Lord! But why the divided hoof? It represents the twofold object of a good man, who in passing through this world looks forward to a holy and happy eternity. See then how admirable are the precepts of Moses! Clemens notices these remarks of Barnabas with commendation, in Strom. v. p. 244. But many passages exactly the same or of a similar purport occur in Philo, "Πέλεκενομυκίαν," and in a Tract "Περὶ τα ἐκεῖνα το κατετυχον πιθεῖν ἐπιτέλεσθαι," importing in its title that "Wickedness lays snares for Virtue." These extracts it would be tedious to transcribe; others occur also from Aristeus in the Prep. Evang. of Eusebius, book viii. ch. 9.—Grotius.

[Naturalists will overlook the errors of Barnabas, (Mr. L'Oste observes,) in this fine exposition, in respect to the age in which he lived.]

65. The stranger (or sojourner) that is within thy gates.] That is, to the pious but uncircumcised, sojourners, or strangers, mentioned in Leviticus xxii. 25. xxv. 40. 47. and in the titles of the Talmud, "King" and "Synagogue," as well as in Maimonides on Idolatry. (Amst. 1641.)—Grotius.

66. The prohibitory law of meats to cease, &c.] See the Me-kor chajim R. Samuelis Expositio in Pentateuch. Mantue 1559. And the Talmud, title Nida, speaks of the continuance of the law only till the time of the Messiah. It is further observable that certain Jewish Rabbins, Bechai amongst the rest, were of opinion that these restrictions in regard to food were peculiar, and exclusively applicable to the land of Palestine. Besides, it is evident, that the signification of the names of animals is in many instances either unknown to the Jews, or matter of dispute amongst themselves; which God, we must believe, would not have allowed to be the case, if the obligation of the law in this respect had remained in force to the present day.—Grotius.

67, 68. A precept of commemoration and a precept of observance.] The former is expressed by the Hebrew נֵּרִי, and the
batter by 222, according to the distinction made by Rabbi Mo-
ves, of Girona, in his Comment. in Pentateuch. Ven. 1548, and
by Isaac Arama, Ven. 1573.— Grotius.

The terms to “observe” and to “remember” are synonymous
in the language of Moses, in this case, as I have shown in my
Comment. on Deut. v. 1. but what is here stated is in itself
strictly true.—Le Clerc.

69. Carefully obeyed.] The precept of commemoration, no
doubt, was carefully observed by those devout persons who lived
“before the law,” and from them even the Greeks derived a cer-
tain degree of reverence for the seventh day, as Clemens has re-
marked in Strom. v. p. 256. See further on this subject the first
book of this treatise, ch. 16, notes 57—67.—Grotius.

70. We nowhere find their journeys interrupted by the sabbath;
but, after the Exodus, this is constantly observable, for the first
day of security, &c.] That the devout Jews of those early times
could be said, in this sense, τη ἑβαυλή, that is, to have observed
the Sabbaths, is denied by Justin Martyr in his dialogue with
Trypho, § 19, and by Tertullian “against the Jews” in two pas-
sages. See chapters 2.4.—Grotius.

71. The first day of security, &c.] See Nelson's Festivals,
ch. 1.

72. The obligation, it is true, extended, &c.] To all sojourners
in the land; but not to others also, not living in Judæa, who ne-
evertheless were observant of the precepts given to the posterity
of Noah. This distinction is maintained by the Hebrews.—
Grotius.

73. For infants, it is certain, might legally receive circumcision on
the sabbath-day.] So the Hebrew Proverb: ד"טכ מ"כ מ"כ כותב ש"כ
“Circumcision dispenses with the Sabbath.” See John vii. 22.
—Grotius.

74. While the temple remained, &c.] See Numb. xxviii. 9.—
Grotius.

[The note under 22, in Parkhurst, is well worth the reader's
attention, on the subject of circumcision.]

75. See Deut. x. 16. xxx. 6. and Jeremiah iv. 4.

76. See Hebrews iv.

77, 78. The sign of circumcision can boast no peculiar right,
&c.—and was discontinued by the Israelites during the time, &c.]
“ The institution itself (says Justin in his dialogue with Trypho,
§ 23.) was given as a sign or type, not as an act intrinsically
righteous.” And Irenæus says, (book iv. ch. 30. in the beginning)
“The Scriptures teach us that God appointed the rite of cir-
2c
Circumcision, not as being the end, as it were, and perfection of righteousness, but as a peculiar mark of distinction among the race of Abraham: for God said (he observes) to Abraham, ‘Every man child among you shall be circumcised; and ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.” Deut. xvii. 10, 11. Circumcision discontinued. See Joshua v. 4. 7.—Grotius.

79. *At least not inferior, &c.* It was said by R. Levi ben Gerson, that the miracles of the Messiah ought to exceed those of Moses; which was in the highest degree verified by his restoration of the dead to life!—Grotius.


82. *Daniel, to whose righteousness Ezekiel, &c.* See Ezekiel xiv. xxviii. 3. Josephus says of Daniel, (in the latter part of his tenth book of the Antiquities of the Jews,) that “the Spirit of God was with him;” and a little afterwards he says, that “all things predicted or done by Daniel were accomplished with incredible success, so as to place him in the first rank of prophets: he enjoyed, during life, the highest favour and esteem, both from prince and people, and his name survives him in immortal honour: we read his prophetic writings to this day, and they afford ample evidence of his communication with God.”—Grotius.

83. *Before the coming of the Messiah.* The Son of Man, in Daniel, is admitted to be the Messiah by those great “masters of Israel,” Solomon Jarchi, Rabbi Joshua, cited in the Commentaries of Abencedra and Saadia.—Rabbi Joses also, who witnessed the destruction of the temple, declared that the time of the Messiah was come: as R. Jacob testifies, in Capthor.—Grotius.

These names occur in rabbinical books (and that of Levi Gerson, note 80.) amongst other commentators on the sacred writings. See Biblia Hebraica, cum Masora et select. Heb. Interp. Commentariis, studio Joh. Buxtortii. Basil. 1618.] 84. *Nehumiah a Jewish Ruler, &c.* Grotius should have given us in this place a correct and explicit reference: He says, unless my memory fails me, in some letter to his brother William Grotius, that he “received these particulars from some Jew.”—Le Clerc.

The letter of Grotius on this subject was not written to his brother, but to that eminent man Claudius Sarravius: these are his own words: "Nehumiae illius magistri Hebraei, Vir Amplissime, mentio fit in Thalmudicis: ni fallor, est in titulo de Synedrio. Ostendit istum mihi locum olim Hage Stoctoxus. Futo ejus fieri mentionem et in Abenada ad Danielem." See the Epi-
Bishop Patrick, in his preface, says that Grotius "gives a punctual answer to a question propounded by a minister of Rouen, who asked him where he had that of Rabbi Nechumias who made that public declaration (mention in book v. § 14. of this treatise) concerning the appearing of Christ fifty years before our Saviour, to this effect: 'That the time which Daniel had prefixed for the coming of the Messiah could not be prolonged above those fifty years;' which he tells Sarravius (Epist. Claud. Sarrav. p. 52.) is to be found in the Talmud, in the title Sanhedrin, as he remembered, and he thought also in Abenada upon Daniel. This, the Bishop adds, was in the year 1640, when he first put out this book with Annotations; containing the testimonies of those authors in words at length, whom he has alleged; but had forgotten, it seems, to set down where he had this passage of Rabbi Nechumias. Nor is it now to be found among the Annotations; and therefore they that next print the book so enlarged will do well to supply it from hence, out of Sarravius; who was the first person to whom [see his Epist. 197. ad Gallos, p. 460.] he made a present of it after it came out, with the addition of the Testimonies; desiring to be admonished by him, if, in the midst of much business, any thing had escaped him which was less exactly spoken, while he studied to serve the Christian cause."

85. In relation to a future universal kingdom, of divine origin, etc. The stone which smote the image representing empires (Daniel ii. 34, 35.) was declared by Rabbi Levi ben Gerson to be a type of the Messiah; and that kingdom which should "break in pieces and consume" the rest (v. 44.) is in like manner declared by Rabbi Solomon, R. Abenezra, and R. Saadia, to be the kingdom of the Messiah. R. Levi ben Gerson and Saadia understand the Son of Man in Daniel to signify the Messiah. [See note 83. of this book.]—Grotius.

86. This note refers to book i. §17. note 159. on the subject of the Syrian and Egyptian monarchies.—Grotius.

87. Referred by Josephus to his own time.] See his Jewish Antiq. book x. ch. 12. where he observes that "Daniel left in writing, at the same time, predictions relating to the Roman empire, and to the desolation in which the Romans would involve the Jews. All this (says he) was done by divine inspiration, inso-
much that nobody can read the prophetic writings thus left, and consider the predictions thus fulfilled, without astonishment and reverence towards Daniel, who was so highly honoured by the divine favour!" See also the Paraphrase of R. Joseph Jacchiades on Daniel, ch. ix. 24, where he considers the seventy weeks of years to be completed at the destruction of the second temple.—Grotius.

88. A singular degree of effulgent brightness, &c.] Under the title "Proofs" in the Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud, ch. 3. —Grotius.

89. The gift of his peace, &c.] "In this house will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts;" Haggai ii. 9. Observe too, in verse 7, it is written, "The desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory!" How wonderfully do these words of Haggai correspond with those of Malachi here adduced! so that the two prophets reciprocally explain the meaning of each other. That the coming of the Messiah must take place while the second temple was standing to receive him, was perceived, as Rabbi Solomon assures us, by Rabbi Akiba and many others.—Grotius.

90. The Lord whom ye seek, &c.] Mal. iii. 1. This passage is explained by the Jews, in general, in application to the Messiah. —Grotius.

91. The whole of that period from Zorobabel to Vespasian.] It is so described in the Talmud: see the last chapter on the Sanhedrim, as well as the titles Juma or Joma de Sacrificiis, 1648, and Rosch Haschana.—Grotius.

91*. The second temple stood therefore about 600 years: being founded about two years after the return of the Jews, under Zorobabel, from the Babylonish captivity, which happened in the year 538 before Christ; and destroyed about the 69th year of the Christian æra, by Titus, in the reign of Vespasian. The first temple was built by Solomon 992 years before Christ; and lasted about 400 years, being destroyed by Nebuchodonosor in the 598th year of the same epocha before Christ.

92. But gradually repaired and altered, &c.] Philo, on the Creation of the World and its incorruptible state, observes, p. 746. B. edit. 1613. that "a substance only gradually and partially decaying is not in a state of dissolution, but that which perishes in all parts and at the same time." See also the Corpus Juris Civilis, edit. Amst. 1681. Digests, part 2. book v. title i. "de Judiciis," 76. Alfenus lib. vi. beginning with the word "Proponebatur." See also in the same Body of Civil Law, Digests,

† Edit. Amst. 1633.
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93. Herod and Judas of Galilee and others.] These Herodians are mentioned in Matt. xxii. 16. Mark iii. 6. viii. 15. xii. 13. Tertullian, in the beginning of his enumeration of heretical sects, says, “Among these I must also mention the Herodians, who said that Herod was Christ.” Epiphanius speaks of them in similar terms, Heresies, book xx. t. 1. p. 45, 46. edit. Paris. 1622. And with these writers the ancient Scholiast on Persius agrees, satire v. I. 180. where he says that “when Herod was king of Judæa, in the time of Augustus, and in Lower Syria, the Herodians observed his birth-day as a festival equal to the sabbath; placing lighted candles with garlands of violets in their windows in honour of the day.”—Grotius.


96. Not to mention the express language, &c.] Rabbi Jochanan, in his Codex “Schemoth Rabba” (de Remissione) plainly asserts this unconditional appearance of the Messiah. See also R. David Kimchi on Psalm cviii. 5. Josephus well observes respecting Daniel in the latter part of book ix. of his Jewish Antiq. that he “not only, through the whole term of his prophetic office, predicted future events, as the other prophets also did, but likewise the precise period of their accomplishment.” It appears also from Malachi, ch. iii. 1. that the mission of the Messiah was decreed unconditionally to take place when it did; and moreover, as that Messiah was to be the author of a new covenant, (as appears from Malachi in the passage above cited as well as from other prophets,) his coming could not possibly be dependent on the condition of a due observance of the former covenant which he came to abrogate.—Grotius.

97. The number of their sins would occasion the destruction of their city shortly after the time of the Messiah.] See Daniel ix. 24. —Grotius.

98. To heal the transgressions, and to bring his pardon, &c.] See Isaiah liii. 4. & seqq. Jeremiah xxxi. 31, &c. Ezekiel xl. 19. 21.—Grotius.
99. *Isch Copher ישך פפרס.* See the Chaldee Paraphrast on Canticles i. 14. That the Messiah was to "bear our sins" was the declared opinion of R. Judas in his Comment. on Chasidim; and of R. Simeon in Comment. on Bereschith Rabba.—Grotius.


102. *And if ever they attempted to build a temple, they were constantly obliged to abandon the design.* Under Adrian, under Constantine, under Julian. See Chrysostom, book ii. against the Jews, t. vi. pp. 333, 334. edit. Eton. 1612.—Grotius.

103. *Ammianus Marcellinus, a writer not of our persuasion,* &c.] See Chrysostom, as above. He tells us of a "sudden eruption of fire, from the foundations of their intended temple, which consumed many men, and the very stones of that place." The whole passage deserves attention. The same author gives a similar account in his Homily iv. on St. Matthew, t. ii. p. 20.; and in his Discourse on the Divinity of Christ, t. vi. p. 639.—Grotius.

The "Julian" of Bishop Warburton applies forcibly to the subject of this note.

103*.] Moloch is the planet Saturn: the Jews still call it by that name. See Grotius on the Old and New Testament, in his note upon the xviiiith of Deuteronomy, ver. 10. For the mention of this practice, see particularly 2 Kings xxiii. 10. 2 Chron. xxviii. 3. Jeremiah vii. 31. xix. 5.


105.] This argument is offered in reply by Rabbi Samuel, in his epistle to Rabbi Isaac.—Grotius.


107.] See Jer. xxv. 12. xxix. 10.—Grotius.

108.] See the Talmud in Baba Bathra.—Grotius.

* See 1Q3 Placavit, Expiavit, in Buxtorf; and Parkhurst under the same root, viii. And after the various senses given by Poole's Commentators, we find the following on Canticles i. 14. respicere possit fructum mortis Christi, quo factus est botrus Redemptionis, &c. 1 John ii. 2. Significat enim vox illa propitia- tionem sive redemptionem.
109. So absurd are the accounts there given of God's penitence and tears for having suffered the destruction of their city, &c. See the preface to Ecka Rabbi, and similar passages in the Talmud, title Chagiga; in Debarim Rabba; and in Berachoth. — Grotius.


111.] See Talmud, Baba Bathra, and the Chaldee Paraphrase on the Song of Solomon, ch. viii. 2. — Grotius.

[In notes of this description (particularly in note 129. of this book) the translator has not the means of referring so much as he could wish, for the information of some, and for the amusement of others, to the Talmuds and Traditions of the Jews, nor to the names and works of their Doctors, whether Rabbinists or Karaites; nor even to the more useful contents of the principal Targums: but his very limited access to them, and indeed the concise and imperfect mode of reference adopted by his author, will be seldom, it is hoped, a subject of complaint or regret, since the character of these talmudical books and their Commentators, in a scriptural point of view, has been fully stated by Dean Prideaux and others; and the authority of the Rabbinical writers, "in matter of history," has been duly estimated by Grotius himself in his Annott. on Matt. xxiv. 24. as well as by Bishop Stillingfleet, and by others cited by him in his "Origines Sacrae," book i. ch. 3.]

112. Various other matters.] Many of these absurdities have been transcribed by John Gershn, a Christian writer, into his book addressed to the Jews in the German language, edit. Helmont. 1609. (His works are published by Du Pin, 1706.) See his chapters concerning Devils, the Messiah, the Revelations by Elijah, the valley of Hinnom, the kingdom of the ten tribes beyond the river Sabbaticus; and the famous exploits of the Rabbins. — Grotius.

113. But they labour earnestly to appease the wrath of God. Surely, if the Jews may have credit for their own assertions, they are highly deserving of God's favour for their rejection of a false Messiah, while so great a portion of mankind have received him as the true one! — Grotius.


115.] Justin Martyr, in his 2d Apology, 31. describes Barchocheba as the chief cause or leader of the apostasy of the Jews. He is also mentioned by Eusebius in his Hist. Evang.

116. See our former observations on this subject, book ii. § 20. and the notes.—Grotius.


119. See Matt. i. 20.—Grotius.


122. Isaiah xxxv. 5. lxix. 1. Matt. xi. 5. Luke iv. 18. and in various other places. Nor did Our Saviour only heal the sick, the blind, and lame, but he raised the dead also: an example of divine power, which R. Levi ben Gerson ranks among the principal proofs of the true Messiah.—Grotius.

123. David, Ps. ii. 8. xxii. 28. lxviii. 32. lxxii. 8. 17.—Grotius.

124. Isaiah ii. 2. xi. 10. xiv. 1. xix. 18. xxvii. 13. xxxv. xliii. xliii. and particularly xlix. 6. li. 5. lii. 15. liv. iv. 4, 5. lx. 3. & seqq. lxv. 1, 2. lxvi. 19, &c.—Grotius.

125. Zechariah ii. 11. viii. 20. & seqq. ix. 9—11. xiv. 16.—Grotius.


128. See Hosea ii. 23.—Grotius.

129*. Hyrcanus, the second of that name, of the Hasmoncean race, lost the sceptre of the Jews; which passed by permission of the Romans to Herod the Idumean: in his time was Jesus born: but though by Herod’s usurpation the Jewish sceptre was much shaken, yet it was not wholly broken and abolished until the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A.C. 70.
129. **The Chaldean interpreter, &c.** See Jonathan ben Uziel, as well as the Jerusalem Paraphrast; in the Polyglot Bibles; and the Talmuds, title Sanhedrim, Bereshith Rabba; and Jakob ben Joseph on the Pentateuch; Rabbi Solomon, and others. The Hebrew word שלוש, which the Jews now would render a rod of chastisements, is explained by the Chaldee Paraphrase (or Targum) by the word שלוש, Power, Dominion; and by the Greeks in the same sense, Δύναμις, Governour; by Aquila Σέπτρον, Sceptre; and by Symmachus Θρεσία, Power. The word שלוש in Genesis xlix. 10. (see Parkhurst under שלוש, v.) is explained by שלוש, his Son, both by the Chaldee Paraphrast, Rabbi Siloh*, R. Bechay, R. Solomon, Abenesdra, and Kimhi. See the admirable remarks of Chrysostom on this passage, in his Discourse on the Divinity of Christ, t. vi. p. 625. edit. 1612.—Grotius.

130. See Isaiah xi. 10. cited in note 124. which throws light on this extended kingdom of the Messiah.—Grotius.


132. Speaking of the ancient interpreters in the time of the Babylonian captivity, &c. Grotius seems to intend the Chaldee Paraphrasts or Expositors of the Old Testament, and to adopt the Jewish opinion, which makes them older than they really were. See Brian Walton's (Bishop of Chester) Prolegomena to the Polyglot Bible, chap. xii. Lond. 1657.—Le Clerc.

133. **The Scriptures must be often taken in a figurative sense,** &c. So Maimonides, in book Jad, on Deuteronomy, edit. Ven. 1550, would expound the text of Isaiah xi. 6. on the effects of the Messiah's coming, in an allegorical sense; and David Kimchi makes the same remark on the very same passage; and again, to the same purport, on Jeremiah, ch. ii. 15. as well as ch. v. 6.—Grotius.

134. See Genesis xi. 5. xvi. 21. See also on these and similar expressions, the "Ductor Dubitantium" of Maimonides, part i. ch. 10. and ii. ch. 29. & seqq. edit. Basil. 1629; and see the same author on Deuteronomy, where he speaks of "the King," ch. xvii. The Cabalistic book of Nezael Israel interprets the things which relate to the Messiah in a heavenly sense. —Grotius.

135. See Jeremiah ix. 12.—Grotius.

* See Mr. Hewitt's remark on this unknown Rabbi in his "Catalogus Librorum," p. 393.
136.] See Psalms xxxi. 2. and xxxiv. 15.—Grotius.
137.] See Psalm xxxiv. 15. as in the last note.—Grotius.
138.] See Psalm xviii. 8. and Jeremiah xxxii. 37.—Grotius,
139.] See the text of Isaiah xi. 6. & seqq. as in note 133.—
Grotius.
—Grotius.
142.] See 1 Samuel ii. 8. Psalm xxxiv. 18. Prov. xi. 2.
Isaiah lvi. 15. lxvi. 2.—Grotius.
143.] See Genesis xxii. & seqq.—Grotius.
144.] See Exodus, ch. iii.—Grotius.
145.] See 1 Samuel xvi. 7. 11.—Grotius.
146.] See Isaiah lxii. 1. Matt. xi. 5. Zechariah ix. 9.—
Grotius.
147*.] Eliychnium is, literally, the wick of a candle; but me-
tonymically translated "flax." It is proper to observe further,
as the translator has retained the old negative expression of
the general translation of this passage, from which Grotius has de-
parted, that here, as in many places, a figurative expression is
adopted by the Scriptures, by which less is expressed than is in-
tended. "Non solum non confringet, extinguet; sed etiam re-
dintegrabit, accendet." See Hardy's Gr. Test, upon the pas-
sage.—Grotius.
148.] See Genesis iv—Grotius.
149.] The Jews have a tradition to this effect respecting the
death of Isaiah; and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews
refers to it in ch. xi. 37. And Josephus also, book x. ch. 4. of
his Jewish Antiquities. Chalcidius, on the Timeus of Plato,
p. 263. towards the end, edit. 1617. speaks of "prophets put to
death by wicked hands; one of them (says he) sawn asunder,
and another stoned."—Grotius.
150.] See 2 Maccabees, ch. vii.: see also Josephus, ch. ix.
to ch. xiv. (edit. Hudson. Oxon. 1720.) on "the paramount in-
fluence of the reasoning principle" supported by religion, exem-
plified in the martyrdom of the Maccabees.—Grotius.
151.] See Genesis xix.—Grotius.
152.] See Isaiah, ch. liii. which is applied to the Messiah both
by the Chaldee Paraphrase and by the Gemara of the Babyl-
nish Talmud, title Sanhedrim.—Grotius.
Grotius appeals to his translation of this 53d chapter of Isaiah, in proof of his faith in the Divinity and the Satisfaction of Christ, and in vindication of his principles from the charge of Socinianism. This appears in a letter to Gerard Vossius, (see Epist. Praëstant. Virorum, p. 747.) as Bishop Patrick has stated in the preface to his translation in 1680.

153. Grieves.] Abarbanel on Isaiah, edit. 1631. observes, that the word which is here translated morbus in verse 4. of the 53d chapter, and which the English translation renders grief, applies to all kinds of evils.—Grotius.

154. Chastisement of our peace.] The 5th verse of that chapter (where the English version renders the text, “the chastisement of our peace was upon him,”) is explained in application to the Messiah, both in Rabboth, and by Solomon Jarchi, in his Commentary on the Prophets, edit. Gothen. 1713.; Gemara, under title Sanhedrim.—Grotius.

155. His soul an offering for sin.] (English Translation.) This is to be understood, says Rabbi Alseck, of a voluntary endurance of sufferings.—Grotius.

156. He shall see his seed.] (English Translation.) The Hebrew word, which is rendered Seed, the same Rabbi observes, signifies Disciples or Followers. So by the seed of the Serpent the Hebrews understand the Canaanites: And the same sense is given by some to the word Children in Isaiah viii. 18. as the Jerusalem Talmud remarks under title Sanhedrim.—Grotius.

157. And shall be satisfied,] verse 11. which is understood by Abarbanel in reference to a future period of retribution.—Grotius.

158. And he shall divide the spoil with the strong.] (English Translation.) The Gemara of the Babylonish Talmud, under title הַשָּׂרִיבת, understands this passage in a spiritual sense. And Alseck in this place understands by the word translated “spoil” the honours and rewards of the wise or good.—Grotius.

159. All the miseries inflicted on the Jews greatly inferior to their deserts.] This appears from the prophetical denunciations already cited, (see especially § 16. note 104.) and from Daniel, ch. ix. and Nehemiah, ch. ix. Besides, the person thus described by Isaiah was to deprecate the wrath of God on behalf of the Gentiles; which the Jews never do.—Grotius.

160. Have pretended to make two Messiahs.] See Talmud, title Succa: see also Rabbi Solomon and Rabbi David Kimchi.—Grotius.
This very acknowledgement is made by Abar-baniel in more places than one, in his Commentaries on this 53d chapter of Isaiah.—Grotius.

See Jeremiah iv. 4. vi. 10.


See Genesis xxxvii.

See the texts already cited, book ii. § 19. note 162.

See Numbers xi. 6.

See Numbers xi. 33.

See 2 Samuel xv.

See 2 Chronicles xxiv. 21.

See Jeremiah xxvi.

See Jeremiah xxxviii.—Grotius.

Josephus says that no other city ever experienced such dreadful calamities; neither was any period of the world so fruitful of all kinds of wickedness. He adds that the Jews brought upon themselves greater sufferings than any inflicted on them by the Romans who came to punish their enormities.—Grotius.

See Josephus, book xiv. 17. of Jewish Antiq.


See 1 Kings xxii. 27.

See 1 Kings xviii. 17. where Ahab says to Elijah,

אֲרָפְתֶּךָ הִצֵּר יִשְׂרָאֵל

Or Συς διαστρέφων τιν Ἰσραήλ; Art thou he that troubleth Israel?

So say the chief priests about Jesus, in St. Luke's Gospel, xxiii. 2.

Τότον ἐνομεν διαστρέφοντα το ἐδώσ. We found this (man) perverting the nation.—Grotius.

See Jeremiah vii. 4. & seqq. xxvi. 6. 11.—Grotius.

The record of the ancient Rabbins.] See the Talmud title "Sanhedrim," Ketuboth, and Sota: Rabbi Solomon, title "Sanhedrim," as before; c. Helec; and the Talmud, title "Weights." The tradition of Rabbi Judas, in the Gemara, under the same title "Sanhedrim," c. Helec, is that "when the Son of David shall come, the house of divine institution shall become a brothel." See Jeremiah x. 21. and xxiii. 14.—Grotius.

Here was a great error, for Masora was put instead of Gemara: this passage, however, is really extant in the Gemara,
ch. xi. title "Sanhedrim;" viz. that "when the Son of David shall come, the House of Congregation shall become a brothel." See the edition of Cocceius, § 27.—Le Clerc.

179. See Hosea ii. 23.
180. See Jeremiah iii. 14. 17. and Isaiah lii.

182. Philo Judæus, who has frequently established a Trinity in the Godhead.] Philo, on the "Sacrifices of Cain and Abel," p. 173, (edit. 1742, Mangey,) describes God as "being attended by his two supreme energies, authority and goodness, himself alone between the two, and working a threefold impression on the perceptive mind, each of them incomprehensible, for his energies are unbounded, but each of the three comprehends all things." Afterwards, he also describes authority by the term power, and goodness he calls beneficence; and observes that they cannot be expressed by a devout mind, but are there deposited in the secrecy of silent meditation. Similar sentiments occur in his tract on the Cherubim, p. 144. And again, in his second tract on Agriculture, entitled "Περὶ φυτευμάτων Νῶς," p. 342, he speaks of "the self-existent Being, the power of supremacy, and the power of beneficence or mercy." Maimonides, in the beginning of his book "de Fundamentis Legis," edit. Amst. 1638, and after him Josephus Albo, distinguish in the Deity "that which knoweth, that which is known, and knowledge itself." Applicable to this subject are the remarks of Abenezra on Genesis, ch. xviii., and those of Maimonides in his "Ductor Dubitantium," part i. ch. 68.—Grotius.


[See also book i. of the "Allegories," p. 56.]

184. The Maker of the world.] Philo, both in his "Allegories" and in his tract on "the Cherubim," speaks of "the Λόγος or Word of God, by which, as by a kind of instrument, he made the world."—Grotius.

N.B. This phrase is repeatedly used, as well as in the passages here cited. But [the word Λόγος would be more properly rendered ratio, reason, in this passage of Philo, as I have fully shown in my dissertation on the first chapter of St. John.]-Le Clerc.

185. Neither unbegotten as God the Father, &c.] The passage occurs in Philo's tract on the "Ο εις Καιρονόμος," the "heir of things divine," page 502. edit. 1742; and in p. 398. edit. 1613. The same word is called by Philo the "image of God" in the book "de Monarchiā, vol. ii. p. 636. B. (of the last named edi-
186. The same called by Philo himself an angel, &c. In the
"Ἀγγελός;" and again, in that on the "Cherubim," p. 83. C.
He further uses the term "Ἄρχαγγέλος," in his tract on "the
Heir of Divine Things," p. 397. G., as well as in that on "the
Confusion of Tongues," p. 267. B. The word is called by
Rabbi Samuel in "the Mekor Chajim," his exposition of the
Pentateuch, not only Angel but ביבי Jehovah—Grotius.

187. And by Moses the son of Nachman.] See "Josue Impe-
ratoris Historia explicata atque illustrata," by the very learned
Andreas Masius, edit. Ant. 1574. The words of Rabbi Moses,
at ch. v. of Joshua, are translated into Latin, and are, in En-
GLISH, to the following purport: "That angel, or messenger, is
in fact (see the three last verses of that chapter) the Angel Re-
deemer, of whom it was thus written, "Beware of him, &c."—"for
my name is in him." Exodus xxi. 20, 21. That angel, I say,
who said to Jacob, "I am the God of Bethel." See Gen.
ch. xxxi. 13. He, of whom it was said, "God called unto
Moses out of the midst of the bush." But he is called angel
because he governs the world: for it is written, "Jehovah, that
is the Lord God, brought us forth out of Egypt;" and elsewhere,
"he sent his angel, and brought us forth out of Egypt." More-
over it was written, "And the angel of his presence hath given
them salvation;" that is to say, that angel who is the presence of
God: of whom it was said, "My presence shall go with thee,
and I will give thee rest." Exod. xxi. 14. Finally, this is that
same angel of whom the prophet speaks; "And the Lord whom
ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the angel (or
messenger) of the covenant, in whom ye delight." See Malachi,
ch. iii. verse 1. There is another passage of the same Rabbi, as
follows: "Consider attentively what those things mean: for
Moses and the Israelites have always desired to know that first
angel, but they could not understand clearly who he was: for
they did not discover it from others, neither was there any pro-
phetic intimation of that angel sufficiently explicit. But the
face or presence of God signifies God himself, as all expositors
admit without doubt. Nor indeed could any one understand
those things through the medium of a vision, unless he were
profoundly skilful in the legal mysteries." And again, after-
wards, in a passage nearly similar to the first: "My presence
shall go with thee:" Exod. xxxiii. 14. : This is the angel of the covenant whom ye desire: and in whom ye shall behold my face; of whom it was said, "I will hear thee in an acceptable time." "For my name is in him." See Exod. xxiii. 21. "And I will give thee rest." Exod. xxxiii. 14.: or, "I will cause him to be gentle and kind towards thee; not to lead them by a strict system of legal observances, but with gentleness and mercy."— Compare what is said by Manasses Ben-Israel, in his "Concilior," &c. edit. 1683. question xix. on Genesis.—Grotius.

The name of the Rabbi, whom Grotius calls "Nehemannus," is written נחמ, and may therefore be pronounced more properly Nachman.—Le Clerc.

188. The Cabalists consider the Deity as three lights, &c.] See the first Index subjoined to Schindler’s Lexicon Pentaglotton; after page 1992 in the Notes on the Hebrew Ḳeph. Edit. Francof. 1612. The Liber Cabalisticus, called Scheptal, Hanov. 1611. says that הַיִּשָּׁב (i.e., Numbers) in God do not destroy his unity.—Grotius.

189. The Jewish Schechinah, &c.] Distinct from the Holy Spirit. See the Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud, title "Proofs," ch. iii. and that of the Babylonian Talmud, title "Joma," ch. i. —Rabbi Jonathan, in the Preface to Ecka Rabthi, says that the Schechinah remained for three years and a half on Mount Olivet, waiting for the conversion of the Jews. Nothing is more true than this assertion, if rightly understood and applied.—Grotius.

189*. The Shechinah may perhaps, though imperfectly, be described to be "a bright and luminous appearance which symbolically represented the Divine Presence, and was seen to rest itself (as it were) between the cherubims over the mercy seat, when the priest went into the Holy of Holies. This was the peculiar glory of the first temple."——See further on the subject of this miraculous phenomenon, in Prideaux’s Connect. &c. part i. page 119, folio. See also Jennings’s Jewish Antiq. vol. ii. page 29. and Lowman’s Rational of the Hebrew Ritual, part ii. ch. 2.

190. Several of the Hebrew writers.] See Rabbi Solomon, who also in his Commentary on Genesis xix. 18. admits that the Deity might possibly assume the human nature; and even thinks that this assumption did formerly take place for a time. The Talmud, titles Schebooth and Sabbathoth, concurs with Rabbi Solomon in this opinion.—Grotius.

. 191. And hence the Chaldee Paraphrast, &c.] As on the text of Hosea i. 7.—Grotius.

† See Note Q. in the Appendix.
But it is a mistake to imagine that the Chaldee Paraphrast intends, by the \textit{word of God}, to express any other being than God himself; as the learned author of the \textit{Biblia Veritatis} has shown in that work, which was published in 1700, long after his death.—La Clerc.

192. \textit{The august title of God and Lord.} The Hebrew title is הָוָי, as Jonathan and David Kimchi observe on the text of Jeremiah xxiii. 6.; and Rabbi Abba, in Ecka Rabthi, agrees with them in this application of it. See the title מִלַּי, Zechariah xiv. 16. The Talmud in Taanith says, from Isaiah xxv. 8, 9, that it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God! וַיִּזֹּכֶר, \textit{i.e.} Jehovah shall be pointed out, as it were, with a finger.—Grolius.

193.] See also בָּשֵׁם, Psalm xiv. 7. (which Psalm the Chaldee Paraphrast there acknowledges to treat of the Messiah) in addition to the passage of Isaiah above cited. We likewise find ובֵית, in Psalm cx., which treats of the Messiah, as will presently appear.—Grolius.

The substance of the two last notes is given by Bishop Patrick in his Preface; where he says that the concluding words of this section should be rendered thus: \textit{the Messiah is called by that august name of God Jehovah; and also of Lord, viz. Elohim and Adoni.}—Grolius.

194. Psalms ii. and cx. \textit{David Kimchi himself, & c.} These Psalms, and the text of Zechariah ix. 9. are expressly applied to the Messiah by the very learned Rabbi Saadia.—Grotius.

195. The second Psalm is also applied to the Messiah by Abraham Ezra and Rabbi Jonathan, in Bereschith Rabba.—Grolius.

195*.] David began to reign about the year 1055, and Hezekiah, his lineal descendant, about the year 726 before Christ.

196. \textit{Abraham, in the light of an inferior, receives a blessing from Melchisedec: and gave him tithes of all.} Genesis xiv. 19, 20., as due to his sacerdotal office.—Groitus.

197.] See Psalm cx. 2.—Groitus.

198. \textit{As similar passages demonstrate.} See Genesis xlix. 10. expressly treating of the Messiah; as well as those passages which have just been adduced from the prophets.—Groitus.

199. \textit{Convincing proofs of that power, to which, & c.} See the second book of this Treatise, §§ 5, 6. 19, 20.; and indeed the beginning of the present book, § 2.—Groitus.

200. \textit{Sustaining, as they tell us, in the person of a son of Enoch, &c.} His name, according to the Hebrews, was מִתְאֵה, Mentor, which, in Latin, is the name given to a fore-runner or har-
BOOK VI.

1. That real and pure piety which had flourished, &c.] Ammianus Marcellinus, in book xxi. of his Roman History, describes the Emperor Constantius as being easily induced, moreover, to retract what he had done in favour of the Christians, confounding the perfect and simple system of their religion with doting superstitious notions: in which, by a perplexed investigation, rather than a sober and serious adjustment, he excited many differences of opinion; and these, in the rapid increase of schism, he fomented by a war of words, so as to destroy the whole strength of the machine, in his endeavours to wrest every religious rite to a conformity with his own will; while troops of prelates, like public beasts of burden, were running up and down, in different directions, through the synods, improperly so called! — Grotius.

2. All the world, as it were, driven into the church.] See on this subject the excellent observations of St. Chrysostom, in the second Moral of his Homily on 2 Cor. ch. xii., after the tenth verse, t. iii. p. 686. edit. Eton. 1612; or p. 747. edit. Paris. 1633. — Grotius.

3. It was then that Christian princes, &c.] There is a very contemptible saying of Marcian (who rose from obscurity to be
invested with the imperial purple in the East, A.D. 450.) recorded in the Annals of Zonaras, in the latter end of book xiii. edit. Paris. 1686, "That a king should never have recourse to war, so long as it may be in his power to preserve the blessing of peace."—Grotius.

4. Prelates were seen to give way to ambition, &c.] The splendid vices of the church of Rome, under the reign of Valentinian and Damascus, have been curiously observed by the historian Ammianus, book xxiii. 3., who delivers his impartial sense in these expressive words: "The praefecture of Juventius was accompanied with peace and plenty: but the tranquillity of his government was soon disturbed by a bloody sedition of the distracted people. The ardour of Damascus and Ursinus to seize the episcopal seat surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party; the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers; and the prefect, unable to resist or to appease the tumult, was constrained by superior violence to retire into the suburbs. Damascus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction; one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the Basilica of Sicininus, where the Christians hold their religious assemblies; and it was long before the angry minds of the people resumed their accustomed tranquillity. When I consider the splendour of the capital, I am not astonished that so valuable a prize should inflame the desires of ambitious men, and produce the fiercest and most obstinate contests. The successful candidate is secure that he will be enriched by the offerings of matrons; that, as soon as his dress is composed with becoming care and elegance, he may proceed in his chariot through the streets of Rome; and that the sumptuousness of the imperial table will not equal the profuse and delicate entertainments provided by the taste and at the expense of the Roman pontiffs. How much more rationally (continues the honest Pagan) would those pontiffs consult their true happiness, if instead of alleging the greatness of the city as an excuse for their manners, and holding in contempt that grandeur which in their opinion counterbalances its vices, they would imitate the exemplary lives of some provincial bishops, whose temperance and sobriety, whose meau apparel and downcast looks recommend their pure and modest virtue to the Deity and his true worshippers!" ["Perpetuo Numini, verhqueejuscultoribus." The incomparable pliancy of a Polytheist! See Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. ch. xxv. p. 514.] Afterwards, in ch. ix. Ammianus says, that "the prefect Pretextatus, regarding his office in a more exalted point of view, by various acts of integrity and goodness, for which he was conspicuous from his early youth, accomplished an object of rare attainment;
for while he impressed the citizens with awe, he did not forfeit that regard which is generally shaken and impaired towards magistrates by a principle of fear in the minds of the common people: his authority and his firm administration of justice appeased the tumults occasioned by these jarring interests of the Christian disputants; and as the schism of Damasus and Ursinus was extingushed by the exile of the latter, a profound tranquility most opportunely ensued, gaining strength equally from the good disposition of the Roman citizens, and from the popularity and merits of their illustrious praefect, who made various arrangements of great public utility." [See note R. in the Appendix.] This is the Praetextatus, of whom an anecdote is told by St. Jerome in his Epistle lxi. to his friend Pammachius, against the errors of John Bishop of Jerusalem, (t. ii. p. 454. E. edit. Paris. 1624.) which it may not be unseasonable to repeat in this place. "Praetextatus, who died when consul elect, is said to have disguised a reproach in the form of a jest, when in conversation with Pope Damasus he observed, that "if he could obtain the bishoprick of Rome, he himself would immediately embrace the Christian religion." [On this anecdote Gibbon sarcastically says, "It is more than probable that Damasus would not have purchased his conversion at such a price!"] See further what Ammianus says, book xv. ch. 7. towards the end. The African council (Concilium vulgo dictum Africanum, sed compilatio ex diversis Carthaginensiibus, Milevilano, Hipponensiis & alios) had good reason for saying what they did by way of caution to Pope Celestine the First, in the fifth century, against the danger of introducing "the frothy arrogance of that age into the church of Christ; a church which holds forth the light of simplicity and the day of humility to all who truly desire to see God." See the "Sacrosancta Concilia," vol. ii. p. 1676. studio Philippi Labbæi et Gabr. Cossartii (Jesuits), edit. Lut. Par. 1671. The reader is likewise referred, on the subject of this note, to the excellent Epistles of Pope Gregory the First, justly surnamed the Great, book iv. 32. 34. 36. book vi. epist. 30. book vii. Indictio i. epist. 30. edit. 1591.—Grotius.

5. See Genesis ii. and iii.—Grotius.

6. And men made a trade of their religion.] See the quotation from Ammianus, book xxi. 16. in the first note of this book: and again, book xxii. 5. in his history of Julian, he says, "to strengthen the effect of his regulations, when the contending Christian prelates with the divided multitude were introduced into the palace, he exhorted them individually to compose all civil differences, that every one might obey the dictates of his own conscience in matters of religion without molestation and without fear: and this he enforced the more strictly, because he knew that as licentiousness augments divisions, so he should not
have reason to fear the common people becoming afterwards unanimous; knowing too, from past experience, that the ferocity of wild beasts' is not so terrible to the human race as that of Christians mutually inflamed with religious animosity!" Procopius, in his History of the Goths, book i. ch. 3. (though we must listen to him with some reserve in this place as well as others,) has the following passage: " Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus, and Demetrius, Bishop of Philippi in Macedonia, were deputed from Byzantium to consult the Roman Pontiff on a question in dispute among the Christians, and very imperfectly understood by them. The arguments on both sides, though I know them perfectly, I shall by no means recapitulate; for I deem it an act of folly and madness to attempt a deep investigation of the Divine Nature. We mortals, as I conceive, do not comprehend accurately even earthly things, much less are we able to comprehend the mysterious nature of the Divine Being. I would therefore prefer the security of silence on such a subject, cautious only to avoid offensive doubts in regard to matters which others hold sacred: nor would I say more concerning the Deity than that his attribute of goodness is perfect, and the extent of his power universal. Any man, whether priest or layman, who thinks that he has a further insight into this subject, is at liberty to state what he knows." There is a saying of Lysis, the Pythagorean philosopher, (which has been since adopted by Simeon, Bishop of Cyrene,) recorded with approbation by Nicephorus Gregoras, a Byzantine historian, book viii. page 223. E. Col. Allob. 1615. which is as follows: that " philosophy misplaced in popular harangues has been the means of bringing divine subjects into great contempt." The same author, book x. p. 365. D: strongly discourages disputations of this nature; and speaking of the Latins of his own time, he expresses his "ridicule and censure of those Italians who, in such a petulant and presumptuous manner, invade the province of theology." He adds presently, p. 365. E. "For thus with them the mysteries of that sacred science are debased by the rash effusions of illiterate mechanics, all of whom, by these means, become as eager to enter on a syllogism as cattle are to get into their pastures. Disputants of this description, whether doubtful as to points which they may believe rightly, or ignorant as to other points which they ought to believe, have filled all the market-places and public theatres with their theological creed; nor are they so much impudence in the very face of the sun!"—Grotius.

7.] See Genesis xi. Mahomet frequently upbraids the Christians with these controversies; particularly in Azoara xxvi. xxxii.—Grotius.

8.] See 1 Tim. iv. 8. Coloss. ii. 23.—Grotius.
9. See Romans x. 2. and 1 Cor. i. 12. & seqq.—Grotius.
10. See Salvian, book iii. p. 91. on the Government of God, edit. 1623. where he says, "with the exception of some, but very few, individuals, who avoid intentional acts of wickedness, what is the whole Christian world but a sink of vices?"—Grotius.

11. Scythia. The Huns, the Avars, the Sabiri, the Alani, the Euthaliæ, the Turks.—Grotius.

12. Germany. The Goths, the Heruli, the Gepidae, the Vandals, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Suevi, the Alananni, the Saxons, the Varni, the Lombards.—Grotius.

13. Permitted Mahomet to plant in Arabia, &c.] The Life of Mahomet, an English work, by Humphrey Prideaux, D.D. London edit. 1697. is well worth the reader's attention; but, above all, I recommend to his notice the Latin translation of Ismael Abul Feda's Arabic account of the Life and Actions of Mahomet, by the very learned John Gagnier, A.M. with his excellent notes, edit. Oxon. 1723.—Le Clerc.


15. The religion of Mahomet demands implicit faith, &c.] See the Koran, Azoara xiii. according to the first Latin edition of it (which, for the reader's accommodation, is here followed), by Theodore Bibliander, 1550.—Grotius.

16. That the path of salvation cannot be known, &c.] See the answer to question iv. addressed to the Orthodox, among the works of Justin, p. 394. C. edit. Paris. 1615. "The title of this tract is given in book v. § 8. note 54. "It is impossible that any man who seeks the truth "with all his heart and with all his strength," should fail in the object of his search; for these are the words of Christ himself: "Every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." Luke xi. 10. And Origen to the same effect, in his Refutation of Celsus, book viii. 53. "It was incumbent on him to consider that he who sees everything, and who hears everything, the common Father and Lord of all, forms a just estimate of the intention of every individual professing a desire to seek and to worship him; and consequently renders to the faithful and sincere the benefit of his high protection."—Grotius.

17. See Azoara v. xxi.—Grotius.
18. See Azoara v. xii.—Grotius.
19. See Azoara v. lxxi.—Grotius.
20.] See Azoara ii. the temple of Mecca built by Abraham.—Azoara xxxi. other stories about Abraham.—Azoara iii. a confused account of Gideon and Saul.—Grotius.

See Azoara xvii. xxx. xxxviii. many contradictions of the Mosaic accounts in Exodus. See Azoara xxii. many more in the history of Joseph.—Azoara iv. about birds cut in pieces by Abraham, and restored to life.—Azoara v. Mary educated by Zacharias.—Azoara v. and xiii. birds made from clay by Jesus.—Grotius.

21.] Azoara xi.—Grotius.

22.] Azoara ix. and xxxii.—Grotius.

23.] Azoara xxix.—Grotius.


25.] See Azoara iv. xi. xxix. and "Liber Doctrinae Mahumetis" above mentioned.—Grotius.

26.] See the places already cited.—Grotius.

27.] See Azoara xxxi.—Grotius.

28.] See "Liber Generationis Mahumetis," p. 207. published with the Koran, as in note 24.—Grotius.


30.] See Azoara xliii. lxxv. and lxxvi.: see also "Disputatio," &c. as above mentioned, col. 6.—Grotius.

31.] See Azoara xi.—Grotius.

32.] See Azoara v. and xiii.—Grotius.

33.] See Azoara iii. xiv. xvii. xxx. lxxi.—Grotius.

See further on this subject, "the Life of Mahomet," (displaying the true nature of imposture,) published in English by the learned Humphrey Prideaux, D.D. p. 30. Lond. 1697, where he shows very fully that the false prophet did not venture to arrogate to himself the power of performing any miracles. The Mahometans, nevertheless, often boast of this power on his behalf, as we find in the Life of Mahomet by Ismael Abu'l Feda, already cited in note 13. of this book.—Le Clerc.

34. The dove flying down to his ear.] This story of the dove, however, was omitted by our countryman, (the first Laudian
Professor of Arabic, Dr. Pocock, in his version of this treatise into the Arabic language, and he shows that the omission was allowed by Grotius himself; for the Professor observes, that "if some few passages of the 6th book should appear to the reader to have been omitted or altered, such omissions or alterations were made that nothing might be asserted respecting Mahometan affairs and opinions except on the credit and testimony of authors whom the Mahometans themselves allowed to be entirely unobjectionable:" and he adds that "Grotius himself, when personally consulted on that subject, approved of the adoption of this rule." as for example, in the account given by English writers of the dove flying down to the ear of Mahomet. O.

35. A portion of the moon falling down into his sleeve, &c. See Azoar ixiv.; and see this story detailed from the Koran, chapter "Ceramur," by Cantacuzenus in his 2d Oration on Mahomet, § 23. p. 88. edit. Basil. 1543.—Grotius.

36. The first followers of Mahomet a lawless banditti, &c. This appears from the very name Saracen, which signifies Robber or Plunderer, Αρφωτις. See Scaliger, "de Emendatione Temporum," book ii. chapter "de Periodo Arabum," p. 111. B. Genev. 1629.—Grotius.

The first followers of Mahomet were, in fact, robbers; but the word to which Scaliger refers signifies to steal privately, not to rob or plunder by open force. Nobody can suppose that these very persons would have assumed to themselves an appellation of infamy, not to mention the antiquity of this title, prior to the time of Mahomet, since it may be found in Ptolemy and Philostorgius. I would therefore prefer the etymology of the word Saracen from प्र, which signifies in Arabic Oriens, the East: whence प्र, Saracens, or People of the East; as the Arabians also are called in Scripture. On this point see Specimen Histor. Arabum by Dr. E. Pocock, near the beginning, edit. Oxon. 1650.

—Le Clerc.

37.] See Azoara x. xviii. xxxii.—Grotius.

38.] See Azoara xxxii. 57.—Grotius.

39. Repeated overthrows, &c. These have been still greater since the time of Grotius. The Turks have been driven, after numerous and signal defeats, from their Austrian territories, from Hungary, Transylvania, and the ancient Peloponnesus, not many years ago; and from that period the Turkish empire has appeared to be on the decline. In the year 1715, after the first publication of these notes, the Turks indeed regained possession of the Peloponnesus, now called the Morea, which was feebly defended by the Venetian commanders; but in the following year, 1716, when they attempted to invade Hungary and the Island of Corfu, they first experienced a defeat in Hungary by
the Imperialists under Prince Eugene of Savoy, in a general engagement, and were obliged, after an obstinate siege, to surrender the fortified city of Temeswaer, (olim Themiscyra;) and, soon after, they were repulsed, not without great loss, from the island of Corfu, by the valor of Count Schulembourg, and fled to their ships. While I was thus writing (April 1717), the Turks were threatening to renew these attempts with fresh troops, but the Imperialists did not seem to be much alarmed. In fact, in the following campaign, the Turks were again defeated, in a great battle by the same commander, Prince Eugene, at Belgrade, and that important place, with a part of Servia, became subject to the Emperor Charles VI.—Le Clerc.

39.*] Immediately after the taking of Granada, under Ferdinand and Isabella, in the year 1491.

40.] See Azoara xix.—Grotius.

41.] See Lactantius, book v. ch. 19. 23. edit. Gotting. 1736. "Nothing (says he) is of a nature so perfectly spontaneous as religion: if the mind do not accompany the act of the worshipper, religion vanishes at once; there is in fact no religion at all."
—Grotius.


43.] See Euthymius, § 18. and other writers on Turkish affairs.—Grotius.

44.] See Azoara iii. viii. ix. xxxiii.—Grotius.

45.] See also "Bartholomaei Georgievitii de ritibus Turcarum" tomum tertium, p. 182. opera Bibliandri. 1550.—Grotius.

46.] See Azoara ix. on the subject of their frequent ablutions: see also Euthymius, § 12.

47.] See Azoara iii. xxvi. against the use of swine’s flesh.—Grotius.

48.] See Euthymius, § 20. (against the use of wine) and others who have written on the affairs of the Saracens.—Grotius.

49.] See the passage in "Richardi Confutatio," ch. i. and ch. xiv. in Bibliander’s edition of the Koran, &c. above mentioned; as well as Oratio ii. § 18. and Oratio iv. (near the beginning) of John Cantacuzenus in Mahumetem.—Grotius.

50.] See the same places of reference.—Grotius.

51.] See note 24. of this book, § 4.—Grotius.
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And further, on this subject, Euthymias, in the "Disputation contra Saracenos" before mentioned, § 4, where he says, "As our word is perceptibly the offspring of the mind," &c. See likewise the works of Nicholas de Cusa, Cardinal, book i. ch. 13, & seqq. against the Mahometans; and " Richardi Confutation" as before, ch. ix. and ch. xv.—Grotius.

53. Not only may possibly, but must indispensably, deserve the appellation of the Son of God. ] See Luke i. 35. John x. 36. Acts iii. 13—15. xiii. 33. Hebr. i. 5. v. 5. and the "Liber Doctrinae Mahumetis" before mentioned, p. 197. 18, where Jesus is introduced applying to God the title of "his Father."—Grotius.

54. The various absurdities, &c. ] As in the story of Alexander the Great, who came to a fountain in which the sun reposed himself. Azoara xxviii. And again about Solomon, Azoara xxxvii.—Grotius.

55. See " Liber Doctrinae Mahumetis," p. 198. 13. This story of the beautiful woman is taken from the " Liber Enarrationum." See also Consta zuanus, as before, Oratio ii. in Mahumetem, c. 15. —Grotius.


60. See note 52. of the 2d book of this treatise.—Grotius.

61. See 1 Tim. ii. 8. and James iv. 8. Tertullian says in his Apology, ch. 30. " Thither we Christians uplift our eyes with hands expanded, for they are harmless; with heads unveiled, for we have no cause to blush; we live and act, in short, without the cautious aid of an instructor, for we cordially pray for all who possess the Imperial power, that they may enjoy a long life, a secure throne, their house in safety, their armies brave, the senate faithful, the people good, and the world in peace."—Grotius.


63. See 1 Pet. iii. 12. v. 7.—Grotius.

64. See Matt. x. 29.—Grotius.


67. To the name Jesus should be added " the only-begotten Son of God," who is ordained by God to be "a mediator" be-
tween him and us; to whom he hath given all power both in heaven and earth.” 1 Tim. ii. 5. Matt. xxviii. 18.—Le Clerc.

68.] See Acts iv. 12.—Grotius.

69.] See John viii. 41. and the following verses. Matt. vii. 21, John xv. 14. 1 John ii. 3, 4.—Grotius.

70.] See Matt. xiii. 44, 45. 1 Cor. iv. 7. 1 Tim. vi. 20. 2 Tim. i. 14.—Grotius.

71.] See Coloss. iv. 16. 1 Thess. v. 27. Rev. i. 3.—Grotius.

72.] See Tertullian, in “Præscriptione,” chap. 22. speaking of heretics: “They are apt (says he) to deny the plenary inspiration of the apostles: actuated by the same folly which presently turns round upon us, and maintains that the apostles did indeed know all things, but did not universally communicate that knowledge; and thus, in either case, they impute blame to Christ, who sent into the world apostles imperfectly instructed, or else imperfectly honest, according to their mode of arguing this question.” See also his subsequent remarks, which are eminently useful.—Grotius.

73.] See John vii. 17. v. 44. Matt. xi. 25, Philipp. iii. 15. 2 Pet. iii. 16. Hosea xiv. 9.

74.] See 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16. John xx. 31. 1 Pet. i. 23.

75.] See 2 Tim. i. 6. 1 Thess. v. 19.

76.] See Ephes. i. 14. 2 Cor. i. 22. v. 5.

77.] See 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

78.] See 1 Cor. viii. 4. and ch. x. 19.

79.] See 1 Cor. x. 20. Rev. ix. 20.


81.] See 1 Cor. x. 20.

82.] See Ephes. ii. 3. Titus ii. 12.

83.] See 2 Cor. vi. 15.

84.] See Matt. v. 47. vi. 7, 32.

85.] See Matt. v. 20. xxiii. 23. Rom. iii. 20. Galat. ii. 16.


87.] See 1 Cor. vii. 19.

88.] See Gal. vi. 15.

89.] See Gal. v. 6.

90.] See Rom. ix. 6. 1 Cor. x. 18. Gal. vi. 16. John i. 47.

—Grotius.
Book VI.

91. See Rom. ii. 29. And Philo; on Allegories, speaks of "Judas as being a type or symbol of one who makes confusion" (outwardly), book i. p. 42. A. ed. Col. Allob. 1613.—Grotius.

92. See Acts x. 13—15. xv. 19, 20. 1 Cor. x. 25. Coloss. ii. 16. 21.

93. See Coloss. in the passage before mentioned.

94. See the same passage, and Romans xiv. 5.

95. See Coloss. ii. 17. and Heb. x. 1.

96. See John v. 43. 2 Thess. ii. 9. Matt. vii. 15. xxiv. 11. Mark xiii. 22. 1 John iv. 1.

97. See Galatians i. 8.


99. See Heb. i. 2.

100. See 1 Cor. xv. 27. Heb. ii. 5.

101. See Heb. i. 3.

102. See Heb. i. 3. and Coloss. i. 16.

103. See Heb. i. 3. Rev. i. 5.


[It is here due to our author's principles to remark, from Bishop Patrick, that he does not translate the text of Heb. i. 3. "Καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος," in the present tense, but in the past tense, "expiatis peccatis nostris." And in his letter to Vossius he observes, (against his enemies who accused him of Socinianism) that his opinion of the satisfaction made by Christ would appear plainly enough from his translation of the 53d chapter of Isaiah. He wrote expressly on that subject against Socinus.]


106. See Heb. ii. 3—8. iii. 3—6.

107. See Rom. xiii. 12. 2 Cor. vi. 7. x. 4. Ephes. vi. 11—18.

108. See Ephes. vi. 17. 1 Thess. v. 8.


111. See Matt. xxiii. 8. James iii. 1.
112. ] See Romans vi. 3, 4. 1 Cor. i. 13, 15. Galat. iii. 27. Ephes. iv. 5. Coloss. ii. 12.

113. ] See 1 Cor. i. 10, xi. 18, xii. 25.

114. ] See Romans xii. 3, 16. 1 Cor. iv. 6.

115. ] See Romans, as above, and xii. 6. 2 Cor. x. 13. Ephes. iv. 7, 15, 16.

116. ] See Rom. xiv. xv. 2. 1 Cor. viii. 7.

117. ] See Romans xiv. 1. 2 Cor. xii. 20. Gal. v. 20. Philip. i. 16, ii. 9, 15. 1 Cor. xi. 16.

118. ] See Rom. viii. 1—3. 9, xii. 8, xv. 3. 14, 16. 1 Cor. xiii. 2. 2 Cor. vi. viii. 7. 2 Pet. i. 5, 6.


120. ] See Philip. iii. 16, and James i. 22—25.

121. ] See 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12.

122. ] See the preceding text, verses 10, 12. 1 John iii. 2, Matt. v. 8.

123. ] See Matt. xxv. 15, & seqq.

124. ] See 1 Cor. ix. 19—22.


127. ] See James i. 17. 2 Thess. i. 3. 1 Cor. i. 4.

128. ] See James iii. 2. Gal. vi. 1, 2.—Grolius.

129. The particular circumstances of time and place, &c.] The excellent and very learned author of this treatise here aludes to his state of confinement in the castle of Lupstein, Lowenstein, or Louvenstein, in which he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment! Under such circumstances, in point of time and place, nothing surely could have enabled him to compose so many distinguished works with consummate erudition, the most correct judgement, and singular ability, had he not possessed an incredible degree of firmness and tranquillity of mind, and an unshaken faith in God! For all these blessings conferred on him, for the benefit of the whole Christian world, whosoever shall peruse his various works, and this amongst the rest, in a proper frame of mind for the diligent attainment of truth, will doubtless render thanks and praise to the Divine Being, as I do from the bottom of my heart!—Le Clerc.
THE ANNOTATIONS OF LE CLERC ON HIS FIRST BOOK, ENTITLED "A TREATISE ON THE CHOICE OF A RELIGIOUS CREED," ETC.

1.] See Matt. x. 32, 33. See also 2 Tim. ii. 12.; and Rev. iii. 5.

2.] See Matt. v. 14, 15.


The purport of these passages had an especial influence on the conduct of Christians in former times; who from the testimony which they afforded by their sufferings to the tenets and precepts of the Gospel, were denominated martyrs, μάρτυρες, witnesses.

4.] See Romans x. 9—11.

5.] See John xiii. 34, 35. See also 1 John ii. 7. and iii. 11. 16. 23.


7. The continuation of their tenets from age to age.] So likewise the peculiar doctrines and opinions of all philosophers have been transmitted to posterity by means of their respective schools; but the Christian Churches, united by a much stricter and much firmer bond, will propagate to the end of time the doctrine which has been received from their Divine Master with greater certainty and ease; for congregations are almost indispensably necessary to effect this purpose. Pythagoras would gladly have accomplished this very object, but the attempt was fruitless; for there was nothing heavenly in his tenets. See his biographers Diogenes Laertius and Jamblicus.

8. To unite with those of the same profession.] See the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, where he directs the institution of Churches, and Heb. x. 25.

9. Without examination, &c.] See 1 Thess. v. 21.; but still more expressly 1 John iv. 1.

10. A task indeed which requires the utmost candour, &c.] Here we may apply that precept of Our Saviour, which tells us to be "wise as serpents, but harmless as doves," Matt. x. 16.; that is, we should act with simplicity, but not without caution: we should act with prudence, but without that cunning which violates the rules of candour. Few indeed there are who are competent, on all occasions, to steer exactly this middle course between an unguarded simplicity on the one hand, and a disingenuous cunning on the other.

11. If we may not speak our sentiments, &c.] So long as we are permitted to entertain a different opinion, and to avow that
difference of opinion unmolested, there is no occasion to withdraw ourselves from any public society, unless its principles militate against the fundamental doctrines of Christianity: but where this liberty of dissent is denied, and where we cannot live in a society without dissembling or disavowing the truth, there it becomes necessary to leave it; for nothing can justify falsehood or dissimulation for the purpose of supplanting the interests of truth, and with a view to claim those honours which are due to truth alone. Unless we act by this rule, we "put our candle under a bushel." Our Saviour seceded not from the religious assemblies of the Jews; neither did his apostles desert them so long as they were permitted to profess and teach in them the doctrine of their Master. See Acts xiii. 46.

12. It were absurd to form a preference by mere chance, &c.] See note 9. in the first section.

13. Should we lay a stress on points as being certainly true, &c.] This is exactly what is intended by St. Paul, when he says, (Romans xiv. 23.) that " whatsoever is not of faith is sin." In our commentary on that passage we have adduced the words of Philo, edit. Paris. 1640. p. 469. "The most acceptable sacrifice (says he) is a peaceable conduct, and a reserve of our judgment in matters liable to some degree of doubt." And a little afterwards he says, "To be quiet is to be safe when we are in the dark;" that is, "when we are not quite sure how we ought to act." See Mangey's Edition of Philo, vol. i. p. 566. "Πηλ' Φυγαδέων."

14. In regard to some of the apostolical Epistles, &c.] Such are the Epistle to the Hebrews, the 2d Epistle of St. Peter, the 2d and 3d Epistles of St. John; which are not ascribed to their reputed authors without the doubts and objections of learned criticism.

15. These and other articles of necessary connexion with these, &c.] In the foregoing exposition of the Christian doctrine we have observed the order of the Apostles' Creed (as it is called), avoiding all terms which afford matter of theological controversy, as we are considering those points only which obtain the general assent of Christians. Not that we on that account condemn as false or erroneous the additions which have been made to explain or confirm its tenets: on the contrary, we very highly approve of the endeavours which have been used for the purpose of explaining or confirming the truths of divine revelation: much, doubtless, has been done, and may yet be done, for the illustration of those truths. It is well observed by Tertullian, in his Tract " de Virginibus velandis," ch. i. edit. Lut. Par. 1675, that "the rule of faith is altogether one, and only one; invariable; incapable of amendment; that is, the rule which fixes our
belief in one God, the almighty Maker of the universe, and in his Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary; crucified under Pontius Pilate; raised from the dead on the third day; received up into heaven; and now sitting on the right hand of the Father; the future Judge of the living and the dead; through the actual resurrection of the flesh." While these fundamental points of faith are preserved, other matters which now relate to discipline (Le Clerc here inserts the word doctrine) and conduct, are open to some new regulations; but always, be it understood, according to the influence and assistance of the continual grace of God, &c. &c.

16. **This then is the only rule, &c.]** Applicable to this subject is the passage in St. Matt. ch. xxiii. verses 8, 9, 10; where Our Saviour says, "But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren: and call no man your father upon the earth, for One is your Father which is in heaven; neither be ye called masters; for One is your Master, even Christ." See also St. James iii. 1. To the same effect is the passage in Revelation iii. 7., where Christ is said to "have the key of David," and where he is described as being "He that openeth (i.e. heaven) and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth."—If then Christ alone be entitled to our faith, and if there be no other certain record of the Christian revelation than the books of the New Testament, it follows unavoidably that, in matters of faith, these books, and these alone, can be properly received and believed.

17. **If any person, therefore, shall attempt to take away, &c.]** Here we may apply that passage of St. Paul to the Galatians, ch. i. 8. "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And truly no man can safely presume to add anything to the Gospel, as necessary; nor deduct anything from it as superfluous.

18. **De prœcipuis, id est, de prœceptis satis constat,** "De prœcipuis, id est, de prœceptis satis constat," book ii. sect. 18. See also book ii. note 149. "adde etiam de dogmatibus necessariis," &c.—Clericus.

18*. **There is no age involved in such dark clouds of ignorance, &c.]** The tenth and eleventh centuries are allowed, by Papists as well as Protestants, to have been a period of the worst description; and yet if anybody, to satisfy himself on this subject, will peruse the writings of the Fathers at that period, he will find it easy to collect from them all the doctrines which have just been stated in our fourth section. Then, as to the twelfth cen-

† Conversatio is here applied to the act of worshipping idols. See note on the Tract.
tury, St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, lived and wrote in the early part of it; and while his learning, piety, and firmness are generally admired even to this day, his writings, so often read in the centuries which immediately succeeded, have never been condemned as heretical; and certainly from those writings it would be very easy to form a complete body of divinity. This is equally certain with respect to the period extending from the age of St. Bernard to the sixteenth century; and nobody can entertain a doubt of it from that period to the present.

19. The gates of hell, &c.] By the words "Porta sepulcri," I render the Greek Πόρτα σεπολείρι, because neither Ἱλουσ, nor the correspondent Hebrew term הָאָשֶׁר, ever signifies evil spirit or devil, in the Sacred Writings; but merely the grave, or the state of the dead, as Grotius and others have observed. [But the word hell, though we now generally understand by it "the place of torment," properly signifies only "the invisible place or state of the dead:" and so it is frequently used in the English version of the Psalms. The same may be observed of the Greek term, which is generally used in the latter sense only, in the Septuagint version.] From this passage, therefore, one inference may be drawn; namely, that in no period of the world the Christian Church can altogether perish; or, in other words, that a time never can arrive when there will be no society of Christians, among whom the substance of the doctrines of the Gospel shall be faithfully preserved.

20. God intended to create men free agents, &c.] From the earliest ages of Christianity, without exception, this doctrine has obtained in the highest degree the assent of mankind. See the first Apology of Justin Martyr, chapters 54 and 55.: Irenæus, book iv. chapters 9. and 29. towards the end; and chapters 71. and 72.: the Philocalia of Origen, ch. 21. See also Eusebius in his Prep. Evang. book vi. ch. 6. and other writers adduced by Denis Peton (a French Jesuit of consummate learning) in his Dogmata Theologica, vol. i. book vi. ch. 6.; and there are many passages to this purport in his third volume, books iii. iv. and v. Edit. Par. 1644.

22.] See Matt. xiii. 47. & seqq.
23.] See 1 Cor. xi. 19. From the state of human beings, without some favourable change, the existence of sects becomes a necessary consequence, producing a separation and distinction between good men and bad; the former adhering steadily to truth and brotherly love, the latter digressing into all kinds of error. See Matt. xviii. 7.

24. And, indeed, unless there had been dissensions in the Christian Church, &c.] The arguments on this subject are indifferently
25. As some indeed object, &c.] Peter Bayle has urged this objection at great length, and his arguments are set off with all the false colours of rhetoric. See my refutation of them in the French language, in some of the volumes of the Bibliothèque Choisié, particularly in volumes ix. x. xii. edit. Amsterdam, from 1686 to 1727.

26. The sole province of the supreme legislator, &c.] See on this subject Romans xiv. 1. and some following verses; where St. Paul notices the conduct of men who either impose on others the observance of particular rites, or censure and condemn that observance. This right of "judging another man's servant" he expressly denies: judgement is vested in Christ alone. There is a passage to the same effect in the Epistle of St. James, ch. iv. 12. "There is one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: Who art thou that judgest another?"

27. A symbol or pledge of peace, &c.] See 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. where the Apostle, after having mentioned the sacramental cup and bread, of which many are partakers, subjoins this remark, "For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread."—These words plainly show that Christian communion is the intention of the Eucharist, and all the best commentators have seen it in this light.

28. But to celebrate that holy rite on terms which, &c.] The opinion here given was also entertained by Grotius; which appears from his little tract "An semper communicandum per Symbola," where he speaks of certain reasons, "justissimae causae," for refusing to join in communion with others. See Grotii Opera Theolog. tom. iv. p. 511. Amst. 1679.

29. No human being, &c.] See the notes on § i. and note 17. on § iv.

30. Have been sufficiently convinced, &c.] See my Ecclesiastical History, century i. at the year lxxii. 8. and the year lxviii. 8. & seqq.—Le Clerc.

31. That form of sound words, &c.] See a very curious composition, the "Institutio baptizatorum Puerorum," (amongst his other writings,) translated by the author himself from Dutch verse into Latin, in his Opera Theolog. tom. iv. p. 629. And he frequently attests also in his later works, that whatsoever is necessary to salvation is contained with sufficient clearness and certainty in the New Testament. See the Annotations of Grotius on the "Consultatio" of Cassander, (de Articulis controversis inter Catholicos & Protestantes,) towards the conclusion, where he treats of the sufficiency and the perspicuity of Holy writ: and, this point admitted, it is evident that any man may
collect from it the whole sum and substance of Christianity, such as I have stated it in § iv.

32. From his own express words, &c.] See his Annotations on the “Consultatio” of Cassander, Art. xiv. where he says that “Bishops are the chiefs of the Presbyters, and that the superior dignity of their station was previously shown by Christ in the person of St. Peter; was established by the Apostles wherever it could be done; and was sanctioned by the Holy Spirit in the Book of Revelations; wherefore, as it is to be wished that the same pre-eminence be everywhere retained,” &c.

See also afterwards, in his note “De Potestate ecclesiastica,” p. 627, and his “Rivetani Apologetici Discussio,” p. 714, col. 2,—and there is additional evidence on this point afforded by the letters annexed to this little treatise.

33. Any other Lawgiver, &c.] The text which has been already quoted from St. James, ch. iv. 12. (see note 26. § 9.) is express on this subject; and there are other parts of that note which apply to the present point. The case indeed here speaks for itself: for, among the Christian sects, nobody would be willing to admit the authority of his opponent.

34. Were this alone required, &c.] James the First of England was quite of this opinion, if we believe what Isaac Casaubon tells us in the answer to the Letter of Cardinal du Perron; see the third observation, p. 90. edit. Lond. 1612. “The King’s opinion is (says he) that the observation is very just in the exposition of those matters which are of absolute necessity, that such matters (absolutely necessary to salvation) are few in number. His Majesty therefore thinks that nothing could be better calculated to promote a general agreement of religious opinions than a careful separation of points which are necessary from points which are not necessary: that the necessary points should engross our whole attention, while due latitude should be given to Christian liberty of conscience in those which are not of indispensable necessity.”

35. In our present state of ignorance and imperfection, &c.] Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, in his celebrated Treatise on the Trinity, has well observed in book x. n. 70. edit. Paris 1693, that God does not call us to a state of happiness by means of difficult and doubtful propositions, neither does he perplex us with the various figures of oratorical declamation: eternal life is plainly and easily attainable by all mankind, through faith in that Jesus whom God raised up from the dead; and by confessing him to be the Lord!
THE ANNOTATIONS OF LE CLERC ON HIS SECOND BOOK, ENTITLED "A TREATISE ON RELIGIOUS INDIFFERENCE."

1. A certain writer who says, &c.] See Select Discourses of the Rev. John Smith, p. 14. edit. Cambridge 1673. [In the preceding page he also says, that "there are some radical principles of knowledge that are so deeply sunk into the souls of men, as that the impression cannot easily be obliterated, though it may be much darkened," § 2.] On the same ground St. Austin observes in his Serm. cxli. (on the text John xiv. 6. tom. v. col. 682.) that "every man seeks the truth and the life," but every man does not find "the way." And the same writer says in Serm. cl. col. 716. "The human mind hates to be deceived; the compassion which is excited by the unmeaning laugh of an idiot, in the breast of men of sound understanding, shows plainly how much the mind naturally abhors that state of intellectual weakness and deception!" Will you be deceived? or, will you know the truth? Of these two propositions every man would prefer the latter.

2. Never have experienced greater pleasure, &c.] See the Life of Pythagoras, by Diogenes Laertius, book viii. 12.

3. Socrates.] See the "Silva Philologica" of Le Clerc, book i. ch. 3. on the subject of that philosopher.

4. To live in a state of exile, &c.] See Galen, (edit. Paris 1679,) towards the end of the last chapter of his treatise "respecting the dependence of the passions of the mind on the constitution of the body," where he says of the Stoics, that "they verily thought it a point of duty to desert their country rather than their opinions."

5. Thrasea Peto.] A noble instance of independent spirit! He suffered death under the tyranny of Nero, because he would not flatter the vices of the tyrant. See the Annals of Tacitus, book xvi. 24. & seqq.

6. Hebridius Priscus.] The son-in-law of Thrasea, who was banished from Italy at the same time, as Tacitus has also informed us, (see the preceding reference,) and was afterwards put to death by Vespasian, according to Suetonius in his Life of that Emperor, ch. xv. because he had not shown a sufficient degree of respect to his new master. The son of Priscus also was put to death by Domitian. See Suetonius in the Life of Domitian, ch. x. and Tacitus in his Life of Agricola, ch. xiv.

7. Whosoever shall confess, &c.] See St. Matt. x. 32.
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NOTES TO THE TESTIMONIIES.

1. Dr. Henry Newton was afterwards appointed Master of St. Katherine's, on the death of the Earl of Feversham, 1709. See Boyer's Life of Q. Anne, p. 405.

2. Antony Magliabechi, of great learning and remarkable memory, librarian to Cosmo III. Grand Duke of Florence. He left his very fine library to the public, with a fund for its support: died 1714, aged 81.

3. Denis Petau, a French Jesuit of great erudition, born at Orleans in 1583. He was Professor of Philosophy at Bourges at 19 years of age. Peter Gassendi, in his Life of Nicholas de Peiresc, describes Petau as "the most consummate scholar the Jesuits ever had." He died at Paris in 1652. Brietius (Father Briet) an eminent Jesuit, wrote "Annals of the World," &c. Valesius. Henry de Valois; published the Ancient Ecclesiastical Historians; and the first French edition of Ammianus Marcellinus. He was Historiographer of France in the time of Lewis the Fourteenth.

4. Monsieur de la Milletiere, Counsellor in ordinary to the King of France, had the assurance to address a long letter to Charles II. inviting him to embrace popery. See the letter in Bramhall's Works, and the Bishop's Answer to the Frenchman, vol. i. discourse 1.

5. See note S. in the Appendix.

6. See note T. in the Appendix.

7. See Bramhall's Works, Dublin, 1677.

APPENDIX
TO THE
ANNOTATIONS AND TESTIMONIES.

Having mentioned Mr. Clement Barksdale in the "Translator's Preface," I wish to add, in this place, that Mr. Barksdale had attached himself to the writings of Grotius long before the date (1669) which is there mentioned by Bishop Patrick. I have lately been favoured with the sight of a curious and scarce little book, contained in the valuable collection of books and engravings of the Rev. Henry White of Lichfield, which comprises the two first books of Grotius de Veritate, and an abridgement of his preface, as well as of the concluding section of the sixth book of that admirable treatise. Also, in an appendix, "Hugo Grotius his Judgment in sundry points controverted, contained in his Vote for the Churches Peace: and an Epistle consolatorie to Monsieur Du Maurier, the French Ambassadour at the Hague. Translated out of the Latin

By Cl. Barksdale.
The third Edition, corrected;
With lively Brasse peices, newly added.
Nec Omnia, nec Nihil.
London. Printed for W. Lee, at the Turk's Head in Fleet Street, over against Fetter Lane. 1658."

Note A.

Namcaa.] Considering the needless information which is given us in note 24. as matter of conjecture, for the words are "vide-tur intelligere," (where nobody can doubt the application of Cingis to the person of the Mogul Emperor who assumed the title of Jenghiz Khan,) we have reason to complain that no attempt was made by Mr. Le Clerc, in the present note, to give us even a conjecture on the subject of Namcaa: His reason for not giving the required information, as a learned correspondent has observed to me, was perhaps the same which Milton had for not
writing his heroic poem in rhyme, (according to Mr. Pope's observation to Voltaire,) that is, "because he could not;" and yet it is surprising that a character, thus placed by Grotius in the light of a Cyrus or an Alexander, should have been unknown to so great a scholar as Le Clerc. The name indeed occurs not in D'Hérbelot's Bibliothèque Orientale, nor in Visdelou, as a literary friend informs me; but there is a name somewhat similar, Namken or Nankeng, in Du Halde's "Description de la Chine," tom. i. p. 315. fol. edit. 1735. and he has also discovered it, with his usual acuteness and extent of investigation, not only in a German work entitled "Allgemeine Chronik," of General Chronicle, vol. i. p. 98. but likewise in the "Histoire Générale de la Chine, par le Père Joseph-Anne Maire de Moyriac de Mailla," tom. i. p. 197. Still I must admit that the exploits of Namken are dated above 1400 years before the Christian era; neither do they seem to have been attended with any great political effects or extraordinary consequences, beyond the temporary triumph of a bold and successful act of usurpation. Let me here observe, that Chinese proper names are undoubtedly spelt and pronounced by Europeans in a very vague and arbitrary manner. We have instances to this effect in the Modern Universal History, vol. viii. p. 3. note B, and again, p. 92. note W.; and therefore, in tracing the identity of Namcan, we may venture to depart very widely from common orthographical rules: on this ground I avail myself of a further suggestion, which I am only induced to utter with some degree of doubt from that total dissimilarity of names, which no pronunciation can reconcile: In every other light it seems highly reasonable to understand by Namcan the same person whose Chinese name is usually written Tyen-Ming; and at any rate, our purpose will be answered if, on further research, a better claimant of the title can be found in consequence of this conjecture. It seems very probable that Grotius intended to designate the mover of that great revolution which was taking place in China during his own time, (whatever his proper appellation might be,) and it seems equally probable that he is speaking of a person subsequent to Jenghiz Khan in point of date, from the order in which the names are placed. It is further observable, that these two names, "apud Tartaros Cingis, apud Sinenses Namcan," were not originally inserted in the text, but were added by Grotius in his third edition of the book; which edition (as we learn from his Epistles) was prepared for the press in 1631, and the copy of it was left with Vossius on his departure from Holland. See the correspondence between them in 1632. The person to whom I refer was the great grandfather of Xun-Chi, and is described as the first emperor in the Tsing-Chaw, or 22d dynasty. His death, it seems, happened in the year 1627; and the report of his exploits, the stability of his empire, and the distracted state of China, would of course be reported from the
Appendix;]

Eastern world, as the ships successively arrived in Europe between the years 1627 and 1631. It has been further suggested that Namcaa may possibly be a corruption of Manchew, the name of a principal tribe of the Eastern Tartars; and thus the Oriental appellative of a people may have been mistaken for the proper name of an individual. At all events, the termination of the name, Namcaa, seems to render its legitimacy very liable to suspicion; and it is the main object of these remarks to invite more express and conclusive information respecting the identity of a person who is at once very highly distinguished, and very imperfectly known.

Note B.

Valesii Excerpta.] Or rather, "H. Valesii Versio et Notae in C. Porphyrogennetae variorum Graecorum Excerpta. edit. Par. 1654." It appears that Grotius, in pursuit of his moral studies, had previously employed himself (under his sentence of perpetual imprisonment) in a similar mode of self-instruction, as he translated all the maxims of the poets collected by Stobaeus, and the fragments of Menander and Philemon. See the "Excerpta & Florilegium, &c. Stobai, cum Notis," Parisiis, 1623. In the same state of discouragement and depression, his active and intelligent mind was engaged in a plan of extracting from the comic and tragic authors of Greece what related to morality, omitted by Stobaeus, and of translating the extracts into free verse, like that of the Latin comic writers. His improvements of the collection of Stobaeus, with the additions, (as I have observed,) were printed at Paris in 1623; and in 1626 he printed his extracts from the works of ancient Greek poets, &c. with the Latin translations. There is an allusion, though not a direct reference, to these extracts, respecting a memorable passage of a fragment of Euripides, in fabula Syleo, in the last note of the 4th book of this treatise.

Note C.

Baris (vel Masis). "Monti hoc nomen inditum esse plerique consent, ab arce Noe, quod Baris navigium sonet, ut constat ex Ammonio, Hesychio, et Scholiis ad Æschylum et Euripidem, &c. &c. Sed Ch. Joach. Schroderus Medici legendum esse contendit." See further, vol. i. book 1. ch. 3. note C. Josephus Antiq. Jud. ed. Hudson. 1720. But on the whole subject of the Deluge, and the account given by Lucian (in note 89.) the "Analysis of Ancient Mythology," by Mr. Bryant, affords the most curious and interesting remarks; and his learned review of the Gentile histories of that great event, compared with the Mosaic account of it, must surely be consulted with the highest mental gratification! The mountain in question is differently described, as Baris, Masis, Luban, &c. "the Ararat of Moses."
from the different authorities adduced by Mr. Bryant. See especially pp. 9 and 21. vol. iii. edit. 4to. London, 1776.

Note D.


Note E.

Whose tongues have been cut out under religious persecution.] " Vidimus venerabiles viros, qui, abscissis radicitus linguis, suas penas miserabiliter loquebantur." Justiniani Codicis lib. i. tit. 27. "De Officio Praefecti Pretorio Africae," &c. beginning with the words "Quas Gratias." Vid. Corpus Juris Civilis, tom. ii. p. 59. edit. Amst. 1681.

Note F.


Note G.

DCLVII demum Anno Urbis, Cn. Cornelio Lentulo, P. Licinio Crasso, Coss. Senatus Consultum factum est ne Homo immolaretur. Romani sustulere monstra in quibus hominem occidere religiosissimum erat, mandi vero etiam saluberrimum! See the reference to Pliny, lib. 30. cap. 1. But the horrid custom, we find, was revived, and practised to a much later date.

Note H.

Appendix.

Note L


"Malus, ubi bonum se simulat, tunc est pessimus," line 135.


Pub. Syri Vita, ex Petro Crinito desumpta. There is another obscure reference to this author in note 62. of this book, and I have thought that the foregoing account of him would be acceptable to some of my readers. See also Cicero de Oratore, lib. ii. 59. note 77. "Mimorum."

Note K

Fēbris, Honor, &c.] That I may invite the reader's attention as much as possible to a subject so particularly interesting to the feelings of a Christian moralist, the following passages are briefly presented to his view:— "Mens, Pietas, Virtus, Fides, (says Cicerō) consecratur manu : quarum omnium Romae dedicat apud publicā templā sunt." There is then a passage supplied by Lactantius (in the note 84.) in which Cicero reproaches Greece "quod Cupidinum et Amorum simulacrīn Gymnasiis consecrasset." Afterwards, in the text, he proceeds to notice Athens, "quod feceīrunt fanum Contumeliāe et Impudentiāe." But he soon returris to Rome, where he says, "Ara vetus stat in Palatii, Febris: et altera Esquiliis, Malae Fortunae: rerum expetendarum nomina, Salutis, Honoris, Opis, Victoriae : Recte etiam a Calatino Spes consecrata est: Fortunaeque, sit vel hujus dies, (nam valet in omnia dies) ver Re spiciens, ad opem serendam," &c.— Cicero de Legibus, lib. ii. cap. xi. edit. Olivet. So likewise in Livy, book xxvii. ch. 25. edit. Par. 1748. "Marcellus, quum belle Gallico ad Castidium Ædem Honori et Virtutīs visseret," &c.: Pontifices verò negabant unam cellam amplius quàm uni Deo rītē dedicari, quia, si de cælo terta, aut prodigī àliquid in eā factum esset, difficilis procuratio foret; quōd ēōrī Deo res divina foret sciri non possēt." Other reasons are alleged, which
eventually determined the question in favour of Virtue, since the
two deities could not be accommodated at once, on speculation;
"neque enim duobus, nisi certis, deis rite unà hostià fieri!"

Note L.
Consult the Digests or Pandects of Justinian, book xlviili.
title viii. "ad Legem Corneliae de sicariis et veneficiis." 3. Mar-
cianus, lib. 14. "Institutionum," beginning with the word "Ejus-
dem;" and § 2. beginning with "Adjectio." See further, Di-
gests, book xlviil, tit. xix. "de Panis." (page 846.) 88. Paulus,
lib. 5. "Sententiarum," beginning with the words "Si quis ali-
quid ex metallo," &c. and § 5. beginning with "Qui abortionis."
See Corpus Juris Civilis, tom. i. p. 850. edit. Amst. 1681.

Note M.
Consult the Digests of Justinian, book i. title l. "De Jus-
words "Ut Vim atque Injuriam," &c. See Corpus Juris Civilis,
as before, tom. i. p. 60.

Note N.
Auferantur, al. afferantur.] In this memorable extract from
the 3d book of Cicero, "de Republicâ," the text of Lactantius,
I believe, will be found to be auferantur, where Grotius reads af-
ferantur: but as the original work is lost, the true reading, per-
haps, cannot be fully ascertained, nor is the question of much
moment. It chiefly concerns me, as a translator, to observe,
that it was not without difficulty that I made my choice between
the two readings, as Grotius might have sufficient authority for
the latter: but as it might be only a conjectural emendation, I
was at length induced to retain the word auferantur, having found
it in Lactantius, edit. Heumann, Gotting. 1736. and Spark.
Oxon. 1684. as well as in a much older edition, that of Venet.
1509.

It will not be foreign to the general purport of this remark-
able passage to refer the reader to another work of Cicer, which
happily survives! I mean the latter part of his "Oratio pro
Publio Sextio," where the character of the "Vir bonus" is
again drawn by the same masterly hand, and with a congenial
spirit: I particularly allude to § 66. "Qui autem bonam famam
bonorum, qua?solaver Sglorianominaripotest, expetunt.aliis
otium quaerere debent,non sibi. Sudandum est his pro corama-
nibus commodis; adeundes inimicitias; subeunda?sempre pro re-
publicâ tempestates; cum multis audacibus, improbles, nonnun-
quàm etiam potentibus, dimicandum." &c.
Note O.

The quotations from Psalm ii. verses 16, 17. and from Psalm xl. verses 8, 9, 10, 11. appear to have been inadvertently omitted in the first edition of my translation; but they are easily supplied as the verses are here numbered, not from the Bible of James the First, but from the Book of Common Prayer, according to the translation of Cranmer's Bible. It is indeed justly observed by Mr. Le Clerc, in note 56. that the passages cited in this section are paraphrased, not literally translated: but perhaps there is no material deviation from the sense of the received text, except in verse 8. of Psalm xl. which will always remain liable to some critical discussion and difficulty. Various interpretations of this latter part of it, דנהו אביו, Aures perfecisti, perforasti, &c. &c. are given by the commentators in Poli Synopsis, and by writers on the Epistle to the Hebrews, x. 5.; and Mr. Reeves has stated the question very clearly in his collation of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Archbishop Newcome adopts the word סמך from the version of the LXX. and consequently favours the conjectural alteration of Mr. Peirce with regard to the Hebrew text: but "omnes haelectiones bene intellecte (says Capellus) eodem plane redeunt." And indeed there is ample notice of the passage, for every practical purpose, afforded by the latter part of Mr. Parkhurst's note under ה. IV. and in the appendix to Mr. Merrick's Annotations. See also Bishop Horne; and an excellent edition of the Book of Common Prayer, with notes, "by a Member of the Church of England," London, 1813: a publication alike distinguished by its general merits and its particular character, the author of it having united, with such eminent success, the learned labours of the law and the gospel.

Note P.

The reference to Abenada is undoubtedly erroneous; but though Grotius was also mistaken in regard to the title Sanhedrim, I would willingly hope for the future discovery of this important passage in some other part of the Talmuds. Abenada appears to be a name unknown; and if it be an error of the press for Alternisdra in the letters of Sarrau, we remain equally unable to produce the required passage, and consequently the explanation which Grotius has attempted to give amounts (in this respect) to nothing. True pains have been taken by a learned correspondent already mentioned to trace the error to its source; but although he seems as fully persuaded as I am that the veracity of Grotius is entitled to our perfect confidence, every clue which his ingenuity can suggest has been hitherto pursued in vain: The assertion of
Grotius is not as yet proved; but his words are "Ostendit mihi locum," and therefore we may still conclude that he has merely mistaken the title of the book in which the passage was seen by him, not the meaning of the words which he read.

The Synedrium, edit. Cocceii, has been repeatedly but unsuccessfully examined; and though Bishop Patrick observes that "they who next print the book so enlarged will do well to supply this passage of Rabbi Nechunias from hence, out of Sarravius," I must submit with great reluctance to the mortifying necessity of reporting Abenada to be a non-entity, and of leaving the passage itself in its present state of obscurity.

Note Q.

Additamenta ad Lexicon Hebraicum Schindleri: Rusche theboth, sive Abbreviature Hebraice, post p. 1992. If the reference to Schindler cannot be conveniently made, the reader will be amused to learn that the abbreviation in this instance consists of three letters, from Pater, and filius, by which the word is formed, to represent the "tres Hypostases in una stirpem." It is well observed, at the same time, that this is only known "apud peritos scientiae de divino auditu, quos vocant Onvo," the Cabalists. See also "Lexicon breve Rabbinico-Philosophicum," at the end of Buxtorf, under accipere.

Note R.


The lively anecdote which is told by St. Jerome to Pammachius, respecting Pope Damasus and the Consul Elect, induces me to notice in this place the jocose remark of Cicero on the critical point of time in which Prætextatus died; so that it might be fairly recorded of him that he did "Nihil Mali" during his consulate, which of course places him in a singular light; and in proof of the vigilant discharge of his high office, which Cicero calls "mirifica vigilantia," his further observation is "suo toto consulatu somnum non viderit." Epist. ad Familiares, book vii. 30. ad Curium.

It may be proper to remark that the names Juventius or Viventius, Ursinus or Ursicinus, Sicininchus or Libervius, are among the different readings of Ammianus and his commentators, and that I have taken the authority of Mr. Gibbon on this subject.

Note S.

Lord Somers—Studiorum Praeset.] It appears that Lord So-
Appendix.]

Mars was deprived of the Great Seal by King William in 1700, and was out of office till the year 1708, when he was made President of the Council by Queen Anne: but as this latter appointment was subsequent to the date of Dr. Newton's letter (January 16, 1707), the term "Studiorum Prases" was probably applied to him as President of the Royal Society, as he had been elected to that office, and had retired to a very studious course of life after his impeachment in 1701.

Note T.

Francis Cholmondeley. The author of this letter was a branch of the ancient and distinguished house of Cholmondeley, of Vale Royal, in the county of Chester. His elder brother Thomas represented that county in parliament, as the lineal descendants of Thomas have since done in three successive generations. From the Peerages of Collins and Lodge we find that Francis also was in parliament as the representative of a borough in the reign of King William; but the place for which he sat is not specified: Anthony Wood likewise mentions him as having had an honorary M.A. degree conferred on him 17th July 1669; and records the circumstance of his having been in parliament after the accession of the Prince of Orange. There is an anecdote of his parliamentary life, which, if true, (for the authority may not be correct,) evinces an upright and conscientious adherence to principles; for he is said to have been committed to the Tower as a non-juring member of the House of Commons. This is mentioned by Oldmixon in "the Life and posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq." whose mother was Catherine, the sister of Francis Cholmondeley, and whose abilities connected him with the most eminent characters of his time. The college of Brazen Nose in Oxford is entitled to claim Mr. F. C., as having been a gentleman commoner of that society, on the substantial testimony of a large silver tankard which bears his name, although the evidence of his admission is defective through the turbulence and confusion which prevailed at that period. The probability of this circumstance is confirmed by a later connection which took place between the college and the family in question, as the present Dean of Chester was a member, and for several years a fellow, of that society. His relation Francis, the subject of this note, and the younger brother of the Dean's great grandfather Thomas, as above stated, passed the latter part of his life at Vale Royal, having survived his elder brother about twelve years. During his confinement in the Tower his studies are said to have taken a religious turn: it is at all events certain, that his collection of books in divinity, still remaining at Vale Royal, is not only extensive but valuable; and his use of those books was undoubtedly laborious and important, from his nume-
rous interlineations and marginal notes. He was intimate with Addison and other men of that day distinguished by their talents and attainments. The register of the parish of Whitegate, adjoining to Vale Royal, supplies the baptism of Mr. Francis Cholmondeley, 10th January 1635-6; and it appears that he died (unmarried) at Vale Royal, A.D. 1713. There is a full-length picture of him in possession of the present owner of that celebrated mansion.

The letter, which has occasioned this biographical note, was happily preserved in an interleaved prayer-book belonging to the learned and laborious Bishop Kennett. The present possessor of this treasure, which has passed through many hands, is the Rev. T. M. rector of Wormley in Hertfordshire, to whom, as well as to the Dean of Chester, my best acknowledgements are due for the kindness with which they have answered my inquiries on the subject of that book. The letter, probably, was given to Bishop Kennett himself by Mr. (qu. Doctor?) Alexander Forrester, to whom it was addressed, and who, it is presumed, was an ancestor of the present Cecil Forester, Esq. M.P. for Wenlock, of Ross Hall near Shrewsbury.

AND now, in conclusion, let me deprecate the censure or contempt of more advanced students, who require no assistance from this version, as I do not pretend to offer any thing which deserves their notice. It is my sole object to afford some little aid to others of less proficiency, (to the younger part of my professional brethren in particular,) in their perusal of the treatises and annotations of Grotius and Le Clerc, by a faithful translation of the text and comments; and by an occasional enlargement and explanation of the references, where they have appeared to me imperfect or obscure. If I should succeed in this object to a reasonable extent, I shall have done all that I presumed to attempt; and therefore I am willing to hope that the readers whom I have in view may admit the utility of the present publication, (considering the excellence of the original work,) though the secondary nature of my office may afford me no claim to approbation in any other light.

Spt. M.

THE END.
DEFILEMENTS OF THE TEMPLE OF GOD.
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ONE OF THE CHAPLAINS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY.
As the Author of the following Discourse was honoured by a letter from the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Pearson) requesting its publication, he has been induced by the present opportunity to give it a limited circulation. In the letter which he received on this subject, the Vice-Chancellor assured him that, in addition to his own sentiments of satisfaction and approbation, he found reason to believe that those sentiments were "very strongly and very generally" entertained. The writer hopes on this ground to obviate the charge of a flippant obtrusion of his Sermon on the notice of his readers, while he certainly feels gratified by the terms in which its publication was desired by so distinguished a character as the late Dr. Pearson, and by many other individuals to whom the Vice-Chancellor has alluded. It is a further gratification to him, in a period so disturbed by fanciful theories and "doubtful disputation," to avow by these means, and to this extent, (without a more prominent act of authorship,) the result of his best diligence and judgement, and the firm conviction of his own mind respecting the genuine, the SCRIPTURAL sense of certain points, on which the Church of Christ is so unhappily divided.
KNOW YE NOT THAT YE ARE THE TEMPLE OF GOD, AND THAT THE SPIRIT OF GOD DWELLETH IN YOU? IF ANY MAN DEFILE THE TEMPLE OF GOD, HIM SHALL GOD DESTROY, FOR THE TEMPLE OF GOD IS HOLY, WHICH TEMPLE YE ARE.

1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

LIVING as we are in times of uncommon trial, it is not more a principle of duty than it is a natural effect of our condition, that we should direct our thoughts with a proportionate anxiety to the great Author of our being; to that Almighty Power whose "spirit dwelleth in us," and "whose temple we are!" And what argument conducive to this end can possibly impress the mind with greater force than the plain and solemn declaration of my text, that we are, individually* and collectively, "the temple of God;" and that, "if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy?"

These, then, are very interesting words; and though it would be needless to point out from my text before this venerable body the various duties of a Christian life, to enlarge upon their general and extensive import,

* Note A.
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and to enforce their value, their obligation, their necessity, by a particular detail of those duties, they still, perhaps, afford a suitable introduction to my intended discourse, as an earnest and conclusive sentence of reproof against those examples of corruption or defilement which I wish to offer to the most serious consideration: examples are they which concern us all as members of the National Church; not partially the present or even the future ministers of the Gospel, but universally the objects of academical education; some of whom, no doubt, will hereafter constitute the chief civil guardians of our religious establishment!

[But before I enter on this view of my subject, I shall propose to your notice some short observations of a more general nature.

It appears from the context, that the occasion of this Epistle to the Corinthians was partly to reprove the obstinacy of the Jewish rabbins, in their zeal for circumcision and the ceremonial law; but chiefly to oppose the vanity of that specious affectation of learning which led the Gentile philosophers into speculative opinions and doubtful disputation, and which consequently divided their hearers into parties and factions; and to show, at the same time, to the Jewish as well as Gentile converts, the superior sanctity and purer principles of the Christian religion.

It is further observable from the express declaration of St. Paul in the beginning of this Epistle, that though written and directed to a particular church, it was designed to extend to all ages and nations, to "*all that in every place call upon the name of

---

* Note B.
Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours;” and to regulate the faith as well as morals of every individual. Still, no doubt, the appointed ministers of the Church of Christ must feel a more than common interest in the language of my text. It seems, in their instance, to heighten obligations which are indispensible binding upon all: that they, more especially, should resist those errors and avoid those divisions which human philosophy, when opposed to revelation, is too likely to produce: that, as they are commissioned to “preach the Gospel to every creature,” so they should most faithfully embrace and maintain those doctrines which are expressly contained in Holy Writ: that they should practise too, with the strictest uniformity, those Christian precepts and those moral rules of life which they have been solemnly ordained to teach: that this awful character of “the temple of God” may be thus more especially supported in their own persons, and illustrated by their own examples; that the Spirit of God may thus be seen to “dwell” in them in a “faith which worketh by love,” and which approves itself “zealous of good works!”

And here another observation is particularly suggested by the present times:—that, in these our days of fanciful innovation and of bold impiety, the scriptural doctrine of the Spirit is abused and perverted, on the one hand, by the extravagance of folly and enthusiasm; and is insulted, on the other, by the scoffs of infidelity; ridiculed as a vague and visionary scheme, which finds its only origin in the wild imagination of man! The text therefore is important as a plain and direct refutation of that difficult creed of infidels, which totally excludes the divine influence of
the Spirit, while it shows at the same time the scriptural import of that phrase which some men are so fond to use, the "indwelling Spirit of God:" it clearly points out to us a proper limitation of the term, a cautious and accurate application of its sense, to the rebuke of "all pride, vain glory, and hypocrisy," but to the encouragement of the humble, and to the consolation of the penitent.

But indeed these previous observations will be incidentally conveyed, and will be almost unavoidably included, in the subsequent application of my text:]* I proceed therefore to explain myself, under a few distinct heads, respecting those examples to which I have alluded.

I. First then, and principally, I propose from these words (what I hope on this occasion may be useful and appropriate) to hold up to public censure and avoidance a recent instance of spiritual defilement, which comes too plainly within the scope of my text: I mean the fraudulent and unwarrantable practice of some modern translators of the New Testament, in violating† the pure and plain sense of those passages which militate against their tenets. Now, abuses of this nature have more or less obtained from the days of Aquila‡, Theodotion, and Symmachus, to the present hour: but I do not advert to those charges which have been occasionally brought against certain passages of the earliest versions, in proof

* The preceding observations, which are placed between brackets, (from page 436 to page 438,) were, for the sake of brevity, omitted in the delivery of this discourse; as were also the quotations from Cyprian, page 452.
† Note C. ‡ Note D.
of the prejudices and disingenuousness of men in all ages, whether as translators or commentators: neither do I now allude to those later tricks of popish interpreters, by which the Virgin Mary becomes deified, through a perversion of those very words* which in fact disprove her title to divine honours; neither do I now point at their artful and lucrative substitution of the carnal doctrine of penance† for the heavenly doctrine of repentance; neither do I seek in former days, nor in a foreign country, the most glaring examples of this defilement of God's temple!

The spirit of innovation and the zeal of sectarism at home have become so bold and shameless, that we live to witness in this country an impious perversion of the sacred text beyond any former daring! A publication is now circulated, in three different editions, even in this protestant reformed part of Christendom, with the specious title of an "Improved Version of the New Testament," which will be found to alter or omit, with little scruple or limitation, the obvious sense of any passage or expression which may bear too strongly against the system of Socinus and his Unitarian brethren.

But this singular audacity of perversion will receive, I trust, its merited reproof and refutation from much higher authority, and much abler hands‡: From the limited nature of my present office, I presume only to enumerate some few proofs of the fact, to establish the grounds of my complaint, and to justify my censure.

In the very title page, which is artfully recom-

* Note E. † Note F. ‡ Note G.
mended to our confidence by the name of an ARCHBISHOP distinguished for his zeal and learning in the sixteenth century, (while it holds out the lure of a quotation from his preface to the Bishops' Bible,) the reader is still more attracted and more openly invited by the prominent display of ANOTHER ARCHBISHOP'S name, and by the sanction of "A SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE." Thelearned and pious labours of a late venerable primate are described to constitute the basis of this version, and the labours of the society supply the letter and the spirit of it: but if the unwary reader should anticipate the letter or the spirit of that well-known and excellent "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge," which is thus, at first sight, liable to the impatation, his disappointment will be great indeed! It is the difference between a principle of union and a scheme of separation; between truth and error.

Proceeding to the introduction, we are assured by the editors of this improved version, that "in every instance in which either the primate's version or their own differs from the received text, they have placed the words of the received text at the foot of the page," and that "in all important cases they have cited the authorities by which the variation is supported*." What are we to think, then, of the candour of the fidelity of these modern improvers of our text, and consequently of our scriptural doctrines, when in many important passages they totally omit the received text; and even in that passage of St. John v. 18, in which our Saviour is stated to have told the Jews that God was peculiarly† his Father,

* Note H.    † Note I.
"making himself equal with God," they substitute the word "like" for "equal" without the slightest notice, or reference, or vindication! Now I believe that this passage is not included in the number of those apocryphal chapters*, or parts of chapters, which they are attempting to expunge from the canon of the New Testament, and therefore we can only consider it as too insignificant to require their attention, if it do not convict them of a wilful inattention to their own positive engagement!

So likewise in those ardent confessions, extorted by the force of evidence and glowing with the flash of conviction, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God †!" and "Truly this was the Son of God ‡!" as well as in that awful declaration of our Lord himself, when he threatens the impenitence of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, with a doom less tolerable than that of Tyre and Sidon, and the land of Sodom, "in the day of judgement §:" in each of these passages the definite article is confidently changed into the indefinite, (a son of God, a day of judgement,) on their own or similar authority, in despite of their pretended basis the Primate's version, and without any notice whatsoever of the received text: and thus, as far as these verbal alterations can have weight in the decision, (while the proper sonship of Christ, and the awful sentence of one final day, are so expressly and so repeatedly declared in Holy Writ,) they are artfully introduced, and mischievously employed, upon an evident principle of resistance against two of the most essential tenets of the Christian faith!

* Note J. † Matt. xiv. 33. ‡ Matt. xxvii. 44. § Matt. xi. 21. 24.
But improvements of this description, in which similar liberties are taken, will appear too frequently on the most cursory examination of the work to admit of any regular detail. When the authorized version militates against certain tenets, whether Arian, Socinian, or Unitarian, (for it is difficult to define the numerous ramifications of schism, and the nice subdivisions of unbelief,) if they cite the received text at all, it is only to pronounce it "inadmissible," or "liable to be misunderstood," or lastly, to misinterpret the plain sense of it*. "All things that the Father hath are mine," saith our blessed Lord himself: this, say they, means only that "every thing which relates to the kingdom of God in the world is committed to my direction and superintendence†." To have "come forth from God," to have "come down from heaven," to "ascend up where he was before," and other passages of the same unequivocal sense, are, it seems, no argument of our Lord's pre-existent and divine nature, and are confidently explained to be "nothing more than figurative terms," to signify "a searching into the truths of God," and an imparted "knowledge of the divine counsels††." With the same jealous and determined exclusion of our Saviour from any divine or pre-existent state,

* See Improved Version, p. 201. last line. See ditto, p. 345. near the bottom, where they take Mr. Lindsey for their basis instead of the Archbishop, and render S[e]l[r]i[er]s Pro[bi]dence instead of Godhead. It is easy to understand their reason for this improved version, though (in the light of a translation) it is not easy to justify it.

† See Improved Version, p. 251. where this exposition is sanctioned by Dr. Priestley himself!

†† See Improved Version, pp. 209. 211. 222, &c.
that emphatical expression of John the Baptist, that Jesus Christ "was before him," is improved into a sense of trivial import, and is only found to signify that our Saviour "is his principal!" Here again the avowed basis of their version is deserted and disclaimed on the authority of their own interpretation, lest our Saviour should be thought to have existed before John. Now I do not presume to offer a decisive judgement upon the most correct version of this passage, which has been rendered by various terms; but I may be allowed to say that the sense of the received text in this place (while it is abundantly warranted by the authority of syntax and the force of the Greek idiom) appears to me very fully supported and confirmed by the two following additional considerations: First, then, the mere messenger ‡ (though the highly favoured witness of Christ) whose ministry was exercised in the mountainous § and less cultivated parts of Judæa, not the crowded temple of Jerusalem, to make perhaps a more striking distinction between his office and that of his superior, was not likely to place himself so nearly on a level with his divine master as to describe him only by the tame appellation of his principal: the characteristic modesty and humility of the Baptist would probably intend that sense which marks the most strongly his own conscious inferiority: and secondly, the sense of the original passage, and that of the received version of it, appear to have a strong and direct reference to the information contained in the beginning of the same chapter, respecting the eternal

* John i. 18. 30. † Note K. ‡ Note L. § Note M.
pre-existence of the divine Λόγος: but my limits admit of no fuller discussion of these points. I have merely noticed this passage, and other similar specimens, sufficiently to show you the systematic design of these editors to lessen and degrade, on all occasions and by all possible means, the character and office of our blessed Saviour! So again, evidently on the same perverse principle, they have adopted the term "advocate" instead of that of "comforter" in regard to the office of the Holy Spirit. It shall be admitted that the word "advocate," in some instances*, gives the scriptural sense of Παράκλητος; but the substitution of the term for that of comforter, when applied to the Holy Ghost, has nothing to recommend it, or to entitle the alteration to a preference: on the contrary, the relative situation of the parties†, the awful period, the afflicting scene, and the higher import of the term "comforter," appear to me to require the latter sense of the word, and incline me to vindicate its use and its propriety‡.

As a specimen of frivolous and absurd alteration by these professed improvers of our version, it will suffice to notice their new translation of that passage in my text, "him shall God destroy." No, say these instructive critics, "God shall corrupt him." Here again, as in numberless instances, in direct violation of their engagement, no notice is taken of the received text, while the purport of it is weakened and perverted.

If indeed they must employ their rhetorical figure, and translate the Greek text by the same English verb in both parts of the sentence, why would they not

* As in 1 John ii. 1.
† See John xiv. 16. 26. xvi. 7.
‡ Note N.
adopt in both places the single word "destroy" instead of the word "corrupt," as Erasmus has suggested, and as the sense will allow? But no: these improvers must take the verb "corrupt" in both parts of the sentence, and thus they make God corrupt the man who corrupteth his temple! The original word here in question, (φθειρω *), when applied to vices of the mind, and to the introduction of false doctrines, is undoubtedly well rendered by the English word "corrupt;" but surely no other commentators would object to the second meaning of the verb as expressed in this passage, when applied in the sense of punishment to the person of an offender. How contemptible then, how injurious to religion, how foreign to the spirit of the Gospel, are such idle cavils and alterations as these, under pompous pretensions to accuracy and improvement!

But enough may have been said to answer my sole purpose in adverting to the work in question; my present office admits of no formal refutation of its tenets, nor of any adequate illustration of its unscriptural tendency: I leave it therefore with the few following remarks:

First then, if the doctrines of this "Improved Version" be the doctrines of our Saviour and his inspired Apostles, we have hitherto lived in utter darkness: our faith is ignorance, our worship is idolatry; instead of the awful sentence of "everlasting punishment," (which are the express words of Christ†,) we have here presented to our sinful nature a fatal

* Note O. † Matt. xxv. 46.
encouragement to vice' by "the more pleasing hypothesis" of a "temporary and salutary correction," indefinite indeed but not eternal; "inflicted for the benefit of the offender," with an "ultimate restitution of the wicked to virtue and to happiness." Instead of the real agency of Satan or Beelzebub, ("our adversary the Devil," instead of "the rulers of the darkness of this world," we have nothing more to fear than the power of a "heathen god or a human ghost, the supposed chief of possessing demons;" and we find that "the historian" has hitherto amused us only with a "visionary scene" in his account of our Saviour's temptation in the desert, or perhaps "a figurative description of the train of thoughts which passed through the mind of Jesus." When our Saviour told the unbelieving Jews that they are "of their father the Devil," whose "lusts they do," and who was "a murderer from the beginning," and "in whom is no truth," he was only speaking hypothetically, (for the real existence of such a being is denied,) and they were merely to understand a "symbolical person," that is, a "principle of moral evil personified," and a "supposed source of evil." and thus, in these enlightened days, our spiritual danger becomes trifling and ideal. What need of caution, and vigilance, and resistance against symbols, human ghosts, and imaginary agents? Why should we alarm ourselves, and pray for deliverance from the "crafts, the assaults, and the subtility of the Devil," in these times of confident impiety, when taught to embrace a "more
pleasing, a more probable hypothesis," which at once extinguishes that "everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels*;" and cancels the sentence of eternal misery†!

But in the sacred name of Christianity, I would finally consider (and I do feel the consideration to be serious beyond all expression!) what is to become of our best hopes as members of the Church of Christ? How, more especially, are the lower classes of our community to obtain that knowledge which we believe to be true and scriptural, and of vital importance? How are they to live under a just sense of moral duty? and what is to become of their religious principles, their faith in a Redeemer, their obedience to the gospel of Christ, when numerous and cheap copies of this "Improved Version" shall have been industriously circulated through every channel, for a series of years, as the genuine sense and substance of the New Testament copies too printed (as they are already) without any critical or explanatory notes whatsoever, and only sprinkled here and there with a few blind marginal references to a text which they are labouring to vilify and explode, so as to supersede gradually all use or knowledge of its real purport and essential doctrines; supplanting altogether, in their hands and in their hearts, some of the most important articles of the Christian Revelation.§

II. And now, in pursuance of my design, it is impossible to pass without notice, or to notice without

* Matthew xv. 41. † Note P.
‡ One of them is a "small pocket edition, without notes, for popular use." See their Introduction, p. 5.
§ Note Q.
regret, another example of corruption or defilement; not, as in the former instance, resulting from inveterate hostility, but either from the simplicity of ignorance, or from the folly of self-confidence. It is a case in which "the temple of God" becomes defiled even in those very persons who profess exclusively to sanctify it. It is when enthusiasm will dare to call itself inspired. It is when men will arrogate to themselves, even under the disadvantage of natural imbecility or of neglected education, not only a superior but an exclusive commission for the efficacious preaching of the Gospel. Some of these, no doubt, are unhappy self-deceivers, and may claim that pity which they sometimes offer. Others, it must be feared, are confident impostors, presuming upon holy ground to "beguile* unstable souls," to mislead weak brethren, and to "corrupt† the word of God." These are they long ago foretold, "presumptuous and self-willed, speaking evil of dignities‡, despising government, and promising liberty, while they themselves are the servants of corruption:" These are they, "false teachers," repeatedly described by Christ and his Apostles; "false prophets," deceiving many "with swelling words§" to "follow their pernicious ways." These are they with whom the latter times are threatened; the scourges of "an evil and || adulterous generation!" But away with this imaginary excellence, this fancied privilege of inspiration, these rash pretensions to peculiar grace! Within the temple of God presumption

and despair should be equally unknown: they are equally foreign to the proper temper of a Christian. He, the true and real Christian, exerts himself steadily to serve and please God in newness of life; with cheerfulness and yet with awe; with diffidence and yet with joy: in constant faith, in humble hope, in universal charity! He feels his own natural unworthiness, he confesses his own natural insufficiency, he seeks his justification solely "by the faith* of Jesus Christ," while he evinces that faith by a virtuous and persevering obedience. He sees the impiety of imputing his future doom, whether happy or miserable, to God's arbitrary will, and deprecates the absurd as well as dreadful effects of such a tenet upon the lives and actions of mankind; nor ever will he dare to promise any other predestination to life than that which all men may obtain, through the divine grace and mercy, by their pious endeavours to fulfil the plain conditions of the Christian covenant: "This do †, and thou shalt live!"

By these observations I by no means intend to express myself contemptuously towards any conscientious person or religious society whatsoever, on the grounds of an occasional difference of opinion in common points of controversy: there are good and bad members of every community. Individuals of every sect are highly respectable; but surely the candid and considerate of all persuasions will hold me justified in thus rebuking the desilement of God's temple, (for such is every member of Christ,) the desilement of a

* Gal. ii. 16. † Luke x. 28.
temple so holy in its purpose, by ignorant assurance or distempered absurdity. It is a reasonable, an imperious duty, that I should mark with indignant censure the folly of itinerants, and the artifice of impostors, where the blind become leaders of the blind, and where the simple or compound poisons of disaffection and schism are, I fear, often substituted for "the sincere milk of the word;" the subject indeed is in some lights ludicrous*, but the effects are too serious for that smile of ridicule which might be excited by particular views of it; and I do most earnestly lament that our wise and excellent system of legal jurisprudence should still contain in it so palpable an error as that of empowering the lowest mechanic, without any regard to age, to education, or even character, almost without any conditions whatsoever, certainly without any security for his doctrines or his conduct, to assume the sacred functions of a preacher of the gospel! It is no want of Christian charity, I trust, to call this unqualified intrusion a defilement within the meaning of my text. I venerate as much as any man the truly Christian principle of a just and liberal toleration, that peculiar feature and characteristic excellence of our church; but I complain of an extreme which loses sight of all principles conducive to the cause of true religion; and it is matter of equal surprise and concern that an evil of such real magnitude, redeemed by no counterpoise of speculative good.

---

* Quanta putatis esse vos dementiae
Quis capita vestra non dubitatis credere
Cui calceandos vix commisistis pedes!"
should ever have prevailed under the sanction of law. Now a long and expensive course of education, appropriate studies, competent certificates, regular testimonials, previous examinations by men of learning and piety, and finally a most solemn act of ordination conferred by authority of the most sacred nature; these surely are conditions and qualifications for the ministry, affording, beyond a doubt or comparison, a far better claim to public confidence, and a far better promise to the interests of religion.

But how, (say our opponents,) how is it so clear and certain that your tenets are scriptural? and consequently, why are we to think the Church of England a safe and satisfactory guide? I answer, not merely that it has been believed to be so, but that it has been proved to be so, to the perfect conviction of the greatest, the wisest, and the best men that ever lived. The highest names that have done honour to human nature are among the foremost, in every sense, to distinguish this Church as the bulwark of reformed religion, and founded on the rock of Scripture. If the genuine sense of Holy Writ, sufficiently conducive to eternal life, be not known within her pale, wretched is the prospect and hopeless the condition of the world! If certainty of doctrine and truth of revelation be not established here, from the whole tenor and spirit of our Bible, collectively taken, the glad tidings of the Gospel are delusive, and nothing may be safely believed! If the path of salvation be not traced by the patient and pious labours of those eminently learned men who rescued us from the darkness of popish superstition, (and by a splendid succession of
theological writers down to the present hour,) we shall look for it in vain among the rantings of illiterate enthusiasm, and the fanciful theories of unsettled speculation.

III. And here, in a third and last instance, I am unavoidably led to notice a description of men who are still more indefensible in their act of defilement than the bold Socinian, the weak fanatic, or the evil-minded sceptic: they are described with remarkable precision in several of the Epistles of Cyprian; [I select the few following passages:

"Nec putetis sic vos Evangelium Christi asserere, dum vosmet ipsos à Christi grege et ab ejus pace et concordià separatis!"—Cyprian Epist. xliiv.

"Pax vera falsæ pacis mendacio tollitur," &c.—Epist. lv.

"Illud mirandum est, immo indignandum potius et dolendum, Christianos Antichristis assistere, et prævaricatores Fidei atque Ecclesiæ proditores intus in ipsâ Ecclesiâ contra Ecclesiam stare!"—Epist. lxix.

"Spargentes et impugnantes Ecclesiam Christi à Christo ipso adversarii, ab Apostolis ejus Antichristi, nominantur."—Epist. lxxiii.

"Gratulandum est cum tales de Ecclesiâ separantur."—Id. de Unitate Ecclesiae.

"Rapit (inimicus sc.) de ipsâ Ecclesiâ homines," &c. &c.—Ibid.]

The ministers of the Gospel, then, (for to some of that sacred order I now advert with reluctance,) the ordained ministers of our National Church, are "the temple of God" in a sense peculiar and emphatical: there is an especial responsibility attached to them.
individually, and their defilement of the temple by immoral or unholy actions, by "false doctrine, heresy, or schism," is a sin of the deepest dye! It is a base desertion of the most sacred trust that mortals can receive! "Him shall God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." It is not (I am confident) on partial nor on doubtful grounds that I claim for the general body of the national clergy an appropriate sanctity of morals, competent learning, discreet zeal, sound judgement, and sincere piety: but alas, among the Apostles themselves there was a Judas! There will be unhappy instances of mental obliquity or of moral depravity; there will be individuals who betray their charge, and in various ways make shipwreck of their faith! One perhaps, like Demas, through sensual or sordid passions, devoted to this present world: another, like Hymeneus and Philetus, "indulging profane and vain babblings which increase unto more ungodliness." Nay, dissemblers and intruders are found, who avail themselves of regular ordination to disseminate irregular doctrines: there are, κατ' ἐξουσίαν, "Evangelical" divines, the only "true churchmen," the sole preachers of the gospel, whose first qualification for the office is an oral conformity with articles of faith which they practically oppose and deny! Even the mystical and abstruse Swedenborg may boast of some success, though his tenets confound those distinctions which the Scriptures have expressly given us respecting the nature of the Godhead, disavow the atonement of the sufferings

* 2 Tim. ii. 16.  
† Note R.
of Christ in the sense of our second article, and require us to believe the personal intercourse of the Swedish apostle with the Deity, his particular revelations from Heaven, and his frequent communications with the invisible world of spirits!!! But surely such false friends (the most dangerous kind of enemy) did not previously examine those Articles and that Liturgy to which they must have given their previous and positive assent. Do they now consider at stated periods (what each of us may do with advantage) that solemn form of ordination by which they have been commissioned to preach the gospel in conformity with our national and scriptural faith, and are pledged so to do by their own voluntary and sacred engagements *? What can be the feelings and the principles of such offenders, when they still are not ashamed to retain the spiritual offices, and to receive the temporal emoluments of a church, which they virtually disown, and openly betray; self-convicted of this fact, that they controvert and disclaim the doctrines which they have sworn to maintain! But our Saviour himself has said, that "it must needs be that offences come †." Nor indeed are these examples without their use; for, while we consider them with deep concern, we shall feel the more anxious, whether members or ministers of our holy Church, to stand upon our guard! In the former light we shall embrace the more firmly, in the latter we shall deliver the more earnestly from the written word of God ‡.

* See on this point Dr. Hey's Lectures, vol. ii. book iii. ch. 15. sect. 8.
† Matt. xviii. 7. ‡ Note 8.
the great fundamental truths of Christianity, the sinfulness of man, the nature and attributes of the Deity, the authenticity of revealed religion, the incarnation of the Son of God "for us men and for our salvation," the merciful design and the atoning effect of that sacrifice which our Redeemer offered in his own sacred person for the sins of the whole world, his mediatorial office on behalf of the faithful and the penitent, the scriptural "indwelling" of the Spirit of God, neither slighted in scepticism nor over-rated in fanaticism; the certainty of a future and eternal state of happiness or misery according to our deeds; and finally, that animating feature which illumines the whole face of our divine religion, the doctrine of repentance, with a consequent remission of sin.

Here then I shall close what has been offered under my text, with a short summary of its general purport: that purport is plainly the constant preparation of our hearts for the reception of the Spirit of God. That Spirit, we know on the authority of St. Paul, will condescend to "dwell in us" if our hearts be rightly and religiously disposed: thus purified by its divine influence, as far as the frailty and imperfections of human nature will allow, and as our covenant with God through Christ may require, the heart of every Christian (in this sober and limited sense) becomes a "temple of God;" its thoughts and desires become consecrated to his service, which alone is "perfect freedom." There is no real happiness for men, whether ministers or people, unless they seek to become "an habitation* of God through the Spirit." Vain

* Ephes. ii. 22.
and delusive are all other views, all other hopes are treacherous and false! Let us labour then to become "God's building," to "become the temple where his Spirit dwelleth." There is nothing in this precept to countenance the dreams of extravagant rhapsody, the mad claims of peculiar illumination, or the arrogant pretensions of self-taught teachers, self-elected saints! Such dreams, such claims, such pretensions, dishonour and disgrace the modest character of true religion!

On the other hand, we shall equally secure ourselves in these dangerous days against the worse madness of desperate apostasy! We are expressly forewarned of this awful conjuncture, that "in the last days perilous times shall come;" "there shall be a departure from the faith;" "there shall be "mockers," "hypocrites," "blasphemers*!" But these intimations, terrible as they are, should only quicken our vigilance and stimulate our exertions: that, as "we profess and call ourselves Christians," so ought we to "hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." With invincible firmness may we all endeavour (more especially my younger hearers) through the gracious aid of the divine Spirit to keep ourselves equally from every pollution which defiles the holy "temple of God, which temple we are," from the grossness of immorality, from the wildness of speculation, from the weakness of enthusiasm, from the violence of bigotry, from the perverseness of schism, from the abomination of infidelity!

* 2 Tim. iii. 1, 2. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Jude 18.
NOTES TO SERMON.

Note A. p. 435:
CHRISTIANI, et singuli et collecti, ob Spiritum Dei in ipsis habitantem.—Grotius in loc.
Proving all Christians to be the temple of God.—Whitby.
Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost.—1 Cor. vi. 19.

Note B. p. 436.
To all that in every place, &c. 1 Cor. i. 2. I believe that this is generally understood of all the Churches of Christ, whether in Corinth or elsewhere, though it is otherwise explained by most respectable authority: see Dr. Marsh's notes to Michaelis, vol. iv. ch. 14. § 1. confining it to two different descriptions of Christians in Corinth itself: there is however no doubt of the proper application of St. Paul's Epistles to all Christians at the present day.

Note C. p. 438.
It is expressly observed by Beza that this practice is a defilement of God's temple; "Polluere autem Dei templum dicuntur qui carnali facundia puritatem evangelii inquinabant, quique factionibus scindebant ecclesiam; quod neque sint impune laturi." Edit. 1642. The latter clause has a pointed reference to the words before me, "he shall God destroy." In a former edit. 1565. it is added, "et impuro affectu, velut arrogantia turgidi, ex evangelii pradicatione gloriem inanem captabant." Mr. Locke says, "If any man by corrupt doctrine or discipline defileth the temple of God, he shall not be saved with loss, as by fire, but him shall God destroy." He thinks that St. Paul here points to a particular leader of the party against him. Whitby adopts the foregoing sense, but seems inclined to refer the defilement here mentioned to carnal uncleanness, or to idolatry. Hammond in his paraphrase adopts chiefly the sense of corrupt and heretical doctrines, but in his note he understands uncleanness also. Pyle's paraphrase likewise adopts Beza's sense of false doctrines: Gilpin says, "you injure the holy temple of God by your divisions." He justly observes that the original word ἀφείρω will bear two senses; but if it should be confined to one in this passage, he evidently expounds it in the sense of destruction: but see the following note D, more fully on this subject.

Note D. p. 438.
"Aquila, Sinopensis, secundus post 70. eosdem libros ex Hebraeo in Græcum convertit, et multo post tempore sub Hadrianæ floruit: et ejus interpretatio (quod ea quæ de Christo in SS praedicta fuerant, ut a Judæis gratiam iniret, aliter quam 70. vertendo subdolâ obscuritate involverit) jam diu est cūm a recte sententibus, licet in Hexaplis haberetur, aliquis locis non probata est."—Preface to Septuagint, 1653.
"Comme il ne l'entreprit qu'en hain des Chretiens qui l'avoient chassé de l'Eglise à cause de la passion qu'il avoit pour les vaines curiosités de l'Astrologie," &c. &c. See L'Histoire Critique du V. T. liv. 11. c. 9. It was evidently his aim (Aquila's) to favour the Jewish prejudices in his translation; and Moreri observes upon the preceding passage from Father Simon, that "l'auteur parle avec plus d'exactitude de la version d'Aquila." The translation by Theodotion is described by Simon to be "plus hardie que celle d'Aquila, et l'on y trouvoit beaucoup de choses ou retranchées ou ajoutées." Theodotion had been of various sects, particularly a Marcionite and a Jew: the Jews received him on condition that he should translate the Old Testament into Greek, which he did in the reign of Commodus. The preface to Septuagint says of Theodotion, "quod Marcionis hæretici sectator nonnullius locis perverterit potius quàm converterit sacros libros:" where it is added of Symmachus that "Samaranitis offensus, ut placeret Judæis, non unum SS locum perturbato sensu correrperit: Uterque quamvis ct ipsi in Hexaplis circumferrentur, parium fidus interpres habitus est." Reference may be made to Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible for further particulars of these three translators of the Old Testament; as well as to Reeves's Preface to his Collation of the Psalms, page 41, &c. but (contrary to the order in which he places them) the silence of Ireneus about Symmachus seems a strong argument to show that his version was subsequent to that of Theodotion. See also the Norrisian Lectures of the learned Dr. Hey, book i. ch. 6. § 7.

Note E. p. 439.

See Archdeacon Bisset's "Entire History of Christ," &c. preface, p. 7. Dublin, 1807. It is the Diatessaron of Professor White (according to the English version) rendering that work more extensively useful. The Archdeacon says, "The memorable words spoken by our Lord to his mother at the marriage in Cana, 'Τι ἐμοί καὶ σοι, γυναί; are rendered in our English version, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' In the Doway Testament, published by authority and circulated in this country (Ireland) for the edification of the Romanists, the words are thus perverted, 'Woman, what is that to me and to thee?' We speak (he proceeds to observe) of the blessed Virgin with reverence; she was highly favoured; but the gross error of the Romanists respecting her, we and all the reformed churches in Christendom utterly renounce. This passage is one, among many, which flatly contradicts the Romish doctrine; and because it lies as it were upon the surface, and meets the eye of every common reader, it is of great importance that it should not be falsified. Nobody in the least acquainted with the Greek language could have given such an interpretation as the Doway translator has ventured to give: But I fear we cannot ascribe the error of which he is guilty to his ignorance of the Greek idiom, for the same phrase had twice occurred in the Gospel of St. Mark,
and is rendered correctly: The Doway translator therefore was not ignorant!" See John ii. 4. Mark i. 24. and v. 7.

Note F. p. 439.

"I shall just mention one other instance of disagreement between the English and the Doway versions. The Greek word which in the former is rendered 'repent' is interpreted in the latter 'do penance.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>DOWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.'</td>
<td>'Unless you do penance ye shall all likewise perish.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I leave the sagacious reader to comment upon this artful diversity of expression, and to calculate the profits that have arisen from it." Thus far the Archdeacon as before; to which I wish to add that my readers will find a very curious note on the interpolations in the French New Testament printed at Bourdeaux 1686, in the Rev. Ralph Churton's excellent Sermon at Oxford in 1804.

Note G. p. 439.

I have been long since gratified to find this expectation fully realized by the sixth article of the second number of the Quarterly Review; and the public were soon after informed that the Rev. E. Nares of Biddenden was preparing some remarks on this Unitarian version of the New Testament.

Note H. p. 440.

See "Improved Version," &c. p. 4. of the Introduction. The principal authorities (while they profess to stand upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome) are Wakefield, Priestley, Cappe, Lindsey, Lardner, and themselves. I do not presume to judge how far the Archbishop may have volunteered, nor how far he may have been pressed into the service; but I should imagine that he little intended or expected to stand forward in the ranks of his present associates, though they profess to do him justice, and make large promises of an impartial and unbiased judgement in all respects!

Note I. p. 440.

See Campbell on John v. 18, where he fully establishes the emphatical import of the word Ἰησοῦ: but our new editors only understand by the term God's "own Son," or "his beloved Son," that Christ was "the most distinguished of the prophets!" See Improved Version, note on Romans viii. 3. so that even the text Romans viii. 32. and those of John x. 38. and John xiv. 10, 11, are mere phrases, equivalent only to this sense, that our Saviour "spake the words and did the works of the Father." From the Primate's note on these texts is it fair to infer that he intended to deny the pre-existence, the atonement, or the intercession of Christ? They cite him on this occasion; but upon the 5th verse of Romans ix. as well as on the 34th verse of the preceding chapter, they totally desert and contradict him, because he adopts the authorised translation of those very important and conclusive texts.
The text Rom. ix. 5. is so incontrovertible a proof of the divinity of Christ, that the Arians, &c. may well have been desirous of shaking the integrity of this passage; but no scripture seems less liable to question from manuscript versions, the early fathers and the ablest commentators: at least, it is reasonable to ask whether these impartial editors would admit a plausible conjecture, or an ingenious argument, to alter a text of Scripture and a tenet of their faith, under similar circumstances? Griesbach does not suggest a doubt of the authenticity of the received text. So again, in the same chapter, (Romans ix. 3.) this improved edition substitutes a new and unjustifiable interpretation of the text, in place of that affectionate hyperbole by which the Apostle testifies his zeal for the salvation of his brethren. Here again they directly dissent from the Primate. The received text is not only omitted in numerous instances, but it is sometimes quoted falsely. See Improved Version, p. 455. on Phil. ii. 6. where they artfully substitute "as" for "equal with," in that important passage, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," though they pledge themselves always to give the authorised version, and describe this very passage, between inverted commas, as the translation of "the public version!" What tricks are these!

Note J. p. 441.

A large portion of the New Testament is thus degraded into a state of suspicion and distrust. The Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, are in some parts to be doubted, if not rejected as spurious: "Some of the facts have a fabulous appearance,"—"the reasoning is inconclusive,"—"the account of the miraculous conception was probably a fiction;" and if (to continue further their own expressions) they can thus "invalidate the whole story," we may at once resign to them both the fabric of the Christian Church and the prophecy of its founder: Here at least "the gates of hell will have finally prevailed!" See in "Improved Version" the notes on the first and second chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (a small part excepted) and on the beginning of the eighth chapter of St. John, to say nothing of the new version of the beginning of St. John's Gospel. All those

* "I retain the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke (of the birth of our Saviour) on the authority which alone I recognise in the criticism of the Greek Testament, the authority of manuscripts, fathers, and versions, which are unanimous in favour of those chapters."—Dr. Marsh's Letter to the Constructor of the Critical Review, p. 23. Cambridge, 1810.

If argument had any weight, these Unitarian Improvers would have been silenced long ago in their attempts to expunge the first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, by Dr. Bell's conclusive and unanswerable detail of arguments in his "Inquiry into the Divine Missions of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ." Among writers of a later date I may now refer too, with singular satisfaction, to the publication announced in Note G. by the Rev. E. Nares of Biddenden, to Doctor Laurence's "Critical Reflexions," &c. ch. 2.; and to Dr. Magee on "the Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement" in the Notes to his Appendix.
Epistles, and the Apocalypse, which are understood by the term
"Ἀντίλεγόμενον," are again brought into disrepute; that is, the
objections which were formerly made against the Epistle to the
Hebrews, that of James, the 2d Epistle of Peter, the 2d and 3d
of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Book of Revelation, are
carefully preserved and revived, and the high authority, on which
they were finally received into the canon as genuine, is now at
length to be superseded by the higher authority of these new
editors, pronouncing them apocryphal, so that we should read
them with little satisfaction and recommend them with little
confidence. Some of them indeed they would allow to be pub-
licly read for edification, but "not in proof of any doctrine!" But
see Doddridge, part vi. p. 268, 269. and Jones on the Canonical
Authority of the New Testament. See also Bishop Watson's
art. 6. § 19. and Dr. Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iv. With respect
to the canon, however, the Bishop of Lincoln in this instance,
as in many others, has given us such a comprehensive and such
a candid statement of the question (in vol. i. part ii. ch. 1. of his
Elements of Christian Theology) that it is needless to refer to
other works. See particularly pp. 275, 276. and his lordship's
separate statement of the respective testimonies to the genuineness
of the several books of the New Testament.

Note K. p. 443.

Even Mr. Lindsey renders "he was greater than me," with the
approbation of Dr. Lardner, &c. and none of them seems to have
thought the present tense an improvement! Positivus gradus
apud Graecos sæpius usurpatur pro comparativo. Πρῶτος, prior,
superior, antiquior, praestantior: per Enallagēn pro ἠπρότερος.
"Tempore et existentia prior." Lightfoot's Harmonia. The
obvious sense of this passage is of course "inadmissible" by the
present editors. But see their basis, the Archbishop's version, and
indeed all the commentators in Poli Synopsis, besides Burkitt,
Trapp, &c. and particularly Campbell on John i. 15. and John
xv. 18. decisively in favour of the received text.

Note L. p. 443.

The translation of Αὐγγέλος, messenger, is rejected by Mr. King,
(see Morsels of Criticism, section 4. p. 182.) and he maintains
that John the Baptist was "really an angel;" but although
Zacharias and Elizabeth were both "well stricken in years,"
we read expressly in Luke i. 13. "Elizabeth thy wife shall bear
these a son" and with all due deference to the learning and abili-
ties of that author, I cannot bring my mind to a conviction of
the propriety of his criticism in this instance. Sarah, Rebecca,
Rachel, and Hannah, though previously barren, could only re-
gard their respective children as the offspring of human parents;
I mean that Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Samuel are not to be con-
sidered as of divine origin, though the circumstances of their birth were extraordinary, and in some sense miraculous. But I leave Mr. King’s interpretation to more competent judges.

Note M. p. 443.


i. e. the mountainous country of Judæa: “Partes deserti anteriores: loci minus culti, ubi pagi, vici, oppida rariora.”—Pol. Syn.

Note N. p. 444.

Παρακάλητος, comforter, advocate.] It is true that the present editors have the authority of Beza for the word “advocate;” but as they seldom regard that authority, it seems only to have weight with them as far as it may suit their own views; while it happens that in this instance Beza’s translation has been generally deserted by the Protestant interpreters. See Campbell in favour of a third term, that of “monitor,” on John xiv. 6. and his 8th Preliminary Dissertation, part iii. § 8. p. 369. on the Greek Παρακάλητος. See also Dr. Edwards’s Theologia reformata, vol. i. article viii. p. 488. and Lightfoot, Whitby, and the Commentators in general, in favour of the term comforter. The Holy Spirit was doubtless in some lights an advocate, (as to Christ and his gospel,) and he was in other lights a comforter (as to the Apostles and the faithful). See to this effect Whitby on 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Note O. p. 445.

ϕαίζω— corrumpo, vexo, vasto, calamitaten inferno, profilio, perdo, infesto ; venio cum pernicie.

ϕαίζω hic quod ἀπολέσθη disperdet in Matt. xxi. 41. and doubtless the destruction of the offender is here to be understood as in the instances of Athaliah, 2 Kings xi. 16. and of Belshazzar, Daniel v. 1. “illam quod templum, hunc quod templi donaria profanusset.”— Grothus.


“Quod si quis velit Paronomasiam servare, vertat licebit, si quis Dei templum ductruit, hunc ductret Deus, ut Erasmo placuit in annotationibus.” Beza in loc. who adds “Hilarius in Psalm. lxiv. utrobique corrumpendi vocabulo usus est, sed nimium impropiē.” Consult also Parkhurst, Macknight, Bishop Fell, and others. What an indefensible mode of improving the sense of the sacred text, “God will corrupt him!” See the Improved Version, 1 Cor. iii. 17. and the received text as usual omitted.

Note P. p. 447.

See Improved Version, page 62: but see rather Dodwell and Horbery (in refutation of Whiston) on the Eternity of future Punishment; and the last article of Pearson on the Creed, and Craven’s Sermons, 1783. See also Parkhurst under Αἰώνος, § 2, quoting Mark iii. 29. The various references which have been given in these notes have been made under an idea that they
may possibly be acceptable and satisfactory to some part of my readers, though many will deem them superfluous.

Note Q. p. 447.

It is a serious and melancholy consideration, immediately connected with this part of my subject, that in London and all populous towns the number and capacity of our churches should be so greatly inadequate as they are to the accommodation of the poorer classes (that large and important part) of our community, who, as members of the Established Church, are virtually precluded from a due attendance on public worship. It has been justly observed that "the consequence is obvious, and it is deplorable: It is a national misfortune: Its effects are schism, disaffection, and depravity!" Thousands annually are thus rendered indifferent to the duties of the sabbath, and finally become hardened to a total violation of that sacred day, in habits of idleness, intemperance, and vice! Thousands are also driven by this cruel neglect of their spiritual interests (and we must commend their motive) to the miscellaneous mass of religious seceders from the National Church; and thus they become prejudiced against its doctrines and its ministers; alienated from those principles of civil and religious union which it is an essential duty of Christians to maintain: see on this subject the excellent Lectures of the late Bishop Porteus on St. Matthew, vol. i. lect. viii. p. 205. See likewise page 5. of the Bishop of Landaff's impressive sermon before the Society for the Suppression of Vice: mentioned also by the author of "Zeal without Innovation," with additional remarks in his second chapter; and page 471. of that admirable work Archdeacon Daubeney's Guide to the Church. The annual appropriation of a certain sum from the public purse for the erection of churches, under proper conditions and judicious regulations, would surely be a measure of the utmost advantage to the interests of religion! If a third part of the sum required for the building of a church were to be allotted by Parliament as often as the inhabitants of our principal towns should raise by other means the two remaining thirds, it would perhaps encourage this important object in a sufficient degree, while the expense would not be felt by any individual. Had this aid been given (for example) to the liberal exertions of the town and neighbourhood of Birmingham, a spacious free church* would have been completed several years ago, instead of having stood so long unfinished and useless, a subject of regret (if not reproach) to its friends, and of gratification (if not triumph) to its enemies! It would be difficult to estimate the beneficial effects of such an institution, in each populous emporium of British commerce; especially in times like these, when modern improvements of the Christian faith are thus provided "for popular use, in a pocket edition without notes!"

*I have now the sincere satisfaction of adding that the consecration of this Church has been at length accomplished, July 6th, 1813.
Evangelical divines, the only true Churchmen, &c.] Let me hope that the application of these terms may not be misunderstood by my professional brethren: that no offence may be taken where none is intended to be given. The active and zealous ministry of respectable individuals is sometimes exposed to unwarrantable imputations; and a deep sense of duty, which excites them to unusual energy and vigilance, is unjustly ascribed to the impulse of enthusiasm. But in these instances the language of irony recoils on their assailants, and a term of ridicule is an honourable distinction. The defilement of which I speak is that of spiritual pride: it attaches not to those who may receive a title of preeminence contemptuously from others, but to those who apply it pharisaically to themselves: It is when the term "Evangelical" is assumed, not given: It is when the tokens of a "true Churchman" are arrogantly claimed and exclusively assigned, and that too in disparagement of the regular clergy, to lessen their influence, and to seduce the people from their churches. So again, the defilement of which I speak is committed when the scriptural doctrines of the Church of England are perverted or opposed by her clergy; when her cause is betrayed, and the national pulpits are abused, in support of those tenets which are inconsistent with her articles, her homilies, and her liturgy: It is when private opinions promote public schism!

Above fifty years ago the excellent Archbishop Seeker expressed himself very forcibly on this part of my subject: "Et cum præter adversarios veteres, novi et domestici nuper ex ipso academiarum nostrantium sinu prosiluerint, qui se solos æternæ salutis tramitem communestrare, nos in pervicaciam caecorum more evagari, passim predicant, curatissimè dispiciendum est, ut rectō cursu veritatis viam insistamus; horum nec astuti illecti, nec timore percussi, nec odio flagrantès: cavendum, ne, si illi sermones suos ad vulgic captum nimis accommodant ac demittunt, nos hoc nimis dedignemur; ne, si illi sunt justo vehementiores, nos frigidi videamur, et affectuum piorum expertes; ne, si illi efficaciam fidei immoderatè cum maximo fidelium periculo extollunt, nos non minori ingrâtæ eam deprimamus et extenuemus; ne, si illi inanias visa et phantasmata pro certis pignoribus remissionis peccatorum habent, nos in genuinum Spiritus Sancti testimonium sinum imprudentër contumeliosi."—Oratio Synodalis.
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